

Judge Dennis Davis and Professor David Peimer | Descent into Authoritarianism Cabaret, The Crucible, Hamlet, Part 1

- Good morning, gentlemen. I think we should start. We are a little bit after the hour. So, I just want to say welcome back, and to all our participants, welcome to part one of this discussion, or maybe... We'll see how many sessions we have on this topic. So, over to you guys. Thank you very much.

- Thank you very much, Wendy. And again, thank you to Judi and thank you to David, who, when I do these things, I seem to learn more than I give to the audience, so I find it's a great pleasure to be doing these things.

- It's a two-way street, Dennis. Thank you.

- Thank you, David. There's a quote here from "Hamlet". "Speech sleeps in a fool's ear." We're going to come back to "Hamlet", but I suppose the real question for our entire discussion is what do we mean by "knaveish speech"? And are we the fools? But let me recap, if I may, because the purpose of this session and the following one really is to follow upon the three lectures that were given this week. One by Trudy, one by William, and one by myself. I hope that Trudy and myself, in a different capacity, I'm sure I won't, take offence by the fact that perhaps the most central point of the entire week was a point made by William in opening his lecture and referring us to the Reverend Hooker. And I say that because the Reverend Hooker's fundamental theory for constitutional democracy, of which he was one of the foremost forerunners-

- May I borrow you, may I borrow your...

- Was how to constitute a society in which all could be embraced. That is, a society where everybody, notwithstanding their different views, religious affiliations, et cetera, could be incorporated in one holistic society. It's a fantastically interesting and fundamental point, and in the sense, it sets the total scene for both the lectures that Trudy and I gave, and the problem that we're grappling with. How is it possible to sustain a society in which all are embraced? Because absent that requirement, you can't have a constitutional democracy. In other words, absent the idea that we have some ideas that we share, one with the other, it is not possible to sustain a constitutional democratic society for any length of time.

You cannot have half a population who think that gravity actually is a scientific fact and half a population who think it isn't. That i.e. gravity is fake news, to take a simple idea, as explication for what I'm saying. And therefore, what we've chosen to do tonight, and for a further session, because there's an enormous amount that one can talk about, is to take the art form, which, as a humble lawyer, I should tell you, and I say this perhaps a slightly less tutored voice than my esteemed colleague, but nonetheless, art has a revolutionary quality to it, because it, it basically is able to show us, in such clear terms, what the alternative might be, and what the cause of our woes are. And it seems to me that the three art forms that we've chosen, the two plays,

"Hamlet" and "The Crucible", and the film "Cabaret", which David spoke about wonderfully earlier, but to which we return a little later in this programme, all of these try to pose certain questions to us about effectively the problem of that embrace to which William spoke, and which Hooker devoted much of his life. So let me just talk about a couple of them before we move on to deal with "The Crucible". There is, today, and I'd argued on Thursday, and I want to continue to argue today, a form of fake news, which it is true, existed in the past, and which will be shown in the various illustrations to which we are to speak this evening.

That is "Hamlet", "Crucible" and "Cabaret". But it does seem that we have got to a point of fake news of an extraordinarily pernicious kind, one which you could almost argue Goebbels would be chuckling in his grave over, just to the extent to which we've embraced the notion that the myth becomes the lie, and if you repeat it sufficiently, it does become a primary, primary worldview, for a very significant population. And the problem about it is that if you have an absence of truth, if you've simply got, or if you've got a countervailing myth, and I use that word advisedly, which totally trumps, I suppose that's a horrible word to use in this particular context, so let me say overrides the truth, then in that sort of situation, you cannot have law because law is based, at the end of the day, on some agreement, on some consensus, on some rules that we all accept. And if what takes its place is a myth, which totally swamps any idea of truth, what then happens then, certainly what happens then, is you replace the authority of the law with some other version of authority. And that alternative version of authority unquestionably squeezes out any alternative view of the world.

Any other view, any other opinion. Indeed, eventually, it squeezes out reality from the world to such an extent that it takes over, in the most pernicious and all-embracing way so that what you are left with, then, is, as I indicated in the lecture on Thursday, to use John Goodsir again, you have one book, not many, you have one idea, not a multiplicity. You have one view as to how we have to comport ourselves, not many, and the dignity of every one of us who perhaps thinks differently, or thinks along a different line, we are then subjected to the most immense danger, because the legal basis, the constitutional basis, which gives us the right to articulate our views and essentially vindicates the dignity of our human condition, is swept asunder. And it's perhaps for that reason, more than any other, that the play written by Arthur Miller, it is true, written in the context of the anti-American Committee of Senator Joe McCarthy under that awful time of the 1950s. It still rings true today. And whilst we won't have time to talk about the whole play, it was about that play that we wanted to focus on. Now, David, I'm not sure if you want to add anything to this before we show the clip, but please do.

- Thank you. Just to add one or two ideas as well. Our primary focus in looking at the question of dissent into authoritarianism, in particular emerging out of democracies, where the obvious prime example of the 20th century was with the Nazis, and perhaps partly linked to Mussolini and so on, but the primary one, obviously Hitler and the Nazis, coming out of democratic vote, and thus seeing what is resonant today in that question. What is involved in the dissent into authoritarianism, not just as a sort of shopping list of ingredients, but more what resonates with us. And by looking at these three pieces, "Crucible", "Hamlet", and "Cabaret", the idea is not to

explore each of these in enormous depth as a text on their own, but to see what images, what characters, what moments in these remarkable texts speak to us, in a sense of capturing through metaphor, something which crystallises in a visual and visceral way, the main ideas of what we're going to look at, six or seven main ideas, which involve the dissent into authoritarianism, often coming out of democratic worldview. So, it's that as a focus, rather than an in-depth exploration of each play, like with "Amadeus", it was an enormous in-depth exploration of the film itself, and the music, et cetera. So it's to take out some ideas, and the main thing is through metaphor, through image, through art.

Art just being a mirror to human nature, to human foibles, and so on, but to actually prod us and prick us, and disturb us and shock us, surprise us with insights which we absorb through the mobilisation of our imagination. And I'm going to come back to that word imagination again and again, because what is lacking, precisely what Dennis was saying, in the singular view where the authority of the one view, the fundamentalist authority, and it can be any fundamentalist, of nationalism, of any religion or apartheid. Anything that says, "This is the way. This is the light. This is the answer. This is the truth." Not only negates the whole meaning of constitutional democracy, but also sets the stage for authoritarianism to creep to centre stage. And I think that's what these pieces show is how it emerges in "Hamlet" and in "Cabaret", and in "The Crucible", how it starts to take over. The slyness of fascism, the slyness of authoritarianism, can start to take centre stage and the spotlight. And this little phrase from "Hamlet", "A knavish speech sleeps in a fool's ear."

