Old Times

Deeley and his wife Kate are visited by Anna, a mysterious friend of Kate’s from long ago. What begins as a trip down memory lane quickly becomes something more, as long-simmering feelings of fear and jealousy begin to fuel the trio’s passions, sparking a seductive battle for power.

a note from Artistic Director Todd Haimes

What appeals to me in Pinter’s work is the way that it refuses to be pinned down. Not only does each actor, director, and designer develop a new interpretation, but each individual audience member brings a unique perspective to the table. Whatever you take away from the experience is right, in that it reflects what the play said specifically to you. I think people can feel intimidated by Pinter because they think they’ll have the “wrong” answer to the meaning of the play. But there’s truly no such thing. In the world of Pinter, the landscape is always shifting, memory can’t be trusted, passion can flare to violence at any moment, and “wrong” and “right” are simply irrelevant.

when

Autumn. Night.

where

A converted farmhouse.

who

Deeley - a man in his forties
Kate - a woman in her forties
Anna - a woman in her forties
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Ted Sod: American audiences know you primarily as an actor, but you’re also a director and a composer. How and why did you decide to direct for the theatre?

Douglas Hodge: In England, I’ve had a more balanced career directing and acting. It can be quite difficult to juggle the two careers. When I left RADA, I was absolutely set on directing, but I kept being offered acting jobs. Michael Grandage had the idea that I should be his first Associate Director at the Donmar, and I continued going between the two. The lead-in time for a director is huge. You have to commit to directing a year’s time ahead, with casting and designing, and it’s not always easy if you are doing a TV series like “Penny Dreadful.” When I did Cyrano for Roundabout, I was originally supposed to direct and play the title role, but I quickly realized that was madness and we called in Jamie Lloyd, who directed me in Osborne’s Inadmissible Evidence. When Todd Haimes asked what I wanted to do next at Roundabout, I said, “I want to direct.”

TS: Do you prefer directing?
DH: It just tends to be that the grass is always greener. If I’m doing a movie, I suddenly think, Oh God, I wish I could just get a play script I could get my teeth into. If I’m doing eight shows a week in a West End musical, I think, God, how lovely it would be to be in a TV series right now.

TS: Tell us about your history working with Harold Pinter.
DH: We met doing No Man’s Land. Nobody had dared to do another production of No Man’s Land, because it was done originally by Gielgud and Richardson. It was Lady Antonia Fraser, Harold’s wife, who said, “Harold, if you play the part Richardson played, you can finally get that play back on again, and people won’t be so frightened of it.” Harold, having not written for fifteen, sixteen years—he’d had a block—started acting again. He and I and two others were sharing a dressing room at the Almeida. We were both nervous. It was a great leveler in some ways because he was more accessible to me than if he’d just been the writer sitting at the back of the theatre. We became firm friends during that run. And he started to write again. He wrote Moonlight. About three quarters through the run of No Man’s Land, he said, “Listen, there’s this new play I’ve written, and I want you to have a look at it; there’s a part in it for you.” I did Moonlight at the Almeida and the West End, and then I did Betrayal, The Lover and The Collection, The Caretaker. I also directed Victoria Station, Dumb Waiter, and all the sketches.

TS: I’ve read that you consider Pinter a genius.
DH: There is nobody like him in terms of his exactness, rigorousness of thought, and the volatility of his mind. He certainly was a difficult person to get along with. There was this whole volcano of ruthless and frightening emotions that he lived in. And when you act his parts, you become aware of that. I think in terms of me calling him a genius, which is not a word I use lightly, I would say that he’s one of the top three writers of the last one hundred years of the theatre—unparalleled really. I think that the nature of his genius was he had this extraordinary ear for the musicality of the East End Jewish area that he grew up in, a neighborhood that had its own sense of humor, rules, violence, aspirations, and political bias. His ear for that was so acute that he heard it as once removed. When you do his work, it can sound just like a piece of music. Other times, you realize it is completely organic. The theatre was his very lifeblood and his absolute soul, really. I’m not sure that anyone of his ilk remains. There will never be another like him. There are many people that he’s inspired and who sound like him, but I look around and I don’t see anyone with such a devoted idea of what theatre can be and how it can change lives.

TS: What are the acting challenges of Pinter’s language?
DH: Essentially you need to fill your storehouse with enormous emotions—murderous, psychotic emotions—to the point of almost breakdown, in the backstory of the character, and then you step on stage and you’re as polite as you can possibly be. You manage all those deep feelings with short sentences. There is great feeling underneath it. The language he’s using is just literally the tip of the iceberg. He encapsulated a way of communicating that was exactly the way people were speaking at the time, and still are, to some degree. A broken untrusting fractured currency of language. He had an untrammeled access to his subconscious. He was never afraid to allow poetic moments.

TS: Why did you choose to direct Old Times?
DH: It was one of the few plays that I’d never seen of his, and I knew that it was a play that is close to Todd Haimes’s heart. When
Roundabout was in a precarious financial situation, Anthony Hopkins turned up and played Deeley in *Old Times*, and it was a success. Pinter said at one point, “I want to get rid of the doors and windows, and to break out of that.” And I think *Old Times*, which he wrote in three days, is the moment where he started to break new ground and write pieces that were truly experimental, evocative, and poetic, works that were different from *The Caretaker* or *The Homecoming*.

TS: Do you think audiences will see this as a contemporary play or a period piece?

DH: It was written in 1971 and it will be played in 1971, but the theme is jealousy for your lover’s past. And in many a relationship, I know that can surface like a terrible monster. I think it’s very relevant—the issues in it about memory and time and the structure, too, are all modern.

TS: I’ve read at least twenty different interpretations of this play. Did you do any research into those interpretations?

DH: I read all those interpretations, and I don’t think any of them are wrong. I think that they all exist as the reverberations of a natural piece of poetry or a dance piece that you might see. You could come away from seeing *Old Times* and say, “It meant this to me,” or “I got that from it.” And it wouldn’t be a wrong interpretation. What I do feel though is that academic interpretation, in the end, diminishes the piece. The production that I would love to direct is one where we make very specific choices and the play becomes a launch pad for your own imagination. The audience is able to think, God, this could be me talking to my lover now, or it could be my parents’ lover here, or it could be…”

The play is about memory and recollection, so I’ve done research about memory and how it’s perceived. I think Harold himself believed that there is no past, that the past is eternally present, and becomes more present. And the more emotional the moments that we have in the past are, the more present they are. There’s a wonderful quote by Mark Twain—and I’m paraphrasing—“I’m old enough now to only remember the things that never actually happened.”

