

THEATRE ARCHIVE PROJECT

<http://sounds.bl.uk>

David Grant – interview transcript

Interviewer: Caitlin Barratt

22 March 2010

Actor and Stage Manager. Actors; American influence in theatre; audiences, censorship; Company Managers; directors; Sir John Gielgud; Home; Ethel Merman; musicals; props; repertory; Sir Ralph Richardson; theatre design; theatre-going; Touring, West End productions.

CB: So when did you first begin your career in the theatre?

DG: 1956.

CB: And what was that as?

DG: Well, it was in a seaside summer rep that did 8 weeks and it was in Hythe in Kent. It wasn't a proper theatre, it was a hall above the Women's Institute. With a stage, tabs up at one end and two rooms for dressing rooms. And we used to do weekly rep: we used to open on Thursday and play through to the Wednesday, that way if somebody was down for a week's holiday they could see two shows; and it was heavy going and wonderful. I wouldn't have missed a minute of it. Very hard-work because we didn't have a scenic studio or anything like that. So on Wednesday night all the cast used to stay behind and strike the set, which wasn't very big, [laughs] then they'd help build the next week's set. And then one of the other actors called Tony Wiles and I would stay behind and overnight we would paint the set, finishing at about 7 o'clock in the morning. For that we were paid the princely sum of a packet of 20 Senior Service cigarettes. [Both laugh]

CB: Wow!

DG: No Union there!

CB: No, no!

DG: Then we would go back to the digs, have a rest, have something to eat, be back in the theatre at 10, finish doing up the set, then have lunch, then have a dress rehearsal, then have a performance. That was my first job.

CB: First job, right, and how did you get into that? Did you just go to them and ask or...?

DG: I answered an advertisement in The Stage newspaper, which is – was, I think still is - published weekly, and I just wrote off enclosing photographs, and I received a phone call asking me if I'd like to go in for an audition, which I did. I don't remember there being much auditioning, but anyway there was a chat; and, well a few days later, another phone call. I think I was paid £5 a week - I think it was £5 - and out of that of course you had to pay for your digs; there was no lodging allowance or anything like that, it was £5 a week flat.

CB: So you worked in the West End later on, was it quite a difference? So what did your job as Stage Manager entail during that time?

DG: Well, I mean weekly rep. It was weekly rep and that's what it was and you were in charge of the stage and everything. Most of the companies one worked with after Hythe there was a designer and a scenic studio, so you didn't have to bother with that. But you would be responsible for seeing all the props for next week's play were there or the dressing was there, all the furniture was there. So you would spend quite a large amount of your time going round the town begging and borrowing furniture and tea services and curtains - everything you needed for the shows - and it was one's job to make sure it was all there by the Monday morning, when you would go out and collect it. In weekly rep you play Monday to Saturdays. Monday you would return all the stuff you borrowed from the previous week and collect all the stuff you wanted for that week, and you would get it back to the theatre, give it a polish and give it a wash and set it all up.

CB: So why the move, if you don't mind me asking, from actor to stage manager and production?

DG: Well there was more work for stage managers than there was for actors - for me anyway. And one had to live and the theatre was something I had always, always wanted to be involved with. Always wanted to be in it; took me a long time to get to the state where I had a small amount of financial security that I could be out of work for a little while and not end up starving and writing home for money. So I got in it and as I say the stage management jobs came along and the acting didn't, so I just stuck with stage management and it's been - or was - very good to me.

CB: So was it very competitive to be an actor?

DG: Oh yes, yes, it was. I think it still is. Lots and lots of people. It's... I think complete now for Stage Management because most of the drama colleges now do stage management courses. When I started you learnt by experience, which is the best way to learn, I think. So there is still a lot around... I still feel sorry there aren't repertory companies where people can go and do the practical side of their work before suddenly starting in a West End show or something - I mean it would be pretty frightening.

CB: Would you say the theatre was a lot more popular within your time than it is now obviously with television and a lot more films, did you see that kind of change?