As we were talking earlier, Dennis, who is the fool? Who is the ear? We're going to come into... So many metaphors are resonant from this language, speech, the ear, and who's the fool, who isn't, and who is giving the speech, who controls the narratives? So, in looking at these plays, this is the idea, really, in why choosing these pieces. Okay, and then just before we show the clip of "The Crucible", for me, one of the main reasons for us choosing it is because of numerous ideas which are staged in "The Crucible". Aside from the obvious link to the McCarthy era and the witch hunt, which is obviously Arthur Miller's aim for the metaphor, but for us, we start to get a frightening exploration of how the minds of so many are taken over by fake news, by lies, when everybody knows it's not the truth. Everybody knows it's the absence of truth, it's the presence of lie, it's the presence of fakeness, which is being embraced by the majority in "The Crucible".

And to quote her again, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, what happens is that when we have the the uni-dimensional, or mono-dimensional view, we cannot have a full picture, because the story is told through one lens, only. It can be a story of colonialism, it could be a story of racism, it could be a story of Imperial Rome, told through the eyes of Caesar, only. Not through the person who cooks for Caesar, or the slave, whoever. So, it's incomplete, because it lacks the other stories of the other. It only has the story of the self, and it's incomplete, because the stories of the stereotyped other, the so-called primitive, the so-called uncivilised, the so-called savage, those stories are not foregrounded or told. And until we create a space for the other stories, we cannot have a democratic worldview, neither on stage, nor in literature. And for me, what these

plays do, these pieces set up, they set up the authority of the singular narrative, which is precisely what Trump, I really believe, tried to do, in his bumbling way. If he'd been a more effective, more politically astute and historically knowledgeable leader, he might have achieved it. A version of a Hitler, a Mussolini, a Franco, whoever, or even Erdogan or Putin, with with the mafia state. He could have had many variations of it. But to set up the authoritarianism of the singular narrative becomes one of the primary concerns of any intended authoritarian leader. And when it emerges out of democracy, it becomes quite clear what must be negated and sent off stage. So, okay, if we can have the clip please, Judi.

Video clip plays.

- Abigail? I bid you now, search your heart and tell me this, and beware, child, to God, every soul is precious, and his vengeance is terrible on them that take life without cause. Is it possible, child, that the spirits you have seen are illusion only, some deception that may cross your mind-

- This is a base question, sir.

- Child, I would have you consider it.

- I have been hurt, Mr. Danforth! I have seen my blood runnin' out! I have been near to murdered, every day, because I done my duty, pointing out the Devil's people. And this is my reward? To be mistrusted. Denied. Questioned.

- [Danforth] Child, I do not mistrust you.

- Let you beware! Mr. Danforth. Think you to be so mighty the power of hell may not turn your wits? Beware of it. There...

- [Danforth] What is it, child?

- I... I know not. A wind! A cold wind has come!

- Abby!

- Your Honour, I freeze!

- [Proctor] They're pretending!

- [Hathorne] She is cold!

- Mary, do you send this shadow on me?

- [Mary] Lord, save me!

- [Susanna] I freeze, I freeze!

- It is a wind! A wind!

- [Mary] Abby, don't do that!

- Mary Warren, do you witch her? I say to you, do you send your spirit out?

- Oh, let me go, Mr. Proctor!

- [Abigail] Heavenly Father! Take away...

- [Proctor] How do you call Heaven, whore? Whore!

- Man, what do you-

- It is a whore!

- You charge-

- Mr. Danforth, he is lying!

- Mark her! Now she'll suck a scream to stab me with!

- You will prove this! This will not pass!

- I have known her, sir! I have known her!

- You... You are a lecher?

- John, you cannot-

- Oh, Francis, I wish you had some evil in you, that you might know me. A man will not cast away his good name. You surely know that.

- In what time? In what place?

- In the proper place. Where my beasts are bedded. On the last night of my joy, some eight months past. She used to serve me in my house, sir. A man may think God sleeps, but God sees everything. I know it now. I beg you, sir. I beg you! See her what she is! My wife, my dear good wife, took this girl soon after, sir, and put her out on the highroad. But being what she is, a lump of vanity! Excellency, forgive me. Forgive me. She thinks to dance with me on my wife's

grave! And well she might, for I thought of her softly. God help me, I lusted, and there is a promise in such sweat. But it is a whore's vengeance, and you must see it! I set myself entirely in your hands. I know you must see it now!

- [Danforth] You deny every scrap and tittle of this?

- If I must answer that, I will leave, and I will not come back again!

- I have made a bell of my honour. I have rung the doom of my good name. You will believe me, Mr. Danforth. My wife is innocent! Except she knew a whore, when she saw one!

Video clip ends.

- Thanks very much, Judi. Perhaps just some initial thoughts on watching. And I don't want to get into the whole story of "The Crucible" and the many different aspects of all the different characters and so on. But some of the main ideas is that what happens when we, when we see before our eyes, the authority of the single narrative and being told that is the truth. Whether it's the earth is flat or whether it's gravity, as Dennis was saying earlier, it exists or it doesn't. And half the population believes one, and the other half believes the opposite. It's a serious schism, but it is essential for the political leader, because it's the oldest and simplest rule of all politics. Divide and rule. The more you can divide, you create a vacuum, and power can come in and use the one narrative, the fake news narrative, to become the dominant narrative. And the irony in "The Crucible", which for me Arthur Miller captures, is that hysteria and frenzy are necessary and it's necessary for the participants to experience the fear and the attraction of hysteria and frenzy, of a crowd, as we saw on Wednesday last week.

And also even more ironic is that it's necessary to defend the fake news single narrative with hysteria and frenzy. It's defended by being so extreme, by being so extreme, emotional, frenzy, et cetera. And the Nazis understood this only too well, that they could actually put it into marching and the bands and all those images that we know only too well as well. And here, I think he's capturing it in an amazing way on the stage, because there's something frighteningly attractive, grotesquely fascinating, to watch people literally lose themselves in a hysterical frenzy, and get caught up in such a blood, a blood river of emotion and passion, and how attractive it is for others. It's part of a necessary ingredient of a dissent into authoritarianism, to touch these dark places in all of us. And for me, Arthur Miller is not hesitant to go that far and say it's essential, actually, and then to see it's defended in the same way. And if constitutional law can then rise to the occasion of pouring cold ice water, to say, "Whoa, step back."

