

‘It’s telling your story to your family’: Reflections by an older lesbian on being interviewed for a verbatim theatre production.

Clare Summerskill

Abstract:

This article focuses upon the reflections, as provided in a follow-up interview, of an older lesbian who, after being interviewed about her dishonourable discharge from the Royal Navy in 1970, as an audience member, saw parts of her life story being enacted on stage in a piece of verbatim theatre. I examine the concept of shame, as experienced historically by older lesbians and gay men, and, specifically, in regard to this narrator. I discuss how the experience of a lesbian narrator being interviewed by a sympathetic ‘insider’, that is, someone who shared her sexual orientation, and then seeing an actress on stage speaking her own words, provided a path to self-respect, positive identification and pride.

Keywords: lesbian, Navy, verbatim theatre, shame, longitudinal interview

Introduction

In interviews with older lesbians and gay men about their past experiences, narrators will be asked to recall a period in which they were significantly more restrained, both socially and legally than they are nowadays. Male homosexuality was against the law in England until 1967, when it was partially decriminalised by the Sexual Offences Act which permitted legalised private homosexual acts between men aged over twenty one, while at the same time imposing heavier penalties on street offences. The law was not changed for Scotland until 1980, or for Northern Ireland until 1982. In the UK, no legislation has been passed that criminalises sexual activities between women, arguably due to the fact that parliamentarians have had little appetite for discussing the matter. During debates on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 1921, MPs believed that, by ignoring the matter ‘respectable’ women would be prevented from even knowing that lesbian sex existed.¹ The historical silencing of lesbianism in the UK has meant that while their sexual behaviour was not criminalised in the same way as men’s, the visibility of women loving women and, consequently, their political and social agency have, in many ways, been severely limited.

In the armed services, regulations relating to how lesbians and gay men were treated lagged significantly behind laws being passed in Parliament. This fact is pertinent to this study, which focusses on Eileen, who was dismissed from the Women’s Royal Navy Service (known as the Wrens) in 1970 with a dishonourable discharge, after admitting to being a lesbian. The Sexual Offences Act, 1967 did not apply to the merchant navy or to the armed forces. One section of that Act limited its application to the civil arena, with homosexuality in the military remaining an offence under the Army and Air Force Acts 1955 and the Naval Discipline Act 1957. In 1999, the ban on gays serving in the military was suspended after the

European Convention on Human Rights declared that the government's policy of sacking all known homosexuals from the armed forces was a breach of their human rights.

For a majority of the lifetimes of older lesbian and gay men, homosexuality had been regarded by society as a sickness and, although lesbians were not publicly exposed on the same scale as gay men, their non-conforming lifestyles and identities were often viewed as problematic by society. Some were referred to psychiatrists who sought to 'cure' their homosexuality and it was not until 1992 that the World Health Organisation (WHO) declassified homosexuality as a mental illness.² Furthermore, being lesbian or gay has generally been perceived by Western Christian societies as religiously reprehensible. Some, if not all, of these factors contribute to how an older gay man or lesbian speaks about their past experiences when being interviewed.

Nan Alamilla Boyd and Horacio N. Roque Ramirez have observed that conducting queer oral histories requires researchers to navigate a particular set of ethical, political and academic challenges which, they argue, dramatically affect the methods that researchers develop and deploy.³ Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy, writing about pre-Stonewall lesbian history, explains that not being born and raised in a public lesbian and gay culture means that each gay and lesbian person has to construct his or her own life in oppressive contexts, a process that oral history is uniquely suited to reveal.⁴ This understanding speaks to Alistair Thompson's concept of 'composure', whereby he suggests that, in composing our memories, we can remake or repress memories that are still painful or 'unsafe'.⁵ He explains that if we have been excluded from general public acceptance, we seek out particular publics which affirm our identities and the way we want to remember our lives.⁶

Oral history, in its pursuit of unearthing the history of marginalised and less documented communities, is ideally suited to seeking testimonies from older lesbians and gay men who have been historically shamed and criminalised. In common with members of other oppressed sectors of society, lesbians and gay men may welcome the opportunity to be interviewed about their lives, most especially when their stories might benefit others from the same population. However, because of their historical treatment, a tension can exist between their desire to speak out and past experiences of having either been silenced or having experienced adverse consequences when they did speak out about their sexual orientation. Unlike other subaltern populations, lesbians and gay men will have spent a lifetime deciding whether or not to reveal their identity to others and so agreeing to be interviewed is, in itself, an act of 'coming out' and, as such, can carry with it a degree of perceived risk for the narrator. As well as this being the case in oral history work, such concerns are also present in the creation of verbatim theatre plays which are scripted from interviews with older lesbians and gay men.

