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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In its performance history, spectators and government officials have seen productions of Shakespeare’s Richard II as a means in which to critique the government. The most famous instance was during Essex’s rebellion in the early seventeenth century. Essex’s supporters commissioned a performance of Richard II to rally support for their leader. After the performance, Elizabeth I remarked: “I am Richard, know ye not that?” Essex’s supporters were punished yet the acting company evaded persecution.

Later in 1680, Nahum Tate produced an adaptation of Richard II. Tate’s adaptation, The Sicilian Usurper took place in Italy and all of the characters’ names were changed. In addition, Tate included a preface that denied any possible parallels with contemporary politics. Despite his precautions, the performance was shut down by the government (Shewring, 31).

Without explicit intention by artists involved in the production, Shakespeare’s Richard II has been seen as commentary on contemporary politics. This is largely due to the inclusion of the deposition scene in which the political leader is removed from power by a figure that is often portrayed as a superior leader.

In his book Shakespeare Our Contemporary, Jan Kott argued that “Every historical period finds in him [Shakespeare] what it is looking for and what it wants to
see" (3). Kott was referring specifically to Shakespeare's history plays. Knowing that each historical period can find relevance in Shakespeare's works and Richard II has been considered a political play, I originally sought to investigate how British productions of Richard II in the late twentieth century reflected contemporary political events and figures. I selected three productions: John Barton's 1973/1974 production, Terry Hands' 1980 production, and Deborah Warner's 1995 production; because of their intersection with significant transfers of power or debates on leadership within British politics.

John Barton's 1973 production and Terry Hands' 1980 production occurred at rare times in British political history. In 1974, Edward Heath did not resign from his position of Prime Minister though he lost the general election by a slim margin. He attempted to negotiate his stay in power, and when those negotiations failed, he was forced to resign. In 1979, James Callaghan was forced to resign because of a No Confidence Motion. After a No Confidence Motion, parliament generally calls for a Motion of Confidence. It is at this point that the No Confidence Motion is made obsolete. However, there have been two occurrences in history when the Motion of Confidence has failed. The first occurrence was in 1924 and the second occurrence was in 1979 with James Callaghan. When the Motion of Confidence fails, the government must resign or the Parliament is dissolved. These actions lead to a General Election. Either way parliament is reconstructed, which often (but not exclusively) leads to a dramatic transfer of power.

Deborah Warner's production did not occur at a time during which there was a transfer of power in the government. However, issues of leadership were hotly contested in June 1995. John Major, the current prime minister of Great Britain, stepped down as the Conservative party leader. He demanded a re-election in his party. He did not feel
supported by his party members in the House of Commons. He challenged the party members to find a new leader or put their support behind as their leader. He was re-elected as the Conservative party leader, but his actions revealed how opinions of what constituted good leadership were shifting. Two years later, he lost the general election to Labour party leader, Tony Blair.

Originally, I assumed that I would find that the productions reflected the contemporary political events. I sought to find parallels between the political arena and productions of the play. I focused on design elements, portrayals of Richard II and Bolingbroke, and the deposition scene in each of the productions of Richard II. I slowly realized, however, that the relationship between theatre and politics was far more complex.

Too often theatre historians have attempted to reduce the relationship between theatre and politics to a didactic statement or direct parallel. In this study, I have learned that the relationship between politics and theatre is far more complicated. In these three productions, the ‘politics’ appeared in less direct or obvious ways.

In Barton’s production, Richard Pasco and Ian Richardson alternated the roles of Richard II and Bolingbroke. Barton saw these characters as fatal twins whose fates were only decided by the roles which they played. The seamless transposition of Richard II and Bolingbroke paralleled how Edward and Heath interchanged the role of Prime Minister with little to no consequence.

In Hands’ production, politics guided the selection of the Royal Shakespeare Company’s 1980 summer season. Hands and his team of Abdel Farrah (designer), Guy Woolfendon (composer), and Alan Howard (actor) had already staged Henry IV Parts 1
and 2, *Henry V*, and the three parts of *Henry VI*. In 1979, the Conservative Party defeated the Labour Party and with this transition came drastic cuts in the budget. These cuts directly affected the RSC and Terry Hands was appointed to stage a summer blockbuster. With his production team, Hands staged *Richard II* and *Richard III* with Alan Howard in the title roles.

In Warner's production, Warner initiated debates within the theatre that were similar to the debates raging in Parliament. As issues of leadership were hotly contested in relation to Major's premiership, Warner estranged the audience by casting Fiona Shaw in the title role which thereby initiated a re-evaluation of what it meant to be King. Designer Hildegard Bechter was able to distance and incorporate the audience into the production through her set designs. With traverse staging and three tiered seating, Bechtler placed the audience into the active role of critical evaluator for the events within the play.

The chapters that follow analyze both the production elements and the concurrent political events. For each production, I have focused on the visual design elements, performances by the actors playing Richard II and Bolingbroke, the deposition scene, and any framing devices. Images from each of the productions appear before the bibliography.
CHAPTER 2

JOHN BARTON’S RICHARD II: A KING IN PERFORMANCE


Barton’s production concept can be best understood in consideration of the three problems that he identified with the project at the outset. (1) Richard II was centered on the idea of sacramental kingship, an idea foreign to most modern audiences; (2) Richard II was seeped in references to Elizabethan history and required certain knowledge, for example, Bolingbroke’s reign as King Henry IV,¹ that modern audiences lacked; and (3) Richard II, written completely in verse, was filled with poetic images and metaphors that were crucial but easily overlooked (Loney 22-28).
From Barton’s point of view, sacramental kingship was based on the idea that the king had two bodies. One body was the ‘body natural’ which was the individual, subject to death, time, error, and passion. The second body was the ‘body politic,’ which connected the King with his land and people. This body was immortal and flawless. At the coronation, the body natural was married to the body politic in a perfect union.²

Sacramental kingship was an abstract idea that can be understood as analogous with acting. An actor must have a dual nature, the individual and the character. On stage, the audience must accept the actor wholly as his character. As Anne Barton explained, “If we remain aware all the time that this is Laurence Olivier on the stage, something is wrong with the performance” (Loney 25). Similarly, the King plays the role of the ‘body politic.’ The King must immerse himself in the role of the ‘body politic,’ so that the public cannot see his ‘body natural’ or his individual identity.

Barton highlighted the analogy between kingship and acting in order to explain sacramental kingship to a modern audience. He cast two actors, Richardson and Pasco, to alternate the roles of Richard II and Bolingbroke for each performance. Ironically, the trademark of the production, the alternation of roles, was not originally John Barton’s idea and when RSC director Terry Hands suggested it to him, he disregarded it. Once Barton realized that the alternation of roles would help him say something visually about the dual nature of the role, he decided to use it (Greenwald 116).

Role-playing was further accentuated in an elaborate pre-show in which a character signifying William Shakespeare chose the actor who would play Richard II for that performance and upon selection, the company costumed Richard II in a mock coronation. Barton also emphasized the rituals and ceremonies, forums in which Richard
II had to perform, by implementing a formal style of acting throughout the company. Actors faced the audience instead of each other, formally declaiming their lines. Barton carefully orchestrated all movement and maintained great distances between the actors (Greenwald 121). A "ring of ever-present monks, in ominously dark cowls, circled the throne staircase;" This technique of ceremonial display was a prominent and ominous presence throughout the performance. The monks reinforced the connection between religious ritual and kingship (Greenwald 122) and provided an audience for the King.

In a later production of *Richard II*, Ariane Mnouchkine continued Barton's tradition in the utilization of a formalized production concept in her 1981 production of *Richard II* at the Théâtre du Soleil. "Her production emphasized the stylization of movement and costume, and this heightened style extended through the speaking of the blank verse to the interpretation of character" (Shewring 167). Unlike Barton, Mnouchkine employed this formal acting style through the medium of Japanese theatre traditions such as Noh, Peking Opera, Kabuki, and Kathakali (Shewring 168).

Barton's next challenge was to provide the historical context for the play so the audience fully understood the implications of the deposition. To this purpose, Barton interpolated scenes and speeches from Shakespeare’s *2 Henry IV* that detailed the hardships faced by Bolingbroke in his reign as King Henry IV.

Anne Barton explained how John Barton (with Designers O’Brien, Firth, and later Napier) employed a color palette in the production design that progressed from color to darkness as Bolingbroke took control (Loney 22-28). During Richard’s reign, the stage was flooded with light and color. As Bolingbroke gained control, shadows and dark rooms usurped the stage. This was later used in Terry Hands’ 1980 production which
made similar associations. (Hands’ production is discussed at length in the following chapter).

Another visual code in John Barton’s 1973 production was the transformation of Northumberland. Northumberland’s costume predicted his eventual rebellion in the *Henry IV* plays. Throughout the course of *Richard II*, Northumberland became less and less human. By the end of the play, Northumberland appeared as a giant bird of prey that loomed in the background when Richard II was sent to the tower.

John Barton employed additional visual embodiments of Shakespeare’s verse and medieval dumb shows to reinforce the imagery and analogies for an audience unfamiliar with the heightened language; actors appeared on stilts or masked, a snowman melted to reveal Aumerle prior to Act 5 Scene 2, Richard II rode a unicorn on skis while Northumberland and his followers rode apocalyptic black stallions. At times, the sheer spectacle overwhelmed Barton’s production. The visualization was intended to aid the audience in interpretation, but it also restricted the audience’s interpretation.

In this way, Barton’s production was similar to antiquarian productions such as Charles Kean’s 1857 production. Kean’s production was acclaimed for its range and detail in the settings. He included crowd scenes and dumb shows that did not propel the dramatic action, but explored the historic period. Barton’s dumb shows and visual personifications did not explore the historic period, but instead explored the poetic imagery and recurring themes of the play. Like Kean’s production, Barton’s visual additions did not propel the dramatic action.

Antiquarian productions succeeded in separating the performance from any possible reference to contemporary events and politics. Kean’s production was not
considered political or controversial. Similarly, Barton’s production was not tied to
current events or politics. The spectacle separated the production from a contemporary
context despite what I perceive to be seemingly parallel political issues in Great Britain
which I will consider in relation to Barton’s production.

2.1 Design Elements

In an addition to the formal setting required by the style of acting employed by
Barton, O’Brien and Firth also identified four additional needs posed by Barton’s
directorial concept. O’Brien’s and Firth’s design needed to draw attention to “(1) the
alternation of the lead roles within the context of an acting company; (2) the idea of
Richard II as a compulsive role player; (3) the image of the play as a bad dream whose
central figure [was] moving towards destruction;” and (4) the design needed to
accommodate the upper level at Flint Castle in Act 3 Scene 3 (Greenwald 121).

In 1973, the set for Barton’s production consisted of a bridge flanked by steep
stair structures that resembled escalators. The bridge was a lift that could be raised and
lowered. A second level or upper stage was at the top of the stairs. The upper stage was
approximately 10-12 feet above the stage and used for Richard’s public performances.
Michael Greenwald described the bridge as the set’s most striking and notorious piece
from which Richard observed the Lists at Coventry or—more spectacularly—as the Flint
Castle battlements, when the bridge was lowered to bring the King down to earth in his
famous “Down, down I come, like glist’ring Phaeton” speech (Greenwald 121).

In the center of the playing area, the throne stood atop a golden staircase. Monks
in dark cowls circled the throne throughout the production. On either side of playing area,
“in the dark perimeters of the stage,” sets of bleachers held the acting company when they were not on stage (Greenwald 121). This reinforced the alternation of roles within the context of an acting company.

On the forestage, a jar of dirt represented the land of England. After his banishment, Bolingbroke sifted the soil through his hands as he bid farewell to England, “Then England’s ground, farewell, sweet soil, adieu” (I.iii.306). When Richard II returned from Ireland, he also referred to the jar of soil in his speech (Greenwald 123): “Dear earth, I do salute thee with my hand” (III.ii.4-26).

In 1974, the production had to be modified for the Adlywich Theatre in London. The bridge was removed by designer John Napier and the staircase was raised. This choice was derived from theatrical necessity as opposed to artistic choice; the sightlines at the Aldywich were not able to accommodate the tall bridge (Greenwald 122). Napier also enclosed the playing area with curtains that changed from gold to black to green depending on the needs of the scene. Above the stage hung a 14-sided sun made from a golden cloak. At the interval, the golden cloak fluttered to the stage (Shewring 131-132).  

The costumes were used to identify characters and express the character’s psychological state. The costumes worn by company members were functional, but there were moments when the costumes existed in a world of fantasy and hyperbole as opposed to a world of realism. B.A. Young described these moments as times when “characters change[d] their shape according to their function.”

Northumberland (Clement McCallin) twice appears on Cothurni to raise his height by a foot; Sir Piers of Exton (Anthony Dedley) similarly extends himself between his decision to murder Richard and his actual killing of him and also grows a hat covered in Medusa’s serpents. Horses are hobby horses. Masks, either
plain, or golden indicating kingship, or skull-faced indicating death appear irregularly (11 April 1973).

The designs forced the audience to acknowledge that they were watching a theatrical spectacle with symbolic visual codes. The inclusion of these elements by Barton and designers placed the political sphere of rulers and usurpers; namely Richard II, Bolingbroke, and their followers; in the theatrical arena. The political players were theatrical performers whom did not exist in a world of realism, but a world of theatrical spectacle. This reinforced the importance of role-playing in Richard II. The production showcased theatrical elements and in doing so, drew parallels between acting and kingship.

The costumes also served as visual embodiments of the verse. For instance, Northumberland appeared as a bird of prey in Act 5 Scene 1, in response to Richard’s line “For night-owls shriek when mounting larks should sing” (III.iii.183). When Richard II was lowered to stage on the platform during his speech, “Down, down I come, like glist’ring Phaeton” speech (III.iii.178-182), he was appareled like the sun with his arms outstretched, followed by a spotlight (Dutton). He was the embodiment of the sun imagery that occurs throughout the play.

One of the more contentious visual personification was a melting snowman that appeared before Act 5 Scene 2, the scene in which Aumerle’s plans for rebellion were revealed to his parents, the Duke and Duchess of York. Margaret Shewring identified the snowman as Barton’s visual representation to Richard’s line in deposition scene (135).

O that I were a mockery king of snow.
Standing before the sun of Bullingbrook,
To melt myself away in water drops. IV.i.259-261.
The snowman was included in an interpolated scene in which townspeople surrounded the snowman singing traditional Christmas carols and throwing snowballs, oblivious of Richard's fall. The snowman melted to reveal Aumerle (Greenwald 126).¹¹

The visual interpretations of the verse contributed to the overall theatricality of the production and contributed to a nightmare-like quality to Richard's fall. When the rebels plotted against Richard, they wore stylized masks and when they appeared at Flint Castle, they wore stilted shoes (Greenwald 123-124). Exton the executioner appeared on stilts with a head of hair crawling with snakes (Greenwald 126-127).

Costumes were also used to identify the characters. This was particularly important for Richard II and Bolingbroke. As will be demonstrated in the following section, the costume was integral in differentiating between the characters of Bolingbroke and Richard II. When the actor was chosen to play Richard, the entire company dressed him in the appropriate robes. Later in the deposition scene, the costume was associated with the role of King.