And there's other narratives. The narrative is incomplete because the new one of one stereotyped story has taken over, it's incomplete. Now let's hear the stories of all the others. And we start to see from the police, it's emerging now, the cop who was crushed between the doors, what's happened to Pence, I don't know, 60 seconds, or whatever, away from being attacked himself, Pelosi, et cetera. You know, this was a seriously armed insurrection, poorly organised,

poorly planned. It could've resulted in 50/100 people dead, as everybody knows. Brexit. What was the narrative pushed by Brexit? "Take back control." Of what? Sovereignty? Of what? How? Why? A nationalist narrative pumped 350 million pounds on the bus, 350 million pounds coming in for the NHS, every week. These simplistic narratives pushed, under the guise of white nationalism, for me, I'm being personally about Brexit. But another one, the apartheid narratives. The fear of black, the fear of communism, pushed. Now, when people start to imbibe and believe, it becomes a fundamentalist belief. And what we want to look at, as we look at "Hamlet" and some of the other pieces, are ways of attacking it, are ways to de-clothe it of its power and its strength. To show it in its naked horror, for what it really is.

And there are ways which we're going to suggest later, looking at "Hamlet", of bringing approaches which can try and deconstruct it, to show the other stories. And if I may, just one last thing, is that watching the scenes of last Wednesday were almost like a witch hunt. One can see the performance quality of a witch hunt, with the hysteria, the emotion, the frenzy, as we see on the stage with "The Crucible", with a couple of actors and characters. So it's literally a witch hunt is a necessary part, I believe, of descending into authoritarianism, and the irony is taking something which democracy allows, in various ways, as kind of Hyde Park Corner safety valves. And ultimately, ultimately, I think it is about setting up the victimhood, the fool's ear, so these people are the victims of white nationalists, they're the victims because it's a multinational, it's a multicultural society taking over. All of these narratives being spread in the big lie that it was rigged or that the election is stolen. That's the big lie.

But to set that up, you need a group which are going to be for you, the white nationalists or during apartheid, it's a separate nationalistic belief, which is obviously imbued with extreme racism, and many other things. And in Brexit, for me, as well. And what it touches on is the purest in the arian myth, going back to the origin of Hitler. The purest. Who is more pure than the purest arian? The white arian, or the religious, or whatever it is. Or in Islam, it could be the same, and any other religion. And there's the need to destroy the other, or to at least imprison the other, to minimise the effect of the other, so that the self narrative, the victim who has lacked can take back control, who has lacked control, make America great, who has lacked the greatness, comes back from victim to the purity of superiority. I don't know if you want to add some things, Dennis.

- Yes, quite a bit actually, because I think the text is quite extraordinary, in all sorts of ways. Let me give you a quote from the text, just to reinforce what David has said. So, one of the girls who, of course, hope people know about this play, who is part of this hysterical group, the hysteria about the witches, Mary Warren, when she gives testimony for the court, she says the following, she says, "I heard other girls screaming and you, Your Honour, you seem to believe them. And aye, it was only sport at the beginning, sir, but then the whole world cries 'spirits'." And that's a really profound passage because to me, what it really entails is, we start in this way. We don't take the discourse of the false narrative particularly seriously. We think it might just be sport. We might think that Mr. Trump is amusing when he uses various catch phrases, for "Crooked Hillary" and et cetera, et cetera, and a shifty shift, and so and so forth.

But it overwhelms us, eventually. And all of a sudden, the whole world is crying that. That's what Miller says, through the voice of one of his characters. And there are many, many instances of this in the play. So, the Reverend Hale, who's sort of brought in to try to resolve the problem, and he realises that the court proceedings are madness, they're madness because of the fact that he realises, quite frankly, that it's out of control. That the whole world is now calling about spirits and therefore, nobody can get a fair trial, because there is no other reality, because everybody believes in it. And what does he do? He tries to persuade Rebecca and John Proctor, who stand to be executed, to give false testimony to save themselves. In a sense, there's a corrosive effect to fake news, which ultimately forces us into that alternative reality. And it's very interesting, and I want to recommend this to you, for those of you who are interested, in 1996, Arthur Miller published a really fascinating reflective article in the New Yorker on "The Crucible". It appears to have been written at round about the time that the film version with Daniel Day Lewis and whole distinguished cast, which included, by the way, Paul Scofield as the judge.

And he was reflecting on the play, and he said a few things I want to share with you before we move on, 'cause I think they're all very interesting. He said that ineffectively in any play, however trivial, there has to be a still point of moral reference against which to judge and gauge the action. And he posed the point as to whether, at the time he was writing the play, there was any still point of moral reference, given the way in which McCarthy's version of reality had overwhelmed their entire society. And I want to pose that question to us tonight. Is there a still point of moral reference against we could judge the play, or to be more crisp that we could judge the events of Wednesday? And I wonder if I could just be blunt, and forgive me for being so, but it seems to me that, in terms of intellectual honesty, one must raise this. I was stunned by some of the questions I got on Thursday night by some people who seemed to suggest that, "Oh, well, like some of the members of the Republican Party was suggesting, there was a moral equivalence between Black Lives Matter protests and the Donald Trump protests.

Now, let me be clear. Obviously, any form of violence, including the violence that broke out in the Black Lives Matter protests have to be condemned in the strongest terms, and if people don't do that, they are guilty of moral equivalence. I accept that, readily. But to suggest that there was moral equivalence between Black Lives Matter protests, most of which, according to almost all the research, were actually peaceful, and only a small section of which were violent and which were predicated upon the inherent racism of American society, which one should not disguise, and which is a reality. Now, whatever one might think of George Floyd, and there were obviously question marks about him, as a person. What cannot be gain said is that there is extraordinary statistics of brutal police behaviour in relation to Black Americans, African Americans. There is racism there. That's the reality. On the other hand, the protests that took place on Wednesday, we could debate the Black Lives Matter, but we can't debate the fact that what the protests were on Wednesday, as David is quite right, he said, is a complete myth! There was no reality in the fact that the election was stolen.

The election was probably the safest election an American society had ever had. And yet, what

might have started out, to quote Mary Warren, as some sport, suddenly, half the world was crying "Fake news, fake election." And that seems to me there's no moral equivalence there, there's no justification, at all, for what happened on that day. We can debate Black Lives Matter, and you're entitled to, but it does not seem, to me, it seems frightening to me that we live in a world where people are prepared to draw equivalence of this in circumstances with the latter, is very much a modern day version of "The Crucible". And let me conclude by something else Miller said. He said about this play, writing in 1996, "Are we capable of doing these things? These, after all, were our ancestors. Can we turn on our neighbours? They were other.

