



This is a transcript of a podcast available at <http://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/>

<b>Title</b>	<i>Literature and State Censorship: A literary perspective</i>
<b>Description</b>	Peter McDonald and Elleke Boehmer discuss state censorship from a literary perspective; also discussing the issues of nationalism, modernism and Apartheid
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Peter McDonald and Elleke Boehmer
<b>Recording</b>	<a href="http://media.podcasts.ox.ac.uk/engfac/censorship/pmcDonald02.mp3">http://media.podcasts.ox.ac.uk/engfac/censorship/pmcDonald02.mp3</a>
<b>Keywords</b>	literature, censorship, apartheid, south africa, modernism, nationalism, racism, Q323, L214, 1
<b>Part of series</b>	<i>Censorship in Literature in South Africa</i>

---

**Peter McDonald** My name's Peter McDonald I'm one of the English Fellows at St Hugh's College in Oxford and I specialise in literature and English from I suppose the late 19th Century to the present day is what I teach. And I have a range of interests in issues to do with Literature and the Law, Literature and Nationalism, Literature and questions about, you know, its value and public importance I suppose are the kind of areas that I cover. And I'm talking today to Elleke Boehmer.

**Elleke Boehmer** And I, Elleke Boehmer am a Fellow at Wolfson College. I hold a position in what the English Faculty calls World Literature in English here in the English Faculty. And I am interested in issues and subjects contingent to those of Peter, Literature and Nationalism, the good of literature of situations of national struggle and also transnational interconnection.

So Peter shall we proceed.

**Peter McDonald** Great.

**Elleke Boehmer** I haven't actually said "Thanks for this book." It's an incredible read and an amazing story. And one thing that struck me having just come back from South Africa and teaching a few classes there on literature and nationalism and trans nationalism it struck me that as well as writing a history of censorship in the apartheid context across those four decades of the 20th Century you've also written obliquely something of an account of South Africa and the formation of South African writing of South African national writing in those years.

What also struck me about this book and which I'm very impressed by is how you move from a highly imphyrrical very detailed, finely textured study of the workings of a censorship board and the interactions of that board with a whole series of writers and writing to some what we might call universal propositions concerning the nature of the literary, you know what literature is and the good of literature.

Can you talk a bit about how that was, you know how that struck you. How that operated for you?

**Peter McDonald** Well I suppose one of the key things is that the anomaly of the initial discovery I mean we should perhaps mention that both you and I grew up in apartheid South Africa so

there's more behind this than simply academic discussion. But one of the things that struck me is that we all have an idea of what censors are you know we tend to think of them as censorious bureaucrats, people whose vocabularies limited to yes and no and who are out to close everything down in the interests of the State in the case of South Africa very coercive repressive state that was highly motivated by ideological concerns. That's the idea that we will have. I mean the standard anecdote that we always used to get told was about the censors banning *Black Beauty*, Ann Sewall's strange little horse memoir which is a classic sort of story about stupid censors. In fact it's not true, they didn't actually ban it but we won't go into that now.

But the thing that – so just going into the apartheid censorship archives the thing that struck me most was who these people were. And to the fact that they were leading literary intellectuals, literary academics, writers, esteemed university professors these are the people are making these decisions and not only were they these people but there was a specific group of people who were especially powerful and linked to a particular marginal faction within Afrikaans culture. So that was the first big surprise but the other big surprise was which was also I suppose in some ways a very happy thing for me from an academic and intellectual point of view was I suddenly discovered in these archives an absolute mass of evidence for one of the more abstract theoretical concerns that I've always had which is to do with what is the nature of literature. What is literature, what's its function, what's its value in the public domain.

And I'd certainly been schooled in a theoretical tradition series of traditions I should say which is sort of post 1970 in the English speaking world where the whole question of what is literature is a vexed one and that in fact we should stop asking that question what is literature trying to find some set of properties or some set of qualities of the writing that make it literature. And instead what we have to do is to shift the whole debate on who decides.

So if you're thinking about it from that point of view then the abstract theoretical question becomes in many ways a very concrete, very particularised socio political question. And so for me the linkages if you like between my theoretical concerns on the one hand and my historical discoveries on the other were very close and very strong. And its one of the reasons why I wrote the book, yes.

