

Shaking Up Shakespeare Episode 10: Shakespeare and Beyond

Hope Van Der Merwe: I loved the production of *Lady M* because first of all, they named her, they gave her a name. Her name was Margaret.

Marlis Schweitzer: Is it okay to like Shakespeare because maybe you really do, but you're worried that, you know, "Oh, Shakespeare's been canceled."

Liam Lockhart-Rush: No one really is a newcomer to Shakespeare because of how entrenched it is in the colonialist project of Canada.

Music.

Marlis Schweitzer: Welcome to the final episode of *Shaking Up Shakespeare*, the podcast where we acknowledge, investigate, and query Shakespeare's enduring presence on 21st-century Canadian stages. I'm Marlis Schweitzer, one of the hosts of the series, along with Liam Lockhart-Rush and Hope Van Der Merwe.

This podcast was written and recorded in Tkaronto, the traditional territory of the Anishinabek Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, the Wendat, and most recently, the Mississaugas of the Credit. We're grateful for the opportunity to live and work on this land.

Music.

In the first part of this final episode, the three of us, Hope, Liam, and I, reflect on what we've learned from this series in a free-flowing conversation. We conclude with a few words from our interviewees, specifically Cole Alvis, Dawn Jani Birley, Monique Mojica, and Kaitlyn Riordan.

Music.

Marlis Schweitzer: Over a year now we've been dealing with Shakespeare, thinking about Shakespeare, trying to shake up Shakespeare. So this is just an opportunity for us to take a moment and reflect on what we've heard from our many interviewees, what we've learned individually or collectively.... But [it's] also just an opportunity to acknowledge in the interest of love and critique, which has been a running theme throughout our series, the work that remains. What haven't we done yet? What hasn't been acknowledged yet? But before we get there, before we get to the critique, I want to just have a moment and ask you both and I'll jump in as well: how has your perspective on Shakespeare changed, if at all?

Liam Lockhart-Rush: When we began this project, I considered myself a bit of a newcomer to Shakespeare in terms of academic studies. But I feel like this process has been kind of a history lesson for me on Shakespeare and Shakespeare's use in so-called Canada and a history of Canadian theatre as well for the past however many years. The people that we've spoken to have been such big players in the Canadian theatre industry, with Shakespeare and not with Shakespeare. And I think that I learned a lot about the ways that the perspective on

Shakespeare in the theatre community is changing, and how that's also created change in education and other sectors of life as well.

Liam Lockhart-Rush: And I also realized that no one really is a newcomer to Shakespeare because of how entrenched it is in the colonialist project of Canada. There's excerpts of what, for example, Kaitlyn Reardon was saying, at the *(Re)casting Shakespeare in Canada* symposium, about how Shakespeare's quotes had been used as propaganda by Canadian media, specifically in the trial of Louis Riel, how, if that language is so entrenched in our cultural consciousness, then no one is really a newcomer to Shakespeare.

Marlis Schweitzer: As I said in the first episode, I'm not a Shakespeare scholar, but what I've really come to appreciate is the diversity of perspectives on Shakespeare, the importance of continuing to think critically about the legacy, the harmful legacy of his work, how deeply embedded and entwined Shakespeare is within the colonialist project. That was something I knew about a little bit about before, but I think I have a much deeper understanding of now thanks to so many of our interviewees, particularly our Indigenous interviewees...so many of these amazing artists are actively confronting these issues through their work.

And, of course, the academics too. What was exciting to see is that academic perspectives can change, that people maybe who began their careers with an unwavering love of Shakespeare, kind of coming to it with this passion, don't necessarily lose the passion, but through the work develop much sharper, critical perspectives and are able to separate their personal experiences with something like Shakespeare and the first [experience of] coming to see actors and then also understanding: what are the limitations of this? How am I benefiting perhaps from the economy of Shakespeare, and what can I do differently? How can I maybe promote other works, other perspectives, other ways of thinking through and beyond Shakespeare?