They were the others in us, in some ways." "Are we still capable of doing that today?", he wrote. Compared to what happened in Salem. And it seems to me, profoundly important question, that are we capable of not being able to be sucked in to fake news to an extent that we then start justifying doing things to our neighbours because they are the other? That was so central to this play, and what, of course, is critical to it, is you will never have justice, when the entire court case is predicated on that constructed myth, which is why "The Crucible" remains a remarkable play. Now, let me just say anecdotally, the first time I ever saw "The Crucible", was oddly enough in Afrikaans, and those of you who come from Johannesburg, in the theatre district of Braamfontein, in the early 1970s, and the person who played John Proctor was the great Afrikaans actor, Marius Weyers, and I remember thinking to myself, as I listened to it in Afrikaans, just how, to put David's point so crisply, how much the play spoke to me, and to others in the audience about apartheid society, the construct of the apartheid myth. And so it's a play which we've chosen, because it raises all of these questions. One could go on, David, but I'm not going to.

- Okay. Thank you, Dennis. Just one or two points, if I may, as well. In looking at this idea of the single narrative, the earth is flat, or gravity doesn't exist, whatever, or the inversion of truth, where the lie becomes the truth, as Goebbels was... To make almost a whole philosophy out of that propaganda, the idea propaganda. We have to realise as well that it's actually, and I have to be really honest here, it's not easy to break the single story. If we look at some fundamentalists in Judaism, and have raised the question about the chosen people, how easy or difficult is it to really challenge that at a very fundamental level? For every Jewish person. "Am I part of the chosen, above all else in humanity, and history, and current civilizations?" I merely throw it out for all of us to show, on the one hand, is that fake news? Isn't it? In order for me to be intellectually and artistically honest, I have to face, in myself, these very profound questions. Something like the chosen people, or something like the reception of the 10 Commandments, up on the mountain and Moses, et cetera.

And other stories, myths, facts, fake news combinations, which are so deeply embedded in Judaism, or other religions, and where's the link between that and when it becomes fundamentalism which denies and will kill any other interpretation to come in. And I think that's the key area where, as Dennis was saying, the law comes in. The ability and theatre tries to show, the ability that there can be other interpretations of the same event, of the same notion, and it's okay. The danger is when there is a fundamentalist belief and belief being the word, it's

not proven. It's a belief in the one idea. The one great idea. "Jews are responsible for all the ills of Germany." Treaty of Versailles, capitalism, communism, the unemployment in Germany, et cetera. The Jews are the classic scapegoat for all the nightmarish problems of Germany of the 20s. So, one has to look within one's own heart, I think. And I think Arthur Miller has the courage to do this. So, he is writing about the McCarthy era, but I think he's also writing something which is almost eternal to the human condition. And the other point I wanted to make is in the "Hamlet" phrase, "'Tis an unweeded garden that grows to seed, things rank and gross in nature, possess it merely." And Shakespeare often uses the image of an unweeded, or cultivated, or looked after garden, not only in "Hamlet", but in other plays, and he's trying to always say, using this very simple image, "We have to take care of these things." Democracy, perhaps, or a benevolent autocracy existed with Hamlet's daddy. But come the emerging dictator of Claudius, who's setting up a military dictatorship in Denmark, it's an unweeded garden.

Things grow to, you know, they can grow quickly, remarkably quickly, rank and gross. So, a certain vigilance is needed to nurture a kind of garden of democracy, human rights, justice, whatever we want to say. It may be a naive version of a Garden of Eden that Shakespeare is using or I'm interpreting as, but it does what art does. It gives us an image, a metaphor, to try and understand our own reality better. Something is rotten in the state of Denmark. Denmark's a prison, but it wasn't when "Hamlet" as the university student of age of 20 and off he goes to the University of Wittenberg to study, and he comes back and discovers his father, what, has been maybe killed? His mommy, two months after that, is in bed with his uncle who's declared a military dictatorship in Denmark. What the hell's going on? This kid is 20, he's 21. He's studying philosophy and whatever else, at the university and come back, and sees all this. So, I just bring this in, because these things need care. To use one of the other great phrases of Arthur Miller's, from "Death of a Salesman", "Attention must be paid."

And when we take our eye off the ball, and don't pay attention, as the 140 who voted to annul the electoral vote, which they knew it was a lie! When we take our eye off the ball and do things like that, and think it's a game or a joke or going to just get us votes in the next election or funding, we take our eye off the ball, other things come in very quickly. Weeds come into a garden pretty quick. Okay, the one other point which wanted to make, which before we go into the "Hamlet" is from Harari. And I'm sure many of us have all read the wonderful book, "Brief History of Homo Sapiens". And the main idea of Harari's, which is interesting, is what ultimately constitutes human society to stay together? Whether it's a small community living in caves, in ancient times, or living in feudal castles and setups, or nation state or city state, whatever it is, the society, big, small, huge, tiny family. And what the fundamental idea in Harari's book, which I'm sure everyone knows, was, it's a set of myths and beliefs and the set of beliefs, values or stories or myths that are captured in stories, that is what holds people together.

Underneath economics, underneath labour and work and job, underneath even religion is a set of myths and beliefs, which the majority need to buy into, in order to not kill each other at a drop of a hat, in order to not go around killing, raping, just taking whatever we want, from anywhere. We have to have a certain, call it the 10 Commandments, call it call it the five, the five phrases

from the whatever. We need a set of myths and beliefs that, through our imagination, 'cause it's entirely imagined, we buy into. And when that is threatened with fake news and the singular story, we can no longer have debate, discussion, question. We can no longer grow as a society. We cannot certainly have constitutional democracy. And authoritarianism starts to creep in, and Harari, he looks at so many different other examples and culture and history in the book, as we all know. But I think these plays try to deal with it. "The Crucible" dealing with, obviously, religion and witchcraft and all the rest of it in Salem, as the metaphor. "Hamlet", in dealing with it through Denmark, another world, another country, et cetera, but of course, Shakespeare's writing about England. He's saying, "Whoa, this can happen at any time!"

I think he's saying it can happen at any time, in any culture. I don't believe that cultures are going to stand forever, like the statues of Ozymandias in Shelley's great poem. They're not. Cultures are fragile. Ideas are fragile. They need the garden's attention, to use the great Peter Seller's image, I guess, of Chauncey Gardner. But it requires it. And I think, often, we lose sight, and we kind of go through life without being aware of it, enough. Not only as a warning from history, but that no culture's going to last forever. No group is going to stay as it is forever. It needs some value attached. Attention must be paid and value accorded to it. Otherwise, it will. If it had been, perhaps not a Trump, but perhaps somebody else, I believe personally, maybe I'm too sceptical, but it could have moved in another way. If the military had come on board, et cetera, et cetera. With what's happening with Brexit, Northern Ireland could leave. Scotland could leave. What happens? Little England, et cetera. And nationalism rears its head. And also the idea of the single myth, the single story gives rise to the scapegoat, and we know the obvious example of the Jews in Germany.