DG: I think the theatre is having a bit of a renaissance. I think the thing that television did, it made standards improve, and it also meant a lot of actors wouldn't... when it first started coming around - and I'm now talking about the advent of ITV and all independent companies - actors wouldn't leave London to go and do rep because a television might come along. And a lot of the time it didn't but that's what they risked, a lot of actors. I mean what is an unemployed actor? A human being I suppose. I think in those days when I was around, you expected to leave your home. I was very lucky, but a lot of people they had rooms and that's all they had. They got a job and they gave up their room, put everything in a suitcase and went. There's a lovely story about two old actors, one was crossing - well they were both crossing - the Waterloo Bridge, one was going north and one was going south on the other side of the road. One had a tiny... like a little attache case with him and the one without the case bawled across the road 'Oooh! You working?' and the other one turned round and said 'No, moving!'. But it's practically true!

CB: You said you worked in New York as well?

DG: I went to New York when I was very lucky to be involved of a production of Home by David Storey, with a wonderful cast of Gielgud, Richardson, Dandy Nichols and Mona Washborne. And it was a great big hit: it started at the Royal Court and moved into The Apollo on Shaftesbury Avenue. Then it was decided to go to New York and then there was a lot of discussion as to whether I would be going or wouldn't I be going. One day I went to the Royal Court, who was still managing the show to collect the wages, and Helen Montague who was boss lady, she turned round and said 'David, I'm sorry, it's definite you're not going to New York' and I said 'Fine. As long as I know I can look for another job'. It was a matinee day and I got to the theatre and I was doing the rounds before the show. I saw Sir John in his dressing room and he said 'Oh David I think it's a wonderful idea you coming to New York', so I said 'Well, I've just been told I'm not going to New York', 'Who told you that?', so I said 'Well, Helen'. 'Right'. When I got home that night there was a phone call from New York and I was on my way! It was very nice, the first time I've been to New York. Have you ever been?

CB: Yes, adore it.

DG: It's quite a city isn't it? [I think my main job was to calm the ladies, neither of whom wanted to go; it was thought my being there would be a calming influence.] [laughs]. So I had ten days in N.Y. ten days in L.A. another four days in New York and flew home.

CB: Good fun. What was it like in comparison to British theatre, how did the crowds accept it?

DG: Well backstage it was... their unions are very strong and it's very different. We had an incident, because we had a cyclorama for the set and in actual fact, when it was put up on the Sunday, it was put up a foot off-centre and this was not discovered until a couple of days into the week, and what happened was we couldn't... well, the site could not be moved until all the original crew who had worked on it could come back and move it. And one had to wait something like 3 or 4 days before this piece of set could be moved because they had to have the original crew back. I mean, it's very expensive and rather foolish - still that's their way of doing things.

CB: Did you see a development in British theatre where there was a lot more American influence, or outside influence at all, because I think Hollywood, was starting, I think it said 1958 with the Walk of Fame and a lot more influence coming in. Did you see that at all?

DG: Well no, I just think the Americans have always been a very big influence on British theatre, especially musicals because I don't think hardly anybody can do a musical like the Americans. You might not like it, but they just have an energy... and the way they do things I find fascinating. It always used to frustrate me that you would read magazines and hear about these wonderful productions of plays in America and the wonderful casts and the Americans weren't allowed to come over and do them, the same as we weren't allowed to go over and do them over there. That, I think, has largely resolved itself now, and there is a much bigger flow of actors and actresses - like Hair that is coming over and going into the Gielgud, that is the New York cast, well, a few years ago I don't think that would of happened. But I think the Americans will always influence with the lighting, their lighting is usually wonderful, our lighting designers are now I think some of the best in the world, but their equipment... they seem to be very inventive, the lamps they use.

CB: Did you see that... obviously with doing stage management did you see props and scenery change like quite a bit from quite basic from actors helping with it, to...

DG: I think realism has come in more. Because when I started, one would have to quite often make a prop if you couldn't get one and there wasn't a budget to hire it from one of the props shops in London, you'd have to make it. These days it is very rare that stage management would go out and do the prop buying, you have a prop buyer and you unload all your prop problems and dressing problems on them and they go off and sort it out. When I started in the West End, once one had assembled the props list - dressings you left to the designer anyway - then I would go out with the designer for the day, and we would go out and it was lovely shopping and it wasn't costing you a penny! The strangest prop I ever had to sort out - that we had to have made - was in a play called The Old Jest, and one the characters had to pod peas. So we had to have pea pods made, plastic pea pods and every night we used to fill them with peas - it was the time when peas weren't in season, so you couldn't nip to the supermarket and get half a

pound of peas to do it - and the author wouldn't change the vegetable - he wouldn't. So we had to do it, it was really rather strange going to a prop maker, of which there are quite a few, and saying 'Would you please make me...?' - I don't know... what did we have? - "...two dozen pea pods" - that would snap, you know, they had to hold their shape. Strange things!