Hope Van Der Merwe: I don't know that my perspective has shifted because I feel like my perspective as an acting student and now as a graduate and hopefully an actor has kind of always been "consume it but use your brain." And I think this project has just reaffirmed that lesson. I think something that I realized doing this podcast, as an artist, is I think the question of Shakespeare in Canada reflects a larger issue with the theatre industry in Canada because a lot of the artists I spoke to said that Shakespeare is their go-to because it's cheap to produce. And I think that that reflects a larger issue within how the industry is structured, 'cause we want to break away and we want to be doing new things. But then also if there isn't a guaranteed market for those new things and there isn't guaranteed funding, your hands are tied, which I understand. We're very bound and afraid because we don't receive funding and we don't have a guaranteed source of income like theatre artists do in other countries.

Marlis Schweitzer: We've been talking about love and critique, but I think also love and fear. Fear of doing it wrong. Fear of not doing it at all. You know, audiences are like, "Is it okay to laugh? Is it okay to be disgusted?" And then for actors, "Is it okay to do something else? Is it okay to say I don't actually enjoy Shakespeare?" Or is it okay to like Shakespeare because maybe you really do, but you're worried that, you know, "Oh, Shakespeare's been canceled. I can't like him." And you've pointed to the larger systemic issues around funding and prioritizing certain kinds of art, and hopefully we've managed to tackle some of those by looking at the institutions that serve to prop up Shakespeare. But identifying those institutions is not enough. We actually need to then think about how can real change be brought to those institutions? Obviously, there's lots of work that is happening, but how can that work be

furthered? And I think there's a sense, particularly coming out of the pandemic, that companies are just struggling to survive ... many of them. And so how can they demonstrate their value to society? Sometimes it means going back to these pillars. The pillars of culture, so to speak, [of] which Shakespeare is certainly one.

Liam Lockhart-Rush: You're talking about fearing Shakespeare, and I think also there might be some fear around having these kinds of conversations about Shakespeare because I know that for so many years, hundreds of years, it's been held up as this cultural capital or this thing that can't be changed or shouldn't be changed. I think this podcast could have been called No Fear Shakespeare. We're having these conversations with people that really want to have these conversations and I think it helps to have a project like this that is dedicated to that kind of thing.

Hope Van Der Merwe: The role of Shakespeare in Canadian theatre is reflective of a larger systemic issue. Literally every system that exists in the world has been built on the foundation of cis heteropatriarchy and white supremacy and colonialism and ableism and all of the bad isms. And I think, just to be more specific, the theatre industry is one that is still extremely in need of change because it still very much rewards people who embody those things in the correct way. So it still rewards cis het able-bodied white men. And I think the fact that one of the only options that people have to come back to when they're like, "Well, I want to put on a show, but I'm poor and no one's giving me any grants, so the only thing I can do is Shakespeare," that's really indicative of a larger issue because if the only thing that we have to do is still prop up this old white, dead guy, then that's a problem.

Marlis Schweitzer: Yeah, we want to move away from a zombie theatre.. unless it's actually, you know, theatre with zombies... that could be cool.

Music – transition.

Marlis Schweitzer: What excites you about the future of Shakespeare in Canada?

Liam Lockhart-Rush: One of the good things that come out of Shakespeare being royalty free to produce is that you can take the stories and use them in a way that fits the story that you want to tell. And I think that's where a lot of the people we interviewed were pointing towards the future of Shakespeare being is in adaptation. And Shakespeare adaptations are by no means a new thing at all. PJ Prudat talks about how there's 400 years of Shakespeare adaptations so it's not a new concept, but the ways that Shakespeare plays, or the topic of Shakespeare itself, have been used recently and presently to tell stories that might never have been told on Stratford Festival stages.

I'm excited to see *Richard II* at Stratford this season, starring Stephen Jackman-Torkoff, adapted by Brad Fraser, and catering to the stories of the queer community. I think that is amazing because one, it repurposes the stories that a lot of people know. And so you can see a new take on a story and see new people represented in the characters... But also for the people that don't know what kind of adaptation it is, it brings in people who want to see classic renditions of Shakespeare. It brings them in and makes them sit through it, see a different perspective, which is a good thing, I think.

