“DOMINIC: You know Amy’s view: you have to love people. You just have to love them. You have to give love without any conditions at all…”

David Hare, Amy’s View

It is 1979, Esme Allen is a well-known London stage actress. As the play begins, her daughter, Amy, and Amy’s boyfriend, Dominic, visit Esme. Dominic aspires to make action movies while Esme prefers to work in the theatre. Both mother and boyfriend view the other’s aspirations with disdain. To say that Dominic and Esme do not hit it off is an understatement and Amy, who loves them both, finds herself cast as the go-between over the years. As the play progresses toward 1995, we witness Dominic’s rise to prominence in television and film while Esme’s fortunes decline. The play is a rich, complicated look at mother-daughter relationships, money and morality, art and society, and love and loss.

“They know and do not know, what it is to act or suffer,
They know and do not know, that acting is suffering.”

David Hare was born in Sussex, England on June 5, 1947. Hare attended Lancing College and Jesus College in Cambridge. After graduating from Cambridge in 1968 with an honors M.A. in English, Hare briefly worked for the film company A.B. Pathe before co-founding the Portable Theatre Company with Tony Bicat. Portable Theatre, a touring, experimental theatre group, became a leader in the fringe theatre movement. Hare wrote his first plays for Portable Theatre and served as its director from 1968-1971. He also served as literary manager of the Royal Court Theatre from 1969-1970 and as its resident dramatist from 1970-1971.

David Hare’s first major play, Slag (1970), won him the Evening Standard Drama Award for most promising new playwright. Like Slag, The Great Exhibition (1972) viewed the failure of contemporary English society to change or accomplish anything. In 1972, Hare became resident dramatist at Nottingham Playhouse. Brassneck, which Hare wrote with Howard Brenton, was produced there that same year. At the same time, Hare co-founded the Joint Stock Theatre Group with David Aukin and Max Stafford-Clark, and he served as director there from 1975-1980. Knuckle (1974), the first of Hare’s plays to be produced in London’s West End, received the John Llewellyn Rhys Memorial Award; Hare was the first dramatist to win this award, which is the second oldest literary award in Britain and is given to the best work of fiction, poetry, drama or non-fiction by an author under age 35.

Hare’s first plays had established the importance of social and political issues in his work but with Knuckle, he shifted from contemporary satire toward what he calls his “history” plays. Hare’s plays usually present a romantic relationship between members of the middle class and use the decline and corruption of the characters’ careers, relationships and idealism to reflect historical events.

In Fanshen (1975), based on the book by William Hinton, Hare looked at the process of revolution. As a Joint Stock production, Fanshen was a collective effort in which actors collaborated with the writer, improvising and discussing the text at workshops and rehearsals. With Teeth ‘N’ Smiles (1975), Hare returned to an examination of the state of post-World War II English society, which he sees as dominated by dishonesty and corruption. A collaboration with Nick and Tony Bicat, it was Hare’s only play to premiere at the Royal Court Theatre. Plenty was produced in 1978 and was his first original play at the National Theatre. The play, about a woman who served in the French Resistance during World War II but finds only disillusionment in post-war Britain, shows the inability of people to effect change. A Map of the World (1983) expands to a global perspective and uses the device of a play within a play. Pravda (1985), co-written with Howard Brenton, is a scathing attack on the press. In The Secret Rapture, a Margaret Thatcher-like Member of Parliament takes advantage of her sister’s goodness with tragic consequences. A trilogy on institutions, Racing Demon (1990), Murmuring Judges (1991) and Absence of War (1993), look at religion, the legal system and political parties respectively. Skylight (1995) is less directly political, focusing on the failed relationship between two lovers who meet again. The Blue Room (1998) is a sexual romp adapted from Arthur Schnitzler’s La Ronde, while The Judas Kiss (1998) considers the fate of Oscar Wilde.

In addition to directing his own plays, Hare has directed such works as The Pleasure Principle (1973), The Party (1974), Weapons of Happiness (1976) and Devil’s Island (1977). Hare also directed a production of King Lear at the National Theatre in 1986 with Anthony Hopkins as Lear. Hare became associate director at the National Theatre in 1984 and has also been a member of the council of the English Stage Company.