The other starts to emerge, to blame, to attack, so that the fake news narrative can have precedence, and it becomes so deeply embedded in people's minds, we can see how quick it is! How quick the mindset of people can be changed. As Dennis was saying, nearly half the voting population votes one way, votes a fake news way. Votes for lie. In a similar way, I would personally argue about Brexit and other things, we all know about apartheid. So, I just wanted to mention that because I think "The Crucible" is a remarkable piece of work which captures all of these things and obviously giving a very contemporary spin and interpretation of it all that goes with it. But it captures, I think, in the way that theatre sets up a metaphor, an image, not only a mirror, and where we try to see the ingredients, in this case, of an emerging fascism, perhaps. A possible one, anyway. Okay. That's from me.

- I think, given the time, we should deal with the Claudius speech, 'cause I'm not sure we're going to have time for both speeches. 'Cause I'd like to... We should end with the "Cabaret" one. So, perhaps, Judi, if you could give us the Claudius speech from "Hamlet".

Video clip plays.

- Bring in my Lord.

- Now, Hamlet, where's Polonius?

- At supper.

- At supper, where?

- Not where he eats, but where he is eaten. A certain convocation of politic worms are e'en at him. Your worm is your only emperor for diet. We fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for maggots. Your fat king and your lean beggar is but variable service, two dishes, but to one table. That's the end.

- Alas, alas.

- A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm.

- What dost thou mean by this?

- Nothing but to show you how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar.

- Where is Polonius?

- In heaven. Send thither to see. If your messenger find him not there, seek him in the other place yourself. But if indeed you find him not within this month, you shall nose him as you go up the stairs, into the lobby.

- Go seek him there.

- He will stay till you come.

- Hamlet, this deed, for thine especial safety, which we do tender as we dearly grieve for that which thou hast done, must send thee hence with fiery quickness. Therefore, prepare thyself. The bark is ready and the wind at help, the associates tend, and everything is bent for England.

- For England?

- Aye, Hamlet.

- Good!

- So is it, if thou knew'st our purposes.

- I see a cherub that sees them. But come, for England. Farewell, dear mother.

- Thy loving father, Hamlet.

- Mother. Father and mother is man and wife. Man and wife is one flesh. And so, my mother. Come. For England.

- Follow him at foot. Tempt him with speed aboard. Delay it not. I'll have him hence tonight, away. For everything is sealed, done, that else leans on the affair. Pray you make haste! And, England, if my love thou hold'st at aught, as my great power thereof may give thee sense, since yet thy cicatrice looks raw and red, after the Danish sword, and thy free awe pays homage to us, thou mayst not coldly set our sovereign process, which imports at full, by letters congruing to that effect, the present death of Hamlet! Do it, England! For like the hectic in my blood he rages, and thou must cure me! Till I know 'tis done. Howe'er my haps, my joys were ne'er begun.

Video clip ends.

- Okay, thank you. Thanks, Judi. Just some ideas there. For me, Claudius could be a kind of wannabe Trump, almost, or Boris, just some main ideas which emerge, and what's important for me, when Branagh gets hit on the face by Claudius, and you don't often see a production of "Hamlet" with that. And it shows how prone not only to emotion and passion Claudius is, but how insecure he is. That he has to physically hit the guy who may represent the biggest opposition to him. So, what is interesting, for me, coming from "The Crucible" and from "Hamlet" here, and we'll show some more of "Hamlet" next week, is what sustains the myth. What sustains the myth that Claudius is entitled to set up the military dictatorship that he wants? What sustains the myth in "The Crucible", to believe the opposite of what the truth is? And it's a binary structure of of identity. So, you have superior/inferior, civilized/primitive.

The intelligent and the savage. Ultimately, the pure white arian and the impure parasite. And of course the parasite can be the alien, the immigrant, the foreigner, the Jew, the black, et cetera, et cetera. The Irish, whatever. And that's what leads to the stereotype thinking. So, in order to break this, we would have to have an education, or a way of looking at things where stereotype itself becomes something to study in education, at school. What is a stereotype? How do we make it? Why is the black savage primitive, uncivilised? Why is the Jew, avaricious, greedy, cunning, self-obsessed? All these stereotype perceptions, which are part of the inheritance of western culture. How do they come about? How do you break the stereotype, as a very fundamental way of living? Is it part of human nature to always set up stereotypes? I don't believe it. I don't buy it. And I think education could look at...

There could be whole courses on stereotype, or courses on war, on justice, truth, democracy. Instead of just learning as we did in Durban days, 1000 years of every English king and queen, every battle, et cetera, et cetera. I can regurgitate all those facts, but I knew nothing! What is really justice? What is real truth? What is fake news? What does war mean? Why? What is stereotype? How do I challenge myself in education, perhaps? Because that leads to the

scapegoating and the other being set up for blame and perhaps killing, as we saw the fury and the rage, last Wednesday. The second main idea is that the media and the internet. Where they are cunning is that the algorithm is purposely set up, the binary of self and other. So, it's literally black and white. Good and bad. And algorithms take us to an extreme position. So, I want to suggest that a lot of the Facebook, and all these algorithms, and I'm not an expert, and please correct me if I'm wrong, in IT, but a lot of these algorithms are set up, so that we can only experience one of two extremes. And that's classic us-and-them conflict, divide and rule by a savvy politician comes in. So, something in the very algorithm of the media and the internet needs to perhaps be looked at in education, as well.

And the last idea is that "Hamlet" has become the outsider. He's a kid. Branagh's obviously older, playing it. But in the original, he's supposed to be a university student. He's a kid. He's 20, 21. He's the outsider, come back into the inside. And Claudius is so scared because he has the intelligence, the understanding, the ability and the leadership and the military qualities to ditch being a philosophy student and as at the end of "To be or not to be" speech, to get into action. And as he says at the end of play, "Ripeness is all." To become ripe, to take on and lead a revolt against the dictatorship of Claudius. Why does Claudius need to send him to England, to have him declared crazy, mad? England will cure him. Get him out of Denmark. Because he's a threat. If "Hamlet" was really this weak, passive, intellectual, non-military, nonphysical kind of guy, Claudius would not be so scared. He would corrupt him. He'd pull him in. He wouldn't be scared and freaked out by him. So what is it that Claudius is terrified of?

