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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The American Playwrights Theatre, in operation from 1963 until 1980, occupies a unique place in American theatre history. The organization created an unprecedented partnership between the educational theatre and the commercial theatre. This partnership sought to premiere new American plays by established dramatists through a venue other than Broadway; namely, the non-commercial stages of American colleges and universities. Community theatres and regional theatres were included to a lesser degree.

Reasons for Founding

APT was formed in response to the economically oppressive professional theatre situation of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Broadway offered an extremely challenging climate for the professional playwright. Production costs, which had escalated increasingly during the 1950s, were now considered
astronomical. The cost of opening a production in one of the commercial theatre's 30 Broadway theatres had multiplied six-fold over the previous 15 years. In 1944, staging a drama on the Broadway stage required approximately $25,000. By 1960, the investment required was $150,000. For a musical to open in 1944, the cost was about $100,000. In 1960, $600,000 was needed. Within a few days of opening, a production was declared a "success" or "failure" based solely on economic factors. Whereas in the past, a production could remain running for a few weeks with the hopes of steadily increasing business, in the early 1960s many productions closed within a matter of days.¹

Serious dramas, or plays of ideas, fared poorly; many folded quickly. Often, when promising new playwrights or established playwrights offered new serious works, producers and audiences preferred lighter fare. Economics thus dictated that simple comedies and musicals become the standard attractions of the Broadway stage, leaving established writers of serious drama little or no outlet for their work. APT sought to offer playwrights an alternative to the Broadway battleground. The American Playwrights Theatre was formed

with the goal of offering established playwrights of serious drama, or plays of ideas, an outlet for their work without the prohibitive risks of Broadway.²

The organization grew out of a question raised at the 1962 convention of The American Educational Theatre Association. At this time, approximately 1,500 colleges and universities offered courses in theatre and production of plays, though few had extremely developed programs of advanced study.³ A representative of a participating institution asked a panel of theatre professionals, "Why do we have to wait for important plays until three to five years after they see the light of Manhattan?" University producers present at the session expressed a desire to premiere new plays on their stages. The eagerness of the university community to participate as a new outlet for American plays attracted the attention of the convention's professional participants.

² Note: the economic situation of the Broadway stage will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

³ Brockett, 340.
Consideration of Broadway's escalating costs enhanced that attraction.

Goals of Founders

The American Playwrights Theatre was founded the following year (1963) "dedicated to the idea that new plays of ideas of superior caliber to those recently produced on Broadway can be written and produced in the American theatre." The founders of APT recognized the advantages of production in the university setting. Many institutions possessed "physical plants which far surpass(ed) Broadway theatres." Also, a ready pool of talent awaited the new plays. Another attraction, according to APT's founders was that the university setting guaranteed an openness and eagerness about serious drama, so that contemporary playwrights could write, "the plays they want(ed) to write, written as they want(ed) them to be written."*


"With assistance from The Ohio State University Development Fund, and the co-operation of the American Educational Theatre Association (AETA), the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA), and the Dramatists Guild, The American Playwrights Theatre became an incorporated organization in 1964 with headquarters at The Ohio State University."*

Established American playwrights who had achieved critical and commercial Broadway success were solicited for participation. By the end of APT's first year, the list of interested playwrights included such established dramatists as William Inge, Arthur Miller, S.N. Behrman, Arthur Laurents, William Gibson, and Horton Foote. Eventually, as a means of survival for the organization, APT adapted its criteria to allow lesser-known playwrights to submit their work.

Evaluation Process

Plays submitted to APT underwent a series of evaluations before being offered to subscribers. For most of APT's

---


7 "Playwrights Who Have Pledged Cooperation With APT," n.a., 1964, APT Collection, 1.
existence, the play selection process was as follows: An established playwright submitted a script. The play was read by at least one member of the Screening Committee who either rejected the script or allowed it to advance to the Reading Committee. The Reading Committee reviewed the play and returned it with comments to the Executive Director of APT. If the majority of the readers approved the script, the play was offered for production to member organizations which were mainly university theatres, but also included regional and community theatres. The playwright was offered a contract which gave APT controlling rights for one year with the option of renewal. Once a specific number of organizations agreed to produce a play, the script was considered "activated" and production dates were set. Originally, 50 production agreements were considered necessary to guarantee a respectable royalty for the playwright. This number was later lowered to 25 which was considered more practical. The first staging of the script was the "pilot production" and other productions followed. This process enabled simultaneous productions of a new work throughout the United States without the financial risks of a New York debut.*

* David Ayers, personal interview, 1 May 1988.
As mentioned earlier, Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee were founding members of The American Playwrights Theatre, and remained its major voice throughout all of its existence. The team had been represented on Broadway seven times before founding APT. Two of those Broadway productions, *Inherit the Wind* (1955) and *Auntie Mame* (1956), qualified as commercially successful. Three other productions, which were not nearly as commercially successful, *The Gang's All Here* (1959), *Only in America* (1959), and *A Call on Kuprin* (1961), shortly preceded the dramatists' involvement with the organization. Whatever the critical values of the works may have been, economics dictated that the productions close shortly after their openings. Lawrence and Lee, like many other playwrights, had grown disenchanted with the "life-or-death one-shot of Broadway." They considered the New York stage a place where "freedom of speech is constricted by fiscal opportunism." As a result, Lawrence and Lee proved to be a

---


10 Lawrence and Lee, "A 'New Broadway,'" 40.

" APT Fact Sheet, 1.
major force behind the establishment and development of APT.

The organization served to unite the university educational theatre and the commercial professional theatre, and fostered the original productions of such plays as Robert Anderson's *The Days Between*, George Sklar's *And People All Around*, and Jerome Weidman and James Yaffe's *Ivory Tower*. Ron Cowen's *Summertree* and Preston Jones' *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia* were also produced. Lawrence and Lee's own *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* proved to be APT's most successful venture.

Goals of Study

This study traces the establishment, growth, success, and eventual dissolution in 1980 of The American Playwrights Theatre. It discusses the people involved in its founding as well as those persons who participated in the organization throughout its years of existence.

Justification

A study of this nature is important for several reasons. Primarily, it is important to study an attempt to decentralize the American theatre. When APT was founded, success of a play was often measured by its life upon the New York stage. APT
sought to prove that a play could be successful by a different measure. APT exposed a new play to a large audience without a New York debut. Simultaneous debuts across the United States provided new plays with life not dependent upon Broadway critics and economics.

Secondly, APT marks a significant attempt at a collaboration between the professional and educational theatre worlds. The majority of APT members were college/university theatres; regional and community theatres comprised approximately 15% of the total. The venture was sanctioned by The American Educational Theatre Association, The American National Theatre and Academy, and the Dramatists Guild of America. Founding officials included chairpersons of university theatre departments as well as professional theatre practitioners.

Thirdly, the central founders of APT were Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee, playwrights who had received Broadway production before and during the existence of APT. Having experienced both commercial successes and failures, they sought an alternative to the traditional route of professional play production. Also, many other professionally established playwrights agreed to support and/or participate in the venture as a means of premiering new works. In addition to
those dramatists already mentioned, the following playwrights were also involved in, or submitted works to APT at some point: Edward Albee, Jean-Claude van Itallie, Lanford Wilson, David Rabe, John Patrick, Garson Kanin, Tad Mosel, Herman Wouk, Paddy Chayevsky, Archibald MacLeish, Gore Vidal, Stanley Kauffman, Leonard Spigelgass, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Loring Mandel, Henry Denker, and William Saroyan.

Fourthly, the establishment and existence of APT coincided with the major period of establishment of regional theatres. During the 1960s and 1970s both APT and regional theatres contributed to an attempt at decentralization of American theatre. In 1960, only a handful of regional professional theatres existed in major cities in the United States. By 1980, over 200 professional non-profit theatres mounted productions.\(^{12}\) The existence and eventual dissolution of APT coincides with the expansion of the regional theatre movement.

Lastly, the length of existence and the size of operation of APT merits consideration. Founded in 1963, the organization remained in operation until in 1980. No other

\(^{12}\) Brockett, 339, 441.
previous project had sought to unite professional and educational theatre practitioners on such a national scale.

To date, there has been no in-depth study of The American Playwrights Theatre. My own unpublished Masters thesis on APT's most successful production, *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* is the most detailed work on the subject. Entitled *From Thought to Theatre: Creation, Development, and Production of THE NIGHT THOREAU SPENT IN JAIL* by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee, the work deals mainly with the creation of the script, with a chapter of the thesis discussing the pilot production and a few subsequent productions under APT.

Specifically, the current study documents the founding and functioning of a specific group of theatre professionals and educators as it attempted to create an alternative route to production of new plays by established playwrights. New York theatre of the time is well-documented in such publications as *Variety*, *The Best Plays...* series, and *The New York Times*. The establishment of the regional theatre movement is documented in Joseph Wesley Zeigler's *Regional Theatre*. To date, no study has explored The American Playwrights Theatre.
Sources

Primary sources are numerous. The American Playwrights Theatre Collection, housed at The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Theatre Research Institute at The Ohio State University, contains the complete records of APT. It contains audio recordings of most of the annual Board meetings, as well as written minutes of all of those meetings. All correspondence between APT and participating institutions and playwrights is also intact. Ledger books documenting operating and production expenses, copies of submitted and produced scripts, as well as numerous newspaper and magazine clippings are also included. Most of my primary source material comes from this collection.

Also housed at The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Theatre Research Institute is the Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Collection which contains much of the material used in my research into The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail. Since this play premiered under APT, and was its most successful production, this collection is also used.

Secondary sources are also numerous. Many newspaper and magazine articles, based mainly on APT press releases, and reviews by local critics of various productions are available. Some reviews are by national critics of APT pilot productions.
A few general theatre history books contain passing references to APT. They are: *New Broadways: Theatre Across America 1950-1980* by Gerald M. Berkowitz; *Ten Seasons: New York Theatre in the Seventies* by Samuel L. Leiter; and *Twentieth Century Theatre* by Glenn Loney. The citations in these books are all in reference to the APT productions of Lawrence and Lee's *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*.

Findings

The findings of this study are three-fold:

1.) An illustration of the workings of an organization that was a partnership between professional and educational theatre practitioners, including the reasons for its creation and its eventual dissolution.

2.) An illustration of one aspect of American theatre at a time when theatre was becoming more and more decentralized.

3.) An illustration of a theatrical venture that was national in scope, not New York based, and non-commercial.

Methodology and Arrangement

The method of the study is a chronological reconstruction of the American Playwrights Theatre. Beginning with an
overview of the professional, regional, and educational theatre situation immediately preceding the founding of APT, the next chapter discusses the reasons for the founding of the organization, as well as professional and educational reaction to it. The third chapter discusses the first year of operation of APT. Chapters IV and V provide an overview of the history of APT, using the yearly Board Meetings as a framework. Chapters VI deals with four specific APT productions: Robert Anderson's *The Days Between*, Ron Cowen's *Summertree*, Lawrence and Lee's *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*, and Preston Jones' *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*. A concluding chapter follows the discussion of the various productions.

The following study places The American Playwrights Theatre in its position in American theatre history. No previous attempt at the establishment of this kind of a national theatre operation reached the success of APT. Today, regional theatres, in cooperation with The Theatre Communications Group, accomplish in many ways what APT attempted, and, for a time, achieved: the premiere of new plays on the stages of America's non-commercial theatres.
CHAPTER II: FOUNDING

Introduction

The American Playwrights Theatre created an unprecedented partnership between the educational theatre and the commercial theatre. This partnership grew out of playwrights' desire to escape the financial pressures of the commercial theatre, and a desire of the university community to cooperate with the professional dramatists to produce new plays even if the plays had not received a previous commercial success. APT sought to premiere new American plays through a route other than Broadway.

The Late 1950s/Early 1960s: The Commercial Theatre

In the late 1950's and early 1960's, the professional theatre in New York proved to be prohibitively expensive which limited the types of plays producers were willing to back. Louis Kronenberger, editor of The Best Plays of 1959-1960 declared that "we have entered, as is all too well known, a new Broadway era--an era of high costs that makes for a
theatre of hits or flops, with little room for what lies between." This economic climate also influenced the work offered. Producers were hesitant to invest in serious drama, and instead "offered every variety of theatre piece, adaptation, or stunt as a substitute for original plays," thus producing a theatre season during 1959-1960 that was "rich in trash that just hoped to make money." Kronenberger placed the blame squarely on the "ignorant and ill-qualified producers . . . (with) standards as low as their tastes are loutish" who were "helping to create a third theatre that can only be called Sub-Broadway." The economic forces and the low quality of plays made for a "season . . . in which a fifth of the plays closed within a week of opening, and a good third of the plays within two weeks." 

Hobe Morrison, writing for Variety, also discussed the season. Although the number of productions remained the same as the previous year, "total grosses increased, apparently reflecting higher prices and offset by inflated costs." Of the 56 productions during the 1959-1960 season, only ten were classified as "hits." A "hit" for Variety is a production

---

that makes a profit. There were "only two indicated big money makers, 'Fiorello' and 'The Sound of Music.'"²

Morrison also commented on the brevity of the runs of many productions. He wrote, "One of the notable aspects of the season, intensifying a growing tendency of the last few years, was the number of quick flops." Fourteen of the productions had a combined total run of 56 performances, "or an average of four each. Seven others folded after less than three weeks' runs." In regards to profits earned by the season's productions, Morrison stated, "(o)f the 56 productions of the season, 31 lost all or virtually all of their investments."³

The news the following season was even bleaker. Kronenberger stated that during the 1960-1961 season's "final months, there was a feeling almost affirmative, one might even say exultant, about how bad it had been." He described the season's fast flops and low quality as contributing to "a sense of records being smashed, of new lows being set." He cited gag comedies and adaptations as the chief fare of the Broadway stage. "And both these things, whatever, their

³ Morrison, 68.
occasional merit, are essentially hostile to creative writing, to the creative spirit itself." He also cited the season's many musicals as an indication that "Broadway was gearing itself for outright mass entertainment." He identified Broadway as "lying far closer in point of view to TV and the movies than to ballet or opera or literature." Economic factors had forced the Broadway theatre to lower its aspirations of artistic quality and gear itself towards commercial mass appeal, "a distinct trend--with very far-reaching possibilities."

Variety's Hobe Morrison took note of the trend, also. Although he centered his year-end article around four new playwrights, he mentioned the economic cloud hanging over Broadway. He stated that 1960-1961 "was the season when the theatre discovered economics . . . (and) the Broadway air echoed with lamentations and forebodings, the subject mostly financial statistics." Morrison noted that the season saw "only 48 productions, the lowest total since records have been kept."*


Morrison discussed the quality of work of four new playwrights. Although he regarded the plays as serious drama of high quality, only one, *Advise and Consent* by Loring Mandel, qualified as a "hit" in *Variety*'s year end tally. Its "hit" status resulted from its film sale. The only straight play (non-musical) to recover its investment solely from its Broadway run was the comedy *Mary, Mary* by Jean Kerr. The 1960-1961 season was the "first on record without a single serious play payoff on Broadway."*'

The Early 1960s: The Regional Theatre

Playwrights who were discontented with Broadway were unable to look to what was loosely defined at that time as the regional theatre as an alternative. Only a handful of professional theatres existed outside of New York City at the start of the 1960s. A few theatres such as Houston's Alley Theatre; Washington, D.C.'s Arena Stage; and San Francisco's Actors Workshop were established, but could not offer the professional playwright a profitable venue. As the 1960's progressed, many other regional theatres were founded, especially through assistance provided by the Ford

* Morrison, 62.
Foundation's matching grant program. Even as these theatres became established in many of America's major cities, new works by contemporary playwrights were rarely produced on those stages. Between 1947 and 1967, regional theatres "concentrated on classics instead of new writings. . . . As stability became a formal goal, the production of new plays continued to be rare and even foolhardy from an institutional point of view."*

1962: Robert E. Lee; at the AETA Conference

Early in the 1960s, playwright Robert E. Lee attended the 1962 national conference of The American Educational Theatre Association at the University of Oregon in Eugene. Lee's work, in partnership with Jerome Lawrence, had been presented on Broadway upon many occasions. Their Broadway productions included Look, Ma, I'm Dancing (1948); Inherit the Wind (1955); Shangri-La (1956); Auntie Mame (1957); The Gang's All

---


* Zeigler, 188-189.

Lee attended as both a professional playwright and a member of the university community. He had often been involved with college playwriting programs and theatre departments. At the time of the conference, he had recently held the Chair of Playwrighting at Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, and was active in the Theatre Arts Department at UCLA. Through the office of David LeVine, Executive Director of The Dramatists Guild, Lee was invited to speak on the subject of "Production Rights, Royalties, and Releases."

Lee recalls:

In the question and answer period following my remarks, there was a stimulating exchange with representatives of theatres from various parts of the country. The gist of it was: 'Why won't you license your new plays for university and regional productions PRIOR to Broadway?' My answer was simple. 'You won't do them. You want the imprimatur of Broadway success before you will present new works, even by playwrights with established reputations.' But a number of A.E.T.A. members responded with: 'Try us!' I said it would only work if a sufficient body of theatres nationwide would agree to present a new play -- so that the production would constitute a viable ALTERNATIVE to Broadway. Basically, A.E.T.A. said: 'If you will

---

10 *Contemporary Dramatists*, 314.
be an Ambassador to your fellow playwrights, we'll try to co-operate and make it work.'"

1963: Playwrights' Project, National

Lee drew up a memo entitled "Playwright's Project, National" as a means to begin formulating an organization based on the discussions he had held at the conference in Eugene. With extensive input from Jerome Lawrence, a plan to formalize a partnership between commercial and educational theatre took shape. Their joint proposal called "A Playwright's Project, National" was released in April 1963.

The proposal stated that the American theatre needed "a marketplace for plays where the value sense is not corrupted by economic hysteria, petrified tradition and administrative bedlam." It called for an outlet of "Plays of Ideas," because "when plays of thought and substance remain unproduced (or, worse, are presented only to close after a few performances) soon such works will cease to be written." Lawrence and Lee had first-hand experience in fast closings on the Broadway theatre. The proposal held that new plays should be premiered in the university community for three major reasons: the high quality of the "physical plants," the intellectual atmosphere

"Lee, letter, 5 June 1992."
of the university setting, and the eagerness of the campus and community audience to be part of the venture.  

Lawrence and Lee offered their newest play, at that time unnamed, as the debut production for the new organization. Under the plans, once seven major universities agreed to produce a new play, the work would then be licensed to the entire membership. But before actual production was to take place, "an impressive number of productions must be guaranteed— at least 100. Otherwise, the plan degenerates into a glorified 'Try Out,' an academic version of the old Philadelphia— New Haven treadmill." The plan stressed the need to concentrate on production as an end in itself. An executive Authority would be founded to administer the organization which would be an instrument in "influencing the substance of dramatic writing in this country."

The proposal was circulated among university theatre departments that had expressed interest at the Oregon conference. The original departments contacted were University of California at Los Angeles, The Ohio State

---


University, and University of Minnesota. Also contacted were the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA) and the American Educational Theatre Association (AETA).

Information was given to the news media, and in June of 1963, Lewis Funke of The New York Times heralded the creation of A Playwrights' Project National as having "major implications for college and university theatres as well as for Broadway." Funke described the project as "a clearing house for new plays to be turned over to participating colleges and universities." He estimated that a playwright could be guaranteed 50 productions with an average royalty of $500 per production or a total of $25,000. "Moreover, if the play was a success, the playwright could expect productions elsewhere, including Broadway." Funke quoted an interview with Jerome Lawrence in which the playwright said that, with this plan, a dramatist "will have a worthwhile financial return, a new platform, and, indeed, is likely as a consequence to turn up a new kind of play."*  

---

Lawrence and Lee and Ohio State

Lawrence and Lee built on a long-established relationship with The Ohio State University, and contacted OSU about the possibility of providing a physical headquarters for the proposed organization. (Lawrence graduated from OSU (BA 1937) and had received an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters Degree earlier in 1963, and Lee attended nearby Ohio Wesleyan University.) The playwrights contacted W. Hayes Yeager, Chair of Ohio State's Speech Department, and Roy H. Bowen, Director of Theatre. Lawrence and Lee had also submitted the proposal to Stanley Young, Executive Director of the American National Theatre and Academy. Young wrote a letter of support for the project to Fuller in which Young called it "a very exciting idea and one which ANTA and AETA are eager to sponsor." Young offered to contact a "select group of professional playwrights" about their interest in the project."

Lawrence and Lee offered to submit their newest play, Ben, a dramatization of the life of Benjamin Franklin, to the program. In June of 1963, the Department of Speech at OSU issued a statement with the following tenets:

1. Lawrence and Lee's Playwrights' Project National has the wholehearted approval and

---

18 Stanley Young, letter to Dean Osborne Fuller, 18 June 1963, APT Collection.
support of the Department of Speech. We wish to present the first production of Ben in 1964.
2. . . . The Department of Speech at OSU is prepared to provide a national office if Foundation support can be obtained.
3. Two or more staff members will attend the AETA convention in Minneapolis in August.¹⁶

Shortly after this statement was issued, the name of the organization was changed to The American Playwrights Theatre. The new title better reflected the goal of its founders: "to create a national theatre, with a very wide breadth of appeal."¹⁷

**Stanley Young and Playwrights**

Stanley Young set about the task of contacting established professional playwrights who each had received at least one Broadway production of their work. During the summer and fall of 1963, the dramatists responded to Young's request for their endorsement of the proposal.

S.N. Behrman was the first to respond. He commented that he had already heard of the idea from other playwrights and had "expressed interest in it to (producer) Mr. (Robert) Bowen."


Whitehead and to others. . . . Also," he added," I should be delighted to try out a play on you."

John Patrick, however, was not as enthusiastic. He wrote that he did not feel that the idea of The American Playwrights Theatre was a practical one for professional playwrights; at least not for him. He did not give specific reasons for his opinion. This did not preclude him from wishing the organization luck."

During the next few months, numerous other dramatists responded to the idea, all of them favorably. The following playwrights offered support, and some of the writers offered to submit plays at a later date: Emmet Lavery, Arthur Laurents, Barrie Stavis, Arnold Sundgaard.

18 S.W. Behrman, letter to Stanley Young, 26 July 1963, APT Collection.
19 John Patrick, letter to Stanley Young, 29 June 1963, APT Collection.
20 Emmet Lavery, letter to Stanley Young, 29 July 1963, APT Collection.
21 Arthur Laurents, letter to Stanley Young, 29 July 1963, APT Collection.
22 Barrie Stavis, letter to Stanley Young, 30 July 1963, APT Collection.
23 Arnold Sundgaard, letter to Stanley Young, 31 July 1963, APT Collection.

---


25 William Inge, letter to Stanley Young, 1 August, 1963, APT Collection.

26 Elmer Rice, letter to Stanley Young, 1 August, 1963, APT Collection.


29 John Murray, letter to Stanley Young, 6 August, 1963, APT Collection.


31 Louis Coxe, letter to Stanley Young, 13 August 1963, APT Collection.

32 Arthur Miller, letter to Stanley Young, 18 August 1963, APT Collection.

33 William Saroyan, handwritten note to Stanley Young, 25 September 1963, APT Collection.

34 Howard Lindsay, letter to Stanley Young, 4 September, 1963, APT Collection.

35 Ossie Davis, letter to Stanley Young, 14 October 1963, APT Collection.
All of the playwrights applauded the goals of APT, agreed with
the need to decentralize theatre, and endorsed the new venue
to premiere new works. Only two of the dramatists stated
that, although they supported APT, they would not offer a
play. Arthur Miller responded that he had to insist on the
highest production standards possible, and Howard Lindsay
believed that APT could not offer satisfactory financial
returns. These reasons, however, did not preclude the writers
from wishing APT success.

Of the writers listed above, few had received Broadway
production in the years immediately preceding these letters.
Even fewer had enjoyed a Broadway success. Only Arthur
Laurents (Gypsy 1959), William Gibson (The Miracle Worker
1959), Howard Lindsay with his partner Russell Crouse (The
Sound of Music 1959), and Ossie Davis (Purlie Victorious 1961)
held claim to successful productions during a five year period
preceding APT establishment. The other writers had received
their notoriety during earlier times. Whatever the critical
reasons for their lack of Broadway productions and/or

36 Note: For a discussion of most of the dramatists
listed above, see D.L. Kirkpatrick, ed., Contemporary
also, Gerald Bordman, ed., The Oxford Companion to American
successes, it was logical that they would be interested in alternate routes of production.

Lawrence and Lee at AETA Conference

While Stanley Young was receiving responses from the above playwrights, Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee were preparing to address The American Educational Theatre Association at its annual conference. In 1963, the conference was held at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis. Lawrence and Lee spoke on Wednesday, August 28 in a session entitled "Playwrights Program Project." The purpose of the session was three-fold:

To examine the problem of staging a new play; to discuss the values of new play production to educational and community theatres; to enrich the audience's awareness of new plays through examples of experiences resulting from new play production."

Lawrence and Lee presented an outline of The American Playwrights Theatre at the session. Robert E. Lee began the address to the group which he called "probably the largest convocation of theatrical producers in the world." He

---

"American Educational Theatre Association 27th Annual Convention, program, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota; 26, 27, 28 August 1963, APT Collection, 9."
discussed a "wall which presumes to separate the professional theatre, so-called, from the educational theatre in America." Lee then recalled the exchange between him and some of the participants in the previous year's conference in which educational theatre producers expressed interest in new works by established playwrights."

"The American Playwrights Theatre is a plan by which you can be served first," Lee told the gathering. He proposed the organization as "a partnership between professional playwrights and producing universities." He said that he felt that APT should be an autonomous unit, associated with a variety of organizations, but "not an arm of any existing organization." He said that he was there to present a sketch of the operations, subject to change, but something concrete, so that AETA could "take action, as AETA ha(d) (two months earlier), supporting and endorsing APT.""

Jerome Lawrence continued the address. He discussed the actions taken by playwrights Robert Bolt and Edward Albee in their attempts to produce their works. Bolt's A Man for All

---


"Lee, "APT to AETA."
Seasons received a London production before moving to Broadway. Albee's The Zoo Story was "translated into German and produced in Berlin, for the love of God, before anyone would pay attention to it." Lawrence used these examples to illustrate how difficult it was to produce serious drama in the commercial theatre: Broadway was rarely the site of original productions of plays of ideas." Lawrence failed to mention that Robert Bolt is British and the London production was, in many ways, logical.

Lawrence urged those in attendance to help build the national platform proposed by APT. One play per year would be released through the organization, and each APT production would be "an end in itself, achieving an even greater end: a truly National Theatre." He outlined the operations in general terms. Members would pay a yearly membership fee of $250. A play by an established playwright would be selected through a screening process and released for reading to the members of APT. Once a certain amount of members agreed to produce the play, it would be authorized for production by all the members. A basic percentage of the box office would be

"Jerome Lawrence, "APT to AETA," Session on Playwrights Program Project, AETA Convention, Minneapolis, 28 August 1963, ms., APT Collection."
charged as royalties. The royalty charge would attract the professional dramatist, allowing APT to achieve its "main purpose . . . to present the best new works of our mature and experienced playwrights." Lawrence's proposal introduced two presumptions that would prove to be problematic for APT: 1. that playwrights were eager to submit plays of extremely high caliber, and, 2. that APT theatres were ready to accept the plays offered.

AETA Endorsement

After hearing the proposal put forth by Lawrence and Lee, the Board of Directors of The American Educational Theatre Association issued the following statement:

We approve of the idea of making available to non-commercial theatres plays by professional playwrights according to a plan to be developed following the general principles of The American Playwrights Theatre proposal as submitted by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee at the AETA Convention, Minneapolis, 1963, and authorize the Executive

\[\text{\footnotesize\cite{Lawrence}}\]

Details of royalty computation are discussed later in this chapter. Royalties for four specific productions are discussed in Chapter VI. Royalties for all APT productions are listed in the financial statements in Supplement A.

\[\text{\footnotesize\cite{Lawrence}}\] Lawrence, "APT to AETA."
Committee to continue further negotiations."

AETA's endorsement of the plan to produce new plays contrasted with a trend that was present in university and college productions during the previous season. According to a survey of 569 American colleges and universities, there was not much interest in production of new plays. Representatives might have said that they wanted to produce new plays, but their actions said otherwise. During the 1961-1962 season, new plays comprised only 7.4 per cent of the total productions, and only 3.0 per cent were full-length productions. The trend had been toward plays of a safe nature. "Standards," classic or contemporary, dominated the production season. Shakespeare was by far the most produced playwright. A great distance behind him were Williams, Miller, Shaw, Wilder, Anouilh, and Moliere. These "standards" composed 52 per cent of all productions, while recent Broadway successes by contemporary playwrights amounted to 21 per cent."

In light of these trends, AETA's endorsement of APT

---


is somewhat surprising. Perhaps it came in the hopes of changing the production patterns of AETA's membership. If new plays by established dramatists were made readily available, perhaps the educational theatre would produce them. The organization's support, however, was very encouraging to APT's founders.

Board of Governors Meeting

The first official gathering of the directors of the American Playwrights Theatre took place on December 3, 1963 on the campus of The Ohio State University. On this date, the Board of Governors of APT met to solidify the groundwork which had been laid at previous informal meetings. Governors in attendance were J. Osborne Fuller, Dean of OSU College of Arts and Sciences; Edward Cole, Professor at Yale University; Robert E. Lee, playwright; Jack Morrison, Professor at University of California, Los Angeles; Elmer Rice, playwright; Frank Whiting, Professor at University of Minnesota; and Stanley Young, Executive Director of the American National Theatre and Academy, who was substituting for playwright Robert

"The reaction of educational theatre practitioners will be measured and discussed in terms of their subscribing to APT, as well as their responses to APT's first year of operation. Both events are discussed in the next chapter."
Anderson. Present in advisory capacities were W. Hayes Yeager, Chair of OSU Department of Speech; and Roy H. Bowen, Director of Theatre at Ohio State. All of the participants were previously acquainted through their membership in The National Theatre Conference. (Just how these men were appointed to the Board of Governors will be detailed at a later point in a discussion of the By-Laws of APT.)

The major actions taken at this meeting included the appointment of OSU Assistant Professor David H. Ayers as the Executive Director of American Playwrights Theatre. Also, after a few revisions, the Board of Governors approved the proposed By-Laws of the organization.

The Purpose of APT/The By-Laws

The By-Laws stated the purpose of The American Playwrights Theatre as:

to create a truly nation-wide theatre by fostering cooperation between our most active living dramatists and the play-producers of the university, college and non-profit community

---


"David H. Ayers, personal interview, 28 April 1993.

"Ayers, Memo regarding meeting on December 3, 1963."
theatres, thereby enabling the best new works of substance and ideas to enter our dramatic literature through presentation first and nationally on the stages of America's educational theatres, which are both the teaching laboratories and vital channels of communication for the communities they serve. The ultimate end is to enhance the quality of our national drama."

Major Tenets of the By-Laws

Two governing bodies were created: The Board of Governors and The Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees, who were to "have all power and authority over the affairs of this organization," was to include the Chair of the Board of Governors who was to serve as the President of the Board of Trustees; the Chair of OSU's Department of Speech; the Director of Theatre at OSU; the Executive Director of Student Relations at OSU; an advising attorney; the President of the American Educational Theatre Association; a professional playwright; and the Executive Director of the American National Theatre and Academy (By-Laws 3-4).

The second board, the Board of Governors was established "to formulate policies to carry out the purposes of the organization." Governors were to be responsible for four major areas:

---

"American Playwrights Theatre By-Laws, December 1963, 3. (Subsequent references to By-Laws will be parenthetical.)
(1.) the relationship of APT with other appropriate national organizations,
(2.) the nomination of members of a Council on Play Selection,
(3.) the financial arrangements with playwrights and with college, university, and community theatres, and
(4.) rules governing the ways and means of selecting and recommending plays to subscribers.

The Governors included three professional playwrights selected by the Board of the American National Theatre and Academy; three college, university, and community theatre directors selected by the Board of the American Educational Theatre Association; and the President of the Board of Trustees who would serve as Chair of the Board of Governors (By-Laws 5-6).

The development and the composition of the two Boards was an attempt to create a system of checks and balances. In time, the Boards also included directors of regional theatres. By using a combination and an equal number of professional playwrights, university producers, and professional theatre practitioners, APT hoped to provide adequate representation of all factions of the organization.**

The By-Laws described the Council on Play Selection, composed of knowledgable theatre practitioners chosen by APT

** Ayers, interview, 28 April 1993.
members, which would "select one or more new plays each year" to offer to APT theatres (By-Laws 7).

The position of the Executive Director of The American Playwrights Theatre was charged with carrying out the policies of the organization. The Executive Director, "with the cooperation of ANTA, (was to) invite playwrights, both new and well-established, to submit their new plays to the Council on Play Selection." The Executive Director was also instructed to "prepare a standard contract for playwrights (with the help of The Dramatists Guild, and, after consultation with the Board of Governors, prepare a standard contract for producers." (By-Laws 8). (This passage in the By-Laws is the first mention of inclusion of new playwrights in APT. All previous descriptions to AETA, ANTA, and the Dramatists Guild mention only established dramatists.)

Standing Rules of Participation were established for member theatres. An annual subscription fee of $250 for any college, university, community, or resident non-profit professional theatre allowed that member to produce one play. If two or more plays were approved by the Council on Play Selection, an equal additional charge was necessary. Once 50 producing groups agreed to produce the same play, the APT program would be in operation for that play. If fewer than
50 groups were interested, the APT program would be in effect for that play only with the approval of the playwright(s) concerned. Two hundred dollars of each subscription fee was a credit towards royalties, which were to be ten per cent of the actual box office gross. Minimum royalties were set at $100 for the first performance, $50 for the next two performances, and $25 for each subsequent performance. APT was to receive a service fee of ten per cent of the gross royalties (By-Laws 9-10).

Production rights of the selected play(s) were exclusive to APT for an entire year. There was to be no Broadway, Off-Broadway, television, or motion picture release concurrent with the APT contract. There was also "no release within the incorporated city of New York." After the original one year APT contract expired, the playwright had the option of seeking other production venues, continuing with an exclusive APT contract, or granting "irrevocable (but not exclusive) production rights to APT for another year or period of years which would permit them, concurrently with APT production, to market their plays in other ways." (By-Laws 10-11).