Marlis Schweitzer: Absolutely, and I would also say that for Brad Fraser as a playwright, there's an advantage in coming to this material, not only because his adaptation is being staged at this Stratford Festival -- so there's the kind of cultural capital that comes with that - but also it's introducing new audiences to Brad Fraser. Brad Fraser in the nineties and early two thousands was one of *the* queerest, coolest, bad boy-ist playwrights around. His work was shocking and graphic with swear words and sex and it was so exciting. I think there's an opportunity for a new generation who haven't actually read his plays to go back [and ask] "who is this Brad Fraser? I think [the adaptation of *Richard II*] is operating in multiple ways, offering a fresh perspective on Shakespeare, and then for those who are keen enough, like "I want to know more about queer, adaptation or queer playwrights," to go back and read some Brad Fraser." So win-win, I think.

Liam Lockhart-Rush: I agree.

Hope Van Der Merwe: I also agree.

What I find really exciting is the way that some of these plays are being adapted now. We recently saw a production of *Lady M* by 1S1, which is a theatre company that's run by Dawn Jani Birley, who everyone will have heard featured in this podcast. And she's an incredible Deaf actor. And that production was really exciting because it told the story of Lady Macbeth from her perspective.

A point of contention I've always had with a lot of Shakespeare's plays is... like Lady Macbeth, she's this incredible person in Act 1, kind of through Act 2, and then randomly she goes crazy, and then she dies and you don't see any of that happen on stage. And to me that's always felt like a robbery. The men get to die on stage and they get this epic fight scene but Lady M doesn't. We don't see Ophelia die, so we don't get to see if she made the decision to kill herself. And if that was an act of agency, we don't see if it really was an accident and she was actually helpless the way that Queen Gertrude kind of makes it seem in her account. Also, why does Gertrude know exactly what happened? Was she there, was she watching? Was she complicit? We don't know. Every time I see these productions that don't interrogate that further, it's just such a missed opportunity in my opinion.

I loved the production of *Lady M* because, first of all, they named her, they gave her a name. Her name was Margaret. And I loved that it was told through her perspective, this incredible story that revolved around losing a baby. And what that did to her, a story that revolved around an affair that she was maybe having, a story that revolved around a husband who came back from war and had PTSD and then they both were traumatized by this king that they killed because she was having an affair with him. And we saw her go crazy because she was sleepless. It's an act of torture to withhold sleep from someone, and so we see her just completely decline mentally because she's so exhausted and she's seeing this ghost and her husband is being a toxic man.

All this to say, I just really loved how [*Lady M*] contextualized her and gave her power, and also, that it had such little verbal text, which was so fantastic to see. It incorporated ASL and a lot of it was movement-based and that was a very exciting thing that I haven't seen a lot in Canada. I've seen it elsewhere. But that was really pushing the envelope for, I think what a lot of Canadian audiences would have seen cause I really like the idea of people thinking,

“Hmm, I recognize that... Lady Macbeth, I recognize that name.” And then they go and that name recognition gets them in the seat and then they see this other thing and it's nothing like *Macbeth* and it's nothing like what we know colonial theatre to be. And they're exposed to ASL, which a lot of people are not exposed to if they don't know Deaf people personally. And so I really love the idea that it's redefining what theatre could and should be.

Liam Lockhart-Rush: I was absolutely floored by that production as well. One of the ways that Margaret's mental decline was shown was through a lot of repetition of gesture and movement, which is kind of reminiscent of the “out damn spot” moment in the play, but was extrapolated to a lot of repetition of movement with the ASL and with specifically Duncan's ghost. Maybe that's a spoiler, but the ghost that she was seeing was Duncan's ghost. And she was being haunted by his, like repetitious, performative... It was the question...

Hope Van Der Merwe: “Is this baby mine?”

