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In its review of Harley Granville Barker’s production of the *Trojan Women* at the newly opened College of the City of New York stadium in May 1915, the *New York Times* observed: ‘The British are losing 1000 men a day while Hecuba lamented the fall of an ancient city in modern New York.’[[1]](#footnote-1) The newspaper was, of course, not alone in drawing parallels between Euripides’s devastating tale of the sacking of Troy and the scale of death and destruction brought on by World War One. Indeed, it was a connection that Barker and Gilbert Murray – the translator of the play – exploited, where they used Euripides’s words to comment on the horrors that beset Europe.

The time and place of the production was significant: since the outbreak of war the continued neutrality of the United States became increasingly contested, and public opinion was divided as to which side to support. Using various forms of propaganda, pro-Anglo groups worked to emphasise the commonalities between Britain and North America and make clear the brutality of Germany. Barker’s production did just this, opening his audience’s eyes to the harsh reality of war and to the heinous and unjustified actions of the German forces. Yet, it was quite distinct from the rest of the propaganda machine in that it did not herald unquestionably the rights and virtues of the British or simply replicate the nationalistic and jingoistic sentiments that were common parlance at the time. Rather, it served as a warning to the Allied forces as a much as a condemnation of the actions of the Kaiser.

**Crossing the Atlantic**

Prior to the outbreak of war and his trip across the Atlantic, Barker had already carved a position for himself in the London theatre scene as a politically active writer, director and actor. He campaigned tirelessly for a National Theatre in Britain, and his quest to provide an antidote to the dominant ‘star’ system and the long run saw him establish the now legendary seasons at the Court Theatre with partner John Eugene Vedrenne. These seasons, which ran from October 1904 to June 1907, quickly became the home of the New Drama in London, introducing audiences to the work of George Bernard Shaw, Elizabeth Robins and John Galsworthy, among others.

His three Shakespeare productions at the Savoy Theatre between 1912 and 1914 were similarly ground breaking, complete with stripped back, modernist design, a swift unpoetic delivery of the lines and ensemble playing. Although critics were initially reluctant to his iconoclastic approach, his final production – *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* – was heralded a triumph and critics eagerly anticipated his continued journey through Shakespeare’s canon. Britain’s declaration of war on Germany six months later put paid to these plans.

Barker quickly became frustrated by his inability to capitalise on the momentum of the Savoy Shakespeare productions during the enforced break, and became anxious about the future of theatre in Britain.[[2]](#footnote-2) As he explained to George Bernard Shaw, ‘I really cannot sit in England and watch theatrical London crumble around me, so the only thing left for us to do is to make a clean cut of our losses, which, since the war broke out, have been pretty severe.’[[3]](#footnote-3)

Given the rather bleak prospects that he faced, it is not surprising that the offer of staging a season of work for the New York Stage Society was particularly appealing at this time. Not only did the invitation guarantee him a fund of £25,000, but it also gave him the freedom to choose his own company and plays, and offered the promise of establishing in New York what had proved impossible in London, namely, a permanent repertory company. Again, to Shaw, he explained: ‘I come to America to keep flying the flag.’[[4]](#footnote-4).

Barker’s own motives for going were added to by friends, colleagues and figures at the very top of British politics. He and wife Lillah McCarthy enjoyed a close personal relationship with Prime Minister Harold Asquith, who, when hearing of the invitation, applied gentle pressure for them to accept.[[5]](#footnote-5) Not only would it provide a safer outlet for Barker’s frustrations – reminding McCarthy that ‘we don’t want [him] as a soldier’ – but, more significantly, Asquith saw it as invaluable propaganda for the war effort and a chance to promote British interests in the United States.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The neutral position adopted by the U.S. at this time indicated its ambivalent attitude towards Britain and its own position in the war. As a firm believer in the principles of democracy and liberalism, President Woodrow Wilson looked askance at Britain’s blockade of Germany and its use of black list practices to starve the country, both literally and metaphorically. At the same time, as Donald Cameron Watt argues, Wilson foresaw that continued neutrality would have long-term benefits for his country, and that by casting himself in the role of mediator, he – and, in turn, North America – could dictate the final terms of any peace treaty.[[7]](#footnote-7)