Salaries and expenses of various positions were discussed. The APT Trustees and Governors served "without renumeration." Their travel expenses, however, were to be
paid when authorized in advance by the Board of Trustees. The salaries of the Executive Director and support staff were to be determined by the Board of Trustees. Members of the Council on Play Selection were to be paid a fee as recommended by the Board of Governors and approved by the Board of Trustees. Headquarters for all activities pertaining to APT was positioned at The Ohio State University (By-Laws 11-12).

The structure for the American Playwrights Theatre as stated in the original By-Laws discussed above remained basically intact for the duration of the existence of the organization. Some changes, however, were made in subscription fees, play selection, contract rights and number of productions necessary to activate a play. In the following chapters the reasons for these changes are discussed.

Immediate Exceptions to the Rules

In addition to approving the By-Laws at the December 3, 1963 meeting, the Board of Governors took a few additional actions. The first action dealt with the solicitation of new plays. The Governors decided that, in order to expedite the submission of scripts, "for the first year plays would be solicited by invitation from ANTA and that the invitations should be limited to established American playwrights."
Stanley Young, Executive Director of ANTA agreed to issue the
invitations.

The Governors also made an exception in the selection
process for the Council on Play Selection. In order to
implement the program for the 1964-1965 season, they arrived
at a list of jurors "by nominating ten knowledgable theatre
people and then ranking the nominees in order of preference."
The persons selected were Fredric March, John Gassner, Brooks
Atkinson, Harold Clurman tied with Alan Schneider, John Mason
Brown, George Freedley, Elliot Norton, Henry Hewes, and Jean
Dalrymple. Stanley Young was to invite the first three men
to participate. The jurors were to be paid an honorarium of
$50 per script and were to write a one page evaluation of the
script "including a statement of suitability of the play for
APT production. . . . . Emphasis was given to the fact that
the above procedure for play selection was not necessarily the
pattern to be followed in the future."^1

Board of Trustees Meeting

The APT Board of Trustees met for the first time on
December 13, 1963. Those present elected officers for the

---

^1 Ayers, Memo "Board of Governors Meeting on
Trustees: President, Dean J. Osborne Fuller; Vice-President, W. Hayes Yeager; Secretary-Treasurer, Roy H. Bowen. Other APT Trustees were John T. Bonner, Executive Director of Student Relations at Ohio State; C. Emory Glander, Columbus attorney; Kenneth L. Graham, University of Minnesota and president of The American Educational Theatre Association; Jerome Lawrence, playwright; and Stanley Young, Executive Director of the American National Theatre and Academy. As was the case with the Trustees, all these men were previously acquainted through membership in The National Theatre Conference, with the exception of attorney Glander. According to APT's founders, the absence of women on either of the original boards and throughout most of APT's history reflected the lack of women in administrative and major creative positions in all theatre.

Throughout APT's existence, five participants remained constant: Lawrence, Lee, Ayers, Bowen, and Anderson. Secondary figures, such as Young, Morrison, and Rice were also present for long periods. The remaining positions on either

---

*2 David Ayers, Memo to APT Board of Trustees and Board of Governors. "Minutes of first APT Board of Trustees Meeting on December 13, 1963," n.d., 1-3.

*3 Ayers, interview, 28 April 1993.
Board fluctuated over APT's existence, depending on appointments, resignations, active participation, etc. Often, the major figures moved from one board to another, preserving a continuity of leadership.

At their first official meeting, the Trustees made a few suggestions regarding the actions of the Board of Governors. The first major change was in the cost of yearly membership and the computation of royalties. A yearly subscription rate was set at $50. Instead of the flat royalty rate, tabulation was set as follows: in addition to an initial $200 charge, the producing theatre was to pay APT 5% of the first $2,500 taken at the box office, 7 1/2 % of the next $2,500.00 and 10% thereafter. APT was to take its ten per cent from the total royalties.

Also changed was the description of the method of selecting plays for production. The entire statement in regards to the Council on Play Selection was pared down to "the method of selecting the members of the Jury of Play Selection shall be determined by the Board of Governors." This change allowed for adaptions and variations in the process of play selection which permitted APT to survive for many years.
Dean Fuller presented a financial report with information listing OSU as contributing the salary of the Executive Director (who also had teaching responsibilities), office space and equipment, support staff, and $1,000 from the Lawrence and Lee Foundation which was to be used mainly for travel. Fuller stated his intentions to pursue additional funding from the Ford, Rockefeller and Golden Fund Foundations. The OSU Development Fund also pledged $5,000 in matching monies. The Trustees also stated that incorporation as a non-profit organization was necessary as soon as possible."

Elmer Rice and the Dramatists Guild

The same day as the meeting described above, playwright Elmer Rice wrote a letter to David Ayers, Executive Director of APT. Rice reported that he had been present "at a well-attended meeting of the Council of the Dramatists Guild." Rice had "outlined the APT plan, which was received with great interest and universal approval." Rice predicted that there would "be no difficulty at all about an agreement on terms and

"Ayers, Memo regarding meeting on December 13, 1963."
conditions." He requested a copy of the *By-Laws* and offered any type of service necessary."

Ayers responded that the Dramatists Guild could be of service by providing two things: "a resolution of approval of the APT plan and a suggested contract for playwrights." Both of these requests were fulfilled. The contract was developed according to the rights period and royalty terms described above. Absent from the contract were stipulations for a playwright's input regarding choice of director and cast, two terms often present in professional contracts. Ayers also reported that "Brooks Atkinson and Frederic March (were) unable to serve on the Jury on Play Selection", but he had "acceptances from John Gassner and Harold Clurman and hope(d) to have Alan Schneider's acceptance" that day."

The Jury on Play Selection

Schneider agreed to serve on the Jury on Play Selection, and on December 24, 1963 APT made the following announcement:

American Playwrights Theatre has named two New York directors and a Yale professor to a jury which will select the first play in a program

---

**Elmer Rice, letter to David Ayers, 13 December, 1963, APT Collection.**

**David Ayers, letter to Elmer Rice, 17 December 1963, APT Collection, 1.**
for bringing first-run serious drama to the nation's non-commercial stages.

Harold Clurman was described as a New York stage director and producer, John Gassner as the Sterling Professor of Playwriting at Yale University, and Alan Schneider as a prominent New York director. These experts agreed to participate in APT, lending further professional and academic credence to the organization.

Summary

By the end of 1963, the groundwork had been laid for the creation of The American Playwrights Theatre. The organization was a cooperative venture uniting the educational theatre with the commercial theatre. The plan had the approval of professional playwrights, The American National Theatre and Academy, The American Educational Theatre Association, The Dramatists Guild, major universities, and professional directors and critics. The following year tested the organization that had been formed. Reactions to APT by both the playwrights and the participating theatres determined the practicality of such an idealistic plan.

[87 American Playwrights Theatre, News Release, 24 December, 1963, APT Collection, 1.]
CHAPTER III

1964: THE FIRST YEAR

Introduction

The first few years of operation of The American Playwrights Theatre saw periods of frustration, success, embarrassment, conflict, near abandonment, and high achievement. Any organization that involves a large number of participants is bound to weather a variety of situations. APT was no exception. This chapter discusses APT's first year of operation.

The American Playwrights Theatre sought to unite a variety of New York theatre professionals including critics, directors, and playwrights. These professional practitioners joined with instructors and students of educational institutions. Also involved were representatives of the country's few regional theatres and numerous community theatres.

The creation of this national theatre community was not always an easy process. In its pursuit to premiere new plays
by established playwrights on stages outside of New York, APT sometimes met resistance, sometimes acceptance, often complications, but always an agreement on the need to decentralize theatre.

Not all of the plays offered by APT were accepted by its subscribers. Not all of the subscribers rejoined every year. Not every major playwright participated. Plays by "name" playwrights were rejected by the judges and Reading Committee and not even offered to the subscribers. Those plays that were offered and staged met with a variety of reactions by the local and national critics. Sometimes, confusion was present as to the exact goals of APT. In other words, not every aspect of the organization ran smoothly. But its major achievement is that it ran. The American Playwrights Theatre united the educational and professional theatre in the United States throughout much of two decades.

Its subscribers included major regional theatres such as The Dallas Theatre Center, The Alley Theatre, The Goodman Theatre, The Mark Taper Forum, The Cleveland Play House, and Actors Theatre of Louisville. The participating educational subscribers ranged from huge public institutions to small private colleges. The University of California, Los Angeles; University of Minnesota; Seton Hall University; Vassar
College; Marion College of Fon du Lac (Wisconsin); and Flathead Community College in Kalispell, Montana, numbered among APT members. So, too, did community theatres such as Rochester (New York) Community Players, Belmont (Massachusetts) Dramatic Club, Booth Tarkinton Civic Theatre in Indianapolis, Des Moines Community Playhouse, and the Anchorage Community Theatre. Each of these organizations had its own needs and concerns. Each shared the desire to produce new plays.

There was no foolproof method to unite such a varied group. APT devised a plan, implemented it, waited for reaction, adjusted as necessary, and continued. The organization that was originally founded differed from the one that was eventually disbanded. Although the early years, especially, saw a time of continual evolution and redefinition, APT's goals always remained the same: to provide new plays to America's stages without the Broadway stamp of approval. Its method to achieve those goals, however, adjusted to needs of its subscribers and its founders. This ability to adapt allowed APT to survive for as long as it did.

'American Playwrights Theatre, Membership Rosters 1963-1979, APT Collection. Note: Membership varied throughout APT's history. Most of the theatres listed joined intermittently. Few theatres subscribed every year.
The first year of operation (1964) of The American Playwrights Theatre was a mixture of achievement and disappointment. The organization enjoyed a good deal of media coverage and response from academic theatre practitioners, as well as the interest of regional and community theatres. Playwrights of national reputation expressed interest, with some submitting work. Two plays were selected to be offered to APT subscribers. Unfortunately, neither play sufficiently interested subscribers to allow activation. APT theatres did not agree to do fifty productions of either script. The first year of operation did not see the production of an APT play.

Incorporation and Original Publicity

The American Playwrights Theatre was legally incorporated in Columbus, Ohio, on January 20, 1964. The purposes of the organization were those listed in the By-Laws and described in the previous chapter.²

Publicity and media coverage ranged from blurbs in local newspapers to reports in The New York Times. The Ohio State University Monthly ran a feature article on APT and an interview with Jerome Lawrence. The article gave an overview

² American Playwrights Theatre, Articles of Incorporation, 1 January 1964, APT Collection.
of the organization, stating that one of the "enticing opportunities for playwrights" was the chance to "'try out' plays 'on the road' throughout the country before all types of audiences and performed by all types of theatrical groups before exposing them to the risks of Broadway." Another opportunity described was that the playwright can experiment "without having to buck Broadway popularity trends" or deal with "pressures from New York producers and high-priced acting stars."³

The first opportunity listed is illustrative of a perception problem that would follow APT. Although the goal of the organization was to produce new plays throughout the country instead of Broadway, often media coverage would describe productions as "before Broadway." Sometimes this perception was a misinterpretation on the part of the newspaper writer. At other times, APT news releases used the "pre-Broadway" term for publicity. Whatever the source, confusion as to the goal of APT often surrounded the organization.

The same article attributed a purpose to the organization other than those previously stated. "At present," the article

stated, "only plays by experienced successful playwrights will be used, but eventually beginners will be given access to the APT program, too." This was the first public mention of beginning playwrights being considered for APT. The article was unclear as to the source of the information. It could have come from Jerome Lawrence who, as previously stated, was interviewed for the article. There was no mention in any early APT promotional news releases of including the inexperienced playwright. Whatever the cause, this was the first example of another point of confusion that surrounded APT: was it an organization for the established playwright, the new playwright, or both?

Other early media reports were not as confusing. Both The National Observer and The New York Times ran promotional articles based on APT news releases. These articles did not include the information regarding beginning writers which was carried in the OSU article. The Observer and The Times articles described the workings of the organization, its founders, its goals, and its headquarters.¹

APT also received national coverage in an article in *Life Magazine*, although the organization was not mentioned directly by name. Critic Tom Prideaux related his viewing of the original production of *The Child Buyer* by Paul Shyre at the University of Michigan Professional Theatre Program. He described it as "a good play," but did not know where it would go from there since "it probably lacks New York appeal, but will probably play well in other settings." The situation called for, according to Prideaux, "a circuit of university and community theatres which could be booked with a series of new plays and experimental productions that may lack a Broadway box office potential." He was referring to APT when he mentioned the "idea of such a circuit" for which "eight noted playwrights, including S.N. Behrman and William Saroyan have agreed to provide new works." Prideaux concluded by saying that "what the US theater needs is not less of Broadway, but more outlets for different kinds of plays."*

The APT subscription brochure promised such an organization. It described the goal of premiering new works across America instead of on Broadway. "Now noncommercial theatres will be served first with works by experienced

---

professional playwrights," stated the brochure. "APT productions will be important premieres in their own right," it continued, "and will contribute to the growth of the decentralized theatre. They are not intended as tryouts for Broadway." The brochure also announced John Gassner, Harold Clurman, and Alan Schneider as judges who were to select plays "from a group of new scripts by established American playwrights."

The promotional articles and the subscription brochure proved enticing enough. Subscription for the first season numbered at 118 member theatres. Of those, 95 were college/university theatres, 3 were regional theatres, and 20 were community theatres.2 The response was encouraging, though membership enrollment fell short of the hundreds of subscribers anticipated.

The First Plays: *Forests of the Night* and *Banners of Steel*

Stanley Young, Executive Director of the American National Theatre and Academy, notified playwrights of the

---


2 American Playwrights Theatre, 1964 Membership Roster, APT Collection.
establishment of APT. These dramatists were those whom Young considered prominent national playwrights, although there were no specific criteria other than some kind of Broadway production history. By the end of January, "the following playwrights (had) submitted scripts: Louis Coxe, Emmet Lavery, John Murray, William Saroyan, Elmer Rice, and John Wexley. There (were) plays forthcoming from Arnold Sundgaard and Barrie Stavis."* Each of the submitting playwrights had seen his works on the commercial Broadway stage and was therefore eligible to submit plays to APT.

The judges, Clurman, Schneider, and Gassner, considered the scripts, and made their choices. "Two plays have been selected . . . as the APT plays for the 1964-1965 season," Ayers wrote to subscribers, "They are Forests of the Night by Arnold Sundgaard and Banners of Steel by Barrie Stavis."

Public announcement of the winning plays was made on April 1, 1964 in news releases from both APT and ANTA. The APT news release described Forests of the Night as a play "of character and mood which grew out of some 30 improvisations

* Stanley Young, letter to David H. Ayers, 31 January 1964, APT Collection.

developed in collaboration between the playwright and a group of actors from Actors Studio in New York." *Banners of Steel* was described as "one of a quartet of plays on which Stavis ha(d) been working for more than twenty years. It tells the story of John Brown's preparation for the raid on Harper's Ferry which proved one of the factors in touching off The Civil War." Although the play was set in the previous century, "the moral questions of human responsibility raised remains contemporary."  

The ANTA press release included the above information, as well as a description of the announcement being made by Stanley Young of ANTA. It supplied quotes regarding the importance of APT and decentralization of the American theatre. It also gave biographies of the two winning writers. Stavis' three Broadway productions were *Lamp at Midnight*, *The Sun and I*, and *The Man Who Never Died*. Sundgaard had been represented with *The First Crocus*, *Everywhere I Roam*, and the

---

librettos for Kurt Weill's *Down In in the Valley* and Douglas Moore's *Giants in the Earth* which won a Pulitzer Prize."

**AETA vs. APT**

Neither news release mentioned that APT received joint sponsorship by both ANTA and AETA, an oversight which did not sit well with Kenneth L. Graham, of the University of Minnesota and President of AETA. In a letter to David Ayers, Graham wrote that "if APT is a joint ANTA-AETA (or AETA-ANTA) venture then both co-sponsors must be judiciously included in all news releases." Graham continued with saying that not all factions of either organization believed that ANTA and AETA could work together, and that improper identification of such a joint sponsorship made it all the more challenging to convince those dissenters." This situation is illustrative of yet another challenge that would face APT: to unite a number of different organizations and keep everyone happy. Ayers apologized to Graham, expressed his plans to handle all

---


"Kenneth L. Graham, letter to David H. Ayers, 10 April 1964, APT Collection."
APT news releases from the OSU headquarters, and promised to include AETA on all future releases."

The above complication was minor when compared to two other problems that would face APT that beginning year. The first major difficulty arose in response to the promotional article that had appeared in The New York Times. Kenneth M. Cameron of the Drama Department at the University of Rochester in Rochester, New York, used The Times' "Drama Mailbag" to voice his opinion of APT. His letter criticized the organization on many accounts:

With all respects to out-of-work playwrights--(sic) I spent years as one, I should hardly recommend the American Playwrights Theatre... (It is) peculiarly ill-conceived, and designed largely for the benefit of the writers... We find that three hundred year old hits are generally more instructive for student actors and more pertinent to our educational responsibilities... We can find originals on our own without setting up a pension plan for established writers... Will the playwrights of APT really put themselves on the line with university directors and actors--make changes, listen to creative counsel, accept the fact that educational theatre includes people even more talented than they? I doubt it... Any

---

David H. Ayers, letter to Kenneth L. Graham, 23 April 1964, APT Collection.
playwright who can find a way to make a guaranteed $10,000.00 a year has a real flair for theater."  

Understandably, such a letter in a national publication was not good for APT's image.

Stanley Young readily replied, and his response was published two weeks later. "What is 'ill-conceived' about a plan that offers for production to college, university and community theatres across the country original scripts by professional American playwrights?" Young questioned. In response to Cameron's assertion regarding original plays, Young wrote, "None of us had realized that the universities could come up . . . with scripts equal to the work of established American playwrights." Young justified the guaranteed productions and subsequent royalties, saying that "theatre . . . can scarcely exist without playwrights who eat fairly regularly." He also stated that there were over one hundred members of APT at that point and invited Cameron to "come out of the ivy and join with us who are trying to create and further a living theater in America."  

---


* Stanley Young, letter, "The Drama Mailbag," The New York Times, 19 April 1964, 4X.
There is no way to measure the impact made by these two published letters. What is illustrated, however, is another perception that would follow APT: that the organization was designed to benefit the playwright.

In defense of the playwright and of APT, Robert E. Lee wrote a personal letter to Cameron. Lee stated that APT playwrights did put themselves on the line with university producers, "even more so, in fact, than . . . with Broadway producers, for the APT playwrights have waived the control of casting in favor of the judgement of university and community directors." Lee also acknowledged the chance that APT theatres could possibly "do better versions of our own plays than Broadway." Lee continued that the "royalty guarantee is simply a matter of financial reality." Lee also acknowledged that "there are many defects with APT. It may very easily fail," but Lee invited Cameron to continue to show his interest "in a constructive way." In order to deter any accusations of self-promotion on the part of himself and his partner, Lee commented that "Jerry and I have contributed thousands of hours and thousands of dollars to this project, with no hope of any gain whatsoever for ourselves--for we have
disqualified our own works from presentation via the APT plan."

This statement held true for a few years.

Rejection of the First Plays

The second major problem of APT's first year was much more measurable: neither of the "winning" plays were accepted for production. David Ayers realized the possibility of such a situation almost immediately after the plays were announced. The day after sending the scripts to member organizations announcing the plays as the winners, Ayers wrote to members of the Board of Governors. There had actually been twelve plays submitted to ANTA, explained Ayers. George Freedley, theatre critic, author, and an ANTA official, was hired by APT to screen that group and offered five plays to the judges."

"Some of us have read the winning plays and frankly, we are disappointed," wrote Ayers. "Both plays present serious problems of staging and casting and we have grave doubts about the plays being accepted by the participating theatres." Ayers stated that the organization would follow the judges'
decision, but APT should be prepared to offer subscribers one of two things: another play, or a year’s membership extension."

Robert E. Lee evaluated the situation in a letter to Ayers in the following way:

Jerry and I are disappointed in that the selections do not fulfill the promise of APT, namely to make available works which would not otherwise be offered to regional theatres. . . . I find it difficult to understand how only twelve plays were submitted for a guaranteed prize of fifty national productions and $50,000. Jerry and I have disqualified ourselves as contributing playwrights. But it is incredible that Broadway’s authors are so happy with their lot that they ignore this opportunity."*

(The source of Lee’s amount of $50,000 was not named.) Whatever the reason for other playwrights’ lack of response, the Sundgaard and Stavis plays were the offerings for the year.

Ayers and Lee were not the only ones who were disappointed. "Several of the subscribers . . . registered rather strong feelings of disappointment in the plays." The leaders of APT were also "extremely disappointed to learn that Banners of Steel had been widely circulated to university and

* Ayers, memo, 26 March 1964.

community theatres long before the play was entered in the APT competition," a fact Stavis failed to mention upon submission of his script.  

Ayers notified both playwrights that, although they had "won" the APT competition, their scripts would not be produced. In response to a request from Stavis, Ayers quoted subscribers' reactions to Banners of Steel:

'It's appeal is limited, and its demand for the large sized cast make it difficult to produce.'

University of Oklahoma.

'A cast that even a university theatre would be hard put to complete.'

Ball State Teachers College.

'. . . excluded because of its cast requirements'

Trumbull New Theatre, Inc.

'imbalance between male and female roles is a basic reason for our negative reaction.'

Mills College.

'Even if (it) had shown real quality, we thought its casting problems made it a curious choice for the purpose in hand.'

University of Wisconsin.

'tremendous difficulties as far as casting and production in concerned.'

Rochester Community Players."

Sundgaard also requested a summary of the reactions of the subscribers to his play. Ayers provided the following:

'obviously not ready for production'

---

20 David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, 5 May 1964, APT Collection.

21 David H. Ayers, letter to Barrie Stavis, 8 June 1964, APT Collection.
Robert Anderson's Evaluation of the Problems

In a letter headed "This is a personal letter of opinion not to be circulated!", Governor Robert Anderson discussed APT's situation with David Ayers, citing the lack of cooperation of the playwriting community and the absence of quality scripts as the cause of APT's troubles. He stated that neither of the two playwrights whose works had been selected "are well-known enough to make it exciting to do any new play by them, and the plays themselves are not that unusual." Anderson related that he had been involved in other new play ventures, "and they always founder on the question of the plays available." He stated that "there is some myth that there are a number of unproduced works of genius floating around . . . This isn't so. . . . (T)he establishment of APT

---

22 David H. Ayers, letter to Arnold Sundgaard, 29 May 1964, APT Collection.
doesn't automatically bring (the plays) into being."
Regarding the small response on the part of the playwriting community, Anderson felt "it is too bad that a kind of mistrust exists between the college and community theatres and the so-called professional playwright." Also worthy of note in this letter is Anderson’s first mention of a play of his own which he had considered submitting to APT, but he and his agent and his producer felt that the play's subject matter would "prevent its being done in college theatres." The play was Anderson's *The Days Between*, a drama revolving around a writer, his wife, a hint of infidelity, and abortion.

**Stanley Young's Evaluation of the Problems**

Governor Stanley Young also wrote to Ayers, evaluating the situation and offering suggestions. Young cited four major areas which contributed to the year's "apparent failure": deadlines were too cramped to get "a good group of plays," the judges were unaware of the production problems of the participating theatres, Stavis' play had already been rejected by many of the theatres prior to APT's offering, and the "timidity of subscribers in not making a special effort

---

27 Robert A. Anderson, letter to David H. Ayers, 8 May 1964, APT Collection.
to produce plays that were less than perfect." Three of these four concerns reflected upon APT and its judges. The fourth, centering on the subscribers, was Young's subjective evaluation of the situation. He pledged ANTA's continued support "in acquiring scripts and dealing with playwrights." He cautioned that APT would never find a play that would be completely acceptable to all subscribers. Participating theatres would need "to take some chances themselves... (and) not to expect to get Harvey or some similar smash every season." Young also stated that he was pleased that APT was "for the professional playwright rather than for the new playwright (since) there are excessive opportunities now for the new playwright to get his play produced." He did not name these venues. Young closed by saying that he was "extremely disappointed with the way things have gone."

Withdrawal of the Plays and Extension of Memberships

Ayers soon notified the APT subscribers that the organization's offering had proven unsuccessful, and that APT was prepared to take a number of actions "to insure the future fulfillment of the APT promise." The APT program would not

---

Stanley Young, letter to David H. Ayers, 14 May 1964, APT Collection.
be put into operation until the following Autumn, September 1965, and all subscription fees were automatically extended through the next year. Speaking for the Board of Governors, Ayers promised that APT would "begin immediately to exert every effort and to explore all avenues to find superior new works by well-known playwrights for the 65-66 season." If any of the member theatres wanted to produce either of the offered plays, the theatres would need to make arrangements directly with Stavis or Sundgaard. Ayers apologized for the "many unforeseen problems" which included the pressures of time constraints, and "not finding the plays we all hoped for."²⁶

A news release containing much of the above information was issued, and The New York Times carried an article entitled "Playwrights Theatre Group Postpones First Production," which stated that Sundgaard's Forests of the Night and Stavis' Banners of Steel were "not accepted by enough theatres."²⁶ This announcement proved detrimental to APT. To have a play rejected by the non-commercial university theatre community was problematic enough for a commercial dramatist. To have

²⁶ David Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 26 May 1964, APT Collection.

the rejection announced in *The New York Times* compounded the humiliation. Undoubtedly, this announcement deterred other prospective playwrights from submitting works.

**The Question of Eligibility**

The following summer was spent trying to identify and rectify some of APT's problems. A major concern for Ayers was the question of eligibility. He requested "further clarification from the Governors concerning the standard of eligibility for playwrights and plays." APT was presently using a "Broadway representation" as the criterion, but Ayers was not sure that all Governors agree that Broadway credit is the proper criterion for eligibility." Ayers asked the Governors to give the matter some thought and to be ready to discuss it at the Fall board meeting. He also invited comment regarding other issues to be discussed.27

Further Evaluation by Robert Anderson, Edward Cole and Robert E. Lee

Robert Anderson offered further concerns, some directed at the university theatre community, and some directed at the

27 David Ayers, letter to APT Governors, 10 June 1964, APT Collection.
playwrights. All of his concerns were of a very practical nature. "Colleges are not as experimental as APT thought (or adventurous)," he wrote. "Almost more than Broadway, they want only successes." He urged a reconsideration of an entire premise on which APT was founded: do non-professional theatres actually want to try out new plays? He also urged examination of the hesitancy of playwrights to offer works. Their misgivings were justified, Anderson felt, since playwrights stood "a better chance of finding the proper actors for (their) plays in New York where there is a wider choice." With that in mind APT should be prepared to "get plays which haven't been produced, for one reason or another, on Broadway." Monetary concerns also were raised by Anderson. Based on practical matters, he stated that APT should expect to "only get the good plays by the good playwrights when (APT could) arrange some kind of financial return of sufficient size to compete with Broadway." Under APT's royalty plan, a playwright could expect a minimum of $10,000 with 50 theatres producing the work at a guaranteed minimum of $200 per production. Royalty computations thereafter were based on size of theatre, length of run, and box office intake.

---

Yale Professor and Governor Edward Cole received a copy of Anderson's letter and responded in support of Anderson's statements. Cole saw the "summary of the professional playwright's position as more realistic than was Bob Lee's original premise that there are playwrights with good plays which New York producers will not produce and which they are anxious to produce elsewhere." Cole also felt that APT plays "should be selected by dramatic quality and not acceptance and producibility."" Again, acceptance criterion was an issue of debate.

Robert E. Lee contacted Barrie Stavis in response to Stavis' earlier letter to Ayers regarding the reasons for Banners of Steel's rejection. Lee placed the cause of failure of APT's first year with the subscribing theatres. "Obviously, the plan doesn't work. It must be changed." he stated. He suggested approaching the members and saying, "you have rejected the choices of Mssrs. Gassner, Schneider, and Clurman. What do you want? We are professionals. We will try to fill your reasonable needs." He proposed that, perhaps, the direction to take would be to commission new

plays based on members' needs." Copies of Lee's letter to Stavis were sent to members of APT Board of Governors and Board of Trustees for consideration.

Anderson responded negatively to Lee's suggestion. "I really don't think the proposal you set forth would work," Anderson wrote. "Commissioning is not a good idea." Anderson did not feel that any playwright would write "to prescription of what a university needs." Playwrights should be approached, but not told what to write." Commissioning plays would often be a topic of consideration and debate in the future of APT.

Evaluation of the Problems by Stanley Young and Arthur Ballet

Stanley Young expressed concern about "the considerable amount of criticism which has been heaped on our heads as a result of the postponement of the APT program." The criticism was "particularly heavy from members of the Dramatists Guild." From discussing the situation with professional playwrights, Young concluded that unless the By-Laws were changed "to

---


guarantee production of winning plays . . . there will be very few dramatists who will submit scripts." The dramatists, according to Young, felt that there was "nothing to protect them from having next year's choices repudiated by the subscribers." Withdrawing APT's first year offerings had not rested well with the professional writers, said Young. "I can't begin to tell you how many people were angry about the action that was finally taken," he said in closing. "It is going to take some very hard thinking on all our parts to eradicate the hazards and mistakes of last year."

Arthur Ballet, of the University of Minnesota's Office of Advanced Drama Research had replaced Minnesota's Frank Whiting on the Board of Governors. Ballet expressed concern that "the blame of the first year's failure was placed on the educators." He attributed it to the low number of scripts submitted and the poor quality of the ones chosen. More scripts could have been available, Ballet attested. "More writers would have submitted had they been solicited, but Stanley Young, who I understand did the soliciting on behalf of APT, did not choose to ask." (Exactly who Ballet meant was not made clear.) The quality of both plays was "very

---

22 Stanley Young, letter to David H. Ayers, 21 July 1964, APT Collection.
disappointing" he felt, and "the educational theatres exercised excellent producer's judgement in rejecting them."

Subscriber Support of APT

Although subscribers rejected the plays, they still supported the goals of APT. Numerous members agreed that the two plays offered were of poor quality, and expressed support for the organization's decision to delay the official implementation until an appropriate script was found. They agreed that APT was better off waiting at least until the following year when a more suitable play could be offered. Subscribers expressed understanding and appreciation of APT's admission that it simply tried to do too much too quickly.

---


Board Meeting Notification: Discussion of Eligibility and Lack of Plays

A joint meeting of the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees of The American Playwrights Theatre was scheduled for October 1 and 2, 1964 on the campus of The Ohio State University. David Ayers notified the boards of the scheduled meeting and listed two areas of concern: playwright eligibility and the lack of prospective plays. A recent notice regarding APT in the Dramatists Guild Quarterly had brought inquiries from eight playwrights, all of whom had Broadway credit, all of whom wished to submit plays, none of whom were considered major established playwrights. Responses from various play agents had "not been encouraging." Of five agencies contacted, only Audrey Wood's Ashley Famous Agency promised to submit a script. The only other play possibility was Elmer Rice's Slaves of the Lamp which had been submitted the previous year, but had been eliminated from the competition because Rice was on the Board of Governors of APT, and the organization was very concerned about not appearing to be a self-serving vehicle. Based on responses from the Board members, Ayers offered two suggestions to the challenge of finding new plays: commissioning a play after subscriber
input; and polling subscribers as to their favorite playwrights and to approach those playwrights accordingly.24

Robert Anderson and The Days Between

In response to Ayers' notification of the meeting and concern over the lack of scripts, Robert Anderson replied, again referring to The Days Between:

I may bring along a play of mine for informal perusal. At the moment Deborah Kerr is debating whether or not she can do it. . . . Uta Hagen at one time said she would play it, but she didn't approve of my director, and at the time I stuck with my director (like a fool.) It has been under option to Leland Hayward and Alfred de Liagre. . . . and perhaps the subject matter would make it impossible for community theatres. But I might bring it along and let a few people read it.25

The 1964 Joint Meeting of the Boards of Governors and Trustees

The joint meeting of the boards was held as planned and "the major portion of the meeting was devoted to the problems of finding and selecting plays." The most pressing issue was to determine a process of selecting a play for the 1965-66
season. The secondary concern was to develop a standing procedure of play selection for future years. Since the end of the year was rapidly approaching, a means of selection was necessary for the upcoming year. This process would not necessarily be the one used in future seasons.

"Early in the meeting the suggestion was made that APT should become a kind of clearing house for plays with theatres subscribing on a yearly basis, but with no APT promise of a play every year. Under this plan, the competition aspects and judging procedures would be eliminated." The Board agreed that this procedure should be adopted for future selection of APT plays after the 1965-66 season, and planned further discussion of the procedure."

Immediate attention was given to locating a play for the next season. The Board agreed that the "the failure of the previous year's venture (took) away any problem of Governor-playwrights submitting plays, and they decided to consider Elmer Rice's Slaves of the Lamp and Robert Anderson's The Days Between." The selection of the next APT offering would be made by the producers on the Board of Governors and on the

---

Board of Trustees. They were to read the Rice and Anderson scripts, as well as any other plays secured from playwrights whom the Board considered "first echelon playwrights to be invited to participate in the APT program." 39

The List of Playwrights to be Invited to Participate

The establishment of a list of eligible playwrights was a result of Board action to resolve to restrict APT "to the well-established playwright" and to "attempt to eliminate the confusion in the minds of many people that APT was trying to help the new playwrights." The list of 32 dramatists developed at the meeting was as follows:

Edward Albee
Robert Anderson
S.W. Behrman
Truman Capote
Paddy Chayevsky
Marc Connelly
Russell Crouse
Horton Foote
William Gibson
Lorraine Hansberry
Joseph Hayes
Lillian Hellman
William Inge
Garson Kanin
Jean Kerr
Sidney Kingsley
Arthur Laurents
Jerome Lawrence
Robert E. Lee
Howard Lindsey
Archibald MacLeish
Arthur Miller
N. Richard Nash
Paul Osborn
Elmer Rice
Dore Schary
Neil Simon
Samuel Taylor
Core Vidal
Thorton Wilder
Tennessee Williams
Herman Wouk

39 Ayers, Memo, 10 October 1964.
While realizing that "the chance of getting a play from any of these playwrights . . . (was) slight, and that some of the names listed (were) quite impractical and unlikely," various board members agreed to contact the listed playwrights. The list was not released to the press or to subscribers, but was intended for use by board members who were to acquaint the dramatists with APT for future consideration, and also suggest immediate submission of works that might be available. The producers would read any scripts submitted and decide by January 1, 1965 which plays were likely to receive 50 productions."