2.2 Pre-show

The audience entered the theatre without knowing which actor, Pasco or Richardson, would be performing Richard II.¹² The roles were determined during the pre-show. The stage was preset with a 'scarecrow' bearing all the royal robes regalia. An actor playing William Shakespeare entered carrying a book. He mounted the golden staircase and 'conjured' the actors from the wings. The company, dressed identically in brown sweaters and brown trousers, entered in two columns led by Pasco and Richardson who then took their places on either side of Shakespeare. Shakespeare passed the book to the actors, who held it between them, and then he removed the prop crown from the
scarecrow and positioned it above the actors’ heads. Pasco and Richardson each placed a hand on the crown (so that they were holding the book and the crown). With his hands now free, William Shakespeare bowed to the actor playing Richard for that performance. At this point, the company dressed Richard in the royal robes and regalia that donned the scarecrow. These items included: gloves, cloak, crown, orb, and scepter. There was also a wig and mask that Richard rejected. Image 1.1 offers a visual example of the dressing. Though it appears to be a publicity shot, it does offer an example of the ceremonious dressing of the King.

As the company members dressed Richard, Bolingbroke held a mirror in front of him. While Richard was being dressed, other company members who appeared in the first scene also got dressed on stage. Once the Richard was dressed, the company members knelt before him crying ‘God Save the King!’ and proclaiming two rounds of ‘May the King live forever!’ At this point, the company took their places either in the first scene or in the onstage bleachers as Richard began the play with his line: “Old John of Gaunt, time honoured Lancaster (I.i.1).”

The pre-show brought the audience into the theatrical process. The audience not only saw the selection of the actor to play the title role, but watched the actor dress for the part on stage. The actors existed as actors before they existed as characters to the audience. Though Pasco and Richardson had distinct physical characteristics, the similar costumes they wore during the pre-show made them (basically) indistinguishable. Image 1.2 displays the physical resemblance between the two actors. As they (Pasco and Richardson) first stride on to the stage, built alike, both in the same drab uniform, your eye slips from one to the other trying to sort out quickly which is which; and for a moment failing (Guardian 25 April 1973).
Once the King was chosen for that evening, it was the robes and regalia that distinguished the two actors. In this mock coronation, there was no unique characteristic that made one man the King and one man the usurper. One actor was not typecast for his ability to portray a failing monarch or the strong leader who will usurp power. Each actor brought his unique qualities to both of the characters. The characters were placed on equal ground as they stood before William Shakespeare.

The pre-show determined which actor would play Richard that performance and in doing so, selected one of two productions. As the actors alternated roles, it was not only their performance that alternated, but that of the entire company.

2.3 The Players

Barton’s production was framed by the theatrical moment of the audience watching the actors prepare for the role. This framing negated any unique characteristic in Bolingbroke or Richard that would cause him to fail or succeed. The characters were not unique because of the actors since they were switched from night to night. However, the actors portrayed two different Richards and Bollingbrookes.

Pasco’s emotional and vocal range ensured a deeply sensitive and sincere interpretation of a king who lost his authority... By contrast, Richardson’s interpretative skill is one of intellectual distancing, acerbic comment, and detached witty, responses—physical as well as verbal (Shewring 128). The informing idea of this production was the alteration of Richard Pasco and Ian Richardson as Richard and Bolingbroke—in itself a fascinating contrast between an actor naturally warm and ‘romantic’ and one cooler and more ‘classical’ (Thomson 280-281).

Richard Pasco was an actor known for his lyrical recitation of the verse. Often yoked with John Gielgud, he was the epitome of the tragic hero. He passively accepted his fate
when he played Richard II. Judith Cook found him to be a more sympathetic character because he was more emotional. As Bolingbroke, he stumbled upon the deposition. His line, "By god’s name, I’ll ascend the throne" (113), in Act 4 Scene 1, was a realization for Bolingbroke that he could become King.

Ian Richardson was far more assertive in both roles. As Bolingbroke, he appeared to be plotting his overthrow from the first confrontation with Thomas Mowbray. His line, "Such is the breath of kings" (215), in Act 1 Scene 3, was for him like tasting the power on his lips. He admitted in a question and answer session with university students that he preferred the role of Bolingbroke because it was more active role (Dutton). As Richard, Richardson fought against the inevitable downfall.

In a personal interview with Richard Dutton (a historian who saw the production several times), he illustrated the differences between Pasco and Richardson in the role of Richard by referring to the moment in which Richard was formally condemned and accused of having his favorites come between him and his wife to showcase the differences between Pasco and Richardson in the role of Richard II. Pasco passively accepted the charges and claimed his guilt. Richardson challenged the accusations. He responded with darting glances and a shocked face as if to say: 'Who? What? Where? Are they serious?' Richardson’s Richard II was framed with false allegations and fought to keep his reputation untarnished. Pasco chose to accept his doomed fate and false accusations.

Though Richardson and Pasco were the only actors interchanging roles, the production changed drastically depending on which role they performed. Their interaction with the rest of the ensemble created two disparate productions. This
difference was fostered, not negated throughout the process. The rehearsal process for Barton's production was 12 weeks long. Shewring described the process in the following statement:

...as if they were mounting two shows as indeed they are... The outcome of these rehearsals was not to produce cloned performances. Each interpretation was distinctive—drawing on the idiosyncratic skills of each performer.

Producing these two disparate productions was not without its hiccups. Pasco and Richardson had to memorize two sets of lines, often providing the cues for each other.

In the first week or so of this production there have been the inevitable hang-ups, teething troubles with the complex set and the odd occasion when the King has suddenly and solemnly delivered a clutch of Bolingbroke's lines (Guardian 25 April 1973).

As the productions continued, these problems worked themselves out.

2.4 Additions from Henry IV Part 2

Through his additions taken from the Henry IV Part 2, Barton equated the roles of Bolingbroke and Richard in scope, size, and tragedy. The Bolingbroke of Richard II is a terse man who often lets other characters speak for him, even when he is on stage (Shewring, 133). Anne Barton described the effect of Barton's production in this way:

...the insertion of certain lines taken from the second part of Henry IV –lines which are inserted in the last movement of Richard II. In these lines we see the King Henry who really belongs to a later time, to a later play: a tragic, sleepless man already experiencing the torment and the burden of kingship and, of course, in this production, a man who goes himself to visit the imprisoned Richard at Pomphret Castle in the disguise of a groom (Loney, 28).

The program for the production stated that only 20 lines were added from the Henry IV plays. However, 40 lines from these plays were taped into the prompt book for Barton's
production. In Act 5 Scenes 2-3, Barton pasted in King Henry’s lament in Act 1 Scene 6 (Henry IV Part 2) about losing sleep. The lines, spoken by Bolingbroke, illustrated the retribution of the deposition.

How many thousand of my poorest subjects
Are at this hour asleep! O sleep, O gentle sleep,
Nature’s soft nurse, how have I frightened thee,
That thou no more wilt weigh my eyelids down
And steep my senses in forgetfulness?
Why rather, sleep, liest thou in smokey cribs
Than in the perfumed chambers of the great
Under the canopies of costly state,
And lulled with sound of sweetest melody.
There is a history in all men’s lives,
Figuring the nature of the times deceased:
The which observed, a man may prophesy,
With a near aim, of the main chance of things
As yet not come to life...
Northumberland, thou ladder wherewithal
The mounting Bolingbroke ascends my throne,
The time shall not be many hours of age
More than it is ere foul sin, gathering head,
Shall break into corruption.
I know well
That all my reign shall be but as a scene
Acting that argument. Happy low, lie down!
Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown...

After this speech, Barton weaved in Bolingbroke’s line from Richard II: “Can no man tell me of my unthrifty son?” which implied that the sleeplessness led Bolingbroke to inquire about Hal, the future King.

This placement of the sleeplessness speech into Richard II reinforced the tragic elements intertwined with kingship. It was not only Richard’s fall from grace that is tragic in Barton’s production, but also Bolingbroke’s ascension; ‘Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown.’
By interposing this scene into the production, Barton revealed the shame and guilt that King Henry IV carried through the next two plays of the cycle. The Henriad (Richard II, Henry IV Part 1, Henry IV Part 2, and Henry V) traces the great circle of history through Richard’s fall, Bolingbroke’s ascension, Henry IV’s fall, and concludes with Henry V who rises to be the ideal ruler. When viewed alone, Richard II only provides Richard’s fall and Bolingbroke’s ascension. It is tragic for Richard II, but victorious for Bolingbroke. Barton evoked key themes from the Henriad by including text from the next two plays. This inclusion revealed a general cycle of Fortune for both Richard II and Bolingbroke/Henry IV.

After the groom scene (5.4) in which Bolingbroke appeared to Richard II as the horse groom, Barton inserted Act 1 Scene 3 from Henry IV Part 2. In this scene, York reported the discontent of the country to Bolingbroke.

**Bollingbroke:** ...Dost thou perceive the body of our kingdom
How foul it is—what rank diseases grow
And with what danger, near the heart of it?
**York:** Yet it is a body yet distempered,
Which to his former strength may be restored
With good advice and little medicine...²⁰

After Bolingbroke spoke with Richard II during the groom scene, York described the country’s discontent. Bolingbroke then vowed to purge the sin of Richard’s murder by making a religious pilgrimage (which he never completed). The addition of York’s report on the country was significant because it illustrated that the problems of the country remained the same despite the change in leadership.

The additions of the scenes extended the similarities between the roles. Without these scenes from Henry IV, Richard II would have been marked as the vanquished and
Bolingbroke as the victor. The inclusion of these scenes enabled both roles to exist as
victor and vanquished. The lost crown defeats and frees Richard II while the ascension to
the crown is victorious and tragic for Bolingbroke.

2.5 Deposition Scene

In the pre-show, the company members dressed the actor designated to play
Richard II for that performance. This dressing was mirrored in the deposition scene. The
costume was no longer the signifier for Richard II, but for the King. In Richard’s ‘Now
mark me how I will undo myself’ speech\textsuperscript{21}, Richard transferred the symbols of kingship
to Bolingbroke.\textsuperscript{22} Barton followed the text literally so that when Richard stated, “I give
this heavy weight from off my head,” Richard placed the crown on Bolingbroke. When
Richard states, “And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,” Richard handed the sceptre to
Bolingbroke.

By the end of the speech, Richard was left wearing only an open white shirt and
dark pants. This image contrasted sharply with Bolingbroke who was covered in symbols
of kingship. The crown atop his head, a golden mask covered his face and his body was
fully covered by a golden coronation robe; only his hands could be seen holding the orb
and sceptre. This tableau was the visual embodiment of Barton’s production concept (See
Image 1.3). In it, he juxtaposed the dual nature of the King through the use of theatrical
costuming. Richard stood as the individual or ‘body-natural,’ stripped of ceremonious
decoration. The open white shirt displayed the flesh, the sign of mortal weakness, which
up until this point had been covered. Bolingbroke, covered in symbols of kingship,
became the divine ruler or ‘body-politic.’
In the pre-show, the costume appeared to construct the character of Richard, but when coupled with this scene it was understood that the costume actually generated the role of King. This again reinforced the idea that the King was a role to be played and that role required the appropriate costume. Without the costume, it was difficult to differentiate between individual and divine leader, King and usurper.

After Richard forfeited his costume, he called for a mirror that “it may show me what a face I have/ Since it is bankrupt of majesty” (IV.i.265-266). Richard II looked into the mirror and then shattered it. As Bolingbroke picked up the golden frame of mirror, he told Richard II “The shadow of your sorrow hath destroy’d/ The shadow of your face” (IV i.292-293). This line was then repeated by the rest of the company as Bolingbroke slowly lowered the frame over Richard’s head. This gesture was done in such a way that the frame took on three different symbols: halo, crown, and noose. First, the frame was held over Richard’s head as a halo signifying the divine nature of Richard’s kingship. Bolingbroke then rested the frame on Richard’s head as a crown in a perverse coronation. Finally, the frame hung around Richard’s neck as a noose where it remained for the rest of the production and signified Richard’s demise.

2.6 Final Tableau

Barton’s production ended with another coronation, a book-end to his elaborate pre-show in which he crowned an actor with the role of King Richard II. This coronation was Barton’s visual representation of the following speech taken from Act 3 Scene 2.

For within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a King
Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning his pomp (III.ii 160-164).
Bolingbroke, dressed in a dark, hooded robe, entered flanked by two monks in similar robes. After covering his head with the hood, Bolingbroke knelt down between the monks with his back to the audience. A golden coronation robe was brought forward and draped over Bolingbroke. The monks handed him a sceptre and globe, symbols of kingship. Timed with a crescendo in the music, Bolingbroke turned around to face the audience. Bolingbroke’s face was replaced with a death mask, a grinning skull. As the lights went up, the hooded monks revealed themselves as Bolingbroke and Richard II. In this coronation, Barton crowned the one true King, Death, who allowed each mortal King “a breath, a little scene” (III.ii.169).23

As one last exclamation point for his concept, Barton reinstated the role-playing inherent in kingship. Bolingbroke and Richard II worked together to dress the true King, Death, and thereby admitting their kingships were ‘an empty show.’ It was fitting to do so in a seemingly magical illusion. The audience watched Bolingbroke kneel between the monks yet somehow he was seamlessly replaced with a substitute and appeared in a different position. This magical illusion was a parallel to the illusive nature of kingship.

2.7 Concurrent Political Events

Several reviews referenced politics within the production. Irving Wardle argued that Barton’s production was political in his review for the Times.

Not that Mr. Barton is excluding politics, rather he enlarges that side of the play by emphasizing the trail of feuds leading up to the opening quarrel, and forecasting the future with passages from Henry IV and one line from the sleepless Henry which Mr. Barton has craftily stitched into the Shakespearean fabric: “All my reign will be a scene acting that argument (11 April 1973).

The politics in this case refer to the historical politics of Richard’s and Henry IV’s reign. Barton does not favor Bolingbroke in the production, but presents a larger picture that
includes the rise and fall of both Richard II and Henry IV rather than only the fall of Richard II. It may have been more accurate if Wardle replaced 'politics' with 'political history' in that Barton emphasized the rise and fall of two historical figures who were part of the governing body of the nation, or simply historical figures involved in politics.

Judith Cook also referred to the politics of Barton's production in the following statement:

With Ian Richardson and Richard Pasco alternating in the roles of Richard and Bolingbroke, the production becomes, intentionally or not, two very different plays. The Ian Richardson performance was far more political, making Richard continually prone to self-dramatization, an unlikeable person heading for a deserved fall, whereas Richard Pasco was more emotional, and you felt far more sorry for the character (12).

It seems that if Richard was despicable and the audience gained satisfaction from watching him lose everything, then it was a political play. It seems to be more of a political fantasy in which the people of the nation triumph over the villainous dictator. What was more disturbing about Cook’s account is that it was implied that if the audience felt empathy for the ruler during his fall, similar to how the audience felt when Richard Pasco played Richard II, then it was not political. In this case, it may be more appropriate to replace 'political' with 'righteous.'

Even the reviews that did address the political nature of the production did so in a misleading or inaccurate manner. Though there were parallels between Barton’s production and the political events, his production was so innovative and saturated with striking visual elements that these parallels were not investigated by critics or scholarly reviewers.
Barton's production ran from 1973-1974. Edward Heath became Prime Minister in 1970, defeating Harold Wilson. In February 1974 Heath lost a Motion of No Confidence which led to another election. The 1974 election pitted the same contenders as 1970, but resulted in a different victor. Harold Wilson was elected to Prime Minister.

To gain an understanding of these two leaders and the elections they won and lost, it is best to begin by looking at Wilson's reign from 1966-1970.24

Harold Wilson was a very popular politician, known for his quick wit and personality. Biographer Pimlott describes him as 'easy to like, but hard to love.'25 When he was elected in 1966, England was doing well. The country had just won the World Cup. British music and fashions were 'gaining global kudos.' But as historian Kevin Jeffreys points out, 'it was not to be.'