TS: What traits did you need from the actors you’ve cast?

DH: Kelly Reilly is playing Kate, who is a wonderfully sensual being. I think everything comes from her shyness—she has the most immense power and is able to look out the window for a long time and just dream. Kelly has all of those qualities; she has this great, exotic, strange beauty—a real bird of paradise. There’s a quietness about her, an almost unknowable quality. Eve Best has this enormous strength and power, I think. She has a tremendous authority on stage and is equally sexy and wonderful in my eyes. After she had done *The Homecoming* in New York, Pinter said, “Listen, there’s a role you must do in *Old Times*—Anna—please play it one day.” So when we offered to her, she said yes within fifteen minutes. For Deeley, I knew I needed someone who knows the vernacular and has brave authority. Someone sexy and elegant, but who also has a rough diamond edge of violence and emotion to him. Clive Owen is the first person I talked to. He read the piece and immediately called me up and said, “What does it mean? Do you think it means this? Is it this interpretation or is it that?”

TS: Do you have any advice for a young person who wants to direct?

DH: You’re there to let the play out and enable every single department to do the best work they’ve ever done. That’s a thrilling way to direct and to live your life.*
Harold Pinter was born in Hackney, in London’s East End, in October of 1930. An only child, he was born to Jewish parents of very moderate means; his father, a tailor, and his mother, a homemaker, were first-generation descendants of Eastern European immigrants. Like many of his contemporaries, Pinter’s childhood was shaped by the onslaught of World War II; at the age of nine, he was evacuated from London through Operation Pied Piper and resettled in a town in Cornwall. The sense of isolation he felt in Cornwall would come to influence his work, as would the changed London to which he returned during the Blitz, where he was witness to, as his 2008 Guardian obituary put it, “the dramatic nature of wartime life – the palpable fear, the sexual desperation, the genuine sense that everything could end tomorrow.”

Pinter was 15 when World War II came to a close, and by that point the nonconformity and political skepticism that would eventually make its way into his writing had already begun to take root. When he was called, at the age of 18, to report for a period of mandatory military service, he refused. After two military tribunals and two trials, Pinter escaped a prison term but was fined thirty pounds for his conscientious objection.

A fairly apathetic student, Pinter had left school at 16, but his interest in literature (surpassed only by his love for cricket) belied the brevity of his education. He was a film fanatic as well, and a particular fan of surrealist cinema, but he rarely saw or read plays. Still, he had enough experience with drama (mainly acting in Shakespeare plays in grammar school) that he knew he wanted to be an actor. He eventually studied at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art (which he hated and soon left) and the Central School of Speech and Drama. Though he was later quite dismissive of his time at both institutions, the schooling nonetheless prepared him to work as an actor, and he toured Ireland with a repertory company throughout his 20s. It was through this company that he met his first wife, actress Vivien Merchant, whom he wed in 1956.

Pinter had been writing since the age of 12 or 13, when a romance with a neighborhood girl soured and he turned to poetry as a coping mechanism. By 1957, Pinter had already put hundreds of poems and numerous pieces of short fiction to paper, with a dozen or so published in magazines. In ’57, he also wrote his first play, The Room, at the request of a friend, Henry Woolf, for the University of Bristol. Woolf asked for the play to be delivered within a week; Pinter, incredulous, told him he might be able to get it to him in six months, but ended up finishing the play within four days, a brief working period that would be repeated in other first drafts, including that of Old Times (which Pinter completed in three days).

When Merchant became pregnant in 1958, Pinter decided to commit to writing full-time, and he and Merchant moved to London to see out the production of his first full-length play. Unfortunately, this play, The Birthday Party, did not deliver the security they had been hoping for. It was a flop, roundly dismissed by critics, and lasted only a week in the theatre. Pinter framed the box office’s final statement: a total intake of 260 pounds, 140 of them on the play’s opening night. But there was one bright spot in the failure: a review by Harold Hobson of The Sunday Times of London, who praised the play and proclaimed that “Mr. Pinter, on the evidence of this work, possesses the most original, disturbing and arresting talent in theatrical London.”

The review marked a shift in Pinter’s career. His next play, The Caretaker, was met with a frenzy of approval. The play premiered at the Arts Theatre in 1960 and quickly transferred to the West End, where it secured Pinter’s reputation as a preeminent dramatist. Fame and commissions poured in, and Pinter, Merchant, and their son Daniel were able to upgrade to an apartment in the middle-class district of Kew. But a five-year hiatus followed Pinter’s completion of The Caretaker, in which he struggled to write his next play. During this period, he wrote a draft of The
Hothouse, his first stab at a more satirical, political play, but he was unsatisfied with the results and showed it to no one (it was eventually published and produced in 1980).

When his next play, The Homecoming, finally premiered in London in 1965, it was a success. The play transferred to Broadway in 1967, garnering six Tony® nominations and four wins, including the statue for Best Play. But the production was met with mixed reactions from both critics and audiences. Pinter recanted the tension-filled opening night in The Progressive, explaining that “the hostility towards the play was palpable. You could see it. The great thing was, the actors went on and felt it and hated the audience back even more. And they gave it everything they’d got. By the end of the evening, the audience was defeated.” Pinter recalled the event as “one of the greatest theatrical nights of [his] life.”

It comes as no surprise, then, that Pinter was quite comfortable with an antagonistic relationship to his audiences. In a Paris Review interview (conducted the same year as The Homecoming incident), he noted that his primary concern upon a first performance was always “whether the performance has expressed what one set out to express in writing the play,” not whether the audience enjoyed the result.

In the period following The Homecoming, Pinter’s personal life was also undergoing a transformation. No stranger to infidelity (he’d conducted an affair—rumored to be the basis of Betrayal—with journalist and TV personality Joan Bakewell from 1962 - 1969), he began seeing Lady Antonia Fraser, a biographer and historian, in 1975. Both she and Pinter were still married (he to Merchant; she to politician Sir Hugh Fraser). These marriages eventually broke up in a blaze of publicity, and Pinter and Fraser married in 1980. With the marriage, Pinter gained six stepchildren in addition to his son with Merchant (this son, Daniel, rarely saw Pinter in the 80s and cut off all contact in 1993, changing his surname to Brand).