The playwrights listed above reflected the most important established dramatists, according to the leaders of APT. Of the 32 writers listed, 29 were men and three were women. All were Caucasian, except Lorraine Hansberry. As with the absence of women and persons of color on the Boards of APT, their absence on the list of playwrights reflected the professional theatre of the time, according to APT's founders. The list also failed to include some writers who wrote letters of support of the initial announcement of APT.

---

"Ayers, Memo, 10 October 1964.

Ayers, interview, 28 April 1993."
Very few of the playwrights listed had been represented on Broadway since 1960. Fewer still had enjoyed Broadway success since 1960. Some of the writers listed were best known for comedies; their inclusion is curious, since APT was concerned with "Plays of Ideas," or serious drama. Many of the writers had not seen works staged on Broadway in quite some time, and were clearly of "the old guard." Some of the dramatists had hit their strides in the 1930s and 1940s. One, Elmer Rice, had first been represented in 1914. The writers with the most recent commercial successes, (Albee, Hansberry, Simon) were also the youngest. This list represented, in the eyes of the APT Boards, the most commercially successful contemporary playwrights who might be interested in participating in APT. Their inclusion, however, did not guarantee their submission of works.

Selection of Future Plays and Other Decisions

In regards to selecting plays for future years, the Boards decided upon the following basic mode of operation:

1. APT was to become the aforementioned clearing house for new plays by established playwrights.
2. The selection process was no longer a competition.

All judging procedures were to be abolished.
3. Submission was to be by invitation only.

4. Copies of submitted plays were to be mailed to subscribers immediately, and APT was to canvass subscribers as to the possibility of 50 productions.

5. APT was to have no yearly commitment to supply plays. Some years might see the offering of more than one selection, while other years might not see a play offered, in which case the subscription fee was to be applied to the following year.

Other major actions taken at the 1964 joint Board Meeting were to state that the playwright was to choose the location of the APT pilot production, and that there was to be no Broadway or concurrent commercial production of APT plays during the APT rights period. The By-Laws were to be adjusted to reflect all of the decisions made at this meeting.

Characteristics of APT Demonstrated at 1964 Meeting

The 1964 Board Meeting demonstrated important characteristics of The American Playwrights Theatre. Markedly illustrated was APT's ability to adapt in order to survive. APT realized that it did not supply what it had promised to its subscribers, and the organization was willing to change its mode of operation to insure fulfilling its commitment.
This ability to adapt also grew out of APT's desire to survive. Realizing that a repeat of the first year would be disastrous, the Board of APT recognized the need to adapt in order to secure the continuation of the organization.

Another characteristic illustrated at this meeting was the Board's desire to limit participation to playwrights whom it considered to be established professional dramatists. The Board members themselves developed a list rather than compiling one by surveying subscribers or soliciting suggestions by ANTA, AETA, or the Dramatists Guild. Granted, representatives of the various organizations were present on the Boards, but, as previously mentioned, many of them seemed to belong to the "old guard" of Broadway, many of whom had not seen Broadway representation and/or success in many years. It is possible that a list compiled from one or some of the other sources mentioned might have included other, younger, more contemporary playwrights who were also established professionals.

At this meeting, APT's leaders recognized that the organizations could be perceived as self-serving. Originally, board members were ineligible to submit scripts. After the failure of the first year, the rules were adapted and Board Members were allowed to submit works. Elmer Rice and Robert
Anderson, both of whom were board members, offered plays. This reversal of policy contributed to subscribers' perception that APT was a self-promoting agency.

This meeting also demonstrated APT's desire to free itself from a solid commitment of an annual selection. Instead, it would offer plays based on availability. While this decision was justified as a practical choice on the part of the board, the move could have been perceived otherwise by APT subscribers. An organization that was founded with the promise of offering new plays by major dramatists annually was not standing by its original intentions. APT was reneging on its promises.

Stanley Young: Response to Playwright List and Suggestions for APT Future

The first year of operation of APT was coming to a close. The question of finding a suitable play for subscribers was still unanswered. In response to the list compiled at the board meeting, Stanley Young wrote that it was "a very unrealistic list. With the exception of the playwrights on the Board of Governors, (APT) should not expect a new play from any of the invitees." Young reminded Ayers that some of the playwrights on the list "turned down the original
invitation... (and) Lillian Hellman and Tennessee Williams did not respond at all."44"

A few days later, Young again contacted Ayers with a suggestion. Young believed that "future plans must include lesser-known playwrights if (APT is) to function as a worthwhile experiment." He was very concerned with the "serious situation with Samuel French and Dramatists Play Service" if well-known dramatists were to give APT scripts before giving them to the larger houses. If APT were "to have a little more daring" and promote lesser-known writers, the organization could "extend the value of the experiment, and not incur the wrath of French and DPS." Young also stated that APT would become important only when "the subject matter of the plays becomes more daring that the usual subject matter of Broadway."45

Young's suggestions at this point of APT's history went unheeded as its founders chose to focus on the established

44 Stanley Young, letter to David H. Ayers, 28 October 1964, APT Collection. Note: The playwrights' lack of response contradicts APT publicity information. Hellman is often listed as a prospect. Whether this was done with her knowledge is not known. The possibility exists that she had verbally expressed interest at one time, although this is highly unlikely given comments which will be discussed later.

45 Stanley Young, letter to David H. Ayers, 5 November 1964, APT Collection.
writers. In later years, the organization would turn its attention to lesser-known playwrights. At this point, however, APT was still seeking a work from a major dramatist.

Selection of The Days Between

Young's prediction that only the playwrights from the Board were possibilities proved true. After considering both Elmer Rice's Slaves of the Lamp and Robert Anderson's The Days Between, the latter work was "chosen unanimously as the APT play of the 1965-66 season." Subscribers were notified of the selection and sent a copy of the script in December of 1964, before the board's self-imposed deadline of January 1, 1965. Anderson was to select the location of the pilot production, and would possibly direct, depending on his availability.  

Summary: APT's Problems at the end of 1964

The first year of operation of The American Playwrights Theatre provided the group's founders with many more problems than anticipated. The biggest problem was the lack of quality scripts. APT's organizers assumed that the founding of APT

David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 10 December 1964, APT Collection.
was sufficient stimulus for established dramatists to submit their best works. This was clearly not the case. Writers with Broadway credit, but who were not major names in American theatre, submitted work that was inferior. In offering these scripts, APT caused itself serious damage in the eyes of subscribers. These scripts were not the type of plays promised.

Another problem for APT lay in its lack of communication. With various groups participating, communication between factions was not always clear, as was the case in the issuing of news releases. With different groups wanting different things, APT often functioned as a mediator between factions, incorporating numerous needs, but not clearly defining itself. Sometimes news releases described APT as an outlet for established dramatists, sometimes statements included new writers.

This miscommunication led to a third problem for APT: an image problem. APT's subscribers were not always clear as to the goals of the organization. Members joined to get new plays by major writers, and instead received mediocre scripts by lesser playwrights. Originally, APT board members were not eligible to offer work. When that policy was reversed, members could view APT as a self-serving institution.
In evaluating the problems of that first year, APT leaders disagreed as to the causes for failure. Some leaders blamed the playwrights and their refusal to offer work. Other leaders blamed the producers and their refusal to stage work less than perfect. All of the above problems followed APT throughout its existence.

As 1964 ended, however, the American Playwrights Theatre's prospects were on the upswing. Hoping to recover from the "fiasco" of the first year, the organization's future was focused on offering a script by a fully-established professional playwright. Although the script was not brand new or written exclusively for APT, it was an unproduced work which the board felt capable of receiving a minimum of fifty production acceptances; a work which, hopefully, would serve to fully establish APT as a new play producing organization in practice as well as in theory.
CHAPTER IV
1965-1969

Introduction

During the period of 1965 through 1969, the American Playwrights Theatre underwent many changes. The successful 1965 offering of Robert Anderson's *The Days Between* firmly established APT as a viable new play venue. In the next few years, APT offered three more new plays: George Sklar's *And People All Around*, Charles Yaffee and Jerome Weidman's *Ivory Tower*, and Ron Cowen's *Summertree*. Each of these plays received coast to coast production, bringing APT national recognition. During this time, APT also received a major grant from the National Council on the Arts to encourage submission of scripts. The success of the period also brought many challenges.
At the end of 1964, APT's assets amounted to $8,590. As previously mentioned, most of that amount came from Ohio State, mainly from its Development Fund. Originally, $5000 was to be given to APT in a matching grant. The money was actually given in faith, with the intention that APT would earn the same amount. Over a number of years, APT earned the money, but the amount was not required up front. The balance of the $8,590 came from the Lawrence and Lee Foundation, which contributed $1000, and from subscription revenue. Without the activation of either of the plays offered, APT incurred the expense of copying and circulating the scripts, but did not earn money through a percentage of royalties. Another year of doing so would financially burden the organization. All concerned hoped that the next year would run more smoothly.

1965: The Days Between

The Days Between by Robert Anderson was officially offered to APT subscribers in December of 1964. Member theatres were encouraged to decide quickly to produce the

---

1 Figures in text are rounded to the nearest ten dollar amount. Exact figures are listed in the annual financial reports listed in Appendix A.

play. The future of the organization hinged, they were told, upon a positive response to the script. After some prodding during the following weeks and an extension of the response time, many theatres eventually agreed to do the play. By mid-February, 40 theatres agreed to stage it. Of those, 30 were college/university theatres, nine were community theatres and one was a regional theatre. Although 40 agreements were fewer than the amount required for activation, the Board of Governors agreed to activate the play, confident that at least ten more theatres would produce the work.

Robert Anderson chose the Dallas Theatre Center as the location for the pilot production. Artistic Director Paul Baker directed and Anderson was in residence for part of the rehearsal period and for the opening. The production premiered in May of 1965 to a great deal of national attention and served to firmly establish The American Playwrights

---


4 David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 6 January 1965, APT Collection.


Theatre as an alternate route of new play production. By August, 50 theatres had agreed to produce the Anderson drama.\(^7\)

(A detailed description of the process of implementing the APT program with \textit{The Days Between} will be provided in Chapter VI.)

**Critical Reaction**

The response of the national critics to the play and to APT was generally favorable. Many national publications sent representatives to Dallas to view the opening. "(A) lot better than most of the stuff introduced on Broadway last season," declared Howard Taubman in \textit{The New York Times}. "APT has started its brave new effort auspiciously. . . . It is unthinkable that \textit{The Days Between} will not eventually reach Broadway. But while Broadway waits, the country gets first crack at a new, well-made play."\(^8\)

In \textit{The National Observer}, Marion Simon recounted Anderson's curtain speech in which he thanked all concerned with the production because "The American Playwrights Theatre (was) no longer just a dream." The production of the play


proved two things, according to the review. Most importantly, it proved that "the public will patronize a play that has first not been on Broadway." And secondly, Anderson proved that APT was "the thing to do. . . . The risks are not that great in going the APT route."* 

John Chapman for The Sunday News (New York) declared that the commercial New York theatre had become "a place for music shows and comedies," and that the serious playwright needed to look elsewhere for production and appreciation of works, "to the regional theatre as it (was) loosely defined." Chapman felt that with the production of The Days Between "something very important may have happened at the Dallas Theatre Center." With The American Playwrights Theatre, Anderson and other dramatists would "find many audiences in many parts of the country."**

Within a week, Howard Taubman wrote a second article about APT. He discussed the production of plays at three different regional theatres, one of them being The Days

---


** John Chapman, "Tough Year for Broadway: Serious Playwrights are Looking for Some Other Place to Go," The Sunday News (New York), 28 May 1965, Section 2, page 3.
Between at The Dallas Theatre Center. "There is a desperate need for additional forums . . . where new plays can be done without the forbidding cost and crushing pressures (and) . . . the meat grinder of big-time commercial production." He stated that Anderson could only benefit from his experiences of having an entire year and numerous productions to evaluate his script "by the time it gets to Broadway. A New Yorker is glad to say: Welcome."" As complimentary as Taubman was trying to be, his comments served to further the misconception that APT was a pre-Broadway tryout.

Later that year, a large amount of publicity was generated for APT by an article written by Tom Prideaux for Life Magazine. Within two days Prideaux viewed two separate productions of The Days Between on either coast of the country. On a Friday, he saw the production of The Menlo Park Community Theatre in Menlo, California. The next night, he saw the play as produced by Wheaton College in Norton, Massachusetts. Both productions had risen to the "challenge to be inventive and move into new ground" by doing a play that was "not a Broadway hand-me-down." Prideaux saw the patrons of APT member theatres as "an enormously influential new

audience with fresh responses and varied interests." He viewed APT as "an important new project." Prideaux also mentioned an incident that would haunt The American Playwrights Theatre for the next three years. He wrote: "The bait for playwrights is so attractive that William Inge is giving The American Playwrights Theatre his newest play *Not Quite a Love Song.*"\(^{12}\)

**The Inge Incident**

Prideaux based his statement on a news release issued in September by APT which said "A new play by William Inge will be the first work offered to 1966 subscribing producers in The American Playwrights Theatre Program. *Not Quite a Love Song* is a story of love frustrated by social pressures." The release listed all of Inge's credits which included four major Broadway productions, an Academy Award, and a Pulitzer Prize. Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee were quoted as describing the work as "a splendid play--Inge at his best."\(^{13}\)

---


Unfortunately, APT was not able to offer the Inge play, in 1966 or any other year. Inge had mentioned his new work to Robert E. Lee who suggested APT. Robert Anderson also discussed APT with Inge and encouraged him to submit the play. After discussion with his agent Audrey Wood, Inge stated that he would submit the work and granted APT permission to make the above announcement. After further consideration, Inge refused to submit his play during 1965 so that it could be offered during 1966. He wanted to rewrite the work based on reactions of theatre professionals. Although it needed work, Inge still considered it the "strongest writing" he had ever done for the theatre. In its present state, however, he felt that the play was not what he wanted APT subscribers to read. He feared the effect upon his reputation should the play not be accepted by enough

—


15 Robert Anderson, letter to David H. Ayers, 7 June 1965, APT Collection.


17 William Inge, letter to David H. Ayers, 10 October 1965, APT Collection.

18 William Inge, letter to David H. Ayers, 14 October 1965, APT Collection.
subscribers.' There was even talk of a pre-pilot workshop production with the possibility of special funding by a grant from the National Foundation on the Arts with limited audience and exclusion of the press."

A year later, after a total rewrite and with prodding from Lee, Lawrence, Ayers, Anderson, and Wood, Inge finally submitted his play, retitled *Out on the Outskirts of Town*, to the APT Reading Committee, so that it could be considered for offering in 1968. The Reading Committee, at that time composed of Ayers, Bowen, and Lawrence and/or Lee, did not have a favorable response. Nonetheless, it was passed on to the Board of Governors for their reactions. Unanimously, they voted against offering Inge's play to subscribers, sure that it would not acquire a sufficient number of productions. Lawrence and Lee's change of opinion from hearty endorsement to rejection was not explained. The first draft of the play

---

19 David H. Ayers, letter to Jerome Lawrence, 15 October 1965, APT Collection.


was not available for comparison to the rejected draft.) Inge's agent, Audrey Wood, waited until the final consideration by the boards before notifying Inge of the rejection. Inge's immediate reaction is unknown, but he never again submitted work to APT.

Although not completely resolved until 1967, the Inge incident began in 1965. Hoping to build on the momentum generated by the successful offering of The Days Between, APT announced the Inge work, promoted it in publicity, articles, and the yearly brochure, and based much of the annual subscription drive on the promise of the Inge script. Subscribers joined for the following season, only to be disappointed.

An article in The Wall Street Journal publicized the novelty of APT offering a work by Inge. "Mr. Inge is turning his back on Broadway," the article cried. He was "among a growing list of prominent playwrights who are depressed by what they consider the unhealthy climate for serious theatre


23 Inge's script continued to undergo numerous revisions and retitlings. At various times it was titled Almost a Love Song, Not Quite a Love Song, Out on the Outskirts of Town, and, finally, Bud Dooley's Revenge. An unproduced teleplay exists for the last title.
in New York." The article's author, Herbert Lawson, gave an overview of APT and called it the "hope for a renaissance of good drama." Lawson related the story of Eugene O'Neill's start with The Provincetown Players instead of in New York theatre, and encouraged the nurturing of serious drama in front of receptive audiences across the country.²⁵ Again, APT received seemingly positive publicity, only to be viewed negatively when the promise of the Inge play fell through.

Additional publicity was generated on a national scale with the publishing of an article by Ayers in The Educational Theatre Journal. Entitled "American Playwrights Theatre: A Progress Report," the article explained the working of APT, its brief history, the failure of its first year, the offering of The Days Between, and the adjustments which had been made, the most significant of which was the elimination of the judging aspect of play selection. The article also announced the offering of the Inge script.²⁶ The announcement was also


carried in the AETA Newsletter which named the formation of APT as one of AETA’s Top Ten Stories of 1965.™

1965: Two Major Problems

At the annual joint Board Meeting in October of 1965, the leaders of APT acknowledged two major problems: the inability to acquire new plays, and the need to increase the number of subscribers. Solving the first problem would help in solving the second.

Shortly before the Board gathered, Paul Osborn submitted a work entitled *Tomorrow's Monday*. According to the report given at the meeting, the majority of the Reading Committee liked the play, but were doubtful that it would receive the 50 productions needed for activation due to subject matter and casting requirements. Osborn was notified of such, but was also told that the play could be circulated to members if he so desired, and he could accept fewer than 50 productions. Osborn was invited, however, to submit a copy of his *Maiden Voyage*, which had an out of town tryout, but never reached Broadway. Osborn declined the invitation, and decided to

---

offer *Tomorrow's Monday*, prepared to accept fewer than 50 productions.

**The Rice Refusal**

Board Member Elmer Rice had also submitted a work, entitled *The Court of Last Resort*. Rice's script did not get past the Reading Committee and was not circulated since it received an overwhelmingly negative reaction. The Board returned the script to Rice and invited him to submit another of his plays, *As the Sparks Fly Upwards*. Rice refused, and neither play became an APT offering.

Rice had been a Board Member since the founding of APT, and took great offense at the refusal of his plays. He had been informed that one of the reasons that the play was refused was its topic of abortion. If that was, indeed, the reason for refusal, Rice stated, "what the college theatres are after are modern counterparts of the works of J.M. Barrie, A.A. Milne and Booth Tarkington, or *Hamlet* with an all-juvenile cast of characters and no mention of adultery." He criticized the financial aspects of APT, saying that royalties that were to come from 50 "very limited productions" would amount to less than four weeks of a successful Broadway run. He closed by saying "I have given a lot of time and thought
to APT and I'd like very much to see it succeed. . . . but there will have to be more responsiveness from the subscribing theatres." Like Inge, Rice never submitted any other work.

The 1965 Board Meeting

At the 1965 meeting, the possibility of lowering the number of production agreements necessary to activate a script was considered. It was decided to keep the minimum at 50, with the decision of activation at fewer left to the playwright. The Board also decided upon a process to handle uninvited playwrights. Any governor could invite a dramatist whom he knew had a script ready. The invitation was to be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors.

The APT list of eligible playwrights was considered and revised. The name of the recently deceased Lorraine Hansberry was deleted and those of Saul Bellow, Frank Gilroy, Robert Lowell, and Murray Shisgal were added. The playwrights on the list were to receive another invitation to submit their works.

---

and were to be encouraged to write plays specifically for APT."

As 1965 closed, The American Playwrights Theatre had been successfully launched with the offering of The Days Between. Anderson's drama eventually received 54 productions during the 1965-66 season. The organization had received national attention, with critics agreeing upon the need for APT. Unfortunately, the announcement of a forthcoming play by William Inge was a promise APT would not fulfill. Membership stood at 146; an increase over the previous year. Four regional theatres were now members; along with 33 community theatres and 109 university/college theatres. Many of them had joined in response to the announcement of the Inge drama. The prospects of a play for the next year seemed slim. There had been only two submissions, neither of which held much promise. Assets stood at $6830. Royalties from The Days Between would raise this amount.

---

22 David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "Minutes of APT Joint Meeting of Governors and Trustees at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio October 28, 1965," n.d., APT Collection.


1966: *Tomorrow's Monday* and *And People All Around*

At the start of 1966, the Board honored Osborn's request to offer *Tomorrow's Monday*, promoting it as "an enticing mixture of comedy and pathos, with excellent characterization . . . and much the same kind of authenticity and humor of Osborn's *Morning's at Seven".* Only nine subscribers found the work of interest, but none of them actually produced it.*

George Sklar, who was not on the original list of playwrights, but who had been represented on Broadway with *Stevedore, Parade, Life and Death of an American*, and *Laura*, was invited to submit his play *And People All Around*, a drama about civil rights workers in the South. It was described by the Reading Committee as "a fast-moving, hard-hitting, sometimes brutal, and semitragic free-formed treatment of the most important unsolved social problem in the nation."*

The play was offered to subscribers, some of whom opted to present the drama. Sklar accepted Tufts University's offer to stage the pilot production and to host Sklar during part of

---

* "David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Subscribers, 3 January 1966, APT Collection.
* "David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Subscribers, 25 April 1966, APT Collection.
the rehearsal process and opening. Tufts had often presented original productions of new scripts and had just received the 1966 Margo Jones Award for the American university that had done the most to encourage new play writing. Besides the Tufts production, there were 18 other acceptances, and And People All Around was activated for APT production.

The decision to activate the play was a marked departure from original APT procedures that APT had set up for itself. Nineteen productions were far fewer than the ideal 50, but the activation allowed APT to offer a script to its members. The low number of acceptances, however, forced APT to extend the memberships of all subscribers through the following year since APT did not fulfill its promise of 50 productions. The situation would be considered at the year-end Board Meeting.

National Foundation of the Arts Grant

---

"American Playwrights Theatre, News Release, 25 July 1966, APT Collection. Note: Lawrence and Lee had a direct connection with The Margo Jones Award. Jones produced the original production of their Inherit the Wind at her Theatre55 in Dallas. Lawrence and Lee established the award in 1961.

"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Subscribers, 27 July 1966, APT Collection.

"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Members, 18 November 1966, APT Collection."
A grant from the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities proved to be a major boost to the morale of APT. In October of 1966, APT was notified by Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Foundation, that the Foundation had "approved a project submitted by APT, involving the production of two plays by member theatres." The conditions of the grant required that the APT Reading Committee be enlarged to include five members of the Dramatists Guild Council. (Those five would eventually be Arthur Laurents, Henry Denker, Jerome Lawrence, Robert E. Lee, and Robert Anderson. The latter three men had been involved with APT from the start.) The other condition was that the play be approved by the APT Reading Committee and accepted by 25 theatres. The terms of the grant were as follows: When the play was approved and accepted, "each playwright would receive $10,000 as an award." Also, the Foundation would provide matching royalties from subscribing theatres. All monies would then be given to the playwright. There was a matching royalty cap of $15,000 with the possibility of additional funds. The winning plays needed to be selected and activated by the end of December of 1967. The purpose of the project was "to encourage established playwrights of stature to participate in the APT program" in
order to premiere "plays of the highest quality" at regional, university, and community theatres.  

The 1966 Meeting: Major Problems

The prestige of the grant also brought with it the additional pressure of acquiring plays that could be activated. As the Board met for the 1966 annual meeting, "the problem of finding plays for 1967 (was) one of the utmost urgency." Board members had been asked in advance of the meeting to consider lowering the minimum number of productions needed to activate a play to 25. The Days Between and And People All Around were activated with fewer than the required 50, and the Foundation grant only required 25. The lower number of productions appeared much more realistic. It would relieve pressure from the playwrights and could encourage more submissions.

The prospects for a play, however, once again appeared dim. Of the 33 playwrights on the APT list, only 12 responded to the invitations, nine of them positively. Three of them submitted plays that year. As previously mentioned, Paul Osborn submitted Tomorrow's Monday to poor acceptance. Gore Vidal submitted On a March to the Sea which was found

---

28 Roger L. Stevens, letter to Dean J. Osborn Fuller, 12 October, 1966, APT Collection.
unsuitable by the Reading Committee. S.N. Behrman offered *To Offenbach with Love*, which was also refused. Five uninvited playwrights sent scripts. Each of the dramatist had seen his work on Broadway. Four of the scripts were rejected. The fifth, *And People All Around*, found limited acceptances."

When the Board met in December of 1966, it decreased the required number of production agreements to 25. It also named Roy Bowen and David H. Ayers as the "Screening Committee" which would give first reading to all incoming scripts. If Ayers and Bowen thought the work had possibilities with APT, they were to forward it to the Reading Committee which consisted of members of the boards as well as the five Dramatists Guild representatives required for the NCA grant. Pilot productions also came under discussion. It was generally agreed that the pilots should be "prestige productions" and the regional theatres provided the best

---

"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "Agenda and Appendix for 1966 Board Meeting," n.d., APT Collection. Note: Whenever possible, subject matter and titles of submitted plays will be mentioned. APT records do not include all of this information for every play received. From this point on, if the information is not mentioned, it cannot be located in APT files."
possibilities. The challenge of finding a suitable play remained."

The success of *The Days Between* and the resulting favorable publicity that APT received reflected in a slight increase in the number of member organizations. By the end of 1966, 153 theatres had subscribed to the program. Again, four regional theatres were members. Community theatres accounted for 48 subscriptions, and college/university theatres accounted for 101. The Board searched for a play to offer these members. Royalties from *The Days Between* had increased APT's assets slightly to $7250. Assets would have been higher had APT not had to extend memberships at no cost."

1967: *Ivory Tower*

As 1967 began, a possible play selection was submitted. Although not on the APT playwright list, two collaborating playwrights, each with Broadway credit, submitted a new work.

---


41 American Playwrights Theatre, 1966 Membership Roster, APT Collection.

Ivory Tower, based on the treason trial of American poet Ezra Pound, was offered to APT by Jerome Weidman and James Yaffee. Yaffee had adapted Duerrematt's The Deadly Game for Broadway, and Weidman had received a Tony, a New York Drama Critics Circle Award, and the Pulitzer Prize for Fiorello! in collaboration with George Abbott. The Screening Committee approved the script, as did the Reading Committee, and the Board voted to offer the play to APT Subscribers. The University of Michigan's Professional Theatre Program quickly offered to stage the pilot with professional actors, and Yaffee and Weidman agreed to be part of the rehearsal process.43

Not all of the APT members shared the board's enthusiasm, however, and the script was met with neither fast acceptance nor great resistance. Although copies were mailed to all APT theatres, less than a dozen responded one way or the other within the 60 day acceptance period. The Board was eager to get 25 acceptances because the dramatists would receive the additional grant funds. Ideally, this would encourage further submissions by other writers.

---

Acceptances were very slow in coming. Twenty-five production agreements were reached only after numerous memos from Ayers, a letter from Jerome Lawrence, and two joint letters from Lawrence, Lee, and Anderson. The tones of the letters ranged from gentle urging to urgent consideration. Subscribers were told that the future of APT rested on the acceptance of the play. Of most concern to the Board was the lack of response either way. Finally, in December, after a period of almost ten months, the minimum amount of acceptances was achieved. Yaffee and Weidman thus qualified to receive the additional funds.

The grant had some positive effect on playwrights as the number of submissions rose as compared to the previous year. Plays were offered by Paddy Chayevsky, William Inge (as already discussed), Norman Krasna, Leonard Spiegelgass, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Stanley Kaufmann, and others. Of those mentioned only Chayevsky and Inge were on the list of eligible

---


"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT members, 8 December 1967, APT Collection."
dramatists. Arthur Miller was considering rewriting an early, unproduced work about Montezuma, entitled *The Golden Years*, and submitting it to APT. This submission never occurred. There were also approximately 100 scripts offered by unknown playwrights. Unfortunately, none of the plays were considered to be capable of receiving the required amount productions, which, at the time of reading, was still 50. Most of the plays were refused by the Screening Committee. Those that were passed on to the Reading Committee were stopped at that point. No scripts, by either established or unknown writers, were offered to the subscribers.

The constant refusal of scripts contributed to future hesitation by other writers. Scripts were usually returned to the playwrights with a letter stating that the Screening/Reading Committee had found the work interesting, but not capable of receiving the requisite number of productions. The non-acceptance also required that APT extend the subscribers' membership through the next year at no charge, a practice that was proving costly to the organization.

In response to that cost factor, APT changed its policy regarding subscription dues. It was decided that, as of the following year, subscribers would pay their yearly dues,
regardless of whether or not APT offered a play. This
decision probably proved detrimental, especially when made
during a year when no play had been offered. APT's image was
not doing well with its subscribing theatres.

Another image problem was caused by the University of
Michigan's Professional Theatre Training Program. As
previously mentioned, the Program staged the pilot production
of *Ivory Tower*. During the summer, the production toured
nationally, promoted as the pre-Broadway tryout.

The 1967 Board Meeting: Changes in Policy

At the year end 1967 joint Board Meeting, the Governors
and Trustees discussed APT's current and future situation.
It was generally agreed that the list of APT playwrights was
basically meaningless, and that submissions should be sought
by any means possible."

APT's situation was not optimistic. Although the
organization had received a grant from the National Foundation
on the Arts and Humanities, it was only with great difficulty
that enough productions of *Ivory Tower* were negotiated, making

"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Board of Governors and
Trustees, "Summary of Joint Meeting of APT Governors and
Trustees in Columbus, Ohio on September 30, 1967," n.d. APT
Collection."
the playwrights eligible for the award. The grant, however, was for two plays, and finding a second script seemed highly unlikely. The favorable publicity from the previous year generated a rise in submitted scripts and subscribing institutions. Unfortunately, the scripts were judged inferior. Both playwrights and theatres were frustrated. An organization that was founded on the idea of providing non-commercial theatres with new plays by well-known dramatists with productions being an end in themselves was now offering scripts from little known playwrights which received relatively few acceptances, and were billed as out of town pre-Broadway tryouts.

Membership numbers, however, continued to grow. A combination of events caused the rise. There was still publicity announcing a script from Inge, and, once again, memberships were extended at no charge. APT now had more members than ever, 182. Three regional theatres subscribed, 51 community theatres, and 128 university/college theatres. APT’s assets reflected the cost of the subscription extensions. At the end of 1967, assets amounted to $3500. The income from APT’s percentage on royalties was far outweighed

47 American Playwrights Theatre, 1967 Membership Roster, APT Collection.
by the cost of copying and circulating scripts that did not find acceptance.**

1968: *Summertree*

Early in 1968, APT sought and received a one year extension on the grant from the NCA. If another play could be found, that playwright would receive an award comparable to that received by Weidman and Yaffee.**

In the Spring of 1968, 22 year old Ron Cowen's first play received its debut production at Lincoln Center in New York. Cowen had been a student of Jerome Lawrence a few years previous to this premiere. Lawrence saw the Lincoln Center production of the play "and thought it especially suited to university production and suggested that (APT's) rules be adjusted to allow it to be offered."** The rules were adapted, Cowen was invited to submit his work, the script was unanimously approved by the Screening and Reading Committees,

---


** Roger L. Stevens, letter to David H. Ayers, 7 February 1968, APT Collection.

** David H. Ayers, letter to J. Osborn Fuller, 10 April 1968, APT Collection.
and *Summertree* was offered for production to APT theatres.*¹*

Within a few weeks, 25 production agreements were reached and the play was authorized for APT production.*²*

The choice of *Summertree* as an APT offering raised some fundamental questions about the founding principles of the organization.

Those questions were answered by David Ayers in an article in *The Dramatists Guild Quarterly*. The choice, according to Ayers, was "an indication of healthy flexibility, rather than an abandonment of original intentions and goals."*³* (Note: a full description of the APT production of *Summertree* will be covered in Chapter VI.)

*Summertree* was accepted at a fast rate. The Board of Governors, however, decided not to offer the NCA grant to the novice playwright since the selection of the play was a departure from the normal process of APT and from the original concept under which the grant was made. A representative of

---

¹ David H. Ayers, letter to APT Members, 26 April 1968, APT Collection.

² David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 14 June 1968, APT Collection.

the government agency was surprised at such a move, but followed the wishes of APT.** Records do not indicate Cowen's awareness or reaction to the situation.

Earlier that year, William Gibson had submitted a script about the young William Shakespeare, entitled A Cry of Players. The Screening Committee had rejected it on the grounds of the unlikelihood of the play receiving enough acceptances. The play later went on to be staged at The Berkshire Festival and at Lincoln Center.

The acceptance of the Cowen script, which had received a New York production and then APT acceptance, and the rejection of the Gibson work, which received APT rejection and then New York acceptance, raised some questions in regards to the adjustment of the rules. APT no longer knew which direction to go. Was it Summertree's subject matter (a strong anti-war statement), its structure (a free-form montage of memories), or its unanimous stamp of approval by the New York reviewers that proved attractive to the subscribers? David Ayers expressed the situation as follows: "I truly think (A Cry of Players) would not have been accepted by many APT theatres before it was acclaimed at Berkshire and accepted at

**" David H. Ayers, letter to Jerome Lawrence, 15 July 1968, APT Collection."
Lincoln Center. . . . Wish we knew how many of the subscribers took Summertree on the basis of the critical reaction from NYC."

The 1968 Board Meeting: More Policy Changes

By the end of 1968, the success of Summertree proved to be of the most concern at the yearly Board Meeting. Subscribers who had not renewed their membership were rejoining APT so they could produce the play. New subscribers were also joining. Membership numbers and ratios remained the same as the previous year." The offering of the play allowed for billing of renewal memberships, making the organization's financial situation more stable. Assets now stood at $8270." APT was once again operating on a national level.