Hare has written teleplays for the BBC. Licking Hitler (1978) used a World War II setting to examine the pervasiveness of lies in English culture. In Dreams of Leaving (1980) the main character’s loss of idealism leads to despair and madness. Saigon: the Year of the Cat (1983) is about the Vietnam War and again juxtaposes personal lives with historical events. Heading Home (1991) is about a woman looking back at choices she made that led to her life of loneliness.

David Hare has also written several screenplays and even founded Greenpoint Films in 1982. Among his screenplays are Plenty (1985), Wetherby (1985), Strapless (1989), Paris by Night (1989) and Damage (1992).

Hare married theatrical agent Margaret Mathieson in 1970; divorced in 1980, he married designer Nicole Farhi in 1992. She encouraged him to visit Israel and that became the topic of his one-man play, Via Dolorosa (1999).
The art of motherhood—requires finding that delicate balance between involvement with and disengagement from one’s children, between holding and letting go,” writes Evelyn Bassoff in her book, Mothers and Daughters: Loving and Letting Go.1 Amy has accepted the fact that her mother, as an actress, will not always be available and responsive. It seems that the same is true for Esme—until Dominic enters the picture. Esme views Dominic as a threat. He is critical of her lifestyle. Also, Esme believes that Amy loves Dominic far more than he loves her, which alarms her. Consequently, Esme, according to Bassoff, becomes the Critic mom. “The Critic finds fault with the men in your life, up to and including your husband.” 2 We have no knowledge if Esme has always been critical of her daughter, but Esme can be selfish, possessive and judgmental of others. If Amy is the product of the Critic mom, she will probably be noncompetitive and avoid any desire for power or control. She may become the kind of woman who “lends her credit cards to the wrong guys, is always chauffeuring people to airports…and spends hours on the phone negotiating spats between friends. She believes that people will love her only if she serves their needs.” 3

Amy is a “Connector,” according to Cloud and Townsend in The Mom Factor.4 She has the great strength to bond and to empathize. With this quality, she “feels the pain of others. (She) senses the depth of others’ struggle, and she knows what they need…” 5 Thus, according to Cloud and Townsend, Amy enables Dominic to be what he wants to be—loutish or loving, fascinating and philandering. In effect, she becomes the mother he never had. However, she cannot mother Esme in her time of need. In wanting everyone to get along, Amy is torn between the love for her mother and her passion for Dominic.

The playwright, David Hare, says: “I’ve written about women a lot because my subject has often been goodness. The idea of men being good seems to me to be slightly silly.” 6 Though his women may be good, Esme is overbearing, but Hare believes the audience will connect with such overbearing characters because they are intrigued by the choices a modern woman is making. He also believes women “know what’s going on, because they’re sensitized beings; they are more susceptible to life’s vicissitudes than men.” 7 In many of Hare’s plays, the action concerns the loss of ideals, and “it’s women who usually have the ideals in the first place.” 8 Perhaps, it is Amy’s ideal that everyone should love one another that conflicts with Esme’s ideal of refinement, personal responsibility and taste. Their mother-daughter relationship is mature and strong, but it weakens under the strain of Dominic.

“Daughter am I in my mother’s house,  
But mistress in my own.”  
Rudyard Kipling, Our Lady of the Snows
THE DISASTER AT LLOYD’S
Esme’s Financial Downfall

In the late 17th century, sailors flocked to Edward Lloyd’s coffeehouse, near the Thames waterfront in London, to gossip, play cards and conduct business. Edward Lloyd sold them coffee at a penny a cup. Pens, ink and paper were free, as was the news, provided by Lloyd’s runners who ran back and forth between the coffeehouse and the docks gathering the latest information on the voyages of ships and their cargoes.