Pinter’s marriage to Fraser was a happy one, lasting through his death in 2008. The marriage also marked the beginning of a shift in his political concerns. In his ‘67 Paris Review interview, he had denied any interest in writing political plays, saying that “Ultimately, politics do bore me, though I recognize they are responsible for a good deal of suffering.” But in time, his tolerance for observing that suffering grew thin, and he became an outspoken critic of foreign and domestic policy in both Britain and America. The plays of this later period, One for the Road (1984), Mountain Language (1988), Party Time (1991), and Ashes to Ashes (1996) are among his more political works, touching on issues ranging from the psychology of torture to the insidiousness of totalitarian government.

As Pinter aged, he also began to acknowledge that the slippery power dynamics of his early plays were, in themselves, political. In the very same Paris Review interview in which he denied any political aspect to his writing, he also said, “The world is a pretty violent place, it’s as simple as that, so any violence in the plays comes out quite naturally… The violence is really only an expression of the question of dominance and subservience, which is possibly a repeated theme in my plays… I wouldn’t call this violence so much as a battle for positions; it’s a very common, everyday thing.” In later years, this battle took on a political tint, as Pinter expressed a growing hatred of what he perceived to be the hypocrisy of British and American democracy. In interviews of this period, he invokes everything from the US prison system to the British privatization of railways to the suppression of Margaret Thatcher’s regime to the NATO bombing of Serbia as examples of power gone awry. In his 2001 Progressive interview, he was particularly rankled by the propagandistic language of the governments in question—the blankets of rhetoric that implied everything was fine. “I’m always looking for those schisms between language and action,
what you say and what you do,” he explained. “This is where I find constant sources of curiosity and disgust.” Indeed, it is where he found constant inspiration for his plays, in which everyday language can be both poetic and menacing and in which characters rarely say what they mean.

In 2005, Pinter was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature. Still recovering from a period of poor health (he had successfully beaten back esophageal cancer in 2002, but bouts of illness had followed), he accepted the award via video and used the opportunity to attack US foreign policy, particularly as embodied by the invasion of Iraq. Though Pinter also wrote less overtly political plays in his later career (notably 1993’s Moonlight and 2000’s Celebration, his last play), they remain, like all of Pinter’s work, pieces of a larger puzzle. Pinter’s plays have generally been split into three periods. The earliest, the “Comedies of Menace” (The Room, The Birthday Party, The Caretaker, The Homecoming), take place in run-down environments in which a sense of unease pervades, a strange outsider looms, and humor is both a veil for desperation and a protection against violence. The following period, called the “Memory Plays” (Old Times, No Man’s Land, Betrayal) take place in more posh surroundings. These plays are propelled by uncertainty, by the ambiguities of love and sex and the unreliability of memory. The later plays, the “Political Plays,” unmask the subtextual power battles of Pinter’s earlier work and foreground them against broader settings.

But these periods are not inflexible categorizations; many elements of Pinter’s work remain consistent through the vagaries of his subject matter. His emphasis on language (iconic for the rhythmic poetry within its colloquial simplicity), his impossible-to-pin-down characters (his work embraced evasiveness and refuted the notion that writers must hold authoritative knowledge of their characters), and even the stylistic tics of his writing (a habitual use of the “pause,” for which he became notorious) are qualities so distinctive as to have spawned their own adjective, “Pinteresque.” Pinter, who was often loathe to consider himself any sort of influence or icon, rejected the term, insisting that he didn’t know what it meant. But to generations of theatregoers, it has come to represent, in the New York Times’ succinct phrasing, the “ominous in the everyday and the noise within silence.” Within these two realms, Pinter extracts lust, violence, fear, humor, nostalgia, and uncertainty from the most unassuming of ingredients. The result may be disorienting or invigorating, but it is always, very distinctly, Pinter.

In describing his work, Pinter once said that his plays were about “the weasel under the cocktail cabinet.” He came to regret the remark (“Such are the dangers of speaking in public,” he lamented to The Progressive), insisting that it was meant more to stymie the reporter than to provide some grand metaphor for his work. But the image is a useful one: a sense of something off-putting, menacing, or surprising—primal, even—hiding under the banal and civilized. Pinter passed away in London in 2008, the result of liver cancer. He remained artistically active in his final years, penning his last screenplay (Sleuth) in 2007 and speaking, publishing, and performing throughout the aughts. One of his most iconic performances was also one of his last. In 2006, performing in Samuel Beckett’s one-man show Krapp’s Last Tape at the Royal Court Theatre, Pinter drew sold-out crowds to the show’s weeklong run. Audiences were drawn in by Pinter’s legacy, by his legendary friendship with Beckett, and by his encroaching ill health; the waning of his career (he had acknowledged, in 2005, that he would not write another play) brought a meta-awareness to the production that was both painful and profound. Then, and upon his death two years later, Pinter would be remembered as one of the most influential writers of his generation, an artist who challenged his audiences, contemporaries, and critics and whose characters will haunt and delight for decades to come.*
Every writer has his or her own process. Some write the last page first or refuse to start new pieces on a certain day of the week. And most playwrights are intensely private about whatever their process may be. So we are lucky that, upon the occasion of the Broadway debut of *Old Times* in 1971, Pinter sat down with critic Mel Gussow of the *New York Times* and opened a window into this typically murky aspect of an artist’s work.

Pinter’s inspiration was the idea of having two people talk about someone else—which is exactly how *Old Times* starts, with Kate and Deeley talking about Anna. Next, Pinter wasn’t sure how to bring the third person on stage and asked himself, “Is she actually going to walk in the door? Or is it going to be a question of one of those blackouts?” Pinter came up with an alternative, one far more ambiguous in meaning than the other options he had considered. He decided to have this third character already be on stage while the other two talk about her. The audience wonders if this third character can hear what is being said, why she isn’t responding, or if she is even really there. But Pinter never gives us these answers—instead we, as the audience, have to decide for ourselves what is and isn’t going on onstage.

He finished the first draft of the entire script in three days. Pinter had written so fast that he labeled the characters ‘A,’ ‘B,’ and ‘C’ instead of giving them real names—which he often did in his first drafts. At first, his working title was *Others With Dancers* (a repeated line throughout the play), but he changed his mind, thinking, “That’s not it at all,” and decided to name the play *Old Times* instead.

