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The Ancient Egyptian Underworld
The death rituals of the pharaohs and what they reveal about changing ideas of life, death and the afterlife

Agrippina
Discover the incredible life of Rome’s forgotten empress
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Philip Matyszak breaks down the myths of the ancient city-state
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Discover the theology and archaeology behind Christ
We explore the death rites and rituals of the pharaohs and how they evolved over the centuries to reveal changing ideas of life, death and the afterlife

Written by Dr Charlotte Booth

The Egyptian underworld, known by many names including Amduat or Field of Reeds, is a dark and frightening place populated by demons, anti-animals and deities. Descriptions of the underworld are found in numerous funerary texts painted onto the walls of tombs, coffins, funerary objects and papyri. The descriptions vary across the texts although the general premise is that the deceased travelled through the Amduat and would be reborn should specific rituals be carried out adequately.

The contents of the funerary texts evolved over the thousands of years of Egyptian history. However, all of the texts were laid out as a series of hundreds of spells or utterances and were not designed to be read as a continuous text. Spells for preparing the deceased for the afterlife could be used in isolation and out of sequence (i.e. instructions for hour one do not need to be next to hour two) and it is very rare for entire copies of the texts to be discovered in one place.

There are numerous texts, however, dating back as far as the 24th century BCE and each offers a different insight into the evolving relationship ancient Egyptians had with death
and the world beyond. They feared it, revered it and built gigantic monuments to it. What’s more, it is clear that death was not seen as the end, but rather an important junction in the life of a soul. It seems only right that we should tackle it with no less care and deference here.

**PYRAMID TEXTS**

The earliest funerary texts we have are the Old Kingdom Pyramid Texts and unlike later texts they did not include images, consisting purely of hieroglyphic text.

The underworld described in the Pyramid Texts was very similar to the landscape on a boat that these texts described is one that remained central to the beliefs concerning rebirth of the deceased as well as the cycle of the Sun in the centuries that followed. In this context, rebirth or resurrection was intended to mean being reborn into the afterlife rather than into a physical form back on Earth.

The earliest example of the Pyramid Texts is in the pyramid of Unas of the fifth dynasty (2375-2345 BCE) and they remained in use until the reign of Ibi, eighth dynasty (2181-2161 BCE). The texts were only inscribed in the burial and antechamber of the pyramid.

The Pyramid Texts introduce the association between the deceased king and Osiris, the god of the Underworld. In later periods every deceased individual was also referred to as ‘The Osiris’. The Pyramid Texts also show a very close association between the deceased and the sun-god Ra as well as introducing the theme of the king’s ascent to the stars. Utterance 461 of the Pyramid Texts describes the king becoming a star and ruling eternally from the sky amongst his ancestors.

“O King, may you ascend as the morning star, may you be rowed as the lake dweller, may those who are in the abyss be afraid of you, may you give orders to the spirit... The doors of the sky are open to you, the doors of the firmament are thrown open for you, that you may travel by boat to the Field of rushes, that you may cultivate barley, that you may reap emmer and prepare your sustenance therefrom like Horus the son of Atum.”

The afterlife described within these texts was initially only for the king, although by the end of the Old Kingdom some chapters were also used in non-royal tombs.

**THE Coffin TEXTS**

This movement away from an exclusively royal afterlife led to the Pyramid Texts evolving into the Middle Kingdom (2040-1782 BCE) Coffin Texts. These texts appeared in both royal and non-royal tombs but maintained the landscape of the afterlife as being similar to the Utopian idea of Egypt with verdant fields and glistening rivers.

The Coffin Texts, as the name suggests, were primarily inscribed on coffins but there was greater flexibility in how these funeral rights were being applied and therefore also appeared on tomb walls, mummy masks and papyri.

Traditional rituals introduced in the Pyramid Texts, such as the Offering Ritual, in which offerings of food, drink, clothing and ointment were made to the deceased, evolved into a pictorial offering list known as the frieze of objects. This ensured the dead had food and belongings for all of eternity.

There was also a greater emphasis in the Coffin Texts on the heavenly travels of the ba (a human-headed bird that represents the mobility of the soul), the nourishment of the ka (the life-force of a person) and the preservation of the human remains to ensure they all united in the afterlife.

Included in the Coffin Texts was a collection of additional Guides to the Hereafter, the most useful of which was the Book of the Two Ways, which actually included a very helpful map of the underworld.

This map was painted on the base of coffins and depicted two paths: earth and water. The map outlines some of the dangers the deceased

---

**WHAT IS HUMAN?**

**An Egyptian guide to what makes a person**

The Egyptians believed a human was made up of six components that needed to unite in the afterlife in order to be reborn successfully. These elements were:

1. **The physical body**, which was preserved through mumification.
2. **The name** of an individual, which was a powerful weapon. Many of the spells in the funerary texts name various components of demons and their weapons giving the deceased power over them.
3. **The shadow** is a confusing element described in the funerary texts as a powerful entity to be protected. When the sun sets/dies the shadow disappears only to be reborn in the morning. Therefore if the deceased individual has a shadow it shows the presence of the sun.
4. **The ba** was depicted as a human headed bird sometimes with arms. This bird form allowed the spirit of the deceased to physically move from the burial chamber to the tomb and constituted the most mobile aspect of the human spirit.
5. **The ka** was the life-force of a human and was the focus of the offerings given to the deceased. It was created at the same time as the body at the start of life and remained with the body until death.

---

Offerings were regularly made to the gods as they had control over the life force of the world.

---
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A priest performs rights to the gods on behalf of the pharaoh.

The part of the soul known as the ba is depicted with a bird body to show its mobile nature.
The ankh symbol means life, so is very commonly used in tombs.

will face on their journey to rebirth, which include knife-wielding demons, lakes of fire, and gates guarded by gate keepers that the deceased need to name to pass. The idea was that having these maps depicted on tombs and coffins would assist the dead in navigating these numerous hazards and trials so that they might find rebirth more easily.

Ultimately these paths represented tests that would prove the value of a person’s soul and their suitability to be reborn and receive an afterlife at all. While they might meet demons and monsters, they were not passing through hell as some might think – there was only one afterlife. The true punishment for living a bad life or failing these trials was not eternal hellfire as later religions would depict, but simply ceasing to exist at all.

**THE BOOK OF THE DEAD**

In the New Kingdom (1570-1070 BCE), a number of new books were introduced that greatly expanded the understanding of the afterlife and to prepare the dead for their journey with incantations to keep them safe. The most well-known is the so-called Book of the Dead or, as it might be more accurately translated, Spells for Going Forth by Day. There were between 189 and 192 spells contained in the Book, and these were based on themes introduced in the Pyramid and Coffin Texts.

The Book of Going Forth by Day was popular with both royal and non-royal members of society and was written by a number of different priests over 1,000 years. The idea behind it was to see the dead return by day from the Underworld.

One of the key scenes to be introduced in the Book of Going Forth by Day was Spell 125, which is commonly known as the Negative Confession. This spell was recited by the deceased before their heart was weighed against the feather of truth representing the goddess Maat by Anubis, guardian of the scales. This was a symbolic judging of the good and bad deeds of a person’s life, that their heart be weighed against the very concepts of truth, morality and justice.

The premise behind spell 125 is that the deceased listed everything they hadn’t done, omitting anything that had been done. An example of the ‘crimes’ not committed includes: “I have done no falsehood, I have not robbed... I have not stolen, I have not killed men, I have not destroyed food supplies, I have done no crookedness, I have not stolen god’s offerings, I have not told lies, I have not taken food, I have not been sullen, I have not transgressed, I have not killed a sacred bull, I have not committed perjury, I have not stolen bread, I have not eavesdropped.”

As you can see, the Negative Confession combines trivial and terrible crimes together suggesting they were weighted the same in the heart of the deceased. As an ‘insurance’ policy against any crimes committed but not mentioned, a Heart Scarab was placed over the heart of the deceased. This was inscribed with spell 30b of the Book of Going Forth by Day:

*Do not stand against me as witness beside the lords of the ritual.*

“O KING, MAY YOU ASCEND AS THE MORNING STAR, MAY YOU BE ROWED AS THE LAKE DWELLER, MAY THOSE WHO ARE IN THE ABYSS BE AFRAID OF YOU, MAY YOU GIVE ORDERS TO THE SPIRIT”
An Egyptian funeral ceremony as imagined in 1866

Do not say against me, he did do it, about my actions.
Do not make a case against me beside the great god.
Tell my goodness to Ra, hand me to Nehebkau.”

Following the confession the deceased is led to the scales in the Hall of the God of the Underworld, where the Weighing of the Heart takes place. The god Osiris oversees the ritual. Anubis, the god of embalming, is shown levelling the scales and Thoth, the ibis-headed god of writing and knowledge records the result.

If the deceased’s heart weighs the same as the feather then it is judged that they lived a just and moral life and they will continue on their journey through the afterlife. However, if their heart is heavier it will be devoured by Ammit, devourer of the dead with the forelegs of a lion, hind legs of hippopotamus, and head of a crocodile. As a result they were sent to a fire-breathing serpent called The Fiery who denied them a body, casting their soul into oblivion.

In the New Kingdom a further set of funerary texts were produced known as the Books of the Underworld, which once more provided an afterlife exclusively for the king. These included the Book of the Amduat, Book of Gates, and the Book of Caverns.

All were concerned with the 12-hour journey of the sun-god, Ra, except the Book of Caverns, which is divided into six hours. This journey mirrored the journey of the deceased from death to rebirth.

All of these books have similarities in depiction showing the sun-god sailing on his solar barque from the western to eastern horizon along the underworld river, the nocturnal counterpart of the Nile. During this journey the sun is rejuvenated until he is reborn at dawn starting a new day and representing rebirth. The sun-god’s progress is consistently opposed by the enemies of Ra, who are trying to prevent his rebirth. The most prolific is Apophis, depicted as a giant snake, who is continually defeated and restrained throughout the 12-hour journey.

Here an Egyptian scribe named Ani is presented to Osiris

EGYPTIAN MAGIC
How incantations played an important role in death rights

The Book of Going Forth by Day was the first funerary text to specify that some chapters should be written on specific objects. For example Spell Six was to be written on shabti (or ushabti) figures. These were small servant statues placed in the tomb who worked on behalf of the deceased should it be required. The spell reads:

“O Shabti, allotted to me, if I be summoned or if I be detailed to do any work which has to be done in the realm of the dead; if indeed obstacles are implanted for you therewith as a man at his duties, you shall detail yourself or me on every occasion of making arable the fields, of flooding the banks, or of conveying sand from east to west; ‘Here I am’ you shall say.”

However, as with most spells from the funerary texts, even if part of the text was included it was enough to render the spell powerful enough to do the job. Therefore most shabti figures only have a small part of Spell Six on them.
The ritual of mummification was largely reserved for the rich and powerful. It started with the insertion of a hook through a hole near the nose to pull out part of the brain. The brain was not considered important.

The lungs, intestines, stomach and liver would be wrapped in linens after drying and placed inside canopic jars, each with a head representing a different son of Horus, each responsible for guarding that organ.

The corpse would then be covered with natron (naturally occurring salt from dry lake beds) for 70 days so as to sap out any remaining moisture and further protect the body.

The key organ that would not be left outside of the body was the heart as it was considered to be the home of the human soul or spirit and therefore absolutely essential for any journey into the afterlife.

After 40 days of drying, the body would be stuffed with linen or sawdust to give it a more human shape. It was thought to be important that the body be in good shape in the real world so that the soul could travel freely.

After the 70 days of drying was completed, the body would then be wrapped from head to toe in bandages. Some 20 layers could be used in this process that could take up to 20 days to complete.
THE 12-HOUR JOURNEY
The 12-hour nocturnal journey of the sun-god Ra is also by association the journey between death and rebirth of the deceased. However, the hours are represented physically rather than as an abstract concept of time and each ‘hour’ is separated by a gate protected by demons and serpents. The deceased soul was required to know the names of every part of the door, the demon and his weapons in order to pass and proceed to the next hour checkpoint.

The journey is both a physical and a metaphysical journey though, as throughout the 12 hours the sun-god, as a metaphor for the deceased, enters the netherworld as a ba spirit, which merges with the body of Osiris, and is reborn.

The nocturnal journey of the sun-god starts at sunset and is presented in different ways, meaning there is no definitive appearance of the afterlife. The most common imagery however, shows a river flowing through the centre of the underworld, which parallels the Nile, and forms the waterway of the sun.

To a certain extent this water could also be taken to represent the primeval waters of Nun that were present at the start of creation, creating a loop of life, death and rebirth on a metaphysical scale that mirrors the journey of the individual. Along the edge of this waterway stand the blessed dead who cry out joyfully and extended their hands to touch the tow rope of the solar barque.

However, the Book of Nut, depicted in the cenotaph of Seti I at Abydos and in the tomb of Ramesses IV (tomb KV2, in the Valley of the Kings), has a different image of the afterlife. It depicts the sky goddess, Nut, swallowing the sun at night, representing sunset. The sun then travels through her body on his solar barque until the sky-goddess gives birth to him again at dawn. Therefore in this representation, the body of Nut itself is the underworld and rebirth takes on a somewhat more literal form.

The king - later the deceased – is the key figure in the journey, accompanying the sun-god on the solar barque rather than being embodied by Ra. The god of the Underworld Osiris, although present, does not speak. His presence symbolises the body of the deceased.

In Egyptian religion the king is believed to become Osiris upon death. Once the funerary texts were adopted by non-royals the lines between the deceased king and deceased commoners blurred until all deceased were referred to as “The Osiris.”

The sun-god is accompanied in his barque by the deities, Wepwawet (Opener of the Ways), Hathor (Mistress of the Barge), and Horus (Helmsman).

The Book of Gates also adds Sia, the god of perception and Heka, the deity of divine magic.

In this version of the texts we are introduced to the lowest level of the Amduat, the Place of Destruction where the sun-god’s power does not reach. Spell 299b from the Book of Going Forth by Day describes the place as “this terrible land where overturned stars fall on their faces and know not how to raise themselves again”. Spell 175 adds that it is “completely deep, completely dark, completely unending”. It is in this place that people whose hearts weigh more than the feather of truth in the judgment scene are punished by being decapitated, set on fire, and have their hearts torn from their bodies. This is, therefore, the ancient Egyptian concept of oblivion made far more clear and terrifying.

The pinnacle of this 12-hour journey is the rebirth of the sun-god the following morning, which is depicted as the scarab beetle being raised from the primeval waters of Nun into the
MONSTERS OF THE UNDERWORLD

Just some of the recurring guardians who block the path of the dead to the afterlife

APOPHIS

The enemy of the sun-god Ra, Apophis is depicted in various hours of the Underworld journey trying to intercept the sun-god. He was a giant snake and is generally shown being overcome by supporters of Ra. These include the god of chaos, Seth, the Eye of Ra, and even the sun-god in the form of the Great Cat. They attack Apophis enabling the sun-god and therefore the deceased to continue the journey to rebirth. Apophis is not known prior to the Middle Kingdom and gains in popularity throughout the New Kingdom.

AKER

This two-headed lion has one head facing forward and one facing to the rear. He is therefore often given the title of ‘He who is looking forward and behind’. He was sometimes depicted as two lions - named Duaj (meaning ‘yesterday’) and Sefer (meaning ‘tomorrow’) – sitting back to back with the hieroglyphic sign for horizon between them. Aker protected the deceased king against three demonic snakes: Hemtet, Iqeru and Jagw, by ‘encircling’ the deceased king – a metaphor for burying him.

AMMIT

One well-depicted anti-animal, representative of the chaos of the Underworld, is Ammit, also known as the ‘Devourer of the Dead’ or ‘Eater of Hearts’. She was a demon depicted with the hind quarters of a hippopotamus, front quarters of a lion and the head of a crocodile. She is depicted seated beneath the scales in the Hall of Judgement of Osiris. Any heart that was heavier than the feather would be devoured by Ammit, condemning the deceased to oblivion.
The Ancient Egyptian Underworld

The deceased is associated with the spirit. This also marks the point at which the sun-god begins to regenerate and build towards his rebirth at dawn.

Hours seven and eight represent the midnight hour with a theme of the sun-god overcoming his enemies. While still gathering strength, he must defeat the likes of Apophis with magic. Only once this is done can he escape the desert island of Sokar.

Hour nine depicts a procession with the solar barque travelling through the hour with his entourage closing in on the dawn.

Hour ten shows the primordial water of Nun from which all creation began. In this water, helpless bodies of those who drowned in the Nile and deprived a proper burial are depicted.

Hour 11 is filled with preparation for the coming sunrise in the eastern mountains and the rebirth of the sun-god and the deceased. It is said that at this point the eyes of the sun-god are regenerated to show his power returning. A serpent known as the ‘World Encircler’ surrounds the sun protecting him at this time of rebirth.

Hour 12 is the final hour of the journey and the one in which the sun-god re-emerges on the eastern horizon as a scarab beetle announcing a new day, as well as the successful resurrection of the deceased.

Such was how the Egyptian relationship with death was depicted and evolved with time. As funeral rights became more commonplace, so they also became more elaborate and in some ways more colourful for those in power. Life and death were a part of a journey and a way in which ancient Egyptians related their existence with that of the world around them and the gods. Looking at their religious texts and the stories they tell gives us an amazing insight into their beliefs and ways of thinking. It was often dark and gruesome, but in some ways that was a reflection of the dark brutality of the reality before them.
Dr Southon has a PhD in Ancient History and is the co-host of the podcast History Is Sexy with Janina Matthewson. Her first book, Agrippina: Empress, Exile, Hustler, Whore, is available now from Unbound.
The Most Extraordinary Woman of the Roman World

Agrippina

Agrippina the Younger is remembered as the tyrannical mother of Nero. It's time to re-evaluate her legacy

Written by Dr Emma Southon

In 51 CE, Rome saw a sight it had never seen before. The sight came at the end of a grand parade through the streets of Rome, designed to humiliate a captured enemy of the empire. At last, the British rebel Caratacus had been caught and had been displayed with great pomp and circumstance to the Roman people and then, finally, he was to be presented at the feet of the emperor himself. But this time, for the first time in Rome’s 800-year history as a kingdom, then a republic, then an imperial centre, a woman sat beside the emperor. Agrippina Augusta sat on a dais beside her husband, Claudius, with the standards of the Roman army swaying in the breeze behind her. She was the first and only woman to sit as the empress of Rome, as her husband’s equal.

Julia Agrippina Augusta, more commonly remembered as Agrippina the Younger, was 36 years old on that day. She was twice widowed. She had been orphaned before she turned 16 and all five of her siblings had been murdered. Her third and final husband was the emperor Claudius and he was her father’s older brother. Just a decade previously, Agrippina had been living in exile. Her life was a rollercoaster of highs and lows but, in 51 CE, it was at its height. Agrippina was ruling the empire, as she knew she deserved to.

“The early years of Agrippina’s life were full of violence and pain and fear, but they forged her into a woman of incredible strength and ambition”

Agrippina was the daughter of Vipsania Agrippina and Germanicus, and claimed both the emperor Augustus as a great-grandparent through her mother and the ancient aristocratic lineage of the Claudian family through her father. Her parents were Rome’s darlings, adored by everyone, and they fulfilled their promise by having six children. Agrippina seemed to be born into a charmed life, but her childhood turned out to be hard. Germanicus died, under mysterious circumstances, when Agrippina was a toddler. A decade later, after a long-running feud with the emperor Tiberius, her mother and two oldest brothers were exiled and then executed. At 13, Agrippina was married off to her cousin, the notoriously violent Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus, 20 years her senior. The early years of Agrippina’s life were full of violence and pain and fear, but they forged her into a woman of incredible strength and ambition.

In 37 CE, when Agrippina was 22, her fortunes changed. Her great-uncle Tiberius died and her remaining brother Gaius — better known as Caligula — became emperor. Agrippina knew safety for the first time in her life, and she celebrated by immediately becoming pregnant. She gave birth to her only child, Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, ten months after Gaius ascended to the throne. During those ten months, she and
her two sisters enjoyed unprecedented privilege and luxury. They were included in oaths of loyalty alongside their brother and were the first named women to ever appear on a Roman coin. Again, it seemed that Agrippina was settling in for a life of privilege and luxury as an imperial woman. Again, it wasn’t to be. First, their middle sister Drusilla died, sending Gaius into deep grieving. And then Agrippina and her youngest sister Livilla were caught plotting against him.

The details of this plot are deeply obscure. Agrippina, Livilla and Drusilla’s widower Lepidus (also Gaius’s best friend) were tried, and humiliating love letters between Agrippina and Lepidus were read out in court. Whatever the details, it’s apparent that a life of passive luxury did not satisfy Agrippina. She wanted more, and it could have killed her. Gaius was generous, though, and rather than execute them, he sent his sisters to exile on separate islands. Agrippina’s punishment was to be condemned to a life of solitary boredom. As she arrived on the island of Ponza, Agrippina was facing decades of life in exile with her brother as emperor.

 Fortune had other ideas. Just a year later Gaius was assassinated and replaced by his doddering academic uncle Claudius. As all new emperors did, Claudius immediately reversed all his predecessors’ policies, and that included pardoning political prisoners. Agrippina was allowed to return to Rome, but she came back to a strange situation. Claudius was in his 50s and had been deliberately kept out of politics by Augustus and Tiberius. Gaius had brought him into political life but his experience was poor and the senate had no respect for him. They had even less respect for his wife, Messalina, who was in her early 20s. Rome was in constant turmoil, with regular treason trials and occasional rebellions. Claudius responded with frequent executions. Agrippina’s response was to keep herself safe. Her son was the only living male descendant of the Divine Augustus and she was the sole remaining child of the adored Germanicus. They were a powerful threat to the emperor and his own son, who were from the lesser side of the Julio-Claudian family. So, Agrippina stayed away from Rome for five years. She reappeared only when Messalina signed her own death warrant by bizarrely getting married to someone else while Claudius was on a day-trip. Messalina was executed within hours.

Weeks after Messalina’s execution, Agrippina burst back into the spotlight when it was announced that the laws concerning incest were being changed so that Claudius could marry her. He was also going to adopt her son, changing his name to Nero, and betrothe his new son to his daughter Octavia. Agrippina had travelled from princess, to exile, to minor royal, to the incestuous wife of the emperor, all by the age of 30.

For most women in the Roman world, a world in which women were considered to be...
perpetual minors and were not legally allowed to even sign contacts, this would be the height of their ambition. To be the wife of a powerful and aristocratic man and to have a clear pathway to power for their children was the very best that a woman could hope for. Agrippina was different to other Roman women - she was not content with the impotent influence that was a perk of being the emperor's wife. She wanted real power. She wanted to rule.

Agrippina got lucky with her husband. Claudius was bad at politics and bad at ruling, and he was happy to accept help, even from his wife. Agrippina stabilised his reign and the executions and rebellions almost immediately ceased. Within a year, she had taken the honorific Augusta, making her Claudius's equal in name. She celebrated by founding a city in the place of her birth. We now know it as Cologne.

Agrippina became intimately involved in the running and administering of the empire. She was her husband's partner in rule in every way. She broke every rule of appropriate female behaviour by refusing to be a quiet, passive wife. In 52 CE, she caused an immense stir by appearing at a spectacular event, the draining of the Fucine Lake, in a man's military cloak made of gold thread. She glittered and dazzled the crowds of spectators and appalled them. In the same year, she sat in state to receive the captured British rebel Caractacus alongside Claudius. She was a clear, public presence and a part of the Roman state. She even appeared on her husband's coinage, her face overlaid by his. She was everything a Roman woman was not supposed to be.

This is one reason why she appears in the Roman sources as a monster. She was a woman who dared to speak and act in public, and she did it well. A good Roman woman was silent, modest, fertile and domestic. Agrippina was none of these things. She did not act like a good woman should act, and so she was a villain.

Agrippina's only child, who became the emperor Nero, would eventually murder her.

51 CE
53 CE
55 CE
54 CE
52 CE
Nero enters public life.
Caractacus is captured.
Nero and Octavia are married.
Nero kills his stepbrother Britannicus. Agrippina is removed from the imperial palace.
Claudius dies and Nero becomes emperor. Claudius is deified, making Agrippina the widow of a god.
The draining of the Fucine lake.
Nero enters public life.
Caractacus is captured.
Nero and Octavia are married.
Claudius takes the title Augustus. Claudius adopts his son, who is renamed Nero Claudius Caesar. Drusus Germanicus. Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium is founded.
42 CE
44 CE
48 CE
24 JAN 41 CE
41 CE
59 CE
Nero enters public life.
Caractacus is captured.
Nero and Octavia are married.
Claudius takes the title Augustus. Claudius adopts his son, who is renamed Nero Claudius Caesar. Drusus Germanicus. Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium is founded.
Nero enters public life.
Caractacus is captured.
Nero and Octavia are married.
Claudius dies and Nero becomes emperor. Claudius is deified, making Agrippina the widow of a god.
The draining of the Fucine lake.
24 JAN 41 CE
41 CE
Mid-41 CE
41 CE
42 CE
44 CE
51 CE
Nero enters public life. Caractacus is captured.
1 JAN 49 CE
50 CE
54 CE
Agrippina takes the title Augustus. Claudius adopts his son, who is renamed Nero Claudius Caesar. Drusus Germanicus. Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium is founded.
Passianus is consul, but dies early in the year. Agrippina is widowed again.
Agrippina marries Claudius.
Agrippina accompanies her husband on his governorship of Asia.
Gaius is assassinated. Two days later, Claudius takes the throne.
Claudius's wife Messalina is executed for treason.
Agrippina's reign was troubled from the start. She longed to see her son, Nero, become emperor. She worked hard to have him named heir to the throne, which he was finally granted by Claudius when he was only 19. Agrippina's ambition was to become regent for Nero, and she worked tirelessly to ensure this would happen. She placed a crown upon Nero's head and declared him her successor. She held the power of the empire, and she granted it to her son.

Nero became emperor because Agrippina made him so. For many, she was as much to blame for the crimes of his reign as the emperor himself. Agrippina, however, could not have predicted how her son's reign would turn out. It certainly was not how she planned. When the teenage emperor took the throne, Agrippina assumed that she would be regent, and, for the first few months, that's how it seemed to go. In Aphrodisias in Turkey, there survives an extraordinary sculpture depicting Agrippina dressed as the goddess Roma placing a crown upon Nero's head. She holds the power of the empire, and she grants it to her son.