In those days of sail, ships were often lost or wrecked and merchants ruined. Although ship and cargo insurance can be traced back to the Phoenicians, it was at Lloyd’s coffeehouse that modern marine insurance was born. “A shipowner would write on a slip of paper the particulars of a proposed voyage—the name, route and ports of call of a vessel, the value of its hull and cargo and the amount he was willing to pay for ‘insurance.’ Other customers, many of them ship owners themselves, would then decide how much, if any, of the risk they were willing to accept in exchange for the premium. An ‘insurer’ would write his name on the ship owner’s slip under the shipping information (hence the term underwriter).”

Although risky, the business was profitable. Investors formed groups called “syndicates” to back underwriters. By 1771, larceny and betting threatened to overwhelm legitimate business. That year, 79 of the most serious underwriters broke away and established a formal association. Though Edward Lloyd was long dead, his name stuck.

Lloyd’s came of age insuring ships during a succession of wars culminating in the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815. War drove the premiums up. Many ships were sunk and much money was lost, but the skilled underwriters became rich and Lloyd’s grew in size and importance. By the 19th century, its runners had become a worldwide network of intelligence agents, used not only by Lloyd’s for ship monitoring but also by the British government for a variety of economic and military intelligence—a phenomenon that nurtured a reputation for mystery and secrecy at Lloyd’s.

In 1906 after the San Francisco earthquake, Cuthbert Evan Heath, a leading broker and underwriter for Lloyd’s, telegraphed instructions to his California representatives to immediately pay all claims to Lloyd’s customers in full, whatever the terms of their policies. Heath’s dramatic gesture, at a time when U.S. insurers were nickel-and-diming the quake victims, marked Lloyd’s as an emblem of trust in world finance.

Lloyd’s earned for the British balance of payments nearly as much as the entire British banking system. It was the largest private investor in the U.S. government. It was also a cultural and social force. Lloyd’s was so well known in America that in 1936, it was celebrated in a Hollywood movie starring Tyrone Power. By the middle of the 20th century, having passed its 250th birthday, Lloyd’s of London was a powerful force, with name recognition and stature unmatched by any other business enterprise.

Lloyd’s was also unique in structure. Unlike normal publicly held companies whose shareholders could vary the size of their investment (and thus their financial risk), Lloyd’s was backed by investors called Names. A would-be Name was sponsored by an existing Name and had to demonstrate a net worth (in near liquid assets) equal to at least one million dollars. A Name joined one or more syndicates (groups of Names) headed by an underwriter. After assembling the funds his Names had agreed to invest, the underwriter sold insurance policies to clients, collected their premiums and, when necessary, paid their claims.

Although the Names’ investments are equal to the amount of insurance coverage they agree to finance, they are required to post in advance, or pledge, only 30 per cent of that amount usually in the form of securities, a letter of credit or a bank guarantee. Thus, Names have several opportunities for financial gain. They earn a profit when premiums exceed claims; they earn money when premiums draw investment income; and they enjoy income from funds pledged but not actually made available to Lloyd’s.

There is, of course, a catch, a risk that claims might
exceed premiums. And that risk is multiplied many times over by one important factor: a Name incurs unlimited liability for the risk he or she underwrites. Thus, a huge claim can drain a Name of all of his or her assets as Lloyd’s Names were told, tongue in cheek, when they signed on. But in recent history, thousands of Names were to discover that unlimited liability means just what it says.

The Lloyd’s disaster began in 1969 when a dying insulation installer, Clarence Borel, filed a lawsuit in Federal District Court in Beaumont, Texas against 11 asbestos insulation manufacturers. He accused them of knowing the health hazards of asbestos installation and failing to warn anyone of them. Four years later, a Federal Appeals Court ruled that the companies were liable for damages. Lawsuit followed lawsuit, eventually damage awards soared into the billions of dollars and threatened the financial viability of asbestos companies. The companies carried liability insurance, but not enough for such contingencies. The insurer of last resort - the most exposed to the enormous number of claims - would be Lloyd’s and only a few people grasped the enormity of this situation.

Lloyd’s of London had written liability insurance for American asbestos companies since the 1930s; the policies were still in effect and they were generally unlimited. There were no maximum amounts where the insurance stopped paying and no diseases were excluded from the coverage. The potential damage awards and Lloyd’s involvement were limitless.