With his completed first draft, Pinter gave the manuscript first, as he always did, to his wife Vivien Merchant, who went on to play the part of Anna. Halfway through reading the play, however, Vivien expressed confusion, as she had no idea whether the characters were men or women because their names were just letters. Pinter explained the characters’ respective genders to his wife, making her able to understand the story.

Months later, after the third draft, Pinter staged the play in the privacy of his study. Playing all the parts, Pinter, who was also an actor and a director, blocked the play, meticulously moving the characters around the room and through the lines, pauses, and silences of the play. No one else was watching, making him the audience as well.

Next he sent the play, as he had done with every play since *The Homecoming* (1965), to his good friend, absurdist playwright Samuel Beckett, whose opinion Pinter strongly valued. Beckett liked *Old Times*, which greatly pleased Pinter. The third person to read the play was Pinter’s director, Peter Hall. Working in close collaboration, the two prepared the play for production at the Royal Shakespeare Company. Before the play opened in London, Pinter wrote one new line, and for the Broadway debut he said that he changed “a silence to a pause.” Otherwise, the play is exactly as it was originally written. Some writers go through tens or even hundreds of rewrites, and many scripts and plays can take years to write. But for Pinter, that wasn’t the case. Roundabout’s *Old Times* really is almost exactly the same as the draft Pinter wrote in three days back in 1970.
Interview with Actor
Clive Owen

Education Dramaturg Ted Sod spoke with actor Clive Owen about Old Times and his role as Deeley.

Ted Sod: Why did you choose to play the role of Deeley in Harold Pinter’s Old Times? What do you think the play is about?

Clive Owen: I’ve been thinking about doing a play for some time. I was really just waiting for the right thing to come along. I love this play; I think it might be Pinter’s best play. I think it’s just a great piece of writing, and I love the part of Deeley. I was very encouraged by the fact that Doug Hodge, the director, had worked with Pinter often and seems to understand his work very well. It took me a while to say yes because I hadn’t done a play for so long that I had to be sure that it was the right one to do.

In terms of what the play is about, I think it’s one of his more elusive plays. I honestly think you could ask a number of people who have read or seen this play what the play was about and they would say different things. I’ve read reviews from past productions, and people are forever commenting on how difficult it is to really pin down what the play is about. To me it’s primarily about two things: how human beings remember things that happened a while ago and how we reshape those memories according to the way we want to remember them. It’s also a play that is fueled with a sexual jealousy. That seems to be a big theme in Old Times—what went on before this couple became a couple—what they did, how they behaved. The beauty of it is that it is wide open to interpretation, which means every time you do a production of a Pinter play, the people coming together create something original. I feel that our version of Old Times will be different from anybody else’s, and it should be. The play is beautifully written, and the rhythm and structure is so clear that, at the end of the day, we will make decisions in the rehearsal room and connect to things that I am sure will have an effect. The play will have its life. If we just commit to it, it will resonate.

Ted Sod: Does the play have personal resonance for you?

Clive Owen: I wouldn’t say so particularly, no. I do think that Pinter is quintessentially English. I feel excited by that. There’s an underlying anger within Pinter and a seething quality that I find to be quite English.

Ted Sod: Is it a challenge to come back to the stage after working for so many years in front of the camera?

Clive Owen: For sure it is, yes. It was a big decision because of that. When I started acting, it was only to do theatre. I wasn’t really interested in doing film or television. I joined a youth theatre, and I trained at RADA. Then my career took the course it did and I ended up for the last ten to fifteen years doing primarily film—working in front of a camera. Of course, I’ll be nervous by going back on stage, because it’s been a while—but there’s also something exciting about reawakening the thing that set me alight to begin with. It’s why I became an actor. The idea of going into rehearsal for weeks has reminded me how much I loved it, how much I was inspired by it. I’m nervous but very excited at the same time.

Ted Sod: When you were doing stage work or studying at RADA, did you ever work on a play of Pinter’s before?

Clive Owen: No, I haven’t, actually. Over the years I have been asked a number of times to do Pinter plays. I have to say, this is one of my favorites and one of my favorite characters. It was great that this play was put in front of me at this time. I’m beginning to work on Old Times now, just reading it. Pinter’s structure, rhythms, and the way he puts things together—it’s very clear why he does what he does. There’s a real muscularity about it. It’s so precise and so thought through. Sometimes his sentences are odd—it’s not the easiest or most natural way of saying something—but once you mine it and get on top of it, it’s really clear why he’s positioning the words in that way. There’s strength and a precision of meaning in his words, and that is really exciting to begin to work on.

Ted Sod: Do you think that’s because he was an actor himself? Do you think he understood what actors need? He’s become notorious for the Pinter pause?

Clive Owen: I think there’s an element of that. I think he writes great parts. I think his plays are full of conflict. The characters are always in conflict, which always creates good drama. I feel, when you read his work, that the pauses and silences he’s written become really clear. I’ve seen interviews with him where he talks about the famous “Pinter pause.” He explains what a pause and a silence are used for. People get a bit obsessed by it, but to me it’s a very clear indication of a change in thought or a pull back on the rhythm. It seems very clear to me why he’s written them into his scripts.
“TO ME IT’S PRIMARILY ABOUT TWO THINGS: HOW HUMAN BEINGS REMEMBER THINGS THAT HAPPENED A WHILE AGO AND HOW WE RESHAPE THOSE MEMORIES ACCORDING TO THE WAY WE WANT TO REMEMBER THEM.”

TS: You spoke about reading the play in depth. What other preparation do you have to do for a role like this? Do you have to do research or do you just wait until you get to the room and work with the director?

CO: Obviously that’s the crucial bit, but I go back and look at the history of Pinter and try to find out as much as I can. He doesn’t really say too much about his plays. I think he’s a great believer in the plays speaking for themselves. He’s not going to over-analyze them. Also, his plays have an effect because of where they sit. It’s not about black and white. Often he’s working in a very murky gray area. His plays aren’t literal, they’re much more abstract than that. I’ve found out as much as I can about him. I’ve watched some old movies of Pinter. There’s nothing in terms of research and background to the parts. It’s on the page. It’s really just about reading a play over and over so that ideas come to you.

TS: Have you ever been directed by Doug?

CO: No, not at all. I met Doug and talked to him about the play. It feels that he really does understand Pinter probably as well as anybody. The fact that he’s done a lot of Pinter plays, the fact that he worked with Pinter, is very reassuring to me.