CB: Yes seems a very, very odd request! And you were saying before about the weekly reps, did the plays change quite often when you were moving round?

DG: Well you just did one a week. You would do your new play on the Monday night. Tuesday morning you would plot the next play you were going to do, set all your moves and everything. Tuesday afternoon, if one had anything to learn, one would go off and study or go off prop-hunting or furniture-hunting. Then Wednesday morning you would do Act One without the book, you had to know Act One by Wednesday morning. Thursday morning you would do Act Two without the book. Friday morning you would do Act Three without the book; you might get a run-though Friday afternoon of the entire play. If not on the Saturday you would go in and run the entire play and do two performances

CB: Wow!

DG: So all this about an eight hour day – no! Because you would be in there for rehearsal at 10am, you had to set up make sure that everything was tickety-boo to go, so you would be in the theatre at about quarter past 9. And you would get away at about eleven, quarter past eleven at night. Yes, there were things called "meal breaks", but you know, one used to get stropky occasionally and wouldn't do anything until you had a meal. It also depends whether you had a matinée at 2 o'clock or an early evening at 5 o'clock as to how many breaks you got.

CB: Would you say it was quite stressful having several things on at once? Was it, or did you get into the flow?

DG: You got into the flow, and it didn't feel stressful because I think one was doing what one wanted to do, and nothing in life is perfect, there are always drawbacks to everything you do, so it affected your personal life - I don't think it was really called "stress" - well if it did you didn't notice it. Well, rep companies were like families - you're all in there together. Your leading lady and leading gentlemen were sort of the mother and father of the family, you just had a wonderful time.

CB: Would you say that has changed now, like the relationship, obviously saying like a family, would you say it is any different now?

DG: Yes, I don't think the rep companies are around like they were. Touring can be fun. It depends whether you are on a West End tour, where you seem to be working all the time, or a post West End tour, or you are just touring. That can be fun, because if

you are just touring for a couple of weeks you find out when you go to these places what's special - you maybe hire a car and go and have a day out in the countryside. I don't think the ties are quite as strong as a rep if it's a pre West End tour because you know that once you come into London you have done your theatre, at the end of the show everyone is going off home, whereas if you are on tour where is your home? Your digs for the week, so you congregate and keep together.

CB: Were any of the plays you were in ever affected by the Lord Chamberlain censorship?

DG: Yes.

CB: Yes?

DG: When I was at Oxford Playhouse we had a mercurial Greek director called Minos Volakanis, and we were going to do his translation of a Greek – I can't remember the Greek author - anyway he did this translation and in those days one had to submit to the Lord Chamberlain the script. It duly went off - none of us could find anything wrong with it - and the script went off to the Lord Chamberlain. There was a letter from the Lord Chamberlain 'You've got to cut this, you've got to do that' and this that and the other. Minos was furious and said we wouldn't do it and they said well you better go and fight it out with the Lord Chamberlain. So we went up and we met the Lord Chamberlain in his office and I think there were three gentlemen there - charming gentlemen – and they had the script open and they read bits and stage instructions. We said 'Yes? What 's wrong with that?' Minos and I would look at one another, being rather broad-minded, we thought, and they had found inferences that had never even entered our mind. And we said that to them once and he turned round and said 'You must realise you have come to the office where the men have the dirtiest minds in London.' and you thought 'Yes you can see that now, because you really do have the dirtiest minds!' Once we explained our side of the arguments to what that meant and that meant... I think it is a great pity the Lord Chamberlain went, I think with society now, but I think he did a good job. Now with language and things and television, I suppose it is irrelevant, but there was one thing about the Lord Chamberlain that the fact you were safe... it had been passed by him so nobody could come up and start bleating about actions or words because the Lord Chamberlain had passed it.

CB: Did you think it was a good thing, censorship, or did you think it was a little too hypersensitive sometimes?

DG: I don't believe in censorship in everything, but I believe in censorship in the theatre because an audience is made up of many people; of many ages, of many sensitivities, all of whom have a right to go the theatre and see a show... I just think that it... well, I say if I go see something 'wasn't it lovely nobody swore'. Because I think language is used gratuitously, there is no need for a lot of it - it's like comedians nowadays if you watch them on the television - if they want a laugh they say the f word and everyone laughs. It's not funny: they are not comedians, they are swear-merchants.