“To bolster Lloyd’s capital base, Lloyd’s agents began to recruit new Names in 1973” [four years after the first asbestos suit was filed]. The number of Names zoomed beyond 7,000 in the early 70s to 14,000 in 1978 and reached over 34,000 by the late 1980s.”

After nearly three centuries of secretive, discreet, one-by-one recruitment in Great Britain, Lloyd’s agents flew all over the world, especially to North America, extolling the exclusivity of Lloyd’s and the promise of secure investments to those who qualified for membership. According to many of these new recruits, “Lloyd’s sales pitch promised not only risk-free profits, but also the opportunity to join this elite, prestigious society which had existed for 300 years and whose membership included titled British aristocrats.”

Investors were recruited in posh clubs by well-dressed gentlemen who lied to them about the risks of Lloyd’s investments, especially the losses likely to be incurred by the huge asbestos claims as well as environmental damage at sites such as Love Canal. They were led to believe the “unlimited liability clause in their contracts - was a mere formality, part of an initiation rite into an exclusive club.”

Lloyd’s was able to perpetuate this scheme because of their financial system. Instead of figuring profits and losses and closing the books at the end of each year as other businesses do, a Lloyd’s syndicate waits two additional years to account for unresolved or disputed claims. At the end of the third year, the underwriter balances the accounts, estimates the size of unresolved claims and sets aside money to cover them. Unresolved claims can also be reinsured if another syndicate is willing to take them on. However, if these claims are still too numerous or large at the end of the third year to allow the books to close, the underwriter can leave his syndicate’s books open until all claims are covered, even if that takes many years. When asbestos claims began arriving at Lloyd’s, underwriters knew it would take longer than three years to resolve them. From the late 1970s onward, asbestos claims more than doubled each year. Estimates of eventual claims went beyond $100 billion, far exceeding Lloyd’s total reserves and the Names’ combined assets. It is alleged that Lloyd’s masked its losses through creative accounting.

The alleged cover-up, devised by Lloyd’s insiders, was a two-part process. First, in order to post current “profits,” they used funds, which should have been earmarked for reserves against future asbestos claims. Secondly, they formed new Lloyd’s syndicates with newly recruited Names who were unaware of the asbestos problem and had these new Names reinsure the old syndicates. In effect, the old Names (usually Lloyd’s insiders) passed the liability for tremendous potential claims to new Names, some of whom had not been told what they were reinsuring. A letter was drafted informing the Names of the disastrous circumstances, but it was never sent because Lloyd’s insiders feared the information would panic the market and destroy the institution. Meanwhile, on July 23, 1982, Parliament (unknowingly) passed an act giving Lloyd’s its exemption from lawsuits. “It could be held liable for damages only if a plaintiff could prove ‘bad faith’ which is difficult to establish under English law where the ‘buyer beware’ principle is more firmly established than in the U.S.”

In addition, in 1986, Lloyd’s added a clause to its contract with investors which said any legal dispute over investments would have to be resolved in England under English law. Conveniently, foreign investors were not told that Lloyd’s was protected from lawsuits other than bad faith lawsuits in England by Parliament’s act of 1982.

The first sign of trouble bubbled up in June 1991, when Lloyd’s reported a loss of $980 million for 1988 from asbestos and pollution claims (remember the three year delay). In 1989, they declared a loss of $3.85 billion as a result of disasters ranging from the Exxon Valdez oil spill to Hurricane Hugo and the San Francisco earthquake. Nineteen-ninety was even worse with a loss of $4.4 billion.

When investors received cash calls averaging $600,000 instead of dividend checks, angry Names began lawsuits alleging fraud against Lloyd’s and principal officers, underwriters, bankers and agents. Suits brought in California and New York accused not only Lloyd’s, but also 100 other individuals of other companies. Efforts to compute the amount of the alleged swindle ranged from $15 billion to $23.8 billion for the years 1988-92. American Names complained to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, which began an inquiry in 1991. In England, the fraud squad of Scotland
Yard and the City of London police were called in. The flood of reports charging fraud overwhelmed the police, which turned them over to the Serious Fraud office, a unit of the British government that prosecutes financial crimes. As the Lloyd’s losses mounted, law enforcement officials and US judges investigated and found serious wrongdoing at Lloyd’s.