This was the pinnacle of Agrippina's status; she seemed to have transcended the limits placed upon her as a result of her gender and attained true power. It was an illusion, and it did not last. It took only a few months for Nero to realize that his imperial power had no limits and that he did not have to be beholden to his mother. She had granted him the empire, but now the empire was his. She thought she had given him a gift he would freely share with her. What she had really given him was a weapon he could wield against everyone, including her. He was supported in this conclusion by his tutor, the Stoic philosopher and playwright Seneca, who actively opposed the participation of women in politics. Despite owing Agrippina his life and career, Seneca worked with Nero to remove her from all public and political spaces and, in doing so, he exposed how unprotected she was as a woman.

The first crisis for Agrippina's power occurred when a delegation from the troubled province of Armenia came to Rome. Nero received them formally, and Agrippina arrived at the reception expecting the same treatment her husband had given her. She stepped onto the imperial dias to take her seat as the emperor's equal. Seneca and Nero acted swiftly. Nero kissed his mother and then firmly guided her off the dias and out of the room. He humiliated her and destroyed her fragile appearance of power in just a few seconds.

For five years, their relationship continued to deteriorate. There were frequent arguments and threats, and Agrippina's role became less and less public. Although she was still a presence in Nero's reign, she vanished from the sources, but the empire continued to run smoothly, despite Nero's lack of interest or ability. These years are the most difficult for biographers of Agrippina, but it appears that during this time she wrote her autobiography, the only woman in Roman history to have done so. Our main evidence that she was still an active participant in running the empire is that, in 59 CE, Nero decided to kill his mother. It was not easy. Attempts to poison her were thwarted by her habit of taking antidotes and the loyalty of her household. Attempts to stab her were undermined by her popularity with the army and people of Rome and the fear that an overt assassination would end in a revolt.

Eventually, Nero resorted to the bizarre theatrics of a collapsing boat to disguise her death as an accident. He was, apparently, unaware that she was a strong swimmer and she survived too. In terror and despair, and concerned Agrippina would turn the army against him, Nero persuaded a loyal ally to butcher her in her own house. At the age of just 43, Agrippina died in her bedroom, rebellious and furious to the last moment, directing her murderers where to stab her, demanding to be stabbed in her womb. She was buried in an unmarked grave outside of Rome and for years Nero refused to mention her. She was denied the public funeral and honours she deserved. This matricide was seen as one of the greatest crimes of Nero's reign.

Agrippina's life was one of extraordinary lows and exceptional highs. More than any other woman in Roman history, she tried to transcend the legal and social limits that were placed on her in Rome because of her gender. She refused to be put into the easy boxes of wife and mother and instead created the role of Augusta, a partner in the empire. She created her own path, which took her to ruling Rome peacefully for almost a decade and which placed Nero, the destruction of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, on the throne. She was a diplomat and a murderer. She was the sister, niece, wife and mother of emperors. She was an exile and an empress. She was the most extraordinary woman that Rome ever saw.

She tried to transcend the legal and social limits that were placed on her in Rome because of her gender.

The mother of Cologne

The city founded by Agrippina

Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium was founded in 50 CE on the banks of the Rhine. Upgrading a town named Oppidum Ubiorum where Agrippina was born to the status of Roman colony. It was known colloquially as Colonia Agrippinensis - the Agrippinian Colony and, over time, this was shortened to simply the Colony. The city still holds a version of this name today, called Köln in German and Cologne in English. The city was a beacon of Roman culture in the area, populated by retired Roman soldiers and Germanic Roman allies. The upgrade to colony status meant that new temples to the Capitoline Trio and to the imperial cult were built, as well as bath houses, protective walls and a theatre: the foundations of Roman culture. Cologne became an international centre for artisanal glass production and developed its own intricate, signature style of glass decoration called snake-thread. Today, Agrippina is still remembered as the Mother of the City and the Maiden in the annual carnival parade where she is played each year by a man in 'Roman' dress.
Agrippina

Nero's legendary cruelty is depicted here as he tests poisons on a slave.

Nero attempted many times to have his mother killed, finally having her stabbed to death.

Agrippina, dressed as the goddess Roma, crowns her son Nero.
The Scottish artist David Roberts visited the Middle East in 1838 and 1839, depicting Petra just over two decades after it came to the attention of Europeans.

Petra was not well known in the West until the movie Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade was released in 1989. Today, hundreds of thousands of visitors fill the site.
Frankincense and Myrrh

Petra: the beating heart of the Nabataean Kingdom, the wealthy trade hub on the Silk Road, the once vibrant city, lost and forgotten for centuries. What is the story of this fabulous place and why was it lost to obscurity for so long?

Written by Jem Duducu

Located in what is now Jordan’s Arabah Valley, a few hours’ drive from Amman, the story of Petra starts with two key factors. The first is found in the world of luxury and fashion. Egypt was rich and powerful. This was due not to mineral wealth, but to a well-organised society and the fact that the annual flooding of the Nile made the land on its banks the breadbasket of the Mediterranean. As in any complex society, there was a small number of very rich people, but there was also a middle class of merchants and artisans who had disposable incomes. So, how did they spend their money?

Aristocratic Mesopotamian women were possibly the first to invent and wear lipstick, about 5,000 years ago. They also crushed gemstones and used them to decorate their faces, mainly on the lips and around the eyes. Of course, the images from ancient Egypt reveal that both men and women used black eye makeup, something that might seem unusual today but was standard fare then.

Perfume also plays a role in the history of luxury and fashion at this time and is as ancient as makeup. The first reference to perfume also comes from ancient Mesopotamia, around 1200 BCE, when a woman called Tapput is said to have created a scent from a mixture of balsam and myrrh. Her creations were used as perfume by aristocrats and as incense in religious ceremonies, uses that spilled over into the wider world.

This leads us to the Silk Road, a term created by a German explorer in the 19th century. The name suggests this was a specifically designated road, running from east to west (and vice versa). In fact, it was a catch-all term for the multiple routes used...
Petra is actually formed from caves, only the exteriors are traditional built structures.

by the thousands of traders who bought, sold and distributed their wares from distant China, across the gigantic Central Asian steppe, into the Middle East and, eventually, to Europe.

Everywhere, throughout the regions, there is evidence of this trade. The bright blue stones in Tutankhamen’s mask (14th century BCE) are lapis lazuli, which came from Afghanistan; and the oldest silk found in Egypt (which had to have come from China) was discovered on a mummy in the Valley of the Kings, dating from 1070 BCE. Silk scarves dyed in India became the headscarves of tribal women who lived along the Black Sea in Asia Minor. Silk Road trade changed and enhanced the lives of everyone in the regions around it.

Silk Road trade was further enhanced by the Persian Empire, which created the Royal Road (5th century BCE) that ran for nearly 1,800 miles across Asia. The links between east and west were further strengthened during Alexander the Great’s campaign in the 4th century BCE, and it was at this time that Petra became the capital city of the Nabataean Kingdom.

It is Petra’s location that made it so strategically significant. It explains why the city became a central trading hub in the past and why it still exists as an important archaeological site to this day. Putting it simply, it’s hard to manage a city in the desert. But if that city has a source of water and if it is profiting from trade because of its location as a place where caravans from many routes converge, then its success is all but guaranteed. Putting it even more simply, the effort is worth the reward.

The people of Petra were smart enough to realise that they were perfectly placed to trade in the spices, precious metals, silk, ivory and other goods from China, India and the Persian Gulf on their way to the ports of the Mediterranean. We shall also see that they cornered the market in two of the major luxury items of the time. Consumer demand from kingdoms to the west meant regular revenues poured into Petra’s coffers.
The second major factor in the story of Petra is the birth and evolution of the Nabataean Kingdom, a broader factor but not unrelated to the first. Frustratingly, Petra is covered in written inscriptions, but their context is limited. The civilisation was literate, but while we have many fragments of information from coins, inscriptions and other archaeological finds, there are no great historical records or fragments of literature from the kingdom itself. Indeed, most of what we know was written by outsiders trying to explain the Nabataean culture. This ultimately leads to huge amounts of conjecture and not a lot of consensus.

The landscape around Petra is harsh and unforgiving. Everything is composed of the soft red sandstone that forms the surrounding hills and the valley in which the city was constructed. Looking around today it seems impossible that anything like a civilised trading society could survive here let alone flourish to become rich and cosmopolitan. But hidden in the valley’s centre, among the ruins of this once prosperous city, are the remains of the aqueducts that ran for miles from an underground spring. The buildings are not structures, but caves that penetrate the rock cliffs to produce a site filled with palaces and temples, theatres and tombs, villas, baths, fountains and gardens. Petra was an ancient crossroads between east and west, a city alive with camel caravans and a busy marketplace, home to some 30,000 people at its peak 2,000 years ago.

The Nabataean Kingdom covered a patchwork of modern countries, including the Sinai Desert of Egypt, Palestine and Southern Israel, most of Jordan and a small part of northern Saudi Arabia. The kingdom was formed by an alliance of Bedouin tribes, nomads who depended on their herds of camels and horses for survival as they crisscrossed the region in search of grasslands.

The history of the Bedouin is an oral tradition and the name itself is an Anglicised version of an Arabic word, which simply means 'desert dwellers' - it was a completely appropriate name.

The nomadic tribes supplemented their meagre living by raiding outposts on the edges of the desolate regions of desert. Sometimes they would be paid to protect caravans, at other times they would attack them, but as the traffic in the region increased the Bedouin prospered and at some point came together to form the permanent settlement that became the foundation of the Nabataean Kingdom.

The people of Petra didn’t speak Arabic (or even an early version of it) but an early Semitic language that seemed to share a lot in common with Akkadian, the language of Mesopotamia, and the Neo-Assyrian languages to the north. Whatever the limitations of language, the language of trade overcame all obstacles and honed the talents of people who were gifted in business. The growth of the young Nabataean Kingdom coincided with a huge change in the geopolitics of the region when a military
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1 QASR AL-BINT
The ‘Palace of the Pharaoh’s Daughter’ is thought to have served as the city’s main temple. Worship of Nabataean deities Dushara and al-Uzza is thought to have been centred here.

2 AD-DEIR
Petra’s largest monument, the ‘Monastery’ sits on a high plateau of Jebel ad-Deir. It’s thought to have served as a temple-cenotaph commemorating King Obodas I.

3 OBELISK TOMB
Named for the four obelisks that dominate its façade, the Obelisk tomb sits above the façade of the Bab el Siq Triclinium (a banqueting hall), which is believed to have been carved later.

The Theatre
The theatre exactly follows Roman design rules but with the Nabataean architectural twist of the entire structure being hollowed out from a sheer rock face.

5 AL-KHAZNEH
Archaeologists theorise that this was the mortuary temple of either King Aretas III or Aretas IV, built as a place to worship the sovereign as well as being his burial place.

6URN TOMB
The multi-level Urn Tomb is the first of five façades (known together as the Royal Tombs) that loom over Petra’s colonnaded street from a ledge cut into Jebel al-Khubta.
campaign, largely between Egypt to the south and the Persian Empire to the north, led to a change in the spheres of influence and allowed Petra to gain an advantage. The result of all of this was that the Nabataeans gained the monopoly on that super-luxurious item of the ancient world, frankincense. Frankincense is, in essence, plant sap. It comes from a hardy bush that grows in hot and arid environments. Indeed, the plant is unusual in its ability to grow in such a harsh environment; it’s even been known to grow out of solid rock. This kind of landscape pretty much summarises the Arabian Peninsula as well as the Horn of Africa, and as Petra was the major trading centre in the region, it became the natural outlet for this resin.

The earliest images of frankincense appear on a temple in Egypt built by Hatshepsut, who died in the 15th century BCE. This confirms and underlines its importance as well as its antiquity. The frankincense, in this case, had come from the land of Punt, which, while its exact location is still contested, seems to have been in the general area of the Horn of Africa.

The reason for its importance is the aromatic qualities of its granules, used, as mentioned earlier, by the rich as perfume and by the religious as devotional incense. Its rarity made it a very expensive commodity, and the monopoly helped make Petra even wealthier.

Then there was myrrh. While Petra didn’t have a monopoly on this, it was one of the epicentres of myrrh trade, and once again, we are in the realm of perfumes and incense. Myrrh has been valued for thousands of years for these qualities, but unlike frankincense, it is a natural antiseptic. It is derived from a very thorny tree called Commiphora, whose natural habitat is, once again, the Arabian Peninsula and the Horn of Africa. It is interesting to note that this may be an example of a product that went the other way on the Silk Road as it has been a part of Chinese medicine for at least a millennia.

By now you might well have made a connection between the kingdom’s two major exports and the Bible. However, before we get to the most famous example of their importance, it’s worth pointing out that myrrh is mentioned a number of times in the Bible. It is almost uniquely associated with religious ritual, but on one occasion it warns of its intoxicating qualities. Touching briefly on the Nativity, there is, of course, the story of the three wise men bringing gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh to the baby Jesus. The point of the gifts is that they were all fabulously expensive and, quite literally, gifts fit for a king.

To anyone around at the time, these gifts would have validated Jesus’ position as a King of Kings. To anyone around at the time, these gifts would have validated Jesus’ position as a King of Kings. The two gifts of frankincense and myrrh were very much associated with areas outside of the Roman Empire and to the east of it. They point to a number of anti-Roman sentiments in the New Testament, right up to Jesus’ title of King of Kings, which was actually the Persian emperor’s title of Shahenshah. In other words, with the Roman persecution of the Christians and Jews at the time of the writing of the New Testament, there seems to have been a desire to look to other cultures to validate Jesus’ role on Earth.

There is, however, another connection between the Nabataean Kingdom (and specifically Petra) and the Bible. King Aretas IV was king from roughly 9 BCE to 40 CE, in other words, he was a contemporary of Jesus. Aretas married his daughter to Herod Antipas, the King Herod of New Testament fame. Herod would eventually divorce
her and marry his brother’s wife, a union that caused a scandal. John the Baptist was outspoken in his condemnation of this immoral marriage, and it was this opposition that led to Herod’s decision to have him beheaded. So, once again, we see the Nabataean Kingdom playing a role in other, better-known regimes.

But it is Aretas who leads us straight back to Petra, where the people demonstrated a flair for the theatrical with the city’s main entrance via a natural ravine that splits the towering rocks for almost a mile. Once through it, the visitor is confronted with the most famous site in Petra, Al Khazneh, or the Treasury.

It is said that the name comes from the riches stored in the great urn at the top of the circular building at the facade’s centre. In reality, the structure is thought to be the mausoleum of Aretas IV. The statues at the front of this magnificent edifice clearly relate to the pagan gods of both Rome and Greece, and show that Greco-Roman polytheism was alive and well even outside of the Roman Empire. It is also a reminder that not only did the Nabataean Kingdom have the ability to spread soft power through many regions and empires by means of trade, but in turn, those trade routes brought back other cultures and concepts, including theology.

Although protected from sight by the natural ravine, Petra was poorly defended and very rich. It was, therefore, an obvious target for attack, and yet, it was surprisingly hard to conquer. The kingdom was notorious for its dry and desolate location, so sending a large army to conquer what was, in essence, a desert would almost invariably lead to that invading force having to retreat due to lack of water. The standard tactic of these desert-dwelling Bedouin forces of the Nabataean Kingdom was to harry invading armies and then melt away to allow the heat and lack of water to do their work for them, while their own forces replenished their water supplies.

“The statues at the front of this magnificent edifice clearly relate to the pagan gods of both Rome and Greece”
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The towering Ad-Deir, also known as the Monastery

at hidden watering holes. It was a simple but effective strategy. Diodorus, a Greek writer in the 1st century BCE, wrote: "Neither the Assyrians of old, nor the king of the Medes and Persians, nor yet those of the Macedonians have been able to enslave them, and [...] They never brought their attempts to successful conclusion." Adding that the Nabataeans were "exceptionally fond of freedom".

It should be noted that the Nabataean Kingdom fought against a number of foes and expanded under a number of their kings. That's not to say they won every battle, but they were certainly a force to be reckoned with, despite the fact that they were on the edges of two large empires. The Nabataeans feuded with the Persians on a number of occasions, but it was the ever-growing Roman Empire that was to be their undoing. Although there are no historical accounts or oral traditions of any great clashes by the armies of the Nabataeans in the region, we do know that by 107 CE, there were Roman military outposts in the kingdom, after which it became known as Arabia Petraea. It was about this time, in 106 CE, that the last King of the Nabataeans died, Rabbel II seems to have had an heir but he never took the throne. It could well have been that the lack of an obvious/strong successor, linked to a kingdom increasingly dependent on the much richer Roman Empire, led to a peaceful or administrative takeover, rather than one by military force.

While it wasn't quite the most easterly territory of the Roman Empire, Arabia Petraea was absolutely a frontier land. A change in leadership and the integration of these lands into Roman territories ultimately led to Petra's demise. Trade routes changed and, over time, the city became a backwater as the population dwindled. A devastating earthquake in 363 CE dealt a final blow when it destroyed the water management system, making the city untenable as a settlement.

Arabia Petraea would remain part of the Eastern Roman Empire, now called the Byzantine Empire, into the 7th century. It would remain connected to this civilisation for centuries after Rome itself had fallen to the barbarians. However, in the 630s it would become the first eastern province to fall to a new civilisation, the Islamic Caliphate. From that point on, Petra would be part of Muslim lands, a concept that would have been completely alien to the original inhabitants.

Petra did not fall to the sword, nor was it burnt to the ground by a barbarian horde. It was abandoned and because it was hidden away, it was all but forgotten for nearly 2,000 years. For centuries, its only visitors were bandits who took advantage of its shelter and isolation, and some Bedouin families who lived on the site.

Then in 1812, a Swiss adventurer by the name of Johann Ludwig Burckhardt, intrigued by tales of a lost city in the desert, posed as an Arab sheikh and persuaded a local guide to show him the ruins of what turned out to be Petra. In the 1980s, the few families still living there were relocated (not always willingly) when the site received UNESCO World Heritage status.

In the greater scheme of things, Petra was not a huge city, nor was it renowned at the time for its grandeur. In comparison to another ancient city such as Ephesus, the site pales in both its size and the quality of its statues and edifices. However, Petra's incredibly well preserved and wonderfully ornate facades, carved into the living rock, are what make it unique. Its location made it what it was and preserved it for future generations.
The Battle of Tanagra is a rare example of Athens and Sparta facing each other in war, with their allies and protectorates fighting each other far more often in an ongoing proxy war between the powers. This particular battle predates the Peloponnesian War by 26 years.
Author of books on Sparta and Athens breaks down some of the myths and misunderstandings about the two ancient civilisations

In your book, Sparta: Rise of a Warrior Nation, you describe Sparta as “remarkably unremarkable”. Could you tell us what made it so different as a city from other major centres of population at the time? My comment refers to early Sparta before 700 BCE. At this time most contemporaries would not have ranked Sparta as one of the great cities of Greece. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about Archaic Sparta was that the ‘city’ consisted of four villages alongside the River Eurotas. Unlike most Greek cities, Sparta was unwalled, though in another sense geography provided all the barriers the Spartans needed - and then some.

The only other oddity was that the early Spartans had imposed a state called ‘helotage’ - somewhere between serfdom and slavery - on some conquered peoples from nearby towns. Nevertheless all Greek cities had their idiosyncrasies, and early Sparta would have been unusual if it had none. So overall, Sparta in the early Archaic era was an average Greek city.

What would you say were the advantages and disadvantages of Sparta having a dual monarchy system consisting of two hereditary kings?

When your king is also a war leader in a warrior state, having a spare on hand is almost essential. Generally one ruler stayed at home while the other was on campaign. Also, while succession struggles got messy in late Sparta, the fact that one king was one of several checks on the other prevented matters from getting out of hand. On the whole, Spartan kings seem to have worked well together, giving the state the advantages of a monarchy without many of the drawbacks.

Do we have much evidence of whether or not this was a relatively smooth or effective form of government for Sparta?

The kings were only part of the Spartan government. Perhaps most important was a...
King Leonidas I, thanks in part to his sacrifice against the invading Persian forces, remains a powerful figure in Ancient Greek history, popularised in pop culture and often cited through history as an example of a native force making a valiant stand against a foreign power.

King Leonidas I, thanks in part to his sacrifice against the invading Persian forces, remains a powerful figure in Ancient Greek history, popularised in pop culture and often cited through history as an example of a native force making a valiant stand against a foreign power.

'senate' called the Gerousia, which interpreted the (conveniently unwritten) laws. The Gerousia could impeach a king and frequently did. The Spartan government machine did work relatively smoothly - the key word being 'relatively'. Sparta tried hard to hide reports of political ructions within its 'ideal state' - nevertheless, stories of corruption, nepotism and brutal power struggles sometimes escaped.

To this day, Sparta has a reputation for being a society built around its military. Is it fair to say that this was always the primary concern of the Spartan people?

True, to the same extent as saying a singer's career is built around their voice. Sparta was a militarised state to an almost pathological degree.

For just one example, I can't imagine any other society where a married woman was encouraged to take lovers if they would breed better warriors than her husband could. During the classical era, the Spartans were the only Greek state with a large professional warrior class, and they were trained for the job from childhood.

It also has a reputation for being relatively conservative and slow to action or innovation. Is that a fair judgement?

This was not the case with early Sparta, which performed some remarkably innovative social engineering to create the state that it became. Yet by the classical era Sparta had a fetishistic belief that their society was as perfect as it could get. This made the Spartans resist essential changes - and their hidebound attitude to reform was a major cause in Sparta's eventual downfall. Militarily, Sparta was always slow to act because the Spartan army was needed at home in case of the Helot uprising that the state constantly dreaded - with justification.

How much of what we understand about Sparta is derived from the records of its neighbours, and how much is from Sparta itself?

Apart from subjugated Messenia, Sparta did not really have neighbours. It's that geographical isolation thing. Basically, most of what we have on Sparta comes from the Athenians. But that is also true of Argos, Corinth and any other Greek city except Thebes (which had the later writer Plutarch living nearby). However, some Athenian writers such as Xenophon and Plato were very pro-Sparta, while others such as Aristotle were frankly contemptuous. So we do get a reasonably balanced picture. What records the Spartans had they kept to themselves. The Spartans were famously people of few words. ('Laconic' refers to Lacedaemonia - the land of the Spartans.)

In your book you compared Laconia to the USSR and Attica to the USA, in terms of how outside observers might have interpreted the influence of Sparta and Athens on each other. To extend the analogy, would the concept of a cold war between these two also apply?

All analogies are flawed, and dragging one across two and a half millennia damages it even further.
Certainly there was a cold war between Athens and Sparta, because Greek cities were constantly struggling for power over each other. 'Peace' in classical Greece was cold war by definition. It was considered an intermission between hot wars. However, as realpolitik demanded, Sparta and Athens might - for example - together gang up on the Thebans. If you want a real feud, though, look at Sparta and Argos. Generally speaking, all Greek city-states were constantly in a condition analogous to a cold war with each other.

To your mind was a conflict between Athens and Sparta always inevitable given their political and societal differences?

As an optimist, I believe conflict is never inevitable. Sparta and Athens had no major conflicts of interest that would force a war. Athens was a sea-based trading empire. Sparta was land-locked, rural, had no interest in empire, and made a mess of it when they tried to run other people's affairs. Yet I must concede conflict would happen, simply because shifting alliances meant that all Greek states fought each other at some point. (It is hard not to when battle is almost a rite of passage for your young men.)

However, neither the Spartans nor the Athenians tried to force their society and politics on the other. In their view, if you had a system that worked, you kept it to yourself because it gave you the advantage. If anything, you tried to convince the other city to try something different (and hopefully worse) than what you were doing.

Was the Athenian way of life substantially different from that of a subject of Sparta?

Which 'subject'? Sparta was a very stratified society. There were Spartiates at the top, then mothakes, perioiki, helots and slaves. The aristocrats in both societies had much in common, but elite Athenians found the Spartan outlook frankly nuts.

They admired the Spartiates but had no desire to imitate them. Sparta had nothing resembling the lively mercantile class of Athens, and we must remember that both societies were 90 per cent agricultural. For the majority of people, life consisted of getting up at dawn and wresting a living from uncooperative soil, and spending free time in the rituals of one's village - whether the system of government was Athenian or Spartan. However, because the Spartans oppressed their agricultural population, the difference was that Spartan governance deliberately added a stratum of terror that was absent from life elsewhere.

You have a new book focused on Athens coming out later this year. What can you tell us about it?

This book is set just before Athens plunged into the final, disastrous phase of the Peloponnesian War. I take one day in the life of the city, and show Athens from 24 different perspectives. We spend each hour of the day with a different Athenian. The focus is on ordinary people - a fish seller, a slave, a tavern-owner - yet many of these people come into contact with extraordinary Athenians as they go about their regular lives.

So, for instance, we get a sneak peek at Socrates belly-dancing at a dinner party, and the young Plato preparing to beat up an opponent at wrestling. Entire chapters I did not write, but merely edited and reinterpreted what Athenian writers have said for themselves. Xenophon should sue.

The Battle of Thermopylae remains one of the most famous feats of Sparta as King Leonidas lead a small force to stand against Xerxes's Persian army.
His may be the greatest story ever told, but how do historians sort fact from fiction when it comes to Jesus?

Written by Ben Gazur

"Who do you say that I am?"

Jesus asks his followers in Matthew 16:15. It is a question they wrestled with and is still argued today. Believers may be able to approach the problem of Jesus via faith, but historians must use a different toolkit if they want to explore Jesus and his legacy. There is, and always will be, an impenetrable wall of mystery surrounding Christ the miracle worker as miracles are by their nature singular events that no amount of evidence will ever verify. Christ may be beyond the historian's remit, but Jesus the man is not.

The search for the historical Jesus has been going on almost since the moment of his death. Today there are almost as many Jesuses as there are people looking for him. If you pick up any two books about him you might think they were describing two different people. Marxists find a Marxist, philosophers find a philosopher, and modern Christians find a surprisingly modern Christ who agrees with all their own beliefs and prejudices. There are even those who believe that there was no historical Jesus, though few scholars hold this opinion.

Here we will look at how people have sought Jesus throughout history, what they have uncovered, and what evidence we can rely on when we assess the existence of this extraordinary individual.
Ancient Civilisations

**The Early Texts**

Like many of the great teachers, Jesus never wrote a book. We therefore lack direct access to his words and so must consider the accounts of others to fill us in on what he was like. Historians would love to have multiple contemporary records of Jesus’s life, yet that is unrealistic for the period. Even a locally important figure such as Pontius Pilate is only mentioned a few times by contemporary writers, and only a single partial inscription naming him has been found by archaeologists in nearly 2,000 years.