Based on the above situation, APT again revised its rules. It was decided at the Board Meeting that "any play by any professional playwright (was) eligible for submission as long as it would not be available to subscribers via another

"David H. Ayers, letter to Jerome Lawrence, 2 August 1968, APT Collection.


route, i.e. Samuel French or Dramatists." The American Playwrights Theatre would now offer works by "lesser-known playwrights" as long as the Screening and Reading Committees believed in the possibility of 25 productions. The reason for the change was basically one of economics. Although the organization was founded as a respite from the financial pressures of the commercial theatre, APT was now bowing to financial pressures of another sort. The dollar amount was not nearly as high, but monetary concerns governing the survival of the organization influenced a major change in policy.

Many of the plays had been submitted that year through writers' agents, with many of the writers being "new playwrights" such as John Guare (Muzeeka) and Lanford Wilson (Lemon Sky). None of the plays by new playwrights went past the Ayers/Bowen Screening Committee. Two plays by established playwrights were submitted and not forwarded by the Screening Committee. Scripts by Norman Krasna (Watch the Birdie) and Reginald Denham (The Dog House) did not go to the Reading Committee. However, a few plays made it to the Reading Committee: The Memory Room by George Sklar, The Little Giants by Stanley Young, Summertree by Cowen, A Cry of Players by
Gibson, and *The Porcelain Year* by Reginald Rose. Of these, only *Summertree* went further.

The only other play that was approved by all of the committees was *Maiden Voyage* by Paul Osborn, a script he had previously chosen not to submit to APT. Osborn was well-known for his work, having translated novels into the commercial successes *A Bell for Adano* (1944) and *The World of Suzie Wong* (1958). The work was approved by everyone involved in the reading process except Arthur Laurents, who resigned over the matter. *Maiden Voyage* was written in verse, and Laurents considered the play "unworthy of recommendation," and referred to the play's structure as "rhymed doglets." He considered the quality of all APT plays inferior and no longer wanted to be associated with APT. The Board was concerned about the effect on Osborn should another play of his be rejected, so it was decided that the play would be officially activated before general circulation, thereby removing the threat of rejection. Once again, APT changed its rules to accommodate a specific situation. Although seemingly justified, the change in the process proved confusing to subscribers.

---

Another change came in the form of the *By-Laws*. Many of the founding Board Members were nearing the end of their second terms. The original *By-Laws* prohibited the serving of more than two consecutive terms. At the 1968 meeting, that prohibition was stricken from the rules so that the men most responsible for getting APT started could continue to serve the organization as Governors or as Trustees. A new position of Governor-at-Large was also created, to be filled with a theatre professional of the Board's choice. George C. White, President of the O'Neill Foundation was appointed."

By this time in APT's history (1968), basically two men were responsible for the future of a play with APT. The initial response of the Ayers/Bowen Screening Committee would determine the play's fate. Both men claim that personal taste was not a factor, but both belonged to the era in which the well-made play of American Realism was considered the ideal. Both men admit their personal preference to that style."

Intentionally or not, the personal tastes of these two screeners obviously influenced their decisions. Plays which

---


they thought subscribers would like might not necessarily be the ones that the subscribers wanted. And plays that Bowen and Ayers rejected might have actually received acceptance. There is no way of knowing. They did, however, reject plays that later were produced successfully elsewhere, such as Bones by David Rabe and Fifth of July by Lanford Wilson. Ayers and Bowen also accepted plays that were later rejected by the APT subscribers.

As 1968 closed, APT faced a conflict of interests. A script by an inexperienced and unestablished playwright proved to be a huge success. The organization was adapting its policies, responding to financial pressures. It now posted assets of $8,260, more than double that of the previous year, much of which came from royalty percentage and membership fees. And its basic rules of organizations were being changed to accommodate its founders. Membership counts remained high, and APT was once again enjoying a successful year in terms of the number of productions of the offered play. Summertree eventually received fifty-four productions. APT's basic purpose of offering a new play was being fulfilled. It was not, however, a work by an established American dramatist.
1969: Frustration

The following year, 1969, proved to be one of great frustration for APT. The organization offered two plays to the subscribers: Osborne's *Maiden Voyage* and *The Strangler* by Arnold Powell. Neither play found any acceptance at all. Both were unanimously rejected for production by subscribers. Osborn's play received an unsuccessful Broadway production later that year.

Two others passed the Screening Committee: *Man Better Man* by Erroll Hill which had been produced by The Negro Ensemble Theatre Company and *A Sound of Distant Thunder* by Henry Denker. Neither play received an affirmative vote by the Reading Committee and both were returned to their submitters. Almost 50 other scripts were read by the Screening Committee. These works were submitted by agents, the New Dramatists Committee, the ANTA National Company, and theatres known for producing new plays, such as The Dallas Theatre Center and the McCarter Theatre. Numerous direct submissions by unknown playwrights were also received. All of these were rejected.

Subscriptions dropped again due to a lack of interest. Realizing the "danger of extinction" if APT were to refuse to renew memberships of the subscribers who did join, APT again
changed its policy and extended enrollment for the following year. Although it had offered two plays, neither were produced and APT again did not fulfill its promise. In an attempt to keep some members, all 1969 subscriber were given extensions for 1970.

As had been done in previous years, a panel of APT representatives offered a workshop at the annual AETA convention. A mail questionnaire had been sent earlier in the year, and the panel used the responses as a starting point for its presentation. These responses were concerned mainly with the quality of the scripts. Subscribers wanted "first rate plays from first rate authors, . . . more relevant and contemporary scripts, . . . and a wider and better selection." They asked, "why such dreadful bottom-of-the-trunk scripts." These concerns can be taken as representative of those of the subscribers of APT.

Adding to the problems was the expiration of the grant from the National Foundation on the Arts. Since the Board decided that Cowen was ineligible, and no other play was found suitable, the grant money went unused. This action may well have proved to be very costly in later years when a grant proposal from APT was refused by the National Endowment of the Arts, although no direct connection can be illustrated.
In an attempt to evolve in response to the changing pressures, APT decided to offer a playwright-in-residence program. APT was to still serve its basic purpose of distributing new plays, but would now link playwrights with new scripts with theatres willing to house and nurture the script and playwrights before offering the play for APT distribution. This plan, however, did not prove successful. A few theatres responded, but no playwrights were interested. This program was abandoned after a few years.

The 1969 Board Meeting: Low Enrollment and High Assets

As 1969 ended, subscriber enrollment was extremely low. Membership had dropped to 122 theatres, 60 fewer than the previous two years. Five regional theatres now belonged. Community theatres numbered 21, and university/college theatres numbered 95. Plays were being submitted to the organization, but were more often than not rejected, many times not getting past the Screening Committee.

---

61 David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "Summary of Annual Meeting of APT Governors and Trustees Held on The Ohio State University Campus on October 3 and 4, 1969," n.d., APT Collection.

The composition of the Boards of Governors and Trustees changed a bit, with occasional new members, but the driving force behind APT continued to be the men who founded it. They would often move from one Board to another, generating a kind of "old boys' network" feel to the organization. Financial concerns had proven to be more influential than originally planned, and major decisions were made based on those pressures. Assets now listed at $11,050, mainly a result of royalty percentages from *Ivory Tower* and *Summertree.* Plays by new playwrights were now being offered, and plays by experienced playwrights were seen as rejects. The image of APT was not the prestigious, seemingly altruistic organization it was founded to be. Its ties to AHTA and AETA were weak by now, with neither organization expressing much interest. It seemed likely that the next year would either make or break The American Playwrights Theatre. Now, more than ever, the selection of the ideal play was of major importance.

---

"American Playwrights Theatre, 1969 Financial Report, APT Collection. Note: Royalties for productions were often not posted until the following year. Therefore, a year during which a play was not produced often still posted royalty income."
CHAPTER V
1970-1980

Introduction

As The American Playwrights Theatre entered the 1970s, the organization faced a number of major concerns. During the decade, APT once again went through various periods of frustration, success, conflict, and high achievement. It also reached a point at which dissolution was necessary. The years between 1970 and 1980 saw The American Playwrights Theatre reach its zenith, and, also, its end.

As detailed at the conclusion of the previous chapter, the selection of the ideal play was of major concern to move the organization into the new decade. Disappointment had marked 1969. The leaders of APT had hoped to build on the momentum of Ron Cowen's *Summertree* which had been very successful the previous season. Instead, APT offered its subscribers two plays which found absolutely no acceptances.
As a result, memberships were extended for the year without charge. Another year of such action could financially ruin APT. Also, another year of offering mediocre scripts would discourage and frustrate members who would not renew subscriptions.

The critics covering the early APT productions agreed with the goals of the organization. The media was certainly willing to cover the efforts of APT. The acceptances of The Days Between and Summertree proved that members were willing to provide a play with wide production. Responses were positive, for the most part. APT could work with the ideal script.

1970: The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail

Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee's The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail proved to be the right play at the right time for APT. Based upon the life and works of Henry David Thoreau, the play featured a character who spoke with a social conscience about important contemporary issues, many of which mirrored those of the late 1960s. The character of Thoreau, as well as many other characters, could be played by college age actors. The free-form, stream of consciousness structure
of the piece had recently been established as a popular form which broke from the well-made play structure.

Lawrence and Lee submitted *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* to the APT Board at the end of 1969. By unanimous vote, the play was named as the APT offering for the 1970-1971 season.¹ The play proved extremely attractive to APT members. Almost immediate acceptance from numerous subscribers prompted David Ayers to announce that *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* was authorized for APT production and scheduled at almost 40 theatres. The Ohio State University was selected as the location for the pilot production.² Production agreements for the play came in very quickly, as did new subscriptions from theatres joining for the purpose of staging the drama.

Once again, APT received national media coverage. The pilot production drew the attention of local as well as national press. These reviews, which will be discussed in detail in the following chapter, were extremely positive for both the production and the play. Reviews for other productions of the play around the country were also uniformly

¹ David Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 26 November 1969, APT Collection.

positive. Even when the performances were criticized, the play itself was roundly praised. These reviews generated a great deal of publicity for The American Playwrights Theatre as well as for The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail.

Lawrence and Lee agreed to an 18 month contract with APT. By the time that period was over, 141 theatres had agreed to stage the play, with 135 actually doing so. Of those 135 productions, 7 were done by regional theatres, 26 by community theatres, and 102 by college/university theatres. (A detailed account of the APT production of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail is provided in Chapter VI.)

With The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee, The American Playwrights Theatre realized its potential and accomplished its original goal of premiering a new work by major established dramatists on the non-commercial stages of theatres across the United States. The number of productions of this play exceeded those of any previous script offered through APT, and was not outnumbered by any scripts that were offered afterwards.

---


Capitalizing on the national publicity of so many productions of the play, APT was able to get another article into the *Dramatists Guild Quarterly* in the Summer of 1970. This article gave an overview of the organization, discussed Robert Anderson's experience with *The Days Between*, and publicized Lawrence and Lee's ongoing productions of *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*. The article also announced a call for scripts, inviting both established and novice playwrights to submit their work, and guaranteeing a minimum of $5,000 for any play produced by 25 theatres.¹

1970 Board Meeting

By the time the boards of APT met in October of 1970, the publicity generated by the numerous productions and the *Dramatists Guild Quarterly* article had encouraged over eighty submissions to APT. Of those submissions, two were forwarded by the Screening Committee to the Reading Committee: *The Ides of March* by Jerome Kilty and *A Night at the Black Pig*, about

the early life of August Strindberg, by Charles Wolfe. Neither play was approved to offer to subscribers.

Membership had jumped to 206 members, many of which had joined specifically to present The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail. Eight regional theatres, 37 community theatres, and 161 college/university theatres were members. Unfortunately, as the year drew to a close, APT did not have a play with which to follow the enormous success of the Lawrence and Lee script.

At the year end meeting, there was some discussion regarding the operating procedures and purposes of APT. This discussion illustrated some of APT's basic problems. Gilroy stated that "APT is now close to becoming an important opportunity for playwrights, but that two conditions need(ed) to be met to make the program viable for dramatists." The first need was for a "definitive production" as the pilot production, with the playwright's choice of "any actor, director, and scene designer." The second requirement was for a minimum royalty of at least $35,000. Once these needs were met, Gilroy believed APT could truly accomplish its goals.

---


Trustee Paul Baker of the Dallas Theatre Center suggested that each state's governor's budget contribute $1,000.00 to that state's university to be used as royalty for the production of an APT play. Jerome Lawrence stated that APT should circulate plays of "unorthodox, experimental, or special nature" because there was "a new era of theatre and APT subscribers should be subjected to plays from all phases of drama."

1970: Problems

The above statements from members of APT's Boards illustrate a major problem for APT. Even though 1970 was extremely successful with productions of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, APT's governing body continued to try to change the structure and nature of the organization based on the latest events, namely the lack, once again, of prospective scripts. Gilroy's and Baker's suggestions were highly unrealistic. A royalty of $35,000 was far beyond the average APT royalty. As will be discussed in Chapter VI, Lawrence and Lee's royalty exceeded that amount, but their play was, in almost every way, the exceptional APT experience. Gilroy's

suggestion of guaranteeing the playwrights' choice of talent conflicted with the original premise of APT, namely employing university and regional talent to premiere the new works. Baker's suggestion of a $1,000 donation from each state was also unrealistic. Lawrence's recognition of new structure came only after his success with the form, which, by now, was no longer experimental. None of their comments were actually useful in solving the problem at hand, and all seemed to be out of touch with the practicalities of the organization with which they were involved. Assets posted at $8,660, much less than the previous year. The cost of copying and circulating scripts, along with other operating expenses, once again had taken its toll. Royalties from *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* had not yet been posted. APT moved into 1971 without a play to offer its subscribers.

1971: Two Scripts Offered, Both Rejected

It was not until March of 1971 that APT offered two scripts to its subscribers. The late submissions came from Henry Denker, who offered *The Headhunters*, and Herbert Appleman, who offered *A Perfect Gentleman*. The Screening and

Reading Committees approved and recommended both scripts. Unfortunately, subscribers were hesitant to accept these plays; Denker's script received ten acceptances and Appleman's received one. Since these acceptances were not of sufficient number to activate the scripts for productions, neither play was produced under the auspices of APT.10

APT, AETA, and ANTA

In 1971, the appointments of some Board members were nearing the end of their tenure, and replacements or renewals needed to be named. Playwright Frank Gilroy had been appointed by ANTA, and Jack Morrison, of UCLA, had been appointed by AETA. The Boards recommended to the respective agencies that the representatives be reappointed. ANTA agreed with the suggestion and reappointed Gilroy. AETA president Burnett Hopgood disregarded APT's suggestions and instead appointed Marcella Cisney of University of Michigan as an APT Governor. The appointment met with resistance, but there was nothing to be done. In order to have the sanction of AETA, APT had to accept the appointment. The Board of APT was able to retain the services of Morrison, however, by creating a new

Governor-at-Large position to which Morrison was immediately appointed."

It was this move that signalled a further retreat from cooperation between AETA and APT and strained an already somewhat distant relationship. Cisney was accepted as a Member of the Board, but was never very active. Morrison continued to be as active as he had been since the founding of the organization. When the Board next met at the end of 1971, the By-Laws were amended so that the president of AETA and AETA's Executive Committee could "suggest an appointment to the Board, but the final appointment rest(ed) with the APT Trustees." It was decided that "AETA and AETA (were) to be given less responsibility in appointing Board members." This move served to distance APT from two organizations which had been instrumental in its founding. The cooperation between organizations from both the educational and professional theatre worlds grew strained, hardly united in the way that the founders originally had intended. Also appointed to the Board of Governors at this meeting was Ohio State's new Chair


of the Theatre Department, John A. Walker. This appointment would prove important in later years in determining the fate of APT.

1971: The Continual Refusal of Scripts

Throughout 1971, scripts continued to come to David Ayers for submission to APT. During that year, over 100 plays were submitted. A few were passed beyond the Ayers/Bowen Screening Committee. Of those forwarded, only the two mentioned above were offered to subscribers. None others were found suitable.

A problem of response time had developed. Often it was difficult for Ayers to get a reaction from the Reading Committee. Also, the responses from the Committee were sometimes ambiguous. A play might be considered a good script, but not probable to get sufficient APT productions. Often the endorsement would be a positive one "with reservations." In order to simplify the decision "to duplicate and circulate" a play to subscribers, "it was decided that the final decision on offering a particular play should be left to the Executive Director."¹ David Ayers now had full responsibility for the final decision. In an effort

¹ David H. Ayers, letter to APT Governors and Trustees, 17 September 1971, APT Collection.
to simplify or clarify the process of play selection, the ultimate decision was left in the hands of one person whose personal tastes were sure to influence the choices made.

At the end of 1971, APT once again found itself without a prospective play. As a result of the popularity of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, APT still counted 206 theatre producing organizations among its ranks. Unfortunately, the 1971 offerings were not nearly as popular as Lawrence and Lee's work. As APT readied itself to move into 1972, there was nothing to offer. As a result, subscriptions of all member organizations were extended at no charge for the following year. David Ayers and other leaders of APT feared "a tremendous reduction in APT subscription . . . should the Board decide to require payment for the 1972 subscription renewal." Luckily, assets stood at $11,680 as a result of the success of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail. This amount permitted the extension of membership without depleting APT's finances.

---


15 David H. Ayers, letter to Governors and Trustees, "1971 Board Meeting."

1972: *Echoes*

In March of 1972, H. Richard Nash, whose writing credits included the Broadway productions of *See the Jaguar*, *The Rainmaker*, and *110 in the Shade*, and the screenplay of *Porgy and Bess*, submitted *Echoes*. It was forwarded by both the Screening Committee and Reading Committee and offered to APT subscribers in April of 1972. In June, it was authorized for APT production with 11 acceptances, the lowest number of production agreements used to activate a play to date. Three other plays by "name" playwrights had also been submitted, but rejected: *The Dancing Mice* by John Patrick, *Brown Pelican* by George Sklar, and *The Recantation of Galileo Galilei* by Eric Bentley.  

Response to Nash's play was far from overwhelming. By the time the Board was notified of its annual Fall meeting, only 17 theatres had agreed to produce *Echoes*. APT continued to support the play, however, and all of the productions eventually took place. *Echoes*, despite its limited reception by APT theatres, was the first APT play to receive a

---

*"* David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 10 April 1972, APT Collection.

*"* David H. Ayers, letter to APT Governors and Trustees, 2 June 1972, APT Collection.
simultaneous Broadway production while still under APT option. APT had waived its Broadway restrictions in order to be able to offer the play, and Nash was able to find the New York backers. The publicity of a Broadway staging, however, did not encourage any additional APT productions.” Echoes closed and opened on Broadway on the same night.

1972: Jabberwock: Another Play by Lawrence and Lee

Also, by the time the Board was notified of the Fall meeting to take place in October, there had been approximately 80 plays considered by the Screening Committee. The only one to be forwarded by the Reading Committee was another Lawrence and Lee work, Jabberwock: Improbabilities Lived and Imagined by James Thurber in the Fictional City of Columbus, Ohio. According to the subscribers' notification of the play, "Lawrence and Lee agreed to submit their new play for APT consideration only after being pressured by the Executive Director's office to do so. They submitted their work with the understanding that if anyone on the Governing Boards ha(d)

reservations about offering the play to the membership, they (would) withdraw it."²⁰

The submission of the play about Thurber was more than a happy coincidence. Ohio State was in the process of building a new theatre complex. The largest theatre was to be named Thurber Theatre, and the Lawrence and Lee work was to be the opening production. The arrangement with OSU was secure before the submission of the play to APT. Ayers, as a member of the OSU faculty, had access to the script without it being officially offered to APT. He urged the authors to submit the play to the Board for discussion at the upcoming annual meeting.

Another topic that the Board was instructed to consider was distancing that had been affected by the discontinuation of the AETA appointments to the Board. While APT no longer wanted AETA's appointments, it still wanted AETA's assistance. In an effort to bridge any differences, the president of AETA became an APT Governor-at-Large, enabling the president to offer suggestions and to be involved in the running of the organization. The President of AETA, which shortly became ATA

²⁰ David H. Ayers, letter to APT Governors and Trustees, 22 September 1972, APT Collection.
when restructured into the American Theatre Association, was Jed Davis."

1972 Board Meeting: Endorsement and Evaluation

Two major actions occurred at the 1972 October meeting: the unanimous endorsement of the Lawrence and Lee work, and a frank evaluation of The American Playwrights Theatre. The discussion was called for by Board of Trustees President Jerome Lawrence. Playwright Terrence McNally, who had recently been invited to join the Board of Governors as a playwright representative, stated that APT had "some serious public relations problems among the younger writers (because) APT doesn't even do the best plays of established playwrights. . . . Playwrights are generally suspicious of APT." 22 Another "younger playwright" had served a very brief tenure with APT. John Guare served for only few months before resigning in June of 1972. His reasons for leaving had to do with the nature of ensemble work and a play being a reflection of the place

---

21 David H. Ayers, letter to APT Governors and Trustees, "1971 Meeting."

22 David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "Summary of Annual Joint Meeting of APT Governors and Trustees Held in Columbus, Ohio on September 30 and October 1, 1972," n.d., APT Collection.
of origin. He disagreed with the idea of numerous debuts of a new work."

Other comments offered at this meeting included some by Board of Governors Member Marcella Cisney who thought that APT ought to change its course and "find a particularly exciting and gifted young playwright and attempt to arrange a series of national productions of this script." Robert Anderson reminded the group of APT's original purpose: to provide established playwrights with "an alternative avenue to and a substantial number of productions." Anderson felt that until APT could provide playwrights with "a launching pad the way New York does . . . and make the royalties more worthwhile," superior scripts would not be submitted. John Walker pointed out the lack of enthusiasm for APT on the part of subscribing theatres as evidenced by the poor attendance at the APT presentation at the annual ATA conference. Governor Edward Cole of Yale University pointed out that many universities simply would not do new plays since their curricula required a commitment to the classics. When schools did perform new works, he added, they were often plays written by students.

---

"22 John Guare, letter to David H. Ayers, quoted in David H. Ayers, letter to APT Governors and Trustees, 12 June 1972, APT Collection."
Governor Paul Baker of the Dallas Theatre Center noted poor promotional materials as a major problem for APT and suggested pursuing foundation support. Trustee and Treasurer Roy Bowen noted that APT assets stood at $8,100, a decrease over the previous year.\(^2\) Income from royalty percentages of *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* prevented a major decrease in assets, but another year of extending subscriptions would burden APT. ATA President and Governor-at-Large Jed Davis noted that APT "got lost" under the new restructuring of the organization into the American Theatre Association, and that ATA and APT needed a "more active liason." The discussion and evaluation of APT was concluded by Robert E. Lee's statement that "although APT was being torn apart at this meeting, the miracle of the organization is that no other (such) project has lasted for ten years."\(^2\) He did not name the projects.

The fact that the Board of Governors and Trustees had to have an open discussion of APT's problems illustrates that the organization was aware of its situation. Even after the discussion, no solutions were actually reached. It was clear


\(^2\) David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "1972 Board Meeting," APT Collection.
that APT was not getting, and probably would not get, the plays that it had desired. Its leaders were not in agreement as to the direction in which the organization should go. APT's resources were low. And once again, APT was offering a play by its founders, Lawrence and Lee. Although it might not have been intentionally self-promoting, it certainly appeared that way.

As already mentioned, John Guare had resigned from APT earlier that year. At this meeting, a replacement needed to be named to be invited to join the Board of Governors. Nominated at this meeting were the New York experimental theatre practitioners Adrienne Kennedy, Ellen Stewart, Megan Terry and Jean-Claude van Itallie. The Board of Trustees, who dealt with these nominations, unanimously suggested van Itallie, who accepted and served a short tenure with the organization. Although APT seemed open to letting in younger playwrights, the preference was definitely towards younger male playwrights, continuing APT's image of an "old boy's network." Van Itallie's experimental work was a great deal different than the work of APT's founders. However, it was not nearly as removed from their frame of reference as the works of the women nominated. The evaluation is incidental in the long run; Van Itallie resigned shortly thereafter,
citing a lack of interest, and never actually participated in APT.** The women were not invited to participate and, most likely, never knew of their nominations.

As 1972 ended, APT still tried to keep up a positive image for its subscribers. The announcement of another Lawrence and Lee play was cushioned with the statement that the playwrights were hesitant to offer their new play to APT "feeling that other playwrights should be afforded the extraordinary experience" that they had had with The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail. It was only after the unanimous support of the Governors and Trustees that Lawrence and Lee decided to offer the play to APT members. The playwrights also requested that the original production take place in greater New York City or Southern California "under the supervision of the playwrights, with customary Dramatist Guild approval of cast, director and overall production."**

These stipulations were in direct opposition to the original APT contract which asked playwrights to forego the customary casting and production approvals. Also, the

---

** Jean-Claude van Itallie, letter to David H. Ayers, 12 September 1974, APT Collection.

" David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 1 December 1972, APT Collection.
playwrights desire to debut in the commercial theatre centers of New York or Southern California (i.e. Los Angeles) was in contradiction to the idea of new plays premiering in non-commercial venues. This announcement to the APT membership surely caused numerous questions as to the goals of APT. Seemingly, Lawrence and Lee were concerned heavily with the commercial potential of the play, desiring a professional level debut in a commercial area. At this point the organization could be viewed as a vehicle for its founders who changed the rules and regulations as they found necessary.

The December 1972 announcement of Jabberwock as a selection was coupled with the announcement of APT's receipt of a special award from the New England Theatre Conference. The award was given to APT "for realizing its aim of serving a truly decentralized theatre by offering new plays to non-commercial theatres," and for encouraging a working relationship between American dramatists and the play producers of university, community and resident theatres.²⁸

1973: Jabberwock

²⁸ Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 1 December 1972.
Jabberwock was accepted by a number of APT theatres, though hardly as many as had presented The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail. The pilot production was directed by Paul Baker at the Dallas Theatre Center where its five week run was 80 per cent presold before the play opened. Baker credited the sale to the "remarkable publicity value of a new work by Lawrence and Lee." (The city of Dallas had previously proved quite supportive of the playwrights. Margo Jones had staged the original production of Inherit the Wind at her Theatre55 to resounding success and a future Broadway run. Perhaps the Dallas audience was hoping for a repeat success.) Lawrence and Lee revised their script based on the Dallas production and the revised version was used for the subsequent 40 APT productions over the following year. Although the March 1973 Dallas Theatre Company staging of Jabberwock was billed as the pilot production, the play had actually been produced the previous November. As previously mentioned, the play was staged on the campus of The Ohio State University as the

opening production of its new theatre complex's Thurber Theatre. 30

1973: Continual Lack of Plays

Publicity generated by the productions of Jabberwock was limited, however, and APT was once again without an offering for its subscribers for the following year. There had been approximately 80 submissions to the Screening Committee. Of those plays, three were forwarded to the Reading Committee: Ghost Dance by Stuart Vaughan; The Great Chan by James Lee, whose Career had enjoyed a Broadway run; and a musical version of Anna Cora Mowatt's Fashion by Richard Bimonte and Jim Wise, whose credits included Dames at Sea. The Reading Committee did not accept any of these plays, and none of them were offered to the subscribers. There was also the possibility of acquiring Arthur Miller's The American Clock. Robert Anderson had approached Miller who "did not seem disinterested" at the prospect. Miller, however, wanted to see how the play fared at its premiere at The Professional Theatre Program at The University of Michigan. Once the play debuted, Miller was no longer interested in offering it to

---

30 American Playwright Theatre, Jabberwock Production File, APT Collection.
APT. Frank Gilroy was also, for a time, interested in going the APT route. He found Broadway success in 1964 with the Pulitzer Prize winning *The Subject Was Roses*. He had an untitled play which he was willing to offer, but only if APT "could provide a pilot production in which he could have the actors whom he would choose for an eventual Broadway production and which he could direct." Ayers, Lawrence and Lee told Gilroy that "such an arrangement might indeed be possible" and agreed to find an APT theatre willing to fill those requirements. Ultimately, for whatever reasons, Gilroy did not offer his play to APT. His stipulations, however, showed his intentions to use APT as a pre-Broadway tryout route. By agreeing to satisfy Gilroy's desires, APT's leaders condoned the practice.

1973: Other Problems

Problems, direct and indirect, with ATA continued to plague APT. ATA recently had begun its New Play Program which hoped to provide non-commercial theatres with new scripts by professional writers; much the same goal as APT. APT began

---

to "feel in direct conflict with the ATA New Play Program."

Also, APT felt that ATA, "since its reorganization, had been of no help whatever in publicizing APT. . . . (During 1971) several news releases written especially for the ATA newsletter, were ignored."

Jed Davis, President of ATA, was not unaware of the problems of communication between the two organizations. He contacted Jerome Lawrence with some suggestions on "how to strengthen APT's ties to ATA." The first suggestion was to keep the ATA President as a Governor-at-Large of APT. The ATA President was elected annually. Davis suggested that the ATA Committee on Appointments designate one person for a three year term to serve on the APT Board of Governors "for purposes of continuity." This type of appointment was part of APT's original plan, but had been discontinued when the APT Governors and Trustees did not approve of the person appointed. If Davis was familiar with the history of the relationship between the organizations, he chose to disregard it. He also suggested that the President of the APT Trustees submit a yearly report to ATA "to keep everyone reminded of the liaison." Davis proposed that the Chair and Vice-Chair of

---

ATA's New Play Program should be on the APT mailing list. He also suggested that the Executive Director should submit news releases for inclusion in ATA's *Theatre News.*" As previously mentioned, Ayers had sent numerous releases, all of which had been ignored. There existed an opposition between the two groups. APT wanted ATA's help, but did not want ATA’s appointments. ATA encouraged APT to submit information, but continually failed to publish that information for its members.

**1973 Board Meeting: Reacting to the Regional Theatres**

The 1973 Joint Meeting of the APT Boards of Governors and Trustees was poorly attended. Meeting notes do not record those in attendance, but mention the low number of Board members present. Those persons who did attend made a few major decisions.

The first of these actions was described as "Plans for Extensions and Expansion" and reflected the growing influence of regional theatres in the American theatre of the early 1970s. Their decision was as follows:

> Because Broadway, and recently, the Regional theatres, have been able to "launch" a play more

---

"Jed Davis, letter to Jerome Lawrence, 2 October 1973, APT Collection."
successfully than APT (with the exception of THOREAU), playwrights tend to gravitate to regional and Broadway producers. The idea of APT becoming the "national arm" for the regional theatre was proposed and adopted. A selected group of regional theatres which have, over the last few years, been successful in the recruitment of significant new plays will, hopefully, become recruiters for APT. APT Board members will attend performances of new works in the regional theatres and will attempt to interest the authors in submitting the play to APT. By this means, and with substantial funding, the Board members hope to offer an annual package of 5 or 6 plays to the subscribers.

Board members were encouraged to approach the following regional theatres: The American Conservatory Theatre, The Mark Taper Forum, The Arena Stage, The Long Wharf Theatre, The Chelsea Theatre Center, The Hartford Stage Company, and the American Place Theatre.\(^\text{34}\)

The second major action taken at this meeting concerned funding for APT. It was decided that

in order to provide more scripts and more choices for APT subscribers, and to offer playwrights the advantage of professional actors for key roles, special directors when needed, and a salary when attending rehearsals, annual appeals should be made to a number of appropriate foundations. Board members should approach foundations with the idea of obtaining grants for the "national arm for regional theatre" expansion.

Funds suggested included The John Golden Fund, The Dramatists Guild Fund, The Rockefeller Foundation, The National Endowment for the Arts, The Mellon Foundation and The Ohio Foundation. The New York centered Shubert Foundation was also suggested as an option, but the thrust of that proposal was not to be to benefit the regional theatre. Rather, the proposal was to stress the "enlightenment and self-interest to Broadway de-emphasizing the alternative to Broadway and stressing feed back to Broadway."* 

1973: Making Assumptions

The first decision made at this meeting rested upon a number of suppositions made by the APT Board. First of all, the Board members supposed that a "national arm of the regional theatre" was actually needed. Was there really a need, or desire on the part of the theatres, for such an organization? Or was this new purpose simply a justification to continue the existence of APT, an organization that was having trouble achieving its original goals? There had not been a call on the part of the regional theatres for such an organization. And if there had been, the theatres probably

would have gone to ATA or ANTA, two groups with many more contacts than APT. Or the regionals could have created their own network for such a purpose. The Theatre Communication Guild, founded in 1961, was originally dedicated to aiding regional theatres with casting, job placement, management, and research concerns. In January of 1973, the organization broadened its service to include the publishing of the TCG Newsletter which included the "New Scripts" section, "a forum to increase the visibility of both unproduced work and that which has had only limited exposure." An organization that APT was hoping to become was already in existence. APT's founders were either unaware of the Theatre Communications Guild, or hoped to replace it.

A second supposition in regards to the "national arm of the regional theatres" proposition was the cooperation of the theatres. How could APT make such a decision without first consulting the theatres themselves? There was no guarantee that the theatres would go along with APT's plan that the theatres would refer the plays to APT. Many of the regional

---


theatres named had been APT subscribers at various times. Few had been constant members. Most theatres had joined when APT offered a play they wanted to produce. If the theatres had not been satisfied with APT, why would they offer works to the organization?

A third presumption was the cooperation of the playwrights. If the regionals were doing new plays by playwrights, both established and new, why would the playwrights go along with APT? Chances are that many of the dramatists had submitted works to APT in the past which had been refused. If regionals were giving exposure to works of writers who had previously been rejected by APT, why would the writers now want to collaborate with APT? Even if the writers had no previous experience with APT, they surely did not need to work with the organization to get further productions of their work, at other regional theatres or elsewhere. This could be negotiated by the writers' agents or by the writers themselves. Surely, other regionals would attend a theatre's productions as well as the New York backers, looking for new scripts. As previously noted, APT had a serious image problem with many playwrights, and the success at a regional theatre would not automatically make a writer want to give a script to APT.
Another presumption regarding this decision was the idea that enough playwrights would cooperate with APT so that five or six plays could be offered annually. This number was highly unrealistic given APT's failure to approve even one script in previous years. Also, the types of plays being done at regionals were not necessarily those that would be accepted by APT's subscribers. Subject matter, age of characters, and production requirements still limited the selection of many community, college and university producers.