The John Major government in 1995 rejected a request for a broader, deeper investigation. In the U.S., the 11 states that sued Lloyd’s were unable to receive satisfaction because of the stipulation that legal disputes must be resolved in England. However, in 1996, Lloyd’s concocted a settlement called Reconstruction and Renewal, to assuage angry Names. It consisted of two parts. First, Lloyd’s established a reinsurance company called Equitas to take responsibility for all pre-1993 obligations, including asbestos and pollution claims. Secondly, the Name’s pre-1993 obligations would be reduced and capped if the Names agreed to pay the reduced obligations and withdraw all claims against Lloyd’s. The game plan to many seemed to be: “Force the Names to pay now so as to drain them of the funds to sue later.”

But the settlement was too late for many. Many ruined Names will not have the chance to rebuild their lives because they are over age 58 and their resources are gone. Moreover, “at a recent Annual General Meeting, a Name called for a moment of silence for the 34 people who had committed suicide as a result of their losses at Lloyd’s. … Literally, thousands of people have much less to live for and much more to regret.”

In February 2000, a case began against Lloyd’s. The United Names Organization, a group that refused to settle their asbestos related debts with Lloyd’s because they claim they are the victims of a massive swindle, filed the lawsuit. They alleged that Lloyd’s duped them into becoming Names by fraudulently misrepresenting their profits and concealing the losses of the asbestos claims. Furthermore, they claim this massive fraud was not the work of just a few underwriters, but was masterminded and operated by the Lloyd’s hierarchy itself. Called the Jaffray case, the name of one of the dissidents, it is filed in English court with English barristers.

At present, Lloyd’s share of the global insurance market has fallen from 10% at the beginning of the 20th century to less than 2% today. The number of Names has diminished from a high of 34,000 ten years ago to fewer than 5,000 today. The losses continue, with Moody’s Investor Service predicting that Lloyd’s will lose $400 million this year.

Lloyd’s itself exudes confidence. A recent brochure, Priorities for Growth, 2000-2003, says: “Our future vision is of a Society containing strong, well-managed, increasingly independent businesses operating to very high standards, sharing in the collective assets we describe as the Lloyd’s franchise.” But before this bright prediction can happen, Lloyd’s must face the most serious threat ever to its existence.

Postscript: From Time November 13, 2000 pp. 65-66. After one of the biggest and most complex 20-week courtroom battles brought against Lloyd’s by Names who refused to participate in the Reconstruction and Renewal Settlement, Lloyd’s received a verdict of not guilty of defrauding investors. Because of Lloyd’s immunity to anything other than “bad faith” or fraud, the Names were unable to bring a suit for the crime of negligence. The Names failed to prove to the satisfaction of the judge that Lloyd’s itself had committed fraud. “More specifically the judge rejected the allegation that Lloyd’s Council was aware that exposure to asbestos-related claims required reserves ‘far in excess’ of those reported in Lloyd’s accounts.” But the judge did go on to say, “the catalog of failings and incompetence in the 1980s by underwriters, managing agents, members’ agents and others…is staggering (and brought disgrace on one of the City’s great markets).” The judge further suggested that Lloyd’s seek “fair, overall settlement with the dissidents…” "Few Names were stunned by the result. Some saw the decision as a typical example of the Establishment protecting itself. Others…will seek to battle on. They are emboldened by the recent entry into force of the European Convention on Human Rights, which they claim allows Lloyd’s to be sued for negligence in lieu of fraud.”