For a peripatetic teacher such as Jesus to receive even that level of attention would be remarkable. The earliest sources that give an account of him come from the New Testament. Most scholars date the letters of Saint Paul to the 50s CE, just two decades after the death of Jesus. Unfortunately the Pauline Epistles are written not with an eye to describing the historical Jesus, but to help settle theological debates within churches. From the references that are made to the life of Jesus we can glean such facts as Jesus was born, he taught, and he was crucified.

He makes references to Jesus’s brothers and describes how he met one of the brothers, James, in Jerusalem (described as a cousin or step-brother in some orthodoxes). Paul also knew of and had met some of ‘the 12’ - the close followers of Jesus. Paul, who never met Jesus while he was alive, at least had access to eyewitnesses.

By far the longest accounts of Jesus’s life in the New Testament are the gospels. Despite the names traditionally attached to them (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John) the texts are actually anonymous.

The dates of their composition are generally agreed as being between 66-70 CE for Mark and 90-110 CE for John. It is unlikely that the authors ever met Jesus but they may well have had access to reports from people who did. The gospel of Luke tells us: “Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word. With this in mind, since I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning, I too decided to write an orderly account for you.” It would be tempting to take the gospels then as the authoritative and accurate chronicles of the life of Jesus.

While it is easy to talk about the gospels as one collection, they offer a diverse set of viewpoints and often differ in their chronicling of the life of Jesus. The common nativity story known to us from many nursery school Christmas plays appears nowhere in any one gospel, but is constructed from aspects in Matthew and Luke.

Where the gospels do include the same details they often disagree with each other, such as with the date of the Last Supper. Worse for historians is when the gospels do not agree with facts from other sources.
In the Medieval period a great trade in relics supposedly belonging to Jesus sprang up throughout Europe. The dates check out for several of these relics, yet their authenticity is widely debated. This page demonstrates some of the most well-known relics with their respective locations and authenticity levels.

Crown of Thorns
Location: Notre Dame de Paris, France
Authenticity: The dates check out
Purported to be the mocking crown worn by Christ during his crucifixion, this crown of thorns was the property of the Byzantine Empire from at least the 6th century and passed to Louis IX of France in 1238 in exchange for propping up the Crusader kingdom that briefly usurped Constantinople. Thorns were handed out as high-value gifts to monarchs and church leaders, and both the age and type of plant used to weave the crown are consistent with the Near East of Antiquity.

Shroud of Turin
Location: Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist, Italy
Authenticity: Pretty unlikely
The Shroud of Turin is supposed to be the burial cloth in which Jesus was placed in the tomb. Visible on the fabric is the image of a bearded man, as well as blood stains. Scientific analysis has cast doubt on its age, while comparison to textiles from the era show the Turin Shroud to be inconsistent with 1st century techniques.

Veil of Veronica
Location: Monopello, Italy
Authenticity: Blatant fantasy
An apocryphal tale emerging in the Middle Ages has St Veronica offering a cloth to Jesus to wipe his face on the way to his crucifixion. When he does so an image of his face is miraculously transferred to the material. Several veils are said to exist and the most recent is the Monopello Image which emerged in the headlines in 1999. Local tradition claimed it was deposited by an anonymous pilgrim in the 16th century, but given veneration of the Veil of Veronica is such a late development it’s unlikely this, or any other contenders, are authentic Biblical artefacts.

Spear of Longinus
Location: Hofburg Palace, Austria
Authenticity: Definitely not
The Holy Lance is believed to be the spear that the Roman centurion Longinus used to pierce the side of Christ at the Crucifixion, and has been a part of the regalia of Central Europe’s Holy Roman emperors since the 10th century. Claimed to be different sacred relics at different points in history, recent research dates it to the 8th or 9th century, so whoever it stabbed was most definitely not the Prince of Peace.

Holy Grail
Location: Metropolitan Museum of Art, USA
Authenticity: No chance
Said to be the goblet that Christ used at the Last Supper, the Holy Grail emerged as an object of veneration in the Middle Ages. There are numerous claimants, including the Antioch Chalice (pictured), which was found in Syria in 1910. Unfortunately, the Antioch Chalice has since been dated to the 6th century and is believed to have been a type of standing lamp used in Christian worship.

Holy Nail
Location: Treasury of Trier Cathedral, Germany
Authenticity: Inconclusive
The nails that were hammered into the hands and feet of Jesus. The first holy nails were found by St Helena, but many more have come to light since. Holy nails have been converted into royal helmets, horse bridles, and the Iron Crown of Lombardy: yet many more remain in churches. The dates may match up, but it’s fair to assume nails existed in the 1st century for reasons other than the Son of God’s character arc.
This traditional image of Jesus must have originated somewhere, but is it true to life?

The gospel of Luke has Joseph and Mary travelling from Nazareth to Bethlehem to take part in an empire-wide census ordered by the Emperor Augustus, under the governorship of Quirinius, while Herod the Great was king. There is no other record of a census of the whole Roman world taking place at one time, and certainly none that would require people to return to far away towns because their ancestors lived there.

The main problem with Luke’s account though is that Quirinius was governor of Syria from 6 CE, and Herod the Great had died in 4 BCE. It would be impossible for Luke’s account to be accurate.

Whatever the literary and moral qualities of the gospels, they must be viewed as historical artefacts and not history.

OUTSIDER SOURCES
When studying the past it is always good to have multiple sources that have multiple views. Historians want accounts not just from supporters but from opponents too. The gospel writers clearly revered Jesus so it would be useful to see what those who did not worship him had to say.

All Roman sources on Jesus come from after his death, but there are some close enough in time to

Discoveries such as the texts at Nag Hammadi shed new light on who Jesus was.

The Good Shepherd
In the catacombs of Rome can be found paintings of Jesus as a beardless youth carrying a sheep dating from the 3rd century. Possibly not meant to represent the historical Jesus but as an allegory of his role.

Healing the Paralytic
A wall painting from Syria dated around 230 CE shows Jesus in the act of performing a miracle laid out in much the same way as a modern comic strip. Unfortunately the details of Jesus himself are difficult to discern.

Tomb of Commodilla
This 4th-century mural of Jesus is the earliest yet discovered which show him with a beard and long hair, a style not native to Rome. This would become the prototypical image of Jesus in art over the following centuries.

FACE TO FAITH
By comparing images of Jesus it is possible to trace the development of Christian belief into the nature of Christ.

Alexamenos Graffito
Perhaps the earliest image of Jesus, this is not a flattering one. The graffito shows a man raising his hands to a crucified figure – a man with the head of a donkey. Underneath is written “Alexamenos worships his god.”
be useful to historians. Within 100 years of Jesus's crucifixion we have potential mentions of Jesus by three writers.

Suetonius in his 121 CE history of the reign of Emperor Claudius says Claudius expelled Jews from Rome "since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus". The nearness of Chrestus to Christ has led many to identify the two figures, but we learn nothing from this reference except perhaps that there were Christians in Rome by that point. Similarly the famous 112 CE letter of Pliny the Younger where he asks Emperor Trajan how to deal with Christians in his province is valuable evidence of the early church, but not about Jesus himself.

The historian Tacitus, when he recounts the Great Fire in Rome, describes how Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations "called Christians by the populace". Importantly for our purposes he then describes their leader "Christus" who "suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus".

We do not know the source of Tacitus's information on the life of Jesus but he is a valuable outsider source even if the Pilate Inscription does call him a "prefect" rather than a "procurator".

The longest account comes from the Jewish historian Josephus, writing around 94 CE. In his Antiquity of the Jews there is the following passage: "About this time there lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one ought to call him a man. For he was one who performed surprising deeds and was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly. He won over many Jews and many of the Greeks. He was the Christ. And when, upon the accusation of the principal men among us, Pilate had condemned him to a cross, those who had first come to love him did not cease."

Josephus's comment on Jesus, often called the Testimonium Flavianum, has been cast into doubt in recent years. There are those who think that this section of Josephus's work was entirely concocted by later Christian copyists looking to bolster evidence for their beliefs. Some researchers however see a kernel of authentic testimony in Josephus's writings. Perhaps Josephus did write about Jesus's crucifixion, but later scribes glossed the text to make it more laudatory to Jesus. If this is the case it happened early, as Christian authors quote the passage in the 4th century CE. If the answers are not in the texts then other sources about Jesus had to be found.

RELIQ HUNTERS
Catholic altars have generally always contained relics - either some part of a saint's body or something closely associated with them. The New Testament gives examples of people being healed just by touching the robe of Jesus so it was natural that followers would search out items that had been close to him. Such a search, if able to provide physical evidence of Jesus's life, would be valuable to historians. Perhaps the most famous early relic hunter was Helena, mother of Constantine. Constantine was the first Roman emperor to allow Christians to worship legally and he converted, on his deathbed, to Christianity. Once installed as emperor of Rome in 306 CE he gave his mother unlimited funds to tour the Holy Land in search of relics. Many sites still visited by Christians today, such as the Church of the Nativity, were first built by Helena.

According to legend it was while Helena was constructing a church over the site of Calvary that she discovered three buried crosses. To test which

"ABOUT THIS TIME THERE LIVED JESUS, A WISE MAN, IF INDEED ONE OUGHT TO CALL HIM A MAN"
was the one on which Jesus died, Helena had a sick woman brought to touch each in turn. It was contact with the third cross, which healed the woman, and Helena declared she had found the True Cross. A peer-reviewed journal today would be unlikely to accept such evidence. Other writers record how Helena found the nails used in the crucifixion and the seamless robe of Jesus. The demand for relics only grew with time and proliferated to such an extent that it is now impossible to find any that are unambiguously genuine and shed any light on the life of Jesus. Fragments of the True Cross were so numerous that John Calvin declared in 1543: "If all the pieces that could be found were collected together, they would make a big ship-load. Yet the gospel testifies that a single man was able to carry it." If historians were to seek physical proof of the life of Jesus, they would have to wait for archaeological methodologies to improve.

**DIGGING FOR JESUS**

The spectacular monuments of Egypt sparked a rush among Europeans to see them, excavate new sites, and return with astounding artefacts in the 19th century. This boom created the first group of people who pursued archaeology in the first systematic way, if only haphazardly at first. From these beginnings other researchers moved into the Holy Land looking to locate the many sites mentioned in the Bible.

The first to survey locations in Palestine often made connections with New Testament sites on only the most flimsy of evidence, sometimes just on a feeling. Later archaeologists were able to locate important sites more accurately, even those doubted as real. The gospel of John mentions a pool at Bethesda with porticos and five entrances. Many questioned whether such a place ever existed, but in the 19th century a site very much as described was excavated. This helps place the narrative of Jesus's life in geographical space. Other discoveries have revealed much about what it was like to be alive in 1st-century CE Palestine. Much biblical archaeology remains highly controversial though and forgeries have proliferated, including fragments of Dead Sea Scrolls that ended up in the Museum of the Bible.

**BOOKS IN THE SAND**

Undisputed physical evidence of Jesus may not have been turned up by archaeologists, but research both in Palestine and other places has turned up a wealth of rediscovered written material. The New Testament as we have it today is a collection of texts written by different people, in different places, at different times. To get to the currently accepted collection of texts took centuries of debate within the church and many, many other writings were excluded. Simply because those in the past did not accept them as inspired does not necessarily mean they are of no use to historians today.

These Apocryphal texts, as those not included in the Canonical Bible are called, offer some startlingly different views of Jesus. The Infancy Gospel of Thomas, dating from the 2nd century, features a young Jesus who causes the death of a playmate and withers another child, though he does restore them in the end. It is easy to see why such a text was left out of the Bible but that does not make all such apocrypha useless. Recent efforts to get to the true historical Jesus have used close textual criticism. By comparing texts, canonical or otherwise, scholars are able to make judgements about the historicity of the events and sayings they describe. Several criteria have been suggested for seeking truth in biblical texts. The criterion of multiple attestations means that if several sources that do not rely on
“Some parts of the gospels make reference to the Aramaic that Jesus and his disciples spoke.”

Each other both say the same thing, then it is more likely to be true.

The criterion of dissimilarity says that if an act or saying of Jesus is different from what you would expect a 1st-century Jewish teacher to say, then it is more likely to be genuine. There is also the criterion of embarrassment. If a source is pro-Christian and yet says something that seems to harm the Christian argument, then it is more likely to be referencing a historical fact.

A close reading of the texts can turn up interesting features that may point to authenticity. Some parts of the gospels, written in Greek, make reference to the Aramaic that Jesus and his disciples spoke. In the gospel of Mark, Jesus is said to have raised a girl from the dead by saying “Talitha koum!” the gospel writer then glosses the Aramaic for his audience saying “which means ‘Little girl, I say to you, get up!’” The other gospel writers give similar translations too, which suggests a number of stories about Jesus were originally told in Aramaic, placing them in the cultural situation where Jesus lived.

“Who do you say I am?”

Who then was the real Jesus? It can sometimes look as if 2,000 years of work have left us little better off than those in the decades immediately after his death. Like Pilate, we must ask, “What is truth?” All historical knowledge is a series of probabilities. The stronger the evidence, the more probable something is to have happened in the way we believe.

For Jesus it seems that the most anyone can say with certainty is that a man called Yeshua was born around the turn of the 1st century, was a teacher who had several disciples, travelled around preaching, caused some trouble in Jerusalem, and was crucified around the year 30 CE. All other facts of his life must be determined on the balance of the evidence available to us.

Whatever we make of Jesus’s life, we can be sure his remarkable afterlife will continue as long as there are historians to argue the case.
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Written by Jessica Leggett
The king’s excitement to see his new bride had dissipated as soon as he had laid his eyes on her. She was nothing like the demure and pretty princess pictured in her portrait. After their meeting was over, the infuriated king rounded on Cromwell and shouted, “I like her not! I like her not!” The story of King Henry VIII’s rejection of his fourth wife, Anne of Cleves, has been passed down for centuries, so how did he end up with a bride that repulsed him? How did courtship and marriage work in Tudor England?

For the aristocracy, marriage was a question of political and economic interest, used as a means to further the power and social status of the family. With children dependent on their families for both land and money, they had little choice but to leave their choice of partner to their elders.

In particular, daughters depended on the cash dowries given to their groom or his father and had less say in their future compared to sons, who did not lose their property after their marriage. As for women, their wealth was automatically transferred to their husbands upon their wedding - leaving it to the men to negotiate a suitable marriage.

It was believed that without the financial means to support themselves, common couples would be unable to maintain a household and would descend into poverty, especially once they expanded their families. Consequently, extended periods of courting filled with small gifts and long engagements were common in everyday Tudor England, with couples typically marrying in their late twenties.

Although money and power were important, there was even more at stake when it came to royal marriages. In this context, marriage was used to secure treaties, form new international alliances or even reinforce pre-existing ones. Foreign brides hailed from the most powerful dynasties of Europe, raised from birth as pawns to secure the most favourable marriages for their families.

No wonder then that King Edward IV’s decision to secretly marry Elizabeth Woodville in 1464 was so controversial, because it ruined his chances to secure a foreign alliance. To make matters worse, Elizabeth was the widow of Sir John Grey, a Lancastrian knight who had died fighting the Yorkists at the Second Battle of St Albans, and had been left impoverished by his death - not exactly an ideal choice of bride for a young king securing his throne.

Of course, Edward’s choice to marry Elizabeth was not purely down to love, but also to show that he was capable of making decisions without the Earl of Warwick, the man nicknamed the ‘Kingmaker’. The secret marriage humiliated Warwick, who had been negotiating an alliance with France, and led to increasing jealousy and tension between the powerful factions at court as the Woodville family rose to prominence. While Edward was a Yorkist and not a Tudor king, his decision to marry at home highlighted the importance, as well as the difficulties, of choosing the right bride.

Then again, marrying domestically was not always a negative thing depending on political circumstances.

“Henry VIII
Likes: Turkey legs, wine, getting my way
Dislikes: Vegetables, disloyalty, the French
Looking for a new queen who can treat me like the king I am. Like, literally, I’m the king. If you didn’t know that already then you’ll soon learn all about it when you meet me.”

“Warwick, who had been negotiating an alliance with France”

Marie of Guise
If you can’t deal with me at my worst, you don’t deserve me at my best.
I’m an independent woman with no time for games. I work hard and I play hard. If you can’t handle that, you may as well move on. (And don’t bother if you’re under 6 feet tall)
“Not a cut-and-dry story”
We spoke to historian and author Alison Weir about Anne of Cleves, the subject of her new novel.

Have you discovered anything new about Anne of Cleves during your research?
Well, I’ve got some new theories about her. It was something that King Henry VIII said after their wedding night that gave me a storyline, because he kept saying that she was not a virgin. Now, that was quite startling actually because you would have thought that as royal princess she would have been brought up quite strictly in a very sheltered manner. It made me wonder what if Henry was telling what he believed to be the truth? And then I thought how could Anna have conducted an illicit affair or even have had an illegitimate baby? So that gave me one of the storylines for the novel and then I was researching Anna, I found what could be seen as corroborating evidence, but I don’t want to say too much because it would be a spoiler.

Why did you choose to use the German version of her name?
Well she signed herself ‘Anna’ and that was obviously her name, but also the book is meant to be written entirely from her point of view and she would have seen the world from a German perspective. So, I think it was right to call her Anna of Kleve.

Was picking Anne from a painting an unusual way to pick a bride?
Yes, in the context of European diplomacy, that was the best way for princes to find out what their future brides looked like. It is common with the advancement of portraiture in the 16th century for portraits to be sent to prospective brides and bridegrooms.

Why did Henry mostly choose wives from among his court?
Well I can only agree with David Starkey that he wanted to be in love and be loved. It was very unusual, his view on marriage: for his time because he threw away diplomatic advantages. Yet he was willing to put the alliance on the line and risk angering Anna’s brother for the sake of his own personal taste.

Lastly, what do you wish more people knew about Anne?
After her divorce and Henry’s death, she became under the influence of a very dangerous man called Sir Thomas Carden and thanks to him, she was implicated in Wyatt’s rebellion of Mary Tudor’s reign and she never recovered Mary’s friendship in full after that — and that is so little known! This is one of the things I wish people knew about her because hers was not such a cut-and-dry story as you would think.

The famous portrait of Anna of Cleves, painted by Hans Holbein the Younger.

King Henry VII, the first Tudor king, married Edward and Elizabeth’s eldest daughter, Princess Elizabeth of York, to unite the claims of the Lancastrian and York Houses once and for all.

It was a shrewd decision because Elizabeth had her own claim to the English throne, one that was – in fact – stronger than her husband’s. Their marriage strengthened Henry’s position on the throne, allowing him to focus on pursuing stability throughout his realm and building his new dynasty.

To do this, Henry needed foreign allies and arranged for his 11-year-old son and heir, Prince Arthur of Wales, to marry the Spanish Princess Catherine of Aragon, the daughter of Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon. Popularly known as the Catholic Monarchs, Isabella and Ferdinand were a formidable force in Europe and ideal allies for Henry against France.

This alliance was so important to both King Henry and Spain that when Arthur’s untimely death aged just 15, the king obtained a papal dispensation for Catherine to marry his new heir, Prince Henry, instead. Also, he was well aware that if Catherine returned to Spain then he would be forced to return the dowry money that he had received upon the young couple’s marriage.

However, Catherine’s appeal as a desirable bride significantly diminished after the death of her mother in 1504. The crowns of Castile and Aragon had been united with Isabella and Ferdinand’s marriage, but Isabella’s death meant that the Castilian throne went to Catherine’s elder sister, Juana. Since she was no longer the daughter of two reigning monarchs, King Henry was reluctant to see the marriage between Catherine and Prince Henry through.

Forced to languish in limbo at the English court as a result, Catherine’s cause seemed lost when Prince Henry renounced his engagement to her, most likely at the urging of his father. Yet, in a surprising twist of events, when the prince ascended the throne as King Henry VIII after the death of his father in 1509, the new king announced he would marry Catherine after all.

King Henry VIII had a rather unconventional approach when it came to his marriages and, interestingly, he was the first king since Richard II to have more than one. A man who loved being in love. Henry was passionately devoted to Catherine in the early years of their marriage, and he even wrote to his father-in-law that “the love I bear to Catherine is such that if I were still free, I would choose her for wife before all other”.

While beauty and piety were important attributes for a royal bride, fertility was the most important of all. Although Catherine and Henry had one living daughter, Mary, the queen’s failure to provide a male heir ultimately led the king into a battle to end their marriage and marry his mistress, Anne Boleyn, in 1533, with whom he was completely enamoured.

Of course, we all know that Anne also failed to provide Henry with a male heir and instead gave him another daughter, Elizabeth. Within three years, their marriage disintegrated, and the king famously had his queen executed on trumped up charges of high treason, adultery, incest and witchcraft. Just 11 days later, Henry married his new mistress, Jane Seymour, who gave birth to their son, Edward, and finally...
succeeded in giving the king the male heir he so desperately wanted, only for her to die two weeks after childbirth.

Jane’s death devastated Henry and it would be another three years before he married again, the longest distance between any of his marriages. Although the king preferred to choose his own wives, he grew increasingly worried that England was becoming far too isolated when, in 1538, a truce was made between Francis I of France and Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. Aware that he only had one male heir to continue his dynasty, Henry agreed to look for a new, foreign-born wife at the urging of Thomas Cromwell, chief minister.

Searching for his fourth bride, Henry took a new approach this time and commissioned Hans Holbein the Younger to paint portraits of the noblewomen eligible for marriage, including Christina of Denmark, Amelia of Cleves and her sister, Anne. Observing their portraits, Henry was drawn to Christina and immediately opened negotiations for her hand in marriage.

At 16 years old, she was three decades younger than the king, and her guardian and aunt, Mary of Hungary, resisted attempts for the match due to Henry’s reputation – after all, he had executed one of his wives. Even Christina disliked the idea of marrying Henry, and was said to have declared, “If I had two heads, one should be at the King of England’s disposal.”

Henry turned his attentions to Anne, the daughter of the Duke of Cleves. On paper, it was an ideal match since the House of Cleves was an ideal Protestant ally for England and would give Henry the power he wanted in Europe. Having studied Anne’s portrait, the king believed himself to be completely in love with the fair German princess and was impatient for his new bride to arrive.

Unfortunately, Henry was less than impressed with Anne when they met in person, considering her – among many things – too plain. However, it was too late to turn back and so the king was forced to go ahead with the wedding in January 1540, to avoid upsetting his new allies. Although he tried, Henry was unable to consummate the marriage and complained to Cromwell that Anne had “very evil smells about her” and that her body repulsed him.

Unsurprisingly, Henry quickly engaged himself in an affair with Anne’s young lady-in-waiting, Catherine Howard, and was eager to marry her. Just six months after their wedding, Henry had his marriage to Anne annulled, which benefitted her greatly as she received a generous settlement that included Hever Castle. She remained in England for the rest of her life and affectionately became known as the ‘King’s sister’ while Cromwell lost his head for his role in the ill-fated marriage.

With no precedent set for a king consort, the marriage treaty was designed to protect Mary’s engaged to François, Dauphin of France, and a few years later to her cousin, the future Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who broke their engagement to marry Isabella of Portugal.

With the breakdown of her parents’ marriage and her subsequent illegitimacy, Mary’s marital prospects plummeted. By the time she became queen in 1553, Mary was 37 years old and by royal standards was an old maid. Desperate to provide a Catholic heir for the throne, she married Charles V’s 26-year-old son Philip, who had no interest in her despite Mary’s obvious love for him.

Mary was the first woman to rule England in her own right and therefore negotiating her marriage was uncharted territory. It proved to be a difficult task, especially with opposition from Parliament, who were concerned that England would be subject to Spanish rule. They attempted to persuade her to marry an Englishman, which she refused to do, even though the people of England were also against her plans to marry Philip - sparking Wyatt’s rebellion in 1554.

With no precedent set for a king consort, the marriage treaty was designed to protect Mary’s
Hampton Court was one of Henry VIII’s preferred residences.

autonomy, limit Philip’s power in England and ensure that he could not inherit the throne if the queen died before him. The negotiations took so long that Mary had been on the throne for over a year by the time she finally married Philip and she died just four years later in 1558. Sadly, Mary never had the heir she so desperately wanted.

Having witnessed the turmoil of her father’s marriages, the loss of her mother and the struggle Mary faced when it came to her marriage, it is no surprise that her half-sister and successor, Elizabeth, was so reluctant to marry. Almost immediately after taking the throne, Elizabeth’s councillors concerned themselves with finding her a husband so that she could provide an heir.

The queen of England was the most eligible bride in Europe and throughout her reign, numerous suitors competed for Elizabeth’s hand. While her father pursued his brides personally, she had ambassadors flocking to appeal to her on behalf of their masters, including King Eric XIV of Sweden, Archduke Charles of Austria and even her former brother-in-law, Philip. Assuming the throne as a young woman gave the queen years to consider her suitors and enjoy these courtships, although she only offered them ‘fair words but no promises’ in return.

Elizabeth is often presented as a formidable queen, which in many ways she was, but she was also an indecisive ruler who could spend months hesitating over a decision. It was a tactic she employed to keep Parliament at bay whenever the frustrated question of her marriage arose. In the meantime, Elizabeth developed her iconic image as the ‘Virgin Queen’, wedded to her country.

Of course, the one man that Elizabeth was in love with was Robert Dudley. In stark contrast to Mary, where Parliament tried to encourage her to marry an Englishman, they opposed a marriage to Dudley. Not only were they opposed to the rise in status he would receive as consort, they feared that he would attempt to usurp her power.

The last time Elizabeth came seriously close to marriage was during the 1570s, when negotiations were opened with Francis, Duke of Anjou. They proved to be very fond of each other, with Elizabeth affectionately referring to the Duke as her ‘frog’ and wearing a pair of frog-shaped earrings that he had gifted her.

Unfortunately, Elizabeth was forced to let go of the idea of marrying Francis when it became clear that Parliament, as well as her subjects, would not support the queen marrying a French Catholic. Instead, the question of an heir to the English throne would follow the ‘Virgin Queen’ to her deathbed, bringing an end to the Tudor dynasty after over a century.
Ragnar Lodbrok gained a whole new following thanks to the History TV show Vikings.
The First Viking

Legend and history meet with Ragnar Loðbrók, the Viking forefather who fought monsters and led raids on Saxon England

Written by Edoardo Albert

Listen. Do you hear? That sound. That is the sound of lamentation. Sigurd the Dragon Slayer and Brynhild the Fair are dead. The trees whisper it, the rivers carry tidings to the heaving, restless sea; the rain and the wind, the sun and the stars tell the news. Sigurd is dead. Brynhild has departed.