 This ambivalence was also reflected in the press of the time. Years before the establishment of the so-called ‘special relationship’, the threat to American commercial interests posed by British competition coupled with the presence of significant German and Irish diasporas living in the States led many to be suspicious of the British cause. While the majority of the newspapers in circulation during the period were either pro-Allied forces or decidedly neutral, there were a number of publications that took a strong pro-German stance, including those that fell under the control of William Randolph Hearst, owner of one of the largest newspaper and magazine empires in the States.[[8]](#footnote-8) Hearst wrote editorials in such newspapers as *New York American* declaring that ‘the war was purely an economic struggle’ and that ‘England and Japan were more menacing to American neutrality than Germany’.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Public discourse surrounding the war was thus a contested space, and pro-Anglo and pro-intervention parties had to convince the American public not only that Britain was its natural ally, but also that the threat of Germany would soon reach its eastern shores. Jessica Bennett and Mark Hampton have examined closely the propaganda material published by Wellington House – Britain’s War Propaganda Bureau – and disseminated via certain sections of the press, making any further exposition here unnecessary. Such publications as *The Barbarism of Berlin* (G.K. Chesterton, 1914), *After Twelve Months of War* (Charles Masterman, 1915) and *Why Britain is at War* (Sir Edward Cook, 1915) were, they argue, written to project ‘an image of Anglicized virtues under threat by German barbarism, aggression, and militarism.’[[10]](#footnote-10) By arguing that Britain fought for those very values held dear by the American people – including justice, honour, humanity and civilization – such material emphasized the commonalities between Britain and the United States, creating what Bennett and Hampton call an ‘Anglo-American imagined community’.

Herein lies the significance of Barker’s invitation to New York. While by no means as direct or explicit as the Wellington House material, it, too, provided an opportunity of highlighting the deep and lasting bond between the two countries, and to garner public favour by demonstrating the strength and artistic skill of the British theatre.

Barker’s own views on the war were complicated. As a member of the Fabian Society, he was committed to the principles of democratic socialism and favoured an internationalist foreign policy as opposed to the pervading policy of isolationism. Yet, he was far less vocal in his condemnation of war than his fellow Fabian, close friend and collaborator George Bernard Shaw, whose ‘Common Sense About the War’ caused outrage when it was published in 1914. Like Shaw, Barker was very sceptical about the war and declared to Gilbert Murray that he would sign a protest against it ‘with my blood if anything were to be gained by shedding it’.[[11]](#footnote-11) At the same time, he felt the patriotic pull to contribute to the war and was torn by indecision about what to do. His work in New York provided him with a clear purpose, even if only for a short time.

**Euripides in New York**

Barker’s season opened at the Wallack’s Theatre, New York, on 27 January 1915 with productions of Shaw’s *Androcles and the Lion* and Anatole France’s *The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife*. With the exception of McCarthy and actor O. P. Heggie, the company was an entirely new Anglo-American group brought together for the event. On 16 February he added *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* to the repertory followed closely by Shaw’s *The Doctor’s Dilemma* nine days later. The press was generally very positive about the season, although the New York audience – used to the length of run being a demarcation of success – struggled to grasp its repertory structure. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* received particular acclaim, while numerous articles appeared in journals such as *Theatre* celebrating Barker’s presence in the city, commending the lessons and methods he introduced to the New York theatre scene, and reporting on innovations taking place in the British theatre.

 In so far as its intention was to spread awareness of the British theatre and encourage people to look on it positively, the season was successful. However, Barker quickly became homesick and frustrated, once again pessimistic about the future of the theatre and torn between his commitment to it and his sense of national obligation. In another letter to Shaw, less than a month after the opening of his New York season, he set out his anxiety:

What is going to happen after the war? […] It would be a great mental relief to be in the trenches […] If there was anything I could do – (I mean not by going “to the front” – for heaven knows I should be no use there […]) I should be delighted to drop all plans here – for after all, ultimately, this *isn’t* my job – and to come back to England.[[12]](#footnote-12)

However, during an excursion to the Yale Bowl in New Haven, Barker saw the potential the space had to be transformed into a Greek amphitheatre, offering the perfect setting for the plays of Euripides and bringing with it a new drive and sense of creative excitement.