Liam Lockhart-Rush: “Is this baby mine?” And that was what was haunting her after she had killed him. The use of gesture in every way was gorgeous.

Hope Van Der Merwe: Something that excites me about the future of Shakespeare in Canada is in productions like *Lady M* and *Queen Goneril*, we're using the Master's tools to dismantle the Master's house. I find it really thought-provoking when someone uses Shakespeare as a source text or puts on some kind of production of Shakespeare but then makes societal issues very, very apparent through either adaptation, through casting. And in doing it in a way that subverts a lot of other productions that have done it kind of the straight and narrow way. It makes it more obvious what's wrong with the text and what's wrong also in our world.

Marlis Schweitzer: Right, and it's contending with the ghosts, with the specter of Shakespeare too. We talked about how this whole project comes from earlier conversations where people couldn't help but invoke Shakespeare when they were talking about theatre in Canada. So Shakespeare does hover over so many of our companies and artists and the way that they think about themselves in the world. So grappling with it, actually saying, “Okay, everybody has some knowledge of Shakespeare. If you're participating in Anglo-Canadian society in some way, you have encountered Shakespeare, even if it hasn't been identified as such.” And so what you're pointing to is directors and companies that are going, “Okay, this is a text that will allow us to say something different, and we know that our audience will be with us. We know that our audience will actually be able to identify what's new and innovative and exciting and maybe disruptive or upsetting because of their pre-existing familiarity, because they come in with 400 plus years of the ghost of Shakespeare hanging over them.”

[I] haven't seen this production yet - I'm going tonight - to see Shakespeare in the Ruff's production of *Richard Three*. What they've done is, instead of having one actor embody the role of Richard, they have two actors. One of the Richards is played by blind actor Alex Bulmer, who is an incredibly gifted artist, and the other is played by a woman named Alexia Vassos, who also lives with a disability. And so this production, I anticipate, is really grappling with exactly what Debbie Patterson was speaking to: who is Richard? And what does this mean when you see these Richards, two Richards that are both, in different ways,

living in a society that views them as disabled? What will it mean for an audience to see those two Richards? And then it also features Christine Horne, who originated the role of *Prince Hamlet*, and she's playing "everybody else." So this is a production with three women grappling with questions of masculinity, power, violence, violence towards self as well, and societal expectations and societal harm.

The concept is really exciting and fresh and it goes to what is an important mandate for a company like Shakespeare in the Ruff. And we're seeing more and more companies who, in their mandates, in their operating structures, are not just like, well, "We're gonna produce one play and yeah, that'll be our play about disability, and then we've checked that one off and we can come back to that in another five years." They are really, in their mandate, thinking about how can they do things differently? How can they connect with their communities and acknowledge that theatre should be for everyone. So I think more and more companies are thinking in that way. And so that excites me too about the future of Shakespeare, that the mandates of companies like Shakespeare in the Ruff are shifting and are politically progressive in their outlook.

Liam Lockhart-Rush: And ambitious too. I think it's super exciting for a company like Shakespeare in the Ruff that has built up such a big reputation in Canada for their outdoor Shakespeare is now at a place where they can take risks like this and really do exciting things.

Hope Van Der Merwe: I'm also very excited to see this. I firmly, firmly believe that disabled characters, at the very least, should be played by disabled actors. So this is definitely a step in the right direction. It's really exciting that a company like Ruff, like Liam said, that has kind of built up a dedicated audience is putting on a production like this in the right way. As people open their doors more to disabled artists one day, I hope disabled artists will not only exclusively be offered disabled roles if they're offered any roles at all. I'm really excited for the day when I can go to see a show at the Stratford Festival and there's a disabled artist on stage and being disabled has nothing to do with their character. That's just their circumstance and that's just who they are. So I'm really, really excited for that. And I feel like Ruff doing this production that's a step in the right direction.

Music – transition.