**Elleke Boehmer** Was there a particular moment, thinking still of the story of the book, the back story of the book, your story was there a particular moment in the archive, a particular – you know document you pulled out or a personality a censors personality you came into contact with. Was there a moment when things crystallised in that way when you saw, you know, my god these theoretical concerns that I've had these many years, they are pin pointed right here in this particular censors report for example.

**Peter McDonald** I suppose yes it was very early on in the sense that where I suddenly developed – I initially went into the archive actually out of curiosity and actually partly to win some arguments that I used to have in the 1980s with various peers in not particular salubrious environments. And one of the arguments was to do with the value of J M [Kutseers 0:07:04] writing in the context of their struggle against apartheid. And the view I encountered was one was either it's irrelevant or too high minded. Or it's actually inimical to the struggle.

And one of the knock down arguments used was but look he's never been banned – he was never banned. In fact people knew that he'd also been let through by the censors. So he's clearly – this is not revolutionary writing. So that was an issue – just one of the reasons why the first censorship reports I just tried to find in order to settle those or to try to deal with those arguments was to look at the ones for Kutseer. And one of the first ones I found were the censor reports on 'In the Heart of the Country' J M Kutseer's second fiction.

And it was really reading – there were three censor's reports one by a poet and literary academic called [[?? 0:08:06]]. The other one by an academic at the University of Stellenbosch called Charles Fensham and the third one was by a very well known Afrikaans writer Anna [[Loe 0:08:23]]. And - so it was first of all that these were people first of all commenting on it. And some of them were colleagues of Kutseer's at the University of Cape Town, [[?? 0:08:31]] in particular that was strange. And then the other thing was really I suppose it was Anna Loe's report more than anything else she tended to be quite diffusive and she wrote a lot. And just realising that what these people were doing was hardly ever referring to the law, they just did not refer to the law. I expected to see reports where somebody would sit down and say look this is, you know, piece of seditious writing according to Clause 47(2)(a) and so on never, hardly ever referring to the law.

What they were doing were writing extended bits of literary criticism often of an incredibly personal kind which was also very strange. Far more you know intimate and personal than much literary criticism would be – they were giving you in a sense quite a raw response. Remember it's a book that's just been published, a raw response to this which is often deeply felt and quite passionate.

And so that was interesting, you know what was this got to do with censorship you know people writing these sorts of things. Of course it was kind of funny to find out later on that Anna Loe in fact reprocessed here censors report as two newspaper reviews of 'In the Heart of the Country' so that was a further kind of anomaly. But it was just having to deal with this evidence. What am I to make of this and then realising interestingly that Kutseer was being let through by the censors because they believed his writing conformed to their idea of the literary which they saw themselves as protecting. And of course what's interesting is that Kutseer's writing was in many ways extremely hostile to that conception of the literary. So he's being passed as literary in terms that I think Kutseer himself but certainly his writings would repudiate.

So having to deal with that and having to explain to myself why did these people even get there, why were they there in the first place. That was a surprise. So that then forced me into a much bigger investigation into the history of the system and trying to explain that.

So what emerges from that too is a very profound sense on your part and a deepening sense across the process of producing the book of the complicity of literature with a capital 'L', you know that civilising force, the complicity of that with the state. The contamination of literature by the political, by the national, by the involvement of the police in the maintenance of literature with a capital 'L' were you shocked by that or did it as I think you're implying confirm certain suspicions that you'd had for a long time.

**Peter McDonald** I was surprised by the extent of the power if you like of these people. I mean in the sense I suppose one of the things that you could say that the book deals with implicitly is that I ask the question, in a sense the kind of questions that you would think you'd never really ask but what would happen if you gave literary critics real power. Not just people commenting in newspapers, not just people in academic discussions but you gave them real power in the world what would happen. Well I think what the apartheid censorship system shows is you would get extraordinary discrepancies and absurdities creeping in to the public domain of literature as to what gets let in to that public domain as literature and what doesn't. You know here again you know we would find let's say a collection of poems by Mafika Gwala quite clearly against the regime, quite clearly articulated within a black consciousness formation of the 1970s asserting the dignity of black people via the lyric poem all those kinds of powers because the censors admire the writers oratorical powers whereas in a sense an equally interesting selection of poems

by Ingoapele Madingoane called 'Africa My Beginning' gets banned because that's deemed to be seditious propaganda.