One has only to guess how people now view Lloyd’s motto “Uberrima Fides (Utmost Good Faith).”
THE DECLINE OF CULTURE

“Art is a human activity having for its purpose the transmission to others of the highest and best feelings to which men have risen.”
Leo Nikolaevich Tolstoi, What is Art? (1898)

In the play, Dominic has strong feelings about art and culture. He says: “We all know art is encrusted in snobbery. People feel frightened. The arts establishment tries to make them feel cowed. —So we [the television medium] say to them: ‘Don’t be bullied. Just follow your own instincts. Don’t let anyone dictate to you. Make up your own minds.’” 17 Like Dominic, many perceive art and culture to be an intellectual activity, something one aspires to understand and appreciate. It exists in a rarified atmosphere; it is not an easily accessible or a vital part of our everyday lives. This is where the conflict arises between high culture (that of the upper classes) and popular culture. “You were elitist if you created works of art and you were elitist if you bought them,” writes Robert Brustein in his essay The Decline of Serious Culture. “Love of art was perceived in some quarters as equivalent to being indifferent to suffering, inequality and injustice. These implications of callousness — caused a major retreat — the surrender of many of the standards and values that make a serious culture possible.” 18

Attacks on elitism began with the division between “high art” and “low art.” In the 18th century, there was little distinction between high and popular music, but in the early 19th century, under the influence of the Romantic Movement, with its idea of “genius” on one hand and “folk” on the other, the schism began. Thus, “German classical music came to be seen as high art [Kultur], while other forms of composed music [Italian opera, for example] or virtuoso performances [soon to be embodied in Franz Liszt] were seen as ‘popular’ entertainment.” 19 Such differences became permanent within what now is called the music industry: the “popular” music crowd going for novelty, stars and clubs; the “art” music public going to orchestra and chamber music concerts. This distinction has also carried over to theatre, poetry and literature, etc.

While some commentators decry the lowering of cultural standards, Michael Kammen suggests that the current trend is a mixing and blurring of taste levels. In his book, American Culture, American Tastes, he differentiates between high and popular culture. “High culture is expected to connect humankind to its finest past achievements, whereas popular culture provides more ephemeral access to amusement and experiences across class lines in the here and now. High culture is meant to create as well as preserve. The objective of popular and mass culture is not enduring excellence, but pleasure and commercial appeal.” 20

The problem of our declining culture/taste lies in the difference between cultural authority and cultural power. “Cultural expertise as a social force conveyed by people who function as authorities has the capacity to bestow legitimacy and respectability upon a cultural custom or product.” 21 Cultural power, on the other hand, “involves the production, promotion and dissemination of cultural artifacts.” 22 Critics and museums wield the cultural authority more often than not, whereas movie studios, television and advertising agencies exert the cultural power. With the passage of time, however, significant changes have happened. A professional class of cultural experts emerged before the turn of the century and in the period from 1910 to 1940. After World War II, academic scholars enjoyed a degree of cultural authority, but that trend has reversed since 1970. “Ordinary people — the consumers of cultural artifacts — have steadily increased their own cultural authority, especially in the last 40 years or so.” 23 Consequently, a film, a rock group, or a play may be a success at the box office even though dismissed by the critics. Conversely, what the critics admire may go unnoticed by the public. Thus, cultural expertise is not the influence it once was.

The marked decline of cultural authority during the late 20th century has been a combined result of corporate power and cultural democracy. Mass media, television and technology have brought a change in attitude; the impact of satellite communication has altered the taste patterns of people everywhere. And what are the consequences of this situation? There has been “an increase in cultural populism accompanied by a decline in elitism, but also a loss of guidance in raising cultural taste.” 24 So, is Dominic’s show a harbinger of future cultural achievements or the lack of them?

“Nouveau
And yesterday’s forgotten
And you can’t tell good from rotten
And today it’s all a matter of promotion
But then - you can’t divide art today.”
Stephen Sondheim, “Putting it Together,” Sunday in the Park with George
THE ACTRESS WHO CREATED ESME: DAME JUDITH DENCH

“At the end of David Hare’s Amy’s View, when Judi Dench as the actress Esme is about to perform in the play within the play and utters her final line—‘So we’re alone’—she invokes the universal feeling among actors: elation, mixed with terror and peppered with apprehension.” Brien Cox, “The Lonely Elation of the Monologuist.” New York Times. May 16,1999