A swift solution to a strike by seamen proved to be beyond even Wilson's powers of persuasion. The balance of payments deficit, always the ghost at the feast, made one of its periodic appearances, and sterling began to slide once again, forcing the Government in its 'July measures' into precisely the sort of 'freeze and squeeze' that it had slammed the Tories for during the years of 'stop-go'. Wilson not only looked like a man who had won an election under false pretenses, but also took flak for failing to act sufficiently early to shore up the currency, thereby forcing ... greater spending cuts and a more severe economic slowdown—and incomes policy—than may have been necessary (123).

The late 1960's were a time of change for Great Britain and the rest of the world. There were student revolts in France, German, Italy, Great Britain, and United States (Seldon 18-19). There were also great strides in civil and human rights. For some, this was a "dangerous lurch in the direction of a permissive society," but for others it was a much needed move towards a "more honest and humane Britain" (Childs 156).

Between the years of 1966 and 1970, Wilson's popularity had its ups and downs. By 1969, his popularity was such that the press frequently suggested that Wilson could
not survive until the next election. Winning the election seemed completely out of the question. It was at this point, that Wilson’s popularity took a turn for the best. The Government handled the crisis in Northern Ireland well and the economy began to improve (Pimlott 550). Wilson’s image was recovering and the election began to look promising for another Labour victory.

In the 1970 election, Wilson’s campaign was much different than that of 1966. Ben Pimlott observed that, “This time a good deal more ducking and weaving had become necessary, in order to defend against which his past claims could be judged” (555). Wilson was relying more on his personality than his politics.

Whenever he could, Wilson kept off politics. His style was not so much ‘presidential’ as that of a stage personality who could share old jokes with fans. He had a word or quip for every situation...More flashes, a few handshakes, and he was gone. Those of us who took our politics more seriously found the non-performance revealing: evidence that the election itself had no content, and we—the individual members—had no existence at all (Pimlott 555-556).

Though the election took place three years earlier than Barton’s production. There were parallels between Barton’s concept of role-playing in political leadership and the performance of Wilson during the election. In both of these examples given by Pimlott, Wilson was playing a role in the election. He was a ‘stage personality’ and for those serious politicians (which included Pimlott as a political historian and biographer); it was a ‘non-performance.’

While Wilson was performing, Heath was pleading with the voters to wake up and recognize what the real issues of the election were. In a speech the weekend before the election, he challenged them to see the diversion that Labour was trying to pull and ridiculed Wilson’s campaigning techniques as ‘sham sunshine.’
It may have been Heath’s speech or it may have been the frustration of the voters with the candidates, but the 1970 election had a record low attendance with only a 72% turnout.27 Wilson had entered the election, certain of a victory. To the surprise of many, it was Heath, “the most despised politician in post-war Britain” who became the Prime Minister (Childs 157).

There were feelings of antipathy for both candidates. As Cabinet ministers entered 10 Downing Street to say their farewell to Wilson, they passed crowds that were laughing, clapping, and shouting: ‘Out! Out! Out!’ Pimlott described these crowds “as impatient for blood at a public execution” (558). When Heath entered 10 Downing Street, a woman in the crowd threw paint on him (Childs 162). Like Barton’s production of Richard II, the accession into power intermixed defeat with the victory.

In retrospect, Anthony Seldon identified Heath’s term in office (1970-1974) as a major turning point for Great Britain.

The Heath government is intriguing in part because it promoted elements of both the old and the new worlds and was trapped uneasily as one paradigm was beginning to lose its hold, but the other model had yet to secure intellectual credibility on popular backing. The government’s predicament moreover was compounded as it was in office at a time of unusual unrest and turbulence, both domestically and internationally.28

In the February 1974 election, Wilson put the question “Who governs Britain?” to the public. Bogdanor observed that “The voters…failed to return an unequivocal answer.” The Labour party won more seats, but not a majority of the votes. It was a “hung Parliament, Britain’s first since 1929” (Bogdanor 371).
Heath tried to create a coalition with one of the minor political parties, but failed and was forced to resign. Harold Wilson returned to 10 Downing Street. Childs observed that though “the incumbents in Downing Street changed: the problems remained the same” (Childs 177). The turnout had improved since the 1970 election, but there was no clear cut winner. The votes and percentages were close. Heath had replaced Wilson in 1970, but similar problems remained.

In Barton’s production, he complicated the distinction between the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ leader. They were, in fact, interchangeable. Bolingbroke and Richard were paired as fatal twins. They were only distinguishable by the role they played. Wilson and Heath provided an interesting mirror. Neither of them won by a large majority and appeared to be interchangeable as the country switched from Wilson to Heath and back to Wilson with little improvement or change.

2.8 Reception

Reviews and accounts focused on the multiple ways in which Barton broke the performance history tradition from his “audacious decision to cast two actors to alternate the principle roles to the equally audacious theatricality of these roles” (Shewring 136).

Barton’s production embraced the role-playing and theatricality of kingship in Shakespeare’s text. His production was also the first to use spectacle to explore the poetic verse. The reviews were mixed, but for most of the critics, Barton’s production was oversaturated and overwhelming. There were so many images and innovative readings that it was difficult to keep pace with Barton. In his 1974 revival in London, he cut some
of the spectacle, the Duchess of Gloucester no longer appeared as a ghost who sprang from her grave (via a trap door in the stage), Northumberland no longer hovered over Richard II as a giant bird of prey, and Richard II no longer set like the sun on a descending platform at Flint Castle. Some of these choices were born out of theatrical necessity (like the descending platform at Flint Castle), but others were artistically motivated.

At the outset of his process, Barton addressed four problems that he faced as a director. All of the problems stemmed from the complications of making Shakespeare’s play understandable for a modern audience. Barton’s solutions provided visual and directorial interpretations of the text for the audience. He was able to control how the text was received and in doing so, he severely restricted the interpretation. He succeeded in making his meaning clear, but at what costs? Barton’s flaw was that he did not trust his audience to make an intelligent interpretation on their own.

2.9 Conclusion

Though Barton’s production did not include a political agenda, I believe that the audience who saw his production could find parallel threads in British politics. Even without the artist’s intentions, political readings can and do occur. For example, Richardson and Pasco both noticed a difference in reception when they performed Richard II in New York City. Pasco explained to Glenn Loney:

Last night I was playing the King, and Ian was playing Bolingbroke, and I said to him, “On certain lines and words I’ve got laughs that I’ve never gotten laughs before. What’s wrong—what am I doing? Is my wig on wrong, or something?” He said, “No, for god’s sake, don’t you get understand it is the political
implication of this play at this time [the Watergate scandals] which are white hot?"

Though the production was not intended to address the Watergate scandal in America, Richardson recognized that the audience was making a connection to the contemporary political climate. Similar connections could be made to the British contemporary political climate.

In his 1974 campaign, Wilson had asked ‘Who governs Britain?’ but Bogdanor identified a different question for the 1970 election.

Instead of answering the question ‘Who governs?’, the election posed a quite different question: ‘How was Britain to be governed?’ But there was also a hint of a more dangerous question lurking in the background, the question of whether Britain was in fact governable at all (Bogdanor 373).

Great Britain had struggled since the late 1960’s and the political leaders were seen as merely playing the roles. Barton’s production and Shakespeare’s text contained many parallels. Richard II was the story of a deposition of a monarch by divine right. Previous productions emphasized the differences between Bolingbroke and Richard II, but Barton’s production made them so similar that they could be and were interchanged. Like Heath and Wilson, both Richard II and Bolingbroke were overwhelmed by the responsibilities of a leading a once powerful nation that now appeared to be moving into a great recession.
Many members Shakespeare's audience would have likely known what happened next in the story... They knew that Henry's whole succeeding reign would be one of rebellion and civil war, and that his dynasty would ultimately be swept away from a throne it had no right to possess... When Henry talks about making a voyage to the Holy Land, "To wash this blood off from my guilty hands," in the last line of the play. Elizabethans would have known that he never made that journey because he spent the remainder of his reign fighting down rebellion, and that he finally died ironically in a chamber called Jerusalem, in England (Loney 28).

Anne Barton explained [in Glenn Loney's book Staging Shakespeare] "Elizabethans believed that the King had two selves or two natures or bodies. One of these bodies was like the one that all of us have: an individual self, subject to death, subject to time, subject to passions, to errors and mistakes. But the King was also invested with, at the moment of coronation, a second body—a body-politic. This body, in which the King is incorporated with his land and his people—things which cannot, by their nature, die—this body is immortal and flawless. It is not subject to errors, to passion, to mistakes... the coronation, the moment of anointing, is supposed to weld his bodies together" (23).

When the show toured to London in 1974, Barton removed this controversial and unpopular piece of stage business (Greenwald 126).

In one dumb show, 'King Richard is Received in Silence,' Richard II walked into a crowd scene and a space was kept open around him. A boy approached and pointed one finger at Richard. This action triggered a barrage of noise and insults from the crowd (Shewring 53).

B.A. Young described Barton’s set: "a stage design quite unrelated to the content of the play: on either side of the stage a steep, narrow flight of steps resembling a London transport escalator rising high into the air and supporting between them a kind of concrete bridge that can be raised and lowered" (11 April 1973).

This image of the setting sun was repeated in Barry Kyle's 1986 production. Designer William Dudley included an emblematic sun which began in his perihelion and slowly set as the production progressed.

"A similar approach was later used in Mnouchkine's 1980 production in which she developed the idea of état or 'state' for each character which was a primary passion that took over the character. Each 'state,' which may be as brief as fifteen seconds, needs to be shown or externalized by the performer through an exaggerated use of movement as well as vocal display" (Shewring 168).

Timothy O'Brien and Tazeena Firth 1973, John Napier 1975

In Richard II, the sun imagery is associated with King. The following are excerpts that reference the sun:

I.iii.144-147 Bollingbroke: Your will be done: this must my comfort be,/Sun that warms you here shall shine on me;/ And those his golden beams to you here lent/ Shall point on me and gild my banishment.

II.i.11-12 Gaunt: More are men's ends mark'd than their lives before:/ The setting sun, and music at the close...

II.iv.18-22 Earl of Salisbury: Ah, Richard, with the eyes of heavy mind/ I see thy glory like a shooting star Fall to the base earth from the firmament./ Thy sun sets weeping in the lowly west./ Witnessing storms to come, woe and unrest:

III.iii.62-67 Bollingbroke: See, see, King Richard doth himself appear./ As doth the blushing discontented sun/ From out the fiery portal of the east./ When he perceives the ominous clouds are bent/ To dim his glory and to stain the track/ Of his bright passage to the occident.

IV.i.33-37 Fitzwater: If that thy valour stand on sympathy,/ There is my gage, Aumerle, in gage to thine: By that fair sun which shows me where thou stand'st;/ I heard thee say, and vauntingly thou spakest it/ That thou wert cause of noble Gloucester's death.
IV.i. 52-56 Lord: I task the earth to the like, forsworn Aumerle:/ And spur thee on with full as many lies
As may be holloa'd in thy treacherous ear/ From sun to sun: there is my honour's pawn:/ Engage it to the
trial, if thou darest.
IV.i.222-227 King Richard: God save King Harry, unking'd Richard says./ And send him many years of
sunshine days!
IV.i.260-262 Richard: O that I were amockery king of snow,/ Standing before the sun of Bolingbroke,/ To
melt myself away in water-drops!
IV.i.283-284 Richard:...was this the face / That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?

10 Shewring also pointed out that the snowman was identified as ‘JB’ in the prompt book. She expressed
her inclination (which I also share) that ‘JB’ stood for John Barton (135).

11 It was unclear to me whether Aumerle was standing behind the snowman or somehow, in the snowman.

12 There were also times when the actors did not know who would be playing the roles. In a presentation at
The Brooklyn College Shakespeare Conference, Richardson and Pasco described how they would have to
check the playbill each night to see who would play Richard II. One night, they both lined up on stage right
(from where the actor playing Richard II entered) and had to have a stage manager check the playbill
outside of the theatre to see who actually was Richard for that performance (Loney 39-40).

13 Richardson later commented that the actor playing Richard II always entered from and stood on stage
right.

14 Taken from descriptions provided by Margaret Shewring (123), Michael Greenwald (122), and blocking
notes from preshow:
Preshow Action:

1. WS enters L pros. X DC of truck signals
cd, enter from US
AW LT
GC PD SS-orb
MA MC JW-Q's cloak
JK JB JG- wig
JG WG JC-crown
JW RM
JC ME
DH DB
SS CMc
K Bol

2. WS
K Bol
K and Bol hold book

3. WS gets crown fr. Scarecrow. Holds it over book. K and Bol each put 1 hand lo crown. WS takes
book

4. As WS bows, K takes crown- K sits on steps OP side.
WS breaks DR by pros
Bol breaks DL, DB who puts gloves on him
LM takes mask from K and X US G. truck
MA collects wig and mirror from truck and shows them to K.
K. rejects them. MA gives JW wig and mirror. JW and JG exit R Pros.
See original notes for drawing
they dress
Gaunt dressed DL by JB (milkchick-sic) and WG
At nod prom K, Bol break
K kneels DS of truck facing US
AW and MC get cloak from truck
ME stands by scarecrow and hands cloak. He then takes scarecrow off UR.
AW and MC h to K. Put cloak over him
K ascends truck. AW and MC fellow
As he moves, Gaunt X C and kneels facing US
Carl enters UL X to UC as K ascends
LT hands scepter to JN
SS hands orb to MA
RM crowns K facing US
MA hands orb to K
JK hands scepter
WS hands book to MC and AW
"God save the King” as music ends- All kneel
See original for kneel positions
"May the King live forever.” (2nd) King turns DS.
hands scepter MS and orb JN back
mask to RM
hand back to K

K sits.
Gaunt turns DS and sits on steps
Lords sit BA SS JL JB WG LT
MA AW GC PD MC JK

15 As Cook explained, “... whereas Richard Pasco was more emotional, and you felt far more sorry for the character” (12).

16 How long a time lies in one little word!/ Four lagging winters and four wanton springs/ End in a word: Such is the breath of kings (I.iii.213-215)

17 I was unable to locate the line in the text, but it could have been an addition or alteration of Barton’s. Lines III.i.11-15 offered the following accusations to Richard’s favorites. You have in manner with your sinful hours/ Made a divorce betwixt his queen and him./ Broke the possession of a royal bed/ And stain’d the beauty of a fair queen’s cheeks/ With tears drawn from her eyes by your foul wrongs.

18 “Initially, it was agreed that each actor would pursue an individual interpretation of the roles...To insure autonomy Pasco and Richardson agreed that, when possible, neither would watch the other rehearse. Soon they were lingering after rehearsals to discuss concepts, argue alternatives, attack the roles from varying perspectives. Ultimately, they worked side by side, with Barton serving as an enthusiastic mediator” (Greenwald 118).

19 Below the cast list, the following statement was added: “The text for this production contains cuts of about 500 lines; and about 20 lines from Henry IV Part Two have been added” (Program 6-7).

20 This may be a scene reinvented through John Barton’s editing as it is not distinguishable in Shakespeare’s text in either of the Henry IV plays.