 With the help of a committee of prominent academics, Barker organised a short tour of Euripides’s *Iphigenia in Tauris* and *The Trojan Women* to the stadia of prominent east coast universities. Beginning at Yale on 15 May, the productions travelled to Harvard, the College of the City of New York, and the University of Pennsylvania before finishing at Princeton on 12 June.[[13]](#footnote-13) Although there had been earlier small-scale outdoor productions, this was the first major open-air professional production of a Greek tragedy in the US, and so garnered a great deal of attention.

 This was not the first time Barker worked on Euripides; rather, he had been a key feature of his early work, and, together with Murray, he introduced wider Britain to it.[[14]](#footnote-14) His first production – *Hippolytus* for the New Century Theatre in May 1904 – was seen to be a watershed moment in the British theatre. Barker chose to begin his Court Theatre venture with a revised production of *Hippolytus*, and Euripides became the second most staged writer at the Court behind Shaw. The Greek tragedian was thus staged as part of the New Drama, and his plays were seen in dialogue with the work of Shaw, Robins and others.

 Barker’s chief aim was not to present Euripides’s plays as antiquarian artefacts, but, rather, ‘to take a play which was a living thing two thousand years ago and provide for its interpreting as a living thing to an audience of to-day.’[[15]](#footnote-15) With the help of Murray’s translations, Barker was able to highlight the contemporary relevance of the plays and use them to comment on the social and political situation of the time. His 1907 *Medea*, for example, was ‘deliberately performed against the upsurge of public interest in the movement for women’s suffrage.’[[16]](#footnote-16) Such productions helped to make Euripides both accessible and popular.

 Given this, Barker’s choice of *Iphigenia in Tauris* and, in particular, *The Trojan Women* for the stadia tour was no coincidence. Barker had originally staged the latter in 1905, with the shadow of the Boer Wars still looming over Britain. Murray was vocal in his criticism of Britain’s actions in South Africa, and his translation, coupled with Barker’s production, argued that powerful nations would inevitably ‘sink into subhuman, barbaric treatment of their enemies and rivals’, as Britain had done[[17]](#footnote-17) The parallel was not lost on its audience, with Leonard Hobhouse commenting that the production ‘revived troubles that lie too near’.[[18]](#footnote-18)

 The timing of the 1915 production was no less significant, coming, as it did, in the midst of new revelations of Germany’s actions in the war. The sinking of the Lusitania liner by a German U-boat on 7 May 1915 – a week before Barker’s Greek tour began – and the subsequent death of 1,198 people caused outrage on both sides of the Atlantic, with many taking this to prove that Germany was targeting civilians. Five days later, the Committee on Alleged German Outrages released its report – commonly known as the Bryce Report – which centred on the treatment of the Belgian population since Germany’s invasion at the start of the war. It included first-hand ‘evidence’ from a number of sources, including the testimonies of individuals whose villages had been attacked by German troops. It concluded that the German army was guilty of murdering innocent Belgian civilians en masse, including children, raping women, looting towns and, breaking the rules of war. Not surprisingly, this Report was seized on by Wellington House as proof of Germany’s barbarism, and was widely distributed to allied and neutral countries, especially North America.

 While it is not within the remit of this paper to discuss the validity of these claims, it is important to note that they provided a context for Barker’s production and primed the audience to experience the horrors of the sacking of Troy from a contemporary position and to sense the reality of it. At the same time, watching such actions take place on stage brought a new sense of reality and truth to the newspapers reports on the Rape of Belgium.

 Murray made this link clear in a new preface he wrote for the play ahead of the tour that was published in the *New York Times*:

The burden of the Trojan women has now fallen upon others, upon Belgian women, French women, upon the women of Poland and Serbia. God grant that the discipline of the Allies may hold firm, and that mankind may not have to add to that tragic list the names of German […] women![[19]](#footnote-19)

He goes on to note that the barbarism seen in World War One was something that he mistakenly thought was a thing of the past, before stating clearly that the Allied forces sought peace while the Germans chose war.