So those, you know, what would happen if you gave critics real power well their ideas of literature would have an extraordinary sway in the world and be and create a deformed culture in that way. So yes I was always surprised as to how deeply implicated literature was and of course another thing I think probably worth saying is that the conception of literature that the apartheid censors had was not entirely peculiar to them. It was shared by many across what we could call the western and indeed some parts of the eastern world at that time. I mean they are important local inflections and local differences but nonetheless many of their assumptions were widely shared so that's where it becomes part of a much larger story. And I think, I hope in away it produces evidence where any of us professionally committed to the study of literature have to think about what we do and what we represent and what we are.

**Elleke Boehmer** And what its implications are and its impact on the real world if any. I mean still thinking about this question of the power that these censors had on the real world which we as the literary critics don't have in our contexts here for example sitting in Oxford today. And thinking also of the anomalies as you've just said that that threw up where you know one, you know, work of lyricism, a collection of lyrical poems is past and another isn't. What do you think on the basis of the research drove these largely Afrikaans literary critics/censors. What was the passion was it for the nation as romantically conceived or as the people, the soul of the people. Was it that that they were trying to safeguard, foster, protect or was it something else. Was it some sense of the experimental, you know literatures pushing the boundary and their sense that nonetheless even though they were concerned to foster the soul of the people they wanted also to allow the people room to express themselves, yes in the modern world.

**Peter McDonald** Yes I think of course that is where they have to go in terms of the longer history as to why these people were there. And I suppose the most interesting aspect of that is really the linkage between literature and nationalism which is what you're touching on. Where what I expected again a standard view of say what Afrikaans nationalism represents is it is an extension of romantic 19th Century thinking, you know that the kind of thinking associated with people like Helder and so on the German traditionalists particular German tutonic traditions of national thinking but you know in many ways there's big questions in relation to Irish nationalism, you know the kind of aspirations that underlay the anti colonial movement in Ireland bearing in mind I know from your work that you know that there were interesting connections between the Irish and the Boers in the 19th Century where the Irish were the only people I think in the Boer War shooting each other where they are on the side of the Empire and on the other hand some were supporting the Boers. So you know there's those historical linkages. But what was interesting is that there is certainly there was within Afrikaans nationalist thinking and here we're talking about when you say, you know the soul of the people we're talking really about a rationalised conception of the Falk. So that the idea of the Afrikaans community only understood as a Falk and of course understand in racialised terms the white Afrikaans speaking Falk. So kind of a racialised, ethno linguistic people.

If you take it back to the 19th Century there's the mainstream view is the one that says well there's a think called the Falk spirit, the spirit of the soul of the people. And that what literature constitutes is the ultimate expression and embodiment giving voice to that Falk. So if you like it's the way of getting at the essence of what the Falk is.

This was a mainstream Afrikaans view and it has implicitly built into it an idea of what the writer is. The writer is the conduit, the spokesperson for the spirit. It's through the writer that the spirit of the Falk emerges.

So I certainly – that was what I thought was the view. But then as you dug into the history of the system you realised that actually the most influential people ultimately behind why this particular group of censors had so much power in the system were a marginal group within Afrikaana nationalist led culture of that time. Still absolutely bound into Afrikaana nationalist culture. They're associated primarily with a poet, a leading Afrikaans poet called [?? 0:18:43]] and one of the easiest ways I think of grasping [?? 0:18:46]] stature within Afrikaans culture is he's the Afrikaans equivalent of W B Yeats. He's as controversial, a nationalist and as complicated a nationalist and as big a figure as W B Yeats.

And the interesting thing is that even compared to Yeats who still bought into notions certainly in the 1890s of the Celtic Spirit of the notion of some sort of essence or soul of the Irish [?? 0:19:18]] was in many ways especially after the war, after the second world war in many ways a kind of modernist nationalist who thought there was no such defined final thing as the [Falk's 0:19:32]] character. That actually the key thing about this character was that it was always open to the future, mobile, experimental, exploratory. And so the real reason why this particular group got there was not so much that there was a particular group of censors who wanted to protect literature in general, there's an element of that. But there's a particular group of censors who wanted to protect this idea of the Falk. And what they had to do was ensure that clerics as in Dutch Reform Church Ministers and the political elite didn't get hold of the system.

But actually this particular literary elite got hold of the system and again I have to stress that it was a marginal elite. A kind of an internal dissident group.