21 I have included the full text of Richard’s speech: “Now mark me how I will undo myself./ I give this heavy weight from off my head./ And this unwieldy scepter from my hand,/ The pride of kingly say from out my heart./With mine own tears I wash away my balm./With mine own hands I give away my crown./
With mine own tongue deny my sacred state;/ With mine own breaths release all duterous oaths;/ All pomp and majesty I do foreswear / My acts, decrees, and statues I deny./ God pardon all oaths that are broke to me:/ God keep all vows unbroken are made to thee:/ Make me, that nothing have, with nothing grieved;/ And thou with all pleased, that hast achieved./ Long mayst thou live in Richard's seat to sit,/ And soon lie Richard in an earthy pit..."(IV.i.200-217)

22 Ariane Mnouchkine adapted a similar technique in her 1980 production of Richard II. After the scene was complete, Richard II was undressed by black robed attendants. “These lavish fabrics were item by item transferred to Bolingbroke. Here the bulk of the multi-layered costumes were exploited to advantage. Richard became physically much smaller and more vulnerable as he handed over the layers’ of power. Bolingbroke gained in physical stature as he assumed the royal trappings of authority” (Shewring 172).

23 In her book, Shakespeare and the Idea of Play, Anne Barton identified the death of the King as the realization that to be a king is to play a role. “In the moment of death, the king is parted from the role which, since his coronation, he had seemed completely identified... He lays aside his borrowed splendour, the grandeur which now reveals itself as mere illusion, and his entire life, in retrospect, acquires the quality of an empty show” (115-116).

24 Wilson was in power from 1964-1970. It was the election of 1966 and his reign until 1970 that provides a context for the elections and the production.

25 Ben Pimlott provided the following description of Wilson: “Wilson had the affectionate loyalty of his assistants and officials. He could manage large gatherings brilliantly, and was the best television communicator in politics. He was funny, sharp, clever, likeable, affable, approachable, brave, lacking in pomposity or side, and tortuously honest. Despite a wretched press, he was the most popular prime minister over a long period since the war. But he failed to acquire the confidence or even the trust of most of those closest to him in age and status, including those who careers he advanced. He found relationships on the basis of equality impossible to maintain: suspicion clouded them all. Though he was easy to like, he was hard to love. He did not exude warmth and did not attract it. Neither did he attract generosity, and—when the trappings of office and the weapon of patronage were stripped from him—he received more than his fair share of blame.” (567).

26 “I have to say to the British people “For heaven’s sake, wake up”,’ Heath pleaded on Saturday. ‘I want them to recognize what the real issues are, because Labour has pursued a policy of diversion with a bogus story of sham sunshine’” (Pimlott 557).


28 In this ‘old’ world, the state was seen as having a major role as monopoly supplier of many goods and services, trade unions were lauded and powerful, and the pursuit of equality was regarded as a core objective of government. Five years after Heath’s government fell from power, Mrs. Thatcher was in Downing Street in 1979, and a new world was shortly to unfold where government itself was no longer considered to be benign, priority was given to boosting private provision at the expense of the collective, and a vast expansion of unemployment and even poverty was openly tolerated (Seldon 1).
CHAPTER 3

TERRY HANDS' RICHARD II: REFLECTING HISTORY AND POLITICS IN PERFORMANCE

In 1980, Terry Hands directed a production of Richard II at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre. Concurrent with Richard II, Terry Hands was also directing a production of Richard III. On the completion of these two productions, the production team of director Terry Hands, designer Abdel Farrah, composer Guy Woolfendon, and actor Alan Howard had collaborated on the entire Shakespeare History cycle. Terry Hands cast Alan Howard as Richard II and David Suchet as Bolingbroke. In Richard III, Howard was again cast as the title role and David Suchet played King Edward.

Hands began the cycle with Henry V in 1975. Ironically, he began the cycle at the completion of the Henriad (Richard II, Henry IV Parts 1 and 2, Henry V) and ended at the beginning. In all of these performances, Alan Howard played the title role. Within the 1980 season, Hands was also directing the final play in the history sequence with Richard III. Consequently, his production of Richard II alluded to the civil unrest that befell England in the Henry IV plays and Richard III.

Hands’ production was influenced by John Barton’s 1973/1974 production for the Royal Shakespeare Company. As discussed in the previous chapter, Barton’s production was saturated with meta-theatrical references, visual spectacle, and interpolated scenes. In his 1980 production, Hands crystallized some of the ideas first introduced by Barton
such as the anticipation of Henry IV's tumultuous reign; the parallel between acting and kingship; and a design concept that associated the transfer in power with the movement from light to darkness.

In Barton's production, Ian Richardson and Richard Pasco alternated the roles of Bolingbroke and Richard II. In an elaborate pre-show, William Shakespeare selected the actor to play Richard II for that performance. The company dressed that actor in a mock coronation which linked the King as a role to be played. During the deposition scene, Richard II transferred the trappings of kingship to Bolingbroke which again reinforced the importance of role-play.

In Hands' production, the similarities between acting and kingship were demonstrated through Howard's portrayal of Richard II. As Richard II and Richard III opened, Alan Howard was at his prime as described by Terry Grimely.

Tall, slender, strong with floppy hair and short-sighted blue eyes, he is attractive to women, commanding when necessary but frequently overlooked in a crowd... He is hard to imitate and seems able to play with a minimum of make-up any physical type... by turns Richard II, all poetry and sweetness, and Richard III, full of prose and horror: the one a true king who becomes a man while losing a throne, the other a usurper who becomes a monster while grabbing one (29 Oct 1980).

In his portrayal of Richard II, Howard found a way to perform himself—a commanding actor fully aware of his own dramatic presence and an eye for effect. Howard's Richard II was an adept actor and politician who understood the form and structure of his government yet still refused to play by the rules. When pulled off his throne, many reviewers compared him to an actor who had lost his script.

Barton's 1973/1974 production opened many doors for future directors. Terry Hands was one of the first directors to walk through. This chapter analyzes Hands' work
in 1980 by examining the production’s placement in the performance history tradition of *Richard II* and within the context of political arena of Great Britain in the late 1970s through the early 1980s.

### 3.1 Design Elements

Abdel Farrah’s set consisted of a raked back wall and ramp. The rectangular floor was covered in gold stretching from the forestage almost to the back cloth (Page 73). Farrah’s set was metaphoric. During the tournament scene, the wall tilted backwards and revealed Richard II seated at his throne on an elevated platform. Perched at his feet was a small white rabbit and behind him, colorful banners waved.² Because of the movement of the wall, Richard appeared as the sun rising over the horizon.

The period style of the costumes and set evolved as Bolingbroke took power. Farrah explained to Terry Grimley of *The Birmingham Post*: “So after Richard’s deposition you have a totally contrary world taking over, a far more practical, less glamorous world than the Gothic.” In his set design elements, Farrah began by imitating Gothic extravagance and equated this style with Richard II. When Richard II was in control, the stage was flooded with light, gold, and color. As the power balance tilted towards Bolingbroke, the scenes became darker and more mysterious. Torches became the only source of light and the sets faded into expansive rooms and hidden stairways. Richard and his followers were associated with gold, while Bolingbroke and his men wore somber, dark colors. Farrah described it “as though a crow [was] taking over from a dove” (Page 74).

Image 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 illustrate the contrast between Richard II and Bolingbroke. In Image 2.1, Richard II (Alan Howard) sits at the feet of Bolingbroke (David Suchet)
during the deposition scene. Richard’s white terry cloth robe stands out against Bolingbroke’s black pants and dark brown knee-length fur vest. The fur used in Bolingbroke’s costume recalls a primitive or less refined nature, particularly when compared to Richard’s robes worn before the deposition. In Image 2.2, Richard appears appareled like the sun in a long, golden robe with delicate buttons trailing down his torso. Image 2.3 presents a well-worn Bolingbroke, matured with age and responsibility. His short beard indicates a passage of time since the deposition. Again, Bolingbroke appeared in fur. No longer a long fur vest, the fur accessory is an ermine stole wrapped securely around his neck. Together, these three images present a condensed yet nuanced depiction of Farrah’s concept.

Farrah’s concept focused on the transition of power and its visual reflection. In this way, Farrah’s concept was similar to that of Timothy O’Brien and Tazeena Firth in Barton’s 1973 production of Richard II. Like Firth and O’Brien, Farrah represented quite explicitly the visual manifestations of the loss of power during the deposition scene. The world looked much darker with the rise of King Henry IV.

3.2 The Actors

Hands’ production opened with a formal, medieval tableau with Howard at the center. Irving Wardle described the company as being “as flat as playing cards” positioned in “emblematic postures” (4 Nov 1980). Suchet and Howard were two dimensional characters until they began to move. The addition of movement to the stage picture pushed the characters into three dimensions. This tableau resonated with the performance history of Richard II in which Bolingbroke and Richard had been two
dimensional characters: good king and bad king, hero and villain. In Hands’ production, both Suchet and Howard presented complicated characters that underwent transformations as the power shifted.

Suchet’s character began as a businessman who negotiated his way into the monarchy (See Image 2.3). Once there, the impending weight of responsibility overwhelmed him. Irving Wardle described the progression in the following statement.

David Suchet’s Bolingbroke, who begins as an armour-plated cipher, then matures into an affably open-hearted invader and a coldly-masked opportunist, before finishing as a haunted figure bent under the weight of usurped kingship (4 Nov 1980).

Reviewers hesitated to place Suchet in the role of hero or villain as illustrated by David Ford.

David Suchet’s rebellious duke is provoking. When he smiles (which is often) he is disarming. When he shouts, an instability creeps in. He is neither the white hero or the black villain (4 Nov 1980).

The three dimensional characters created by Howard and Suchet were influenced by their knowledge of the remaining history plays. Suchet and Howard had the advantage of working together in all of Hands’ productions of Shakespeare’s history plays. They utilized the knowledge of what was to come in the Henry IV plays. Both Howard and Suchet allowed future events to affect their portrayals as demonstrated Michael Billington of the Guardian noted.

Behind the folderol, Alan Howard’s Richard is from the start a nervy monarch casting doubtful glances at Bolingbroke when he asks what would happen ‘were he my kingdom’s heir.’ And David Suchet’s Bolingbroke suggests a whole history of trouble ahead when, having seized the crown from Richard, he offers it to Northumberland to carry, and thinks better of it (4 Nov 1980).
John Barton’s 1973/1974 production of Richard II also acknowledged the events in the subsequent plays of the history cycle. Rather than leaving it to non-verbal gestures and line readings, Barton actually inserted lines and scenes from both of the Henry IV plays. Hands’ task was more challenging. Without the aid of interpolated scenes and text, he had to convey the ominous future. Abdel Farrah, one of Hands’ frequent collaborators, was able to provide the visual representation while Howard and Suchet embodied the impending downfall in their portrayals.

Alan Howard added the role of Richard II to a resume that included all of the kings in the history cycle: Henry IV, Hal, Henry V, and Richard III. Like Howard himself, his Richard II was an exceptional leading man.

His Richard is first shown set like a golden jewel at the centre of a stiff, formal medieval tableau. Order is everywhere and everything, and Mr. Howard almost sleepwalks through the rituals he royally performs, so assured is this king of his ability to play the part God cast him in... (Tinker 11 Nov 1981).

In this production, Richard II knew the intricacies and structures surrounding the role he played, but chose not to play according to the rules. As Tinker suggests, Richard II seemed to sleep walk through the ceremonies and rituals that he performed as King.

In Frank Benson’s 1896 production, Benson also demonstrated the mechanized routine of kingship. Benson’s Richard II was so acclimated to his role that even after his deposition he was unable to separate himself from the routines of kingship. When he was handed the mirror in Act 4 Scene 1, he absentmindedly climbed the stairs to his throne and was just about to sit down when he remembered himself; with a short laugh and apologetic gesture, he allowed Bolingbroke to take the throne (Shewring 66).
When Ian Richardson performed Richard II in Barton’s production, he acknowledged that Richard II had been crowned at a young age and therefore had grown into this exalted role. Richardson described how when he handed off a prop or costume to another character or issued a command to a servant, he never looked to make sure someone was going to take the object or follow the command; he knew it would be done. For Richardson, this demonstrated how indoctrinated Richard II had become at his role as King (Shewring 127).

One of the unique qualities that Howard brought to the role was his ability to suggest the incredible competence possessed by Richard II. Jack Tinker of the Daily Mail explained how Howard showed us “that Richard’s grasp on affair [was] always at least two steps ahead of the events cousin Henry [thrusted] upon him.” This can be contrasted with Deborah Warner’s production in 1995. Warner cast Fiona Shaw as Richard II who played the King as an awkward adolescent and inept at the complicated role he was assigned. Howard’s Richard was not inadequate; his mistakes did not stem from his lack of knowledge, but rather his lack of morals. His immorality was encapsulated in following moment described by Jack Tinker in the Daily Mail.

...when he grabs Bolingbroke’s birthright he acknowledges the enormity of the deed by casually cupping his hand to his ear waiting for the inevitable tirade from his uncle. It comes, and he smiles knowingly as if he had conjured the reaction from thin air (11 Nov 1981)

There was no doubt that Howard’s Richard II knew his action was wrong. He enjoyed the stir it caused among his court and uncle. Fully aware of the ‘rules’ and consequences, Howard played his hand. His only blind spot was his overestimation of the power of divine monarchy.
The tragedy in Hands’ production was that when Richard II, the polished actor, lost the monarchy, he also lost the role that he was destined to perform. Howard continued the acting metaphor by playing the deposition and the scenes thereafter as an actor who had lost his script. Irving Wardle described the “What must the king do now?” speech (III.iii.143) as “terrified gabble” (4 Nov 1980). After the deposition scene, Richard II amplified his already dramatic exit as he snatched Aumerle’s blue hankercheif and “strode out hiding his face, still an actor with an eye to effect” (Page 78).

As melodramatic and operatic as Richard II was, Bolingbroke was equally businesslike and reserved. B.A. Young of the Financial Times described Suchet’s Bolingbroke as “intellectual, reserved in manner, modest in dress.” What was consistent between the characters was the weight of the accountability carried with the crown. Richard II chose to shirk responsibility and serve his own interests. Bolingbroke was immediately overwhelmed.

3.3 Deposition Scene

The deposition scene of Hands’ production showcased Richard II, an actor who refused to give up center stage. In this scene, Howard captured Richard’s desperate need to retain control of the role he was born to play. This scene in Hands’ production epitomized the relationship between acting and kingship, in a way that was not achieved in Barton’s production.

Richard II maintained control of the situation during the empty bucket speech (IV.i.181-190). On ‘Here, cousin seize the crown,’ he held the crown in front of
Bolingbroke. After the line ‘Here, cousin/ On this side, my hand,’ Richard II took Bolingbroke’s hand and made him hold the crown. Though Bolingbroke was the usurper, Richard II was the aggressor.

Consistent with his earlier behavior, Howard’s Richard II understood the rules of deposition, but refused to abide them. This usurpation of the abdication ritual was echoed in Warner’s 1995 production. Shaw’s Richard II forced her court (and the audience) to acknowledge the absurdity of ‘unkinging’ a king. Shaw made a game of her deposition while Howard made a spectacle.

Howard began ‘Now mark me how I will do undo myself’ (IV.i.203-221) by placing the crown on his own head. He placed the crown on his head prior to using the first person. In this way, he linked himself, ‘I’ and ‘me,’ not as an individual but as the King of England. It was the King who was undoing himself, not Richard II the individual.