There was a man who heard the whisper of rain and wind, who saw the tears of the sun and the grief of the stars. That man was Heimir, foster father to Brynhild, and his grief for the fair Brynhild was as great as if she had been the daughter of his loins. Then Heimir laid down his plough and put aside his crown and forsook his kingdom.

For Brynhild and Sigurd had had a daughter, Aslaug, and they had asked Heimir to take her as foster-daughter in turn. However, Aslaug being only three years old, Heimir had not yet brought her to his own kingdom. But now Heimir put aside all else, even his grief, and rushed to Aslaug. For Sigurd had thrown down many men in his might and now that he was dead and fear of him no longer held his enemies in thrall, they would seek vengeance on his living flesh. His kingdom, Hlymdal, was dead and fear of him no longer held his enemies in thrall, they would seek vengeance on his living flesh.

So Heimir had a marvellous harp made with cunning and craft, so that little Aslaug might be hidden within it. And with her, in the harp, Heimir stowed other precious things - gold and silver, and fine clothes - for he foresaw that they would be travelling far. Leaving his kingdom, Heimir set forth as a wanderer, a beggar carrying a harp that he might play for his supper and his bed. They wandered far and wide.

Whenever they were far from the eyes of men, Heimir would take the harp apart and let little Aslaug bathe. For food while Aslaug was shut in the harp, he gave to her a wine-leek, for its virtue is such that a person may live long on it, even when they have no other food to eat. And when Aslaug cried, out of fear of the dark and the confinement of her safety, Heimir would play the harp, quietening her - he was marvellously skilled at the harp.

In his wanderings, Heimir came to Norway, to a farm called Spangareid. An old couple lived there - Ake and his wife Grima. When Heimir knocked on their door, Grima answered. “Why come you here, stranger?” Grima asked.

“I mean you no harm, old woman,” said Heimir. “I am a wanderer, a beggar, far from home. I ask only for a space near the fireside so that I might warm these old bones.” “You'll be asking me to feed you once you're sitting by the fire, I'll be bound,” said Grima.

But Heimir held up his hands, blue with cold. “I am a harpist. I want only to warm these fingers before the black cold takes them.” “All right,” said Grima. “I’ll let you in. No food, mind. We’ve none to spare for beggars.”

As Grima fed the fire, Heimir set his harp down beside him then held his hands to the flames. But Grima, sharp-eyed, sharp-tongued, sharp-witted Grima, saw something hanging from the harp and as she bustled around the farmhouse she looked closer and saw it was a piece of the richest cloth. Grima realised that this was no ordinary beggar. “Listen, beggar, I spoke harshly to you, for we see few enough people here on our farm. Stay, for my husband will be back from the forest, and I will give you food to eat, and a place for you to sleep tonight.”

Heimir looked at the crafty old woman but the snow blindness dimmed his sight and he did not see the guile glint in her eye. “I am grateful. I fear another night in the open would be the end of me.” “Let me show you where you can sleep.” So the old woman took Heimir to the barley barn and he lay down there, with the harp beside him, to sleep amid the warm sacks of barley. While Heimir slept, Grima set to her tasks, but she was too excited to do much. So when Ake, her husband, came home, he found the house unswept, the fire unbanked, and the animals not fed. Ake looked round, then looked to sharp-eyed Grima and said, “You must be very happy. For every day, I work, chopping wood and hauling it home until my fingers bleed while you sit and do nothing.” Then sharp-tongued Grima said, “Would you like to do the work of a moment and, by that work, keep us fat and contented all the rest of our lives?” “What work is that, old woman?” asked Ake. “A man came to our farm today. An old man, a beggar he said. But I saw, with these sharp eyes, the gold glint from his finger and gold cloth in his harp.”
THE REAL RAGNAR
A historical legend or merely fiction?

The sagas start in legend and end in history, with diversions into tales of adventure and chivalry throughout. But the saga of Ragnar Lodbrok neatly straddles the transition from legend to history: it begins by anchoring its future wife of Ragnar in the greatest of Norse legends, the story of Sigurd the Dragon Slayer and Brynhild (ignoring the difficulty of Sigurd and Brynhild belonging to a time four centuries earlier), and ends with the sons of Ragnar, men such as Ivar the Boneless and Sigurd Snake-in-the-Eye, who are undoubtedly historical figures.

Whether Ragnar himself was a historical character remains unknown. While a group of Viking war chiefs were known as sons of Lodbrok, this could refer to a tribal founder as their actual paternal father. But if Ragnar was real, he likely first appears in the historical record in 845 CE, when a Viking chieftain named Regimund led 120 longships up the River Seine to attack Paris. According to the French chroniclers, this Ragnar succumbed to the plague that devastated the Vikings besieging Paris. But ‘Ragnar’ pops up again in the following decades: he raids Scotland and the Isles, settles in Dublin, attacks Angles and, finally, dies in a snake-filled pit in York. Actually, Ragnar appears to have died at least five times during his career.

It’s possible that a series of different Viking chieftains who shared similar names had their stories conflated into one character: Ragnar Lodbrok. Once this process began, the pull of a good hero with name recognition would ensure that other tales would be ascribed to him, in the same way that Arthur, at most a war leader of the Britons, became the exemplar of Medieval chivalry.

With the modern reinterpretation of Vikings, which has seen them change from bloodthirsty rapists to intrepid explorers and traders, it was only a matter of time before Ragnar Lodbrok would be reimagined for the screen. Vikings makes for great television but it conflates different times and characters, making the historical Rollo, the first ruler of Normandy, Ragnar’s brother and contemporary, when in reality Ragnar came two generations before Rollo. But such tale making is in keeping with the writers of the sagas.

He is very old but I think he must have been a great warrior when he was young. I put him in the barley barn and he is lying there,” Grima looked at her husband, and the thought of what she planned to do glinted in her eyes. “Fast asleep,” she added.

“Who have you? Ake, then if you husband, I’ll take the beggar man for my husband and we’ll drive you out. You weren’t here when he came: you didn’t hear the beggar words he poured over me. But I would not listen - I vowed to stay true to my husband. Much good that does me! Mark this, Ake, and mark it well: I’ll take him to my bed and kill you if you don’t take this chance.” Grima put her hand on Ake’s arm. “We won’t get another chance like this, Ake,” the woman wheedled, cunningly.

Then Ake nodded his head and he took his axe and sharpened it. Grima brought Ake to where Heimir lay, the harp by his side. He was snoring.

“Do it!” whispered Grima. “But run away after you strike, lest he lay hand on you.” Then Grima took the harp and ran back to the farmhouse.

Ake took his axe and stood beside the sleeping, snoring Heimir. He raised his axe high and brought it down but, striking, the weapon caught on bone and flew from his hands. Heimir roared from his sleep, limbs thrashing, and Ake fled from the barn. But the blow was deep, a death blow, although such were Heimir’s death throes that the whole barn came down.

Ake found Grima in the farmhouse with the harp.

“It’s done,” he said.

“Well be rich,” said Grima. “Mark my words.”

But the old man shook his head. “This won’t end well. His blood will bring down blood on us.”

“Pah,” said the old lady. And she opened the harp.

“This is bad,” said Ake.

“It’s true,” said Grima; “she is not what I expected. Who are you?” But to whatever question they asked, Aslaug gave no answer.

It was as if the young girl had no speech.

“This is bad,” said Ake.

“Nonsense,” said Grima. “I need some help around the house. She will be called Kraka, after my mother, and I will simply say, if anyone asks us, that she is our own daughter.”

“No one will believe you,” said Ake. “We’re both so ugly. No one will believe Kraka is our daughter.”

“I will make her ugly,” said Grima. “I will shave her head, and tar it, and dress her in rags, so people will think she is my daughter.”

Grima set the girl to doing chores on the farm. There Kraka grew up, in poverty and silence.

In Gautland there was a jarl named Harrud. He was wealthy and powerful, and he had a daughter named Pöra. Of all women, she was the most beautiful and her manner was as lovely and gracious as her appearance. Her nickname was Fortress-Hart, for she excelled other women as the deer excels other animals. Harrud doted on his daughter, and had a bower made for her use, near his hall.

Every day Harrud would send Pöra a gift. One day he sent her a little snake of great beauty. Pöra liked the snake and put it in a box with a piece of gold for its bed. But at once the snake began to grow, so that within a few days it was too big for its box, and it lay curled round it. Once out of the box, the snake grew quicker, so that it soon lay wrapped around Pöra’s bower and none might enter or leave save only the man who brought the serpent its food: a whole ox.

The gold beneath the snake grew with it too, so that it lay upon a great heap. Then Harrud swore an oath that whatever man killed the snake and freed Pöra would have Pöra as his wife and the snake’s gold as her dowry. Many men heard this, but none dared to face the serpent.

The king of Denmark was Sigurd Hring. His fame was great, for he had killed Harald Wartooth at the battle of Bréville.

Ragnar was the son of Sigurd. He was a giant among men, handsome, feared by his enemies and beloved of his friends. He had already gathered men to his warship and earned a reputation as a great warrior when he heard of the promise Jarl Herrud had made. But Ragnar made no oath, nor did he talk of the serpent that had imprisoned Pöra. Instead, he had some clothes made: shaggy trousers and a shaggy cape, which he boiled in tar. Then he sailed to Gautland and pulled his warship up on a beach not far from Jarl Harrud’s hall. But Ragnar did not go to greet the jarl that night. Instead, he woke early, before anyone else had got up, and Ragnar put on the tar-covered trousers and cape he had made, and he took a spear from the rack. Climbing down from his ship,
An imagining of the discovery of Aslaug by Mårten Eskil Winge

Ragnar rolled on the beach, covering his trousers and cloak in sand. Then he removed the rivet holding the spear head on its shaft.

Ragnar went through the dawn to the jarl’s hall. All were sleeping there. Ragnar went to Pōra’s bower. He saw the serpent coiled round it, asleep. At once, he stabbed it with the spear. Pulling the spear out, he stabbed again, cutting through the serpent's spine, and he twisted the spear so its head broke off.

In its death throes, a stream of acid blood gushed from the serpent, striking Ragnar. But the sandy cloak and shaggy trousers protected him from the deadly blood. Pōra, wakened by the death agony of the serpent; saw a hooded man striding away and she called after him. But Ragnar did not turn, and answered in riddles, before walking away.

Pōra wondered who the man might be who had killed the serpent and freed her. Could such a giant be a man? When Jarl Harrud, wakened by the death, went to bora’s bower. All were sleeping there. Ragnar went to bora’s bower.

Miklagard itself. Jarl Harrud, glad at so worthy a deed spread through all the Northlands and beyond; the men who wielded that spear bring it forward and I shall keep my promise to him, whatever his degree”

An old woman greeted them. The men asked her name and the old lady replied to them, “My name is Grima. Who are you?”

“We are the men of the great Ragnar Loðbrók. Now help us bake his bread.”

But the old woman held up her hands. Her fingers were twisted and bent. “These old hands can’t do such hard work. But I have a daughter who can do the baking for you. Her name is Kraka, but she has grown so headstrong I can barely control her. Ask her yourself when she gets back.”

Kraka had taken the cattle to water in the morning. But as she watered the cattle, she had seen the great ship, moored in the inlet, with painted shields lining its sides and the painted head of a great serpent at its prow. Seeing the ship, Kraka undressed and washed herself, despite Grima having forbidden it. Then she brushed her golden hair that had grown long. For few people came to Spangareid and, with so few visitors, Grima had grown lazy and stopped shaving Kraka’s head.

Leading the cattle, Kráka came home. And the men, bent over the fire, stopped what they were doing when they saw her and they turned to Grima and asked, “Is this your daughter?”

“She is,” said Grima.

“How can that be,” said the men, “when she is so beautiful and you are so ugly?”

Don’t judge this old woman in her age. I was a beauty too when I was young.”

The men asked Kráka to help them bake the bread, telling her to knead the dough into loaves that they would then bake. Kráka bent over the dough, kneading it, then handing it to the men to bake. But the men could not stop staring at her, and so they burned all the bread as if she be one whit less beautiful than Pōra, then you will die.”

But when Ragnar’s messengers tried to sail to the beach, the headwind was too great and they could not reach the land.

 Denied, Ragnar’s eagerness to see this maiden waxed and he told his men to give her this message: “If she is truly more beautiful than Pōra, then I want her for my bed. Tell her I will meet her, but that she they baked it. With the burnt bread, they returned to the ship. But when they served the bread to the crew, the crew complained that it was burnt.

“You had one task,” said Ragnar, who was hungry. “You could not even do that.”

“It’s not our fault,” said the men. “There was this woman there, and she was so beautiful we could not stop staring at her, and so we burned the bread.”

“No woman is as beautiful as Pōra,” said Ragnar, and his voice was low and threatening.

But the men did not hear the threat and protested all the more that the woman they had seen was indeed more beautiful than Pōra.

Then Ragnar spoke. “I will send other men and they will bring back report of this woman of whom you speak. If it be as you say, then I will pardon your incompetence. But if she be one whit less beautiful than Pōra, then you will die.”

And you are so ugly?”

“Grima. Who are you?”

“Pora,” said Ragnar, and his voice was waxed and he took to keeping of others, and to still his sorrow he took to his warship and set sail.

One morning when they were anchored in a small inlet, Ragnar’s men woke early and took the rowing boat and rowed to land to bake bread. On the beach, they saw a farm not far away and the men took their wheat to the farm so that they might use its oven.

An old woman greeted them. The men asked her name and she replied, “My name is Grima. Who are you?”

“We are the men of the great Ragnar Loðbrók. Now help us bake his bread.”

But the old woman held up her hands. Her fingers were twisted and bent. “These old hands can’t do such hard work. But I have a daughter who can do the baking for you. Her name is Kraka, but she has grown so headstrong I can barely control her. Ask her yourself when she gets back.”

Kraka had taken the cattle to water in the morning. But as she watered the cattle, she had seen the great ship, moored in the inlet, with painted shields lining its sides and the painted head of a great serpent at its prow. Seeing the ship, Kraka undressed and washed herself, despite Grima having forbidden it. Then she brushed her golden hair that had grown long. For few people came to Spangareid and, with so few visitors, Grima had grown lazy and stopped shaving Kraka’s head.

Leading the cattle, Kráka came home. And the men, bent over the fire, stopped what they were doing when they saw her and they turned to Grima and asked, “Is this your daughter?”

“She is,” said Grima.

“How can that be,” said the men, “when she is so beautiful and you are so ugly?”

Don’t judge this old woman in her age. I was a beauty too when I was young.”

The men asked Kráka to help them bake the bread, telling her to knead the dough into loaves that they would then bake. Kráka bent over the dough, kneading it, then handing it to the men to bake. But the men could not stop staring at her, so that they burned all the bread as
must come to Ragnar Loðbrók naked but clothed, full
yet hungry, alone and with company.
When the wind turned, Ragnar's messengers set
sail. They landed and went up to the farmhouse and
found Kraka waiting for them. Then they looked
upon her and saw that the reports of her beauty
were nothing less than the truth: she was more
beautiful than Póra the Fair. The messengers bowed
before her, and told her they came with word from
Ragnar Loðbrók.
Kraka said, "I will come to your ship tomorrow, as
the great Ragnar Loðbrók commands."
She watched the messengers sail back to Ragnar's
warship, moored in the bay. And through the night,
Kraka thought upon Ragnar's message. Then, when
dawn was breaking, she went to see Ake. The old
man was chopping wood. His dog, the only creature
he loved, snarled at Kraka.
"Will you lend me your fishing net?" Kraka asked
him. "I will catch us some fish for our lunch."
"Take it," said Ake. "Saves me getting wet and cold,
standing in the bay."
"I'll need to take the dog too," said Kraka, "or the
gulls will steal the fish."
"About time someone else did some work
round here," said Ake. "Go with her, dog." The dog,
disgruntled, followed Kraka back to the farmhouse.
In the house, Kraka took an onion, then stripped her
body and draped her long hair over her breasts.
"Will you lend me your fishing net?" Kraka asked
him. "I will catch us some fish for our lunch."
"Take it," said Ake. "Saves me getting wet and cold,
standing in the bay."
"I'll need to take the dog too," said Kraka, "or the
gulls will steal the fish."
"About time someone else did some work
round here," said Ake. "Go with her, dog." The dog,
disgruntled, followed Kraka back to the farmhouse.
In the house, Kraka took an onion, then stripped her
body and draped her long hair over her breasts.
"Come, dog," Kraka said and, with the animal
following, she went down to the bay. Grima saw her
walking down to the beach: naked yet clothed, alone
but with company. And she realised, suddenly, the
wit of the girl who had been so long her drudge.
"But she is not full yet hungry."
Then Grima saw Kraka raise the onion to her lips,
bite into it, chew and then spit it out.
"Ragnar will smell the onion and know she has
eaten but is not sated."
Overnight Ragnar had moved his warship closer to
the beach. Now, seeing her upon the strand, he called
to her, asking if she was the one whom men said was
dearer than Póra the Fair.
"I come at the bidding of Ragnar, renowned
through all the northlands - no maid would dare
refuse him. As you commanded, I stand before you
naked yet clothed, neither hungry nor full, alone but
with a companion."
"Come to me," said Ragnar.
"I will come to you if you promise me and my
companion safe conduct," said the brave maiden.
"You shall have it," said Ragnar. He sent his men to
row her to the warship.
When Kraka stood before him, the blood rose in
Ragnar Loðbrók as it had not done since Póra, and
he reached for her. But Ake's dog, seeing this, bit
Ragnar's hand. Ragnar's men prised the animal off
the king and strangled it. Thus died the only creature
that Ake, the old man, loved.
Ragnar's wound was not deep, and he seated Kraka
beside him while it was bound, and spoke with her.
"The kindness of a king might expect to be repaid
by the embrace of a fair maid," he said, and as he
spoke he had his men lay out rich cloth and gold and
jewels before Kraka.
But the maid replied, "A true king keeps his word.
You have promised me safe conduct: surely you will
honour your oath and let me go hence, a maid intact."
Ragnar said, "I would wish that you come with me."
Kraka shook her head. "I know well you have set
forth upon some task: you are a viking, and it may
well be that when you return you will have forgotten
me. But know this, O King. If, when you sail again
past the farm at Spangareid, you remember me, then
I will give thought again on coming with you."
Ragnar had his men bring forth a dress of woven
gold, one that Póra had worn, and laid it before Kraka.
But Kraka refused the gift. "What suits this maid, who
drives the goats to water, are rags, not the fine clothes
of Póra the All-Fair. Nor can I wear such clothes while
I live with Grima and Ake. But if you still wish me to
go with you when you return, then send your men to
call for me and I will listen to their words."
Ragnar swore oath upon his gold armring that he
would not forget Kraka. But Kraka gave him no more
answer, and Ragnar had his men take her back to
shore. Then, with the wind shifting, Ragnar set sail.
But always before his eyes was the memory of the
maid who had come to him naked and yet clothed.
Then came the evening when, looking to the bay,
Kraka saw the snake-proved ship riding there, and
men rowing to shore.
"The king has returned for you, as he swore,"
Ragnar's men told her.
"I will come with you in the morning," said Kráka.
As the sun rose, Kráka went to where Gríma and
Ake lay abed, and spoke to her foster parents in tones
she had never used before.

The saga of Ragnar Lodbrok, illustrated by
19th-century painter August Malmström

Two manuscripts survive of the saga of Ragnar Loðbrók
(Ragnars saga lodbrokar). They were written at the start
of the 19th century but are thought to be retellings of a
lost original written around 1230. The manuscript
presents Ragnar's saga as the direct continuation of
Völsunga saga. This is the main source of the story of
Ragnar, beginning with the story of how Aslaug is
raised by Grima and Ake and concluding with the adventures
of the sons of Loðbrók. The saga includes material telling
of Ragnar's death and the revenge of his sons, which
is recounted in the next chapter of this book, together
with further material from the Tale of Ragnar's Sons
(Patr xor Ragnars sonum). Further tales of Ragnar were
included in the lost Skjaldunge saga, but, fortunately,
large portions of Skjaldunge saga were included in a
Latin version of the saga written by the Icelandic
historian Arngrímur Jónsson in 1596.

The Sögubrot ('saga fragment') is part of the lost
Skjaldunge saga incorporating a little about Ragnar
and more about his sons. Finally, the Krákalum, which
is found in the same manuscript as the one containing
Ragnars saga loðbrokar is a poem in the typical Norse
form of a 'life poem' generally sung, ironically, as the
protagonist is dying. As dying people are said to see
their life pass before their eyes, the life poem also
reviews the deeds of the dying hero, who thereby takes
an inordinate amount of time to pass into death.
"You think me too young to remember what you did when first I came to you: how, though bound by guest law, you killed my foster father, Heimir the Faithful. But I remember well."

Kraka pointed at Áke. "I killed the dog, which alone you loved, for in truth none could love Grimr Sharp-Tongue. I could have paid you back myself, killing you as you slept just as you killed Heimir, but in memory of the years I have lived with you I have stayed my hand. But know this: I now pronounce your doom. From today, each day that passes shall be worse than the day it follows, and the worst shall be your last. Now, we part forever."

Then Kraka went to where the boat waited for her. The king welcomed her but when night came he would sleep with her, Kraka refused.

"Before I come to your bed, I would have a wedding feast, and a welcome in your land."

Ragnar, hearing the wisdom of this, accepted, but urged his men to sail all the faster. Once at his kingdom, he ordered a great wedding feast and Ragnar and Kraka were married. But that night, when Ragnar would lie with her for the first time, Kraka put her finger to his lips.

"Wait," she said. "You have waited long, but wait just three nights more. For if we share a bed tonight, then my heart tells me the child I bear shall suffer for our impatience."

But Ragnar roared with laughter. "I have waited months, Kraka, months."

"I have given you gold and silver, my kingdom and my heart. I will wait for you no longer."

So that night they were joined, and their marriage healed the pain of Þóra's loss. But the telling of Kraka's heart proved true; for their first child, born of that first coupling, had gristle where his bones should have been, and he was named Ívar the Boneless. Though boundless in wit, his men had to bear him on their shields; for he could barely walk.

There were other sons born to Ragnar and Kraka: Björn and Halfdan. But some of Ragnar's men began to whisper that it was not fit for a king to be married to a peasant. Óystein, king of the Swedes, had a daughter of great beauty. Ragnar should forget Kraka and marry that woman instead. But Kraka, hearing tell of this, told him the tale of how she was in fact Aslaug, the daughter of the hero Sigurd and the valkyrie Brynhild. But Ragnar would not believe her tale. Kraka said, "If my words be true, then the son who sits now in my belly will bear a mark like a snake lying in his eye, and you will call him Sigurd Snake-in-the-Eye."

"Wait," she said. "You have waited long, but wait just three nights more. For if we share a bed tonight, then my heart tells me the child I bear shall suffer for our impatience."

So it was. Kraka gave birth to a boy and when he opened his eyes for the first time, Ragnar saw there a mark like a coiled snake. And all men came to know that Kraka was, in truth, Aslaug, daughter of Sigurd Dragon Slayer and Brynhild the Fair.

The tale of their sons is told in the saga of the sons of Ragnar. It also tells of how Ragnar met his death when King Ælle cast him into a pit of serpents.

There too is told how Ragnar's sons took terrible vengeance for the killing of their father, and many other things beside. But now, this tale of Ragnar Lodbrok is done.
Charles II’s Great Escape
After he was defeated, the king became the most wanted man in England and embarked on the greatest adventure of his life

Written by Melanie Clegg

On 5 August 1651, a Scottish Covenanter army crossed the border into England and proceeded to make its way south, its progress hampered by internal strife between King Charles and his Scottish commanders, the apathy of the troops and the overt hostility of the English. Any vague hopes Charles might have had that he would be hailed as a conquering hero and feted in every town and village along his route would turn to ashes when he found city gates barred against him and previously loyal royalists refusing to join him.

By the time Charles and his men reached Worcester on 22 August, they were exhausted, starving and thoroughly fed up. They had been beset by mass desertions since crossing the border and now comprised a mere 16,000 men - a respectable amount in other circumstances, but definitely no match for the huge Commonwealth army that was heading their way and which would attack on 2 September, the first anniversary of the Battle of Dunbar.

Charles knew right from the start that it would take a miracle to beat Cromwell's army, but even while his forces were being decimated, he fought to the very end and showed remarkable courage and perseverance in the face of certain defeat as the battle descended into desperate hand-to-hand combat in the city streets. He wanted to stay until the bitter end, but as dusk fell on the blood-splattered streets of Worcester and it became impossible to ignore the fact that his cause was in tatters, he finally agreed to flee the city, which involved narrowly evading capture by the enemy troops that had been ordered to seize him at his lodgings before slipping out through St Martin’s Gate in the north of the city while a few of his last remaining cavalry troops distracted the enemy by mounting a final desperate charge down the High Street. Charles was exhausted, depressed and defeated and he was about to embark on the greatest adventure of his life.

Charles did not escape from the debacle at Worcester alone; with him was a faithful band of around 60 supporters, including his friends Lord Wilmot, Lord Derby and Charles Giffard. They knew that Cromwell would waste no time before sending troops out into the countryside to
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apprehend them and so their main priority was to get as far away from Worcester as possible before finding somewhere to hide out.

After they got hopelessly lost in the dark and unfamiliar countryside, Lord Derby suggested that they asked for help from a royalist Catholic family, headed by the five Penderel brothers of Boscobel House, who had sheltered him after he was injured a week earlier. The party therefore rode in the direction of Kidderminster before making their way to one of Giffard’s properties, where they sent a message to the Penderels, who were luckily more than willing to take on the huge risk of sheltering the fugitive king. As Charles was unusually tall and had a distinctive swarthy appearance, the group did what they could to disguise him by dressing him in farm labourer clothes, cutting his long dark hair, teaching him the local dialect and squashing his feet into peasant shoes, which were far too small for his enormous feet and caused him terrible discomfort.

Thus disguised, Charles was taken in the early hours of the morning to a nearby coppice, where he spent the day hiding with one of the Penderel brothers, while enemy troops scoured the countryside for him. They had nothing to eat or drink and there was torrential rain all day, which made them miserable but at least meant that the enemy was just as keen to get indoors and so did not search the woods as diligently as they might otherwise have done. As soon as night fell, the pair snuck to a nearby manor for food before heading on foot to Madeley Court in Shropshire, close to the Welsh border. However, when they got there in the middle of the night, it was to learn that it was deserted. Thus disguised, Charles made it plain that even though he wasn’t welcome until he was decided absolutely was left with no option but to make the same mistake and was decisively crushed by Cromwell’s at the Battle of Dunbar in September 1650.