In 1999, Dame Judi Dench was awarded her first Tony Award for her portrayal of Esme in Amy’s View. Though not a surprising accolade for an actress who has garnered over 20 awards in her native England, Dench said, “It’s extraordinary to come to a country where two years ago I wasn’t even known. And suddenly this happens…it is a surreal experience.” The previous year, Dench won her first Academy Award for Best Supporting Actress for the film, Shakespeare in Love. American audiences were suddenly aware of this British actress whose career has spanned more than 40 years with some of the best theatre companies in the world. Her stage career has defined her as one of England’s leading actresses and Dench, like Esme, has performed in all media. Dench confesses that theatre is her first love, but her roles in television and film have made her an international success.

Dench met David Hare in 1981 when she was cast in his television drama Saigon - Year of the Cat, a production that met insurmountable difficulties. As Hare said, “It could not have been a more difficult shoot. It would have tried anybody and it showed her to be such an extraordinarily good character, as well as a wonderful actress...” Hare kept Dench in mind for future projects, such as the film Wetherby which he wrote and directed. When he had completed half of the script for Amy’s View, he told Dench he had a role that suited her. Knowing Dench’s reputation for accepting parts without reading the entire script, Hare admits writing the final act with Dench in mind.

Though Dench’s professional life parallels Esme’s career, she reported having a difficult time creating the role. “I think I’m more adventurous than she [Esme] is. She’s of the old school, when the West End was full of straight plays.” One area in which Dench could identify with Esme was her belief in the importance of theatre. “It’s absolutely vital,” she says. “Theatre is live communication with other people. You’ve got to think that every night there is a whole group out there and they need to be told a story.”
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ACTIVITIES

LANGUAGE ARTS

Students apply thinking skills to their reading, writing, speaking, listening and viewing.
*Colorado Model Content Standard: Reading and Writing #4*

Students know how culture and experience influence people’s perceptions of places and regions.
*Colorado Model Content Standard: Geography #2.3*

1. Although *Amy’s View* is written in English and takes place in an English-speaking country, many aspects of the play are location-specific. For example, the English use words and phrases that are not common to Americans; the play also describes places and events in English history that are unfamiliar to most American audiences.

Imagine you have been given the task of “translating” the play to an American setting. Make a list of things from the play (words, phrases, pronouns, events, etc.) that you would need to change and how you could place them in America. For example, rather than the West End, maybe Esme would be a seasoned Broadway actress living in upstate New York.

After completing this task, make a list of the aspects of the play that you would not change: the themes, plot events, relationships, characters, etc. Compare the two lists. Why are some things location-specific while others are universal? What is the difference? How does the setting of a play affect, or not affect the story? What would you identify as the universal themes of the play?

Students read and recognize literature as a record of human experience.
*Colorado Model Content Standard: Reading and Writing #6*

2. One of the central conflicts of *Amy’s View* is the relationship between Esme and Dominic. The source of friction for the two characters stems from opposing value systems: one represents the modern, technological generation while the other symbolizes tradition and established convention.

Select one of the character’s views and analyze what their position might be for the following topics:
- City life versus Rural life.
- Popular culture versus High culture in the entertainment industry.
- Change versus Tradition in relationships and marriage.

In a debate format, defend either Esme or Dominic’s position on one of the topics. After you have defended one of the character’s positions, analyze your own opinions and values in terms of tradition, relationships, change, culture, etc. What in your life has affected your beliefs? How do your values impact the decisions you make, the way you live your life?

Students write and speak for a variety of purposes and audiences.
*Colorado Model Content Standard: Reading and Writing #2*

Students understand and apply the creative process to fundamental skills of acting, playwriting and directing.
*Colorado Model Content Standard: Theatre #2*

3. An actor’s job is to create a character out of the facts presented in the play and what s/he can surmise about the character’s life. Sometimes an actor will perform character development activities to help him/her know or understand the character better.

Select one of the characters from the play and complete the following character development exercises:
- List the facts that you know about the character from the play (e.g. age, gender, occupation, where they live, etc.)
- List adjectives that describe the personality traits of the character using their actions and language from the play.