Connections between verbatim theatre and oral history

Verbatim plays are non-fictional pieces of drama where the words of real people are recorded and transcribed by a playwright who then includes extracts from those interviews in a theatrical script. On stage, actors play the characters of the real individuals whose

words are being used. The theatre scholar Deidre Heddon describes verbatim theatre as ‘a form of theatre which places interviews with people at the heart of the process and product’.⁷ From my own work in both oral history and verbatim theatre I have observed that they are closely connected disciplines, since both practices are centred in similar methodologies, subjects, and ethical concerns.

At its core, the process of gathering oral history consists of recording people's experiences, whether they be their life stories or their memories about a particular subject or theme, and those interviews are then usually archived in audio and transcribed form. My own method of creating verbatim theatre is to gather interviews, again usually about an incident, subject or period, to transcribe them and then employ extracts from the transcriptions to create a script - the aim of this work being a theatrical production. In both oral history and verbatim theatre, stories are often sought from members of marginalised, and sometimes silenced populations, which are then documented and dispersed amongst the communities from which the contributors came.⁸ They can then be made accessible to wider audiences, who might have been unaware of the issues addressed in the forms of public archives or theatre tours.

Although the two disciplines of oral history and verbatim theatre can in no way be conflated, since they have differing final objectives - one being the creation of a broader historiography and the other, a theatrical production - the closest area of communality between them lies in the interviewing process. In both areas, a critical focus of research lies in the experience of the narrator who shares their stories and experiences.

Eileen

Gateway to Heaven is a verbatim play based on interviews with twenty-four older lesbians and gay men. It addresses their lives and experiences in the UK from the 1940s to the 1990s, in a society where the majority of people's sexual orientation differed from their own. I wrote the play, and it was performed by my theatre company, Artemis. I first interviewed narrators for the play in 2004, and in 2006 the production toured to fifteen theatres around the UK. When initially interviewed in 2004, Eileen, originally from Newcastle, but then living in London, was in her early sixties.

From her own choice, almost all of Eileen's interview focussed on her ten-year career in the Women's Royal Naval Service and she spoke in detail about how she had been dishonourably discharged from the British Armed Services in 1970 after she had been accused of, and had admitted to, being a lesbian. Eileen joined the Wrens when she was nineteen and she explained that:

My world opened up from there. I had lots of different relationships with women. We'd ask each other things like: 'Didn't I see you in Southampton in that pub? What's it called again?' So, life became quite rich in that respect because you felt you were part of an inner sanctum with people who understood you and shared your career. I became a quarters petty officer and then I rose to the grand rank of chief petty officer, which is the highest of the non-commissioned ranks [...] I think

lesbians were always a little bit more adventurous, a little more career orientated, more focused and usually did extraordinary things. People who were really good at their jobs. So there was a certain amount of pride in belonging to our group of people and I was at that good place when I got found out.⁹

After ten years of service, Eileen became caught up in what she refers to as 'the witch hunts' when some women were accused by their superior officers of being lesbians, sometimes supported by documented evidence in the form of love letters or from word-of-mouth confessions made by other women. This is another extract from her interview:

I was standing in front of the officer in charge and I could see copies of my letters that were written some time earlier, quite a few years ago and she charged me with being a lesbian. So, what do you do? I wasn't going to lie. I thought, 'She's got evidence in front of me', and in that split second it seemed better not to lie. To be called a liar would have seemed worse than being a lesbian to me. She said, 'Do you know what it means?' And I said yes, I did. I suppose I was in shock. I just couldn't believe it really. It took a while to sink in but basically my career was at an end from that moment on.¹⁰

Eileen told me:

I can see myself, I was standing on the steps waiting for my taxi to take me to my bedsit in Earls Court, which was all I could afford, and just still in shock four weeks on. My uniform had been handed in. I'd had to do all these leaving rounds. You had to go to your pay department to hand back your pay book, your equipment and uniform, and it's like everything was taken away from you. There was tremendous shame involved in that and, of course, I was out without a pension.¹¹