**Elleke Boehmer** A fraction.

**Peter McDonald** Yes a fraction of that group. So the reason why these people were there is to protect the interests of that group who were interested in defending some notion of the Falk as an endlessly open category not as a closed fixed essence which had a spirit that the writer could manifest.

So that was a real surprise. And dealing with the ramifications of that so the ways in which it works out in detail in the decisions are for instance is why these censors are both on the one hand interested in a writer as the voice of his or her people whatever that might be but also the ways in which the writing would achieve some sort of universality because it would speak to this larger openness that they wanted to preserve which they felt the clerics with their anxieties about moral censorship and pornography and hostility to writers as an elite and certainly the politicians wanted to close down. So that was – I had to learn and rethink my assumptions about the relationship between literature and nationalism in order to try to understand that.

**Elleke Boehmer** As modernism, the modernism of someone like [?? 0:21:30]] came in as a third factor if you like into that relationship of literature and nationalism.

**Peter McDonald** Yes, right. So it's a kind of a late 20th Century version of nationalism as opposed to simply what I thought an inheritance of 19th Century nationalism.

**Elleke Boehmer** Yes, yes that's just so interesting. I mean how was it from your point of view as after all somebody who's written about Conrad as a modernist yourself in terms of your literary interests to witness, to confront, to come up close to again this word resurfaces, the complicity also of modernist writing, you know it's another aspect that connects us. I, too, have worked on early 20th Century European modernism and I have always personally seen the experimental, the avant garde almost as a good in itself to push the boundaries what we understand by the literary but here what your research uncovered was that modernism too was complicit with the particularly reactionary race entrenched form of nationalism.

**Peter McDonald** I suppose the specifics and of course the power that these particular censors had again struck me as anomalous and simply the fact that anyway these kind of – this kind of thinking had anything to do with censorship decision making that was a surprise. But in terms of the longer history of modernism I would say no it doesn't – it didn't completely surprise me because I've always had the view that modernism isn't one thing for one thing. It's the many modernisms. And here we're talking about a specific literary movement of the early 20th Century but also even within a rather closely defined kind of modernism there are all sorts of anomalies and you can have certain kinds of modernist writing that head in the direction of some of T S Elliott's more rebarbative anti-Semitic kinds of writing and it's, you know, it's of course – I'm not saying it's simply and easily dismissible and identifiable to anti Semitic but it's a kind of writing that is caught up in rather standard clichéd tropes about anti Semitism. We're talking here about some of the Quattro end poems, we're talking about bits of the wasteland and things that were excluded from the wasteland. But also in a sense Elliott's whole relationship to a western tradition of thinking which I regard Elliott as in a sense very clearly reinforcing many assumptions built into the western tradition. Many of those assumptions which also permeated racist thinking. So there's that. But then on the other hand you can point to on say issues of anti Semitism of that specific one or issues of race you can point to someone like Joyce and you point to Ulysses. And that seems to be you know something completely different and very consciously turning its back on that western tradition of hierarchical thinking of you know the superiority of certain bodies above other bodies. Of even spirit above body.

So there's a very mixed story about modernism and of course we don't have to point to say people like Elliott. You can also look at Seline in the French context and so on. And where the relationship between experimental writing and extremely reactionary forms of thought is never as easy and as comfortable as we think. So I never had that view but I certainly, that didn't mean that there were not lots of surprises within the apartheid decision process.

**Elleke Boehmer** Again it's to me so interesting and so readable in the book that trajectory that takes us from the you know the very specific, the decision made on a single day by a particular censor or a particular avante garde national poet as in [ [?? 0:25:44] ] to the wider ramifications of that in the world. If you like the movement from the local or the regional where that is South Africa apartheid South Africa out to literature trans nationally. And still keeping that trajectory in mind coming down as a were to the specific again I was particularly fascinated by the role that certain writers played in this story. So I wondered if we could pull out the name Andre Brink.

**Peter McDonald** Right.

**Elleke Boehmer** Up to this point for me personally a writer read in both English and Afrikaans have never been quite sure about in terms of his literary interest. A very popular writer, globally popular. In this story here the literature police story Brink emerges as a much more interesting character than I had suspected.