TS: Can you tell us what you look for from a director? What is it that you like to get from a director?

CO: Inspired, really. It’s a very difficult question. It’s not always obvious things. It’s really just to be supported and inspired. I think the best directors get the best work out of actors by making them feel good and making them feel like they can do anything. How you get to that point, I don’t know, but that’s the objective. I worked with the great Mike Nichols. People always talked about how brilliant he was with actors. You just wanted to do it for that guy, but also he was great at making you feel like you could do anything. When an actor is in that position, they’re wide open, and that’s where you get the best work, really.

TS: Do you have any advice for young people who may be thinking about a career as an actor? Is that something you’re willing to share?

CO: The only thing I would say is: If you are thinking about it, make sure you’re doing it for the right reasons. We live in a time where people want things so quickly. When I started acting, I always had the idea I was in it for the long haul. I wanted to make a career out of it. I loved what I was doing. The idea of making a living out of it—something that I could do for a long time—was really attractive to me. It seemed to me that the best way to do that was to work hard and make sure I was doing it, always, for the right reasons. The choices I’ve made, they’re all related to work, and doing work that I felt was important and fulfilling. That’s carried me all the way through. We do live in a time where people get things very quickly. It’s all so immediate. If I was advising anyone young who was going into acting, I would just say, it’s all about the work. Everything else that comes with acting is not as important as actually getting down and doing the work.”
Harold Pinter emerged as a playwright during a crucial turning point in the evolution of British theatre. Through most of the 1950s, the artistic and social orientation of English theatre was highly conservative. Playwrights Terence Rattigan and Noël Coward had become popular in the 1920s and ’30s and continued to dominate London stages in the ’40s and ’50s. Rattigan acknowledged that he was writing for an imaginary theatregoer whom he named Aunt Edna: a middle-class, conservative spectator who did not want to be challenged or feel uncomfortable.

During this same period in America, Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller dramatized the desires and anxieties of their audiences, and in Europe, Jean Genet, Samuel Beckett, and Eugene Ionesco exploded traditional narrative and structure. Meanwhile, English drama remained so insulated that Miller said it was “hermetically sealed against the way society moves.” Instead of representing the lives of real people in post-war society, the British stage clung to an old-fashioned style that had been popular before the war. Plays focused on upper- and upper-middle-class characters who accepted their place in the hierarchy and didn’t threaten the status quo. Well-made plotlines enforced a highly rational and reassuring view of life. Some popular plays, like Rattigan’s The Winslow Boy, took place prior to World War I and romanticized England’s distant past.

Any British playwright who wanted to push the boundaries faced official censorship. The Office of the Lord Chamberlain had to approve all plays performed everywhere except the smallest theatres. The Lord Chamberlain ruled on decency, impropriety, subject matter, and language, controlling what could be shown onstage until 1962.

The cue for a real change came in 1956. Director George Devine had observed Bertolt Brecht and the Berliner Ensemble and aspired to bring its rigor and political commitment to England. Devine founded his new English Stage Company at the Royal Court Theatre—some distance from London’s West End—and looked for plays that would challenge the current fare. His first production was John Osborne’s Look Back in Anger, a fierce drama about “angry young man” Jimmy Porter that portrayed sex, politics, and class as no British play had before. Critics applauded the play as a testament of alienated youth. It established a new movement known as “kitchen sink drama,” which focused on the grittier, dirtier, and poorer aspects of British life. For the first time in their lives, young and working-class Brits could see themselves onstage.

The success of Look Back in Anger proved there was an audience and appetite for vital new work and opened the door for other young playwrights such as John Arden, Shelagh Delaney, and 26-year-old Harold Pinter. This generation shared the experience of being teens during World War II, then coming of age during the Cold War. The constant threat of nuclear annihilation instilled a pessimistic, nonrational world view, which translated into challenging new theatrical visions. By the time Pinter’s The Birthday Party opened in 1958, the stage was set for a new movement of theatre that was innovative, relevant, and defiantly uninterested in pleasing Aunt Edna. •
From the hurt rage of Medea to the poisonous suspicion of Othello, romantic jealousy drives some of theatre’s most dramatic plays. Novelist Howard Johnson explains that “jealousy is wordy; it gorges on language. It is hyperbolic, growing fatter on every expression of itself. This is delicious for any writer who is not an understater of emotion.” While Harold Pinter may prefer to understate emotion, at least on the surface, a heated jealousy simmers beneath each word—and pause—of Old Times.

Psychologists understand jealousy as a multidimensional response, involving thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. It often starts with the thought, either based on actual evidence or sometimes with no basis in reality, that one’s relationship is threatened. An emotional reaction follows the thought, which leads to action. “Detective behaviors” involve asking questions, checking up on a partner, or reading their texts, while “protective behaviors” would include taking steps to keep one’s partner away from the rival.

Jealousy is linked to human evolution: it is in our biological interest to protect our mate from competition and ensure that our own genes survive. From an evolutionary view, men are more likely to feel jealous of sexual competition, while women are more jealous of romantic competition. Jealousy protects men from having their genes from being replaced by a competitor and from unknowingly raising someone else’s offspring. For women, a jealous response would help prevent one’s mate from wandering and abandoning their offspring.

Some jealousy is considered normal, even healthy. When there is an actual threat, jealousy may spur a couple to take action and reconcile. But jealousy is pathological, or extremely unhealthy, when the threat is only imagined and connected to delusional thinking or paranoia. Emotions and resulting jealous behavior may be extreme and even violent. Such jealousy is never healthy and can lead to abusive relationships.

The jealousy most apparent in Old Times would probably not be classified as healthy by most therapists. The real-life phenomenon known as “retroactive jealousy” (or retrospective, or retrograde jealousy) describes feeling threatened by a partner’s past relationships and sexual history. The threat is in the past, so it is usually imaginary rather than real. Retroactive jealousy is characterized by intrusive thoughts and images, highly-charged emotional responses, and extreme detective behaviors.

Retroactive jealousy may be linked to a number of subconscious drives. An intimate relationship may stir up childhood anxieties, such as feelings of not being loved by our parents or of competition with siblings. Fears of being left out and not feeling special can manifest in excessive curiosity about a partner’s past and a need for constant reassurance. Some people have a deep belief that we all have a limited amount of happiness allotted to us, leading to a fear that the partner was happier in the past than in the present relationship. Jealousy of the partner’s past can also lead to projection. Some people may unconsciously provoke insecurity in their partner by sending signals that their past relationship was better than the present one. By keeping their partner insecure and jealous, they can then hold the power in the relationship.