After the interviews for the play were completed and the script was written, Eileen was invited to the final show. During the performance she saw me, as an actress, playing her 'character' in a scene where I narrated her exact words and acted out the time she had been interviewed by a superior officer and charged with being a lesbian. After the tour of the play ended, I stayed in touch with Eileen and we became friends. On one occasion, Eileen revealed to me what a huge step it was for her to have told me the story that had been employed in the play and then to have seen the scene acted out dramatically. She also mentioned that being interviewed about her past experiences had made her look afresh at some of the events about which she had spoken. These comments led me, in 2012, eight years after my first interview with her and while I was researching the role of a contributor in a piece of verbatim theatre for my MA, to interview her again in what I term, a 'longitudinal' interview. I wanted to ask her about her experience of the initial interview and I hoped to acquire feedback with respect to her involvement in the theatre project.

It is rare for either oral historians or verbatim theatre practitioners to have access to documentation relating to how a narrator has been impacted by their being interviewed and so I am indebted to Eileen for her feedback, upon which I am now able to reflect critically. During the longitudinal interview, which I conducted in her home, one of the questions I posed addressed an incident when I had called Eileen on the phone during the

final scripting period and had asked her for some further details about her dismissal from the Wrens. My reason for this phone call was to ensure that the play would portray, as accurately as possible, the military codes, language and procedure of an internal naval investigation. Eileen answered my questions about styles of salute, what rank the officer held, what both their uniforms looked like (since we had to hire them in for the show), and who said what to whom in the incident where she was officially dismissed from the Navy.

In that phone call, I also took the opportunity to ask her if she would mind very much if I made her accent a Yorkshire one rather than a Newcastle accent, as I was struggling with perfecting that accent and did not want the audience to be in any way distracted from the content of the scene by my poor accent! What I discovered in the longitudinal interview was that she had found this follow-up phone interview to be, in comparison to the first interview, an extremely problematic exchange. Below is a transcribed portion of the interview relating to this matter. I have included my own questions as well as Eileen's comments, addressing Alessandro Portelli's concern that 'When the researcher's voice is cut out the narrator's voice is distorted'.¹² Discussing the follow-up phone call, our conversation went as follows:

CLARE: I think I said 'What were the words, what was the rank, what would they have called you?' I don't know if you remember that?

EILEEN: I do, yes I do. Do you know, I think I had a resistance to that.

CLARE: Did you really?

EILEEN: Yes, I think I did.

CLARE: Perhaps it brought home what I was really going to do with the scene in a way that maybe the first interview hadn't.

EILEEN: Yes, I think I did. I was quite puzzled why you wanted to know all those details. But I wasn't puzzled really when I thought about it - it was resistance.

CLARE: And why was it resistance?

EILEEN: Well, it was activating all the associations with the uniform, the time, the climate, the accent, the people that were around. What did she say? What did I say? The whole regulation part of it, and it activated all the finer detail of the memory and I didn't want to go there, probably. It was the usual in-built resistance, you know, that I think we all have. In my experience, most of us have that in our community really. Most people don't go there. They won't be interviewed ... in the lesbian and gay community.¹³

Eileen's comments reveal how she found being questioned about the precise details relating to the time that she had been thrown out of the Navy far more difficult than our initial interview. The reason for this could be partly to do with the fact that she was unprepared for the conversation and partly because the questions were so very specific. She employed the word 'resistance' to describe how she felt during the phone call and explained that the details about which she was being asked re-triggered a whole range of feelings which she

had experienced at the time of her dismissal. This exchange forced me to critically reflect upon ethical concerns relating to interviewing someone in a phone call for the purpose of obtaining information that I had not secured in the initial interview. However, I am of the opinion that her discomfort was not so much my unannounced intrusiveness, but more to do with the fact that the details I was asking her about brought up buried feelings and old wounds relating to the time when her career had been forcibly terminated due to her sexual orientation.

Historical shaming of lesbians and gay men

Groups in society that have suffered prejudice and stigma will often have also experienced shame as well as shaming. Kaufman and Raphael claim that: 'When we are shamed our attention immediately turns inward and we become suddenly impaled under the magnifying gaze of our own eyes. Now we are *watching* ourselves and we feel excruciatingly exposed, revealed as lesser'.¹⁴ This comment possibly reflects Eileen's experience of the phone call interview when I asked her several in-depth questions about her dismissal from the Navy. In her original testimony, she had employed the phrase 'I can see myself', which suggests that the interview had enabled her to take the position of looking back at her younger self, but, arguably, the phone call accentuated her sense of exposure. A phone call conversation is quite different from a face-to-face interview where interpersonal space allows for expressions of signals by an interviewer, both verbal and non-verbal, which can reassure the narrator. Paul Gilbert and Bernice Andrews have also observed that shame is an acute arousal or fear of being exposed, scrutinised or judged negatively by others.¹⁵ So, in the phone call situation, it is possible that Eileen did not feel supported by a sympathetic listener as she had in her first interview, and so had felt quite alone with her memories.