In Barton’s production, this speech ceremoniously transferred the symbols of kingship from Richard II to Bolingbroke. In Hands’ production, Richard II transferred the crown from himself to Bolingbroke but the sceptre and orb were held by York. As Richard II picked up the prop, he announced it, “And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand” (205) and then passed it to Bolingbroke. After adorning Bolingbroke with the objects of kingship, Howard guided him by hand to the throne and forced him to sit down after the line “‘God save King Henry,’ unkinged Richard says” (219). Howard’s Richard II was the master of ceremonies, orchestrating his own overthrow. He even created tears to “wash away [his] balm” (207), by licking his finger before wiping his eye. 
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As the scene progressed, Richard grew more manic. When Richard told Northumberland, “Mine eyes are full of tears, I cannot see” (244), Aumerle gave him his handkerchief. Richard repaid this act of compassion by directing the biting response to him “But they can see a sort of traitors here” (246). 7

Irving Wardle described the mirror scene as one in which “he move[d] in a matter of seconds from lachrymose self-pity to spitting contempt and sardonic defense” (4 Nov 1980). After seeing his reflection, Richard smashed his fist through the mirror. 14 lines later, a hysterical Howard danced with Aumerle as he told the court, “I am a greater than a king:/ For when I was a king my flatterers/ Were then but subjects” (305-307). Struggling to hold onto the centre stage, Howard changed tactics rapidly.

The faster Howard went, the more tragic the scene became. In the opening scenes of the production, Howard could command the stage with his presence alone. Young described Howard’s royal aura: “As we begin, the King stands before a costly crown with a gesture that speaks wordlessly of his divine right” (4 Nov 1980). In the deposition scene, Howard frantically demanded attention in the starring role. Jack Tinker described Howard’s Richard II as “a panicked performer whose script ha[d] been given to someone else—as indeed Richard’s ha[d]” (11 Nov 1981).

Barton’s 1973/1974 production acknowledged the connection between acting and kingship, but he was only able to skim the surface. Barton’s deposition scene focused on the ritual and ceremony. Hands’ production delved further into the relationship as it investigated what happens when the leading man is violently pulled out of the show.

Also unique to Hands’ production was the exploration of the relationship between Aumerle and Richard II. Aumerle appeared to be the most affected (besides Richard II)
by the deposition. With a blue handkerchief, Aumerle wiped away his tears while Richard attacked him with verbal barbs. He received the brunt of Richard’s derision despite his compassion. As Richard made his exit, he snatched Aumerle’s handkerchief and blew his nose before discarding it downstage center. Aumerle could not tear himself away from the spot as he stroked the blue cloth and began to plot his rebellion against Bolingbroke.

3.4 Concurrent Political Events

Hands’ production opened in the fall of 1980. One and a half years earlier, Great Britain had been faced with ‘Winter of Discontent’ under the leadership of Prime Minister James Callaghan. In January 1979, 1.5 million public service workers went on strike. This was followed by a series of selective and highly publicized strikes. With the growing popularity of television, images of children being denied school lunches, hospitals denying the sick, bodies left unburied in cemeteries, and rubbish piling up in local parks flooded the airwaves (Marwick 288 and Reitan 24).

Coined by Peter Jenkins of the Guardian, the ‘Winter of Discontent’ was a series of strikes that crippled Great Britain in the winter of 1979 (Marwick 288). Jenkins misused the opening line from Shakespeare’s Richard III (‘Now begins the winter of our discontent) which in context signified the ending of perilous rule. In 1979, the term ‘Winter of Discontent’ was used in mass media to describe the poor conditions of the country.

Prior to the winter of 1978-1979, Callaghan had been viewed as a stable and competent leader as demonstrated in the following statement by Kevin Jeffreys:
...the Prime Minister’s authority was beyond question. As he pored reflectively over his papers in his study or in bed, taking his time rather than rushing to judgment or spreading fears of conspiracies, the old sailor was manifestly in command. He was, many felt, the supreme coporatist, working closely with the TUC General Council in economic planning. But his democratic skills were always on view as he took trouble to keep lines open to backbenchers. He never missed a management committee meeting in Cardiff South East; his standing in opinion polls was consistently high. Margaret Thatcher, as Tory leader, was usually brushed aside, not without a fair touch of chauvinism in the process (145).

Callaghan may have been popular in the autumn, but the Winter of Discontent destroyed his image as a competent leader. Not only was Callaghan unable to deal with union negotiations, the press exploited the following incident.

Returning on 10 January 1979 from a meeting of European leaders in the French West Indies, Callaghan, looking relaxed and sun-tanned, was pressed by reporters on the industrial chaos. What Callaghan said was: ‘I don’t think that other people in the world would share the view there is mounting chaos.’ That, for journalistic purposes, was turned into ‘Crisis- what crisis?’

Newspapers printed the picture of the sun-tanned Callaghan under the headlines ‘Crisis- what crisis?’ and public opinion of his leadership, in Callaghan’s own words, underwent a ‘sea change’” (Marwick 283).³

As Brendan Evans explained in Thatcherism and British Politics 1975-1999, “in political history ‘events make history,’ and leadership is the product of circumstances” (1). Public opinion of Callaghan may have underwent a sea change, but not without reason. As the strikes 1979 ravished the country, Callaghan refused to call a state of emergency against his beloved unions (Jeffreys 147). In March 1979, the Scottish Nationalists moved a vote of No Confidence. The situation was so dire that on the day of the vote, even the catering staff at Parliament was on strike (Reitan 25). Callaghan lost the vote 312 to 311 and was forced to call an election.
Margaret Thatcher represented the Conservative Party in the spring election. Despite the tragic winter, “opinion polls gave Callaghan a higher personal rating than Thatcher” (Marwick 289). Both Thatcher and Callaghan created public images for themselves that they sold to the public.

Thatcher adjusted her strident and stern image. She worked with the Tory director of Publicity, Gordon Reese, to soften her image by lowering her voice and speaking more slowly. Eric J. Evans described the result as “certainly less strident, but also eerily synthetic.” However, “party managers nevertheless claimed to detect increased voter appeal and Reece would gain a knighthood in image manipulation” (Evans 16).

Callaghan capitalized on his greater personal popularity and “dropped into his practised, indeed threadbare, routine as the experienced uncle who had seen it all and who was solid, unflappable and secure” (Evans 16). Once a member of the navy, Callaghan also attempted to link himself with “the good old days when the British Navy, from its base in his home town of Pompey, ruled the world” and Great Britain was “a more secure and ordered society” (Jeffreys 149).

Callaghan entered the election with a stronger presence in the opinion polls, but it was Thatcher who left the election as the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Though Thatcher was not well liked, she was considered competent and decisive. Unfortunately, Callaghan was considered neither. Brendan Evans identified two elements that explained the election results: “the unpopularity of the Labour government and the credibility of the Conservative opposition in offering an alternative” (Evans 47).

The budget for Thatcher’s first year in office was so savage and she was so unpopular that even members of the Conservative Party did not expect her to stay in
office for the full term. Adult unemployment increased more in 1980 than it had in the last 50 years (Evans 59). Ministers outside of her cabinet argued for change in the budget and Thatcher famously declared; “U-turn if you want… this lady’s not for turning.” This was a reference to Edward Heath’s tendency to recant his more controversial decisions which Thatcher referred to as ‘u-turning.’ The irony of this statement was that the ‘u-turning’ was in reference to the opposition of Thatcher’s cuts which severely affected the arts (specifically the Royal Shakespeare Company as will be discussed later), yet her trademark line was a reference to the title of Christopher Fry’s post-war play *The Lady’s Not for Burning*.10

At the beginning of 1981, shortly after Hands’ production opened, polls recorded Thatcher “as the most unpopular Prime Minister since polling began” (Evans 61). In the summer of 1981, Great Britain suffered riots throughout the country and Thatcher was “reputed to have sympathised only with the shopkeepers whose property was looted” (Evans 65). The term Thatcherism was borne out of derision. Coined by Thatcher’s political opponents, it was used “to conjure images of harshness, divisiveness, and discontinuity with the past” (Evans x).

Not until the Argentinian occupation of the Falkland Islands in 1982 did public opinion of Thatcher begin to shift (Marwick 296). This again proved Brendan Evans’ statement that “in political history ‘events make history,’ and leadership is the product of circumstances” (1). In the statement below, Marwick described Thatcher’s performance.

...Thatcher, at her best in a crisis of this sort, acted with great decisiveness in mustering and dispatching a military task-force... The Thatcher Conservative Government was in the ascendant; many, probably a majority in the electorate, remained opposed to much of her philosophy, but she not only offered, but was
now palpably perceived to be offering, a toughness and leadership that could not be matched anywhere else in the political spectrum (296).

Whether or not people agreed with her actions, they could not deny that Thatcher’s actions were consistent with her rhetoric. She proved to be as tough and decisive as promised, in addition, she proved to be a tougher and more decisive leader than had previously been seen in British politics. Her reign continued through the 1980s until she chose John Major as her successor in the Conservative Party.

3.5 Political Manifestations in Hands’ Production

The election of the Conservative government, which was “dedicated to the rolling back of the role of the state in the arts” (Chambers 74), meant that the Royal Shakespeare Company needed to bolster ticket sales with a summer blockbuster.

In 1975, Terry Hands directed Henry V, Henry IV Parts 1 and 2, and Merry Wives of Windsor. Hands and Farrah had presented an idealistically patriotic production of Henry V. At that time, the RSC faced financial difficulties and was forced to listen to criticism from the right which dictated the season should open with an uplifting production of Henry V. Alan Sinfield described the struggle faced by Hands “to give a positive reading of the play which was not so clumsily patriotic as to violate the company’s political identity” (184).

In 1975, Terry Hands was the first director to be responsible for an entire season. His success was such that in 1977, with the same production team and Alan Howard (again) playing the title roles, Hands directed all three parts of Henry IV. In 1980, the Royal Shakespeare Company turned to Hands and his magic formula; Abdel Farrah, Alan Howard, and Guy Woolfendon; to increase ticket sales and bring in the summer crowds.
In an interview with Terry Grimley of The Birmingham Post, Hands explained:

"We had no intention of doing them [Richard II and Richard III] this year, but we were desperate for popular plays. We suddenly found ourselves doing them before we wanted."

3.6 Conclusion

Hands’ production occurred one year after the election of 1979. The transition of power from Callaghan to Thatcher was a transition full of apprehension. Abdel Farrah’s design concept captured the trepidation present in the play and Great Britain. Callaghan’s reign was associated with Great Britain’s glory days.

For many, Callaghan symbolized (lamented, some felt) a more secure and ordered society, the good old days when the British Navy, from its base in his home town of Pompey, ruled the world (Jeffreys, 149).

Farrah’s design moved from the ornate Gothic style to a bleak world of shadows and distrust. The costumes worn by Richard II and his followers were colorful, while Bolingbroke and his supporters wore somber colors. Farrah described it ‘as though a crow [was] taking over from a dove’ (Page, 74).

In Farrah’s design concept, he captured the trepidation of a society moving towards a new era. Thatcher was not a popular leader, but she was a viable alternative to Callaghan. Her premiership got off to a rough start and the country did not have the foresight of the sequel like Bolingbroke has.

Though spectators may have drawn parallels the situation represented on stage and their society, the politics in Hands’ 1980 production were far more complex. Critics
and scholarly reviewers did not make connections between the contemporary political context and the production. Hands and Farrah also did not explicitly address the political nature of the production.

The reviews for the production focused on splendour and intricacy of Farrah’s design concept\(^\text{11}\) as well as the contrast between Alan Howard and David Suchet in the roles of Richard II and Bolingbroke.\(^\text{12}\) Alan Howard was lauded both in his portrayal of Richard II\(^\text{13}\) and his achievement of playing all of Shakespeare’s kings.\(^\text{14}\) The politics of Hands’ production were located in the need which it fulfilled; when Thatcher cut funding to the arts, Hands was recruited to repeat his previous successes with Shakespeare’s history plays.
1 In 1975, Terry Hands directed *Henry V*, *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, and *Merry Wives of Windsor*. In 1977, Hands directed all three parts of *Henry IV*.

2 Michael Billington described it in the following statement: “...we even see a tilted wooden stage lowered to reveal Richard on a golden throne with a white hare at his feet and brave banners behind” (4 Nov 1980).

3 Tinker illustrated the ways in which Howard embodied the relation between acting and kingship: “...when the king is stripped of his props and plundered of his royal role that Howard’s grasp on the text totally mesmerises, surprises, and delights. He attacks familiar lines like a panicked performer whose script has been given to someone else—as indeed Richard’s has” (11 Nov 1981).

4 I have included the following blocking notes for IV.i.181-190. “Give me the crown (York gives crown to Richard—Richard to L of Bol). / Here, cousin (holds crown in front of Bolingbroke) seize the crown. Here, cousin—/ On this side, my hand (Takes Bol’s hand and makes him hold the crown with him), and on that side, thine./ Now is this golden crown like a deep well /That owes two buckets, filling one another, / The emptier ever dancing in the air, / The other down, unseen, and full of water. / That bucket down and full of tears am I / Drinking my grief whilst you mount up on high.”

5 I have included the following blocking notes for IV.i.215-219. “(Returns to L of Bolingbroke and holds his hand)Make me, that nothing have, with nothing grieved, (Takes Bol to throne-Bol mounts the steps)And thou with all pleased, that hast all achieved. / Long mayst thou live in Richard’s seat to sit, (Xs DS of Bol to R of throne, still holding his hand)/ And soon lie Richard in an earthy pit. / ‘God save King Henry,’ unkinged Richard says,(Makes Bolingbroke sit on throne).”

6 I have included the following blocking notes for IV.i.201-207. “(puts the crown on) Now mark me how I will undo myself. / I give this heavy weight from off my head (gives crown back to Bol, putting it on his head). (takes the sceptre from York and gives it to Bol)And this unwieldy scepter from my hand, (Takes orb from York and gives it to Bol) The pride of kingly sway from out my heart. / (Licks his fingers and wipes his eyes)With mine own tears I wash away my balm.”

7 I have included the following blocking notes for IV.i.244-246. “Mine eyes are full of tears, I cannot see (Aumerle hands the hankercchief to Richard). / And yet salt water blinds them not so much/ But they can see a sort of (Turns to Aumerle) traitors here.”

8 Callaghan also referenced Shakespeare to describe the dramatic change in his popularity. A ‘sea change’ is from Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*.

9 Margaret Thatcher entered Downing Street on 3 May 1979 while still an outsider in the British political and social establishment... As a result many commentators, including a few within the ranks of her own party, expected that the programme which she was inaugurating would be a temporary aberration before normal service was resumed (Evans 51).

10 During the public-spending round in the autumn of 1980 non-Thatcherite ministers argued for the maintenance of public expenditure and investment, while at the party conference Thatcher declared: ‘U-turn if you want...this lady’s not for turning’ (the reference to the post-war Christopher Fry play *The Lady’s Not for Burning* being provided by her highly literate script writer Ronald Miller). Marwick, 290.