CB: So... this I think is rather a broad question, but what sorts of plays were most popular throughout the fifties and the sixties?

DG: It changed. I can't remember the year but John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* I think changed a lot.

CB: Yes - I think it's called the "turning point in British theatre".

DG: Yes, because before then you would have very light comedies by Hugh and Margaret Williams say - Somerset Maugham – lovely light comedies you could go and enjoy. Nobody said anything nasty, nobody did anything nasty unless you went to a thriller but if you went to a thriller you expected nasty. And then suddenly after John Osborne and *Look Back in Anger*, things... the type of play changed dramatically that people wanted to see. I think people are maybe getting a little bit bored with those now, wanting to see... like, Coward's being revived: *Private Lives* at the Vaudeville anyway. When we were in New York last year we went to see *Blithe Spirit* and they had just produced *Present Laughter* in New York, maybe the younger audience are a little more interested in seeing the type of theatre we had in the thirties. I mean it has got to progress, everything has got to change, but I mean don't throw the baby out with the bath water!

CB: Would you say the theatre was more universal? Now you could say there are a lot of plays directed at certain groups.

DG: Yes, I think it possibly was. There was, in a way a safety about going to the theatre, you went to see your star or the playwright's work and it didn't really challenge anything. Maybe these days everybody has to be challenged, you know in society as well as entertainment habits.

CB: You were saying about seeing the stars; was that, do you think, one of the main aspects of theatre-going? To see Olivier - I think you said Ralph Richardson - and John Gielgud, was that one of the big parts if you could see someone like that?

DG: Oh yes, you see they were... well, I don't think there is anybody like them these days. To see Sir John and Sir Ralph and Paul Scofield, young Judi Dench, Celia Johnson, Maggie Smith. Margaret Leighton... this list is really rather endless. You would go and see a play because they were in it. When I had the opportunity to do *Home*, to be working with Sir Ralph and Sir John - you know, what was better than that? And lovely, lovely people... Sir Ralph's humour could be a little quirky at times, but they were lovely people to work with. Very considerate and very kind. We had an understudy who had to go on rather quickly in *Home*, and the work Sir John did with her in the afternoon, she went on in the evening, was wonderful. Arranged the schedule so the two of them could spend some time together and they spent about over an hour and a half just working on little bits that affected them. Very, very generous. Lovely people. Celia Johnson, Judi Dench, Maggie Smith...

CB: Would you say the actors themselves have changed a little now or...?

DG: Oh yes. I think they have changed - a long change. There used to be a very famous production company in London called H.M Tennent who ruled the West End after the war... And as regards to what you wore when you went out there were very strict rules and regulations - you didn't go around in jeans and sweater shirts, when you came to the theatre you were properly dressed - ladies always had to wear gloves. I've never forgotten - she is dead now, but never mind - I was going along the back of Maiden Lane one night and Jean Simmons was appearing in A Little Night Music and there were people outside waiting for her to come out. And she came out and she looked like a char woman. And I just thought 'You have done yourself no service'. These people are expecting to see this lovely glamorous lady and you come out and look like a char woman. So they are not going to go home and say 'she came out and she looked beautiful; she had a fur coat this that and the other...'. I think it is pity they don't dress the actor. There was one actress - she also is dead - she was always broke, but she would take a bus, or a tube or walk to within about 50 yards of the Stage Door where she would hail a taxi. So she would always arrive, and her fans would see her arrive and get out of taxi. The image is part of the job.

CB: Would you say the image was very important?

DG: Well I think so. Image is important. Nowadays, if you see Judi Dench or Maggie Smith out and about they always look elegant and smart.

CB: Do you think there was that pressure on obviously theatre actors to look as good as the film stars as well?

DG: Yes, well most of them were earning their money, they could afford to do it.

CB: Was there a lot of money in it?

DG: Well if you were a big star there was money. I don't know what they get nowadays but then, I'm sure nowadays you would think 'God!'. But then they were possibly, I don't know, earning about £100 a week, but £100 a week twenty or thirty years ago was £100 a week!

CB: Was it easy to work your way through like, the ranks almost of acting, or stage management from the rep to the West End?