The other decisions regarding funding of APT productions so that a playwright could be guaranteed a situation comparable to a Broadway premiere moved APT further away from its original intention. It had originally sought to be an alternative to Broadway, but was now seemingly trying to recreate Broadway on alternative stages. The idea of guaranteeing money for choice of performers, special directors, and rehearsal salary for the playwright mirrored the Broadway commercialism to which APT was supposedly opposed. In such a situation, the university would simply serve as nothing more than a tryout stage with major roles going to professionals, a director being imported, and the playwright being paid to be part of rehearsals. The advantage
to students of working with professionals would be overshadowed by the proving ground nature of the production.

As 1973 closed, The American Playwrights Theatre was in a state of flux. Not finding satisfaction with submitted scripts, and realizing that it would probably never again achieve the success of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, APT was searching for a new direction. Membership had dropped considerably, to 138 members. Eight regional theatres belonged, as did 25 community theatres and 105 university/college theatres. The regional theatres were premiering far more new plays than APT, and APT no longer seemed to serve a viable purpose. Hoping to enjoy part of the success of the regionals, APT attempted to attach itself to the regional theatres, even though there was not a clear need for such an attachment. Assets of APT listed at $9,020, a slight rise over the previous year, due mainly to The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail royalties. Even the governing Boards of the organization seemed troubled. Many of the Board members were not interested enough to attend the annual meeting. Those who

---


did attend made decisions to move APT in some very unrealistic directions.

1974: The Problems Continue: ACTF, ATA, and NEA

The following year, 1974, was one of the worst years of APT's existence. Upon the suggestion of Michael Kanin, director of The American College Theatre Festival, APT agreed to offer to its members the winning script of the ACTF Playwrighting Competition. APT production was listed as one of the prizes of the competition. That year the winning script was Neil Cuthbert's farce, The Soft Touch. The play had been staged at the Kennedy Center as part of the final competition for ACTF and had been received quite warmly. Despite encouragement from David Ayers and other members of the Boards, Cuthbert refused to accept the APT productions as part of his prize and would not allow APT to offer his script. Entry into the competition did not require the winner to accept all of the prizes offered.

---


Another unfortunate incident for APT came in the form of Robert E. Lee's address to ATA in the summer of 1974. As President of APT's Trustees, Lee reported to ATA as its President Jed Davis had requested. Lee's address expressed "regret" that more of his "colleagues in the Dramatists Guild had not participated more wholeheartedly in the APT program, following the lead of Robert Anderson, the late Elmer Rice, and others." He encouraged ATA's membership to change that record and participate with APT to "implement a tide of new plays onto regional stages. . . . to turn the tributary into the mainstream." 42

Lee's address drew little response in the form of opinion or plays submitted to APT. If anything, it called further attention to the regional theatres and detracted interest from APT. Again, APT could not provide any reason for playwrights to submit their work to the organization instead of just approaching the other regional theatres. Submissions to APT

hit an all-time low, with less than two dozen scripts submitted."³

Another problem in 1974 came in the form of a major setback for APT when it applied for a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. APT sought a grant in the amount of $60,000. The breakdown was as follows: $3,000 to fund a graduate student position in public relations; $7,000 to fund duplication and dissemination of scripts, and production of promotional brochures, news releases, etc.; and $50,000 to fund playwriting awards and matching royalties (two awards at $10,000 each and $30,000 in matching royalties). The grant was intended to assist APT "to better accomplish the purpose of making available to the university, community, and resident theatre the best new works of contemporary American playwrights."⁴ Unfortunately, the NEA did not find APT's

---
³ David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "1975 Annual Board Meeting Agenda and Schedule," 8 October 1975, APT Collection. Note: Information regarding 1974 APT history is contained in the 1975 Meeting Agenda. As will be explained shortly, there was no Board Meeting in 1974.

mission worthy of support. The application for the grant was "not among those recommended for approval."

Board members were notified of the NEA grant rejection. Ayers' letter also announced the possibility of offering a new play by unknown Dallas Theatre Center resident playwright Preston Jones, entitled *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*. Board members were also informed of the scheduling of the annual joint meeting.

1974: Board Meeting Cancellation

The announcement of the meeting met with little enthusiasm. Robert E. Lee suggested cancelling the meeting, stating that APT's problems were "far more external than internal." The lack of submissions, he felt, was "not due to the inflexibility of the mechanism." The problem was "apathy--on the part of ATA, DGA, and NEA." Lee posed the following questions which he felt were some of APT's major problems:

Why did NEA, once a supporter, refuse us a cent?

---

"Ruth Mayleas, Director of Theatre Program, National Endowment for the Arts, letter to Raymond S. Bungo, 6 September 1974, APT Collection.

"David H. Ayers, letter to APT Governors and Trustees, 3 September 1974, APT Collection."
Why is ATA so laodicean? Why does DGA purr over New Dramatists, yet ignore the only other avenue by which new works can become dramatic literature?*^ 

The decision was made to cancel the annual meeting. The cancellation announcement also included a copy of Lee's letter. Ann S. Hill, president-elect, of ATA received the letter and responded. She reminded Ayers and the Board Members of the original objective of APT: "to get recognized playwrights to give their plays to regional and university theatres rather than/or before Broadway production." She described the change of direction of APT as just cause for producers to lose interest. "If APT is to go to unknown authors, Preston Jones, or an ACTF winner, then the attraction to producers may change, too." She related a conversation with Professor Cecil Jones, Director of Vanderbilt University Theatre. Jones had originally belonged (to APT), found nothing of interest in it and dropped it, took it up again for THOREAU and now, again, had withdrawn. . . . There was nothing of interest. . . . I'm sure he reflects a great many people--what can we (ATA) do about it?**

---


** Ann S. Hill, letter to David H. Ayers, 8 October 1974, APT Collection.
The response from Arthur Ballet of the University of Minnesota, who had been a part of APT from the start, was even more to the point. He saw the NEA denial "as a reflection of attitudes." He suggested an APT Board meeting in early 1975 "to discuss calling an end to APT.... All instruments serve their purpose," he wrote, "and there is a time to say 'enough is enough' and move on to other instruments."**

Undaunted by these criticisms, APT did not disband, and extended membership to 1974 subscribing theatres for 1975 at no cost. Memberships had been extended in the past due to lack of acceptance of the play offered. This year was the first time that memberships were extended because APT did not even offer a play for the members to refuse. Membership had fallen to 122 subscribing theatres. Of those theatres subscribing, six were regionals, 21 community, and 95 were university/college theatre.*® Subscription revenue and Jabberwock royalty had raised APT's assets to $13,060.*'

---

1975: *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*

APT entered 1975 offering Preston Jones' play *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*. The play had premiered at the Dallas Theatre Center in a workshop production in late 1973. It was resurrected shortly thereafter as part of The Dallas Playmarket '74 which staged "eight full length fully produced plays written by Dallas Theatre Center professional playwrights. Jones' play was described as

a comedy about a domino-playing, whiskey-drinking group of men in a small West Texas town. They are trying to hold together the waning Knights of the White Magnolia club (a group slightly right of the Ku Klux Klan) because it's their once-a-week excuse to escape from their humdrum existence."

**APT Productions**

The play received rave reviews from both local and national critics. David Ayers was invited to Dallas to view the plays, and invited Jones to submit his work to APT. Jones accepted and in October of 1974, the play was offered to the APT subscribers. Jones agreed to a 20 month contract with APT

---

"*The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*, program, Dallas Theatre Center, 4 December 1974, APT Collection.

"*The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*, program, Dallas Theatre Center, 16-24 May 1974, APT Collection."
which made the play available from January 1975 through the Autumn of 1976. The play received thirty productions through APT, over one third of them at regional theatres.

Commercial Staging

Jones' contract did not prevent a concurrent or subsequent Broadway production, and in March of 1975 the play opened at the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C. in a production that moved to Broadway the following September. As will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter, The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia was the only play in APT's history to enjoy a respectable run through APT and then move to the Broadway stage. In this case, APT was definitely used as the play's proving ground before it moved into the high financial pressures of the New York theatre.

APT was unable to garner national recognition for the process by which the play reached Broadway. Producer Robert Whitehead was the backer behind Kennedy Center and New York

---

"David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 7 November 1974, APT Collection.

productions. He and Jones' agent Audrey Wood pressured APT "to limit APT productions and curtail all APT publicity."
The Board of APT complied because they wanted "to serve the best interests of the playwright and not steal the thunder from a Broadway launching of the play." They "agreed not to send out national publicity releases concerning APT's acquisition of the play." Whitehead and Wood also did not want productions in potential touring areas of the New York production and tried to limit performances in major cities. Against their objections, the play was licensed to regional theatres in Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago and Cleveland, all of which paid royalties far beyond the norm due to APT's royalty structure."

The production of The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia was the major event for APT during 1975. The royalties generated by the success of Jones' play almost compensated for the free extension of subscriptions. At the end of 1975, APT assets stood at $12,050, a $1,000 decrease

"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "1975 Annual Board Meeting Agenda and Schedule," 8 October 1975, APT Collection."
from the previous year. Without the royalty, APT would have had to absorb both subscription and operating expenses. Unfortunately, the organization was unable to capitalize on the success of the play it had helped nourish. APT was acknowledged locally through program notation, but was not able to promote itself through press releases which could have generated national news articles.

1975 Board Meeting: Out of Touch

At the 1975 joint meeting, the Board members "reaffirmed a commitment to circulating a number of plays annually." It was also reported that submissions were extremely low and that none of the scripts had gotten past the Ayers/Bowen Screening Committee. The annual subscription fee was "to always be required since more than one play (would) be offered." The fee was to be charged "without consideration of whether a play ha(d) been activated with twenty-five productions." It was also decided that it was important "to give more weight to the merit of the play than to its probable acceptance by the membership" and that "popularity should not be the criterion but rather whether the play is a good one." Another order of

---

business was that the new script cover would list the names of the APT Governors and Trustees. "This idea was readily adopted."*

By this time, it seems that the APT Governors and Trustees who met that day were far from in touch with the problems of the organization. In a year when APT was unable to capitalize on the success of one of its scripts, was unable to receive many submissions, did not accept any of the scripts that were submitted, and, thus, had no play to offer its subscribers for the following year, its leader were deciding that APT's mission was to offer numerous selections. At a time when APT was clearly in trouble, its Board was discussing the design of script covers, and making plans for the future as if all was well.

1976: *Ladyhouse Blues*

The following year, 1976, was also a very poor year for the American Playwrights Theatre. Script submission was extremely low, but three plays were circulated to members: *Stand Off at Beaver and Pine* by Sally Netzel, *Animals are

---

*"David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "Summary of Annual Joint Meeting of APT Governors and Trustees Held in Columbus Ohio on October 25, 1975," APT Collection.*
Passing from Our Lives by Robert Eisele, and Ladyhouse Blues by Kevin O'Morrison. The first two received no acceptances and the third, about a family of women during World War II, initially received limited acceptance, but later went on to be staged by 30 APT theatres. Of the plays submitted, the Screening Committee read and rejected all of the following: all winning plays from the O'Neill Center's annual competition, as well as plays by Lanford Wilson (The Mound Builders), Isreal Horowitz (The Reason We Act), Mordeci Gorelick (Yes and No and Andrus, or The Vision), George Sklar (Powerhouse), and Martin Sherman (Cracks). The plays were judged not suitable for APT.""

1976 Board Meeting: Disinterest and Delusion

Almost one third of the Governors and Trustees did not attend the 1976 Board Meeting. Those missing included Governors Terrence McNally, Preston Jones, and Edward Albee. Jones was invited to join the Board after the success of The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia. Albee joined as a replacement for Jean-Claude van Itallie, who

resigned shortly after his appointment. The minutes of this meeting note a discussion "of whether APT (was), under its present system of operation, still serving an important purpose. . . . There was no suggestion, however, that APT go out of business or change its basic goals or procedures." The majority of the meeting was devoted to a "discussion of where to get better scripts." 60

At a time when dissolution was a distinct possibility, the leaders of APT continued to see the organization as a viable option to premiere new plays. At a time when the submission of scripts was at an all time low, APT hoped to offer its subscribers an exciting new play. Membership reflected the theatres that found Jones' play attractive. Regional theatre members now numbered 13, community theatres numbered 27, and university/college theatres accounted for 90 memberships." Jones' play required middle age men, something in short supply in university theatre departments, but available in the other two venues. Assets for APT also

---


reflected the popularity of The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia. Although the play received fewer productions than The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, it earned more royalties due to its stagings at regional theatres which garnered higher royalties. At the end of 1976, APT posted assets of $12,530.  

1977: Frustration Continues

Another bad year for the American Playwrights Theatre followed in 1976. Ladyhouse Blues continued to be activated, but did not generate much enthusiasm. There were six more members than the previous year, all of who had joined to present O'Morrison's work. The number of script submissions was again low, with fewer than 50 plays submitted. Only four garnered interest from the Screening Committee: Michael Kanin's The White Queen; Eric Bentley's Lord Alfred's Lover, about the life of Oscar Wilde; Preston Jones' Santa Fe Sunshine, another comedy-drama set in a small Texas town; and Yip Harburg's What a Day for a Miracle, a musical about the Children's Crusades. All but Bentley's play were passed to the Reading Committee which chose not to offer any of the

---

plays to the subscribers. The subject matter of a gay relationship quite possibly prevented the Screening Committee from advancing Bentley's play.

1977: Board Meeting: Evaluation by the Younger Playwrights: Albee and McNally

When the Boards met for the annual meeting at the end of 1977, there again was no discussion of disbanding. APT had not offered a play that year, and did not have one to offer the following year. At the meeting, the discussion leaned towards "selling" APT to playwrights and theatres. John Walker, chair of Ohio State's Department of Theatre and Trustee of APT, "noted that the original focus of APT had changed from the established playwright to the promising new playwright" and encouraged the organization to continue along those lines. At this point in time, APT received plays from a variety of sources and had been doing so for some time. Scripts came from name playwrights, agents, new writers, and

---


amateurs. The source actually was not important to the readers. They were looking for something that they felt would be accepted by the subscribers.

At the same meeting, Edward Albee “registered concern that many interesting plays will be rejected because of the problem of limited production acceptance by member theatres.” Albee was in agreement with the process by which a play was accepted by APT. He felt that it had “less to do with the excellence of the work than to the degree of acceptability.” He stated that he would be “reluctant to recommend most of the work he (found) interesting.” Albee’s evaluation was accurate in many ways. A script went through numerous readings before being offered. Most plays, however, did not get past the Bowen/Ayers Screening Committee. As mentioned earlier, their tastes surely influenced the choice of plays. Their decisions were also very much based upon their belief in the possibility of acceptance of the scripts for production by member theatres.

Terrence McNally suggested that APT “concentrate more on developing scripts through pilot productions.” He thought APT should nourish new plays by acting as a "working producer" in

“David Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "1977 Meeting."
the development of the scripts before offering them for nationwide presentation." McNally's suggestion described a need in the theatre community, but not a practical role for APT which was not in a position to act as such a "working producer."

At the end of 1977, APT membership had fallen further. Regional theatres still numbered at 13, but community theatres numbered 25, and college/university theatres numbered 83." Assets, posted at $10,970 again reflected royalty from Jones' play, but were less than the previous year."

1977: Ayers Suggests Disbanding

Although disbanding APT was not discussed at this meeting, the possibility loomed. Shortly after the meeting, Ayers expressed his thoughts to John Walker in a memo titled "Some thoughts on why we should consider abolishing APT." In response to Walker's suggestion that APT encourage the new playwright, Ayers stated that in 13 years of operation, there

"David Ayers, Memo to APT Governors and Trustees, "1977 Meeting."


had been only two successful plays by unestablished authors, *Summertree* and *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*, so the likelihood of APT attracting other new writers was low."

Ayers continued by stating that when APT started in 1963, the Tyrone Guthrie Theatre was the only major resident theatre, and that, at the time, it was not actively committed to producing new plays. The situation had changed by 1977 and many of the numerous regional theatres which had emerged since 1963 were dedicated to staging new works. Often, those theatres proved to be tryout arenas for plays that eventually moved to New York. There was no need for APT to serve such a purpose, felt Ayers. "If APT went out of business what void would be left?" He believed that Jones' play would have been produced by just as many regional theatres if APT had not handled the play. They "could have just arranged these productions with Audrey Wood." Ayers also listed other avenues for new works: the Theatre Communications Group Newsletter nominations, the O'Neill Center, the American

---

"David H. Ayers, Memo to John Walker, 23 November 1977, APT Collection."
College Theatre Festival, ATA's New Play Program, and regional playwriting contests."

To the memo, Ayers attached the October 1977 TCG Newsletter which contained two articles of major interest to APT. The first documented the closing of Arthur Ballet's Office of Advanced Drama Research. The organization was begun, like APT, in 1963. The OADR received grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and the National Council on the Arts for the purpose of matching new plays with theatres. In an interview, Ballet cited a "bullish market for new American plays" as the reason for the closing. "Theatres nationwide are engaged in a talent hunt unprecedented in the history of the American stage," stated the article. "Contests, conferences, and workshop readings" were plentiful and "the need for a national middleman ha(d) ceased to exist."71

The other article in the same newsletter proved to be prophetic, and listed a source that would shortly become another outlet for new American plays. The Actors Theatre of Louisville was sponsoring their first Festival of New American

70 David Ayers, Memo to Walker, APT Collection.

Plays featuring Marsha Norman's *Getting Out.* The event was later renamed the Humana Festival of New American Plays and went on to become the premiere new play festival in the country.

1978 Board Meeting: Cancelled Due to Finances, to Lack of Interest and to Broadway

Interest in APT waned on the part of its leaders, and when the time came for the annual Meeting in 1978, the announcement was not met with enthusiasm. "A further complication resulted from the September openings of the new McNally and Lawrence and Lee plays in New York." McNally's *Broadway! Broadway!* was slated to open on September 23. Lawrence and Lee's *First Monday in October* was to open in early October. The 1978 Board Meeting was bypassed because of "financial considerations, the fact that less than half the


74 Jerome Lawrence, letter to David H. Ayers, 31 July 1978, APT Collection.

75 Jerome Lawrence, letter to John Walker, 24 July 1978, APT Collection.
Board members could be available, and there was little business needing the attention of the Board Members. Membership had fallen further. Membership stood at 98, the same as APT's first year of operation. Eleven regional theatres were members, as were 23 community theatres and 64 university/college theatres. APT's assets had fallen to $8,640.

1979: Dormancy

1979 was basically a dormant year for APT and in October of that year, John Walker, APT President and retiring Chair of OSU's theatre department, contacted all of the Trustees and notified them of a meeting later that month "to review APT's situation and to make some decisions as to its future." He stated that the climate in New York was now different than when APT was founded. Broadway was still prohibitively expensive, but the Off- and Off-off-Broadway theatre was very active in producing new works. The regional theatre also


provided "a rich variety of additional opportunities." Playwrights, contended Walker, were sending work to those forums and "the quantity and quality of APT scripts (were) disappointing." Only "bottom drawer" items were being submitted after they had "already unsuccessfully done the usual rounds."

Walker attached to his memo an article from The New York Times describing the opportunities for new plays. The New York area offered a thriving scene with theatres such as New York Public Theatre, the Manhattan Theatre Club, the Phoenix Theatre, the American Place Theatre, Playwright's Horizon, Circle Rep, and many more. The article also stated that "the commitment to new work and to the nurturing of promising new writers" was shared by many regional counterparts across the country. The regionals formed a national network that was of great importance to the future of the American theatre because a play could be developed through a number of regional productions. The article cited Marsha Norman's Getting Out.

---

"John A. Walker, Memo to APT Trustees, 11 October 1979, APT Collection."
as a success due to the regional theatres, having had numerous stagings before arriving for its New York run.***

1979 Board Meeting: Suspension of Operations

When the Trustees met in October of 1979, membership in APT stood at 100, the lowest in its history."' The decision to disband seemed to have been made before they even met, and on October 25, 1979 the APT Trustees voted to "suspend operations in terms of soliciting scripts and of accepting memberships." A suspension was enacted as opposed to a dissolution because the Trustees hoped to publish an anthology of APT plays which was to "become the present purpose of the organization." It was hoped that each playwright could write an introduction his work, and Lawrence and Lee volunteered to write the introduction to the anthology. After the anthology’s publication, APT was to be dissolved by a mail vote. Upon the occasion of the announcement of the dissolution, a press release was to be issued "to the effect


that the work of APT (was) now being carried forward by other people and other organizations, and that the purpose of APT had been accomplished." It was to be announced that APT had completed "16 years of distinguished service, thereby ending the program on a positive note."*®

Dissolution

After considerable negotiations during 1980-1981 with The Ohio State University Press, the plans of publishing the anthology were abandoned. Most of the plays were already available from other sources. There was no longer a need for APT's existence and in June 1981, John Walker proposed the following: to deposit all of APT's records with Special Collections in the OSU Library; to establish an APT Playwriting Scholarship with the remaining funds; and to dissolve APT under the laws of the state of Ohio. He asked for a postcard mail vote on the matter from the Trustees.*®

*® David H. Ayers, Memo to APT Trustees, "Summary of the Meeting of APT Trustees Held at The Fawcett Center in Columbus, Ohio on October 23, 1979," n.d., APT Collection.

*® John W. Walker, letter to APT Trustees, 1 June 1981, APT Collection.
The Trustees replied in accordance in September of 1981. "The Corporation known as The American Playwrights Theatre was legally dissolved on March 3, 1982."  

Summary  
APT remained in existence for 18 years. During that time, it united members of the commercial theatre with members of the non-commercial theatre. It enjoyed periods of high achievement and great disappointment. Originally founded to premiere new plays by established American dramatists on the stages of the country's non-commercial theatres, APT eventually offered plays by unknown playwrights. Membership in APT rose and fell in response to the plays offered. Few theatres subscribed every year. Four major APT productions, each of which marked a distinct turning point in the organization's history, are discussed in the following chapter.


CHAPTER VI
REPRESENTATIVE PRODUCTIONS

Introduction

This chapter focuses on four plays which received production through The American Playwrights Theatre. Each production occurred at an important point of APT's history, and each made a significant contribution to the organization. The productions are The Days Between by Robert Anderson (1965), Summertree by Ron Cowen (1968), The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee (1970), and The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia by Preston Jones (1974).

Each of these plays received APT productions which were considered successful in terms of the number of productions, the critical responses to those productions, and the critical responses to the plays themselves. Each play's debut marked a significant point in APT's history. Each came to APT in a different way. Each play signalled a turning point in APT policy.
The Days Between, like The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, received its world premiere through APT. Summertree, like The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia debuted elsewhere. Each of the plays received productions after its contract period with APT.

This chapter discusses each of these four plays, including the way in which the play came to APT, its APT production, the significance of the production, and the play's history before and after APT.

The Days Between by Robert Anderson

The Days Between by Robert Anderson was the first play produced under the auspices of The American Playwrights Theatre. Although it was not written especially for APT, it fit the criterion of having been written by an established American dramatist. Anderson had been represented on Broadway with Tea and Sympathy (1953); All Summer Long (1954); and Silent Night, Lonely Night (1959). The Days Between received its world premiere at the APT pilot production in May of 1965 at The Dallas Theatre Center. The resulting successful

---

production and national critical acclaim and publicity served to firmly establish The American Playwrights Theatre as an organization dedicated to debuting new works by major American dramatists on the stages of the country's non-commercial theatres.

The plot of the play is as follows: "David Ives, 40, a college professor who has known early success as a writer, has taken the summer away from teaching to work on a new book. He hasn't published in ten years, and is afraid that the 'follow-up' will be inferior. Barbara, his wife, is unfulfilled and lonely, knowing that David feels useless and a failure at his unproductivity." The couple is visited by a long-time acquaintance and also by a former student. The student has achieved his own success, and the friend "stirs a need" in Barbara. David leaves after Barbara tells him of an abortion performed years earlier "to prevent further responsibility and frustration." Eventually, the couple is reunited "as they promise to help one another face life."²

Anderson had written the play a few years earlier, and had hoped for a Broadway production. The play passed between

two producers, Leland Hayward and Alfred de Liagre, both of whom had let their options expire for want of the appropriate female lead. Both Deborah Kerr and Uta Hagen expressed interest in the work, but neither had signed to perform, either due to other commitments or conflicts with prospective directors. Deborah Kerr's husband did not approve of a Broadway production, since they were living in Switzerland and he did not want to be separated. Uta Hagen liked the script a great deal but would not work with director Daniel Mann (*Come Back, Little Sheba* and *The Rose Tattoo*) whom Anderson and agent Audrey Wood had selected. Within three months after Hagen's refusal, Mann decided against directing Anderson's drama. In an effort to get the play staged, Anderson brought the play to the 1964 APT Board Meeting. Although he realized that the subject matter might not be palatable to some community and university theatres, Anderson decided to offer it for consideration.

*The Days Between* was unanimously endorsed by the Board to be offered to the subscribers. The offering of the drama

---


signalled a change in the established, but untested, policy of APT. First, a play by an APT Board member was considered. Under the original intentions of the organization, this would not have been permitted. Second, the play was not brand new. Anderson had tried to have it staged in other venues. The play's history, however, was not publicized when the play was made available. It was announced as a new play by Robert Anderson, which it was in a sense, since it had not been staged. Anderson was to select the location of the pilot production. There was also the possibility that he might direct. The announcement of the play's availability was coupled with the urgings of AETA president Kenneth L. Graham for quick acceptance of the play which would signal "a significant step toward decentralized nationwide theatre." He urged for more than the required 50, hoping for at least 100 productions of the play. By the start of February 1965, APT had received nine requests for the pilot production; six

---

* David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 10 December 1964, APT Collection.

* Kenneth L. Graham, letter to APT Subscribers, 10 December 1964, APT Collection.
from college/university theatres, two from community theatres, and one from a regional theatre.'

There were not by this time, however, sufficient numbers of theatres interested in producing The Days Between. Although many theatres wanted the pilot, there were not yet 50 committed to staging the play. Anderson wanted to see his drama produced, but did not want APT to change its rules to do so. At the Board Meeting the previous Fall, "the Trustees and Governors felt that (APT) should hold fast to the 50 production minimum." Anderson was later contacted in January by Robert E. Lee, "who said, 'Don't even go with 49.'" Anderson agreed that the 50 production limit was necessary or it would "be the end of APT." Another change of policy was reached in short time, however, and The Days Between was licensed with only 40 acceptances, but "the Governors (felt) that at least 50 productions (would) be promised by the beginning of the production rights period in September."

---


* David H. Ayers, letter to Subscribers, 5 February 1965, APT Collection.
Anderson chose the Dallas Theatre Center as the location for the pilot production. Artistic Director Paul Baker was chosen as director. Anderson agreed to be in residence, so that he could see the play "through the pilot production much as he would see it through rehearsals and out-of-town tryouts for Broadway." The script that emerged from this production would be used for all subsequent APT productions.  

The playwright was present at auditions and casting of the play, and returned weeks later for a period of ten days before opening. Upon his second arrival, Anderson was "very disappointed" in what he saw of the production. After "a sleepless night," he and director Baker "restarted from scratch." Anderson was quite pleased with the finished product, and felt that the female lead was "magnificent, the best performance in that role of all of the APT productions."  

The Days Between opened at the Dallas Theatre Center on May 19, 1965 with Mary Sue Fridge and Ryland Merkey in the leading roles. The Assistant Director was Preston Jones, and

---


11 Anderson, interview.
settings and costumes were by David Pursley. By the opening performance, 48 other theatres had agreed to present the drama, and these directors were invited to attend the Dallas pilot. Random House Publishers, who had put Anderson’s other dramas into print, issued copies of The Days Between to coincide with the opening.

The notices in the local and national presses were on the positive side, but by no means raves. As noted in Chapter Four, the critics were overwhelmingly supportive of the goals of APT and were quite complimentary to the achievement of The Days Between as a step towards decentralization.

The local reviewers varied in their opinions of the play. Gynter Quill of the Waco Tribune Press believed that Anderson had created “real persons, not attitudes,” but “failed to make (the audience) care greatly for them.” Quill did, however, find the play “a refreshing contrast to the concentrated amorality and the scurvy defeatism and the maudlin whining of late years.” He was extremely complimentary of Mary Sue

---

12 The Days Between, program, The Dallas Theatre Center, 19 May 1965.

Fridge's "remarkable exhibition of controlled acting," but he could "not be kind to others in the cast." 14

Dallas Times Herald reviewer Virgil Miers agreed with Quill's assessment of the acting, and called the drama "a play of little truths and large crises that can stir an audience even when it can't engulf it." Although it had problems, Miers admired its "basic integrity." 15

The Dallas Morning News was the most complimentary of the local reviews. John Neville felt that the "taut 2 act drama ... hit strongly home ... sensitive, thought-provoking, significant, and a cogent comment." He, too, gave rave reviews to Fridge, and polite reviews to the rest of the cast. 16

On the national level, reactions to the play and production were comparable to those of the local reviewers. Marion Simon in The National Observer spent most of his piece describing Anderson's curtain speech and the goals of APT.


15 Virgil Miers, "Fresh at the Center, An Anderson Play," Dallas Times Herald, 20 May 1965, 8B.

16 John Neville, "No Wine or Roses in 'Day Between'," The Dallas Morning News, 20 May 1965, 18A.
Perhaps in an attempt not to dampen the spirit of success felt at the opening, Simon did not reveal his personal reaction. Rather he related the following:

Opinions on the merits of the play varied among members of the opening night audience. But nearly everyone agreed that Miss Fridge was excellent in a role that caused two Broadway producers to drop their options on the play for lack of a suitable female star."

(Once *The Days Between* was accepted for production at APT theatres, the play's history was made available, promoting APT as an alternative route of production.)

Howard Taubman of *The New York Times*, in two different articles, found the play "forceful and sensitive" and "compelling," but felt that it could "be improved (by) the time it gets to Broadway, as it undoubtedly will." He found Fridge "especially impressive.""

In *The Saturday Review*, Henry Hewes judged the play "as an interesting new work (which) seems to manufacture dramatic climaxes and explanations somewhat too unbelievably." Despite


the play's minor problems, Hewes felt that "Anderson ha(d) been given a well-staged and enthusiastically received start, and still ha(d) forty-nine tryout towns to improve (the play) in." Hewes, also, was quite complimentary of Fridge's performance."

When examined together, these reviews point to a few evaluations that can be made regarding the pilot production of *The Days Between*. The play itself was basically effective as a dramatic portrait of a man and woman caught at a crossroads in their life together. The abrupt climaxes and resolutions, however, contributed to a sense of melodrama within the work. The production was admirable, with positive reactions to the directing and, especially, the actress in the female lead.

Months later Robert Anderson evaluated the experience in an article in *The Christian Science Monitor*. Beginning with a type of disclaimer, Anderson stated that he did not give his play to APT out of any "angry revolt against Broadway," explaining that he had "profited enormously from Broadway's virtues and hope(d) to profit from them again." In the case of *The Days Between*, he stated, he had tired of waiting

---

for "the right time." Without relating his initial
disappointment when he arrived for rehearsals, Anderson called
the days in Dallas "among the happiest of (his) theatre life."
He expressed admiration for Baker and his ensemble of actors
and artists. Anderson found the experience "exhilarating and
liberating," and he urged other dramatists "to go APT." 20

After the pilot at Dallas, other theatres that had agreed
to produce the play received a revised script, photographs of
the set at Dallas, the groundplan, and the property list.
These materials, with the exception of the script, were meant
as suggestions, and were not absolutely required to be used. 21

The Days Between was eventually scheduled at 54 theatres
and actually produced at 50. Of these theatres, 16 were
community theatres, 32 were college/university theatres, and
2 were regional theatres. 22 Anderson viewed twelve of these
productions and was in residence "at a few." He travelled
from "theatre to theatre, forwarding rewrites to APT." These

20 Robert Anderson, "A Playwright's View: What It Is Like

21 David H. Ayers, letter to APT Producers, 16 August 1965.

22 American Playwright Theatre, "Days Between Box Office
Statements," APT Collection.
revisions were then forwarded to future producing theatres.\(^{23}\) The travelling eventually took its toll on Anderson. Many times, there were mixups as to who was responsible for the expenses of his visits. When calling an end to his visiting of productions, Anderson evaluated the situation:

\[
\text{They all feel if they're doing my play, I come along with the play, and they're insulted if I don't come. I want to do all I can for the cause, but as I've often said, I can't swing either the time or the money.}^{24}\]

Productions of The Days Between continued throughout the United States until the end of 1966. Reactions to the various productions almost invariably mirrored those to the pilot: compliments to the play, but suggestions of the need for improvements; general admiration of the production; positive reactions to the directing; mention of and agreement with the goals of APT; polite reaction to the performances of the male lead and the supporting players; and raves for the actress in the leading female role.\(^{26}\)

\(^{23}\) Anderson, interview.

\(^{24}\) Robert Anderson, letter to David H. Ayers, 8 October 1965, APT Collection.

\(^{26}\) American Playwrights Theatre, "Days Between: Newspaper Reviews and Articles," APT Collection.
By the end of its tenure with APT, the drama had been performed in twenty-two different states. Its last APT production was by The Little Theatre of Alexandria, Virginia in December 1966. When that production took place, The Days Between had been with APT for over two years, and had been seen, literally, coast to coast. Anderson's royalties amounted to $10,800.

The Days Between served to establish the American Playwrights Theatre in its quest to premiere new plays by established American dramatists on the stages of the nation's non-commercial theatres. The number and success of productions proved that the idea could work: that theatres were willing to produce plays without prior production and approval of the Broadway stage.

A Broadway production of The Days Between, however, was always a hope for Anderson; the APT productions were often billed as pre-Broadway. That production did not occur.

In the early 1970s, actress Liv Ullman read a copy of the play and found the female lead, according to Anderson, "the best part written for a woman in a very long time." She wanted to

---


* 1965 and 1966 Financial Reports.
do a film version, and encouraged Anderson to write a screenplay. He obliged, and Ullman interested Jack Lemmon in the male lead. Lemmon, however, wanted to do it as television work, and committed to the project in that medium. Unfortunately, "no network would do it, so that was the end of that." 