Gilbert and Andrews understand shame to be an involuntary response to an awareness that one has lost status and is devalued.¹⁶ Far from arguing that any older lesbian or gay man would inevitably feel a sense of shame about their sexual orientation, I suggest however, that Eileen's particular story can be better understood by examining how the concept of shame may have previously impacted her life. In the following extract from the longitudinal interview, she describes some of the connections between a sense of shame in losing her job and how that impacted her emotionally and financially, and her own sense of feeling shame about her sexual orientation. She explains that 'services no longer required' which was the official phrase used to describe her dismissal 'could mean anything to a civilian employer, but you knew what it meant'.¹⁷ Reflecting upon her experience of receiving a dishonourable discharge, Eileen made the following comments:

EILEEN: It is part and parcel of the internalised homophobic process, so it probably activated a sense of shame big time. I had to find somewhere to live and I was in a tiny little bedsit in a horrible area of Earl's Court. And hiding away, what else could I do? I couldn't see my friends and I had to find my own job. I wasn't out to my parents so I couldn't go back home. I had to tell them a lie. So I was telling a lot more lies 'cos I had to justify somehow suddenly ending a career. So, telling lies shames

you as well, and that's part, again, of the homophobic stuff, and so they were very, very miserable, I suppose, shameful times.¹⁸

Kaufman and Raphael observe that a sense of belonging grows only through positive identification with others. They argue that any specific minority group - ethnic, racial or sexual - will inevitably be controlled by negative cultural images that, once internalised, obstruct the development of a coherent minority identity.¹⁹ Whilst substantial legal gains and advances in societal understanding have made it much easier for people to identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender in the present day, in the stories that older lesbians and gay men narrate about their past (in the case of interviews for the play *Gateway to Heaven*, from the 1940s to the 1990s), there will not only have been memories of being shamed by others, but some narrators will also have battled over their lifetimes with a sense of internalised homophobia. Speaking about her own sexual orientation, Eileen states that:

As much as we might put it out there politically, and anger, and all that sort of thing, there's always that little wound, that little bit that niggles away, that internalised homophobia, that it's wrong somehow. I know it isn't, but there's always that little bit... if you've come through my generation of time.²⁰

In the longitudinal interview, after Eileen had first mentioned the shame she felt at being dismissed from the Wrens, I took the opportunity to ask her to expand upon that concept in relation to her own experiences. She commented:

I think that shame is internalised homophobia. That's part of it. It's not the whole of it, but it is part of it, I think. So, I think the shame was there anyway as part of the internalised homophobia, as well as all the other things that I've described, and the interview would have opened that up, which I would have preferred not to have. But, with hindsight, I know that it was a good thing for me because it's opened it out.²¹

Kaufman and Raphael suggest that silence reinforces shame, arguing that silence is the distinctive way for the wider culture to oppress lesbian and gay men.²² In being interviewed, with the understanding that the personal stories she shared were going to be made public, Eileen broke that silence.

Positionality

Ethical concerns abound in interviewing situations when narrators come from marginalised or vulnerable communities since there is always a danger within such work of exploitation or appropriation of the interview material by those who are conducting the projects. But older lesbians and gay men who share their stories with oral historians are taking additional risks when they agree to be interviewed in regard to coming out, hoping that they can do so safely and without adverse repercussions. The level of trust a narrator from this population holds both in the interviewer and in the project itself is therefore of critical importance in

such situations and, in interviewing older lesbians and gay men, I suggest this is significantly increased when the interviewer shares the same sexual orientation as the narrator.