Yet, Murray was careful not to stir up anti-German hatred, but instead, focused on the issue of all warfare. His final words, echoing those of Poseidon at the beginning of the play, warned that ‘those who are swift to make war for the sake of gain shall find in their wars not profit, but bitter loss.’ To this end, he invited Woodrow Wilson to write an introduction to the play, given his pro-peace stance, but the President declined due to the common perception of Barker’s presence being tied to pro-Anglo propaganda and that for him to be associated with it would compromise his own neutral position.[[20]](#footnote-20)

However, the link between *The Trojan Women* and the horrors of World War One were not solely due to the text or Murray’s words. It was also reinforced by specific artistic decisions made by Barker.

***The Trojan Women* as a Community Event**

Of particular significance was the choice of staging the works in the large semi-public spaces of the college stadia. Obviously, it was the space of the Yale Bowl that first inspired the idea for the tour, when Barker quickly saw the ease at which the stadium could be adapted to resemble an amphitheatre. But, more importantly, the stadia are spaces usually associated with sporting events and central to the everyday life of the campus. Indeed, the performances came complete with the ubiquitous peanut seller, who inserted Euripides’s name in his usual calling sales patter.[[21]](#footnote-21) Likewise, the performances all began at 4.30pm – often coinciding with sporting events taking place close by – and, each lasting two hours, were timed to end as the sun was setting.

 While there are various practical reasons for these choices, they also worked to distinguish the productions from conventional theatre and the expectations associated with them in terms of who would be in the audience and how they should behave. Instead, both *The Trojan Women* and *Iphigenia in Tauris* were presented more like community events, a point bolstered up by the fact that they were only performed once on each site.[[22]](#footnote-22) The openness and familiarity of the space signified that these were performances open to all, and to which people could bring food and drinks, as if at a festival or sporting event.

 The size of each venue also meant that it could hold a very large audience. The estimated attendance for the performance at the Yale Bowl was over 10,000 people, while over the course of the run, it was estimated that between 60,000 and 100,000 people saw the productions.[[23]](#footnote-23) The fact that a theatre director could draw such crowds was impressive, but that he could do so for productions of Greek tragedy was nothing short of astounding. [[24]](#footnote-24)

As well as being large in size, the audience was relatively mixed, demographically speaking. First, Barker ensured that the ticket prices were affordable – for the New York performances, for example, 2000 seats were available for each production at a price of 15 cents each (about $3.60 by today’s standard). Also in New York, the graduating students from local high schools were required to attend, meaning that there was a generational mix in the audience.[[25]](#footnote-25) The same was true at Harvard, where the *Boston Evening Transcript* reported a high number of high and prep school students in attendance.[[26]](#footnote-26) Barker also wanted to ensure that a large proportion of the audience came from the local community, and so cast students from the colleges or people from the town in minor parts. Not only did this guarantee audiences coming to see their friend or colleague in action, but it encouraged the public to see the performance as belonging to them and being part of their community.

Of course, presenting the play as a public event in this way connected it to its origins in the religious festivals of Ancient Greece. Yet, more than any pretensions to historical reconstruction, the setting served to bring huge sections of society together so that they could experience, learn about and understand the horrors of war as a group. It became something akin to a civic or religious experience, generating a Durkheimian collective effervescence that bound the individuals together as a community, even if only for a short time.

**The Great Outdoors**

As well as enabling the coming together of huge numbers of people, these large, open-air spaces influenced the style of the performance and the scope of what Barker could achieve. He was a firm believer in the need to stage Euripides’s plays outside, arguing:

The mere transference from outdoors in will prove deadening. And no one who has ever sat in a Greek theatre […] will easily be reconciled to the disfiguring of all this behind footlights.[[27]](#footnote-27)

The layout of the traditional Greek theatre, of course, included the orchestra between the stage and the audience. In occupying this liminal space, the chorus provided a vital link between the performer and the spectator. The danger of the footlights, Barker warned, is that they marked a clear distinction between them, and thus made it more difficult to establish the necessary bond, without which the play would become a piece of ‘museum theatre’. This was a problem that Barker had struggled with in his London productions of the plays, where he had to make do with relatively small and cramped proscenium arch theatres.