Could you talk a bit about the role of Brink in the story of the Censorship Board. You know the ways in which he – well there were moments when he was passed when, you know, his writing was actually quite controversial but was he passed because he was deemed to speak for the soul of the people or was deemed to form part of what you call the Falk avante gard you know the people's avante gard pushing the boundaries of what it was possible to say about the people or you know were there times then when he was held back because he was deemed to be pornographic and to fall foul of the more if you like conservative elements within the censorship board. Let's talk a bit about Andre Brink because I think a writer that can people relate to cross culturally.

**Peter McDonald** Absolutely right I mean he's a major figure I mean a figure of huge abundant energy, prejudicious in his output extraordinary. But also the other thing I think people need to know most immediately about Brink in this story is that Brink is the first Afrikaans writer to be banned. 'Looking on Darkness' [[Kenneth's Funny Aunt 0:28:16]] is the Afrikaans title 1974 it was the first Afrikaans book to be banned. I'd always known that. I think everybody had always known that in South Africa at one point or another. What I didn't know and of course I think what most people had probably forgotten was that until that point a number of Brink's novels had actually got into the system, interestingly like a lot of Afrikaans works in the 1960s got into the system but via outraged church groups who individuals under acting their influence all actual groups of church groups sent in his works and demanded that they be banned largely on moral grounds. And the interesting thing is that a number of Brink's early novels of the '60s get let through, the censors decide not to ban them.

The one in which they vacillated the most was a novel called in 1967 I think I remember rightly when it was published called 'Mis Skin Noit' or Maybe – in English – 'Maybe Never'. And one of the interesting things about that decision was that it was very – the censors were very very divided. Basically one particular faction thought this wasn't great enough literature to merit being passed. Another thought the opposite and there was a big argy bargee and discussion within the Censorship Board. What is interesting about that though is that this is Brink at that point being published by the leading publisher of the '60s experimental group called the [[?? 0:29:57]] in Afrikaans who are kind at that point understood as a kind of an emergent Falk avante gard they were in that modernist tradition but taking if you like crudely into a post modernist direction.

So a whole series of Brink's works and indeed some [[?? 0:30:11]] works were let through in the 1960s and again you know just largely because this literary group finally despite the internal divisions decided that this was great, enough literature and was important for the, you know they said you know the intellectual and spiritual life of the Falk. And the slight anomaly for Brink I would imagine and he wrote a really interesting view about this book is that the people who were deciding his fate at least two of them had taught him as a student at the University of [[?? 0:30:45]] so his works are being decided by his former professors.

The interesting change that then happens is in 1974 Brink there's a crucial year within this younger generation of writers of 1968 which seems that 1968 was a crucial year for every – just about everybody. Where they decided that if you like the notion of contributing and making a great Falk literature was itself collaborationist. That actually that was caught up with a certain notion of, a narrow conception of nationalism however dissident you were, however critical you were you were nonetheless caught up and still an understanding of the Afrikaans community as a Falk that had to have supremacy over everyone else in South Africa.

And they broke with it. The person who led that was [[?? 0:31:38]]. [[?? 0:31:40]] but Brink was also at the foreground of that charge, that internal debate with themselves where they in a sense then started to move into a conception of the Afrikaans community which was not only not rationalised but it was in a sense anti Falk. They broke with that official form of dissidence which the censors were allowing and they broke and they started going to a more extreme form of dissidence which they saw as fundamental.

So the ways in which Kenneth Funny Aunt [[?? 0:32:07]] only that it's pornographic that they regard the sexual descriptions as any of this kind of slightly silly things amongst the censors saying that you know that Brink's sexual descriptions are over romanticised. And there are other sexual descriptions that you can let through [[?? 0:32:22]] whatever there are more less

sentimentalised or whatever. There's those kinds of things. But the key thing is they start to say this is committed literature and which they regard as a kind of derogatory category or something committed to use their kind of satiric flow phraseology. This is literature en gage and is therefore not literary enough because it's in a sense too political to be literary.

And it's really that kind of thinking that starts to dominate the way in which the censors react to this new shift within the younger generation of Afrikaans writers and they start to ban committed Afrikaans literature beginning with the Brink.

**Elleke Boehmer** What that is such an interesting and key example of is that is of how the formation of what we might call South African writing in various languages across the 20th Century comes out of if you like an elaborate dance of censor and writer. That, you know, the censor decrees if you like or draws a boundary the writer exceeds but then is circumscribed again by the shifting definitions of the censor. So there's, you know, there's a push and there's a pull.