Hamlet has learned to think independently. I don't think it's by chance Shakespeare sends him to university, study philosophy, come back and endless debates and discussions and the soliloquies. All these things, things of metaphysics and life, there's nothing neither right, nor wrong, but thinking makes it so. All the remarkable metaphysical insights that Hamlet has. Shakespeare sends him to study philosophy and brings him back. He can think independently, and that's the threat that Claudius picks up. And that could be at a root of education, as opposed to an education that trains us to think in the one narrative, primarily. Is there a leader like this in our times, in England or America, or anywhere, that Hamlet could be a wannabe Hamlet? We can talk about that later. Dennis, over to you.

- No. Fine, David. Because of the time, I was going to make a number of points about "Hamlet", but I'll reserve that for part two, because I think it would be good to end on that extraordinary clip that we're about to show on "Cabaret". But I wanted just to preface that by something. It's traditional within the Jewish tradition to always say something about the week's Parshah portion. That this particular portion of the Torah actually has so much to do with what we're talking about. And I'm going to truncate my remarks in two minutes, because in this week's Parshah that would've been read in shuls, if COVID hadn't been around, we read about the fact that five times we're told in text that God hardened Pharaoh's heart and the rabbis are particularly worried about this because how do you reconcile the idea that God had to harden Pharaoh's heart, when fundamental to our tradition is the idea of free will?

In other words, if there was free will, why on earth did God have to harden the heart? And if God was going to do that, why didn't he just basically command Pharaoh to do the decent thing and allow the Jews to leave Egypt? What does it mean to ask the question about hardening of the heart? And the most creative answer given by one of the commentators, who I wanted to share with you, is this. That actually, the idea of hardening of the heart, of Pharaoh, was this. That Pharaoh's heart was hardened, in that when the plagues unfolded upon the Egyptian people, God did not want Pharaoh to release the Jews simply because of the pragmatic reason that disaster was going to engulf the Egyptians. He wanted Pharaoh, the only way that effectively would be right and proper to release the Jewish people was because of the fact that all human beings are created in the image of God, and that if you were going to acknowledge a universal God from whom we all, as it were, descend, then, for Pharaoh should have done it for that reason. And what was meant by "hardening of the heart", was simply this. Was to essentially harden Pharaoh's heart so that he would resist simply allowing the Jews out, because of the plague, until such time as he had come to terms with the fact that you don't do things for pragmatic reasons but for some moral basis. It's a profound insight into the notion that we tend to continuously adhere to the view, "Oh, well, if leaders are pragmatic."

Well, in the short time, fine. But unless you've got some vision of the world, maybe it is a myth, as David has suggested, but a myth that embraces us all. A myth that may be predicated on an idea that there is an almighty and that we are all created in his image. But that's neither here nor there. The point is, unless you've got policies that are predicated on some form of universal moral code, you are always going to be in trouble. And what the alternative is, is this idea of the gamer, the person who says, "Well, I can game the situation by riding the autocrat to my own benefit, to use him for my own advantage. I don't have to respond in a moral way. What can happen is, okay, so he's an autocrat, but we can manipulate him." And if you behave in that kind of pragmatic way, disaster generally unfolds. And this an extraordinary scene from "Cabaret" with the song and the comments which are made at the end, particularly by Michael York. Just, it seems to me, reflect on the disastrous course that so many took in Germany that notwithstanding the fact that Hitler was an awful autocrat, well, we could use him to our advantage.

And if you want to be blunt about it, I know it's an entirely different situation, Hitler and Trump and again, I want to make sure that I've not being drawing a moral equivalence between the two. But the fact that many within the Republican Party thought they could use Trump, knowing who he was and knowing what he was for their own advantage, always ends in moral disaster. This particularly, seems to me, one of the most extraordinary clips for me, on all of film, because it so frighteningly reflects precisely what we are talking about. And it precisely reflects also the point that we're making throughout this hour. Just how that myth grows. Again from Mary Warren, it might have been sport at the beginning, may be one or two who sing, but before you know it, you've got 75, or 100 million people singing the same song, and by goodness, for the rest of us then, our lives are in serious jeopardy. So, let's watch this clip with those views and the insights that both of us have suggested over the last hour.

Video clip plays.

♪ The sun on the meadow ♪ ♪ Is summery warm ♪ ♪ The stag in the forest ♪ ♪ Runs free ♪ ♪ But
gather together ♪ ♪ To greet the storm ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ To me ♪ ♪ The branch of the
linden ♪ ♪ Is leafy and green ♪ ♪ The Rhine gives its gold ♪ ♪ To the sea ♪ ♪ But somewhere a
glory ♪ ♪ Awaits unseen ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ To me ♪ ♪ The babe in his cradle ♪ ♪ Is
closing his eyes ♪ ♪ The blossom embraces ♪ ♪ The bee ♪ ♪ But soon, says a whisper ♪ ♪ Arise,
arise ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ To me ♪ ♪ Oh, Fatherland, Fatherland ♪ ♪ Show us the sign ♪ ♪
Your children have waited to see ♪ ♪ The morning will come ♪ ♪ When the world is mine ♪ ♪
Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ To me ♪ ♪ Oh, Fatherland,
Fatherland ♪ ♪ Show us the sign ♪ ♪ Your children have waited to see ♪ ♪ The morning will come
♪ ♪ When the world is mine ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs
♪ ♪ To me ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs to me ♪

- Still think you can control them? ♪ Oh, Fatherland, Fatherland ♪ ♪ Show us the sign ♪ ♪ Your
children have waited to see ♪ ♪ The morning will come ♪ ♪ When the world is mine ♪ ♪ Tomorrow
belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪ ♪ To me ♪ ♪ Tomorrow belongs ♪

Video clip ends.

- I'm not sure there's much to say after that, but I'm prepared to seed my couple of last moments
to you, David. It says everything for me.

- It says everything, Dennis. And I've nothing really more to say. But it shows how the dissent
authoritarianism, in one three-minute song.

- [Dennis] Yeah.

- And how you can take and you can fill fake news, fill the minds with so many different, with one
thing. And you know, anyway, I'm not going to say more. It's all there. It's obvious.

- Yeah, absolutely.

- Thank you.

- We'll return in our second part, but I suspect there are questions, Judi, am I right? I see a
whole lot on.

- Yes. Yeah, there are some questions and some comments, if you don't mind going through
them.

- All right. Do you want us to just do it ourselves?

- [Judi] Yes, please. If you could just read them out and then-
- David, I had a quick squiz. There are some for you and there's some for me.
- [David] Sure.
- You want to start? I'll add mine.
- [David] Yep.
- Yeah, there are quite a lot of just observations, I think, which are quite right.
- [David] Yeah.