Marlis Schweitzer: We don't want to close out this podcast with our own words. Rather, we want to close out this podcast with the words of some of the artists we've interviewed. There are certain topics we didn't get an opportunity to explore or examine as thoroughly as we might have. Some of this was a factor of time and the structure of the episodes as they evolved. But there were some really important points that came up in the interviews that we want to ensure we acknowledge and share. For example, we didn't have an opportunity to talk specifically about the really exciting work that Trans and Two-Spirit and other queer artists are undertaking when it comes to not just Shakespeare, but works beyond Shakespeare. And so here we have two-spirit artists Cole Alvis, talking a little bit about her work with trans artist Emma Frankland.

Cole Alvis: I'm thinking about Emma Frankland, who's a trans artist from the UK that I got to do some collaborations with recently and she's written an article about John Lyly, who's one of these pre-Shakespearean classical authors, of which some of Shakespeare's plays are

inspired by, let's say. So things like *Twelfth Night* and *As You Like It* are both updates of an original play called *Galatea* by John Lyly. And in regards to queerness in Lyly's original play, there was queerness and transness openly. And those aspects were shifted. Shakespeare's been crafted for a purpose and in the case of *Galatea*, or rather the case of *Twelfth Night*, and *As You Like It*, Emma is proposing that that purpose was queer and trans erasure. And so this is important because often in the contemporary climate, [when] we're looking at specifically trans rights, it's spoken about often as though it's something new, and we've arrived in this place of newness with transness because of these edits and this erasure process. And then the success of these versions of these stories by William Shakespeare being the ones that are rolled out globally, so that that erasure continues.

Marlis Schweitzer: For more on Emma's important work, please check out our show notes with links to the *Engendering the Stage* project and Emma Frankland's most recent production of *Galatea*.

Transition - music

Earlier this episode we talked about Dawn Jani Birley, and her IS1 production of *Lady M*, and so we wanted to give a little bit more space to Dawn to share her thoughts on theatre, Deaf audiences, and the way that they've been excluded from mainstream theatre, as well as to talk about the important work she's been doing around translation. Once again, Dawn is voiced by Kate Lewis. A full video recording of Dawn in conversation with Jeff Ho is available on the [castingcanadiantheatre](http://castingcanadiantheatre.com) website. Please see our shownotes for more.

Dawn Jani Birley: I had an interest in acting, but I was confronted with a lot of barriers, people denying me opportunities because I was Deaf. And so my opportunity to engage with Shakespeare and to put it out there has given Deaf people the opportunity to be exposed to Shakespeare in a way that they never would have before. Typically Shakespeare is more commonly found in hearing theatre than in Deaf theatre. We have our own literature, our own history. So, of course we intersected it with some exposure to Shakespeare. But typically what we're doing is when we do that, we're looking at the language and thinking, "How do we translate that into sign language?" Because I live in Scandinavia, I sign in Swedish Sign Language, Norwegian Sign Language, and Finnish Sign Language. And so translation is always top of mind. So I think, "How do we convey not just the literal meaning, but the cultural meaning? How do we express it?" And of course, it's not the same in each language. So sometimes I'm thinking, you know, obviously Shakespeare is English. So we think, "How do we convey that in a language which is not English? How do we understand the text?" And for me, I'm always thinking of the text. I think that is an experience that I want to offer Deaf people. As I think of hearing people, when you read the script, the text is there, and of course the delivery is different, but you can actually deliver the lines without fully understanding them, which is not something which is available to me because I have to translate it before I can deliver it, and I have to understand it before I can translate it.

Translation is my playground. I love to challenge myself to make discoveries, to think about all the various meanings of a word. And as somebody born and raised culturally Deaf, I can think, "How can I convey that?" And in theatre in general, it's important to know that it's not accessible for Deaf people. Many of us just don't go to the theatre because it's not in a language or a culture that is accessible to us. So communication access is always the number

one barrier for Deaf people, communication access to everything that's going on [in] the world.

Music

Liam Lockhart-Rush: Some artists we spoke to ask why Shakespeare continues to be privileged and centered in conversations about theatre, language, and culture. Here is Kuna Rappahannock theatre artist Monique Mojica.