Next, review your list of facts about the character and use your imagination to answer the following questions as the character would:
- What is your favorite color? What kind of music do you listen to? What animal best represents you? What are your hobbies? What things do you dislike doing? Who in the play do you feel closest to? Who in the play is your nemesis?

After completing your character development, discuss how these questions would affect your performance? How would the character walk? What would s/he wear? How would they sound when they speak? Try walking or saying a phrase as your character and letting your class/audience guess who you are portraying.

Students apply knowledge of the past to analyze present-day issues and events from multiple, historically objective perspectives.
*Colorado Model Content Standards: History #2.3*
4. Amy’s View was the title of Amy’s editorial publication that expressed her view of certain issues and events. Select and read an article from the editorial section of a current newspaper. What is the issue that the editor is analyzing? What are the opinions of the editor regarding the matter? Do you agree or disagree with the editor’s position? Write a letter in response to the article defending your view of the situation.

MATHEMATICS

Students develop number sense and use numbers and number relationships in problem-solving situations and communicate the reasoning used in solving these problems. Colorado Model Content Standard: Mathematics #1

1. Esme’s attempt to invest her money has disastrous consequences. You do not have a lot of money to invest but you wish to invest it wisely. A bank is offering an opportunity for you to accumulate money. You begin by putting 10 cents into the bank. For the first month the money is in the bank, it earns nothing, but for every month after that, each 10 cents you have earns 10 cents more in interest.

Each new 10 cents you make must stay a month before earning a dime, just like the original. So, in January you would put in 10 cents, get no extra, and have a total of 10 cents at the end of the month. In February, you would have the original 10 cents and would make 10 cents interest, and so have a total of 20 cents at the end of the month. The money would continue to accumulate in that manner.

Remember, you only put in one dime of your own money – the rest accumulates as a result of the interest it earns.

How much would you have by December 31, 2000, if you put 10 cents in the bank on Jan. 1, 2000?

2. Time is advantageous when saving money. The earlier you begin saving the more money you save. There is also the rule of 72. The rule of 72 says that to find the number of years to double your money at a given interest rate, you just divide the interest rate into 72. For example if you want to know how long it would take $1,000 to double at 8% interest divide 8 into 72 and you would get 9 years.

For simplicity, assume that you start saving at 16 years of age and save $1000. You save this same $1000 until you are 66 years old. How much would you have if the interest rates were: 8% until the money doubles then 9% until the money doubles then 6% until the money doubles then 8% until the money doubles then 6% until the money doubles

For a more complex problem, explore what you would have saved if you saved $1000 a year from age 16 to age 66. How much money will you have?

3. Esme is in a new play and it is sold out on each of the three Saturdays that it is playing. The theatre has 24 rows of seats with 16 seats per row. The Saturday evening ticket price is $25.00. How much money did the theatre take in for ticket sales to these three shows?

For a more complex problem, find what the 3 weeks taking would be if Mondays and Tuesdays are only 65% full, Wednesdays are 75% full, Thursdays are 80% full and Friday’s are 95% full. Sundays are dark; this means it is a day off.

4. A teacher takes her rowdy class to a mini-movie theatre and decides that he would allow no more than two kids in any one row including horizontal, vertical and diagonal rows. Below two kids have already been seated.

Represented by @ in the seating chart, so no more kids are allowed in the corner-to-corner diagonal. How many kids, at most, can sit in the Mini-Movie Theater?

@XXXXX
XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX @

5. The Marquee of the theatre usually lists the main stars of the show. There are five equally important stars. How many different ways are there to list these five names?
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Inside Out is intended for students and teachers but may be enjoyed by audiences of all ages.
Answer Key
1. $23.30
2. $32,000
3. $28,800
4. 12
   @XXXX@
   XX@@XX
   X@XX@X
   X@XX@X
   XX@@XX
   @XXXX@
5. There are $1 \times 2 \times 3 \times 4 \times 5 = 120$ different ways.

Sources
Http://mathforum.com/midpow/
solutions/solution.ehtml?puzzle=36

http://mathforum.com/elempow/
solutions/solution.ehtml?puzzle=12