Q&A and Comments:

- Oh, there's one here by Guido. "The current examples given all revolve around Trumpism. Is the same concern not equally valid around the cancel culture, the Lincoln Project, the BLM Antifa incidents on conformity?" Let me just say this. I'm a virulent opponent to the cancel culture, in the sense that, and I've written a lot about that, within the South African context, because it seems to me that once you do that, it's a virulent form of identity politics that effectively ruins universities and ruins ideas. I have enormous sympathy with my students, particularly black students who've come from backgrounds within the townships and who feel very alienated in universities which still perpetuate very much a kind of dominant white culture. And I do believe that we've got major challenges in South Africa, as I've indicated in my previous lecture, to try to embrace all, going back to Hooker, and dealing with that but that can never justify, ever justify a cancel culture.

I mean, that would be totally antithetical, it seems to me, to the thrust of all four of the sessions we've had this week. But I'm sorry to say, as to the Antifa stuff, I mean, one is not quite certain how much this is real, and how much this is a myth. Certainly, when you read the FBI report, even the Department of Justice, there's no equivalence between Antifa and these right-wing lunatics who have Camp Auschwitz. If you're not horrified by that, you won't be horrified by anything. And the fact of the matter is, I was particularly intrigued, and I want to recommend this to everybody, and my children pointed out to me a podcast, which I've listened to a few times, one called "Slow Burn", which has a five-part series about David Duke, who essentially, in many ways, was the precursor to Donald Trump. Not because Trump was a Klansman, or because Trump embraced Nazism, or celebrated Hitler's birthday, 'cause the matter of the kind of tactics that were used, "Make America Great" meant "Make America White".

And I'm sorry, you can't draw an equivalence through that and some construct Antifa, to the extent that it exists. As for the Lincoln Project, why should people within the Republican Party, who are horrified by Trump, not have said so earlier? So, I'm sorry. No, it's not about conformity.

It's about diversity. If Antifa exists, the extent it does, of course it's horrifying, but it's not the same threat as what we're facing with at the moment. And I really must insist that we talk through this on the basis that gravity actually exists. I think, David, you've got a question here.

- Sure. Thanks.

- From Brexit. Over to you.

- An interesting one from Robin.

- [Dennis] Not that I don't agree with you!

- Thank you. Irony or cleverness that Trump perpetuates the myth that he is the target of a witch hunt. And that's exactly, and I'm not equating Trump with Hitler or Mussolini, or any of them, at all, or the apartheid. But there has to be the victimhood first, who have been deprived of their previous superiority, and become inferior in the binary, and in order to reassert their greatness again, to become the superior ruling group again, they have to perpetuate the victimhood myth. And it's exactly what Trump does. That he is the victim of a witch hunt of a rigged election. And during apartheid, obviously the Afrikaans, they are the victims, which is true, historically, of the British concentration camps, the British colonialism, et cetera.

But they're not the only ones. And did they have to go as far with extreme racism as they did for over 40 something years of apartheid? So, it's the same... There's always the dialectic, I think, of victimhood, which previously was part of the ruling superior group, in inverted commas, which then needs to come back, take back control, make it great again. Whatever. Come back. The arian, you know, come back. Okay. You said there was one about Brexit?

- Yes, David. There was. Sorry. Let me just get back there. "Your raising of Brexit as suggesting a false narrative is troubling. Is there justifiable basis for believing the EU bureaucracy is accountable to the electorate?"

- Thank you.

- You don't have to say-

- Thank you. And as I saw that, living in England, and in the UK, what can I say? I have to be say that I'm caught up in the binary of the pro- and anti-Brexit, but I think it's going to lead to, maybe not disastrous, but very unpleasant things. I think it's a natural course, historically, perhaps, after the Empire. One looks at the history of Rome, of Carthage, of the Zulu Empire, of many, many others. It's perhaps a natural evolution, of course, plus the enlightenment, et cetera, et cetera, to withdraw back in on itself, a kind of nationalism, in a way. But I think it's a using of nationalism for certain ends.

I don't see how the... So, I see sovereignty as a myth, 'cause I don't think in this globalised world, there is such a thing as sovereignty and the links to the EU and I guess, ultimately, they literally pay the price, because everything will become more expensive, because being out of the single market, so people will be happy for 10% more expense, there's no protection of the European Court of Justice, human rights, et cetera, et cetera. It's already in the newspapers today. The rights of employees are starting to be degraded. They're going to challenge the 48-hour working week. Anything can happen. They're going to challenge holiday money and pay. Et cetera, et cetera.

All these things I'm sure are going to come in because there's no, ironically, big brother protection of the European Court of Human Rights. But I see it in a similar way of... It's not as extreme, obviously, but I see some of these ideas of a very subtle... A couple of elements of a one-party state, because if you get rid of Scotland, get rid of all those votes, all those MPs who might have gone SNP or Labour, and Northern Ireland, et cetera. One party could rule for a long time. Maybe. I'm the rookie. I'm the outsider, inside England. So, I don't perhaps have the right to say.

- You're entitled to check the fifth beyond that.

- [David] Thank you.

- The next, "You talk about Trump's derogatory remarks, which are indeed infantile, but there are insults on both sides of the aisle. Pelosi's comments are just as incendiary." Let me make a couple of points about that, 'cause again goes to the heart of what we're talking about. Trump's remarks aren't infantile. Infantile is a small child's remarks. Trump is the President of the United States of America. When he says about people who call about Camp Auschwitz and that six million weren't enough, and he talks about these people, about "We love you." That's not infantile. That's the President of the United States of America talking. When Trump refuses to condemn right wing racists and says there were decent people on both sides, in particular clashes, that's not infantile. That's dangerous. When he makes anti-Muslim statements of the most vicious kind, that's not infantile. That goes to the heart of the idea of Hooker. Do we embrace everybody? We don't. Trump's remarks have been consistently, essentially divisive, because he has a project! His project was never to attract the votes of the majority of the people. He went for a base. And I encourage you to listen to Slow Burn's presentation of David Duke, and you will see the similarities.

Do I think that Nancy Pelosi's remarks are fantastically good? No! I'm not a fan of Nancy Pelosi. Do I think that you tear up the speech at the State of the Union? No, that's not my style. I mean, funny enough, somebody said to me today that when I interview on television, I'm relatively polite, which is not necessarily my default position, I assure you. But what it is, is I do believe that you get more out of people, when in a sense you try to engage with them. So, I'm not suggesting that her remarks on various things are great, but sorry, they're not as incendiary. They really aren't, because they don't go to the heart of the enterprise, which is this. Do you

actually treat people with respect, notwithstanding their colour, their race, and their sexual orientation? To take but three, and their religion. And I'm sorry, Donald Trump did not do that, and it's not good enough to simply relegate him to some trials. Somebody who's in the kindergarten does not deserve to be the President of the United States of America, by the way, with his finger on the nuclear bomb. So, no, no. I'm sorry to tell you. I have to stoutly disagree with your problem. "So, how do we qualify now," says Tony, "the aspirational utopian court of Israel for the Jews in the context of us being just another tribe taking a singular narrative?" Well, I mean... That's a seminar all of its own. But let me just make two comments.