Monique Mojica: I think it's really unnecessary as we create bodies of work, and I say bodies of work because why shouldn't native theatre artists have all different genres of Indigenous theatre. You know, we are always pressured to have one. "Well, what is Indigenous theatre?" And then they set us loose to squabble about what it is and what it isn't.

Liam Lockhart-Rush: Monique is joined by Cole Alvis in the call for funding and supporting new stories told by Indigenous theatre makers.

Cole Alvis: So I guess bringing it back to my abolition metaphor, one of the things that I understand is for some reason the police budget will always go up. We can defund healthcare, we can defund education, but there will always be a need for more police, seems to be the political appetite. And what we know is when communities are invested in, there is a reduction in crime. Police do not prevent crime, they respond to it. And so how this relates to Shakespeare and Stratford, or the state of the arts in so-called Canada... what is it to run around and plug all the holes of a sinking ship when we could be looking at communities who are targeted, communities who are deliberately underfunded, over-surveilled? What might the arts be in Canada if the funds that we dedicate to often one direction -- I don't even want to say more evenly distributed, I want to say more strategically distributed -- what would Canadian art be then?

Cole Alvis: The ongoing colonial project in Canada loves the binary, loves the patriarchy, makes excuses for misogyny left and right. And part of that is the destabilizing of Indigenous nations and the persecution of particularly Indigenous women and 2S folks. And so I link these ongoing crises to Shakespeare when we know that these stories were crafted with intention, while I also hold my position of questioning whether all these resources need to be going to this place.

Monique Mojica: I would rather [have] learned the poetics of performance as it is still enacted among my nations and borrow from that and craft that so I can transpose it to the theatre that I want to do. I would rather work with young Indigenous theatre creators who are looking at material culture and patterns and the way that story narrative is encoded in our material culture. And how do we then structure our performances also based on the purpose of performance within our cultures? Almost all the language reclamation that I've done is because I needed to say certain parts of a script in Dulegaya. I needed to say certain parts of a script in Renape. So I had to find out, "How do I say that?" So that's radical. It's radical healing. It's radical resistance. And it ain't Shakespeare. Because all of the encoded rules of Shakespeare come from another time, another place, another history, another culture, another belief system, another spiritual grounding. It's part of the system that perpetuates white supremacy 'cause you're flattening out and losing so much that is not the same in other

cultures and other experiences. And a lot is not the same. And a lot of assumptions are made in theatre, you know?

One of the examples I usually give, I worked for many years with, an old white guy theatre dramaturge named Ric Knowles. He's written a lot about theatre and during the creation of *Chocolate Woman Dreams the Milky Way*, I remember him saying - and it was always good cause his observations were always really helpful -he goes, "You know, I'm so uncomfortable I can't get used to the fact that it's so embedded in me that you do something three times or there's three beats or there's three acts, but you're doing everything in twos and fours and sixes and eights." And we say, "Yeah, because one of the Kuna aesthetic principles is duality, and what's embedded in that duality, what is encoded in that duality... every time... I mean, you see a mola, there'll be a turtle with two heads, not because turtles have two heads there, but because everything in Kuna culture pays homage to, and is in respect for, the duality of Creator, which is *Baba Naga*, father, mother, neither male or female, father, mother. So you do things in twos, you do things in multiples of twos. And he was really aware of his discomfort. But what he said that was so mind blowing to me, and I said, "Well what does that three come from? Why three?" He goes, "it's the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It's the Holy Ghost." So that's what I mean when I say that there's an encoding of white supremacy that is invisible and normalized because of that invisibility that my business is about shattering.

The proscenium comes from the church. Why do I want the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost in my work? Why is that widely accepted as universal? No, it's not universal, it's Christian. That's what I've been on the trail of searching down and asking other Indigenous performers, "Well, what you got that's important. What you got? What you got? If you had to tell this story, what pulls you? How are your stories told? Are they told in beadwork? You know, what kind of mapping? Are they told in winter counts? Are they told in weavings?" And those iconic forms that appear in tattoos, in weavings, in mola, any kind of textiles, in wampum belts, those encoded forms, iconic forms come from patterning in the earth.