In 1979, The Days Between received a New York production at the Off-Broadway Neighborhood Playhouse Theatre. It ran three weeks. "It was not very well received, except for the leading female part, which was very well done." At the time of this writing, licensing rights for the play are held by Samuel French, though the play is seldom produced.

While travelling to many of the APT productions of his play, Anderson found that, quite often, the drama did not play well on Saturday nights. He recalled that the same situation occurred with his Broadway productions of Silent Night, Lonely Night and Tea and Sympathy. "Hank Fonda hated Saturday nights" while starring in the former, "as did Deborah Kerr" during the latter. As a result, Anderson began a work

---

28 Anderson, interview.


26 Anderson, interview.
originally entitled *Plays for a Saturday Night* during the APT run of *The Days Between.*" The collection of short plays centering on relationships and sexual situations was later retitled *You Know I Can't Hear You When the Water's Running* and received a successful Broadway staging in 1967. The following year, Anderson was represented again on Broadway with *I Never Sang for My Father,* and in 1971 with *Solitaire/Double Solitaire.* In the 1970's he concentrated on novels, and in 1983 *Free and Clear* was staged in New Haven, Connecticut."

After the productions of *The Days Between,* Robert Anderson continued to serve, at various times, as a Governor and a Trustee of APT. He did not, however, submit any other plays to the organization.

*Summertree* by Ron Cowen

Before its run with the American Playwrights Theatre, *Summertree* by Ron Cowen was staged at the Forum Theatre of Lincoln Center. After a workshop staging at the O'Neill Foundation Conference for Playwrights in Waterford,

---

1 Anderson, interview.

Connecticut in the Summer of 1967, Summertree opened in its New York professional production in March of 1968. The production was directed by David Pressman and starred David Birney and Blythe Danner in the major roles. The drama was the 22 year-old playwright's first full-length work, and gained him election to the New Dramatists Committee, giving him the distinction of being the youngest member in that organization's history."

Summertree was a series of short scenes connected by a central visual element, a large tree. The scenes which are presented reflect various points in the life of a young man, the central character who is shown as three personas in the characters of Soldier, Little Boy, and Young Man, each of which are different versions of himself. The Soldier has been mortally wounded in Viet Nam, and the stream-of-consciousness scenes represent his life flashing before his eyes before he dies. Relationships with his girlfriend, father and mother are enacted. The themes of war, the generation gap, true love, and social and political criticism figure highly."

__________________

"Summertree, program, Lincoln Center, 3 March 1968, APT Collection.

"Ron Cowen, Summertree, "Original Script," ts., APT Collection."
The content was perfect for the turbulent late 1960s: the 1968 Summer of Love was a few months away and _Summertree_ reflected numerous concerns of American youth.

The drama received raves from the New York critics, quite an accomplishment for a 22 year-old's first effort at a full-length play. "Here—at long last—is the authentic voice of youth in the theatre! The find of the season!" wrote Emory Lewis of _Cue Magazine_. Dan Sullivan of _The New York Times_ agreed: "It is good to see an author wearing his heart on his sleeve, daring to weep, not trying to play it cool. . . . _Summertree_ will touch you." In _Newsday_, George Oppenheimer declared that "anyone who mourns the sorry state of our theatre and the deplorable condition of our youth can by heartened by _Summertree_."³⁸

Clive Barnes gushed in the powerful _New York Times_ that the play was "beautiful and sensitive; immeasurably moving." Brooks Atkinson called the drama "a tender, compassionate play." _The Times_ Walter Kerr agreed, calling the playwright and production "enormously promising, beautifully sustained."

---

³⁸ _Summertree_, Handbill and Promotional Flyer for Lincoln Center Production, March 1968, APT Collection.

A few years earlier, Cowen had been a playwriting student of Jerome Lawrence at the University of California, Los Angeles. Lawrence saw *Summertree* in production at Lincoln Center and recommended that the rules be adjusted to allow the submission of the play to the American Playwrights Theatre. Robert Anderson saw the production, and agreed that it should be considered.  

The play was accepted by the Committee and offered to the APT subscribers with a letter from Lawrence urging the acceptance of Cowen's work. He related the New York success of the play, and explained that APT was making an exception to the normal APT procedures in order to make (the) play available across the country first and exclusively to APT subscribers. This (was) in keeping with the earnest desire of the Trustees and Governors to make the organization as flexible as possible so that the American Playwrights Theatre (could) provide the most fresh and vital new works to the nation's theatres.  

By this time, only 25 production acceptances were necessary to activate a play, and a month later subscribers had agreed to just nine stagings. In late May of 1968, subscribers were notified that *Summertree* had received the  

---

37 David H. Ayers, letter to APT Reading Committee, 2 April 1968, APT Collection.  

38 Jerome Lawrence, letter to APT Subscribers, 24 April 1968, APT Collection.
Drama Desk Award for outstanding Off-Broadway achievement, and was being considered for a Pulitzer Prize, the first non-Broadway play to be so considered. Subscribers were also notified that Lincoln Center was extending its production, and that Kirk Douglas had bought the film rights. Random House was soon to release the script in print.* Within a few weeks, 25 theatres agreed to produce the play, and Summertree was activated for APT production by all subscribers.** The only restriction was that theatres within a 100 mile radius of New York City could not stage the work since Lincoln Center was considering a return engagement.***

With the offering of Summertree, the American Playwrights Theatre signalled a change of policy on a number of counts. Primarily, APT accepted a play that had been staged before its APT rights period. It had been staged twice: once at the O'Neill Center and then at Lincoln Center. Secondly, Cowen was a new playwright--a very new playwright. Not a promising young playwright in the sense of Lanford Wilson, David Mamet,

---

* David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 22 May 1968, APT Collection.

** David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 14 June 1968, APT Collection.

*** David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers Within 100 Miles of New York City, 26 June 1968, APT Collection.
or David Rabe, but a brand new playwright. He had never before written a full-length play. Thirdly, the play was not written especially for APT. Cowen had written the play, then found the outlet of the O'Neill Center and Lincoln Center. Then, the outlet of APT found him. Fourth, APT now only required 25 production acceptances to activate a play. In the past, 50 productions were required. 1968 was the first year of this policy which had already allowed Ivory Tower to be licensed.

With Summertree, the American Playwright Theatre changed drastically. The organization was founded with the intention of "furthering the quality of our national drama" by premiering new works by major established American dramatists on the stages of the country's non-commercial theatres through a minimum of 50 productions in an attempt to decentralize the American theatre. With Summertree, APT offered an unknown writer's first attempt at playwriting which had already received a critically and commercially successful New York production, and could be activated with half as many production agreements. With the justification of flexibility due to subscribers' demands for new plays by young writers, the founders of APT were able to alter the rules as necessary to keep the organization alive. The fact that the author of
Summertree was also a prize pupil of one of APT's founders could be interpreted as nepotism. Subscribers could not be blamed for not being sure just what APT was trying to accomplish.

Another point regarding acceptance needs to be examined. The qualifying amount of production acceptances came after the announcement of Summertree's reviews, awards, Lincoln Center extension, and Kirk Douglas film sale. Without declaring it a case of post hoc ergo prompter hoc, the possibility certainly exists that many of the subscribers were hesitant to accept the play without the New York stamp of approval. This approval is the exact criterion of success to which APT, in theory, was opposed. Yet, by using those accolades, APT furthered the notion of the necessity of that criterion. If those accolades triggered the rapid acceptances, the participating theatres were guilty of using double standards: they wanted an organization that would offer them an untried play, but would only accept a play after approval by reputable critics.

These questions did not escape the attention of APT's founding fathers. In a letter to Lawrence, Ayers expressed concern over the process of acceptance. He wrote "(I) wish
we knew how many of the subscribers took Summertree on the basis of the critical reaction from NYC.""

Ayers was aware of the possible image problems for APT and tried to correct them in an interview/article in the Summer 1968 Dramatists Guild Quarterly. Ayers was quoted as saying that the acceptance of Summertree was "an indication of healthy flexibility, rather than an abandonment of original intentions and goals." Ayers described the hesitancy of major dramatists to offer scripts, and stated that "a good script by a relatively unknown author (was) preferred over a not-so-good script by a well-known playwright." The author of the article, R.J. Schroeder, followed Ayers' comments with a description of the APT selection and production process, describing the "unexcelled lab conditions at minimal expense" which could be used "prior to offering a play to Broadway." The article urged established writers to get their work to APT immediately. The advice to new writers who wanted their work to be "next season's successor to Summertree" was to "get good New York press notices.""

---

42 David H. Ayers, letter to Jerome Lawrence, 2 August 1968, APT Collection.

The article, an effort by Ayers to clarify APT's position, may have served to blur it even more. APT was shown, again, as a proving ground for Broadway. The organization was also portrayed as seeking plays by new writers which had received New York success. The article's author's comments immediately following Ayers' statements made those comments appear to be official APT policy, especially the suggestion to get good New York reviews.

Whatever the reason, Summertree was accepted at a fast rate. Between September 1968 and July 1969, the play was staged at 55 theatres around the United States. The local reviewers' reactions were mixed. Often, if the performances were judged as weak, the script was faulted. The opposite also held true. When the performances were judged as strong, the drama received raves. Most of the reviews failed to mention APT's affiliation.

Of those 55 producing APT theatres, 4 were regional theatres, 10 were community theatres, and 41 were university/college theatres. The huge majority of the latter


"Summertree Records."
may be attributed to two factors. First of all, there were simply more university/college theatres than regional or community theatres. More importantly, however, was that Summertree's content and form was especially suited to campuses of the late 1960s. It was definitely a play in the right place at the right time. Like The Days Between, Summertree was seen coast to coast before the end of its tenure with APT.

Could Summertree have been so widely produced without APT? Quite possibly, since the subscribing theatres certainly had access to Dramatists Play Service and Samuel French. The play’s New York success was common knowledge. If the theatres had not obtained the rights through APT, they could have gone through the services. APT, however, was certainly much more directly connected to the university community than either of the play services. Widespread production probably occurred more quickly because of APT.

After its production rights period with APT, for which Cowen earned $12,130, "Summertree continued to be produced throughout the country, though not at nearly the same rate. In 1969 the film version starring Kirk Douglas and Martin

Sheen was released to tepid acceptance. Cowen's original screenplay was rejected, and was later rewritten by Rod McKuen, and, eventually by Hollywood professionals, Edward Hume and Stephen Yafa, who received screen credit.  

Cowen continued to write for the theatre throughout the rest of the 1960s and into the 1970s. Those works, however, were not judged to live up to the promise of Summertree. In the 1980s and, currently, in the 1990s, Cowen writes and produces for television. In 1985, he and his partner Daniel Lipman received an Emmy Award for their teleplay of the movie An Early Frost.

The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail

by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee

With Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee's The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, the American Playwrights Theatre realized its potential and accomplished its original goal of premiering a new work by major established dramatists on the

---
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stages of non-commercial theatres across the United States. The widespread production of the work marked an achievement which was unprecedented and which remains unmatched in American theatre history.

Based upon the life of Henry David Thoreau, the play was begun years earlier and was originally entitled *A Different Drummer: The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*. Although the title page credits both authors, the initial research was done by Jerome Lawrence who also wrote the first draft. Lee eventually collaborated on the project. The final product was *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* which was submitted to the APT Board at the end of 1969, but only after Robert E. Lee "resigned his place on the Board of Governors specifically to make the submission of this play a less 'self-serving' gesture."

The response from the Reading Committee was unanimously favorable and the play was named as the APT offering for the

---


1970-1971 season. Within 90 days, David Ayers notified APT subscribers that The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail was authorized for production and scheduled at almost 40 theatres. The Ohio State University pilot production would be done in honor of the University's Centennial.

The same information was included in a news release the following day which also contained quotes by people who had read the script. George Oppenheimer, President of the New York Drama Critics Circle called the play "intellectually and theatrically exciting" containing "grace, compassion and style . . . largely obsolete in today's theatre." He declared that the play held both "an earthy humor and wisdom" as well as "tremendous relevance." George C. White, President of the Eugene O'Neill Memorial Theatre Center found the play "marvelous and timely . . . an extraordinary piece of theatre." Richard Coe, drama critic at The Washington Post called the script "absolutely fascinating" and "imaginatively commanding." Representatives of member theatres called The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail "one of the happiest and most

---

1 David Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 26 November 1969, APT Collection.
2 David Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 23 February 1970, APT Collection.
exciting things to happen in the American theatre for a very long time" and "moving, beautifully written, warm and human." Lawrence and Lee described their drama as "a trip: a journey into the soul and mind of a great and influential American, a true modern, a man of now and of tomorrow."  

The drama, set on the factual night on which Thoreau was jailed for refusal to pay taxes, reflected contemporary playwriting forms. The play, like Summertree, is a series of short scenes, most of which are flashbacks that relate a number of events in the life of Thoreau. It is a very free-form play which reflects the 1960s movement away from traditional well-made play dramatic structure. Its protagonist, Thoreau, was a revolutionary of his day, speaking out against an unpopular president and an even more unpopular war, urging a retreat to nature and peaceful demonstration as means to reform a corrupt society.

The parallels with the contemporary social upheaval of the late 1960s, an unpopular President Nixon, and the Viet Nam conflict made the script quite appealing to university communities. Most of the characters could be played by college age actors. The set called for skeletal suggestive

scenery which could easily represent various locations, much of which could be done with lights and sounds. The subject matter, the form, the production requirements, and the audience of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail made it the perfect product for the American Playwrights Theatre to offer to its members.

The pilot production opened on April 21, 1970 on the campus of The Ohio State University. APT Trustee and OSU Associate Professor of Theatre Roy H. Bowen directed, and APT Executive Director and OSU Assistant Professor of Theatre David Ayers played Henry David Thoreau.

The production drew the attention of local as well as national press. "How very wonderful it is to welcome literacy back to the theatre," wrote Columbus Citizen-Journal reviewer Gene Gerrard. "This intellectually satisfying new play ... has a richness of imagination and perception hard to come by in our time. ... Here is a stimulating play with style, civilized wit, humanity, and passion." Donald Houck of The

---


Columbus Dispatch praised the play and the production as "witty, with stellar performances."

George Oppenheimer of Newsday attended the opening performance and reacted with the following:

Scene after scene in this superior play, a literary work as well as a theatrical experience, move you to laughter or close to tears. The language is often that of Thoreau and Emerson, but it is beautifully matched by the dialogue of Lawrence and Lee. They possess an aptitude for graceful yet powerful speeches and a passionate belief in the goodness and rightness of Thoreau's stand against war and against the abrogation of civil rights."

Unfortunately, the pilot production of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail at The Ohio State University found itself in the middle of campus riots which had grown out of peaceful anti-war demonstrations. The second week of production was cancelled because the center of the rioting was in the same area of campus as the theatre. The play was revived ten weeks later to comparable success."

In the months to follow, Lawrence and Lee's drama was staged coast to coast, and in Alaska and Hawaii. Reviews for

---
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these productions of were almost always positive. Even when the performances were criticized, the play itself was highly complimented. Lawand Lee agreed to an eighteen month contract period with APT. By the time that period was over, 141 theatres had agreed to stage the play, with 135 actually doing so. Of those 135 productions, 7 were done by regional theatres, 26 by community theatres, and 102 by college/university theatres. The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail was staged in 36 states; Washington, D.C.; Sidney, Australia; and Ontario, Canada. These numerous stagings made the work the most produced script in APT history. Royalties for Lawrence and Lee amounted to $49,870.

A huge amount of publicity was generated for the American Playwrights Theatre as well as for The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail. According to David Ayers, who played Thoreau in the pilot production at OSU, the production of the play "was the zenith" of APT.

---

9 APT, Thoreau Production Records.
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The history books agree with Ayers' statement. Glenn Loney's *Twentieth Century Theatre* contains the following entry:

1972: January 1: The American Playwrights Theatre circuit's option on Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee's *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* expires. The authors are not distressed. The play has received 141 separate productions across the nation, many in college communities."

Gerald Berkowitz reported that "the authors happily noted that more people saw that play in one season than had seen their biggest Broadway hits, *Inherit the Wind* and *Mame* in their total combined runs." According to Samuel L. Leiter, these figures proved that it was now "possible for an American play to be successful without ever even having a major New York production.""

Lawrence and Lee often travelled the country viewing productions of *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*. They each also directed various productions, or were in residence for

"Glenn Loney, *Twentieth Century Theatre*, 2 vols. (New York: Facts on File Productions, 1983) 2: 405. (Note: Loney's statement is based on the number of production agreements, not the amount of actual productions.)


part of the rehearsal period. After viewing many of the productions, Lawrence and Lee quite often noted changes or revisions to be made in the script. "They were always revising," according to David Ayers. "They'd send me the latest revisions and we'd send them on to producing organizations." The acting edition of the play contains several notes of production suggestions from the playwrights based on their experience with the APT stagings.

Otis L. Guernsey, Jr., editor of The Best Plays series, included the drama in his 1970-1971 volume, noting the widespread production without a previous New York production. Guernsey observed that the play "exemplif[ed] the growing importance and even influence of the coast-to-coast theatre." Reflecting the growth of theatre outside of New York, the volume marked an expansion for the series. For the first time, a "complete directory of programs presented in the more than 50 professional regional theatre in the United States and Canada" was included, as well as a listing of all "world or American premiere productions of a new script on the coast-


to-coast circuit." For added insight, Guernsey asked Lawrence and Lee to introduce the section on "The Theatre Around the United States."

In that article, the dramatists called the APT productions of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail "the most stimulating and exciting experience of (their) playwriting lives... yet it had not come close to those parochial few blocks of real estate known as Broadway." Lawrence and Lee related numerous experiences from various productions, during which they "made discoveries as playwrights—valuable nuances, subtleties in character relationships, staging devices—which were passed on to the next production." The developments "did not take place under the pressure of a half-million-dollar investment (or) under the threat of a possible out-of-town closing." The authors called APT "the new Broadway," with producers and an audience that was eager to work on new plays, and whose reactions were "like beautiful thunder."**

---


Both playwrights credit APT with the success of the play. "APT was a miracle for that play," exclaimed Lawrence, "because it proved that a play could become one of the most widely produced plays of our time without a Broadway Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval." Lee agreed. "It is interesting to note," he stated, "that there has not been a major first-class production of Thoreau on Broadway, yet it is one of the most produced plays of our time."

Copies in print of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail have passed the 500,000 mark. That amount matches that of another work by Lawrence and Lee, Inherit the Wind. The latter play, however, had been produced on Broadway. The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail received its premiere through APT.

There had been, however, negotiations in 1971 for a Broadway production to be backed by Cheryl Crawford and Hal Wallis. Lawrence and Lee sold the film rights to Wallis which included financing a Broadway production. Scheduling difficulties and an actors' strike prevented the New York

---

" Jerome Lawrence, personal interview, 5 May 1988.

production from being realized. Lawrence and Lee completed the screenplay in 1972 which also has yet to be realized.

Lawrence discussed the possibility of the New York production as well as a movie version in an interview in the Los Angeles Times. Lawrence expressed his pleasure at either prospect, but reiterated his commitment to APT in saying "the idea is still to do plays elsewhere instead of Broadway."

The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail proved that the goals behind the founding of the American Playwrights Theatre were actually attainable. The play's offering signalled no major change of policy for APT since the play enabled the organization to function exactly as designed. The social, political and academic climate was right for the content of the drama. Lawrence and Lee's play achieved nationwide, wide-scale acceptance, production and approval without prior New York success. The drama was offered to APT before being offered to any other organization, received numerous APT productions, and later went on to numerous other productions.

---


It has been translated into Dutch, Mandarin, Russian and Portuguese. The play has surpassed 500,000 copies in print in the Bantam Books edition and continues to be produced today. Lawrence and Lee consider The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail "far and away the best of all the 39 plays (they've) written."

After the production of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, Lawrence and Lee continued to guide APT. In 1971, their The Incomparable Max received Broadway production. In 1972, they submitted Jabberwock to APT. That same year, First Monday in October premiered at the Cleveland Play House. The drama reached Broadway in 1978. In addition to professional pursuits, both men remain active in educational theatre, often as visiting professors.

---
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THE LAST MEETING OF THE KNIGHTS OF THE WHITE MAGNOLIA

by Preston Jones

Throughout much of the 1960s and into the early 1970s Preston Jones served a theatrical apprenticeship at the Dallas Theatre Center under Artistic Director Paul Baker. Jones began the relationship as a supplement to his graduate studies, and then continued as a jack-of-all-trades theatre practitioner in various jobs, including actor, director, set builder, box office clerk, and truck driver. He was also assistant director to Baker on the APT pilot of The Days Between, and was in residence for production of other APT plays. In 1972, Jones became the managing director of Down Center Stage, the Dallas Theatre Center's workshop theatre, where he hoped to premiere new plays by local playwrights. Dismayed by the lack of quality scripts, Jones decided to try his hand at playwriting. In 1966, he had written a script for his master's thesis from Trinity University. Wanting to write again, he set the action for a trilogy of plays in a fictitious west Texas town called Bradleyville. He wrote Lu Ann Hampton Laverty Oberlander in the Spring of 1973, and wrote The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia a few months later. Within the following year, The Oldest
Living Graduate rounded out the three works which eventually became known as The Bradleyville Trilogy and, later, The Texas Trilogy.  

As described in the previous chapter, The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia was about a men's club in small-town Texas. Its white, racist members, who are mostly age thirty and over, are trying to preserve the organization which serves no particular purpose other than providing an excuse to drink beer, play dominoes, and discuss gossip and the wonders of Texas. The club's custodian, a "Negro," has the final word, exposing the folly and uselessness of such groups.

Jones' play premiered at the Down Center Stage on December 4, 1973, and ran for 13 performances. Local reception was positive. One reviewer called the play "a most effective piece of satire, laced with some top-flight dialogue

---


77 Preston Jones, The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia, 1973, ts., APT Collection.

80 The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia, program, Down Center Stage at The Dallas Theatre Center, 4 December, 1973, APT Collection.
and a solid feel for characterization." Another reviewer found it a "very funny, very perceptive play."

Staged as part of The Dallas Playmarket '74, Jones' play returned later that season. The Festival featured eight full-length plays by Dallas Theatre Center professional playwrights. Local and national reviewers attended the event and found Jones' play to be the hit of the Playmarket. It was named "a new masterpiece (and) simply the best comedy set in Texas." In The London Times, Irving Wardle stated that the action of the play was "a god-given situation and Jones exploit(ed) it marvelously." Bruce Cook, of The National Observer declared that the "first-rate, truly exciting" play

---

"1 Mike Alexander, "'Knights' Comedy Also Bitter-sweet," The Dallas Times-Herald, 5 December 1973, 8.


"3 The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia, program, Dallas Playmarket '74, The Dallas Theatre Center, 16-24 May 1974, APT Collection.

"4 Tom Nickell, "Playmarket Unveils Brilliant Comedies," San Antonio News, 22 May 1974, 29

"could establish Preston Jones as the most important American playwright to come along in years."

In attendance at the Playmarket were super agent Audrey Wood, who had "discovered" Tennesse Williams and William Inge; and director Alan Schneider. Both were impressed with the play. Wood immediately arranged to become Jones' literary agent, and Schneider arranged to direct the play at Washington, D.C.'s Arena Stage.

Also present was APT's David Ayers who was also taken with the work. He arranged to circulate it to the Reading Committee as a possible APT offering. The play was about to have quite a future. A few weeks later, Paul Baker wrote to Ayers with the following information:

Zelda Fichandler (of Washington, D.C.'s Arena Stage) wants to do the Trilogy; Joe Papp wants to go further with Preston's plays; Mark Taper Theatre wants to do Magnolia; and Preston is very thrilled that you are going to circulate the play.

The reactions from the Reading Committee were all very positive and the play was offered to APT subscribers for a 20

" Bruce Cook, "Dallas Grows Its Own Playwrights," The National Observer, 8 June 1974, 22.

* " Busby, Preston Jones, 13.

month rights period beginning January 1, 1975 and running until September 1, 1976."

Shortly after the play was offered to APT Subscribers, the Dallas Theatre Center revived the play yet again, this time staging the entire trilogy of Jones' work." The restaging caused another wave of publicity for the play and for Jones. Once again, reviews were extremely positive, complimenting Jones' ear for dialogue and ability to create regional color. Bruce Cook went so far as to declare that "regional theatre has now brought forth its first major playwright in Preston Jones." The national recognition, combined with Audrey Wood's prompting, encouraged Broadway producer Robert Whitehead to become interested in Jones' Trilogy. Arrangements were begun to present the three plays at Washington, D.C.'s Kennedy Center, and then to move the production to Broadway."

---

"  David H. Ayers, letter to APT Subscribers, 7 October 1974, APT Collection.


While preparations for the professional New York production were underway, APT theatres accepted Jones' work for their own stages, though not in great numbers. The play was activated with fewer than the requisite twenty-five productions with APT leaders confident in its future."

Eventually, The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia was staged by 29 APT theatres. Of those productions, nine were at college/university theatres, eleven were at community theatres, and nine others were at regional theatres."

Most of these productions were received quite well. The play was judged to be very realistic in its depiction of Texas regional flavor, and Jones' ability to capture poignancy as well as humor was complimented. Many reviews mentioned audiences reacting with laughter as well as with tears."

Jones' contract did not preclude Broadway production during the APT rights period, and in the spring of 1976

---


34 American Playwrights Theatre, "Last Meeting Productions," APT Collection.

35 American Playwrights Theatre, "APT Production Records: The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia," APT Collection.
Whitehead's pre-Broadway production of *The Texas Trilogy* opened at the Kennedy Center under Alan Schneider's direction. "The Washington critics raved. "At last—a new and original American play. . . . funny, true, and touching," wrote Richard Coe in *The Washington Post.*" David Richards of *The Washington Star* named "Preston Jones as a major new talent to be watched closely." "The Washington Post continued to champion Jones during the next few months, focusing three feature stories on him and his works."

In May of 1976, Jones again received national attention, this time from *Newsweek*'s Jack Kroll who discussed the American regional theatre movement. The only thing that the movement had not provided the country, according to Kroll, was a regional playwright. "Now, that omission has been corrected with the emergence of Preston Jones," Kroll declared, calling

**"The Texas Trilogy," program, The Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 27 March 1976, APT Collection.**

**Richard Coe, "Lasting 'Last Meeting'," *The Washington Post*, 27 March 1976, C1-C2.**


the dramatist a "rare thing, a truly popular playwright who communicates directly and clearly with his audience." 100 Attention continued to be paid to Jones with a story in The Saturday Review which featured his photograph and the headline "Preston Jones: Has Texas Spawned a New O'Neill?" on the cover of the magazine. The feature named Jones "the most promising American playwright to come along in two or three decades." It continued by saying that "though he has yet to receive a notice from a New York critic, Jones is already a writer of some standing, owing to productions under the auspices of The American Playwrights Theatre." 101 With this article, Jones had now been compared to Tennessee Williams, William Inge, and Eugene O'Neill.

His agent Audrey Wood recalled, "When I saw that, I was terrified." Jones was now coming into a New York Broadway production with huge advance publicity, and critical acclaim from around the country. Wood stated that "New Yorkers do not like to be told by out-of-town critics how good something


Roy H. Bowen, APT Secretary-Treasurer had a similar reaction. "I shuddered when I read that," he remembered. "That was an incredible amount of publicity to live up to for a new playwright." 

Wood was right about the New York critics. The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia, the second installment of A Texas Trilogy, opened at the Broadhurst Theatre on September 22, 1976. The plays were to be done in repertory on alternating nights. Lu Ann Hampton Laverty Oberlander opened the previous night and The Oldest Living Graduate premiered the following evening. "Never in Broadway history had three plays opened on the wave of such critical enthusiasm elsewhere." Some reviews were favorable, some were polite, some were mixed, but Clive Barnes's piece in The New York Times sealed the fate of the undertaking. Calling The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia, "all texture and little substance," he said

---

102 Wood, 250-251.

103 Bowen, interview.

104 A Texas Trilogy, program, Broadhurst Theatre, 21 September 1976, APT Collection.

"one can hardly wade through the atmosphere to get to the play." Barnes accused Jones of trying "to take the genre of the soap opera and raise it to fine art." He said the play was "not all that bad, but also not all that interesting." 106 The review hurt box office business a great deal. "The Texas Trilogy had a respectable Broadway run, but when it closed it was far from a commercial success." 107 The three plays received a total combined run of 63 performances. 108 The Texas Trilogy's closing "marked the Broadway failure of three dramas that had touched audiences wherever they had been performed," wrote The National Observer's Clifford Ridley in response to Barnes' fate-sealing review. 109 Those audiences were the viewers of APT productions.

Those productions proved quite helpful to Jones. After the Kennedy Center opening he wrote to Ayers: "the thing that gave me the greatest amount of poise throughout it all, was that I'd seen enough productions to have an idea what would

107 Wood, 252.
109 Ridley, 42.
Jones was grateful to APT for all the productions and for all the media coverage, although he was aware that riding the wave of publicity into New York might be a handicap. He soon learned that it was. After the Broadway closing he took solace in knowing that, "because of the APT productions, theatre is alive and well--somewhere out here in this big country."^11^1

As mentioned in the previous chapter, producer Whitehead did not want to the APT productions to jeopardize the New York staging in any way. Whitehead and Wood did not want the regional productions to steal the thunder of the East Coast premiere and urged APT to limit APT productions and press releases. Wanting to serve the best interests of the playwright, APT agreed to the limitations. The organization was credited in the program, but few reviews or articles mention APT. In its effort to survive, APT compromised on its original requirement for producing theatres to publicize APT.

The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia marks the last major undertaking of the American Playwrights

^10^ Preston Jones, letter to David Ayers, 31 May 1976, APT Collection.

Theatre. Unable to capitalize on the play's offering, APT served as little more than a booking agent or rights handler. And, once again, a play was offered that was written by an unknown playwright, marking another reversal in policy. Jones' work, however, received the most literary attention of all the APT works presented. The work was reviewed and promoted with critical acceptance far greater than any other APT work.

The solid establishment of the regional theatre movement was clearly illustrated in the events surrounding the productions of the play. Articles written about Jones' work refer to the movement as a given presence in American theatre. The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia was able to be staged at a number of regional theatres before its Broadway debut. Although Jones' producer might not have agreed to the value of those productions, Jones acknowledged otherwise.

By 1976, it was possible for a play to receive professional production at regional theatres prior to a New York premiere. For this particular play, APT served as a connection between script and theatre. If APT had not been in existence, however, the connection still could have been made. If anything, the events surrounding the American
Playwrights Theatre production of *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia*, proved that APT was near the end of its existence. It was simply providing a script service to regional theatres which could have been provided by other services if APT had not done so. At this time, Samuel French, Dramatists Play Service, and the Theatre Communications Group New Play Service were in existence.

Neither of the works that deal with the history of the production of *The Texas Trilogy* credits the American Playwrights Theatre as making much of a contribution. Wood's work does not discuss APT at all, and Busby's *Preston Jones* briefly mentions the organization as assuring "production by repertory and college theatres around the country."  

APT production royalties amounted to $52,352. Those figures do not include income from the Whitehead Kennedy Center/Broadway production." During the next two years, Jones wrote two more plays, *Santa Fe Sunshine* and *A Place on the Magdalena Flats*. Both were staged at the Dallas Theatre Center. Neither reached Broadway."  

---

112 Busby, 14.


114 Wood, 253.
Jones died in 1979 of bleeding ulcers. Agent Audrey Vood and Jones Scholar Bette Sewell each relate stories that friends claim that it was not the ulcers that killed him: that it was the New York critics." Roy Bowen offered another cause. "The recognition APT gave Jones caused his death," he recalled. "He had always been a poor, struggling actor. And, suddenly, he had money. All this money. And he drank and he drank and he drank. I think a big factor in his death was all the money he made. It was pitiful. APT killed him." The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia continued to be produced after its tenure with APT, although its popularity (and novelty) decreased shortly afterwards. An unproduced film script exists.

Summary

The four plays discussed in this chapter mark major events in the history of the American Playwrights Theatre. Robert Anderson's The Days Between (1965) solidly established the organization by realizing coast to coast production on

---


Bowen, interview.

Wood, 254.
America's non-commercial stages of a previously unproduced script. Ron Cowen's *Summertree* (1968) signalled a change in policy, being a previously staged work by an unknown playwright. APT provided a network for rapid dissemination of the script, illustrating that flexibility was the key to the organization's survival. *Summertree* also proved that theatres wanted plays on contemporary subjects, regardless of the author. Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee's *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* (1970) allowed APT to function as designed. The drama, a new script by established authors had not been previously submitted to any other venue. Focusing on both an historical character and contemporary issues, the play found the widest acceptance of any APT play. Its numerous staging and huge audience proved that a play could be seen and accepted on a large scale without a previous Broadway run. Preston Jones' *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia* (1974) was APT's last major undertaking. Produced in as many regional theatres as college/university theatres, the play's complex production history illustrates the growing influence of the "tributary theatre" in the United States. With this production, APT served as little more than a play service or a booking agent between script and theatre. By this time, the American Playwrights Theatre had run its
course. The rise of the regional theatre, the lack of suitable scripts, and the decrease of enthusiasm on the part of its founders contributed to the decision to suspend operations.¹⁶ Within a few years, APT was dissolved. The following chapter places APT in historical context and in its place in American theatre history.

¹⁶ Ayers, interview, 1993.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

Introduction

The American Playwrights Theatre, which operated from 1963 until 1980, occupies a unique position in American theatre history. Founded by representatives of commercial, non-commercial, and university/college theatres, APT created a partnership among these worlds. This union centered on one goal: to premiere new plays on the stages of America's non-commercial theatres. APT's original plan focused on works by established American dramatists. In time, younger playwrights also participated. Beyond actual production of the new works, the ultimate goal of APT, according to its By-Laws, was "to enhance the quality of our national drama."