Almost a week after Charles’ escape from Worcester, Cromwell issued this poster offering a reward for Charles’ capture – from this point on he became the most wanted man in his own kingdom.
In a story full of acts of heroism, that of Jane Lane, who accompanied a disguised Charles as he rode south to Bristol, is perhaps one of the most significant. After the Restoration, Charles would look back on his great escape as one of the most important and exciting times in his life, even if at the time, he was often frightened, hungry, cold and depressed.
Wolverhampton, another Catholic residence where he was reunited with his friend Lord Wilmot. Although he had ridden an old mill horse part of the way, he made most of the journey by foot, which meant that he was in terrible pain by the time he arrived at Moseley. Charles was already deeply impressed and touched by the risks that his Catholic subjects were prepared to take on his behalf, but when a priest knelt before him to wash and treat his injured feet, he was completely overcome and promised that when he regained his crown, Catholics would no longer suffer the persecutions that they had endured since the Reformation. Although he was very conscious of the need to distance himself from the Catholicism practised by his mother and her circle, which naturally led to constant rumours that he himself was a secret Papist, from this point onwards Charles would indeed feel a great sympathy and gratitude towards his Catholic subjects, who were already endangering themselves by practising their faith and yet still willingly risked their lives by helping him to escape.

Charles spent two days at Moseley Old Hall where, to his great relief, he was able to sleep in a bed for the first time since he had escaped Worcester. However, once again he found himself hurriedly stuffed into a priest hole when enemy troops arrived to search the house and interrogate the owner, Thomas Whitgreave, who was known to be a royalist sympathiser. By the time he was able to emerge from his cramped hiding place, Charles had resolved to leave Moseley and so, at the suggestion of Wilmot, moved on in the middle of the night to Bentley Hall, which was an hour away by foot and the residence of a royalist officer, Colonel Lane, and his intrepid sister Jane.

The reason for this move was that Wilmot had discovered that Jane Lane, a Catholic who was required by law to apply for an official travel permit if she wished to travel beyond a five-mile radius of her home, was in possession of a permit that would enable her to travel with a male servant in order to visit her heavily pregnant sister who lived in Abbeys Leigh near Bristol. The quick-witted Wilmot immediately realised what a perfect opportunity this was to get Charles out of the area and the plan was made all the more attractive by the fact that Bristol was then one of the main ports in England with ships leaving for destinations all around Europe, including France.

In the early hours of 10 September, eight days after his escape from Worcester, Charles, who went by the alias of Will Jackson, once again donned servant clothes and assumed the local accent before setting off on the road south, with Jane Lane perched behind him on his horse. At first they made good time, but then were forced to halt in Bromsgrove when they discovered that their horse had lost a shoe. As the servant, it was Charles’ task to deal with the blacksmith, who turned out to be a great admirer of Cromwell. When Charles asked him if there was any news about the aftermath of Worcester, the smith replied that “that rogue Charles Stuart” had not been captured, upon which Charles mischievously and not a little ruefully “told him that if that rogue were taken, he deserved to be hanged more than all the rest, for bringing in the Scots”, upon which the smith grinned and told the fugitive king that he “spoke like an honest fellow”, upon which they parted on the best of terms.

The rest of the journey south passed without incident, although they encountered Commonwealth troops several times along the way.

On one occasion, they stayed with one of Jane’s relatives, but while she slept in comfort upstairs, Charles spent the evening with the servants and was even asked to turn the spit in the kitchen, which he did so badly that the cook loudly scolded him for being useless.
Charles II’s Great Escape

Boscobel House
Boscobel was home to the Penderel family, which was headed by five devoutly Catholic brothers. Luckily for Charles they were more than willing to help him escape, and they sheltered him for several days.

Madeley Court
Charles knew that he had support in Wales and so it was decided that he should move on to Madeley Court, close to the Welsh border. But on arriving there, he was immediately turned away as the area was rife with enemy patrols searching for him.

Kidderminster
After narrowly escaping the debacle at Worcester, Charles and his band of fellow fugitives headed for Kidderminster but ended up getting lost due to the darkness and unfamiliarity of the countryside. They stopped at Kinver Heath close by in order to make a proper plan for Charles’ escape.

Worcester
A strategically important city close to the Welsh border, it was here that Charles and his Scottish army clashed with Cromwell’s troops in September 1651. The battle lasted for several hours and after the royalist army was driven back into the city, involved fighting in the streets, where they were decisively defeated.

Moseley Hall
After leaving Boscobel, Charles went, mostly by foot, to Moseley Hall, where his injured feet were tended by a Catholic priest, Father John Huddleston. Many years later, when Charles was on his deathbed, Huddleston visited him and administered the last rites so that Charles died as a Roman Catholic.

Bentley Hall
The residence of Captain Lane and his courageous sister Jane, who would ride with a heavily disguised Charles to Bristol when it was decided that he should move further south.
On 12 September, they reached their destination, Abbots Leigh, where they remained for three days with Charles styalng in character as Will Jackson the whole time so that not even Jane’s sister and her family knew his true identity. There was a scare early on when one of the servants, who had fought in Charles’ own regiment, tried to describe the king to a friend and when asked if it was true that he was unusually tall, gestured towards Charles, without realising who he was, and said that he was three fingers taller than Mistress Lane’s new servant. Meanwhile, another servant, the butler John Pope, who had once worked for Charles’ father, quietly informed Jane that he had instantly guessed that Will Jackson, with his close cropped hair, curious accent and unusually big feet, was not all that he seemed.

Luckily, Pope was extremely loyal and the perfect accomplice when it came to discreetly making enquiries in nearby Bristol about the next sailings to France or Spain – only to discover that there were no suitable ships for almost a month. Charles definitely couldn’t wait four weeks so Pope was extremely loyal and the perfect accomplice when it came to discreetly making enquiries in nearby Bristol about the next sailings to France or Spain – only to discover that there were no suitable ships for almost a month. Charles definitely couldn’t wait four weeks so Pope was extremely loyal and the perfect accomplice when it came to discreetly making enquiries in nearby Bristol about the next sailings to France or Spain – only to discover that there were no suitable ships for almost a month. Charles definitely couldn’t wait four weeks so Pope suggested that he move further south to Trent House, near Sherborne in Dorset, the residence of the Wyndham family, who had perfect royalist credentials as they were connected by marriage to Charles’ former wet nurse. The Wyndhams hoped to smuggle Charles out of the country from one of the many West Country ports, most likely nearby Lyme, and began negotiations with a Captain Ellesdon, who might be prepared to whisk Charles, now pretending to be an impecunious gentleman trying to escape his creditors, out of the country to Saint-Malo in France. In the meantime, Charles did his best to stay out of trouble, although on one occasion he was sent to the nearby church to find out why the bells had suddenly started pealing, only to be gleefully informed, to his mingled amusement and horror, that they were tolling because the king had been killed at Worcester.

By 22 September, they had managed to strike a deal with Ellesdon, who arranged for a local sailor by the name of Limbry to pick Charles and Lord Wilmot up in Charmouth and convey them to France for the princely sum of £60. As Jane Lane had already returned home, this time Charles’ companion was Juliana Coningsby, a cousin of Captain Wyndham, who gamely agreed to pretend that she was eloping with the young king – a subterfuge that continued when they reached the inn in Charmouth where they were to wait while Wilmot went down to the coast to meet their boat and make sure that all was well before Charles emerged. When Limbry failed to make an appearance because his wife had become suspicious and locked him in their house to ensure that he couldn’t keep his secret nighttime rendezvous, the group were forced to think of a new plan.

Desperate to leave England at any cost, Charles suggested that they continue along the coast to Bridport to see if there were any ships leaving from there, only to arrive and find the town full of Commonwealth soldiers waiting to embark for the Channel Islands. It may have been more prudent to abandon the plan altogether but Charles boldly rode into the very heart of the town and dismounted at a busy inn. When it became clear that there were no boats to be had, Charles and Juliana met up with Wilmot, who had travelled to Bridport separately, and decided that it was time to beat a hasty retreat before they were recognised.

Their behaviour in Charmouth had already raised suspicions and by taking a small country lane rather than the main route out of Bridport, and they narrowly escaped colliding with a patrol that was looking for them. Unfortunately, neither Charles nor Wilmot were especially well acquainted with the area and they soon became lost, which forced them to halt in the next village and take a room so that they could recover and plan their next move. They were just settling down for the night when some enemy soldiers arrived and took over the downstairs rooms.

Charles and Wilmot had no idea what to do until one of the camp followers who accompanied the
The house most closely associated with Charles’ escape is Boscobel House in Shropshire.

“Charles was informed that the bells were tolling because the king was dead”

troops went into labour and a huge fight broke out between the soldiers, inn keeper and locals about who would have responsibility for the baby should the mother decide to abandon it in the parish. Luckily for Charles, the soldiers made themselves so unpopular in the process that they were asked to leave, clearing the way for Charles to make his escape back to Trent House shortly afterwards.

For the next two weeks, Charles was forced to lie low while the Wyndham family and the always redoubtable Wilmot worked hard to put together another plan to smuggle their king out of the country to safety. As all of the nearby West Country ports were full of Commonwealth troops waiting to be sent to the Channel Islands, it was decided that Charles should travel incognito much further along the coast to Sussex, where Wilmot was already building up a network of useful contacts who might be able to help.

Accordingly, on 6 October, Charles and Juliana once again set out, this time turning their horses east towards Heale House in Amesbury, which was owned by Katherine Hyde, a cousin of Charles’ friend Edward Hyde. Although he had intended to keep up his pretence of being Juliana’s servant, he was immediately recognised by Mrs Hyde, who told him that although she was loyal, she couldn’t vouch for anyone else in her household and so advised that he pretend to leave at first light and then quietly return later in the day before hiding out in the house’s priest hole. As always, Charles agreed to do whatever was necessary to ensure the safety of his host and used the pretence of leaving as an opportunity to visit nearby Stonehenge, which he had never seen before.

Charles stayed at Heale House for five days while he waited for Wilmot to send word about his next move, spending most of his time in the cramped confines of the house’s priest hole - an experience that left him with a dislike of confined spaces. When Wilmot finally gave the all clear on 13 October, Charles continued along the coast to Brighthelmstone (now known as Brighton), where he stayed in the George Inn on West Street while Wilmot made the final arrangements for his departure, which involved getting a local merchant drunk enough to agree to help Charles and Wilmot, this time posing as a pair of fugitive illegal duellists, out of the country by acting as a go-between with a Captain Tattershall, who had a vessel waiting to depart to France. Everything went smoothly until the evening before their planned departure when Tattershall came to the George Inn to meet his passengers and immediately recognised Charles. Although he assured the young king of his loyalty and desire to serve him, he still could not resist holding him to ransom by refusing to leave at the planned hour until he had been given more money.

In the early hours of the next morning, Charles and Wilmot finally climbed on board Tattershall’s ship, the aptly named Surprise, and five hours later, when the tide had at last turned in their favour, they set sail for France. It was 15 October and Charles had been a fugitive for over six weeks – he had been depressed, uncomfortable, cold, wet, terrified, exhausted and hungry, but as the English coastline slipped slowly out of view, his overwhelming feeling was probably elation, not just to have survived despite the odds being stacked so overwhelmingly against him but to have experienced first-hand the enduring loyalty and affection of his people, many of whom risked their own lives in order to help him. It was an extraordinary and humbling experience that he would never forget and would have a profound effect on him for the rest of his life.
Forget Hillary Clinton’s failure to take the White House. The fascinating story of Woodrow Wilson’s second wife Edith raises the question of whether America has already had a female president - and just didn’t know it.

Written by Beth Wyatt

On 2 October 1919, Edith Bolling Wilson’s life took a traumatic turn. Her husband Woodrow Wilson, 28th President of the United States, had suffered a stroke, which partially paralysed his body and severely weakened his constitution, leaving him “a shadow of his former self”, according to his butler Ike Hoover. Edith was a dutiful First Lady, devoted to her husband and his public service, and proud of her role as his most treasured confidante. But her husband’s ill health led Edith to assume what has been described as her ‘secret presidency’, an unprecedented development that prompted gossip and controversy at the time and has been hotly debated ever since. Until Woodrow’s term concluded in 1921, Edith looked after his business, acting as a gatekeeper who managed access to the president, chose which matters should or should not be presented to him, and collaborated with his physician to conceal the gravity of his illness.

Edith’s “stewardship”, as she described it, did not go unnoticed – one outraged Republican senator dismissed it as the “petticoat government”. Edith’s life had become far removed from the heady days of 1915 when she was courted by the lovestruck president.
The couple crossed paths in unsettling times. Europe and the wider world were held in the grip of a war that had killed and wounded thousands, and would take many more lives before its end. Pressure was increasing on Woodrow and his administration, with the sinking of ocean liner the Lusitania – which caused the deaths of more than 1,000 people including 128 Americans – leading to questions of whether the United States should intervene in World War I. The president had some weighty decisions ahead of him, but he was to be driven to distraction by a vivacious widow called Edith Bolling Galt. The 42-year-old, born and raised in Virginia, was to turn her fellow southerner’s head quite considerably.

It is said the 58-year-old president first caught a glimpse of Edith strolling down a Washington street, but they were not to meet until an introduction was hosted by Woodrow’s cousin Helen Bones at the White House in March 1915. Edith and Woodrow had both been widowed – the president was heartbroken at the death of Ellen, his wife of almost 30 years, in August 1914, and Edith’s husband of 12 years, Norman Galt, had died in 1908. Edith experienced a new independence following her husband’s death. She inherited his family’s prosperous jewellery business, toured Europe, and upon her return to Washington she was known for driving her new automobile around its streets (it is thought she was one of the first women to drive in the capital). Woodrow was taken by the intriguing Edith, and he began to conduct himself in a manner quite at odds with his public image as a serious, academically minded man.

The president wrote numerous love letters to Edith, gifted her with roses, orchids and books, and took her on strolls around Rock Creek Park, where it is said that he jumped over walls and hugged her, to the embarrassment of the secret service men accompanying them. It didn’t take long for Woodrow’s colleagues and the media to cotton on to this budding romance. He proposed just two months after the couple had met. Edith declined this advance, possibly due to conventions of the time that saw women reject initial proposals. When she later reconsidered, Edith had reservations due to the timing – the president was due to run for another term in the 1916 elections. But she shook them off, and the pair were wed in a private service at Edith’s Washington home on 18 December 1915.

It soon became apparent that Edith made a fine First Lady. America entered World War I in 1917 and throughout the remainder of the conflict’s duration, Edith set an example to the American public through activities such as forming a Red Cross unit at the White House, grazing sheep on the lawn to avoid the use of a mower (and donating the sheep’s wool to the charity), sewing pyjamas for soldiers being cared for in hospitals, visiting wounded servicemen in the country and abroad, and hosting such dates as gasless Sundays,
“Edith set an example to the American public through activities such as forming a Red Cross unit at the White House”

Checklist for the modern First Lady

How Edith influenced the actions of future presidents’ wives

- **Play your part in times of adversity**
  Edith was a strong role model for American women during World War I. She set an example through taking up charity work, visiting wounded soldiers, and encouraging changes in diet and clothing where this would assist the war effort.

- **Champion a cause**
  First Ladies have been able to wield their own influence through promoting particular patriotic causes. But, it has been said, that where the likes of Eleanor Roosevelt championed social change, Edith’s passionate cause was her husband.

- **Schmooze international politicians and royalty**
  Edith mingled with high-ranking European politicians at the Paris Peace Conference, was a guest of King George and Queen Mary’s at Buckingham Palace, and admitted Belgium’s king and queen to Woodrow’s sickbed in the time after his stroke.

- **Pen a bestselling memoir**
  Michelle Obama is the latest in a long line of former First Ladies to publish a memoir. Edith’s intimate effort, *My Memoir*, became a bestseller, but criticism included arguments that she dabbled with the truth, and focused more on her social life than, for example, her ‘secret presidency’.

- **Preserve your husband’s legacy**
  Edith was committed to Woodrow to the end. In the decades following his passing, she donated his papers to the Library of Congress, looked over the script for the Hollywood film about his life, and agreed to their love letters being published (after her death).
meatless Mondays and wheatless Wednesdays at the White House.

Despite having little formal education, Edith proved to be an opinionated and devoted adviser to the president; indeed it has been said that the depths of her involvement with the daily routines of the White House were unlike that of any previous First Lady. Even during their engagement, Woodrow gave Edith copies of his speeches to gauge her thoughts on them; he also shared diplomatic statements with her. Edith once wrote to Woodrow: “Much as I love your delicious love letters I believe I enjoy even more the ones in which you tell me ... of what you are working on - the things that fill your thoughts and demand your best effort, for then I feel I am sharing your work and being taken into partnership as it were.”

Edith provided emotional and domestic, as well as political, support to her husband; she gave comfort as the strain of World War I grew on him; when his health worsened she encouraged him to change his diet and take up more exercise, and she had an influence in shaking up his public image - it has been remarked that Woodrow and Edith became in their time the most celebrated president and First Lady, surpassing all the couples who came before them.

Following the Allies’ victory in the war, Edith accompanied Woodrow to the Paris Peace Conference, and to subsequent tours of London and Rome at which they met the countries’ respective royal families. She also joined her husband on his 27-day tour of the United States.
in autumn 1919 to convince the country that they should ratify the Treaty of Versailles and join Woodrow's newly formed global peace organisation, the League of Nations. But as Edith and Dr Cary T Grayson, his physician, had feared, the tour took a toll on Woodrow's health and he fell gravely ill. On 25 September 1919 the president collapsed following a speech he gave in Pueblo, Colorado, and the trio rushed back to Washington. But Woodrow had a severe stroke on 2 October and it seems he was never able to recover from this trauma.

Edith took the reins. To what extent is debatable - some have said she was in effect America's first, and only, female president, while others argue that she had little real power and was only carrying President Wilson's wishes, both vocally communicated and those she assumed of him. The First Lady wrote about what she described as her “stewardship” in *My Memoir*, the autobiography she published in 1938 and which was partially serialised in *The Saturday Evening Post* as Europe marched towards another global war. An extract titled 'When Woodrow Was III', published on 25 February 1939, saw Edith write: "I studied every paper, sent for the different secretaries or senators, and tried to digest and present in tabloid form the things that, despite my vigilance, had to go to the President. I, myself, never made a single decision regarding the disposition of public affairs. The only decision that was mine was what was important and what was not, and the very important decision of when to present them to my husband."

But some politicians did not see it this way. Republican Senator Albert Fall, an opponent of Wilson's, declared in outrage: "We have a petticoat government! Wilson is not acting! Mrs Wilson is President!"

One particularly controversial element of Edith's stewardship was the fact that she deliberately concealed the severity of her husband's illness. In her previously mentioned article 'When Woodrow Was III', she wrote that Woodrow's mind had not been affected by his stroke: "An arm and one leg were useless, but, thank God, the brain was clear and untouched." She added that she enquired with his doctors about whether he should resign and one strongly advised against taking such a course of action, as it would have a negative impact on both the president and the country.

Edith's memoir has been heavily scrutinised, and indeed one of her biographers exclaimed it was “fanciful”. Her description of Woodrow being entirely fit to continue as president does not stand up in the face of the knowledge we have of his condition - his left arm was paralysed by the stroke, he was blind in one eye, his voice would give out after speaking for a while, and he was hardly able to move; he could not get out of bed until mid-November. The president was after some time able to independently walk short distances, but he was so weak that he couldn't attend a cabinet meeting until spring 1920.

Edith and Dr Grayson cooed the president from the outside world, allowing him contact only with themselves and his daughters from his first marriage (Edith and Woodrow did not have any children together). In an entire month, no one from the government saw the president, and the public was made to believe that he was resting from a bout of exhaustion. Not everyone was satisfied with this explanation. On 5 December 1919, Republicans sitting in Congress sent representatives to look upon his condition in person. This incident, later christened the visit of the "smelling committee", was no challenge for Edith and Dr Grayson - they simply adjusted Woodrow's position and posture so the true extent of his disabilities was hidden.

The First Lady may have claimed that she brought all important matters before the president, but it has been said that there were many letters left unopened and issues ignored, with Edith either neglecting the approaches of cabinet members or approving their actions based on her views or those she predicted of her husband. Arguments that Edith was de facto president waver in light of the government appearing to have not functioned well at all - America almost went to war with Mexico over a dispute about Americans drilling for oil in the country, and Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, could not get through to Edith, and by extension Woodrow, for a long time. Eventually the issue was brought
Edith has been described as the most powerful of all America’s First Ladies, with her stewardship of the administration following her husband’s stroke in 1919. But the ascendancy in public life she had experienced since marrying Woodrow Wilson did not mean she was inclined for other women to occupy such prominent positions in American society. In fact, Edith, who was known for her strong opinions, has been described as an opponent of women’s suffrage movements in the United States. She came into conflict with the matter due to her husband increasingly becoming the target of protests by campaigners, with women frequently picketing the White House. Woodrow began to sympathise with the idea of states being able to decide for or against votes for women, but he was not interested in securing national suffrage for them. Edith, who appeared to particularly dislike Alice Paul’s National Woman’s Party, made comments such as describing suffrage campaigners as “despicable”, and she wrote in her diary that she hated the subject with “acute agony”. Though it has to be said that some historians have suggested that Edith’s views were more ambiguous and that she didn’t deny she was a supporter in the face of overwhelming public opinion that she was. It has been argued that the First Lady was concerned about what women’s suffrage would mean for her role as her husband’s champion and protector. Woodrow eventually changed his mind on the matter, partially it seemed because of women’s efforts in World War I, and Edith took the chance to join her husband in voting for the next president in 1920.
“Edith’s denial of reality saw her implore her husband to seek a third term in 1920, when he could not even make it down the corridor to his office”

before the president and he was able to direct a solution and diffuse the crisis. Edith’s handling of the storm around the United States joining the League of Nations has also been intensely debated, with some commentators theorising that Edith’s failure to bring differing voices before the president - rather than just her own - meant there was less chance of Woodrow offering compromises to his opponents, and therefore the possibility of the country becoming a member of the League was lost.

However the reader stands on the matter of whether Edith was or was not the ‘secret president’, it is clear that her role in controlling access to her husband meant she was able to freeze out those advisors of his she distrusted. Her chief concern was in facilitating the president’s public service by being his closest confidante and adviser; she was fiercely protective and had a long-held hostility towards many politicians in his circle. Woodrow’s adviser, Edward M House, and his Secretary of the Treasury, William G McAdoo, for example, offended Edith when they encouraged the president to not marry her ahead of the 1916 presidential elections, using a fictional blackmail threat from Mary Hulbert Peck - a woman Woodrow had been close to during his first marriage - to bolster these attempts. Others Edith was suspicious of included Joe Tumulty, her husband’s personal secretary, who also cautioned against the marriage taking place at that time; Secretary of State Robert Lansing - who she saw as a traitor because he held cabinet meetings while Woodrow was ill following his stroke; and Henry Cabot Lodge, the Republican senator who spearheaded the opposition to America approving the Treaty of Versailles - Edith had her revenge on the latter by refusing his request to attend the president’s funeral.

Given the severity of Woodrow’s condition, it seems extraordinary that he remained in post as president. It is unclear how the history of post-war America, which suffered the same economic gloom as Europe, could have been different if vice president Thomas Riley Marshall had taken over and government had been able to operate at its full efficiency. Edith’s denial of reality saw her implore her husband to seek a third term in 1920, when he could not even make it down the corridor to his office. But the Democrats did not renominate him, and Republican Warren G Harding was elected in 1921 on a campaign that promised “a return to normalcy”.

In March that year, the former president and first lady settled into a new home in Washington and Edith cared for her husband until he died in 1924 aged 67. She devoted the rest of her life to ensuring his legacy lived on - her autobiography My Memoir (1938) was a bestseller, she permitted the couple’s love letters to be edited and published after her death, and she assisted Ray Stannard Baker in collating material for his authorised, eight-volume biography of Woodrow, which won the Pulitzer Prize.

Edith also donated her husband’s papers to the Library of Congress, aided the establishment of what became the Woodrow Wilson Library and Museum (at the Virginia residence where he was born), read, in 1942, the script for the Hollywood movie Wilson, and took part in the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Events in 1956, celebrating 100 years since his birth.

The former First Lady remained relatively active in Democrat Party circles for the rest of her life. She campaigned for Franklin D Roosevelt when he was a nominee for the presidency (Edith was a long-time friend of Roosevelt and his wife Eleanor), took part in party conventions, and in 1961 was invited by John F Kennedy to join his inaugural procession. Typifying her never-ending devotion to her husband and his memory, Edith was on the day she died due to attend the unveiling of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge, built to link Washington to Maryland and Virginia. This date, 28 December 1961, was the anniversary of her husband’s birth 105 years earlier. The 89-year-old Edith was buried alongside Woodrow at the Washington National Cathedral following her funeral there. She is the only First Lady to have had a funeral held at the cathedral.

Edith’s ‘secret presidency’ has continued to fascinate, and it was brought into the spotlight when Hillary Clinton vied to become the US’s first woman president. As that ultimate glass ceiling continues to elude women, Edith’s unlikely story will surely continue to be debated and enjoyed.
Murder, revenge and adultery. Would it surprise you that parts of the story of Cersei Lannisters can be found in the stories of the real she-wolves of Medieval history?

Written by Sharon Bennett Connolly

Ruthless, methodical, direct, unrelenting, driven. Just some of the words that might be used to describe some of the most powerful and influential women of the long, dark Medieval era. Of course different terms may have been used about them at the time: manipulative, conniving, duplicitous, power-hungry and so on. In fact, such terms were probably still being passed around until fairly recently when we began to reassess centuries of gender-driven bias against these women.

Does that alone make them people to be admired? No, not necessarily. No more than we might admire the men of this era who were similarly motivated or compelled towards power. Their stories are, however, hugely compelling and are hard to view without some admiration given the societal hurdles they were forced to overcome in a world where power more often than not lay in the hands of men. Still, the Medieval queens and consorts navigated the halls of power and managed to carve for themselves some portion of political influence that was not only used to protect themselves against the tides of fortune that might otherwise scupper them, but used as a foundation from which they struck out and made advances for themselves.