DG: I was very lucky because after, I went virtually from job to job when I was in the West End. And then I went and did a comedy - or a farce - called No Sex Please, We're British in the Strand Theatre as it was then. The management for them were a lovely couple John and Lisel Gale and that was actually like being with a family again, and I

was with them for about 8 or 9 years. As soon as something came off, John would say 'Don't worry, David, I have got something for you'. Maybe I had to have a week off or two, but it didn't matter because you knew at the end of a set period of time you would be working again, and you could budget... you could go off and have your holiday and things, so I didn't really have to look very far for my work.

CB: It's often been called the 'Golden Age of Theatre', would you say it is? Obviously you have worked continuously afterwards into the eighties and nineties, would you say it was...?

DG: I think maybe it started in the fifties. What I would call the Golden Age - I'm not sure when it ended, but I think it maybe started in the fifties. It was just because you had wonderful plays, you had wonderful casts, you had wonderful productions, good directors. Everything seemed to glow. Yes, I used to love going to the theatre in those days; I don't enjoy going so much nowadays, I don't know why. It costs too much! There's not a lot on I personally would want to fork out the money to see. I'd like to see *Private Lives* at the Vaudeville.

CB: Whilst you were working did you manage to see a lot of theatre outside your own companies?

DG: It depended, you used to rely on matinée days. If your matinée was a Wednesday, and there was a matinée of something you wanted to see on a Thursday then you would see a matinée. One didn't have evenings off. In my time in the theatre I think I had 5 or 6 evenings off - mainly things to do with the management I was with when I wasn't working on a show.

CB: Are there any plays in particular that stick in your mind as being defining, like you have worked on?

DG: I think things I've worked... George Bernard Shaw programme of Max Adrian - that will always sit in my mind. *Lettice and Lovage* with Maggie Smith. *Home* was a treat just to be working with those gentlemen. Things that I have seen and not involved with... but it was... a wonderful play by Graham Greene with Paul Scofield - the imagery of the play and everything was wonderful. *The Entertainer* - I didn't see it at the Court, I saw it at the Palace. Something that will always stick in my mind was seeing Ethel Merman in *Hello Dolly!*.

CB: Wow!

DG: I mean that was just, just incredible. And *Gypsy* with Tyne Daly, that was pretty incredible as well. Merman was just... [laughs] they had a catwalk they used to come down, she came out to do one of the numbers parading up and down the catwalk and there were was a whole load of kids up in the gallery who were not appreciative of Miss Merman's talent. She came out and they obviously got on her nit as they did everyone.

And without missing a beat or a note, anything - she just looked up at the gallery and said 'Shut up' - and they did of course - and just went straight on and I thought 'that is incredible!'. The courage to suddenly, in the middle of a number - and you know the orchestra, Conductor was going all the time, not to throw yourself off! Wonderful, I loved that! What else...? I would really have to think about that - golden moments should spring to mind... Opera... Renée Fleming in Eugene Onegin - that was magic moments. We did a wonderful musical called The Mitford Girls - Julia Sutton sang a great number called "Other People's Babies" - every night I would go and see her singing it.

CB: Would you say that in the fifties and sixties young people had more appreciation for the theatre? Like now you go out and people shout out.

DG: Oh I think those days - it has stopped now - you had our first nighters, you had the clack and if they didn't like you they let you know. In those days the audiences were very much on the ball to let you know what they think it wasn't all set and light. There was a production of The Scottish Play with Sir Michael Redgrave, and the audience were letting him know what they thought of him.

CB: That's the way to do it.

DG: That's the way to do it! Yeah, but also I think youngsters... you could sit in the gallery for about one [shilling] and two pence, which I suppose was a lot of money depending on what you were earning but it didn't seem a lot of money. And some of the galleries were very uncomfortable, but you could sit in the gallery for one and three and see a West End play with West End stars or international stars, but nowadays I think galleries are madly overpriced - it is a pity, it's where students went, you know, out of work actors: you didn't sit in the posh seats, you went in the gallery.

CB: Do you think as well, people, now people turn up in jeans and things like that, did people dress up more, was it more of an event?