Theatre has always been a medium to explore the darker aspects of humanity, and Pinter explores jealousy in many of his plays. Perhaps, like Johnson, he too likes to explore “the dark, interior stickiness of the subject, where torment knows it should not be left to itself, but wants it no other way, and the victim forever haunts the border between the thing he fears and the thing he longs for.”
Roundabout Theatre Company has been producing Pinter’s plays since 1971, when the one act play The Lover opened in Roundabout’s original theatre, the basement of a converted supermarket on 26th Street. Old Times is Roundabout’s eleventh Pinter production—and in the American Airlines Theatre there will not be the sound of grocery carts rolling overhead. Take a journey through Roundabout’s history to find out more.
The work of Harold Pinter is notoriously difficult to pin down. His plays feel simultaneously quiet and loud, cool and heated, light and dense. So how to boil down a long and varied career into something more easily understood? The man himself, whose only attempt at describing his work amounted to saying it’s about “the weasel under the cocktail cabinet,” hasn’t provided us with much analysis. Here, we look at the words used by those who knew Pinter and his plays best to describe the essence of this playwright.

“[He had] gifts for finding the ominous in the everyday and the noise within silence [that] made him the most influential and imitated dramatist of his generation…Mr. Pinter captured the anxiety and ambiguity of life in the second half of the 20th century with terse, hypnotic dialogue filled with gaping pauses and the prospect of imminent violence…His plays often take place in a single, increasingly claustrophobic room, where conversation is a minefield and even innocuous-seeming words can wound.”

—Mel Gussow and Ben Brantley, The New York Times

“Man’s existential fear, not as an abstraction, but as something real, ordinary and acceptable as an everyday occurrence — here we have the core of Pinter’s work as a dramatist.”—Martin Esslin, Pinter: The Playwright

“[Before Pinter,] one thing plays had in common: you were supposed to believe what people said up there. If somebody comes in and says, ‘Tea or coffee?’ and the answer is ‘Tea,’ you are entitled to assume that somebody is offered a choice of two drinks, and the second person has stated a preference…[After Pinter, there are alternatives,] such as the man preferred coffee but the other person wished him to have tea, or that he preferred the stuff you make from coffee beans under the impression that it was called tea.”

—Tom Stoppard, Playwright

“Words are weapons that the characters use to discomfort or destroy each other.”

—Peter Hall, frequent director of Pinter plays

“He mapped out his own country with its own distinctive topography – a place haunted by the shifting ambivalence of memory, flecked by uncertainty, reeking of sex and echoing with strange, mordant laughter. It was, in short, Pinterland, and it will induce recognition in audiences, and ensure his classic status, for as long as plays are staged.”

—Michael Billington, The Guardian
PINTER BY THE NUMBERS

THEATRE

PINTER wrote 32 PLAYS

Directed 17 of his own PLAYS (one production was in French and one in Italian)

Acted in 7 of his own PLAYS

PINTER AND HODGE

Pinter plays
Harold Pinter
has appeared in

A Kind of Alaska 1998
The Lover 1998
The Collection 1998
Betrayal 1998
The Caretaker 2000
One for the Road 2001

Pinter plays
Douglas Hodge
has appeared in

No Man’s Land 1993
No易于 1993
Moony sensit 1995
Old Times 1985
The Homecoming 1969
The Caretaker 1960

As the characters Hirst and Foster, Pinter and Hodge (respectively) shared two “silences” and no “pauses” in No Man’s Land. Pinter and Hodge never played the same character.

ACTIVIST

Pinter publicly opposed:
- Cold War politics
- Nuclear weapons
- Apartheid
- The Gulf War
- NATO bombing of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo conflict
- 2001 War in Afghanistan
- 2003 Invasion of Iraq
- Torture of imprisoned writers in Turkey
- Turkish suppression of the Kurdish language
- The U.S. blockade of Cuba

Pinter supported:
- A fair trial for Slobodan Milosevic
- Independent Jewish Voices, a group which spoke out against pro-Israel bias in Britain

FILM

PINTER wrote 24 SCREENPLAYS

3 were never filmed

2 were nominated for Oscars®
(The French Lieutenant’s Woman & Betrayal)

8 BOOKS OF POETRY

1 NOBEL PRIZE

BROADWAY

PINTER IN NYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadway Productions</th>
<th>Off-Broadway Productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Homecoming
Betrayal
No Man’s Land
The Birthday Party
Old Times
The Collection
The Lover
Landscape
Silence
The Room
A Kind of Alaska
The House
The Dumbwaiter
A Slight Ache
Moonlight
One for the Road
Mountain Language
Aches to Ashes
Celebration
Victoria Station
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Playwrights give actors and directors clues to how a line or scene should be played in many ways. Harold Pinter is noted for writing ellipses, silences, and pauses into his scripts—as many as 222 in one play. These pauses highlight the moments when something important is not being said or when a crisis is taking place within a character or between characters. Pinter's pauses are connected to his distrust of words: to Pinter, language is "highly ambiguous," mostly "stale, dead terminology," and another meaning lurks "below what is said." He said, "My job is not to impose upon [my characters], not to subject them to a false articulation, by which I mean forcing a character to speak what he could not speak."

It can be difficult for an actor or director to discover each pause's specific meaning and place within the rhythm of the text. The term "Pinter pause" in popular culture refers to a long, pregnant pause on stage, sometimes connoting a slow production.

Sir Peter Hall, prolific director of Pinter's plays, has explained how he interprets each type of "Pinter Pause."

1. . . : Three dots signifies a pressure point. A search for a word – the character is unable to express him/herself clearly.
3. Silence: Extreme crisis point. Often a character emerges from a silence completely changed. This change is often unexpected and highly dramatic – the actor must fill the pause with intention.