Such women, who came to be deemed she-wolves as a derogatory epithet, a term that has been somewhat reclaimed as an empowering association in the centuries since, remain massively interesting figures. And with the success of shows like Game of Thrones with its fictional versions of similarly powerful and driven women, we can’t help but think that they remain as influential now on our understanding of the way women are expected to wield power as they would have been in their own time. So, what follows is a series of profiles on some of the most important ‘she-wolves’ of Medieval history from the 10th to the 14th century, from consorts to warrior women, usurpers to natural-born leaders. Cross them at your peril.
While often magnanimous in victory, Æthelflæd could be ruthless when it was her friends who were attacked; even she was not immune from the desire for revenge.

Æthelflæd
Lady of Mercia

The daughter of King Alfred the Great, Æthelflæd was married to Æthelred, ealdorman of Mercia. She was a strong, brave woman, and is often regarded more as a partner to Æthelred than a meek, obedient wife. Although she exercised regal rights in Mercia even before her husband’s death, after Æthelred died in 911 CE, it was left to Æthelflæd to lead the Mercians in the fight against the Danes. Alongside her brother, King Edward of Wessex, it is universally acknowledged that Æthelflæd helped to push back the Viking incursions. Losing four of her greatest captains in the battle to capture Derby in 917 CE, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reported: “With God’s help Ethelfleda, lady of Mercia, captured the fortress known as Derby with all its assets. Four of her favoured ministers were slain inside the gates.” In 918 CE, Æthelflæd captured Leicester, ravaging the countryside around the town until the Danes surrendered.

The combination of her indefatigable forces and compassion in victory saw the Danes soon suing for peace; in the summer of 918 CE, the noblemen and magnates of York sent emissaries to Æthelflæd, promising that they would surrender to her. She personally led campaigns against the Welsh, the Norse and the Danes – though whether she actually wielded a sword in battle is unknown.

While often magnanimous in victory, Æthelflæd could be ruthless when it was her friends who were attacked. In June 916 CE, on the feast of Saint Cyriac, Æthelflæd’s good friend Abbot Egbert was murdered for no known reason. The Mercian abbot and his retainers were ambushed and killed while travelling in the Welsh mountain kingdom of Brycheiniog. The abbot had been under Æthelflæd’s protection and within three days she was leading an army into Wales to exact revenge. Her army ravaged Brycheiniog, burning the little kingdom and taking many hostages. Although King Tewdr escaped Æthelflæd, his wife did not; Queen Angharad and 33 others were taken back to Mercia as hostages. Æthelflæd’s strength and determination was complemented by her quick actions and an impressive ruthless streak. When the Welsh king eventually submitted to Æthelflæd, he promised to serve her faithfully.

Æthelflæd died suddenly in June 918 CE. She did not live to see the successful conclusion to the work she and her brother had worked tirelessly to achieve; between 910 and 920 CE, all Danish territories south of Yorkshire had been conquered.
At first sight, it is easy to have sympathy for Isabella of Angouleme. She was married at a very young age - she was no more than 12 and may have been as young as ten - to 'Bad' King John, the man who left women to starve in his dungeons and murdered his own nephew. Isabella and John were married in 1200 and, after 16 years together, they had five children; the youngest, Eleanor, was born in 1215.

When John died in October 1216, however, Isabella didn’t spend much time seeking to comfort and protect her children. As soon as her oldest son, Henry III, was crowned with her own ‘chaplet’, Isabella started making arrangements to go home, to her own lands in Angouleme, France. In 1217 she left England, supposedly escorting her daughter Joan to her new family, but she never returned. Joan had been betrothed, at the age of four, to Hugh X de Lusignan, Count of La Marche and the son of Hugh IX de Lusignan.

In 1220, however, in a scandalous about-face Hugh IX repudiated Joan and married her mother, his father’s former betrothed. And poor nine-year-old Joan’s erstwhile betrothed was now her stepfather! But worse was to come...

Isabella is thought to have had a vicious temper, similar to her first husband, King John’s. Instead of being sent back to England, as you would expect, Joan went from being Hugh’s betrothed to his prisoner. She was held hostage to ensure Hugh’s continued control of her dower lands, and as a guarantee to the transfer of his new wife’s dower. England, on the other hand, was withholding Queen Isabella’s dower against the return of Joan’s dower lands.

Isabella wrote to her son, Henry III, to explain and justify why she had supplanted her own daughter as Hugh’s bride, claiming that his ‘friends’ were worried about Joan’s youth and forcing Hugh to repudiate the English princess in favour of a French bride who was old enough to bear him a son. Isabella had married Hugh to stop him going over to the French and to guarantee his allegiance to her son. Ironically, the proposed union of Hugh IX and Isabella, and of their lands, was the reason John had married Isabella in the first place – to prevent the lands of La Marche and Angouleme challenging Plantagenet superiority in the region. Little Joan was returned to England towards the end of 1220, but the arguments over Isabella’s English lands continued and they were confiscated, for a short time, in 1221.

Isabella would not retire in peace, however, and in 1224 she and Hugh betrayed Henry by allying themselves with the king of France. In exchange for a substantial pension, they supported a French invasion of Poitou (the lands in France belonging to the king of England, her son).

Although she reconciled with Henry in 1230, Isabella and Hugh continued to play the kings of France and England against each other, always looking for the advantage. In 1242, for example, when Henry III invaded Poitou, Hugh X initially gave support to his English stepson, only to change sides once more. Isabella herself was implicated in a plot to poison King Louis IX of France, only to be foiled at the last minute.

As contemporaries described her as “more Jezebel than Isabel”, accused her of “sorcery and witchcraft”, Isabella of Angouleme’s reputation as a heartless mother and habitual schemer seems set to remain. With little to recommend her, she stands out as a she-wolf with an impressive ruthless streak, even against her own son.
France seems to have suffered great with mental illness. Isabeau of Bavaria, Queen of France, has been accused of almost every crime imaginable, from adultery and incest to treason and avarice. Various described as being beautiful and hypnotic or so obese that she was crippled, the chroniclers have not been kind to Isabeau. According to them, her moral corruption led to the neglect of her children and betrayal of her husband and country.

However, they ignored the challenges faced by a queen whose husband was sinking deeper and deeper into the realms of insanity, going so far as killing four of his own knights during one mental breakdown and thinking he was made of glass in another. Married to King Charles VI of France, also known as Charles 'the Mad', Isabeau was left to raise her children and navigate the dangers and intrigues of court politics with little assistance from her mentally disturbed husband. Her political alliance with Louis of Orléans, her husband's brother, led to her imprisonment amid slanderous rumours of adultery and incest - from the opposing political party.

To add to this, France was - not that they knew it at the time - halfway through the conflict with England that would become known as the Hundred Years' War. The war was going badly for France - Henry V defeated them at Agincourt - and Isabeau was forced to put her signature to the Treaty of Troyes in 1420. In that instant she disinherited her own son, the dauphin, making Henry V heir to King Charles and handing France over to England. Much of Isabeau's life and career has been re-examined in the 20th century and she has been exonerated of many of the accusations against her, but, despite the fact Isabeau was backed into a corner, she still signed away her son's inheritance in favour of a foreign power.
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“Eleanor did, however, commit one of the most heinous crimes a woman could in the Medieval world”

Eleanor of Aquitaine is iconic. Probably the most famous woman of the Middle Ages, she is the only woman to have ever worn the crowns of both England and France.

Eleanor’s long life saw her weather the dangers of crusade, scandal, siege, imprisonment and betrayal to emerge as the great matriarch of Europe. When her first husband, Louis VII, led the Second Crusade, Eleanor went with him, only to find herself mired in scandal. Her uncle Raymond of Toulouse, Prince of Antioch, welcomed her warmly and lavished such attention on her that rumours arose of an affair. Despite a lack of concrete evidence, Eleanor spent most of the crusade under close guard on her husband’s orders. Louis and Eleanor’s marriage had been dealt a fatal blow; they left the Holy Land in 1149 and their divorce was finally proclaimed in March 1152. By May 1152, Eleanor was married again, this time to the man who would become her first husband’s rival. Henry of Anjou became king of England in 1154 and eventually built an empire that extended 1,000 miles, from Scotland in the north to the Pyrenees in the south.

Later rumours again mired Eleanor in scandal, accusing her of murdering Henry’s lover Rosamund Clifford. In one extravagant version, Rosamund was hidden in her secret bower within a maze but, with the help of a silken thread, jealous Eleanor still found her and stabbed her while she bathed. In another, the discarded queen forced Rosamund to drink from a poisoned cup. Of course, a closely guarded prisoner in Old Sarum or at Winchester as Eleanor was at the time of Rosamund’s death, it was impossible for her to do any such thing.

Eleanor did, however, commit one of the most heinous crimes a woman could in the Medieval world: she rebelled against her husband. In 1173, her eldest son by Henry, also called Henry, rebelled against his father and fled to the French court for support. His father-in-law, King Louis VII, welcomed the disgruntled Angevin prince and Eleanor of Aquitaine, having sided with her sons against her husband, sent two of her other sons, 15-year-old Richard and 14-year-old Geoffrey, to join their older brother at the French court, while she rallied her barons in Poitou to their cause. In 1174, when the rebellion failed, Henry accepted the submission of his sons.

Eleanor, who was captured as she rode towards safety in France, was not so fortunate. While it was not encouraged for sons to rebel against their father, it could be seen as boys flexing their muscles. For a wife to rebel against her husband was practically unheard of, and therefore deserved harsher punishment. Unforgiven and defeated, Eleanor was sent to perpetual imprisonment in various castles. She was only released after Henry II’s death, when her favourite son, Richard I, the Lionheart, ascended England’s throne.

If she had done everything of which she was accused - murder, incest, adultery and rebellion - Eleanor would be the ultimate she-wolf. As it was, her rebellion, an act unprecedented for a queen, meant she paid the price with her freedom for the next 15 years.
Isabella of France was the wife and queen of Edward II of England. In 1325, after 17 years of marriage, during a trip to France to negotiate terms with her brother, the French king Charles IV, who had seized Edward's lands in France, Isabella saw an opportunity to take a stand against the unfairness of her situation. Ignored, spied on and persecuted by her husband's favourite, the hated Hugh Despencer, Isabella refused to return home. Isabella took to wearing widow's weeds and claimed: "Someone has come between my husband and myself, trying to break this bond. I protest that I will not return until this intruder has been removed but, discarding my marriage garment, I shall assume the robes of widowhood and mourning until I am avenged of this Pharisee."

With her son Edward, the heir to the throne, with her in France, and with the help of her close friend and adviser - and, quite possibly, her lover - Roger Mortimer, Isabella started attracting support from Edward's disillusioned subjects. In 1326, she launched the invasion of England that would see her husband fleeing for his life in the face of her advancing army. Edward and Hugh were captured near Llantrisant in Wales. Edward was sent to imprisonment in Berkeley Castle. Hugh Despencer was taken before a military tribunal in Hereford, blamed for the collapse of the queen's marriage and humiliating Isabella. He was given no right to reply. Paraded through Hereford, before being dragged on a sled to the town square, Despencer suffered the full horror of a traitor's death. He was hanged from a specially-erected gallows, 50 feet high; cut down whilst still alive, his intestines were cut out and burned before his eyes, before his head was cut off to end his agony. Despencer's death demonstrated the anger Isabella felt towards her husband and his favourite. Edward's death may well have been just as gruesome - or not at all. Some claim he escaped to the continent, dying years later in Italy, while others are convinced that he was killed in Berkeley Castle, although probably not by a red-hot poker up his bum. Whatever happened to Edward, Isabella's revenge was complete; Despencer had been destroyed and Edward was deposed and replaced with his son, the 14-year-old Edward III.

For three years Isabella and Mortimer ruled England, only to be themselves deposed by Edward III when he turned 18; their own arrogance and mismanagement of England causing their downfall. Mortimer was hanged at Tyburn and Isabella spent her remaining years in house arrest, the she-wolf who had launched an invasion of England and deposed - and possibly murdered - her husband, only to be deposed herself.
Reigning over the world’s largest nation for over 300 years, the Romanov family oversaw great changes in Russian society. Read all about their story, and find out how they met their grisly end, in our riveting new bookazine.
HITLER’S WAR ON ART

Inside the 1937 exhibition of ‘degenerate art’ that the Nazis loved to hate

Written by Philippa Grafton

The ‘Degenerate Art’ exhibition is a gigantic success and a deadly blow,” wrote Joseph Goebbels on 24 July 1937, five days after the show’s opening.

A hit in the eyes of Hitler’s right-hand man and propaganda minister, the Degenerate Art exhibition was unlike any other exposition that had been put on in Germany before. This, after all, was one exhibition no artist wanted to be a part of, driven by hate, revulsion, rejection and, above all, retribution.

In the wake of World War I, Germany was a shattered nation. Lumped with crippling war reparations and led by an incompetent government, it was tumbling into ruin. The emergence of a young and unqualified nobody called Adolf Hitler onto the political scene, however, soon changed the country’s fortunes. Within years, Hitler had scared through German politics and by 1934 he had manipulated his position and named himself Führer, and with this new title came absolute power.

But before his meteoric rise in politics, Hitler had dreamt of an entirely different life. In 1907 Hitler applied to the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna, determined to pursue a career as an artist. He was rejected, but the young man was determined and applied again the following year. Once again he was rebuffed, beaten to this prize place by more expressive, experimental artists.

His creative ambition now relegated to a mere pipe dream, Hitler was bitter - and hellbent on revenge.
Upon achieving ultimate power, Hitler was determined to make Germany his own aesthetic paradise. While prized Nazi architects, such as Paul Ludwig Troost and later Albert Speer, embarked on transforming Germany into a neoclassical haven, Hitler was preparing to strike his vengeful blow upon the art world that had rejected him nearly two decades before.

In September 1933, Hitler had set up the Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, with Joseph Goebbels at the helm. Goebbels tasked Adolf Ziegler, the Nazi artist, with purging German galleries of ‘degenerate’ art.
TO EXHIBIT

Of all those showcased in the exhibition, one very vocal anti-Nazi artist was conspicuously absent. Unashamedly anti-Nazi, John Heartfield was one of Hitler's biggest critics and at one point was fifth on the Gestapo's most-wanted list. So it's remarkable that this local dissenter didn't feature in the exhibition at all.

Born to German parents as Helmund Herzfeld in the late 19th century, he was called up to fight in World War I in September 1914. Convinced at the futility of war, however, Herzfeld feigned a mental breakdown and was dismissed from military service. It was impossible, he believed, to fight in a conflict that he deemed the greatest insanity of all.

As anti-British sentiment swept Germany, he chose to Anglicise his name and became known as John Heartfield. Upon moving to the capital, Heartfield became involved in the Berlin Dada scene, where he came to the realisation that creating art that wasn't anti-war was to be complicit in the government's propaganda campaign. In response, he turned his back on traditional art and embraced photomontage, creating dozens of anti-war, anti-Hitler and anti-Nazi compositions that were published in several communist and anti-fascist magazines.

Heartfield was an integral part of the artistic resistance against the Nazis, but by using the press rather than the canvas to voice his disdain for the regime, he ensured that he wasn't an easy figure to attack. After all, Heartfield's press-published collages were impossible to round up and destroy; they could just as easily return with a vengeance.

Heinrich Hoffman, was drafted in to redevelop the exhibition at the last minute. Dismayed at incurring the wrath of the Führer, Goebbels imagined a completely new kind of show to serve as a counter-exhibition to Great German Art. Desperate to regain Hitler's favour, Goebbels pitched an exhibition of degenerate art to highlight the disparity between 'traitorous' and 'patriotic' art. The idea went down a storm, and on 29 June, Hitler officially gave his seal of approval.

The next day, Goebbels appointed Adolf Ziegler - Hitler's favourite painter and later known as the 'Master of German Public Hair' for his nude paintings - to head up a nationwide purge of the galleries, confiscating any works deemed degenerate. Ziegler was only too happy to comply, expelling thousands of works of art from the public view, over 650 of which would soon feature in the Degenerate Art exhibition. While works created by any artist deemed degenerate were rounded up, including works by Mondrian, Picasso and van Gogh, it was the work of German and Germany-based artists that were chosen for this very public humiliation.

In a matter of just two weeks, the exhibition was planned in its entirety. Held in Munich's Institute of Archaeology in the Hofgarten, the Degenerate Art exhibition...
Crowds begin to gather around the entrance of the Degenerate Art exhibition, held in Munich’s Galeriestraße.

was just round the corner from the House of Art, the home of Hitler’s Great German Art show. On 18 July 1937, the Great German Art exhibition opened with much fanfare - but the popularity of its counter-exhibition that opened the next day was unprecedented; over the course of its showing, the Degenerate Art show reeled in five times as many visitors as its upmarket companion.

Around 112 artists were exhibited in this hugely popular show, among them Wassily Kandinsky, Otto Dix, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Max Beckmann and Oskar Kokoschka, who was widely considered one of Austria’s greatest artists of the era.

The art of these anti-Nazi artists, however, hung side by side with some unexpected companions. Emil Nolde, a proud and long-serving member of the Nazi Party, found his creations tarred as degenerate, and his paintings featured heavily throughout the exhibition. It was a catastrophe for the artist, who had long been supported, promoted and patronised by none other than Goebbels.

Artworks vied for space on the walls and floors of the exhibition space with tags attached to each work that listed the price that galleries had paid to possess them. But with the dark, tumultuous days of the Weimar Republic and hyperinflation not even a decade prior, the costs were wildly exaggerated. On these seemingly eye-watering tags, a line read, “Paid for with hard-earned tax-payers’ money.”

Surrounding the art, graffiti condemning the works was scrawled all over the walls: “Mockery of God”, “An insult to German womanhood”, “The ideal – cretin and whore”. Spread across several rooms, only sections of the exhibition were themed. The show opened with a room devoted to blasphemy and religious art; the second room dealt with Jews, while a third contended with the salt-of-the-earth people of Germany, including soldiers, women and farmers. The rest of the exhibition descended into unorganised chaos.

The Degenerate Art exhibition was a complete fiasco, an embarrassment to any curator. Paintings hung mere inches from one another and artworks were commonly misnamed or wrongly identified.
Confiscated by the Nazis on 27 March 1938, this self-portrait by van Gogh was sold at auction in Switzerland a year later. Attributed. Rather than an exhibition, this was a propaganda spectacle designed to enrage and provoke; it was exactly what the Nazis envisioned. These creations, unworthy in their eyes of being called “art”, were unworthy of hanging on the walls of Germany’s great gallery, and were unworthy of being seen by the German population.

When the exhibition opened on 19 July 1937, children were forbidden from attending for fear that they would be terrified - or worse, corrupted - by the obscenity of the art. For those who did attend, visitors were actively encouraged to interact with the art - actors were even hired to mingle with the crowd in order to provoke reactions. Some sneered, some shouted, some spat. In the almost four-month run of the Degenerate Art exhibition, the show was considered one of the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda’s greatest successes. When it closed on 30 November, it had averaged around 20,000 visitors a day. With such exceptional engagement, the exhibition was taken on the road, visiting 11 other cities across Germany and Austria until it officially closed in 1941. More than just a popular exhibition, it proved to be one of the most powerful early Nazi propaganda campaigns, sending shockwaves not just throughout Germany, but across the world.

While many in Germany were glad to celebrate the ‘worthy’ art and culture of Nazi Germany, not all who visited the Degenerate Art exhibition were visiting for what the Nazis believed were the right reasons. Certainly, many visitors went to be shocked and to show their disdain for modern art, but for others the Degenerate Art exhibition was an opportunity to say farewell forever to some of these contemporary masterpieces.

In the wake of the Degenerate Art exhibition, the collection was divided. Some works were destroyed, deemed worthless, while those considered valuable on an international market were flogged at auctions.
But what of the artists whose reputations were ruined by the Degenerate Art exhibition? Formerly Austria’s greatest artist, Oskar Kokoschka fled to Czechoslovakia, then later the UK, before settling in Switzerland where he died in 1980. Utterly ruined by his fall from grace, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner killed himself in 1938. Max Beckmann, like Kokoschka, escaped into exile. The once-proud Nazi Emil Nolde was banned from ever painting again by his one-time compatriots, so took up watercolours, a medium that didn’t smell and was therefore easy to hide. All degenerate artists who worked in universities and art schools lost their positions.

Many of the artists who unwillingly starred in the Degenerate Art exhibition are today little more than just names on paper. With careers cut down in their prime, we’ll never truly know what could have become of some of these creative geniuses.

for cut-down prices, including works by van Gogh, Gauguin and Picasso. In the ultimate act of hypocrisy, many degenerate works of art that were looted and sold by the Nazis were acquired by the very men who sold them, bargain-hunters on the prowl for their next fortune. The rest ended up dispersed across the world or tragically lost.

THE GOTTBEGNADETEN LIST

In a bid to build Nazi culture, a list of very special artists was drawn up.

In the wake of the Degenerate Art exhibition Hitler and Goebbels were determined to see Nazi culture blossom and grow. In the record entitled the ‘Gottbegnadeten list’ – or ‘God-gifted’ list – was drawn up, featuring artists, musicians, actors, authors and other creatives that were considered national treasures. Among these prized figures were composer Richard Strauss, Nobel Prize-winning writer Gerhart Hauptmann and actor Heinz Rühmann. The honour meant that a letter was sent to the recipient, but is also guaranteed that the recipient was exempt from military mobilisation; these figures’ contributions to culture were deemed more valuable than they could be in war.

Arno Breker was one such artist who found himself on the God-gifted list. Championed as one of the greatest sculptors of the Third Reich, Breker had created sculptures for the 1936 Olympic Games, as well as creating two bronze sculptures to stand outside the Reich Chancellery. Exempt from military service, Breker was appointed the official sculptor of the Nazi Party and was gifted a studio, as well as almost 50 assistants.

By the time the Third Reich crumbled, Breker’s reputation had spread far and wide. Identified as a ‘fellow traveller’ of the Nazi Party than necessarily a Nazi himself, Breker was fined and left to continue his life in Düsseldorf. Over the next few decades he was commissioned by several wealthy and powerful patrons, including the King of Morocco. In 1985 a museum devoted to Breker’s works opened in Nörvenich, Germany. He died in 1991 still a celebrated German artist, but many of his list-mates died in relative obscurity, their talent irrevocably tarnished by their relationships with the Nazis.
WAR & CONFLICT

Explore history's greatest wars and conflicts, and the people who fought in them

D-Day and the Liberation of Europe
A superstar lineup of historians join us to dissect Operation Overlord from multiple angles

The Battle of Poitiers
Just how the Black Prince overcame the odds during the Hundred Years' War?

War in the Air
Take a look at the Imperial War Museum's restored RAF photos

Battle of Gravelines
How Sir Francis Drake chased off the Spanish Armada

Harold Wins at Hastings
Anglo-Saxon England could have soared if William the Conqueror had failed
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We mark the 75th anniversary of Operation Overlord, from the storming of Normandy’s beaches to the liberation of Paris

Written by Jonathan Gordon and Linda Hervieux, with contributions from James Holland and Sarah Rose
Author and historian James Holland talks us through how the Allied invasion cemented its advantage despite unexpected setbacks.

The liberation of France was not a foregone conclusion. Everyone knew D-Day was coming—Americans, Brits, Poles, and, importantly, the Nazis. For months the Allies had been working to create and hide the vital invasion force and supply drop points where the landing would happen, but it was inevitable: What was less clear was how successful they would be. As James Holland, author of Normandy ’44 and Big Week (telling many other little lies) tells us, it was a one step at a time process. “The one priority of D-Day is to make sure that it doesn’t fail and that success absolutely everything,” he insists.

And everyone’s got terribly obsessed about D-Day targets and the fact that no one actually achieved what they were supposed to do on the invasion front.”

What Holland is referring to is a certain territorial targets that didn’t get hit. The US forces taking Caen, or British and Canadian troops taking Caen. These things would come in the days and weeks that followed, but they didn’t happen on day one. The German response to invasion was slow and uneven, but the terrain was challenging. And whatever gifting there may have been back in London or Washington, objectively, one of D-Day was achieved. “Everyone got inland, everyone got a toe hold, flanks were secured,” explains Holland. “By anyone’s reckoning, D-Day was an incredible success and they achieved tactical surprise.”

Footsoldiers established, the Allied ‘Big War’ approach could be applied, having led a vanguard of 150,000 troops and now following them up with every bit of medical, mechanical, logistic, aerial and naval support that they could muster. “What you’ve got is true because the Allies have overwhelming material advantage,” Holland tells us. “Of that there is absolutely no question. They’ve got millions of men back in the UK, hundreds of thousands of vehicles, thousands of tanks and guns and the airforce. But the limit to how much you can bring over in one go or even in two goes does matter because of the constraints of shipping.”

Could the Allies get those resources to mainland France from across the Channel before Germany could reinforce and mount a counterattack? Thankfully, landing raids all across France that already been decimating transportation links and communications, albeit in a rather spread out fashion so as not to give away that Normandy would be the point of entry. That slowed down a German response and then from D-Day onwards the Allies could be even more precise. “Once D-Day arrives the cat is out of the bag and then you no longer have to roam across a wide area to cover all bases and keep the enemy guessing. You now know it’s going to be Normandy, so you can focus on the approach road to Normandy and any German troops heading to Normandy whether they be from Le Mans or Brittany or either parts of France, the moment they start moving in daylight they’re going to be hammered by fighter bombers and bombers.” As an example of Allied success in this approach, 12 airfields were built from scratch in Normandy by Allied forces in the first two weeks of the invasion, materially cutting off an flight times for fighter bombers. All this means that the Allies are in charge of what happens post-Normandy, but the German reaction was uncharacteristically lacking in pragmatism and made the situation increasingly fraught and attritional.

The German response ranged from bizarre to genuinely petty but, if you’re looking at how the Germans did, they shouldn’t have done...
much worse, to be perfectly honest,” is Holland’s assessment. “There are some assumptions that are made before the campaign, before D-Day, which are based on previous experience of coming up against the Germans, which suggest that they will retreat in stages once you’ve established an initial foothold.” But Hitler had other ideas. “The difference is that Hitler decides that the Germans have to fight close to the coast, they’ve got to fight for every yard. On one level that makes no sense at all, because for most of the Normandy campaign they remained in range of offshore naval guns, so there’s a whole range of firepower that they wouldn’t have facing them if they went further inland.” So instead of retreating in stages and giving up ground to the Allies quickly, the battle becomes much slower and dogged. “Why everyone is generally a bit down on the Allied effort in Normandy is that it looks like they’re not making much headway for the best part of June and July,” says Holland. “In actual fact, they’re doing really well because what they’re doing is they’re grinding down those all-important Panzer divisions as they’re reaching the front and they’re never giving them a chance to operate in a coordinated counterattack, which is where they’re going to be at their most dangerous.”