11 The following reviews from B.A. Young and Irving Wardle illustrate how Farrah’s design was received. “*Richard II* has the old full-blooded look, the costumes rich, the settings, though stylized, breathing out the air of monarchs” (Young, 4 Nov 1980). “The sense of historical transition is graphically conveyed by Farrah’s stage” (Wardle 4 Nov 1980).
The following reviews from B.A. Young, and Michael Billington illustrate how Suchet’s performance was received. “Suchet’s Bolingbroke, a very good performance, makes a total contrast. He is an intellectual, reserved in manner, modest in dress. (After he becomes King, he grows a little grey beard and wears spectacles.) It is true that he has not the same class of poetry to speak; but when he treats the lines as drama, and not as opera, this brings out the innermost feelings more effectively” (Young, Nov 1980). “Alan Howard’s Richard also has the right star presence: peacock-proud in the early scenes, trembling hysteric as he sees his kingdom crumble all around him, and truly regretful when he sees his life has been full of ‘self and vain conceits.” ...But though it is a fine performance it doesn’t overshadow David Suchet’s Bolingbroke, who starts as a greedy opportunist with his eyes fixed firmly on the crown and who grows into a rheumy, bespectacled, ermine-scarfed figure, filled with retrospective compassion” (Billington 4 Nov 1980).

The following reviews from B.A. Young, Irving Wardle, and Jack Tinker illustrate how Howard’s performance was received. “The King is Alan Howard, decked in a shoulder-length blond wig, moving always with youthful grace and a regal dignity even in prison” (Young 4 Nov 1980). “Richard II famously embodies the equation between acting and kingship, and such is Mr. Howard’s general approach to the part. What counts, though, is the detail with which he fills it out. Before things start going wrong he radiates invulnerability in costumes conveying the insistent imagery of the sun...Announcing his seizure of the dead Gaunt’s estate, he cups a hand to his ear ready for the inevitable blast from Tony Church’s York. It is a beautifully-placed moment, after a maliciously unfeeling exchange with his cronies, that the royal playboy moves downstage and says of York: “He always loved us”, in puzzled apprehension of the bad times to come” (Wardle 4 Nov 1980). “...when the king is stripped of his props and plundered of his royal role that Howard’s grasp on the text totally mesmerises, surprises, and delights. He attacks familiar lines like a panicked performer whose script has been given to someone else—as indeed Richard’s has” (Tinker 11 Nov 1981).

The following excerpts detail Howard’s mastery at playing all of Shakespeare’s kings. “Alan Howard...will play both Richards. This means that in the last five years he will have performed all the major roles in the complete Shakespeare history cycle—eight plays in all. All these productions have been staged by the same production team of Terry Hands director, designer Farrah and composer Guy Woolfenden” (Warwick Advertiser, 10 Oct 1980). “After acting the title role in all three parts of Henry VI (sometimes in a single day) and Prince Hal in both parts of Henry IV and Henry V (also, on several occasions, in a single day) he faces the critics next week playing Richard II on Monday and Richard III on Tuesday” (Evening Standard 31 Oct 1980).
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CHAPTER 4

DEBORAH WARNER’S RICHARD II: EVALUATING LEADERSHIP AT A DISTANCE

In June 1995, Deborah Warner directed a production of Richard II that opened at the National Theatre in London. The production later toured to several European cities including Salzburg, Austria and Paris, France. Warner cast Fiona Shaw in the title role and David Threlfall into the role of Bolingbroke.

Warner’s casting of the title role defined the production; however, gender was not the main issue. As Margaret Shewring argued, it was not significant that the role of a King was played by a woman, but it was significant that the role of the King was a role to be played. By placing Fiona Shaw in the role, kingship became an ‘elaborate theatrical charade’ (Shewring 182) which encouraged audience to re-interrogate and re-evaluate what it meant to be King. Warner employed other distancing devices within the production including Hildegarde Bechtler’s set design which both distanced and integrated the audience, a pre-show that introduced then removed symbols of kingship and ritual, and acting styles employed by Shaw and Threlfall. These devices forced the audience to reconcile contradictions between what was presented and what the text of the play described. For example, Fiona Shaw played the title role. The audience had to reconcile a female actress playing the role of King. Through the act of reconciliation, the
audience had to acknowledge that the production was not a replication of reality or a realistic portrayal, but a theatrical production and the role of a King was a role to be performed.

John Barton also utilized distancing devices in his 1973/1974 production of *Richard II* to highlight the relationship between actor and monarch. In Barton's production, the roles of Richard II and Bolingbroke were shared by Richard Pasco and Ian Richardson. In an elaborate pre-show, an actor identified as William Shakespeare selected the actor who would perform the role of Richard II in the subsequent performance.

Like Barton, Warner highlighted the reflective relationship between Richard II and Bolingbroke. In Barton's production, however, the two main characters were fatal twins whose destinies were controlled by the roles they played. The tragedy was in the role of king. Pulled from his role, Richard was left with nothing. Placed into the role, Bolingbroke could not escape the responsibilities and sacrifices tied to his new role. Warner's production concept differed slightly in that she presented two contrasting figures in Threelfall's Bolingbroke and Shaw's Richard II. The characters were not victims of the roles that they played; instead, each character, as portrayed, had unique traits that defined his identity. At the same time, though, the two characters had complementary personalities.

Shaw's Richard II was a clumsy, socially awkward adolescent who had not yet grown up. He laughed a little too loud, his comments were always a little bit off, and he did not seem to be at home within his body. His overzealous bows struck him off balance and he was constantly fidgeting as he did not seem to know what to do with his limbs.
Richard II contrasted sharply with Threlfall’s Bolingbroke. Threlfall exuded decisiveness and commanded attention just as Shaw was racked with indecision and demanded attention from her court. In this way, Shaw and Bolingbroke were mirror images or inverse reflections of each other. Together, the characters balanced one another. Paul Taylor described the two as “platonic doubles” who “inversely reflect[ed] each other, both the placings [sic] of a curiously under-willed fate, like figures on escalators moving in opposite directions.” Carol Chillington Rutter elaborated on this idea when she described the relationship as “not just twins by the male and female sides of what once had been a single self, now violently ruptured” (318).

Warner chose to emphasize the familial love between the Richard II and Bolingbroke. Similarly, Richard Cottrell’s 1968 production of Richard II (with Ian McKellan as Richard II) highlighted the importance of the familial bonds. Margaret Shewring observed that “noblemen and officials [had] obviously grown up together and represent[ed] various generations of family bonds and conflicts” (83). In contrast to Contrell’s production, Warner instead focused on the intimate relationship between Richard II and Bolingbroke, as opposed to the entire extended family. The tragedy of Warner’s production was the deterioration of this relationship. The intimacy of this relationship was explored in a way that had not been explored before. The exploration was made possible by Shaw’s gender.

Warner and Shaw identified gender, the “socially constructed division between the sexes” that includes “culturally determined groups of attributes including emotional and psychological characteristics” (Taylor), as the only problem of the production; however it was through Shaw’s gender that Warner’s concept developed and broke away
from traditional interpretations of Shakespeare’s play. This chapter will begin to answer
the question posed by Fiona Shaw in her interview with Carol Chilington Rutter (315):
“so what happens, what is released, if a woman plays Richard II?”

4.1 Design Elements

Margaret Shewring identified Hildegard Bechtler’s set design as “an integral
factor in this challenge to conventional interpretation” (181). Bechtler set the action on a
traverse stage with the audience lining both sides. The entrances were located on both
terms of the stage and bisected the center of the stage. Carol Chilington Rutter provided
the following description:

A narrow traverse stage in bare, honey-colored wood was flanked by steeply
raked seats that rose behind barricades... Their positions on either side of the
action configured the idea of “seeing double”: there could be no consensus
viewpoint here, no single way of looking at things “from the front”. Every scene
was played to a double audience, and spectators were aware of seeing across the
playing space a mirror image of themselves (319).

Bechtler created a mirror on stage for the audience. When looking at the stage, the
audience also saw their reflections in the audience members that sat directly across the
stage. The spectators were forced to watch their own double, their own reflection as they
watched the actions of the play unfold. The relationship between the two sides of the
audience echoed the reflective relationship between the two main characters.

As Rutter noted, there was no single vantage point from which to watch the
production. The multiple vantage point perspective was not unique to Warner’s
production as it occurs whenever a production takes place on a thrust and theatre in the
round arrangement. But due to the set up of the playing area, as Shewring argued, it was
“not possible for any individual spectator to encompass the whole scene at any given moment, so that he or she had to be selective and, hence, maintain a critical distance” (181).

Though the audience had to maintain a ‘critical distance,’ Bechtler’s design also incorporated the audience into the dramatic action. The audience either sat in “high-sided wooden stalls” that comprised of “blocks of raked seats in three tiers” or “a raised balcony” that was located above the wooden stalls and one of the ends of the stage (Shewring 181). The audience became spectators in “choir stalls, on benches in the House of Commons, behind barriers at a joust, and in grandstands at tennis” (Rutter). Bechtler’s design succeeded in incorporating the audience as critical observers in the world of the play.

4.2 Pre-show

Warner’s production began as soon as the audience entered the theatre. Arturo Annechino’s devotional music was sung by an acapella woman’s choir and objects related to kingship were laid out on pedestals down the length of the stage.¹ John Marshall, dressed in a cleric robe, sat on stage reading a Bible. Upstage behind a gauze curtain, actors came out singly or in pairs to warm up. Once they finishing warming up, Richard’s servants dressed Shaw in a coronation robe, crown, and sceptre in a very ceremonial fashion. Image 3.1 presents Shaw in her coronation robes. Shaw’s coronation robes were not constructed of lavish fabrics and rich colors. Shewring described the fabrics as having “been brought together almost a random, as by a child dressing up,
using old sheets and tunics to piece together a brave show” (182). Again, Bechtler reinforced the contradictions inherent in Richard’s performance. Richard is dressed ceremoniously as a King with rags and piecemeal royal regalia.

The dressing of the King was reminiscent of both Brecht’s famous ‘dressing of the Pope’ scene in Galileo and John Barton’s 1973/1974 production of Richard II. In Galileo and Barton’s production, the pieces of costume were used to signify the act of transformation from the individual into the political or religious leader. After Shaw was dressed, she received communion and led a procession upstage behind the scrim. Marshall gathered the objects of kingships before exiting the stage. The lights went down to a blackout. When the lights came back up, Shaw ran on stage laughing without her robes, stopped abruptly, and awkwardly bowed to her court.

The pre-show showcased ceremonious rituals that were tied with kingship and past performances of Richard II. Beginning with the antiquarian movement in the nineteenth century and Charles Kean’s 1857 production, performances of Richard II included the pageantry and ceremony associated with the medieval period. Even when faced with a low budget, Richard Cottrell’s 1968 production evoked the period through the pageantry of banners, candelabra, high-backed thrones, formal movements and Tudor plainsong (Shewring 82).

Warner’s pre-show incorporated her production into the performance history of the play by setting up a critical distance. She acknowledged the traditions associated in performance by creating parallels in the pre-show through the devotional music, the dressing of the King, and the objects tied with kingship. She then removed these parallel
features thus creating a distance between her production and what has come before. As Marshall removed the objects of kingship from their pedestals, Warner removed *Richard II* from its pedestal.

### 4.3 Vocal Delivery

*Richard II* is one of the few Shakespeare plays written entirely in verse. Shaw and Threlfall presented contrasting approaches to the Shakespearean verse. Shaw’s style\(^2\) hearkened to John Barton and his approach in the 1963/1964 production of *War of the Roses*.\(^3\) Barton embraced the heightened language but did so in such a way as to break up the verse as opposed to reciting it lyrically with no breaks or unnecessary pauses.

Shaw jarringly broke up the delivery of the verse into short fragments, not adhering to the iambic pentameter rhythm that Shakespeare had constructed. She also added guttural exclamations, vocal explosions within a line, and audible breaths. An examination of Act 1.4 provides one example of the wide variety of sounds and rhythms that Shaw added to the text. When Green tells Richard that “Expedient manage must be made, my liege” (39), Shaw started groaning ‘Euuuhhh. Euuuhhh’ and rocked her body holding her head. She continued this for several beats and then she leapt up and declared quickly “We will ourself in person to this war” (42). After checking with the other characters on stage for approval, she continued in her speech. After she finished the speech with “For we will make for Ireland presently” (53), she began making farmyard noises such as ‘oink, oink’ and ‘baaaa, baaaa.’ This was echoed by the other characters on stage. The noises then continued into the next scene (Gaunt’s death scene) when Shaw entered, funeral wreath in hand.
Act 3.2 provided another example of how Shaw altered the rhythm of the text. There were many long speeches in this scene and the audience began to see how the character of Richard was falling apart. In order to show Richard’s emotional stress, Shaw shared with the audience how Richard was struggling to maintain composure by adding audible breaths within the lines to gain strength and momentum. There were times when she flew through the lines and times where she added pauses at the end of lines and within lines. This was most apparent in the following speech:

...For you have mistook me all this while.
I live with bread like you, feel want,
Taste grief, need friends: subjected thus
How can you say I am a king? (174-177)

In the following lines and phrases: ‘I live with bread like you,’ ‘feel want,’ and ‘taste grief,’ she added a pause between each clause. On, ‘need friends,’ she lengthened ‘need’ into at least five beats. Because of the long ‘e’ of *need*, it came out as a painful whine of complaint to her courtiers. Because the lines do not complete a regular line of iambic pentameter, it could be argued that the pauses and extension of beats were justified. However, the pauses were longer than one or two beats. Shaw surpassed the length of pauses and word extensions that would have made the lines regular iambic pentameter.

Shaw’s vocal delivery marked a break in performance history tradition. Richard II has often been seen and portrayed as a tragic poet. This tradition began in 1896 with Frank Benson and continued with such actors as William Poel (1899), John Gielgud (1929 and 1934), and Richard Pasco (1973/1974). Benson, Poel, Gielgud, and Pasco created an intellectual character. Richard II the poet separated himself from the situation and provided philosophical commentary on deposition.
Shaw fought against the poetry. She did not separate herself from the situation, instead she embodied it. Benson, Poel, and Gielgud, and Pasco located the experience of Richard II in their minds, while Shaw kept it within her body. Her visceral vocal delivery forced the audience to attend to her idiosyncratic methods of distortion and fragmentation. She called attention to her identity as an actress as she interpolated her own sounds and exclamations.

In contrast to Shaw who separated the verse into shorter fragments and added other vocalizations to the text, Threlfall spoke the verse smoothly with few interruption or artificial pauses. He embraced the traditional rhythms, speech patterns, and heightened language. His style was reminiscent of John Gielgud and Richard Pasco, the great Shakespearean poets (See Image 3.3).

In Act 2.3, Bolingbroke had to justify his treason to York. Threlfall selected his words carefully and spoke in an understated voice; he was quiet and earnest as he argued “As I was banished, I was banish’d Herford, /But as I come, I come for Lancaster” (II.iii.113-114). The majority of this speech is written in regular iambic pentameter with only a few lines running into excess syllables. The logic is found in the verse and builds naturally into a persuasive argument. Up until this point, York has argued vehemently that Bolingbroke is in the wrong. After this argument, York still finds him a rebel but can better emphasize with the situation. His deliberate delivery and self-control allowed Shakespeare’s persuasive argument to shine through.
This unadorned style of acting was contrasted with Shaw's embellished and sometimes erratic delivery of the lines. During the speech above, Threlfall exuded a calm and powerful stage presence. He held his ground firmly and added no unnecessary physical movement.