### PAUSES & SILENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Pauses</th>
<th>Silences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Birthday Party</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Caretaker</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Homecoming</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Times</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Man's Land</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrayal</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dumbwaiter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Silent Ache</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Night Out</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSTANCE HOFFMAN—COSTUME DESIGNER
In reading and listening to the play, I have responded to the way experience and memory refract and resonate among the characters. The past and the present merge, and each of the characters' memories of events feels both true and mutable—shifting, improvised in the present—their various selves living and dead in each of their views of the past. In approaching the design for the clothes, we wanted to locate the play in the time in which it was first produced, in large part because of the text references to the post-war London of the characters' shared youth, but also because the 1970s was a decade that used nostalgia and memory consciously in the way people dressed. The 1920s, 30s and 40s were all revisited in both streetwear and high fashion in the 1970s, I think as a way of recapturing the glamor and the romance of a time which seemed simpler and more idealistic than the weary 1970s did. The decade blurs time, at the same time that it distills the past into icons, which serves our feeling that these three characters, while very human, are like beautiful gods on plinths.

CLIVE GOODWIN—SOUND DESIGNER
Pinter once said: “The past is what you remember, imagine you remember, convince yourself you remember, or pretend you remember.” The challenge of designing sound for a Pinter play with a score by Thom Yorke was irresistible. The aim became to ensure that the intriguingly surreal and compelling otherworldliness of both is delivered to the audience in a way that steals into the mind, underpinning where needed and impacting where necessary. All while playing into the subconscious of the audience as if hearing their own dreams, memories, and thoughts. Witness to the events unfolding in front of them or perhaps recollecting past experiences of their own. As we explore the entangled threads of the characters' lives and move through the soundscapes of their memories, we discover that reality is mutable and not the predictable framework that we hoped it would be. In the same way the sound must be both immediate and alternately subliminal in its presence, accompanying us on our visit to this eternal dimension where Deeley, Kate, and Anna are forever experiencing a single part of their lives.
DIRECTOR DOUGLAS HODGE ON COLLABORATING WITH SET DESIGNER CHRISTINE JONES:
Christine took all the imagery I gave her and went further with it. The stage will constantly revolve, so imperceptibly that the audience won’t see it. And after about ten to fifteen minutes, they might think, gosh, those people are now standing in a different place, and that stage is clearly moving. Christine is an extremely architectural designer. I suggested unhelpful things, such as the walls are made of ice, and she took it and ran with it in her own way.

DIRECTOR DOUGLAS HODGE ON THE USE OF MUSIC IN OLD TIMES:
I’ve asked Thom Yorke from Radiohead to write the music. I just felt that we should have wonderful music at the beginning and the end, and as the play transitions from Act 1 into Act 2. I emailed Thom and said, ”Would you be up for it?” and he read the play, fell in love with it, and immediately came back with some music that was all played backwards. He’s written three or four pieces that we’ll definitely use.
PRE-SHOW ACTIVITIES

HOW DOES A PLAYWRIGHT USE PAUSES TO CONVEY MEANING?

Playwrights give actors and directors clues to how a line or scene should be played in many ways. Harold Pinter is noted for writing ellipses, silences, and pauses into his scripts. These pauses highlight the moments when something important is not being said or when a crisis is taking place within a character or between characters.

(Common core standards:CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.SL.11-12.6)

- **PREPARE**
  - As a group, brainstorm a list of ideas for the conflict of a scene between two or three characters. If needed, review script formatting.

- **WRITE**
  - Working alone, students write a ten-to-twenty line scene based on one of the ideas. After a defined period of time, move students into small groups for a first reading, where they hear their scenes read out loud. Students should not offer feedback on each other’s scenes at this point. Students return to working alone and revise their scenes by crossing out three lines or sentences and replacing them with pauses.

- **PRESENT**
  - Create a space in the classroom for staged readings. Actors stand for the staged reading, and scripts are placed on music stands if possible. Ask the audience to listen for the meaning behind each pause.

- **DISCUSS**
  - What is happening between the characters in each pause? What do you think the removed lines were? Which version was more interesting to hear? Why?

HOW DO ACTORS USE TABLEAUX TO EXPRESS CHARACTERS’ RELATIONSHIPS?

In Harold Pinter’s plays, information about characters is often NOT revealed through dialogue, but in silences, facial expression, and physical movement. Audiences are challenged to watch for clues about the relationships. In this activity, students work in groups and make physical choices to express dynamics between characters.

(Common Core Standards:CCSS SL 1b)

- **PREPARE**
  - Explain that Old Times will focus on a triangle between three people. Ask students to generate a list of situations where 3 people may be involved in a triangle (e.g., a romantic triangle, two family members and a stranger, two friends and a new person, two workers and a boss, two students and a teacher).

- **CREATE**
  - Students work in groups of four: 3 actors + 1 student director. Students choose one type of triangle from the list and assign each actor a character in the triangle. Each team has 2 chairs. Ask students to create 3 tableaux (still stage pictures), representing three moments of time for these characters. Each tableau must use all 3 characters and both chairs; the chairs may be used any way. As they rehearse, encourage students to pay attention to posture, level, eye focus, facial expression within each tableau. The more precise and specific, the stronger they will be to watch.

- **PRESENT**
  - Ask teams to present their tableaux. For more theatricality, have the student directors call “lights out” for the class to close their eyes while the actors get in position, and “lights up” to open their eyes to see each tableau. Encourage the audience to look for physical clues about the relationships in each tableau. You may ask the actors to silently hold their positions while the class makes inferences about the scene.

- **DISCUSS**
  - How do actors use physical choices to communicate to an audience? As an audience, what can you understand about the story by watching the actors’ physical choices? What can you look for when you are watching the show?
POST-SHOW ACTIVITIES

HOW DO ACTORS ANALYZE DIALOGUE IN OLD TIMES IN ORDER TO PLAY THE SUBTEXT?

Performing a play like *Old Times* requires actors to make many choices about their subtext: thoughts and feelings that are not directly stated in the dialogue. In this activity, students analyze dialogue from the play to determine its subtextual meaning. (Common Core Standards: RL 4)

**Note:** Print out enough PDFs of the worksheet for each student prior to the lesson. PDF FOUND HERE.

**DISCUSS** Facilitate a discussion about students’ observations of how the performance used subtext. First, brainstorm moments they remember from the play. Then, recall specific examples of how actors expressed thoughts or feelings indirectly, without explicitly speaking in dialogue. These are examples of subtext, a powerful tool for actors.

**PRESENT** Explain that students will work in pairs as actors to make choices about Pinter’s play. Pass out the *Old Times* Subtext Worksheet, and go over instructions.

After students have written subtext for their role, allow them to come in front of the class. Ask them to first go through the speaking all their *subtext* aloud. Then, having them read the dialogue only. Ask them to communicate the subtext under the lines, without saying it. They may use physical choices to express their subtext.