Despite mounting criticism at home, Eisenhower and Montgomery held things together and most importantly the soldiers on the ground showed their bravery. “The bottom line is that fighting in 1944 against an array of spectacularly violent and powerful weapons, whether German, American or British, is fraught with danger. The fact of the matter is you can have all of the fire support in the world, but your leading troops still have to take ground. They still have to get out of their foxholes, out of their places of camouflage and cover and advance across a field or across open ground and face the guns of the enemy. That is incredibly dangerous. Lots of people get wounded and killed and it is incredibly hard to make serious progress.”
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Holland is a World War II specialist whose recent books include Normandy ’44, D-Day and the Battle for France and Big Week: The Biggest Air Battle of War Two.

---

**BRITISH EMPIRE**

- In charge of the Second Army landing at Gold Beach, June Beach and Sword Beach.
- Providing land, sea and air manpower.

**USA**

- Handled Omaha Beach and Utah Beach with additional air and sea support, as well as being the key financial backer of the invasion.

**CANADA**

- 14,000 Canadians stormed the beach at Juno along with 110 Canadian ships manned by 10,000 sailors.

**FRANCE**

- French paratroopers landed with British Special Air Service on D-Day with the rest of the 400,000 strong French army landing later.

**POLAND**

- Thousands of Polish soldiers had escaped after German occupation and now supported the landings on land and in the air.

**THE NETHERLANDS**

- The Dutch government-in-exile based in London supported the invasion with a number of motorised divisions and three ships.

**BELGIUM**

- Belgian pilots flew with the RAF and a special Section Belgé was formed within the Royal Navy for more Free Belgians to serve.

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

- Also served in their own units within the RAF during D-Day with ground troops joining the invasion in the days and weeks that followed.

**DENMARK**

- The Danes primarily contributed to the invasion with their naval personnel on British Navy ships crossing the Channel.

**NORWAY**

- A number of Norwegian soldiers sought refuge in Britain and returned to the mainland as part of the British armed services.

**AUSTRALIA**

- Some 2,000 Australian pilots took part in D-Day along with 500 sailors in the fleet, followed by some ground support down the line.

**NEW ZEALAND**

- No formal divisions from New Zealand landed on D-Day, but there were pilots, infantry and specialists present as well as an official observer.

**LUXEMBOURG**

- Several Luxembourgers were part of the 1st Belgian Infantry, manning artillery and landed with that group for the Battle of Normandy.
Some of the key moments that took the Allies from the beaches to the French capital

1. **7 June 1944: Liberation of Bayeux**
   The small city of Bayeux becomes the first French city of its size to be liberated after D-Day when the 30th Northumbrian Division moved in with minimal German resistance.

2. **29 June 1944: Capture of Cherbourg**
   The Cotentin Peninsula and most particularly the deep water port at Cherbourg were of massive strategic importance to Allied forces once the initial landing in Normandy was accomplished. Setting sail from Cherbourg, Allied forces would allow the rest of the invasion force of the Allies to land and for more reinforcements to be brought into France.
   Fighting for the peninsula starts almost immediately with the US 2nd and 101st Airborne Divisions landing at its base on 6 June. Having cut off the defenders, an all-out attack on Cherbourg by the US began 22 June supported by heavy bombardment from nearby battleships. They are joined by British Commandos on 26 June, while the 79th Division captures Fort du Poile. The last of the harbour defenders surrender on 29 June.

3. **9 July 1944: Caen Airfield Captured**
   It was originally hoped that Caen would be captured before the end of the first day of fighting (some infantrymen even had folding bicycles to speed their progress), but heavy going meant that armoured support was held back, and when the assault was restarted, the German defences were in place. Montgomery issued the call to hold for significant reinforcements, to have an overwhelming force take the town and secure the important airfield needed by the RAF. Operation Epsom starts on 23 June and ends on 1 July without success, but once the town is surrounded and hit hard from the air from 7 July, German defences finally began to give way. The town is liberated by 17 July and the last of the German resistance cleared by 19 July, securing an all-important location for the Allies moving forward.

6. **25 August 1944: Liberation of Paris**
   With the German forces decimated in Normandy, the path to Paris is not exactly easy, but much clearer. The move on the French capital had already started on 17 August with French Resistance forces leading uprisings and taking control of key locations around the city. The original plan for liberating France was focused around forcing German troops out rather than liberating Paris, since Hitler had threatened to spare the city if the Allies moved on it. Charles de Gaulle argues for the French citizens to be supported (perhaps also concerned about who would end up in control of the French liberation if his Free French Army wasn’t seen to be involved), and so his forces are supported by the Allies, including the Spanish Civil War veterans of the 9th Armoured Company in taking back the city, forcing the surrender of the German garrison by 25 August. A combination of the people of France and the allied military come together to free the capital with the Allies, strengthening the narrative that “Free France” had meant to liberate itself.
31 July 1944
Saint-Lô

There’s a reason why Saint-Lô became known as the ‘Capital of Ruins’ after it was identified as an important crossroads for potential German reinforcements, it is clear to see why Saint-Lô was heavily targeted by the Allies in their efforts to take control of the city. It was consistently the target of heavy bombing as the US look to take the city, leaving around 95 per cent of Saint-Lô in rubble. Thanks to the significant nature of the fighting through Normandy’s hedgerows, the XV Corps of the First United States Army didn’t begin their approach until 15 July, coming in from the north and west. Further bombing from the Allies and German forces destroyed even more of the city, but ultimately the German’s choice to retreat as they can no longer hold the area.

21 August 1944
The Falaise Pocket

The decisive battle of the liberation of Normandy was the Battle of Falaise, this was the battle that marked the end of German resistance in Normandy. The battle was fought between 13 and 28 August 1944, with the aim of trapping German forces between Falaise and the Seine River. The battle was part of Operation Cobra, which was launched by Allied forces on 25 July 1944, with the goal of opening a new front in France and cutting off German forces in the region. The battle ended with the German forces being trapped between Falaise and the Seine River, and forced to retreat. The battle resulted in the capture of thousands of German soldiers and was a significant victory for the Allies in the Battle of Normandy.
Sonia Purnell talks to us about the important role that Allied-organised guerrilla actions had in aiding the invasion of Normandy

While the liberation of France was ultimately going to be achieved through overwhelming land, sea and air forces on the part of the Allies, the role of more clandestine operatives should never be ignored. The RAF and USAF led bombing raids up and down France to disrupt German movement, but the Special Operations Executive (SOE) for Britain and Office of Strategic Services (OSS) for the US also provided help. Coded messages via radio broadcasts from the BBC French Service were supported by operatives on the ground, recruited from all sorts of backgrounds and nationalities, who would bridge the gap between the French Resistance and Allied planning.

“Those agents who succeeded in bringing the Resistance units behind the Allied campaign, it tended to be through almost sheer force of character. They had to not only be military leaders, but incredible diplomats - ambassadors for the allied cause. Two very different skill sets I think.”

One such agent is the subject of Purnell’s most recent book, A Woman of No Importance, that chronicles the daring exploits of Virginia Hall, who the Gestapo called “the most dangerous of all Allied spies.” Her experiences behind the lines offer some interesting insights into how sabotage operations were handled across France in the lead-up to D-Day.

“Following Allied orders from London she bombed the railway lines connecting the German garrison at Le Puy to the Germans’ supplies. She cut the telephone wires, meaning that they had to radio each other and of course radio signals they could intercept so they could find out what they were talking about,” explains Purnell. “Bit by bit she was able to cut off that garrison and make them feel like they were surrounded by huge forces. Because they intercepted the signals, the Resistance always seemed to be wherever they were. If they tried to make a break for it, the Resistance was always there because they knew that they were coming.”

Operations like this, even with relatively untrained fighters such as Hall would have been working with, helped to confuse the Nazi occupation, giving them the impression of a much bigger organisation than really existed. But direct action was only one part of what the SOE and OSS were doing behind the lines. They also wanted a steady stream of information.

“Hall was sending back a lot of intelligence to Allied command.” Purnell tells us. “I found out that in the American army magazine in the 1980s they ran an article that she had discovered evidence of some of the intelligence that she had sent back when she was disguised as a nurse.”
FOUR STAGES OF SABOTAGE

The key plans the Allies had to disrupt the Nazis in France

1. Plan Vert: Attack Rail
   - This was a simple objective of destroying and disrupting as many rail systems as possible within a 15-day period in the lead up to and on D-Day. This would massively hinder reinforcements and the supply chain.

2. Plan Bleu: Cut the Power
   - With troops hopefully slowed down, the next target was to make life for those in position as tough as possible. Plan Bleu involved attacking electrical facilities so that there was no power around German positions.

3. Plan Tortue: Keep Delaying
   - On top of attacks on the rail network, the Allies also wanted the French Resistance to engage the enemy and delay troops and resources as much as possible from reaching Normandy via roads or even just garrisoned nearby.

4. Plan Violet: Cut Comms
   - The Allies had cracked German codes and so they wanted to hear everything that was being said. That meant forcing them to open channels, like radio rather than using telephone lines, so the Resistance was directed to cut them.

Excerpt from A Woman of No Importance by Sonia Purnell:

“Virginia Hall received the Distinguished Service Cross in late 1945—before the war and lost her left leg in a hunting accident. Hall herself had worked at the American Embassy in Warsaw, Poland before the war and lost her left leg in a hunting accident. “SOE agents come from a huge variety of backgrounds,” Purnell adds. “Dents Rake, one of my favourites, was a musical artist and had been a child tumbler in a circus. Edward Zeff had been a haberdasher in Paris. These were unlikely people.” But while their backgrounds were disparate, they had a common attitude and approach that was needed in the chaos of war: “You had these very daring people that were prepared to break the rules. I don’t think Virginia would have survived if she obeyed all of the rules. I think she knew how to survive and that didn’t always mean doing exactly what you were told.”

Once 6 June came around and Operation Overlord was in full force in Normandy, the mission for spies became even more intense as uniformed officers from Operation Jedburgh joined the fight in teams of three to help coordinate even more French Resistance operations. Hall was among those given a team to command, right up to and beyond the Liberation of Paris. “She stayed in the Haute-Loire region until it was liberated in August and she stayed around until September when things were cleared up a bit. She then set off with her band to find more Germans. Because it was September the Allies were moving forward quickly and the Resistance was being replaced by conventional armies. Her role in France was coming to an end but at that point focus was turning to other parts of Europe and she was trained up ready to go into Austria.”
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A Woman of No Importance by Sonia Purnell, telling the story of SOE and OSS agent Virginia Hall during World War II, is available now and is being made into a movie.
**Who were the French Resistance?**
As the name would suggest, they were mostly French citizens, although some members and leadership were from abroad, which we'll explain a little in a moment, in terms of the background of the French Resistance members, they were from a broad range of professions. Many were already politically active in trade unions or political parties (like the Communist party), while others were students, academics and even Roman Catholic priests. Both men and women were actively involved in the movement.

**Where was the Resistance located?**
All over France in small pockets or groups, often with no clear communication with other Resistance cells. The idea of a French Resistance is a broad term for a relatively unorganised movement, but one that gained greater organisation the longer Northern France was occupied and the Vichy regime was in charge in the south.

**What did they do?**
Different cells would have different approaches depending on their disposition and composition. In the rural areas, armed groups known as Maquis would wage guerrilla warfare against German and Vichy forces. Other groups would publish and distribute newspapers in opposition to those in power to maintain a sense of Free French identity and stoke the flames of liberation. Other groups would work to hinder the Vichy regime and German forces in the north with sabotage of communications, rail lines and more. These efforts were sometimes made in coordination with Allied objectives as D-Day approached. They were also able to successfully feed intelligence back to the Allies.

**How important were they to D-Day?**
Pretty important in terms of helping to disrupt German communications and transportation links along with the British SOE and American OSS. Once D-Day was underway, the Allies needed to not only advance quickly, but also hope the Nazis didn't reinforce to match them. With Enigma cracked and safer communications disrupted, the Allies were able to translate German plans and adapt while reinforcements were delayed from arriving through sabotage.

**What was Charles de Gaulle's role?**
He didn't have direct control of Resistance groups prior to 1944, but his speeches and attempts to unite them were effective and once France was liberated he was able to absorb many of the fighting fit Resistance members into his French Forces of the Interior (FFI), which was a more formally organised group recognised by Allied military and commanded by General Marie-Pierre Koenig.

**So, who were these foreign Resistance fighters?**
They were numerous and from many nations, some would have been veterans of the Spanish Civil War living in exile in France, standing up to another far right regime. Others were from Britain, Denmark, Armenia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Georgia, Germany, Austria and many more nations. Standing up to the Nazi occupation was a calling many answered.

**How dangerous was it to be part of the Resistance?**
Immensely dangerous for multiple reasons. First, it was dangerous work involving taking on a far superior and better-equipped force head on. The Resistance didn't have the means to take on German armoured divisions and had nothing to withstand their firepower. Additionally, in occupied and Vichy France, there were no guarantees of safety and knowing who you could trust was always hard. Gestapo agents infiltrated some movements and others might be sold out by locals for rewards. Lastly, since the Germans didn't recognise the Resistance as a legitimate military force they were not protected as prisoners of war under the Hague conventions and could be subject to torture and execution.
When troops flooded into Paris to support the civilian uprisings that looked to overthrow the German occupation, they were not led by British, American or Canadian commanders. They were French. Although the Free French Army had been a smaller quotient of the invading forces, their commander, Philippe Leclerc de Hauteclocque, was the one leading forces into Paris, an important gesture on the part of the Allies to have France free its own capital. Credit for securing this concession from the Allies belongs to Charles de Gaulle, head of the Free French forces, but he was not a figure without some controversy.

"He's definitely right-wing and he's spectacularly arrogant, incredibly touchy, but he does have this terrific charisma and he does have this galvanising effect," James Holland explains. "I think what's clear once he does come over to France is the Allies suddenly go, 'Okay, so there is big support for de Gaulle.'"]

"It wasn't his political leanings that seemed to have concerned the Allies though so much as what his postwar intentions might be and their unintended role in supporting them.

"The person who is really putting the kibosh on de Gaulle having a greater role is primarily President Roosevelt," says Holland. "He just doesn't like the cut of his jib and he thinks that if they're not careful France will be replacing one dictator with another. Pétain will be out and de Gaulle will be in."

"Let us be firm, pure and faithful; at the end of our sorrow, there is the greatest glory of the world. that of the men who did not give in."
We take a look at the role women played in Operation Overlord, with author Sarah Rose

Since women were not permitted to take on combat roles in any of the western Allied forces, it might be easy to overlook their contribution to the war effort as a whole. And by that we don’t just mean the work done on the home fronts where women needed to step into factories and workshops to take the place of men drafted into service. Women aged 17 to 43, in Britain, could also opt to join one of the auxiliary branches of the military or serve in special operations as part of the SOE or OSS. While such work wouldn’t put them on the front line, it wouldn’t mean they were out of harm’s way either.

In terms of espionage work, women were ideal candidates off the bat for occupied France according to author Sarah Rose. “The demographic of war is overwhelmingly female. We think of war as a very macho space, it’s a very GI Joe type environment. But in an occupied country the men in France were in POW camps or had been shipped off as slave labour to Germany. There were very few men left. If there was a man who was fighting fit and of a draftable age, then what was he doing in France on a bicycle? Whereas a woman blended in.” Rose has chronicled the experiences of three such women in her book D-Day Girls.

Still, in this era, there was a taboo around having women serve in the military and those behind enemy lines would have been in the minority. That being said, there is still a tendency to downplay the contribution made elsewhere according to Rose. “There are many factors in why women’s contributions haven’t been recognised. One is that their work tends to get dismissed as clerical or secretarial, when in fact when you are receiving arms and you are using them you’re a soldier as much as anybody else. When you are hiding Resistance forces, you are working in the Resistance. So some of it was just a reclassification.”

And this applies just as aptly to the more official military posts available such as the Women’s Army Corps in the US where 150,000 women served or the Auxiliary Territorial Service in Britain where 190,000 women joined the war effort. Such services were not just secretaries back home either, with nurses on the ships heading across the Channel, pilots getting planes where they needed to be for the RAF and getting the injured back home for medical attention, radar operators, code breakers, weapon analysts, electricians, mechanics, cooks, clerks and so much more. Women were not always a visible part of Operation Overlord, but their contribution needs to be acknowledged.

It’s just a shame that in some cases it is only recently that these efforts were being recognised, but Rose understands where some of that resistance was coming from. “We want to respect those who fell on the beaches, we want to acknowledge the heroes and there is a bit of defensiveness, that if we start saying the women were heroes too we’re somehow taking the heroism away from the men on the beaches,” she concludes. “It’s as if there isn’t enough to go around, but the truth is there is. They were all heroes and it does not diminish the role of anyone to acknowledge someone else’s role.”
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**Elizabeth L Gardner of the American WASP, sits ready to fly a Martin B-26 Marauder**

_A member of the Auxiliary Territorial Service (ATS) works with legal documents for the Alperton Administrative Depot._

**Women’s Auxiliary Air Force WAAF**

Splitting out from the ATS where pilots had previously operated, this organisation brought those women under the wing of the RAF proper, but were still only civilian pilots transporting planes. Women in this unit, however, also worked on radar, communications and in plotting courses in the operation room.

**Auxiliary Territorial Service ATS**

While formed in 1938, the ATS was really a return of the voluntary Women’s Auxiliary Army Corps that had been formed in 1917 and disbanded after World War I in 1921. Members of the ATS would operate anti-aircraft guns, work as military police, as mechanics, drivers and much more.

**Women’s Royal Naval Service WRNS**

Another WWII service that was revived for WWII, the WRNS (as they were known) had their roles increased to now include flying transport planes. Its recruitment poster that encouraged women to join to “free a man for the fleet” indicates the broadly support staff positions that were available to women.

**Nursing Service**

Each service had its own nursing corps with Queen Alexandra’s Royal Naval Nursing Service; Queen Mary’s Royal Air Force Nursing Service. During D-Day they would have been expected to help the injured get away from the landings to hospital ships.

**Women’s Army Corps WAC**

Starting out as an auxiliary unit and changed to active duty in 1943, the US’s WAC was assigned to various duties such as switchboards, mechanics, drivers and so on. That said, it was explicit in their training that they needed to be ready to replace and take over from men, just as women in Europe were doing.

**Women Airforce Service Pilots WASP**

The WASP was a civilian unit despite numerous efforts in Congress to change that. Its role was mainly transporting military aircraft and cargo, even so, 38 WASP members are believed to have been killed during the war. In 1977, WASP members were finally given veteran status in the US.
It was the water that surprised Henry Parham — so much water. Soldiers weighted down with too much gear were drowning before his eyes as Parham, a 22-year-old soldier in the United States Army, dropped into the sea off Omaha Beach. He struggled to keep his head above water as he struggled his way to the sand. It wasn’t a much better option there as enemy fire cut down men all around him.

Parham, a bus porter back home in Virginia, was a member of the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion, the only black combat unit to land on D-Day in the segregated United States Army. In the early hours of 6 June 1944, the men of the 320th boarded more than 150 landing craft, taking with them balloons that Royal Air Force crews had inflated at ports along the coast in southern England. Their mission was to raise a curtain of the silvery spheres high over the beaches to protect the men and material from German dive-bombers. The balloons packed a secret punch: a plane strike would trigger a small bomb attached to the cable that anchored the balloon to the ground. A good hit could blow a wing or the gas tank. While the infantrymen they landed with hustled to get off the beach, the 320th men were staying put. In the days and weeks following, some balloons companies would move up the coast to help liberate key ports such as Cherbourg.

In the weeks after the invasion, the 320th men raised more than 140 balloons over Omaha and Utah beaches. Pilots were terrified of the gasbags, lurking in the clouds as high as 2,000 feet. “If a Nazi bird nests in my nest,” a private from Mississippi told a newspaperman, “he won’t nestle nowhere else.” Although the balloons were deemed a success and the 320th men achieved a level of fame as their handlers, the battalion was all but written out of the story of D-Day. It was a common story for black soldiers. The famed squadron of black pilots known as the Tuskegee Airmen were all but forgotten until the mid 1990s after a movie was made about them for American television.

One of the 320th men, a medic wounded in the landing named Waverly Woodson, saved so many lives on 6 June that he would be nominated for the Medal of Honor. He would not receive it. No black soldiers did during World War II. There is a campaign underway to change that, led by the Woodson family and Senator Chris Van Hollen of Maryland.

But the 320th were not the only black soldiers who landed on the beach on 6 June. By nightfall, more than 1,000 African-Americans would join them, the majority assigned to labour battalions. Under relentless fire, they unloaded ships and moved supplies. The 4042nd Quartermaster Truck Company won a commendation from General Dwight D Eisenhower for displaying ingenuity for salvaging vehicles sunk during the landing. The balloon flyers were the only...
other black unit cited for carrying out their mission with courage and determination.

**Shadow of Jim Crow**
The men of the 320th trained to fly their balloons in Tennessee at Camp Tyson, which, like much of the US in the 1940s, was segregated by race. Black troops were considered inferior, not as intelligent or brave. Forays off base weren’t much better: on a trip to Memphis, Wilson Monk and his friends were stunned to see a line of German prisoners of war file into a restaurant where black soldiers weren’t allowed. Residents in the southern towns where most army bases were situated shunned the black soldiers - or worse. Run-ins with local or military police could be dangerous. One 320th man was fatally shot in the back. “Black men ain’t no men,” said Samuel L. Mattison, a 320th veteran who was court-martialed after he fought with cops off-base. “We were like little dogs.”

The 320th men were among more than 130,000 African-American troops that trained in Britain during the war. In the towns and villages of Wales and Oxfordshire where they were billeted, their arrival was big news. “One day Hollywood came to town,” said Ken Clark, who was a boy of ten in southern Wales when the black GIs showed up. The “tan Yanks” were welcomed by the locals, who were happy to share their meager rations with the visitors. It was a “spark of light,” said Arthur Guest of South Carolina, a 320th soldier who landed on Utah Beach. Black soldiers were regulars at Sunday services, dipping into their pockets for the collection basket and singing in the choirs.

**The Beginnings of a Movement**
The respectful treatment African-Americans received outside their own country, from Britain to Asia even in occupied Germany, was a revelation. No longer willing to live as second-class citizens, their experiences abroad would help fuel the budding civil rights movement. But it took a tragedy for the army to finally equalize the treatment of the races. In February 1946, Isaac Woodard, a black soldier on his way home to Georgia, was blinded during a severe beating by cops in the South Carolina. Photos of Woodard in uniform, his head swathed in bandages, shocked the nation. “This (expletive) has got to stop,” President Harry Truman told his staff. Two years later, Truman finally signed Executive Order 9981, ending racial segregation in the US Armed Forces.
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n the death of King Charles IV of France in 1328, Edward III of England was his closest male heir and therefore the legitimate successor to the throne of the childless Charles. This was due to the ancient Salian (or Salic) law that prevented female succession (it had, however, only been enacted in 1316).

Despite Edward’s legitimate claim, the French crowned Philip, Count of Valois, King Philip VI of France, and the slighted Edward refused to pay him homage. In revenge, Philip confiscated Edward’s lands in Aquitaine (held as a vassal duchy to the crown of France). Edward therefore declared war against France and plunged England and France into war that would last, on and off, for the next 116 years—a conflict we now know as the Hundred Years’ War.

In 1340, Edward declared himself king of France and his forces achieved spectacular success against the French in the early years of the war, winning the naval battle at Sluys in 1340 and then at the Battle of Crécy in 1346. This allowed the English to capture Calais in 1347. More campaigning was interrupted by the outbreak and spread of the Black Death.
which reached and proliferated in France and then England in 1348 and 1349. Philip VI died in 1350 to be replaced by his son who became King Jean II (or King John), known as ‘le bon’, or ‘the Good’.

French manoeuvres against English Gascony were renewed in 1352 and a new campaign by English forces in France was planned in 1354, one to be led by Edward’s eldest son, Edward, the Black Prince. His campaign would culminate in one of the greatest and most significant victories of English forces against the French during the Hundred Years’ War, at Poitiers in September 1356.

We have a relatively large number of sources for the campaigns of the Black Prince and the Battle of Poitiers, but none of them provides a complete picture; all have the usual issues of bias and reliability that must be resolved, and we are left with multiple, partial pictures, some of which contradict one another. Nonetheless, we can, with care, use them all to create a relatively certain picture.

Edward landed with his relatively small force (no more than 4,000 men) in Gascony in September 1355. He was reinforced with local troops bringing his strength up to approximately 8,000 men. The immediate plan was a large raid from Bordeaux to Narbonne, the Grand Chevauchée, plundering indiscriminately and burning towns along the outward and return journeys (more than 500 were put to the torch). It was a brutal strategy aimed at depriving the French crown of revenue, and of provoking them. French forces avoided challenging Edward to open battle, however.

The English returned to friendly territory for winter, but small raids began again in the new year and spring 1356. More reinforcements arrived and Edward left on a new raid that would take him northeast towards Bourges. Edward learned at Vierzon that the French forces under King Jean were making their way towards him in late August. He therefore turned west towards Tours; he had marched 320 miles (514 kilometres) in a month.

The English army was unable to cross the Loire river; the French had broken all the bridges. The French drew nearer and Edward withdrew over the River Cher towards La Haye. On the morning of 18 September, the French army had caught up with the English and were outside Poitiers. Battle was unavoidable. Being a Sunday, the skirmish would be fought on the following day, giving the English time to reinforce their position and the French time to gather more reinforcements.

It is still debated today whether the English were attempting to provoke a battle or avoid one (or to retreat at the first opportunity). The rejection of all attempts at negotiation by Edward made provocation more likely although the English were severely outnumbered. The confidence of their successes up to that point and the confidence of (and in) Edward had a part to play. The position the English army had taken up was also defensively very strong. Despite this, the exact location of the Poitiers battlefield remains in doubt.

The French had caught up with the English army south of Poitiers on the banks of the River Miosson, but Edward was able to find ground that was defensible and not the open plains of most of the area. One source tells us this was “one league” (5.5 kilometres) from Poitiers, another two leagues - so there is imprecision. The specific fields of
'Beauvoir and Maupertuis' are also mentioned. The hedges, marshes, vines and bushes of the English position have since disappeared, so locating it remains problematic. The French chronicler Jean Froissart tells us that the position was a "length of road strongly protected by hedges and bushes, and they have lined the hedge on both sides with their archers". Other sources such as Geoffrey le Baker mention a "dense wood", a marsh and a ditch, while others combine all of these features. The French would be able to charge downhill most of the way towards the English, although the last stretch to the English lines turned uphill slightly.