4.4 Deposition Scene

An examination of the deposition scene illustrates how Threlfall and Shaw handled movement for their characters. Over the course of 74 lines, Shaw's blocking notes called for a hyperactive Richard:

FS [Fiona Shaw] sits by DL [David Lyon, Earl of Salisbury]
FS rises XC [crosses center] puts crown on floor
[FS] X [crosses] sits R with DL
FS XC, DT [David Threlfall] and FS go for crown put it between them
FS does clockwise circuit of DT
FS puts crown on floor
FS backs U/S [upstage] a little
Same as 7 (FS backs U/S a little]
FS X to MB (Michael Bryant, Duke of York)
FS X U [crosses upstage] sits chair
FS rises X slowly D/S [downstage] to DT
FS picks up crown
FS puts crown on DT head
FS kneels
FS lies face down)
SR [Struan Rodger, Northumberland] rises X to SL [stage left] of FS kneels by her
FS kneels up
FS rises
FS wanders about

Shaw's Richard II was all over the stage during the abdication. In an interview with Carol Chillington Rutter, Fiona Shaw explained:

This scene was not the one Bollingbroke envisaged. If only Richard could say, 'I, Richard of Bordeaux, give you...’ in a solemn, pompous voice, then everything would be fine (322).
Shaw refused to play the allotted role of the usurped. She interacted with those in her court who turned against her. She did not stand still and solemnly accept her fate; she railed against it. Even the stage manager could not contain Shaw’s movement as demonstrated by the description ‘FS wanders about.’

David Threlfall’s only movement was in relation to Shaw. After Shaw placed the crown between her and Bolingbroke on “Here, cousin, seize the crown;” (IV.i.181), she clapped her hands, snapped her fingers, jumped down, and hit the ground with her hand. The next “Here cousin” (182), was a calling to Bolingbroke to join her in what appeared to be a childhood game of theirs. When she repeated the actions, Bolingbroke joined her and when they jumped down, they both grabbed the crown. As Shaw recited the famous empty bucket speech, she and Bolingbroke circled each other. After that point, David Threlfall remained physically grounded.

The actions involved in the apparent childhood game between Bolingbroke and Richard—the clapping hands, snapping fingers, jumping down, and hitting the ground—demonstrated the familial bond between these cousins. This was further emphasized at the end of Richard’s ‘Now mark me how I will undo myself’ speech, (199-210). On the line, “God save King Henry,” Shaw placed the crown on Bolingbroke and clung to him in an embrace.

The deposition scene not only reinforced the contrast between Shaw and Threlfall as characters but also highlighted the intimate relationship between these characters despite the public forum in which the scene takes place. In an interview, Fiona Shaw explained her interest in exploring the love affair between Richard II and Bolingbroke.
I was interested in the private love affair between Richard and Bolingbroke. I wanted to play a Richard who loves Bolingbroke. If he hates Bolingbroke, if his cousin is his archenemy, then the play is about one cousin who hates another cousin for destroying him. That’s not interesting. What’s interesting is when the person you’re destroying is the person you love (Rutter 318-319).

Shaw explained that she created a pre-history for the characters in which Bolingbroke had always been Richard’s protector. This explained why Shaw ran and hid behind Bolingbroke when Northumberland tried to bully Richard into signing the abdication papers (Rutter 320). This intimate and familial relationship is illustrated in Image 3.2. Though Bolingbroke usurped the throne, Richard still expected him to be his protector. When Shaw hid behind Threlfall, he instinctively reached back to hold him. Bolingbroke still loved Richard. As the scene progressed and Shaw grew more manic, silent tears streamed down Bolingbroke’s face.

In Barton’s production, the tragedy was contained within the sacrifices inherent in the role of King—to be a King was to forfeit your identity as an individual. In Hands’ production, the tragedy was watching an accomplished actor lose the only role he knew how to play. In Warner’s production, Bolingbroke learned that to take the crown was to destroy someone he loved. With the all the productions, kingship was associated with destruction—of the individual, a role, or a relationship.

Equally important in the deposition scene was what did not transpire on stage. The deposition scene has often been played as a dramatic scene of political ritual. In both Barton’s 1973/1974 production and Mnouchkine’s 1980 production, the deposition was a reverse coronation. Often during Richard’s ‘Now mark me how I will undo myself’ speech (IV.i.200-217), Richard has transferred the symbols of kingship to Bolingbroke.
John Barton followed the text literally so that when Richard stated “I give this heavy weight from off my head,” Richard placed the crown on Bolingbroke. When Richard states “And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,” Richard handed the sceptre to Bolingbroke. By the end of the speech, Richard was left wearing only an open white shirt and dark pants. This image contrasted sharply with Bolingbroke who was enclosed within symbols of kingship. A golden mask covered his face and only his hands could be seen holding the orb and sceptre.

In Ariane Mnouchkine’s production, the costumes “indicated some Japanese influence in the bulky, full-skirted, multi-layered and richly coloured trappings reminiscent of the Samuri” (Shewring 171). The transfer of costumes did not occur until the end of the scene. Black robed attendants undressed Richard II as described by Margaret Shewring below.

These lavish fabrics were item by item transferred to Bolingbroke. Here the bulk of the multi-layered costumes were exploited to advantage. Richard became physically much smaller and more vulnerable as he handed over the layers’ of power. Bolingbroke gained in physical stature as he assumed the royal trappings of authority” (172).

Barton and Mnouchkine emphasized the ceremony and the transfer of the trappings of kingship. Warner’s deposition scene mocked the ceremonious transfer of power. Shaw’s Richard II “came into the scene fully aware of the irony of the situation.” She forced Bolingbroke, the court, and audience to recognize the absurdity of the ritual. In an interview with Carol Chilington Rutter, Shaw explained how she saw Richard’s attitude when entered the deposition scene:

So, here we are in Parliament and somebody’s the king. I wonder who it could be? Because it used to be me. My cousin, whom I’ve agreed to make king (insofar
as one can make him king), is here, too. So what would you like me to do? Give the crown away? Okay—there it is. In the basket (Rutter 322).

Shaw refused to follow the rules of the deposition. Pomp and ritual would have removed the emotion of the scene. Emotion, in turn, revealed the pomp and ceremony of kingship. Richard II was a king by divine right, but through the ceremony of deposition, Richard’s identity as King is somehow revoked. Shaw told Carol Chillington Rutter, “The moment Richard crowns Henry is the ultimate declaration that the crowning means nothing. ‘God save King Henry, unking’d Richard says’ (IV.i.220). ‘Unking’d’—that’s a wonderful word. You can’t unking someone” (Rutter 322).

When Shaw ‘unking’d’ herself in Richard’s ‘Now mark me how I will undo myself’ speech (IV.i.200-217), she emphasized the false illusion of the ceremony. In Mnouchine’s and Barton’s productions, Richard II transferred the trappings of kingship to Bolingbroke in a reverse coronation. But Shaw emptied the ceremony of royal power by miming how she would undress herself had she a costume to remove. As Rutter explained: “There was nothing there, nothing in her hands: the emperor had no clothes” (322). Shaw existed as a King without the external trappings. There were no material symbols of kingship that designated her to that role, so how could she possibly be ‘unking’d’? The illusion of the ceremony was revealed; Richard could give Bolingbroke the crown, but not the kingship.

4.5 Reception

In Great Britain, the production was met with mixed and sometimes hostile reviews because Warner had cast Fiona Shaw in the title role. On her choice of both directing
Richard II and casting Fiona Shaw as the title role, Deborah Warner told Claire Armitstead from the Guardian:

It is a fabulous play and I had no intention of dying before I directed it. Fiona for me is the most exciting and suitable Richard that I could think of. The only thing that stood in the way was gender.

Gender served to benefit and discredit Shaw in her portrayal of Richard II. For Michael Coveny, Shaw’s gender was fitting for the role in that she “complicat[ed] the medieval notion of a man anointed to a role he can hardly fulfill.” Other reviewers, like Rhoda Koenig, were less favorable to the cross-casting and discredited Shaw because of her gender.

Though Richard II was an ineffectual King, he was a King, and was a man. If an actress can project masculinity (and some are more capable of doing so than some actors) there is nothing against her taking up the sceptre and orb. Judging by this outing, though, Shaw doesn’t have enough maleness to play Peter Pan.

In Great Britain, the reviewers all had to make peace with Shaw’s gender before evaluating the production. The reviewer either had to acknowledge gender as not affecting the production or ways in which her gender enhanced or detracted from the production. Few reviewers were like Koenig and unable to accept or move past Shaw’s gender when evaluating the production.¹²

In interviews with Shaw before, during, and after the production, she addressed how her gender affected the production and her portrayal. She admitted that she had not originally anticipated the ‘great taboo that she was breaking’ when she “wandered into the labyrinth of theatre and gender,”¹³ but she also argued that her gender initiated a new reading of the play and the issues surrounding kingship. She explained to Richard Covington.
only a woman playing the king could estrange the role sufficiently for this
demystification to happen and to permit a British audience to consider what a
very odd idea a “king” is.

Rutter attributed the uneasiness elicited in British reviewers to the fear of the unknown:

The “girl” was not going to play the Richard they knew from a dozen previous
productions, the wastrel, the gormless poltroon outmaneuvered by his barons, the
“girly” king (314).

Some reviewers like Irving Wardle and Carol Chilington Rutter,¹⁴ associated Warner’s
production with John Barton’s 1973/1974 production. These reviewers may have placed
the production in the performance history context but abstained from placing it within a
political context.

When the production was performed in France in January 1996, reviewers
focused on the role of politics. Based on the performance history of Richard II in France
(and other non-English speaking European countries), it was not surprising that
connections were made between Warner’s production and contemporary politics.
Margaret Shewring explained European productions emphasized “the play’s discussions
of the behaviour appropriate to someone in a position of authority, and the strains that
such a position places on the individual” as opposed to lessons in British history or
antiquarian celebration of medieval times (154). An article from Le Monde about the
production of Richard II and its relation to current events in both France and Great
Britain described the play with its issues of leadership and the deposition of a leader as
both current and troubling.

A un moment où l’Angleterre s’interroge sévèrement sur la pérennité de la
couronne et du royaume, à un moment où la France vient de porter en terre celui
que l’on tient assez unanimement pour le dernier monarque républicain, Richard II
met en scène... C’est on ne peut plus actuel, effectivement, et dérangeant en ce que
le texte se garde bien de donner une quelconque leçon, d’esquisser une
quelconque solution pour tous ceux qui devront survivre à un système révolu tandis qu’il magnifie un ordre politique, religieux et social qui appartient déjà au passé.

At the moment when England is severely questioning over the durability of the Crown and of the realm, at the moment when France has just buried a leader who they unanimously considered the last monarch, Richard II takes the scene...In fact, it could not be more current and troubling in that the text takes care not to give the slightest lesson in evoking any solution for all those living in a bygone system that idealizes a political, religious, and social order which belongs in the past (16 January 1996).

The review placed Warner’s production within the political context of current events.

Great Britain was still recovering from both Thatcherism and its departure. In addition, issues of leadership were being hotly contested in Great Britain as Prime Minister John Major was facing the Leadership Contest of 1995.

4.6 Concurrent Political Events

In 1979, Margaret Thatcher became prime minister of Great Britain. She was in office until 1990 when John Major was elected. Thatcher’s Prime Ministerial ghost haunted Major throughout his career. In May 1995, the publication of Thatcher’s autobiographical The Path to Power delivered another blow to Major. These memoirs provided details on her life up until her election, but more damaging to Major was the second part of the book in which she responded to the state of British politics after 1990. Thatcher began this section by listing all the mistakes made by the Major administration. She focused on Great Britain’s role in Europe, defense and foreign policy of the West, the relationship with the United States, the inaction and subsequent weakness in relations with Russia, and the disarray in NATO. She ends her tirade with the following challenge.

Not that everything is bad. The world is a freer, if not necessarily safer, place than during the Cold War. But that most important element of political success is missing—a sense of purpose.
Of course, I would say that, wouldn’t I? Perhaps. But others who often criticized me in Government are saying it too. In the pages which follow... I offer some thoughts about putting these things right. It is now, however, for others to take the action required (469).

Thatcher’s memoirs and the aforementioned challenge brought her reign back into the public eye and initiated additional comparisons with Major’s administration. The press was quick to pick up on the challenged issued by Thatcher. Articles, political cartoons, and commentary represented Thatcher in monstrous forms attacking John Major. Heather Nunn identifies some of the images of Thatcher that were used in the mass media at this time.

In numerous media representations, Thatcher as vampire, voodoo witch, murderous strangler and tidal wave erupted like the return of the Conservative repressed to stab, throttle, drown, shoot or haunt the nightmares of ineffectual Major. Mid-year, as the publications of her memoirs approached and the debates over Major’s political future continued, motifs of Thatcher as uncanny or violent were common place (178).

Major had consistently sought to distance himself from Thatcher. When Major was initially elected, he built up an image of himself as the ordinary man. In his autobiography published in 1999, Major stated:

I wanted to show that it was possible to be prime minister and remain a human being, just like the fifty-five million other human beings in the country, but with an exceptional job” (Major 210).

In the beginning of his term, he was praised for this image. This was a sharp contrast with Margaret Thatcher and many of the Conservative party ideals. It gave the British public a tangible example of an everyday person rising to the top. It gave them hope for their own possibilities (Foley 195). After two years, this image began to tarnish. Previously, he had been praised and now he was being scorned. His image did not change, but the public was no longer satisfied with that role in which John Major was cast.
... He was now castigated for being ordinary in an exceptional position and for inducing extraordinary failures because of who he was and where he served. Ambition was seen to have surpassed ability... His style of leadership was now interpreted as a sign of weakness rather than strength... Major did not merely lose his leadership; he lost control over how that leadership was defined and interpreted (Foley 195).

It was not a matter of whether or not Major became a bad leader. It was a matter of what constituted 'good' leadership. Major's leadership qualities became outdated within his time. To many people, Major appeared to be weak. He lacked the aura of power and purpose.

In June 1995, John Major, the current prime minister of Great Britain, stepped down as the Conservative party leader. He demanded a re-election in his party because of a lack of support within his party. He challenged the party members to find a new leader or put their support behind as their leader. This action showed the public that there was a problem in leadership within their government.16

John Major's challenge was met with mixed reviews. Some applauded him for finally taking a stand and showing his strength. Some people looked down upon the action.

As many ways, the resignation was an act of public humiliation in which the prime minister openly conceded that he could not control his own party. It was an admission of weakness (Foley 130-131).

Early on, Major stated that he would only continue as party leader if he received a minimum of 215 votes in his re-election. Though he won with 218 votes (Foley 131), issues of leadership were raised in Great Britain. His admission to not having control over his party, let alone the country, was a blow to the high expectations and ideals of a
country leader. Major "epitomised the problems that a leader can confront when the tide of contested standards turns against the person in the leadership position" (Foley 194).

This tide continued against him in the 1997 election. John Major's leadership did not change during his term, but the country was looking for a new kind of leadership. The public favored the dynamic leadership of Tony Blair and the New Labour party in the 1997 election. The two years between Major's challenge to the House of Commons and the election were years in which leadership and ideas surrounding leadership were hotly contested.

4.7 Conclusion

Shaw described Warner as a director who is apolitical but who is able to release the "emotional heartbeat of a play." Shaw felt that "if you hit the emotional heartbeat of a play, you also hit the chaotic area—the problematic area, the area you're going to have to examine. If you hit that, the politics will follow" (Rutter 319). Warner and Shaw did not make any explicit comments connecting the production with politics; however, I find that the play resonated with parallels to contemporary political events.