**REFLECT** How did writing and speaking the subtext help you “play the subtext” as an actor? Why do you think Harold Pinter uses so much in subtext?

HOW DOES A PLAYWRIGHT USE PINTERESQUE LANGUAGE TO CRAFT A SCENE ABOUT JEALOUSY?

*Old Times* exhibits the characteristics of Harold Pinter’s writing style: short lines of dialogue, pauses, silences, ellipses, and more meaning underneath what is said (the subtext) than in the words alone. (Common Core Standards: CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.11-12.3.D)

**PREPARE** Re-read “The Not-So-Hidden Forces of Jealousy” in this Upstage Playgoers’ Guide. Besides romantic jealousy, what other types of jealousy would make interesting plays?

**WRITE** Working alone or in pairs, students write a ten-to-twenty line scene on the theme of jealousy. After a defined period of time has passed, students are asked to return to their work and revise as if they were writing in the style of Harold Pinter: each line of dialogue should be no longer than one short sentence, and use of pauses, silences, and ellipses is encouraged.

**PRESENT** Create a space in the classroom for staged readings. Actors stand for the staged reading, and scripts are placed on music stands if possible. Ask the audience to listen for the scene’s subtext, and to pay attention to each word that is spoken. It may be helpful to share the original version of a few scenes as well.

**DISCUSS** What changed in your scenes when you tried to write in the style of Harold Pinter? What worked about it? What was challenging about it? As actors, which version would you prefer to perform?
Glossary

Austere
- Serious; uncompromising.
- Deely explains that he and his crew took an austere look at the woman in black.

Beguiling
- Attractive and intriguing.
- When asked if she finds England damp, Anna’s responds “rather beguilingly so.”

Bejus
- An Irish expression; used to express surprise or for emphasis.
- Deely uses “bejusus” to emphasize his dilemma of whether or not to marry Kate.

Fleapit
- A run-down place; usually a movie theatre.
- Deely says he popped into a fleapit to see a movie.

Globules
- Droplets of a substance.
- Deely says that Kate doesn’t properly dry herself off because there are always globules dripping about.

Incomparable
- Cannot be matched; unlike anything else.
- Deely describes Anna as being incomparable.

Lest
- For fear that; used with the intention of preventing an undesirable outcome.
- Anna says she would be afraid to go far from home, lest when she returned her home would be gone.

Odd Man Out
- A 1947 film about a man running from the police.
- Deely and Kate met after a showing of Odd Man Out.

Pervade
- Infuse; to spread throughout something.
- Anna speaks about how ripples pervade the surface of a body of water.

Queuing
- To form a line; usually while waiting for something.
- When describing their life in London, Anna recalls queuing all night with Kate.

Resources


ROUNDABOUT THEATRE COMPANY - 50TH ANNIVERSARY SEASON

Roundabout Theatre Company (Todd Haimes, Artistic Director) is 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 founded in 1965 and now celebrating its 50th anniversary, 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. Roundabout presents this work on its five stages and across the country through national tours. Since moving to Broadway 20 years ago, Roundabout productions have received 208 Tony Award nominations, 202 Drama Desk nominations and 239 Outer Critics Circle nominations. More information on Roundabout’s mission, history and programs can be found by visiting roundabouttheatre.org.

2015-2016 SEASON

By Harold Pinter
Starring Clive Owen, Eve Best and Kelly Reilly
Directed by Douglas Hodge

By Stephen Karam
Directed by Joe Mantello

By Helen Edmundson
Based upon the novel by Émile Zola
Starring Keira Knightley, Gabriel Ebert, Matt Ryan and Judith Light
Directed by Evan Cabnet

By Michael Frayn
Directed by Jeremy Herrin

Book by Joe Masteroff
Music by Jerry Bock
Lyrics by Sheldon Harnick
Choreographed by Warren Carlyle
Directed by Scott Ellis

By Eugene O’Neill
Starring Jessica Lange, Gabriel Byrne, Michael Shannon and John Gallagher, Jr.
Directed by Jonathan Kent

By Lindsey Ferrentino
Directed by Patricia McGregor

STAFF SPOTLIGHT: INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR OF FACILITY OPERATIONS, VALERIE SIMMONS

Ted Sod: Tell us about yourself. Where were you born and educated? How and when did you become the Director of Facility Operations?

Valerie Simmons: I am a native New Yorker—born and bred in New York City. I’m a product of the CUNY school system, having done my undergraduate degree in English and Theatre at Queens College and my MFA in Theatre/Performing Arts Administration at Brooklyn College. I came to my current job 7 years ago at the request of Harold Wolpert, Roundabout’s Managing Director. I had worked for 10 years as Director of Theater Operations at The Joyce Theater, had worked for Harold as Theatre Manager during the renovation and opening of Manhattan Theatre Club’s Biltmore (now Samuel J. Friedman) Theatre, where I remained for 3 years, and followed by 2 years as Director of Operations at Frederick P. Rose Hall at Jazz at Lincoln Center. With its 4 theatres and 3 rehearsal studios and the upcoming addition of the Sondheim Theatre, Harold felt my experience would be an asset to Roundabout’s facility operations.

TS: What is the best part of your job? What is the hardest part?

VS: The best part of my job is working with many of my incredibly skilled and talented colleagues at Roundabout. I am fortunate that the staffs of our theatres share their years of experience and help me solve many of the problems that arise. The hardest part of my job is needing to be available 24/7. Inevitably, things break down late at night, early in the morning, over the weekend, or when I’m on vacation, so I’m always on call.

TS: Why do you choose to work at Roundabout?

VS: I chose to work at Roundabout because I not only was a fan of the variety of theatre it produced, but it afforded me the opportunity to use my skills to manage a variety of facilities; to have been integrally involved in the opening of the Stephen Sondheim Theatre, the first Gold LEED theatre on Broadway; and to work with my incredibly knowledgeable and invested staff and my Roundabout colleagues.

Learn more at roundabouttheatre.org. Find us on: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram.
As a student, 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.

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.

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 or anything else that might make noise, please turn it off before the show begins.

As a not-for-profit organization, we rely on the support of our passionate individual, foundation, corporate, and government donors. Because of these dedicated supporters who give generously each year, all of our Education programs and activities are made possible. Due to space limitations, this list reflects gifts of $5,000 and above to Education at Roundabout during the 2014-2015 school year:
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