 Of course, there was the danger of the actors being lost in the mammoth spaces, so Barker stripped the performance back to an almost archetypal level, with clear movements and striking set pieces. This served a dual purpose: it ensured that audience members could see the action on the stage regardless of where they sat in the auditorium; and it ensured that anyone who did not know or understand the play could still follow the action. It was not about staging the work as a spectacle in the Victorian sense of the word, rather the aim was to capture visually the terror and pity of the play in a series of memorable images so that the full force of Euripides’s statement on war could be felt.

 One particular moment that resonated with the critics was the image of Hecuba holding the body of Astyanax towards the end of the play. Lillah McCarthy played the role of Hecuba, looking, as Barker told Murray, ‘like the Queen of the Belgians’ wearing multi-layered robes, a tall, cone-shaped crown and carrying a long hooked sceptre that gave her an impressive stature.[[28]](#footnote-28) However, Barker instructed McCarthy to sit and remove the crown, robes and sceptre on the arrival of the Greek messenger with the dead body.[[29]](#footnote-29) At once she transformed from the Queen into an ordinary, everyday, fragile civilian clasping the body of a dead child and delivering her monologue through sobs. As the *New York Times* noted, the audience was enthralled by this beautifully poignant moment and watched silently as ‘alone on the desolate shore, the white-haired mother of Hector is left to commune with the body of his little son.’[[30]](#footnote-30) Murray explained the image and its significance for the production: ‘A solitary old woman with a dead child in her arms: that on the human side is the result of the deeds of glory.’[[31]](#footnote-31)

 Another central moment came after this scene, where, as the chorus carried out the dead body, soldiers lit three large cauldrons around the stage to signify the final burning of Troy. The act of starting a fire on the stage created a haunting effect: the audience could see, smell and hear the fire as it grew, filling the stage with dark clouds of black smoke, again making the destruction of war only too real for the assembled audience.[[32]](#footnote-32) The *Boston American* described how the ‘moans and shrieks of the women who constituted the chorus, together with the outbursts of magnificent rage and grief of Hecuba […], who, at times, was [completely] enveloped in smoke’ gave the scene ‘a [thrill] of realism.’[[33]](#footnote-33) This moment was made particularly striking by the near twilight in which it was being performed. The dim light, the building smoke and the fact that the chorus was dressed all in grey meant that it was soon difficult to see them, making it seem as if they had disappeared and become part of the smoke itself.

**A Successful Campaign?**

It is difficult to discern just how successful Barker’s production was in terms of its intention. In seeking to make clear the continued relevance of Euripides, especially with regards the war in Europe, he certainly achieved his goal. Nearly every newspaper article made the connection, some more explicitly than others. *The Philadelphia Inquirer* observed:

There is something timely in the great open-air performance of “The Trojan Women” before an American audience of many thousand persons at a moment when the eyes of the world are centred on Europe.[[34]](#footnote-34)

The *Philadelphia Public Ledger* similarly concluded that the play was ‘so modern in its intent that it might be called “The Belgian Women”.[[35]](#footnote-35) It is also no coincidence that a great number of the reviews appeared next to or near articles concerned with the war or specific peace efforts.[[36]](#footnote-36)

 Barker was also successful in his quest to make Euripides popular. Copies of the plays, which were made available at the stadia and in the local towns, were sold in high numbers, with 1500 copies of *The Trojan Women* being sold ahead of its Harvard performance, while the combined sales of both plays in New York reached 5000 before the production opened.[[37]](#footnote-37)

What is difficult to ascertain, however, is the impact it had on American attitudes to the war. The United States did, of course, enter the war in 1917, although there is no suggestion here that it was in any way the result of Barker’s work. Yet, the tour needs to be considered – as I have done here ­– as part of the propaganda campaign to bring British and US politics together and celebrate the similarities between them in order to create something of a community that supports each other. It was, for want of a better phrase, part of the long process towards the ‘special relationship’.

In this way, and by bringing large groups of people together to listen to the words of Euripides, Barker was able to bring the Greek tragedian to life and use it to open the audience’s minds, eyes and hearts to the atrocities taking place in Europe.
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