When examining the history of The American Playwrights Theatre and attempting to place it in historical context, two areas require investigation: the external situation and the internal situation. The external situation refers to the theatre world outside of APT: the events in the New York
theatre, the development of the regional theatre, and the situation in the university/college theatre. The internal situation refers to the operations of APT: the lack of suitable plays, the constant changes in direction and policy, and the seeming conflicts of interests. While both the internal and external situation reflects and affects the other, the areas are divided for purposes of examination.

The External Situation

New York

As discussed in Chapter I, when APT was founded in the early 1960s, economics oppressively hovered over the New York theatre. For the remainder of the decade and throughout the one that followed, production costs for Broadway continued to climb. Off-Broadway, which had been formed in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a revolt to Broadway's escalating financial pressures, was, by the 1970s, as commercially oriented and economically restrictive as Broadway. Off-off Broadway originated, much like its predecessor, as an alternative to the financial problems and pressures of the commercial theatre. By the early 1970s, Off-off Broadway fostered productions of many new plays and the development of new playwrights. Occasionally, some of the work made the jump to
the commercial venue. Similar transitions, which will be discussed shortly, were made by plays that originated in the regional theatres.

By the mid-seventies it was clear that the New York commercial theatre, meaning primarily Broadway, had become not so much an arena for premieres as a showroom for the best work created elsewhere. The economics of the commercial theatre had simply made it impossible or extremely difficult for a major show to begin from scratch (on Broadway.)

The Regional Theatre

During the period of existence of APT, the regional theatre grew in size in the number of producing organizations and grew in power in its ability to produce new plays, some of which moved into the commercial venue. As previously discussed, only a handful of regional theatres existed when APT was founded in 1963, and those theatres rarely staged new works. By 1980, the situation was much different. Theatre Profiles 4: A Resource Book of Nonprofit Professional Theatres in the United States published by the Theatre Communications Group listed 164 non-commercial theatre

---

producing organizations.² "The sixty-two largest regional theatres alone accounted for 614 productions of 450 different plays, with an average of one world premiere per theatre."³

The impact of the regional contributions to commercial theatre was measured in 1980.

Of the thirty-three shows playing on Broadway in the first week of January, only seven had begun life there. Four were imports from London, . . . two were transfers from Off-Broadway, . . . eight (were) from Off-Off Broadway and institutional theatres in New York City, . . . and ten were first produced elsewhere in the country, in theatres ranging from the Arena . . . and the Guthrie . . . to the Kingston Mines Theatre in Chicago . . . and the George Street Playhouse in New Brunswick, N.J.⁴

Another measurement focused on prize-winning plays.

"Between 1970 and 1980 only one of the Tony Award-winning plays, five of the Tony musicals and one of the Pulitzer Prize plays were original Broadway productions."⁵ The regional theatres were responsible for the original staging of many of the productions.


⁴ Berkowitz, 177.

⁵ Berkowitz, 177.
In addition to the regional theatre's connection with the commercial New York theatre, the regionals also supplied numerous cities throughout the country with professional theatre, something previously done mainly by touring companies of New York successes. Regardless of whether or not the regionals' productions of new plays moved elsewhere, the theatres still provided a level of professionalism that was not available when APT was founded. The practice of foundation support, most notably from the Ford Foundation, enabled the regionals to concentrate on quality and on types of plays outside of the reach of the commercial theatre. It is hardly surprising that there was more Shakespeare in the regional theatre than on Broadway between 1960 and 1980; . . . particularly heartening is that there were more new American plays as well."*

The University/College Theatre

While the number of productions of new American plays rose in the regional theatres during the 1960s and 1970s, the production of standard plays and recent commercial hits continued to be the trend in university/college theatres. As

* Berkowitz, 93.
previously mentioned, the most popular playwrights among university producers at the time of APT's founding were Shakespeare, Williams, Shaw, Wilder, Anouilh, and Moliere. In 1970, the list of authors who were produced the previous season varied slightly. Shakespeare, again followed by Williams, still headed the list. Albee, Ionesco, Shaw and Neil Simon completed it. Ten different plays by Albee were produced, and Simon's The Odd Couple had been released for university production, explaining the dramatists' inclusion in the list.  

The 1971-1972 list once again included Shakespeare as the most produced playwright. He was distantly followed by Moliere, Charles Schulz, Williams, and Simon. Schulz's You're a Good Man, Charlie Brown proved very popular, and Simon had eight different plays available.  

In 1973-1974, which was the last year such information was available, Shakespeare again led the list. Following him were Paul Zindel, Moliere, Williams, Pinter, and Shaw. Zindel's inclusion was explained

---


by his five plays that were "for and about and with women." The survey reported no new trends, and "simply confirms the conservative pattern that characterizes the past decade of play production in American educational theatre." (It is safe to assume that the trend continued through the end of the decade.)

In 1980, the commercial New York theatre, the regional theatre, and the university/college theatre each reflected distinct trends. The commercial theatre, producing plays under great financial pressure, often looked to other venues for new works that had proven successful elsewhere. The regional theatre, firmly situated in many major American cities, produced high-quality stagings, many of which were new plays. The university/college theatre continued its trend of producing standards, either classic (Shakespeare) or contemporary (Williams.) It also produced recent commercial successes (Simon and Schulz.) These trends each had ramifications for The American Playwrights Theatre, a situation which is discussed shortly.

The Internal Situation

The Lack of Suitable Plays

The inability to locate plays deemed suitable for production was a major problem for APT throughout its entire existence. This extended from three sources: playwrights' hesitancy to submit plays, APT's process of screening and accepting scripts, and producing theatres' hesitancy to accept plays.

The playwrights' hesitancy to submit plays grew out of an uncertainty of the quality of the productions, a lack of financial reward, and a fear of rejection. Not much incentive existed for the playwright to offer scripts. When soliciting work, APT often promoted the unique experience of the playwright seeing a work in numerous stagings, learning from those stagings, and incorporating any script changes necessary. But not many playwrights wanted to see their work in numerous productions, especially those over which the playwrights had no control.

The playwrights were rightly reluctant to give their new plays to theatres where they could not be sure of the quality of production. . . . The Dramatists Guild contract gives the playwright complete control (over) casting, director, set designer, and we (the playwrights) guard these controls as essential to seeing the proper realization of our plays. In effect, we had to
reliquish all these controls when a play was done in APT."10

"We asked a lot (of the playwright)," recalled David Ayers. "There was a lack of support. They were naturally skeptical and wary that their play would be damaged. And sometimes it was."11

Such an event occurred when Anderson viewed his The Days Between in the Wheaton College production in Norton, Massachusetts. His immediate response was recorded in a letter to Ayers.

This is the first time I really feel the sting of having my play appraised in such a terrible production. I know that it is inevitable and it's all part of the game and the cause. But Tom Prideaux (of Life Magazine) was shocked, too, at the Wheaton production.12

An insulting parody of the play at the evening's cast party completed Anderson's dissatisfaction with the experience.13

A few days later, Anderson reported his viewing of the Pennsylvania State University's production:

I must say my courage is waning. After Wheaton the week before. It is one thing to be understanding

11 Ayers, personal interview, 1993.
13 Ayers, interview, 1993.
about bad acting or production, but another to wake up the next morning and see the critics praise the acting and the production, call them all valiant in their struggle with a not-so-good play. . . . At both Wheaton and Penn the leading ladies drove me up the wall. They became hysterical on stage, as actresses, not as the character. . . . (In each instance, their directors thought them excellent. . . . Also, their theatre is something like a Gothic Mosque, seating untold thousands potentially, with a 20 foot orchestra pit between the stage and the first row of people. . . . and a very empty auditorium."

A few months later, Ayers reported another production to Anderson. The news was not any better:

I have been putting off writing you because I hate depressing you with news of the Weatherwane (Community Playhouse in Akron, Ohio) production. It was terrible! Barbara was about 5'4" and maybe 160 lbs. You can imagine how grotesque were the love scenes. . . . The stage was a cluttered mess on an 18 x 18 stage."

Lillian Hellman must have undergone similar experiences when viewing her plays. In the early 1960s, Robert Anderson often promoted the American Playwrights Theatre at meetings of the Dramatists Guild. "'Bob,' Lillian Hellman and others would say, 'Have you ever seen your plays done in a university

---


Fear of experiences like those described above, which resulted in part from the dramatists' relinquishing of production rights, prevented playwrights from submitting work to APT.

Another factor preventing the submission of scripts was the lack of any sizable financial return. Some of the 1964 publicity information for APT describes the possibility of playwrights earning $50,000 from 50 productions of a script. This amount was often quoted in letters by APT's founders. The determination of this amount remains a mystery. APT guaranteed $200 per production to the playwright, after a 5% deduction for APT's operating expenses. Anything approaching an extended run was subject to additional royalties. Even if 50 theatres produced a script, the royalty paid to the playwright would amount to approximately $10,000.

"I made about $10,000 (from the APT productions of The Days Between,) stated Anderson. "That does not make it an alternate to Broadway." Ron Cowen earned slightly more than that amount from the APT productions of Summertree, and that followed a successful New York run and a movie sale. APT earnings were not the sole source of income for the play.

---

Lawrence and Lee's *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail* earned almost five times the amount of Anderson's total, but it received almost three times as many productions. A number of those were in regional theatres whose numbers had increased. These productions usually earned a higher income at the box office, making the playwrights' income rise. Lawrence and Lee also had the potential of the earnings of a Broadway production as a result of its numerous APT stagings. Their earnings rose greatly through the film sale of the script. Preston Jones' *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia* proved to post the highest earnings of all of the APT plays, even though it was produced at fewer theatres than *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*. Many regional theatres produced the work in extended runs, earning Jones increased royalties.

These plays, the most successful of APT's offerings, still did not earn as much as a successful Broadway staging. However, APT did provide a route of production for the works. In the cases of Cowen's and Jones' works, APT supplied a route of script dissemination after successful premieres. In the cases of Anderson and Lawrence and Lee, APT gave the plays staging they might not have received otherwise.

Fear of rejection also contributed to the playwrights' reluctance to submit scripts. Many writers responded
positively to the idea of APT. A number of them actually submitted work. APT refused just about everything.

Many of the works justified the refusal. "Some producers felt that they were getting plays that couldn't be done anywhere else. And to some extent they were right." 17

A number of the works offered to APT, and some offered to the subscribers, were works that were unable to find production elsewhere. Many of them did not find production with APT either.

Unfortunately, one the offerings of the organization's first year of operation was a script which many producers had seen previously and refused. When it was refused again, this time by APT members, the refusal was announced in The New York Times. This kind of publicity was hardly the kind desired by a playwright. The announcement caused irreparable damage to APT, not to mention the playwrights' reputations. Not many playwrights were willing to see their plays announced as failing to find production with amateur theatre groups.

In seeming direct contrast, however, a lack of submitted scripts was not one of APT's problems. Numerous scripts came to APT yearly, most of which were refused. APT was probably

17 Anderson, interview.
seen by many writers as just another option. If submission resulted in production, so much the better. If not, there was nothing lost. These scripts, however, were not the best efforts of the dramatists. If the works were top quality, why would a writer send it to APT instead of trying for a commercial production? "Basically playwrights gave plays they couldn't get done elsewhere." 

One critic of APT asked "why such dreadful bottom-of-the-trunk plays?" APT rarely offered these poor plays to subscribers; and those that were offered out of desperation to offer something were refused for production. Jerome Lawrence claimed that "(none) of the plays chosen were ever 'trunk' plays." However, some plays were staged through APT that would not have found production elsewhere.

The Process of Screening and Accepting Scripts

The actual choosing of the scripts leads to the second internal situation that merits discussion: the process of screening and accepting plays. The problems in the system were three-fold: the criteria for playwrights, the number of

---


* Lawrence, personal interview, 15 February 1992.
production agreements necessary to activate a selection, and
the actual process of screening and accepting.

APT was founded as an alternate route to production for
plays by "established" playwrights. The definition of
"established" was constantly in flux. At times, it meant
"professional." At other times, it meant "Broadway
production" or "New York production." Before the definition
of "established" was ever certain, APT selected Cowen's
Summertree, an action which dispelled any limitation of
"established." The move was explained as an attempt to
broaden the scope of APT.

Any playwright would be confused, and rightly so. A
young dramatist who was looking for production of a new play
would not have submitted it to an organization that was for
"established" playwrights. In contrast, a playwright who had
been successful previously and had a script ready to offer APT
when the organization changed directions, would probably not
have offered it. Playwrights were simply unsure as to what
APT was. Robert Anderson was "constantly re-explaining it to
members of the Dramatists Guild."²⁰ David Ayers recalled that

the confusion "got to be an embarrassment when determining eligibility." 21

The idea of a minimum number of productions required to activate a script also caused problems for APT. Often a play was evaluated by the Reading Committee as a good play, but incapable of attaining sufficient productions. Plays which were of production quality were refused because APT's leaders did not believe enough theatres would accept the play for productions. These plays sometimes received production in other venues, as was the case with Lemon Sky, The Mound Builders, and Fifth of July by Lanford Wilson. Also refused by APT, and gaining production elsewhere, were Bones by David Rabe, The Latent Heterosexual by Paddy Chayevsky, Muzeeka by John Guare, and A Cry of Players by William Gibson. These and other plays were refused by the Screening or Reading Committee without being offered to APT subscribers. The refusal resulted from the Committee's belief that the plays would not be accepted for a sufficient number of productions.

The actual process of screening and reading plays also merits attention. For much of APT's existence, David Ayers and Roy Bowen functioned as the official Screening Committee

for new plays. Their decisions determined the fate of a play with APT. If they thought the play capable of achieving a sufficient number of productions, it was passed on to the Reading Committee who would offer their thoughts. The tastes of Ayers and Bowen surely influenced their choices, although both men, who were theatre practitioners in an age in which the well-made American realistic play was the optimum ideal, state that personal taste did not influence their decisions. They claim to have been in search of plays that were "suitable for university production" in terms of casting, set requirements, and audience appeal. But the criteria for "suitable" was never really defined. Ayers defined it as "anything with a spark of excitement." His own preference "tended against outright absurdism," of which APT received a great deal. Although he did not care for the newer forms of drama, he "sent a good many on to the Reading Committee." But what Ayers and Bowen found suitable for college production was not necessarily what college producers wanted. Most of Ayers and Bowen's choices were refused either by the Reading Committee or by the APT subscribers. In count, most of the
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22 Ayers and Bowen, interviews, 1993.

23 Ayers, interview, 1993.
APT members did not produce APT selections, even in years when enough theatres agreed to sufficient productions to activate a play.

Generational differences in taste were expressed by the reactions of the younger playwrights who were invited to participate on the Boards of APT. Terrence McNally, the only younger playwright to complete a full three year term on an APT Board, expressed his concern with the "image problem" of APT among the younger playwrights who were not sure if APT wanted the kind of plays they had to offer. John Guare resigned because he did not agree with the numerous stagings of a new work, and Jean-Claude van Itallie did not "like judging and screening and writing with those judges in mind." Edward Albee expressed the harshest criticism of APT and the plays offered. In his letter of resignation from the Board of Governors, he wrote:

I'm greatly distressed by the quality of work accepted and encouraged, compared with the quality of the work submitted for consideration by various Governors and rejected for various reasons, in spite of its clearly superior quality. Simply, I don't want my name associated with the kind of work

---

24 Jean-Claude van Itallie, letter to David H. Ayers, 12 September 1974, APT Collection.
that the American Playwrights Theatre is presently encouraging."

The last play to be activated before Albee's resignation was O'Morrison's *Ladyhouse Blues*, a play with an all-female cast in the well-made play structure, a play which Ayers and Bowen and the Reading Committee endorsed because of its casting requirements.

The third problem related to the seeming lack of suitable plays was the subscribers' hesitancy to accept the offered scripts. "Some of the reluctance was due to practicalities of casting, etc." explained Ayers. "They also lacked confidence in the works. They expected finished scripts."* Jerome Lawrence claimed that "a few universities were damn near belligerent in their antipathy to the marriage of the academic and the professional theatres."* Whatever the desires to stage new plays which were originally expressed to Robert E. Lee at the 1962 AETA conference, university theatres did not readily embrace APT. Much of the hesitancy resulted

---

26 Edward Albee, letter to David H. Ayers, 24 October 1978, APT Collection.


27 Lawrence, interview, 1993.
from the unproven nature of the scripts. Subscribers needed some prospect of success. *The Days Between* found acceptance due to Robert Anderson's previous successes, and *Summertree* found acceptance as a result of positive New York reviews. Without some kind of guarantee, prospective producers hesitated to accept unproven scripts. Therefore, according to Bowen, producers "were not as willing as they should have been. You have to take a chance. When you do a play, you have to take a chance."*

Most APT producers were not willing to risk the production of an untried script which was less than ideal. They, therefore, depended upon the standards, either classical or modern, and the recent Broadway hit. Modern critical successes were also popular. Works by playwrights such as Brecht, Ionesco, and Beckett were also staged. The standards fulfilled the literary and historical functions of many university/college theatre departments. The recent critical successes served to train students in contemporary styles of production. The Broadway hits helped to balance the season and aided the box office.

* Bowen, interview.
The Constant Changes in Direction and Policy

The lack of a constant focus caused a great deal of problems for APT. "To enhance the quality of our national drama" proved to be a difficult goal, however admirable and, seemingly, altruistic. The actual process of debuting new works on non-commercial stages as a means of attaining that goal provided a significant challenge. APT underwent numerous changes in direction and policy. Many of those changes resulted from APT's desperate desire to survive.

The biggest continuing change in direction and policy was, as previously mentioned, APT's fluctuation in regards to defining its playwrights' eligibility. At first, APT was a type of "contest" for established playwrights. Then, it was a "clearing house" for invited established playwrights without the contest atmosphere. Then, APT was for established playwrights and "anyone whom the Board deemed eligible" for participation. Shortly thereafter, an announcement in The Dramatists Guild Quarterly opened the organization to Guild members' scripts. Then, upon finding Summertree, APT promoted itself as having been interested in the younger playwright all along. The first few years, subscribers were told, were a matter of getting the organization on its feet. The younger
playwrights were always considered as potential possibilities, especially since subscribers wanted their works, APT said. This fluctuation was confusing for everyone: the subscribers, the playwrights, and even the leaders of APT.

A second confusing change in policy came with the offering of Summertree. APT was offering a play that had already been staged. It was a new work, but a produced work. Reviews of those productions influenced subscribers to accept the work for APT stagings, but Summertree’s offering, nevertheless, heralded another change in policy. APT now offered a previously staged work by a novice playwright; quite a change from its original goals.

Also, with Summertree, came exceptions to commercial restrictions. These changes again allowed APT to survive. The By-Laws of APT restrict any commercial productions during the APT rights period. This regulation changed when APT restricted members within a 100 mile radius of New York City from producing the play because of a possible return engagement to Lincoln Center. This restriction was fundamental in APT’s procurement of Cowen’s work. Another change came when Maiden Voyage, which had found extremely limited APT acceptance, received a Broadway production while still under its APT contract. Another change came when
Lawrence and Lee requested the premiere of Jabberwock to take place in the commercial centers of New York or Southern California. The Whitehead licensing of The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia concurrent with its APT contract was yet another exception to the rule.

Other changes came in fluctuations in relationships with AETA, ANTA, and the Dramatists Guild. All of these organizations endorsed APT's initial efforts. Over time, the relationships grew strained for a variety of reasons. When APT disbanded, the participation of any of these organizations was minimal.

Further changes, or additions, in focus followed APT throughout its existence. In an effort to survive and make itself appealing to prospective members, APT tried to offer a number of additional programs. A playwright-in-residence program, in which APT would "wed" playwrights with a possible script to interested theatres, was begun and disbanded within a matter of a year. "APT II" sought to offer "worthy scripts" to theatres for workshop productions. These scripts, of an experimental nature, were to be of high quality, but not appealing to a wide number of producers. This project, also, was announced and disbanded within a year. Its one offering was Burton Russell's Low on High about a depressed college
student in a campus bar. APT's third unsuccessful program was its quest to become "the national arm" of the regional theatre movement, a function already filled by the Theatre Communications Group.

The Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest, on a variety of levels surrounded APT. The organization often served as a vehicle for the playwrights. Even though the financial gains were not as rewarding as those offered by a Broadway production, an APT production was better than no production at all. Staging under APT was the only life that some of the plays ever saw. Most of the plays submitted came to APT only after other avenues of production did not prove successful, making the organization a clearing house for scripts.

Another conflict of interests came in the types of plays offered to APT subscribers, most of which were college/university theatres. APT's first activated play, The Days Between, required a cast far beyond the maturity level of most undergraduate programs. This held true for many of APT's offerings. If APT was an organization designed to supply new scripts suitable for college/university production, why did so many of the casts require mature performers? The answer
to that question lies in the playwrights' submissions of scripts which did not find acceptance elsewhere. With the possible exception of The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, the plays were not written with APT in mind. The plays were not written especially for the college level performer.

A major conflict of interest occurred with the production of the Lawrence and Lee works. When founding APT, Lawrence and Lee originally offered to submit a play entitled Ben. The play was never submitted. Lawrence and Lee then took great pains to point out that they had "disqualified" themselves from offering their own works. Then, when APT's machinery was in place, but a play was not, they offered The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail which became APT's most widely produced play.

A few years later, another Lawrence and Lee work, Jabberwock, was offered for production. Whether or not Lawrence and Lee's submission of works was intentionally planned or happily circumstantial is unknown. Although their benefits in no way compensate for their time and effort invested in the organization, they did benefit heavily from the organization they founded. They benefitted financially from the APT royalties from production of two scripts which might not have found acceptance elsewhere. Although The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail proved immensely popular, it might not have done so
had APT not been in place. With the play, APT achieved its major goal, but it was achieved with a work written by its founders. *Jabberwocky*, debuting at Ohio State in a non-APT production, was also disseminated through APT. Although limited in its acceptance, it received more productions though the organization than if the play were offered through another play service. Subscribers to APT were very familiar with the authors and their recent success with *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*. That momentum undoubtedly influenced the acceptances of the script. Lawrence and Lee also benefitted from the publicity and notoriety associated with their founding of the organization.

Lawrence and Lee's founding and guidance of APT also served as another conflict of interest for the organization. Often, plays were activated, criteria were changed, and rules adapted as a result of Lawrence and Lee's suggestion. These events often allowed APT to survive and benefit from the changes. The implementation of the changes, however, often reached Governors and Trustees and subscribers as already accomplished before input was requested. An example was the announcement of *Summertree* which was couched with the description of the play in performance which was viewed by Lawrence who suggested the rules be adapted to allow the
play's inclusion. Throughout most of APT's history, Lawrence and Lee spearheaded any changes that were made which enabled APT to survive. During this time, the dramatists were also writing two plays which later found production through the organization they established.

Another conflict of interests arose when Board member playwrights participated in the commercial theatre. Lawrence and Lee, Anderson, and McNally were on the Board of APT, an organization committed to the non-commercial production of plays. All of the writers, however, had works on Broadway during the time they were serving on the APT board. While founding APT, Lawrence and Lee adapted their previous commercial success Auntie Mame into the musical Mame, which opened on Broadway in 1966. During their involvement with APT, Lawrence and Lee's other Broadway productions included Diamond Orchid (1965), Dear World (1969), The Incomparable Max (1971), and First Monday in October (1978). Anderson debuted You Know I Can't Hear You When the Water's Running (1967), I Never Sang for My Father (1968), and Solitaire/Double Solitaire (1971). McNally debuted The Ritz (1975) and Broadway! Broadway! (1978).²⁹ In each case, the playwrights

²⁹ Contemporary Dramatists.
did not offer the work to APT because they considered it "not right" for the organization. APT "took a lot of heat for that," recalled Ayers. "Producers said that if they (the playwrights) really believed in APT, why didn't they give us those plays first." Given the requirements of casting and the subject matter of many of the plays, acceptance by APT was questionable for those plays. But, so too, was the acceptance of *The Days Between* for the very same reasons.

**Summary**

The American Playwrights Theatre was an organization surrounded by problems. It overcame many of them, adapting and changing as necessary in order to survive. Whether or not APT achieved its goal of enhancing our national drama remains to be seen. Even then, the evaluation would be purely subjective. Nor can APT be judged by the amount of productions its plays received. As often evidenced in the New York theatre, longevity or mass appeal is not always indicative of quality.

What defines APT most is its vision. Founded in 1963, APT sought many of the same goals as other non-commercial

---

30 Ayers, interview, 1993.
theatre venues, such as Off- and Off-Off-Broadway and the undeveloped regional theatres. APT recognized the importance of new works for a vital, living theatre. And it recognized the importance of a forum for those works free of financial pressures. APT acknowledged that the support of playwrights is necessary for a healthy theatre. And it asserted the need for new plays to stimulate theatrical activity.

The vision and goals of APT, once novel and untried, but now standard and proven, have become the backbone of the regional theatre movement in the United States. Regional theatres now accomplish many of the intentions of the American Playwrights Theatre. Regionals nurture playwrights through residencies and workshop productions, often offering premieres of works by accomplished and novice writers. Some of these plays make their ways to the commercial New York theatre, some do not. Contemporary plays are able to have a life, however, independent of Broadway, a feat first accomplished through APT. As Samuel Leiter wrote in describing the regionals' influence in America:

It was now also possible for an American play to be successful without ever even having a major New York production—as happened, for example, with

Leiter, however, fails to credit The American Playwrights Theatre. AFT did not decentralize-theatre on its own. It was one organization which shared a vision with other parts of the theatre world. With one production in particular, that vision was a reality.

Unfortunately, what AFT held in vision, it lacked in sight. The organization was founded on a very idealistic premise: that established playwrights would give high quality works to an organization consisting of university/college theatres, the fledgling regional theatres and the country's community theatres. Although playwrights expressed support of the idea, and theatre producers promised participation, the logistics of making the operation function simply overwhelmed the leaders. Most playwrights submitted less than high quality works, most subscribers refused to accept anything less than excellent plays, and the AFT leaders were hard pressed to get either group to compromise. AFT was unprepared to handle the unexpected problems that arose from such a complicated union of participants. Eventually, the internal situation, combined with the external influence of a growing

---

31 Leiter, 56.
regional theatre movement, contributed to the dissolution of The American Playwrights Theatre.
APPENDIX A

AMERICAN PLAYWRIGHTS THEATRE

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: 1964-1980
1964 Financial Statement

Current APT Assets: As of October 1, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntington National Bank Account</td>
<td>$5,391.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Alumnae Development Fund Account</td>
<td>$3,203.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Alumnae Development Fund Account</td>
<td>$8,594.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSU ALUMNAE DEVELOPMENT FUND

Acct. # 21861
December 1, 1963 — June 30, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence and Lee Educational Foundation Grant</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund Grant</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel: Governors Meeting Dec. 63</td>
<td>$772.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees Meeting Dec. 63</td>
<td>$108.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$880.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Judging: Schneider, Clurman, Gassner</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Duplication and Mailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication for Judges</td>
<td>$415.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dup. and Mailing to Subscribers</td>
<td>$711.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,126.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$2,796.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$3,203.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

' American Playwrights Theatre, 1964 Financial Statement, APT Collection. Note: The above and all subsequent references to APT financial statements are copied directly from the statements, all of which are found in The APT Collection.
1964 (Cont.)

HUNTINGTON NATIONAL BANK ACCOUNT

Total Receipts: 115 Subscriptions @ $50. each $5,750.00
Subscription Refund (Memphis Little Theatre) 50.00 $5,700.00

Expenditures
  Play Screening (George Freedley) $300.00
  Entertainment 6.20
  Letterhead Stencil 2.00
  Miscellaneous .75 $308.95
  Balance $5391.05

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES CONTRIBUTION

Director's Salary: Nov 1, 1963 - Sept 30, 1964 Portion of Time APT $6,324.00
Secretary, Mar 9, 1964 - Sept 30, 1964 Portion of Time APT 1,204.00 Total $7,528.00

DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH CONTRIBUTION

Letterhead and Stationery 332.50
Business Forms 149.82
Announcement Brochure 80.00
Postage Cost Estimate 300.00
Telephone Cost Estimate 150.00
Typewriter 193.50
Office Supplies Estimate 50.00 Total $1,255.82
## PROJECTED ESTIMATE OF APT EXPENDITURES FOR 1964-65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governors and Trustees Meeting</td>
<td>Total Estimate: $1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated travel expense</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated food and incidentals</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Judging Fees (Based on 1963-64 figure)</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Production costs</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of plays for judges</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of plays for subscribers (per play)</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing of plays to subscribers (per play)</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Projected Estimate of Major Expenses for 1964-1965 Based on the Last Year's Formula for Judging**

- For One Play: $5,000.00
- For Two Plays: $5,150.00
1965 Financial Statement

Huntington National Bank Account

Oct 1, 1964 through Sept 30, 1965

Total Receipts: $2640.39
Advance Royalties: Days Between $1735.39
Other Income: 905.00

EXPENDITURES
Royalty: Robert Anderson 511.22
Royalty refund to Dallas Theatre Cntr 224.17
Travel Expense 97.42
Entertainment 18.35
Office Supplies 3.15
Brochures 420.00
Miscellaneous 5.90
Salary for Secretarial Help 1500.00
Total $2780.21

Balance as of October 1, 1964 $5391.05
Total receipts Oct 1, 64 - Sept 30, 65 2640.39
Total Expenditures Oct 1, 64 - Sept 30, 65 2780.21

APT Huntington National Bank Assets $5251.23

Note: Total reported assets include $1,424.17 in royalty to be paid to the playwright. Actual Huntington assets as of Sept 30, 1965 are $3,827.06.
1965 (Cont.)