During the longitudinal interview, I asked Eileen whether she had felt more comfortable sharing her stories with an interviewer of the same sexual orientation than with a heterosexual interviewer. She was adamant that this was the case. Eileen told me: 'I was interested in my contribution being recorded in some way' and she said that she knew of some of my work around LGBTQ history.²³ She told me: 'I knew you from where I'd seen you talk and where you'd performed and been involved so I knew where you were coming from and your attitude as well as knowing you as a performer'.²⁴ In evaluating whether it was our shared sexual orientation that afforded Eileen a greater degree of trust in the interview process and the project, I also have to acknowledge, from this comment, that my identity as a public figure clearly played some part in her view of my work. However, arguably, the two aspects are not mutually exclusive since my work is, and always has been, focussed on the LGBTQ community. Eileen knew that the production she was contributing to was being created by a lesbian whose previous work had been performed to predominantly LGBTQ audiences.

Boyd and Ramírez contend that what they term 'queer oral histories' have previously gone unmentioned in mainstream historical texts, and that new methods must be employed in the reclaiming of these testimonies.²⁵ They see queerness as being in the transmission of those narratives, from queer narrator to queer listener and they contend that having an insider interviewer is vital in such work, arguing that: 'If there is not a narrator to claim that sexual space of queer historical being and its retelling, and a queer researcher to hear, record, and draw out yet more details, desire, and meaning from it, that no queer oral history is possible'.²⁶ Since this methodology emerges from the understanding that the stories of LGBTQ people have been hidden, untold or silenced historically, it makes sense that an 'insider' interviewer – someone who shares the same sexual orientation - would help in the recovery of these lost testimonies.

A path from shame to pride

Kaufman and Raphael contend that the path to gay pride, rather than staying in a place of shame about being gay, requires positive identification directly with other gay men and lesbians, not only by having personal sexual encounters, but also together as people bound by shared experience.²⁷ I suggest that for Eileen, such a transition was achieved not only through offering her testimony to a sympathetic listener who shared the same sexual orientation as her, but also by the presentation of her enacted story to members of her own community.

At the first performance of the piece, to which Eileen was invited, the audience mainly comprised of members of lesbian and gay groups and organisations that had been approached by the theatre company. During the longitudinal interview, she told me that seeing 'her' scene enacted theatrically had made her cry - 'the first time I'd really cried about it'²⁸ - and she said that when the play ended, 'I'd never felt so lonely in all my life. I

can still feel it now. I felt that really deep sense of aloneness',²⁹ a comment that reflects her past feelings of isolation, which had been triggered by revisiting an horrendous period of her life. However, she added that 'I did have a lot of sympathy that night. I remember that. It was there in the audience'.³⁰

Eileen's sexual orientation played a significant part in her life story, as narrated to me during both interviews. She had realised that she was a lesbian after joining the Wrens and then explored and delighted in her newly discovered sexuality, feeling herself to be a part of a community of similar women. Her lesbianism was the reason why she was dishonorably discharged from that profession and, thereafter, she was excluded from the friendship network she had made in the Navy and was prevented from advancing that career. Seeing her story enacted on stage had a profound impact upon her, as can often be the case with contributors to pieces of verbatim theatre since there will inevitably be a heightening of experience in watching one's own words and life story portrayed theatrically. Amanda Stuart Fisher, writing about verbatim theatre created from interviews with vulnerable narrators, proposes that 'the enactment of the verbatim subject's story by a professional actor can facilitate a moment of recognition and a positive process of empathetic identification which, if handled carefully, can be beneficial or even therapeutic for the verbatim subjects who offer up their stories in this way'.³¹ It is possible, although not inevitable, that sharing personal testimony for the purpose of its depiction in a play, rather than narrating memories for an oral history project, can enable an even greater degree of reflection and reflexivity for the narrator.

Furthermore, Eileen's story was performed to an audience of supportive members of the LGBTQ population, many of whom were also older lesbians, and the play was staged at a time when prejudicial laws against lesbians and gays in the armed services had been repealed. On the night that Eileen first saw the show, events from her life history, rather than being in any way judged adversely were, instead, celebrated - a fact that afforded her the possibility of moving from a place of silence and shame around the memories she had shared to one of validation and pride.

Conclusion

Gilbert and Andrews examine the causes of, and reactions to, shame, suggesting that shame is an involuntary response to an awareness that one has lost status and is devalued.³² The sense of shame that Eileen spoke about in the interview she originally provided for the play concerned two areas. One was related to her sexual orientation, which was not accepted generally in society or within her chosen profession, and the other was the shame she experienced in receiving a dishonourable discharge from a profession which she loved and at which she had excelled. These two areas are, of course, completely interrelated, with homophobic prejudice being at their core.