A few days ago I was engaged in a discussion with the translator, eminent critic Leon de Kock in Johannesburg. In which he was suggesting that what we might call South African literature no longer exists, you know, it's been so buffeted and infiltrated by global forces, genres from elsewhere, chick-lit if you like the Detective Novel. And what I was suggesting in contrary distinction to that is that on the contrary we continue to have a very very clear sense of what South African literature is and it partly comes out of that elaborate dance between if you like the committed, the en gage that which is concerned with the matter of South Africa and then exceeding it. Going beyond it.

From your research and from this book and the discussions that you've been having around it and subsequent to it do you still have a strong sense that there is something that we might call perhaps especially now in the 21st Century South African writing regardless of language? And if you like a body of national literature that we can teach in the classroom. Or do you think we've moved beyond that.

Because if I can just add a final footnote to that. It seems to me that here you have as well as offering a literary history of censorship in a particular context you've also offered a deeply textually embedded account of the evolution of South African writing in the 20th Century. De Kock was saying, you know, "Look around you where are the literary histories, the interesting 21st Century literary histories of South African writing?" I said "The literature police."

**Peter McDonald** Good for you. I think we probably also need to start thinking about wrapping things up but I think no that's a really great and interesting question. I think probably my answer is two fold. That in a sense on the one hand now in South Africa, you know as in India after independence in 1947 there is a massively important nation building project via literature and indeed not only literature orator, all forms of cultural expression of various kinds.

There's a major effort because the forms and varieties of South African literature that we've had in the past have all been deformed. So there's a whole way of rethinking about this corpus or body of work which we want to call South African literature. So you know the State for instance, the Ministry of – the Department of Arts and Culture have recently in fact in this month is launching a collection of books called South African Classics which are out of print books in African languages – [?? 0:37:09], Zulu, [[Setswana 0:37:11]] and so on by major writers of the 20th Century.

And going back to [?? 0:37:16], A C Jordan these kinds of writers. Cheap paperbacks being put into all public libraries. You know that's an enormously important exercise in if you

like scholarship and publishing of reclamation. Of reclaiming these traditions that were through colonialism, apartheid and so on marginalised or not sometimes valorised but valorised – valued in problematic ways. To reclaim this tradition – to build up you know a fuller conception of what a South African literature might be like. You know and in many ways going back to our discussion with Brink that was Brink's challenge to his fellow Afrikaans writers, you know don't, you're thinking too narrowly in terms of the Falk I want to identify with all the people who I share South Africa with that this is a South African literature.

So you know that was a challenge back in the '60s for Brink. Now there's an equally – there's that challenge. However at the same time we've got this kind of nation building project through culture if you like going on essential, indispensable thing to do. On the other hand there's a challenge to it because of the conception of space that we now live in. You know the public space, the public domain. What is the public domain?

Of course you know where the movement of literary forms, of kinds of writing, of writings and writers themselves is now so much more profound and of course it's always been there since the days of Empires, it's always been about movement and transaction and borrowing and these sorts of things.

I think now with, you know, partly also the ways in which the Internet has disturbed our conceptions of space even you know what does it mean to be in space well what do you have access to when you're in space here as opposed to in space there, you know this is all changed quite radically. So at the same time and hence my answer's two fold on the one hand there's an essential nation building project on the other hand there are all sorts of ways in which we have to think critically about the ways in which certain kinds of writing, literature and so on can actually be made to fit that. And the ways in which the realities of the world now can be made to fit that conception.

So I would again say you know it's just a question of – partly a question of who's deciding what's that and let's think about who's deciding it and then see what the result is and then what questions it might still raise.

**Elleke Boehmer** Thank you, yes. And I suppose by contrast what is so unique and fascinating about the period that you track in the literature police is that apartheid and the Censorship Board and the state at the time created as it were a bell jar effect within which a certain kind of national literature was being made to grow. We would now say stunted, perhaps form but a certain kind of national literature has been made to grow outside of and away from hived off from the outside world whereas now of course and happily that has come crashing in.

---

© 2010 University of Oxford, Peter McDonald and Elleke Boehmer

*This transcript is released under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 2.0 UK: England & Wales Licence. It can be reused and redistributed globally provided that it is used in a non-commercial way and the work is attributed to the licensors. If a person creates a new work based on the transcript, the new work must be distributed under the same licence. Before reusing, adapting or redistributing, please read and comply with the full licence available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.0/uk/>*