DG: Oh, I think it was more of an event. I always insisted... when I was doing my Company Manager job I was always in a dinner suit every night and a suit for matinées. I think I was, towards the end, the only one doing it. I don't know why people can't do it, there is nothing elitist or classist about being smartly dressed. Also, if you as a member of the audience and you didn't know or wanted to know something and you saw someone in a dinner suit you would possibly feel inclined to go say to them 'Excuse me, can you tell me what time the show is over?'. It is a point of contact for people. And I think also the cast appreciated it. It made you more of the company - you're putting your frock on, as well - always use to call it the frock. Everyone one else was putting theirs on and you put yours on. Now you sometimes go to the West End and see the Company Manager and they are in jeans, sweat-shirt and trainers, and you think 'For God's sake! What are you doing?'. I don't think they know what they are doing, actually. They are representing the management. They are repenting the cast - they are the contact between audience and company. For God's sake! Dress and put a clean shirt on. If you were to go into a theatre and you said 'Could I please see the Company

Manager?' and you went up and saw someone in dirty torn jeans you wouldn't think 'This person knows the answer to what I'm going to ask them'. There we go, things change.

CB: Do you miss that sort of theatre then, obviously your early work with the rep?

DG: Yes, I do miss it. But I get so annoyed when I go to the theatre and see standards that are slipping. I went to Chichester a couple of years ago, I was so incensed that I wrote to the management about it. Do you know Chichester?

CB: Barely.

DG: They have the Minerva which is like the studio, you are seated on three sides and we were seeing... in the second and third act there was a bed on stage. Now the bed had its back to about a third of the audience - all you had to do was move it and put it in a central position. She had medicine bottles by the bed and they were plastic - and this is a period comedy - and I was so annoyed about it, because there is no reason for it. Chichester has money, and anyway bottles aren't that hard to go out and find.

CB: Do you think directors and playwrights conformed almost to a certain style of directing?

DG: Yes I think they did. If you going to see a play by David Hare you vaguely know what you are going to see, the style of what you are going to see. The same with directors. In my day if you went to see something by Frith Banbury or one the other directors of that at time you knew vaguely what you were going to see, how it would be done... didn't agree with it a lot of the time, but you knew what you were going to see.

CB: Would you say... as I said before Look Back in Anger is a turning point, did you think there could be a lot more individuality almost within the theatre after then, for directors to put a new spin on plays?

DG: Yes, I think they could, yes. I think that did change a lot, in a way it was like a learning curve, there weren't many directors who knew how the new theatre was directed. I mean, you had wonderful people like Peter Brook - who did visionary work, wonderful, wonderful work - but the directors came along, the vacuum was filled. So it all went well, theatre's still there and will be.

CB: Always, hopefully. Do you think theatres themselves, like the insides have changed quite a bit, are they less glamorous now?

DG: Yes. I love all the Frank Matcham theatres, what are left. When you went there you knew you were in the theatre like all those wonderful cinema palaces they built in the Depression in

America - they were opulent and so over the top, but they gave you a lift when you went in, and if you go into a lovely glamorous theatre it starts the evening off, starts the performance. Don't think I've been in a modern theatre that I'm that keen on. Chichester's not bad I suppose. The New London, I think, is hell on wheels - none of it seems to work but that play *The War Horse* is so wonderful. The National is not bad. If you want to see new theatres go to Manchester.

CB: Yes, I live near Manchester, so The Lowery...

DG: I've never been there so I can't judge that. Cardiff has the new Opera House; there's a new one in Leicester which I haven't been to - didn't like the old one. I think it's a pity they use so much concrete, wood was the most perfect sound, wood and plaster are the most perfect sounding board for the voice. There is a lovely one in the East End called Wilton's Musical Hall, they use it in a lot of films and that I think is the oldest music hall in London. It is wonderful to go there, because when you go into it the atmosphere is there, an intriguing, lovely place. They are not pulling them down quite so fast as they, did so that a good sign! [laughs]

CB: Do you think the theatres themselves changed when plays changed, as a new idea?

DG: Well I think that's a hard one; when did we last have a new theatre in London? The New London, then there's the Bloomsbury, the Royalty which is now the Peacock. So much stuff now has to fit what was there. I suppose it would be fun or interesting if a new design of theatre could be built so that various style of production could be done. But then sometimes if you have a thing that is too multi-purpose it falls because it never serves anything well. If you have a proscenium or not, you use sidelines. So it would be nice to see a completely open space one could use. Money.

CB: Yes. That's my questions - have you any stories?

DG: Oh don't put stories on tape!