Warner, Bechtler, and Shaw were frequent collaborators. The distancing in Warner's production was tri-fold—Bechtler's designs, Shaw's portrayal, and Warner's vision. Warner and Shaw had a great deal of respect for each other as artists. Warner did not begin the project with the intent to make a political statement, but to showcase Shaw in an exceptional role. To Claire Armistead of the Guardian, Warner stated that "Fiona for me [was] the most exciting and suitable Richard" that she could think of. In this way, the production was centered on Fiona Shaw as Richard II. The distancing devices grew out of the need to reconcile Shaw to the male title role.
Though Shaw identified Warner as being apolitical, Warner had a reputation for political interpretations. In this way, politics were located within the director of the production but not necessarily through the director's agenda. Spectators had an expectation that if Warner was directing a production then it would somehow include a political statement (Dutton).

Warner repeatedly sought to distance the audience from the events on stage. She cast a woman in the role of Richard II. In her pre-show, she set up traditions in performance history—Tudor plainsong, ceremonial dressing of the King, objects associated with kingship—only to tear them down when the performance began.

Through her stage designs, Bechtler both distanced and incorporated the audience into the dramatic action as critical evaluators. The traverse stage meant that the audience was not able to see the stage in its entirety. The spectators had to engage themselves in selecting which area of the stage they would watch. The three-tiered seating arrangement drew the audience into various roles within the dramatic action. These roles included an assembly at Parliament and spectators at a jousting or tennis match.

Richard II is a play about leadership. Shaw and Threlfall presented sharply contrasting characters, and in turn, sharply contrasting styles of leadership. Shaw's character was an emotional adolescent unable to handle the responsibilities of his role, yet unwilling to release his kingship. Threlfall was terse, efficient, and self-disciplined. Bennedict Nightingale argued that "Threlfall [was] a cool, incisive Bolingbroke, as natural as a ruler as Shaw [was] an unnatural one" (22 May 1995).

In 1995 Great Britain did not depose a leader, but issues surrounding leadership were at the forefront. When John Major called for a re-election within his party, he also
called for an evaluation of leadership and what constituted a good leader. I find that these distancing devices succeeded not only in distancing the audience from the production, but also the concept of leadership which at the time was a hotly contested subject. As Warner pushed audiences to reevaluate leadership in all its forms and ceremonies within her production, she also prompted the audiences to reevaluate leadership outside of the theatre.
The objects are listed on the prop setting on stage list as: an Egyptian, a horse, a medallion, a dagger, a small figure, a crystal, and a headless figure. Carol Chilington Rutter saw the objects of kingship as a reference to the seven sons of Edward III or as representation of “Richard Plantagenet’s exquisite profligacy” (319).

‘Style’ is a very tricky term. When I speak of the style of a particular performer, I am referring to Susan Sontag’s concept of style as something which the artist insists on doing. “Every style is a means of insisting on something” (Sontag 155).

John Barton was one of three directors for the RSC tetralogy. The other two directors were Peter Hall and Clifford Wilson.

Ian McKellen presented a similar interpretation when he played Richard II in Richard Cottrell’s 1968 production. He elongated the syllables in ‘need friends’ as Shaw did, which transformed the words an anguished cry (Shewring 86).

I have included the full text of Bolingbroke’s speech to which I have referred: “...I beseech your Grace/ Look on my wrongs with an indifferent eye./ You are my father, for methinks in you/ I see old Gaunt alive. O then, my father,/ Will you permit that I shall stand condemn’d?/ A wandering vagabond, my rights and royalties/ Pluck’d from my arms perforce—and given away/ To upstart unthrifty? Wherefore was I born?/ If that my cousin King be King in England/ It must be granted I am Duke of Lancaster./ You have a son, Aumerle, my noble cousin,/ Had you first died, and he been thus trod down,/ He should have found his uncle Gaunt a father,/ To rouse his wrongs and chase them to the bay./ I am denied to sue my livery here,/ And yet my letters-patents give me leave;/ My father’s goods are all distrain’d and sold;/ And these, and all, are all amiss employed,/ What would you have me do? I am a subject;/ And I challenge law. Attorneys are denied me;/ And therefore personally I lay my claim/ To my inheritance of free descent” (II.iii.115-136).

On the traverse stage, upstage and downstage were in relation to the scrim on one side of the stage. The scrim was upstage, so the stage directions (upstage, downstage) referred to the placement in relation to the scrim.

I have included the blocking notes for Act 4 Scene 1.

Enter Richard and York

K. Rich: Alack, why am I sent for to a king
Before I have shook off the regal thoughts
Werethwith I resign’d? I hardly yet have learn’d
To insinuate, flatter, bow, and bend my knee.
Give sorrow leave a while to tutor
To this submission. Yet I well remember
The favors of these men. Were they not mine?
Did they not [sometimes] cry “All hail!” to me?
Do Judas did to Christ; but He, in twelve,
Found truth in all but one; I, in twelve thousand, none.
God save the King! Will no man say amen?
Am I both the priest and clerk? Well then, amen.
God save the King! although I be not he,
And yet amen, if heaven do think him me.
To do what service am I sent for hither?

York: To do that office of thine own good will [MB rises FS sits by DL]
Which tired majesty did make thee offer:
The resignation of thy state and crown
To Henry Bullingbrook.

K. Rich: Give me the crown. [JS does so (gives FS the crown) sits L again] Here, cousin, seize the crown; [FS rises XC puts crown on floor /X sits R with DL again] Here cousin,
On this side [FS X C, DT and FS go for crown put it between them my hand], and on that side thine.
Now is this golden crown [FS does clockwise circuit of DT] like a deep well
That owes two buckets, filling one another,
The emptier ever dancing in the air,
The other down, unseen, and full of water:
That bucket down and full of tears am I,
Drinking my griefs, whilst you mount up on high.

Bull: I thought you had been willing to resign.

K. Rich: My crown I am, [FS puts crown on floor] but still my griefs are mine.
You may my glories and my state depose,
But not my griefs, still am I king of those.

Bull: Part of your cares you give me with your crown.

K. Rich: Your cares set up [FS backs U/S a little] do not pluck my cares down;
My care is loss of care, by old care done,
Your care is gain of care, by new care won;
The cares I give I have, though given away,
They tend the crown, yet still with me they stay.

Bull: Are you contented to resign the crown? [Same as 7 (FS backs U/S a little)]

K. Rich: Ay, no [FS X to MB], no ay [FS X U sits chair]; for I must nothing be;
Therefore no no, for I resign to thee.
Now mark me how I will undo myself:
I give this heavy weight from off my head,
And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,
The pride of kingly sway from out my heart;
With mine own tears I wash away my balm,
With mine own hands I give away my crown,
With mine own tongue deny my sacred state;
With mine own breath release all dueceous oaths;
All pomp and majesty I do forswear;
My manors [FS rises X slowly D/S to DT], rents, revenue I forego;
My acts, decrees, and statutes I deny;
God pardon all oaths that are broke to me!
God keep all vows unbrooke made to thee!
Make me, that nothing have, with nothing griev’d,
And thou with all pleas’d, that has all achiev’d!
Long mayst thou live in Richard’s seat to sit,
And soon lie Richard in an earthy pit! [FS picks up crown]
[FS puts crown on DT head] God save King Henry, unking’d Richard says,[FS kneels]
And send him many years of sunshine days! [FS lies face down]
What more remains?
No more, [SR rises X to SL of FS kneels by her] but that you read
These accusations, and these grievous crimes
Committed by your person and your followers
Against the state and profit of this land;
That by confessing them, the souls of men
May deem that you are worthyly depos'd.

K. Rich: Must I do so? [FS kneels up] And must I ravel out
My weav'd follies? Gentle Northumberland,
If thy offenses were upon record [FS rises],
Would it not shame thee in so fair a troup
To read a lecture of them? If thou wouldst,
There shouldst thou find one heinous article,
Containing the depositing of a king,
And cracking the strong warrant of an oath,
Mark'd with a blot, dama'd in the book of heaven.
Nay, all of you that stand and look upon me
Whilst that my wretchedness doth bait myself,
Though some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,
Showing an outward pity, yet you Pilates
Have here deliver'd me to my sour cross,
And water cannot wash away your sin.

....Give me that glass, therein will I read.
No deeper wrinkles yet? [FS wanders about] IV.i line 160-234

8 My own notes upon watching the production included the comment: "Richard damn near bounce's off the walls.

9 Carol Chilington Rutter described it as a "game of paddy-whack where the crown... an improbable "bacon" for filching... was the prize. The cousins had obviously invented (sic) this game, had choreographed its over elaborate (sic) routine of slapping hands and thighs, had played it a million times before when the stake was the best piece of cake, the best temais racket" (321).

10 I have included the text for the 'famous empty bucket' speech: "On this side my hand, [and] on that side thine./ Now is this golden crown like a deep well/ That owes two buckets, filling one another./ The emptier ever dancing in the air./ The other down, unseen, and full of water:/ That bucket down and full of tears am I./ Drinking my grieves, whilst you mount up on high" (IV.i. 183-189).

11 In his review for The Independent, Wardle describes the scene and how the actors “magnetically circle each other like a platonically divided creature seeking to unite its two halves” (4 June 1995).

12 Andrew Temple also castigated Shaw’s performance on the basis of her gender. “Surely even the most open-minded theatre-goer is going to wonder during Richard II's long speeches why he looks (as Fiona Shaw does) like Joyce Grenfell. Shut your eyes and you will hear a queen not a king. An all-female show might have some logic to it, but to swap the sex of one central character seems perverse... If the stage is blind to colour should it also be deaf to gender?

Casting is the most important decision that directors make. If the role-reversal becomes the norm, then we the audience must assert our neglected right to laugh and throw fruit when it doesn't work” (21 May 1995).
13 Shaw described her experience in the foreward to Lizbeth Goodman’s Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. “In 1995, I started to play Richard II in a production directed by Deborah Warner at the National Theatre, and wandered into the labyrinth of theatre and gender. I had no idea then how great the taboo was that I was breaking” (xxiii).

14 Irving Wardle is one of the reviewers to draw similarities between Barton’s and Warner’s productions. “It is partly a question of physical casting, given the uncanny resemblance between the close-cropped Fiona Shaw and David Threlfall as the two adversaries. There have been other productions that exploit their duality” (4 June 1995). Carol Chillington Rutter references Barton’s production repeatedly in her review (315-318).

15 Thatcher was a political leader who was an ordinary person that rose to the top. However, once she reached the top, she created an image of herself that was anything but ordinary. In her book Thatcher, Politics, and Fantasy, Heather Nunn elaborated on how Thatcher reinforced the image created for her by the media. “In political speeches, photo opportunities or media interviews, Thatcher’s persona was continually projected as one intimately bound up with fortitude and fortification. Stories of physical endurance as well as of mental strength abounded. These stories, told by Thatcher herself and her media observers, often had a gendered inflection: they indicated strength, resilience, meticulous preparation and a certain defensive aggression as the byword of the ambitious (watchful) political woman. Readers of biographies and magazine articles were continually informed that Thatcher only needed four hours sleep” (40). She was not just a woman, she was an Iron Lady.

Thatcher’s persona as the ‘Iron Lady’ began as a nickname from the Red Star newspaper in Russia. Thatcher took that nickname and made it her trademark. In a dinner speech to the Finley constituency, Thatcher embraced her new identity. “Ladies and gentlemen, I stand before you tonight, in my Red Star chiffon evening gown, my face softly made-up and my fair hair gently waved—the Iron Lady of the western world, a cold war Warrior, an Amazon Philistine, even a Peking plotter. Well, am I any of these things…Yes, I am an Iron Lady—after all it wasn’t a bad thing to be an Iron Duke” (Nunn, 70-71). The juxtaposition of the feminine symbols; the chiffon evening gown, softly made up face, gently waved hair, and the sobriquets denoting a super woman identity is characteristic of Thatcher. She revealed in the juxtapositions of gender roles that she personified. She was not just a woman, but a super woman.

16 “John Major felt he had been forced into a position where in order to resolve the problems of the Conservative party and his government, he would have to give public recognition that a leadership crisis existed. In doing so the prime minister in effect reaffirmed that the difficulties confronting his administration were reducible to leadership and would be resolved by a cathartic injection of leadership” (Foley, 127).
CONCLUSION

In an attempt to define theatre and politics in Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre and Performance, Lalitha Rajan created three sub-categories: the theatre of politics, politics of theatre, and theatre engaging with politics (1054-1057). Hands’ 1980 production falls into the second sub-category, politics of theatre, as his production was commissioned in response to cuts in the government’s budget for the arts. Both Warner’s and Barton’s productions elude classification. Though the productions engaged with politics, Rajan’s definition implied that political implication is an overt choice made by the artists. She used examples of Dario Fo, August Boal, and Bertoldt Brecht. In Warner’s and Barton’s production, the engagement with politics was a by-product and was not the intention of the artist. This does not make the productions any more or less political.

The analysis of these three productions rejects the pre-conceived notion of how politics and theatre were related. There were no explicit connections and as argued by Thomas Postlewait in his article “The Idea of the “Political” in Our Histories of Theatre,” the discussion of “how theatre “mirrors” or “reflects” society” explains “little or nothing” (10). Though the productions were of Shakespeare’s seemingly most political play and produced at significant political moments in Great Britain, I could not find any direct or explicit connections with the contemporary political issues. I could not prove that the productions merely reflected the political context. However, I contend that politics cannot be separated from these productions. As the three production re-shaped views of
performance history, the analysis of these production reshapes how we can re-conceive the relationship between politics and theatre in all of its complexities and limitations.
Suspected missing page 78.
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ILLUSTRATIONS
Image 1.1 (left to right): Richard Mayes (behind), Albert Welling (Messenger), Richard Pasco (Richard II), Jonathan Kent, Clemen McCallin (John of Gaunt). This picture illustrates the ceremonious dressing of Richard II. Photo: courtesy of Sophie Baker.
Image 1.2 (left to right) Ian Richardson (Bolingbroke) and Richard Pasco (Richard II). This picture illustrates the physical similarity between the two actors. As a reviewer from the Guardian explained: "As they (Pasco and Richardson) first stride on to the stage, built alike, both in the same drab uniform, your eye slips from one to the other trying to sort out quickly which is which; and for a moment failing" (25 April 1973). Photo: courtesy of Joe Cocks Studio.
Image 1.3 (left to right) Richard Pasco (Bolingbroke) and Ian Richardson (Richard II). This picture was taken during the abdication scene after Richard II has dressed Bolingbroke in the robes and regalia associated with kingship. Photo: courtesy of Joe Cocks studio.
Image 2.1 (left to right): Alan Howard (Richard II) and David Suchet as Bolingbroke. The contrasts between Richard’s and Bolingbroke’s costumes represent the transition described by Farrah “as though a crow [was] taking over from a dove” (Page 74). Photo: courtesy of Nobby Clark.
Image 2.2: Alan Howard as Richard II. In a jeweled collar, Richard is appareled like the sun. Photo: courtesy of Joe Cocks studio.
Image 2.3: David Suchet as Bolingbroke. This picture is taken from after the deposition. Bolingbroke has grown older with his newfound responsibility. His dark robes and ermine stole can be contrasted with Image 2.2. Bolingbroke’s reign, or the reign of King Henry IV, will be much darker than Richard’s. Photo: courtesy of Nobby Clark.
Image 3.1: Fiona Shaw as Richard II in her coronation robes. Shewring described the fabrics of her robes as having “been brought together almost a random, as by a child dressing up, using old sheets and tunics to piece together a brave show” (182). Photo: courtesy of Neil Libbert.
Image 3.2 (left to right): Fiona Shaw (Richard II) and David Threlfall (Bolingbroke). This publicity picture was used for the cover of the program and illustrates the intimate relationship between the two characters. Photo: courtesy of Neil Libbert.
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