During the three interviews I held with Eileen, a range of emotions came up for her relating to this period of her life. She spoke of the resentment she still felt towards the Navy, her anger at the way in which she had been treated and the sense of shame that she had felt

after being thrown out of the Wrens and having to find her way in society without a job, friends or financial security. Although the interviews and the play quite clearly brought up a mixture of powerful emotions, I suggest that we might still pay close attention to the feelings of shame about which she spoke during the longitudinal interview. These relate to a matter which could be explored in greater depth when critically reflecting upon interviews with older lesbians and gay men because of the prejudicial historical circumstances through which they have lived.

Helen Merrell Lynd, in her study of the experience of shame, states that: 'the very fact that shame is an isolating experience also means that if one can find ways of sharing and communicating it this communication can bring about particular closeness with other persons and with other groups'.³³ Whilst still being extremely proud of her service in the Navy, Eileen understood that an organisation she had once felt strongly a part of had later expelled her. In sharing a painful story with a lesbian interviewer and it being enacted to a predominantly LGBTQ audience, she said: 'It's telling your story to your family, isn't it?'.³⁴ She told me that 'your interview was really a catalyst for that. It started me on another journey'³⁵ - that other journey being one where she became increasingly involved with the LGBTQ community - her new 'family', as a valued and celebrated member wherever her story was told and shared thereafter.

NOTES

1. Caroline Derry, 'Lesbianism and Feminist Legislation in 1921: The Age of Consent and Gross Indecency between Women'. *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 86, Autumn 2018, p 256.
2. Emily Hamer, *Britannia's Glory. A History of Twentieth Century Lesbians*. Gender Studies. London: Bloomsbury Academia, 1996, p 147.
3. Nan Alamilla Boyd and Horacio. N. Roque Ramirez (eds), *Bodies of Evidence: The Practice of Queer Oral History*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2012, p 11.
4. Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy, 'Telling tales: Oral history and the construction of pre-Stonewall lesbian history' in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, first edition, London: Routledge, 1998, p 345.
5. Alistair Thomson, 'Anzac memories: Putting Popular Memory Theory into Practice in Australia' in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, second edition, London, Routledge, 2006, p 310.
6. Thomson, 2006, p 310.
7. Deidre Heddon, *Autobiography and Performance*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2008, p. 115.
8. My own verbatim plays have included *Gateway to Heaven* which I write about in this article, a play based on interviews with twenty-four older lesbians and gay men. (published by Tollington Press, 2019). For the initial play-reading, my theatre company invited members of LGBTQ groups and organisations to Oval House in 2005, holding a post-performance discussion with them, the contributors to the play, and theatre company members, and asking the audience members for feedback about the piece.

9. Interview with Eileen; recorded by Clare Summerskill, 23 November 2004.
10. Interview with Eileen; recorded by Clare Summerskill, 23 November 2004.
11. Interview with Eileen; recorded by Clare Summerskill, 23 November 2004.
12. Alessandro Portelli, 'What Makes Oral History Different?' in Perks and Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, first edition, London: Routledge, 1998, p 71.
13. Interview with Eileen; recorded by Clare Summerskill, 14 Feb 2012.
14. Gershen Kaufman and Lev Raphael. *Coming Out of Shame*. New York: Doubleday, 1996, p 155.
15. Paul Gilbert and Bernice Andrews, (eds), *Shame: Interpersonal Behaviour, Psychopathology, and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, p 6.
16. Gilbert and Andrews, 1998, p 21.
17. Interview with Eileen, 2012, recorded by Clare Summerskill, 14 February 2012.
18. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
19. Kaufman and Raphael, 1996, p 79.
20. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
21. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
22. Kaufman and Raphael, 1996, p 7.
23. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
24. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
25. Boyd and Ramirez (eds), *Bodies of Evidence: The Practice of Queer Oral History*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2012, p 11.
26. Nan Alamilla Boyd and Horacio. N. Roque Ramirez (eds), 2012, p 1.
27. Gershen Kaufman and Lev Raphael, 1996, p 191.
28. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
29. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
30. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
31. Amanda Stuart Fisher, 'That's Who I'd Be, if I Could Sing': Reflections on a Verbatim Project with Mothers of Sexually Abused Children'. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*. Vol 31, no 2, 2011, p 193.
32. Gilbert and Andrews (eds), 1998, p 21.
33. Helen Merrell Lynd, *On Shame and the Search for Identity*. London: Routledge, 1958, p 66.
34. Interview with Eileen, 2012.
35. Interview with Eileen, 2012.