Marlis Schweitzer: Please see our show notes for more about Monique Mojica's writing and career as a ground-breaking, revolutionary artist.

Music - transition

Shaking up Shakespeare isn't just work for artists, and it isn't just work for academics or students either. There's also important work for audiences to do. Audiences need to continue to ignite their curiosity, continue to support theatre companies and artists who are doing the innovative work that you love and that you want to see more of. This call to audiences and the enthusiasm that can come just from seeing live theatre, is something that Kaitlyn Riordan articulated in speaking about the kind of Shakespeare that excites her.

Kaitlyn Riordan: Well, you know, in some ways I'm most interested in Shakespeare today as an audience member. I just continue to be interested and, and partly because the stories can, are sort of a constant and people bring their living culture, and I should say that's a, Peter Brook term, when he worked with really multicultural casts, he invited them to bring their living culture to the work, and that's something that Jani [Lauzon] refers to a lot is, is how Peter Brook worked in that way. But getting to see *Prince Hamlet*, getting to see, even

reading PJ Prudat's *Otîhêw*, the adaptation of *Othello*, and getting insight into specific cultures that I'm not a part of, but through a familiar story through archetypes that I know as an audience member... going to see a Amaka Ume play Hamlet last year at Stratford. It kind of provides for better, for worse, I guess, that kind of familiarity or, the constant of asking the same questions but coming up with different answers. As a human being, I'm still interested in experiencing Shakespeare and understanding my culture, the culture that is evolving through those works.

Marlis Schweitzer: And speaking of audiences, we'd also like to encourage you, our listeners, to think more about what you can do to shake up Shakespeare, whether that's advocating for change to the curriculum in your local schools; for the inclusion of other playwrights and artists that haven't had a traditional place in the school curriculum, particularly the work of Indigenous artists and playwrights; reaching out to local theatre companies to encourage them to stage new plays; or reading works other than Shakespeare; and thinking deeply about what it means to continue celebrating Shakespeare in Canada today.

Hope Van Der Merwe: When you're consuming material by old, white, dead guys, no one is saying don't consume it. Just engage your brain and think critically about it. Also make sure you're consuming other things, not by old, white, dead guys. Continue to question Shakespeare and if it makes people mad, that probably means you're onto something. So keep doing it.

Marlis Schweitzer: Why Shakespeare?

Liam Lockhart-Rush and Hope Van Der Merwe: Why not Shakespeare?

Liam/ Hope/ Marlis: *Shaking Up Shakespeare.*

Music – outro.

Marlis Schweitzer: This podcast is part of *Resetting the Stage* a five-year project that seeks to situate debates about theatrical representation and the politics of casting in Canada within a broad historical context, advancing dialogue with directors, playwrights, actors, educators, students, and other creators who are actively transforming professional Canadian theatre and university level theatre training. For more information on other aspects of the project, please visit castingcanadiantheatre.ca.

Interviews for this podcast were conducted by Marlis Schweitzer, Jeff Ho, Liam Lockhart-Rush, and Hope Van Der Merwe. All episodes written and edited by Marlis, Liam, and Hope, with dramaturgical input from Jeff. Sound mixing and levels by Maddie Bautista. ASL translation by Dawn Jani Birley. Original music by Faith Andrew. Special thanks to Charles Ketchabaw and Will Innes at Fixed Point for support with training, development, audio equipment, and software.

Shaking Up Shakespeare benefits from the following support: a Connections grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada; an Exchange grant from the

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada; funding from the York Research Chair and the York Research Support Grant.

Many thanks to the wonderful people we've interviewed for sharing their important insights and perspectives. We could not have done this without you. Special thanks to our early collaborator, Why Not Theatre, and at York University, thanks to Dean Sarah Bay-Cheng, Mary Pecchia, Aimée Mitchell, and many colleagues, students, and friends.

Thanks for listening to *Shaking Up Shakespeare*.