OSU ALUMNI FUND #521861

October 1, 1964 through September 30, 1965

Development Fund Account Oct 1, 1964 $3203.27

Transfer from Huntington for
secretarial salary 1500.00

EXPENDITURES

Governors and Trustees Meeting $948.20
Duplication: The Days Between 297.42
Postage 252.39
Telephone and Telegraph 172.10
Travel Expenses 861.65
General Duplicating 82.69
Magazine Subscriptions 3.00
Office Expenses 11.72
Duplication: Days Between (Rev) 298.84
Outstanding Orders for Advertising 195.00

Total Expenditures 3123.01 $3123.01

Balance in #521861 1580.26
## PROJECTED ESTIMATE FOR 1965-66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governors and Trustees Meeting</td>
<td>$1200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses (Including Pilot Prod.)</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Option</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of Original Script</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of Revised Script</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Telegraph</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Duplication</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Help</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine Subscriptions</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7070.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1966 Financial Statement
October 1, 1965 through November 30, 1966

**CURRENT ASSETS:** $7,250.85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts</td>
<td>$19,138.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Income</td>
<td>$8,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playwrights Royalty</td>
<td>$10,438.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19,138.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalty Paid</td>
<td>$11,238.10 (Anderson and Sklar royalty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$1,467.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>$319.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>$1,448.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Express</td>
<td>$1,023.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Telegraph</td>
<td>$531.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$224.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>$205.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$2,187.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$72.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,718.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance as of Oct 1, 1965** $6,831.49

**Total Receipts** $19,138.10

**Less Expenditures** $18,718.74

**Balance: Total Assets** $7,250.85
Projected Estimate 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Assets</th>
<th>$7250.85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(includes $500 new 1967 subscriptions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 1967 Income</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 new member subscriptions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8750.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Estimate 1967  Dec 1, 1966 through Nov 30 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Express</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Telegraph</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery and Office Supplies</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Materials</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Help</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Expenditures $7770.00
### 1967 Financial Report

**December 1, 1966 - December 30, 1967**

- **Current Assets** $3500.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts</td>
<td>$4304.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Income</td>
<td>625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty Revenue</td>
<td>3040.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies (Scripts)</td>
<td>139.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Operating Fund</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty Paid</td>
<td>$3040.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense</td>
<td>1404.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>97.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>150.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripts</td>
<td>689.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Express</td>
<td>696.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Telegraph</td>
<td>321.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>190.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>1395.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>69.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $8055.40

- **Balance as of Dec 1, 66** $7250.85
- **Total Receipts** $4304.73
- **Less Expenditures** $8055.40
- **Balance Total Assets** $3500.18
Projected Estimate 1968
As of Sept 30, 1967

Total Assets $3500.18
Estimated 1968 Income (10 new subscribers) 500.00
Total $4000.18


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripts</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Telegraph</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary and Office Supplies</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Materials</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimate Expenditures $7750.00
1968 Financial Report

October 1, 1967 - August 31, 1968

Current Assets $8267.47

Total Receipts $18,628.87

Subscription Income $6200.00
Royalty Revenue 8562.53
Supplies 366.34
OSU Development Fund 3500.00

Total $18628.87

Expenditures

Royalty Paid $ 8162.53
Travel Expense 1358.18
Entertainment 72.24
Duplicating 1463.98
Postage 815.92
Telephone and Telegraph 384.26
Office Supplies 218.22
Wages and Salaries 1295.07
Miscellaneous 91.18

Total $13861.58

Actual Operating Expenses $13,861.58
Less Royalty Paid 8,162.53
5,699.05

Balance as of Oct 1, 1967 $3,500.18
Total Receipts 18,628.87
Less Expenditures 13,861.58
Balance Total Assets $ 8,267.47
1969 Financial Report
Sept 1, 1968 through August 31, 1969

Cash Balance, Sept 1, '68 (Huntington Bank Account) $9025.95
Cash Balance, Sept 1, '68 (OSU Rotary Account) 41.52

Income: Sept 1, 68 through Aug 31, 69
Subscription Revenue $6475.00
Royalty Revenue 11917.02 (Ivory Tower and Summertree)
Script Revenue 552.47
Total Income $18944.49

Total (Cash on hand, Sept 1, 68) $28011.96

Expenses
Royalty Paid 11917.02
Membership Brochures 193.50
Office Supplies 446.45
Refunds 350.00
Travel 1265.93
Postage 703.47
Printshop 1174.26
Telephone 103.03
Miscellaneous 201.52
Total Disbursements $16355.18

Total Receipts over Disbursements 11656.78
Cash Balance Aug 31 Huntington Bank Acct 10657.78
Cash Balance Aug 31 OSU Rotary Acct 998.92
Total Cash Balance $11656.78

Total Disbursements 16355.18

Less Royalty for Ivory Tower and Summertree 11917.02
Actual Operating Expenses 4438.16
Supplement to 1969 Financial Report

OSU Rotary Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance Sept 1, 1968</td>
<td>$41.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from General Acct.</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OSU Rotary Acct.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3041.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$703.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Shop</td>
<td>1174.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>61.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>103.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2042.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Acct)</td>
<td>10657.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11656.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalty for Summertree</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets (Huntington and Rotary Accts)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11056.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sept 1, 1969 through Aug 31, 1970

Cash Balance, Sept 1, 1969 (Huntington Acct) $10,657.86
Cash Balance, Sept 1, 1969 (OSU Rotary) 998.92

Income:
Subscription Revenue $1900.00
Royalty Revenue (Thoreau and Summertree) 2220.49
Script Revenue 278.87
Miscellaneous 4.25
Transferred from Savings 2000.00
Total Income 6,403.61

Total Cash on Hand $18,060.39

Expenses (Includes Huntington and OSU Rotary Accts)
Transfer to Savings $6000.00
Printshop 1687.39
Postage 1249.33
Royalty Paid (Summertree) 820.49
Travel and Board Meeting Expenses 776.33
Miscellaneous 401.59
Office Supplies 383.08
Telephone 265.72
Refunds 55.00

Total Disbursements $11,638.93
Total Receipts 6,421.46
Cash Balance (Huntington) 5,582.26
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 839.20
Total Cash Balance 6,421.46

Actual Expenses
Total Disbursements $11,638.93
Less Royalty for Summertree 820.49
Less Transfer to Savings 6,000.00
Actual Operating Expenses $4,818.44

Statement of Total Cash Assets
Cash Balance (Huntington) $5,582.26
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary Acct) 839.20
Cash Balance (Savings inc. interest) 4,240.00
Less Royalty for Thoreau to be transferred 2,000.00
Total APT Assets Aug 31, 1970 8,661.46
1971 Financial Report

September 1, 1970 through August 31, 1971

Cash Balance, Sept 1, 1970 (Huntington Bank) $5,582.26
Cash Balance, Sept 1, 1971 (OSU Rotary) 839.20

Income
Subscription Revenue
117 renewed @ $50 ea. $ 5,850.00
32 new @ $100 ea. 3,200.00
22 new @ $50 ea. 1,100.00
Total Subscription Revenue $10,150.00

TNT (Thoreau) Royalty $38,767.90
Scripts and Postage 2,280.66
TNT Sound Tapes and Music Royalty 365.00
TNT Late production fees 300.00
Reimbursement for travel, Ayers 178.12
Overpayment of royalty and late fees 117.46
Total Income $52,159.34
Total Cash on Hand Sept 1, 1970 $58,580.80

Expenses (Huntington and OSU Rotary Accts)
TNT Royalty $38,742.62
Print Shop 3,417.36
Travel and Entertainment 2,238.65
Postage 658.39
Xeroxing 617.56
Telephone 459.76
Miscellaneous 407.98
Membership Brochure 290.59
Refunds 122.34
Wages (Part-time student help) 115.13
Audio Tapes 75.45
Total Disbursements $46,949.60

Total Receipts over Disbursements 9,631.20
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank Acct) 8,442.73
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary Acct) 1,188.47

Total Cash Balance 9,631.20
Statement of Actual APT Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$48,949.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less TNT Royalty</td>
<td>38,742.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$10,206.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Total APT Cash Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$8,442.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>1,186.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Savings inc. interest)</td>
<td>4,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Royalty for TNT to be transferred to authors</td>
<td>2,024.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Music Royalty to be transferred to JA Huff</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total APT Cash Assets, Aug 31, 1971</td>
<td>$11,676.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1972 Financial Report

**September 1, 1971 through August 31, 1972**

| Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) | $ 8,442.73 |
| Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)      | 1,188.20   |

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSU Rotary</th>
<th>$ 159.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 New @ $100 ea.</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 New @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Renewal (1973) @ $50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subscription Revenue</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT Royalty</td>
<td>$11,104.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Royalty</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT Scripts and Postage</td>
<td>609.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHOES Royalty</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT Sound and Music Royalty</td>
<td>205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpayment of Royalty</td>
<td>144.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Scripts</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHOES Scripts</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Scripts</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,867.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses (Includes Huntington and OSU Rotary Accts)

| TNT Royalty | $12,903.47 |
| Travel and Entertainment | 3,033.90 |
| Print Shop | 1,169.00 |
| HH Royalty | 1,000.00 |
| Postage | 926.48 |
| Membership Brochure | 693.04 |
| Office Supplies | 517.29 |
| Telephone | 359.60 |
| TNT Music Royalty | 255.00 |
| Xeroxing | 287.13 |
| Refunds | 79.88 |
| Miscellaneous | 147.86 |

**Total Disbursements** | **$21,372.65**

**Total Receipts over disbursements** | **4,126.06**
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) $3,212.53
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 913.53
Total Cash Balance $4,126.06

Statement of Actual APT Expenses
Total Disbursements $21,372.65
Less Royalty Paid for TNT 13,903.47
Actual Operating Expenses $7,469.18

Statement of Total APT Cash Assets
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) $3,212.53
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 913.53
Cash Balance (Savings inc. interest) 4,575.37
Less Royalty to be transferred to author (Echoes) 600.00
Total APT Cash Assets Aug 31, 1972 $8,101.43

Supplement to 1972 Financial Report
OSU Rotary Account

Beginning Balance $1,188.47
Reimbursement of APT Bd. Mtg. Expenses 159.16
Transferred from Huntington Acct. 3,000.00
Total OSU Rotary Acct Fund $4,347.63

Expenses
Print Shop $ 2,149.17
Postage 859.14
Telephone 359.60
Office Supplies 66.19
Total Expenses OSU Rotary Acct $3,434.10

OSU Rotary Balance Sept 1, 1972 913.53
1973 Financial Report

September 1, 1972 through August 31, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$3,212.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Renewed @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>$6,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 new @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 reinstated @ $50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 renewed @ $100 ea.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subscription Revenue.</td>
<td>$6,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Royalty</td>
<td>$4,904.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoes Royalty</td>
<td>3,129.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Scripts</td>
<td>442.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoes Scripts</td>
<td>169.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund on Office Supplies</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Royalty and Other</td>
<td>8,650.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$15,450.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash on Hand</td>
<td>$19,576.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoes Royalty</td>
<td>$3,729.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Royalty</td>
<td>3,554.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Entertainment and Travel</td>
<td>2,872.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Shop</td>
<td>1,939.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>704.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>490.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>436.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xeroxing</td>
<td>238.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>137.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund of subscriptions fees</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$14,154.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts over Disbursements</td>
<td>5,422.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>4,911.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>510.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Balance</td>
<td>5,422.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Actual APT Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$14,154.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Royalty Paid for Echoes and Jabberwock</td>
<td>7,283.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Operating Expenses</td>
<td>6,870.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Total APT Cash Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$4,911.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>510.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Saving inc. interest)</td>
<td>4,804.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Jabberwock Royalty to be transferred to authors</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total APT Cash Assets Aug 31, 1973</td>
<td>$9,026.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1974 Financial Report
September 1, 1973 through September 31, 1974

Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) $4,911.85
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 510.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 Renewed @ $50 ea</td>
<td>$5,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 New @ $50 ea</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reinstated @ $50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Renewed @ $100</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1975 @ $50 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subscription Revenue</td>
<td>5,600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Royalty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Royalty</td>
<td>$6,804.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on High</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Scripts</td>
<td>1,001.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Sound Tapes</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Royalty and Other</td>
<td>$7,976.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Income $13,576.03
Total Cash on Hand $18,998.11

Expenses (Includes Huntington and Rotary Accts.)
Jabberwock Royalty $6,777.23
APT Entertainment and Travel 2,511.62
Print Shop 367.31
Postage 545.28
Telephone 502.16
Office Supplies 90.57
Low on High Royalty 150.00
Telecommunication Center 35.22
Miscellaneous 137.75
Refund of overpayment of royalty 102.00
Refund of overpayment of sub. fees 50.00

Total Disbursements $11,269.14
Total Receipts over Disbursements 7,728.97
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) 6,539.34
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 1,189.63
Total Cash Balance $7,728.97
### Statement of Actual APT Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$11,269.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Royalty Paid for <em>Jabberwock</em> and <em>Low on High</em></td>
<td>7,079.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Operating Expenses for APT</td>
<td>4,189.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Total APT Cash Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$6,539.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Savings inc. interest)</td>
<td>5,329.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Assets</td>
<td>$13,058.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1975 Financial Report

September 1, 1974 through August 31, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$6,539.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>$1,189.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Reinstated @ $50 ea</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Reinstated @ $100 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 New @ $50 ea</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Renewed for '76 @ $50 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New for '76 @ $50 ea</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New for '76 @ $100 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subscription Revenue</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Royalty</td>
<td>$554.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Scripts</td>
<td>235.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Sound Tapes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Royalty</td>
<td>10641.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Scripts</td>
<td>241.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Sound Tape</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest Graduate Royalty</td>
<td>265.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Royalty and Other</td>
<td>$11948.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$12,948.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash on Hand</td>
<td>$20,677.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (Includes Huntington and OSU Rotary Acct.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Entertainment and Travel</td>
<td>$1,593.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabberwock Royalty</td>
<td>1,571.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Royalty</td>
<td>9,311.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest Graduate Royalty</td>
<td>265.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>429.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>378.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Shop</td>
<td>1,321.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>59.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Center (Sound tapes)</td>
<td>20.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>206.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund of overpayment of sub. fees</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$15,208.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts over Disbursements</td>
<td>2,260.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>5,468.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>980.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Balance</td>
<td>6,448.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Actual APT Expenses
Total Disbursements $15,208.70
Less Royalty 11,148.67
Actual Operating Expenses $ 4,060.03

Statement of Total APT Cash Assets
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) $5,468.39
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 980.03
Cash Balance (Savings inc. interest) 5,604.13
Total APT Cash Assets $12,052.55
## 1976 Financial Report

September 1, 1975 through October 31, 1976

**PLEASE NOTE:** This statement does not include Ohio State University's financial contribution to the operation of APT. Ohio State provides a substantial proportion of the salaries for the Executive Director and a secretary, office space and supplies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Balance (Huntington)</th>
<th>$4,625.36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>980.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89 Renewed @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>$4,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Reinstated @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 New @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 New @ $100 ea.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Reinstated @ $100 ea.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Renewed for '77 @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New for '77 @ $50 ea.</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Subscription Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$6,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knights Royalty</strong></td>
<td>$38,607.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Royalty retained by APT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knights Scripts</strong></td>
<td>471.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knights Sound Tapes</strong></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphan Scripts</strong></td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thoreau Sound Tape</strong></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramatist Guild Contribution</strong></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Royalty and Other</strong></td>
<td>$39,606.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Income

**$46,356.36**

### Total Cash on Hand

**$51,961.75**

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APT Board Meeting</td>
<td>$2,167.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>1,458.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATA Convention Expense</td>
<td>531.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Royalty</td>
<td>31,233.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>124.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Shop</td>
<td>1,553.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>405.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supply</td>
<td>96.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>718.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Center</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>183.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>233.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1976 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$38,727.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts</td>
<td>13,234.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington)</td>
<td>10,986.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>2,248.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Balance</td>
<td>$13,234.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Actual APT Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$38,727.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Royalty</td>
<td>31,433.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$ 7,493.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Total APT Cash on Hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington)</td>
<td>$10,986.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>2,248.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Savings inc. interest)</td>
<td>7,354.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total APT Cash on Hand</td>
<td>$20,588.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Knights Royalty to be Transferred</td>
<td>8,051.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total APT Cash Assets</td>
<td>$12,537.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1977 Financial Report

November 1, 1976 through August 31, 1977

PLEASE NOTE: This statement does not include Ohio State University's financial contribution to the operation of APT. Ohio State provides a substantial proportion of the salaries for the Executive Director and a secretary, office space and supplies.

| Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) | $10,986.41 |
| Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)      | 2,248.04   |

**Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79 Renewed @ $50 ea</td>
<td>$3,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Reinstated @ $50 ea</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 New @ $50 ea</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New @ $100 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Reinstated for '78 @ $50 ea</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 New for '78 @ $50 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New for '78 @ $100 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Subscription Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$5,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Royalty</td>
<td>$3,114.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyhouse Royalty</td>
<td>6,349.06* retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyhouse Scripts</td>
<td>286.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals Royalty</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals Scripts</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoreau sound tape</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Royalty and Other</strong></td>
<td>$9,978.51 each theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$15,128.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash on Hand</strong></td>
<td>$28,362.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APT Board Meeting</td>
<td>$2,411.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>1,052.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Royalty</td>
<td>9,640.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyhouse Royalty</td>
<td>6,107.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals Royalty</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supply</td>
<td>476.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>436.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>1,899.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>543.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expenses (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>40.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording center</td>
<td>33.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>130.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>165.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Disbursements**: $23,137.50

**Total Receipts over Disbursements**: 5,225.46

**Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)**: 3,981.55

**Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)**: 1,243.91

**Total Cash Balance**: $5,225.46

### Statement of Actual APT Expenses

**Total Disbursements**: $23,137.50

**Less Royalty**: 15,947.71

**Actual Operating Expenses**: $7,189.79

### Statement of Total APT Cash on Hand

**Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)**: $3,981.55

**Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)**: 1,243.91

**Cash Balance (Savings incl. interest)**: 6,154.00

**Total Cash on Hand**: $11,379.46

**Less Ladyhouse Royalty to be transferred**: 400.00

**Total APT Cash Assets**: $10,979.46
**1978 Financial Report**

**September 1, 1977 through September 30, 1978**

PLEASE NOTE: This statement does not include Ohio State University's financial contribution to the operation of APT. Ohio State provides a substantial proportion of the salaries for the Executive Director and a secretary, office space and supplies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$3,981.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>1,243.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 Renewed @ $50 ea</td>
<td>$4,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 New @ $50 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New @ $100 ea</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 reinsated for '79 @ $50 ea</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subscription Revenue</td>
<td>$4,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of funds from Savings Account</td>
<td>$1,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyhouse Royalty</td>
<td>4,385.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyhouse Scripts</td>
<td>436.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back County Crimes royalty and music</td>
<td>262.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back County Crimes Scripts</td>
<td>110.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Royalty and other</td>
<td>$6,620.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$11,320.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash on hand</td>
<td>$16,545.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (includes Huntington and OSU Rotary Accts.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Board Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>$3,812.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>756.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyhouse Royalty</td>
<td>4,357.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back County Crimes Royalty and Music</td>
<td>262.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supply</td>
<td>234.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>733.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>1,349.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>789.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Center</td>
<td>147.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>83.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>182.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$12,707.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1978 (cont.)

Total Receipts over Disbursements 3,837.79
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) 3,680.50
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 157.29
Total Cash Balance $3,837.79

Statement of Actual Expenses
Total Disbursements $12,707.96
Less Royalty 4,619.68
Actual Operating Expenses $ 8,088.28

Statement of Total APT Cash on Hand
Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) $ 3,680.50
Cash Balance (OSU Rotary) 157.29
Cash Balance (Savings less interest transferred to Huntington Acct for expenses) 4,804.00
Total APT Cash on Hand 8,461.79
Less Royalty to be transferred 0.00
Total APT Cash Assets $ 8,641.79
1979 Financial Report

October 1, 1978 through September 30, 1979

PLEASE NOTE: This statement does not include Ohio State University's financial contribution to the operation of APT. Ohio State provides a substantial proportion of the salaries for the Executive Director and a secretary, office space and supplies.

| Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) | $ 3,680.50 |
| Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)      | 157.29    |

**Income**

- 68 renewed @ $50 ea $ 3,400.00
- 24 new @ $50 ea 1,200.00
- 5 reinstated @ $50 ea 250.00
- 4 new for 1980 @ $50 ea 200.00

Total Subscription Revenue $ 5,050.00

- Dramatist Guild Contribution $ 500.00
- Ladyhouse Blues Royalty 200.00
- Ladyhouse Blues Scripts 58.00

Total Royalty and other $ 758.00

**Total Income** $ 5,808.00

**Total Cash on Hand** 9,645.79

**Expenses**

- APT Travel and Entertainment $ 1,491.95
- APT Certificates 953.39
- Ladyhouse Royalty 200.00
- Telephone 427.98
- Duplicating 135.93
- Postage 462.26
- Office Supply 35.77
- Recording Center 26.20
- Petty Cash 48.88
- Misc. 142.65

Total Disbursements $ 3,925.01

**Total Receipts over Disbursements** 5,720.78

<p>| Cash Balance (Huntington Bank) | 4,651.63 |
| Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)      | 1,069.15 |
| Total Cash Balance             | $5,720.78 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Actual Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>$ 3,995.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Royalty</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Operating Expenses for APT</td>
<td>$ 3,795.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Total APT Cash on Hand</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Huntington Bank)</td>
<td>$ 4,651.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (OSU Rotary)</td>
<td>1,069.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance (Savings incl. interest)</td>
<td>4,904.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total APT Cash on Hand</td>
<td>$10,624.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Royalty to be transferred</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total APT Cash Assets</td>
<td>$10,624.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1979 (cont.)
1980 Financial Report

October 1, 1979 through January 31, 1980

Cash Balance $ 4,651.63

Income
1 Renewed @ $50 ea $50.00

Total Income 50.00

Total Cash on Hand $ 4,701.63

Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APT Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Board Meeting</td>
<td>344.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>39.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Disbursements $ 550.94

Total Receipts over Disbursements 500.94

Total Balance $ 4,150.69
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE MEMBERSHIP ROSTERS
### 1965 Membership Roster

**American Playwrights Theatre**

* Denotes Production of *The Days Between*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Long Beach State College</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Occidental College</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Univ. of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills College</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Redlands</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>Ridgecrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* San Diego State</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State College</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Civic Theatre</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Western State College</td>
<td>Gunnison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Yale University School of Drama</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Storrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, District of Columbia</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Winter Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2. American Playwrights Theatre. *The Days Between* Production File. APT Collection. Note: Not all of the producers of the play are included on this list as some producers were 1966 members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodman Memorial Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hull House Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milliken University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Elmhurst College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knox College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The Peoria Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wabash College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Evansville College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ball State Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne Civic Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>* Des Moines Community Playhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>* University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wichita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wichita Community Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Bowdoin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Colonial Players, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Wheaton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>* University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>* University of Minnesota (Duluth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* University of Minnesota (Minneapolis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorhead State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre Saint Paul, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>* Southeast Missouri State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>* Montana State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vox Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Paper Mill Playhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rider College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>* Civic Theatre of Binghamton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Univ of New York, Binghamton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Univ of New York, Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Adelphi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Colgate University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township Theatre Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Plays and Players, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* State University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Rochester Community Players, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Carolina

University of North Carolina
Wake Forest College

Chapel Hill
Winston-Salem

North Dakota

* North Dakota State University

Fargo

Ohio

* Weathervane Community Playhouse, Inc.
Ohio University
*Baldwin-Wallace College
*Bowling Green State University
*Ohio State University
Denison University
Hiram College
Kent State University
Encore Theatre
Lake Erie College
*Trumball New Theatre, Inc.
Otterbein College
College of Wooster
Youngstown Players, Inc.

Akron
Athens
Berea
Bowling Green
Columbus
Granville
Hiram
Kent
Lima
Painesville
Warren
Westerville
Wooster
Youngstown

Oklahoma

*University of Oklahoma
*The Mummers Theatre, Inc.
*Tulsa Little Theatre, Inc.

Norman
Oklahoma City
Tulsa

Oregon

University of Oregon
*Portland Civic Theatre

Eugene
Portland

Pennsylvania

Harrisburg Community Theatre, Inc.
*University of Pennsylvania
*Pennsylvania State University
Villanova University

Harrisburg
Philadelphia
University Park
Villanova

South Dakota

*University of South Dakota

Vermillion

Tennessee

Memphis Little Theatre
Vanderbilt University
*Oak Ridge Community Playhouse, Inc.

Memphis
Nashville
Oak Ridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Little Theatre of Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Dallas Little Theatre</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Houston State College</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Community Theatre, Inc.</td>
<td>Midland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Antonio Little Theatre</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>Waco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* College of William and Mary</td>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Pullman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Sunset Playhouse</td>
<td>Elm Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Mary College</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Community Players of Sheboygan</td>
<td>Sheboygan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**1968 MEMBERSHIP ROSTER**

**AMERICAN PLAYWRIGHTS THEATRE**

* Denotes Production of *Summertree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo Players</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Calif. at Irvine</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Southern Calif.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Menlo Players</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Modesto Players</td>
<td>Modesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Playhouse</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Redlands</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Calif. at Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States International Univ.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* San Francisco State College</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State College</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Delta College</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Civic Theatre</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Lewis College</td>
<td>Durango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ.</td>
<td>Ft. Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State College</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State College</td>
<td>Gunnison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Storrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington, District of Columbia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The American University</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* American Playwrights Theatre. *Summertree* Production File. APT Collection. Note: Not all of the producers of the play are included on this list as some producers were 1969 members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Universities and Theaters</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>* Wilmington Drama League</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Univ. of South Florida</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>The Pocket Theatre</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Columbia College</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodman Memorial Theatre</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millikin University</td>
<td>Decatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>DeKalb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elmhurst College</td>
<td>Elmhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Kendall College</td>
<td>Evanston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Evanston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bradley University</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Urbana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Theatre of Western Springs</td>
<td>Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Evansville Civic Theatre</td>
<td>Evansville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Evansville College</td>
<td>Evansville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Joseph's College</td>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>Cedar Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Luther College</td>
<td>Decorah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des Moines Community Playhouse</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>Wichita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>* Gallery Circle Theatre</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Petit Theatre Du Vieux Carre</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td>Orono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Colonial Players</td>
<td>Annapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loeb Drama Center, Harvard Univ.</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Dean Junior College</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>Medford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams College</td>
<td>Williamstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstan's Guild of Cranbrook</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Circle Players</td>
<td>Okemos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>* University of Minnesota, Duluth</td>
<td>Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mankato State University</td>
<td>Mankato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* University of Minnesota, Minneapolis</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia College</td>
<td>Moorhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamline University</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>New Stage Theatre</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>* Drury College</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Southeast Missouri State College</td>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Williams Woods College</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Southwest Missouri State College</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>* Montana State College</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>The Omaha Playhouse</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Jersey
- Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison
- Seton Hall University, South Orange
- Trenton State College, Trenton

### New Mexico
- Don Juan Playhouse, Inc., Los Alamos
- New Mexico Inst. of Mining & Technology, Socorro

### New York
- State Univ. of New York, Binghamton, Binghamton
- State University College, Brockport, Brockport
- * Adelphi University, Garden City
- Colgate University, Hamilton
- Cornell University, Ithaca
- Plays and Players, Inc., Jericho
- * State University College, New Paltz, New Paltz
- * Rochester Community Players, Inc., Rochester
- * Syracuse University, Syracuse

### North Carolina
- North Carolina Wesleyan College, Rocky Mount
- * East Carolina University, Greenville
- Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem

### Ohio
- Weathervane Community Playhouse, Inc., Akron
- * University of Akron, Akron
- Ohio University, Athens
- Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea
- * Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green
- * University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati
- * Cleveland Play House, Cleveland
- * Ohio State University, Columbus
- Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware
- * Denison University, Granville
- Hiram College, Hiram
- Kent State University, Kent
- Lakewood Little Theatre, Lakewood
- Lake Erie College, Painesville
- Trumbull New Theatre, Inc., Warren

### Oklahoma
- University of Oklahoma, Norman
- Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Portland Civic Theatre</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>* Harrisburg Community Theatre</td>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Allegheny College</td>
<td>Meadville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Bucks County Community College</td>
<td>Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Temple University</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Carnegie-Mellon Inst. of Technology</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villanova University Theatre</td>
<td>Villanova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York Little Theatre, Inc.</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>University of South Dakota</td>
<td>Vermillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Maryville College</td>
<td>Maryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>* Dallas Theatre Center</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Texas Christian University</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Midland Community Theatre</td>
<td>Midland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity University</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>The Mirror Players, Inc.</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane Civic Theatre</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaCrosse Community Theatre, Inc.</td>
<td>LaCrosse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Mary College</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Players of Sheboygan</td>
<td>Sheboygan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wyoming
University of Wyoming Laramie
1970 MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

AMERICAN PLAYWRIGHTS THEATRE

* Denotes Production of *The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham-Southern College</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens College</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Cabrillo Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Fresno State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Fullerton Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of Calif. at Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of Southern Calif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menlo Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Modesto Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasadena Playhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Univ. of Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of Calif. at Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Santa Barbara State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The Santa Monica Theatre Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Old Globe Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States International Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Univ. of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* San Jose State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Joaquin Delta College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*American Playwrights Theatre. *The Night Thoreau Spent In Jail* Production File. APT Collection. Note: Not all of the producers of the play are included on this list as some producers were 1971 members.
California (cont.)
* Stockton Civic Theatre  Stockton
* Rio Hondo Junior College  Whittier

Colorado
  Ft. Lewis College  Durango
  Colorado State Univ.  Ft. Collins
* Colorado State College  Greeley
  Western State College  Gunnison

Connecticut
  University of Connecticut  Storrs

Washington, District of Columbia
  The American University  Washington, D.C.
* Arena Stage  Washington, D.C.

Florida
  Univ. of South Florida  Tampa

Georgia
  The Pocket Theatre  Atlanta
* Alliance Theatre Company  Atlanta

Hawaii
* University of Hawaii
  Mallory Players  Honolulu
  Kailua

Idaho
* University of Idaho  Moscow

Illinois
* Goodman Memorial Theatre  Chicago
* Northern Illinois University  DeKalb
* Kendall College  Evanston
* Bradley University  Peoria
  University of Illinois  Urbana
* Theatre of Western Springs  Western Springs

Indiana
  Evansville Civic Theatre  Evansville
  University of Evansville  Evansville
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>Cedar Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>Decorah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Des Moines Community Playhouse</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>* Wichita State University</td>
<td>Wichita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>* University of Louisville</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Gallery Circle Theatre</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le Petit Theatre Du Vieux Carre</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Centenary College</td>
<td>Shreveport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>* University of Maine</td>
<td>Orono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loeb Drama Center, Harvard Univ.</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The Concord Players</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Junior College</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Holy Cross</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Ford Community College</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Wayne State University</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Rapids Civic Theatre</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Northern Michigan University</td>
<td>Marquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Muskegon Community Theatre</td>
<td>Muskegon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>University of Minnesota, Duluth</td>
<td>Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mankato State University</td>
<td>Mankato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* University of Minnesota, Minneapolis</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia College</td>
<td>Moorhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorhead State College</td>
<td>Moorhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Hamline University</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
<td>St. Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Mesabi State Jr. College</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mississippi
    New Stage Theatre    Jackson

Missouri
* Southeast Missouri State College    Cape Girardeau
* Williams Woods College    Fulton
  Southwest Missouri State College    Springfield
  Webster College    St. Louis

Montana
* Montana State College    Bozeman

New Hampshire
  Dartmouth    Hanover

New Jersey
* Fairleigh Dickinson University    Madison
* Seton Hall University    South Orange
  Trenton State College    Trenton

New Mexico
* Eastern New Mexico University    Portales
  New Mexico Inst. of Mining & Technology    Socorro

New York
  State Univ. of New York, Binghamton    Binghamton
* State University College, Brockport    Brockport
* State University College, Fredonia    Fredonia
  Adelphi University    Garden City
* State Univ. College of Arts and Sciences    Genesco
  Colgate University    Hamilton
  Hofstra University    Hempstead
  Plays and Players, Inc.    Jericho
* State University College, New Paltz    New Paltz
  National Shakespeare College    New York
  State University College, Oneonta    Oneonta
* Rochester Community Players, Inc.    Rochester
  Syracuse University    Syracuse

North Carolina
  University of North Carolina    Chapel Hill
* The Mint Museum Drama Guild    Charlotte
* Western Carolina University    Cullowhee
* University of North Carolina    Greensboro
* East Carolina University    Greenville
* North Carolina Wesleyan College    Rocky Mount
Ohio
* Weathervane Community Playhouse, Inc. Akron
* Ohio University Athens
* Baldwin-Wallace College Berea
* Bowling Green State University Bowling Green
* University of Cincinnati Cincinnati
  Cuyahoga Community College Cleveland
* Ohio State University Columbus
* Ohio Wesleyan Delaware
  Denison University Granville
* Hiram College Hiram
* Kent State University Kent
  Lakewood Little Theatre Lakewood
  Lake Erie College Painesville
* Wittenburg University Springfield
  The College of Wooster Wooster

Oklahoma
  Oklahoma City University Oklahoma City
* Oklahoma State University Stillwater

Oregon
* University of Oregon Eugene

Pennsylvania
* Erie Civic Theatre Erie
  Harrisburg Community Theatre Harrisburg
  Bucknell University Lewisburg
  Allegheny College Meadville
  Hedgerow Theatre and School Moylan
  Bucks County Community College Newton
  University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia
* Temple University Philadelphia
  Carnegie-Mellon Inst. of Technology Pittsburgh
  Reading Community Club, Inc. Reading
  Players Club of Swarthmore Swarthmore
  York Little Theatre, Inc. York

South Dakota
* University of South Dakota Vermillion

Tennessee
* Maryville College Maryville
  Scarritt College Players Nashville
* The Oakridge Community Playhouse Oakridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>* McMurray College</td>
<td>Abilene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East Texas State University</strong></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Dallas Theatre Center</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>University of Texas at El Paso</strong></td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Texas Christian University</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Southwestern University</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Alley Theatre</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Midland Community Theatre</td>
<td>Midland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Trinity University</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>* University of Utah</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>* University of Virginia</td>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performing Arts Center of Virginia</strong></td>
<td>Toano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>* Western Washington University</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>University of Washington</strong></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Green Bay</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Mary College</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Players of Sheboygan</td>
<td>Sheboygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>* University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Laramie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>Anchorage Community Theatre Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix College Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* University of Arizona</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>California State Univ., Fresno Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Company of Angels</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>California State College Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Menlo Players Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td>Modesto Junior College Modesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>Univ. of Redlands Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>* Old Globe Theatre San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose State College San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Santa Monica Theatre Guild Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Santa Monica Junior College Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Stockton Civic Theatre Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>Rio Hondo Junior College Whittier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucaipa</td>
<td>* Crafton Hills College Yucaipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury, Ontario</td>
<td>Laurentian University Sudbury, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* American Playwrights Theatre. *The Last Meeting of the Knights of the White Magnolia* Production File. APT Collection. Note: Not all of the producers of the play are included on this list as some producers were 1975 members.
Colorado
- Bonfils Theatre, Denver
- Mesa College, Grand Junction
- Colorado State College, Greeley
- Western State College, Gunnison

Washington, District of Columbia
- * Arena Stage, Washington, D.C.

Florida
- Jacksonville University, Jacksonville
- Florida International University, Miami

Georgia
- LaGrange College, La Grange

Idaho
- University of Idaho, Moscow

Illinois
- Northern Illinois University, DeKalb
- Bradley University, Peoria
- University of Illinois, Urbana
- Theatre of Western Springs, Western Springs

Indiana
- Booth Tarkington Civic Theatre, Indianapolis
- * Indiana Repertory Theatre, Indianapolis
- University of Evansville, Evansville

Iowa
- University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls
- Community Theatre of Cedar Rapids, Cedar Rapids
- Luther College, Decorah
- Des Moines Community Playhouse, Des Moines
- Waterloo Community Playhouse, Waterloo

Kansas
- Wichita State University, Wichita

Kentucky
- Eastern Kentucky University, Bowling Green
- University of Kentucky, Lexington
- * Actors Theatre of Louisville, Louisville
Louisiana
Le Petit Theatre Du Vieux Carre
Centenary College

Maine
University of Maine at Gorham

Massachusetts
Bridgewater State College
Loeb Drama Center, Harvard Univ.
Garrett Players, Inc.

Michigan
Ferris Playhouse
Marygrove College Univ. of Detroit
Wayne State University
University of Michigan, Flint
Grand Rapids Civic Theatre
Muskegon Community Theatre
West Shore Community College

Minnesota
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Moorhead State College
Hamline University
Gustavus Adolphus College
* Mesabi State Jr. College

Missouri
Southeast Missouri State College
Williams Woods College
* University of Missouri-Kansas City
Southwest Missouri State College

Montana
Montana State College

Nebraska
University of Nebraska at Omaha

New Hampshire
Dartmouth

New Jersey
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Trenton State College
New York
State Univ. of New York, Binghamton
State University College, Brockport
State University College, Fredonia
Plays and Players, Inc.
State University College, New Paltz
Rochester Community Players, Inc.

North Carolina
University of North Carolina
The Mint Museum Drama Guild
Western Carolina University
East Carolina University
North Carolina School of the Arts

Ohio
Weathervane Community Playhouse, Inc.
Baldwin-Wallace College
Bowling Green State University
Cuyahoga Community College
* Ohio State University
Ohio Wesleyan
Wright State University
Denison University
Kent State University
Lakewood Little Theatre
Miami University
Lake Erie College
Wittenburg University
The College of Wooster

Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma

Pennsylvania
Bloomsburg State College
Bucknell University
Allegheny College
Hedgerow Theatre and School
Temple University
Slippery Rock State College
The Pennsylvania State University
York Little Theatre, Inc.

South Carolina
Converse College
Tennessee
  Maryville College  Maryville
  Memphis State College  Memphis
* The Oakridge Community Playhouse  Oakridge

Texas
  West Texas State University  Canyon
* Dallas Theatre Center  Dallas
  Texas Christian University  Fort Worth
  Southwestern University  Georgetown
  University of Houston  Houston
* Midland Community Theatre  Midland
* Trinity University  San Antonio
  Sherman Community Players  Sherman

Utah
  Utah State University  Logan
  University of Utah  Salt Lake City

Virginia
  University of Virginia  Charlottesville

Washington
  Western Washington University  Bellingham
  Yakima Valley College  Yakima

Wisconsin
  Marian College of Fond Du Lac  Fond Du Lac

Wyoming
  University of Wyoming  Laramie
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