One is I am profound commitment to the idea that we Jewish people, given our history, given the inextricable link between the state, between Israel territory thereof, that in fact a state is something that is central to identity and something we should defend with everything available to us. Does that mean that the state of Israel should exist at the expense of others? No, I don't think there's any sense of inherent, shouldn't be inherent sense of superiority. That is problematic to me. And of course, that raises a real profound debate. But that debate should not, in fact, be at the expense of a fundamental commitment to the idea of a state of Israel, as it exists, for us, the Jewish people. And I don't think that that in a sense means that we're just another tribe taking a single narrative. In fact, it's impossible to consider Jews having a singular narrative.

Our entire tradition is of complex and different narratives, as is exhibited by virtue of the questions we're getting tonight, David and I, and our views and your views. And frankly, we respect your views, even if we resist them. You only have to read a page of to know there's no single narrative within the Jewish tradition at all, and that's what makes us so wonderful, for me. If there's any form of Jewish exceptionalism, for me, it is the fact of our ability to argue, on principle, of arguments for the sake of heaven. It's fundamental to our tradition. "Convicting Trump in the impeachment trial won't break the stolen election story. What will break it? Then what'll take place? How do Americans get back to democratic diversity of thought?" I think we've spoken about that through the process of education, through the idea of reconstruction, of the way in which media is fashioned, the way school kids are taught.

The way, in fact, we even speak this evening. Attempting, as it were, to put up various forms of argument. Yes, the impeachment trial won't break the stolen election story. It's a dilemma. I accept that. Even Joe Biden is anxious not to have it, because it'll slow down his legislative initiatives. But maybe the one thing about the trial, like I thought of many trials, is some form of reality to percolate through the society. The tragedy in America is, given where we are at the moment, half the population will believe it and half won't. So, that is a problem.

- Can I add something in there, Dennis?

- Yes, please, please! Carry on, carry on, yeah.

- Just two things, quickly. The one is I think if there isn't a trial, whether it succeeds or not is a

separate story, I think one is in danger of the appeasement policy and to appease what this guy did, he does have his finger on the nuclear numbers. And if there isn't some sort of reckoning, at least, it's an appeasement. And the history of appeasement ain't a pretty one. That would be my personal opinion. The other thing about, just if I can very quickly mention, the real tragedy for me of Brexit is the rise of English nationalism and how that leads to, again, a single narrative, precedence over the other. So, the foreigner, it was all about the immigrant.

You saw those images, taken from Holocaust images, that Nigel Farage did. Those images to show these massive influx of Turkish and all sorts of other foreigners coming in to England. So, it's an anti-foreigner, anti-other, anti-immigrant, anti anybody who's not the purest, in terms of English nationalism. And I'm scared that that can lead to a narrowing of the mind and a sad narrowing and great loss of a remarkable tradition of this country. That is really, for me, the ultimate sadness of what Brexit represents, on a more historical or cultural scale. Yeah. Over to you, Dennis.

- Okay. There there is a question. Many of these questions were answered already. Just part of a question from Bobby. A recent book that posits that democracies falter over a certain time. There are a whole series of wonderful books now with regard to the question of the fragility, or lack thereof, of democracy. Democracy doesn't just assert itself and remain forever. I think David's quite right and I think the books show that democracy's something which has to be reconstituted, all the time. But I think what we've been arguing is that there's some fundamental components, which, if they basically are destroyed, then democracies do falter. There's the book by Levitsky, which I could recommend highly in this regard.

- I think, sorry, Dennis. Dennis? If I can also add in there. What we'll look at next week is how "Hamlet" can be interpreted as a democratic impulse of independent thought, of independent questioning, curiosity, and thought, as "Hamlet" as a symbol of that, against a narrowing of the mind in the rotten state of Denmark, as it closes its mind to become a dictatorship, possibly under Claudius. And how that, seeing it like that, and in a way democracy, it needs a constant reinvigoration, and growing and changing and moving dynamically. It can't withdraw back in on itself, or I think it does crumble, historically. As I interpret.

- I agree.

- [David] In that way.

- A whole lot of points I think we've answered already. I'm just trawling down. Sorry, there is one, David, which was interesting here. "Having acted as Abigail in 'The Crucible'," says Coreen, "I've experienced the power of performing hysteria for working out group cohesion and affirming a dominant view. David is absolutely correct." Which is interesting.

- Thank you, and also, if I can just add here, what we're saying about education. Just imagine if we had an education which looked at self and other, primitive/civilized, superior/inferior,

stereotype, how we do it, democracy, human rights, rule of law, constitution. Imagine if we'd studied this at high school, as teenagers. Okay, arrogant as teenagers and neurotic as teenagers and all the rest of it, but imagine if that, and then looking at literature, or history or law, or finance or business, or health in different ways, instead of a more kind of silo of this hierarchical set of preordained value, implicit in that educational structure. It could be another whole way. I don't want to sound idealistic here, but democracy, if it's going to carry on, I think it's going to have to start taking on some of these things inside the education system itself.

- Yeah, I think that's about it. Let me see. There's... Yeah. Yeah. There are comments, lots of comments, but it's late and I don't think... I do think there's a point by Guido. Obviously takes issue with my view about Black Lives Matter, but, well, Guido, you and I, hopefully when COVID's over, can go having a beer or a coffee and we can debate our different opinions, provided, all I'm saying is we've got to have a right to do that. And let me make the point, I do think whatever Black Lives Matter, whatever you say about them, racism throughout the world is a problem, and it's something we should deal with. And by the way, for me, it's central to my tradition, my Jewish tradition, that I should be concerned about that. David, I think that's about it. So...

- I'm going to jump in, Dennis. I think I'll jump in.

- Thank you very much. Yeah, yeah. It's only Wendy! Sorry.

- Hello, it's me again. I'm back. Just to say thank you, once again, for an outstanding presentation. Lot of food for thought. So, people will go home and debate all these various issues, and to be continued. This is where we're at, at this moment in time. The conversation continues. Thank you, guys.

- Thanks very much, Wendy.

- Thanks so much, Wendy. Dennis, thank you. Judi, thank you and to everybody-

- Have a lovely week to everybody, and stay safe.

- Beg hug to everybody. Stay safe and-

- [David] Keep the debates going.

- [Wendy] Take care.

- Take care.

- Cheers, bye.