Edward laid out his forces in three divisions, or battles, as was standard practice at the time (Froissart tells us that they were only in one division). Each was commanded by an experienced man, Thomas de Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, on the left, and William de Montagu, Earl of Salisbury, on the right. Edward commanded the centre division and was accompanied by his close friend and skilled military strategist Sir John Chandos. Edward also took advantage of the terrain, drawing up his men behind a hawthorn hedge in which there were two gaps. This meant there were only two routes of attack for the French. According to Froissart, the archers were in a "harrow" formation, probably an open wedge with the point towards the enemy. The archers may have been deployed up to seven ranks deep. The standard English tactic was for the men-at-arms to dismount and fight on foot although Edward had some horses at the ready.

The French also arranged their men in three divisions, according to Froissart each with 16,000 men (giving 60,000 in total); although some accounts mention only 11,000 men. Some modern accounts accept the lower number or a larger one at 26,000 men in total. Regardless, the English were heavily outnumbered. Some reconstructions have four divisions of French, a vanguard and three others (Froissart talks of 300 mounted men being detached to make an initial charge; other sources number this force at 500). With this vanguard was the dauphin of France, the teenaged duke of Normandy Charles, along with the dukes of Bourbon. Despite interruptions from the retreating vanguard, these fresh troops engaged the English infantry. They were peppered with archery fire, which must have taken a great toll on their numbers, but they managed to reach the English lines. In hard fighting, more of the French leadership fell and the standard-bearer of the dauphin was captured. King Jean was dismayed at the defeat of his second division and ordered his three sons, including the defeated dauphin, away from the battlefield. This was probably demoralising to the French and the duke of Orléans, the 21-year-old brother of the king, also retreated with his division at that moment or soon after. Some saw this retreat as the duke fleeing from the battle, but he may have been ordered to do so just as the king's sons had been. This action robbed the French of a large number of troops, but they probably still outnumbered the English. Contemporary chroniclers recorded that this decision robbed the French of the chance of victory. Some among the English thought result of a disagreement between the commanders (the marshals Arnoul d'Audrehem and Jean de Clermont) about tactics. The French knights therefore charged at the English lines in two groups at two separate points, d'Audrehem charged Edward's division while Clermont charged towards Warwick's. These charges proved disastrous and were driven back by the English archers. Clermont was killed, as was the constable, Brienne, and d'Audrehem was captured.

The first French division of dismounted men-at-arms then advanced, led by the dauphin of France, the teenaged duke of Normandy Charles, along with the dukes of Bourbon. Despite interruptions from the retreating vanguard, these fresh troops engaged the English infantry. They were peppered with archery fire, which must have taken a great toll on their numbers, but they managed to reach the English lines. In hard fighting, more of the French leadership fell and the standard-bearer of the dauphin was captured. King Jean was dismayed at the defeat of his second division and ordered his three sons, including the defeated dauphin, away from the battlefield. This was probably demoralising to the French and the duke of Orléans, the 21-year-old brother of the king, also retreated with his division at that moment or soon after. Some saw this retreat as the duke fleeing from the battle, but he may have been ordered to do so just as the king's sons had been. This action robbed the French of a large number of troops, but they probably still outnumbered the English. Contemporary chroniclers recorded that this decision robbed the French of the chance of victory. Some among the English thought
### Battle of Poitiers

**ENGLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN-AT-ARMS (DISMOUNTED)</td>
<td>6-7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGBOWMEN</td>
<td>2k-4k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASCON INFANTRY</td>
<td>1,000-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAVALRY</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHERS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN-AT-ARMS (DISMOUNTED)</td>
<td>11-60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBALESTERS</td>
<td>8,000 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT-ARMED TROOPS</td>
<td>16-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAVALRY</td>
<td>300-500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRINCE EDWARD OF WOODSTOCK**

- Eldest son of King Edward III, born in 1330.
- One of the most successful English commanders during the Hundred Years' War.
- Intelligent, brave, chivalrous.
- Ruthless and brutal, destroyer of those of lesser rank.

**LONGBOWMAN**

- Strong English and Welsh longbowmen dominated the battlefields of Europe for over 150 years.
- High rate of fire and effective up to 300m against most armours.
- Longbowmen were vulnerable to enemy attack and ammunition needed to be plentiful.

**LONGBOW**

- The powerful English longbow was made of yew, 1.8 metres in length, it could fire arrows effectively up to 300 metres.
- Rapid rate of fire, long range and effective on unarmoured targets.
- Used very successfully up to the Battle of Agincourt in 1415
- Specialised training, ammunition shortages.

**ARBALESTERS**

- The arbalest was a late model crossbow that was larger and stronger than earlier models.
- Fire could penetrate armour, superior effective range.
- Slow rate of fire (about two bolts a minute), highly specialised, expensive.

**LANCE**

- The lance was the mounted weapon of choice for knights and men-at-arms during the Hundred Years' War.
- It needed to be cut down to be used on foot, as at Poitiers.
- Powerful and easily produced.
- Cumbersome when cut down, and required two hands when on foot.

*King Jean II on his return to France in 1360, from a near contemporary illustration.*

*The battle of Poitiers from an illumination from an edition of Froissart’s Chronicles.*
that this was a general French retreat and charged in pursuit, but they soon learned of their mistake and a very few English knights were captured (the only ones to fall to such a fate that day). The delay in Jean’s reorganisation probably also gave the English troops a chance to rest.

The remaining French troops joined with King Jean’s division and advanced. This division was therefore larger and consisted of the remaining troops, including some crossbowmen who had been in the constable’s division. By this point in the conflict, which had been raging for perhaps three hours (longer than most medieval battles), the English longbowmen were running short of arrows because they had little impact on the king’s division as it advanced. Edward drew his men into a single division (this may be where Froissart’s error of a single division comes from). The forces with Jean were largely fresh whereas the English had been fighting for most of the battle. Edward now ordered a small force of 60 men-at-arms and 100 archers to mount so that they could encircle the advancing French. This decision implies that this had been a part of Edward’s battle plan all along (the men’s horses would need to be nearby, harnessed and ready). Coming so late in the battle also implies that Edward did not have the numbers to detach this force at the start of it, and so needed to await the later phases of the battle before enacting such a plan. This force was commanded by the capitál de Buch, Jean de Grailly, and his force made its way around a small hill, out of sight of the French. The English archers, their arrows spent, joined the infantry armed with daggers and swords. The capitál de Buch charged the flank of the French as they reached Edward’s lines and this combined attack on two fronts finally broke the French. The bearer of the Oriflamme standard, Geoffrey de Charny, fell with the standard and this signalled the last gasp of the French. King Jean himself was captured and the remaining French fled the field, pursued by the English, eager for prisoners and ransoms. Many fled to Poitiers itself with the English and Gascons on their heels but the gates to the town were shut and many French massacred outside.

The defeat at Poitiers was even more devastating than Crécy had been. The French lost approximately 2,500 men-at-arms whereas the English only lost 40; casualties among less notable troops must have been much higher and we are not given the numbers of wounded. The capture of King Jean and many knights of note was also humiliating. Jean would be held captive until 1360 before being ransomed, and his capture led to the peace of Brétigny in 1360 where the English laid aside claims to the French throne but gained larger possessions in Aquitaine and Calais. The battle of Poitiers was not won by the longbow, but this weapon was an important part of the successful defensive tactics of Edward. In addition to the defensible position that could not be attacked by the superior numbers of the French in one body, Edward’s cavalry encirclement must have been part of his thinking from the start.
Charles advances his division towards the English. The retreating forces of the initial cavalry charge get mixed up in his advance and many men are cut down by English archery fire. The approach to the English position only allows a single division of French to advance at them at a time.

The dauphin advances
Charles advances his division towards the English. The retreating forces of the initial cavalry charge get mixed up in his advance and many men are cut down by English archery fire. The approach to the English position only allows a single division of French to advance at them at a time.

The final advance
Jean leads his enlarged division towards the English. The English arrows are all but depleted so not many Frenchmen fall to archery fire. The English archers join the ranks of the men-at-arms.

Flight and pursuit
The defeat of the dauphin's division causes the French king to hesitate. He sends the dauphin and his other sons away from the battle. Whether through dismay or because he is ordered to do so, the duke of Orléans takes his division from the field. Some English pursue. Jean then gathers all of his remaining troops, including remnants from the first two unsuccessful charges, into a single division and prepares for a final advance.

Fighting to the end
When the French division joins combat with the English, the capital de Buch charges with his cavalry into the flank of the French. This, and possibly some English troops returning from pursuit of the retreating French, turns the tide. The king's standard-bearer is slain and the Oriflamme itself is taken. King Jean is captured (despite his precaution of having 17 men dressed identically to him).

Edward's ruse
Edward takes the opportunity of the French reorganisation to gather all of his men into a single division. He also sends the capital de Buch with a mounted force of 60 men-at-arms and 100 archers behind a hill, unseen, to charge the French advance in the flank.
Military aircraft took to the skies like never before during World War II. Although they had been used in the first global conflict—initially for reconnaissance but then as muscle to break the deadlock of trench warfare—advancing technology and an emphasis on strategic bombing made them more important. Both sides had considerable airpower and techniques up their sleeve. The Luftwaffe would fly above Germany's army as it advanced across western Europe while the RAF used radar to detect and locate the position of approaching enemy aircraft. Radar enabled bombing raids to take place in the dead of night. Planes were also agile enough to be used in aerial combat.

Targets were found on land and across the seas and, while bombs would drop in droves, air superiority was vitally important for gathering intelligence as much as anything else. Fighters and bombers in particular began to take on an iconic status and it’s easy for many to reel off names such as the Lancaster and the Wellington bombers. Some of the images taken during the war have helped to reinforce that and seeing the photos restored and converted to glorious colour helps to bring out the detail. Here we present a selection.
The Kittyhawk Mk III was an improved, shorter-nosed variant of the American Curtiss P-40 Warhawk, and it was given its name by the RAF. Notably, 112 Squadron painted an image of a shark’s mouth on the front. It is seen here taking off at a desert airstrip in Tunisia in April 1943.

Hawker Hurricanes were British single-seat fighter aircraft designed in the early 1930s by Sydney Camm. Tank-busting 40mm cannon were fitted to Mk IID by 6 Squadron but the aircraft were vulnerable to ground fire. Taking off from Gabès, Tunisia, the squadron lost six aircraft and three pilots on 7 April 1943.

The distinctive yellow paintwork of these North American Harvard Mk IIAs marked them out as training aircraft. Pupils at a Service Flying Training School would spend six weeks in advanced flying training before gaining their wings. This is one of eight flight training schools located in South Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe).
The United States’ Martin B-26 Marauders were twin-engined medium bombers that, following raids in North Africa in April 1942 by the 320th Bombardment Group, were used to fight the Nazis in Europe. The Group moved to France in November 1944, bombing key infrastructure from bridges to barracks until V-E Day.

A FLYING SUCCESS

Brightly coloured Stearman PT-17s were used for military training and more than 10,000 were built from 1934 in the United States. Here a group of RAF pilots are learning with the private flying school, Embry-Riddle Company, at Carlstrom Field near Arcadia in Florida.
The long-range medium bomber Wellington GR Mark XIII was the maritime version of the B Mark X and 844 were built in Weybridge and Blackpool. Used in anti-submarine and anti-shipping attacks by 221 Squadron operating with RAF Coastal Command (here in March 1945 over the Aegean), four Air-to-Surface Vessel Mk II radar can be clearly seen.

Avro Lancasters were introduced in February 1942, initially taking part in daylight bombing against targets deep in Nazi Germany. The four-engined heavy bombers were first used by 44 (Rhodesia) Squadron, followed by 97 Squadron. Of the 7,377 Lancasters built, 3,431 were lost through enemy action.

Captain Edwin Fisher became an ACE US pilot of a Republic P-47D Thunderbolt fitted with eight .50 caliber machine guns, shooting down seven enemy aircraft in aerial combat and destroying three V-1 flying bombs. He sits on top of his fighter aircraft – named ‘Shirley Jane II’ – in France in 1944.
Along with the St George’s Cross of England’s patron saint, English ships sailed into battle under a striped ensign which donated different squadrons. This made it easier for commanders to keep track of the battle and for captains to ensure they were in formation amid the smoke, fire and chaos of a close quarter naval engagement.

As has often been the case throughout the history of empires and conquest, it was a combination of greed, self-righteousness and a desire to punish a troublesome neighbour that inspired King Philip II of Spain to attempt to invade England in 1588.

As ruler of the largest empire in the world at the time, Philip’s power was unrivalled, but this didn’t translate into a reign of peace and contentment for his subjects, especially those residing in the Netherlands. A Spanish possession when its crown passed to King Philip II in 1556, since 1568 the Netherlands had been in revolt against its foreign overlords. However, it was not alone in its efforts; a neighbour to the northwest was all too willing to provide aid - England.
Such a blatant disregard for his rule and the sovereignty of his sprawling empire was never going to be ignored by Philip, and when Elizabeth I opted to relieve Mary, Queen of Scots (a devout Catholic) of her head, King Philip’s restraint snapped. The Protestant thorn in his side would have to be removed, and the only way to extract it would be to invade England and restore Catholicism to its people, many of whom Philip believed would rise up in support of their religious saviours as they landed on the English coast. He also had the express support of Pope Sixtus V, who viewed the entire enterprise as a crusade, an electric word bound to invigorate the men set to embark on it.

Such an undertaking was never going to be a simple one, and a vast and well-supplied fleet would take time to organise. Fortunately for Philip, the Pope permitted him to levy ‘crusade taxes’, which went a long way to funding the planned invasion. However, neither divine favour nor convenient taxation could prevent Francis Drake’s raid on Cádiz in April 1587, which saw 30 ships put out of action and vital supplies seized, pushing the Armada’s expedition back by a year.

Further problems occurred in February of the following year when the man chosen to lead the fleet, Alvaro de Bazán, a vastly experienced (and some say undefeated) admiral, died, forcing Philip to elect the duke of Medina Sidonia, Alonso Pérez de Guzmán, to the position. Aware of his own limitations, de Guzmán immediately appealed against his unexpected elevation in the form of a letter to the king, but his efforts were foiled when royal advisors intercepted it.

Despite its inauspicious beginning, the Armada finally set sail from Lisbon on 28 May 1588, putting 160 ships, approximately 32,400 men (of which around 21,500 were soldiers) and 2,400 cannons to sea in the process. Such a force seemed destined to splinter all opposition and restore the heathen nation of England to Catholicism, or at the very least put an end to any English support of the United Provinces (seven states in the Netherlands that had succeeded in ousting the Spanish).

Unfortunately, the plan that this vast fleet was due to follow was anything but simple. The ships were ordered to sail for the Spanish Netherlands, where awaiting their arrival stood...
an army of 30,000 men under the command of the brilliant duke of Parma. Under the cover of the Spanish ships Parma’s troops would be conveyed to England (Kent specifically), where they would make land and begin the invasion. Having successfully stunted the Dutch revolt and returned the southern cities (which today are in Belgium) to Spanish control, Parma, an Italian by the name of Alessandro Farnese, would prove a formidable threat to any English hopes of pushing the invaders back into the sea. Then the weather intervened.

As it would throughout the Armada’s ultimately doomed expedition, the elements turned against it, forcing some of its number to return to port. Then, on 19 July, any hope of maintaining the element of surprise evaporated when the fleet was spotted off the coast of Cornwall. A series of beacons were immediately lit, sending news to London of the King Philip II was determined to restore England to Catholicism

presence of the Spanish. The stage seemed set for a decisive engagement. With the English fleet unable to sail out of Plymouth harbour due to the tide, it was suggested to de Guzmán that the moment had come to strike. Unfortunately for King Philip II’s ambitions, de Guzmán prevaricated and then decided not to act, claiming that engaging the English had not been approved by the king. It was a decision both would come to regret.

As the Spanish made for the Isle of Wight, English fortunes rapidly shifted, the fleet under Lord Howard of Effingham and Francis Drake was now able to escape its containment and pursue the Armada. As the Sun rose on the morning of 21 July the English, by now anchored off Plymouth and having seized the advantage of being upwind of their foes (known as gaining the weather gauge), moved to engage the enemy.

Conscious of the fact that the Spanish fleet was trained to unleash its cannons in one furious burst before rushing up to the top deck and preparing to board their stricken victim, the English wisely kept their distance, firing at range while being sure to maximise their speed advantage to keep out of the reach of Spanish grapples. However, while this meant that they didn’t lose a single ship during the encounter, it also spared the Spanish, who, arranged in a convex arc formation, withstood the barrage easily, only losing two ships (Rosario and San Salvador) when they collided.

As the smoke of the cannons dissipated, Drake found himself consumed by a familiar urge to loot the ailing Spanish ships that had smashed into one another earlier in the day. While doing so would secure both useful information and valuable supplies, it very nearly cost the English fleet, and therefore England as a whole, dearly.

In order to approach his targets Drake required the cover of darkness, so as night fell he extinguished the lantern aboard the Revenge. In doing so he instantly plunged the rest of the English fleet into confusion, for they were relying on the light in order to follow his lead and maintain formation. As the captains of the ships scrambled to restore order Drake sat about boarding and stripping the Spanish vessels, relieving them of gunpowder and – no doubt his favoured prize – gold. He also gained a strategically vital insight into the interior design of the Spanish galleons, which had extremely compact gun decks laden with supplies. As a result, the sailors manning the guns had very little room to manoeuvre, and Drake quickly deduced that reloading and re-firing the Spanish cannons must be a tricky and time-consuming endeavour.

The English spent the following day (22 July) catching up to the Spanish, who had made good use of their 24-hour advantage. However, they couldn’t mitigate the speed of the English ships, who managed to catch up with them.

The next day, the men under Effingham and Drake’s command formed up in preparation for battle, and while a minor skirmish achieved nothing, a full-throttle assault soon after saw four separate English squadrons racing towards their Iberian foes, forcing the Spanish back and thereby preventing them from anchoring safely in the Solent to await news of Parma’s army.

Reluctant to risk defeat, de Guzman instead opted to make for the safety of Calais. This seemingly prudent retreat would prove to be a fatal error.

Having reached Calais on 27 July, the Spanish lowered their anchors in anticipation of collecting Parma’s force of 30,000 well-equipped troops from Dunkirk. Word soon reached them that quickly

Spanish hopes of invading Protestant England were scattered along with its ships
disabused them of this notion. Parma’s army had been almost halved by disease and was in fact not ready to embark.

The Armada’s growing problems were compounded by the news that Dunkirk was being blockaded by valiant Dutch flyboats steered by men who knew all too well that the formidable Spanish ships were too large to sail into the shallow waters off the coast of the Netherlands. Parma was now stranded with no hope of rescue, and the blockade was the death knell for any dreams of spiriting his men to England. To say that overlooking this potential impediment was an oversight by King Philip’s advisors would be an understatement.

As de Guzmán no doubt prevaricated over what to do next the English were plotting a blazing denouement for his fleet. Understandably nervous of lone ships being preyed on, de Guzmán ordered the Armada to drop anchor off Calais in a tight formation, hoping for safety in numbers. What he hadn’t catered for was the English turning this otherwise reasonable decision against the Spanish by exploiting their compact ranks.

With the hour approaching midnight, the silence of the port of Calais was suddenly split by a ripple of panic as the Spanish watched no less than eight fire ships bearing down on them, each one stripped of any unnecessary weight and then crammed to the deck with brimstone, pitch, tar and gunpowder.

Fearing that the looming fire ships were in fact ‘hellburners’ (ships filled with gunpowder charges), the majority of the Armada hastily cut their lines.
and sailed for safety, leaving de Guzmán and the main Spanish warships behind.

While the flaming missiles failed to severely damage any of the Spanish fleet, they did succeed in shattering the previously formidable crescent shape of the Armada. The field had been levelled and the scene was set for a decisive encounter off the Belgian port of Gravelines.

Aware that in order to inflict sufficient damage they would have to close on the enemy to within 100 yards, the English sailed forth and unleashed a torrent of cannon and musket fire. Swathes of Spanish gunners fell in the maelstrom of metal as the broadsides of the Armada’s vessels began to splinter, causing a number of ships to list precariously as their sailors scrambled to return fire. After around eight hours of brutal fighting, five Spanish boats were drifting below the waves and the English were beginning to pull back as their guns ran empty.

The English ‘victory’ at Gravelines sent the final cannonball into the hull of King Philip II’s dreams of conquering England and re-establishing Catholicism, but in truth any threat to the realm of Elizabeth I went up in a cloud of smoke the moment news of Parma’s entrapment reached de Guzmán.

Elizabeth’s famous address at Tilbury sounds somewhat less dramatic when one considers that by the time she gave it, inspiring as it was, the danger had long since passed.

Having prevaricated when decisiveness was required, having held back when a final push could have established a vital foothold, de Guzmán was guilty of many failings, but the doom of the Armada does not rest squarely upon his shoulders. From its conception the plan was destined to flounder, sunk by poor planning and the impetuous whims of a ruler bent on reminding an irritating neighbour of his far-reaching powers.

Having sailed for Scotland following its mauling off Gravelines, the Armada was almost completely obliterated by storms as it made for home. Upon hearing that less than 10,000 of his men had made it home, and many of them ill or dying, King Philip is said to have lambasted the interference of “God’s winds and waves”.

In the years that followed, the reigning naval power of Spain was gradually cancelled out by the emerging seaborne prowess of the English, with both sides sending fleets to harass the other before the inevitability of a peace pact finally became clear to both, culminating in the Treaty of London in 1604. By then King Philip had been dead for six years, his hopes of putting an end to England’s infernal interference in his internal affairs well and truly dashed as a result.

In the centuries to come, Spain’s dominance on the global stage would begin to wane, while the influence of England would see it establish an empire beyond compare. How different the history of the world would have been had de Guzmán managed to land upon England’s shores and unleash the full might of the duke of Parma’s hordes.

---

8 AUGUST 1588

The decisive running battle off the coast of Calais and the Spanish Netherlands cost the fire-damaged Spanish Armada dearly as the English fleet chased them back into the open waters of the English Channel. The Armada’s only chance of survival was to wait out the wind and land its army the Spanish Netherlands, where it could escape Drake’s predations, while the only chance of success was to board the Spanish Army of Flanders in their barges from the coast.

01 The dash for Calais

By dawn on the morning of 8 August, the charred remnant of the Spanish Armada found themselves scattered north east of Calais, with the English fleet chasing them. Heavily damaged by the fireboat attack, the Spanish squadron flagship San Lorenzo attempts to sneak under oars into the neutral port of Calais. Ark Royal is diverted from the fleet to take the San Lorenzo but is warned off by French cannon.
The duke plays for time
San Martin, the duke of Medina Sidonia’s flagship, and four other galleons place themselves between the English and the bruised Armada. Over two hours the brave Spaniards fight a delaying action against the English, giving the Armada time to reform. Despite overwhelming odds, the five Spanish warships make it back to the Armada and take their places in the formation.

"Unfortunately for King Philip II’s ambitions, de Guzmán prevaricated and then decided not to act."

Hidden dangers
The Armada are unable to dash straight for the coast of the Spanish Netherlands and the waiting Spanish Army of Flanders as Dutch rebels have removed the sea marks. These navigation aids revealed the presence of the Shoals of Flanders, submerged sandbanks that had to be taken with caution lest vessels run aground.

The battle is joined
The English, now reinforced by the ships harrying the San Lorenzo at Calais, launch an attack on the right flank of the Spanish Armada, which had formed a crescent with its supply ships protected at the rear. The lighter English ships are easily able to flank the slower Spanish and get close enough to unleash musket volleys as well as cannon fire. Keeping the wind at their backs, the English position themselves so that the Spanish hulls are raised towards them, exposing the vulnerable hull below the waterline.

The battle flounders
Still in formation, the Spanish Armada is heavily battle damaged and by the afternoon the English are starting to run out of ammunition, with some gunners loading chain and other debris into the guns to keep the pressure on. After eight hours of fighting, the English pull away and the Spanish use the breathing space to begin repairs, but as the wind rises their opportunity to make for the Spanish Netherlands departs on the breeze.

The Spanish escape
With the Spanish right flank and rear badly damaged, the formation begins to collapse. Medina Sidonia leads another delaying action to cover the Spanish retreat as the Armada is driven out into the North Sea.

Cast aways
The duke of Parma’s Spanish Army of Flanders—a multinational chiefly concerned with suppressing Dutch revolt—never joins the Spanish Armada and never poses a serious threat to England.

Shallow water pirates
Allied to England, shallow-hulled flyboats commanded by the rebel Dutch waited in the sandbanks. Able to traverse the dangerous waters around the coast, they were poised to harry the Spanish Army of Flanders if its barges set out to join the Armada.
HAROLD WINS AT HASTINGS

Anglo-Saxon England sends the Normans packing, meaning a vastly different English language - and closer ties with Scandinavia

What was the background to the Battle of Hastings in 1066? Who was vying for the throne?

Jump back to 1016, and there was a conquest of England by Danish kings, ending up with King Cnut being on the throne from 1016, an external power conquering and ruling England. Cnut's reign lasted until 1035, before Edward the Confessor became king in 1042. If we jump forward to 1065, Edward is childless, his wife Edith is the daughter of a Godwin, and it’s coming to the point where Edward’s going to die without leaving an heir, and someone has to be king. There are various accounts of Edward promising the throne to different people. Supposedly he promised it to William the Conqueror [of Normandy], and that seems plausible that it did happen. But there’s also accounts he promised it to Harald Hardrada, the king of Norway. And then finally, just before he died, there’s evidence he promised it to
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This Medieval manuscript shows the Norman invasion force disembarking.

READER OFFER: HOLIDAY IN SCENIC NORMANDY

With William the Bastard’s invasion hopes crushed and the flower of Norman chivalry eating English turf, Normandy is easy prey for its rivals to the west, in the duchy of Brittany.

This special six-night tour departs from ports around the south coast and will take in the highlights of the once-mighty duchy, including its fascinating “Norman style” architecture. Trip includes bed, breakfast and a dynastic conflict between would-be dukes.
FIND YOUR NORSE LOVE MATCH ON VÍKINGR

Closer ties with Scandinavia make dynastic ties to the great houses of Denmark a necessity for the upwardly mobile. Swipe right to match your son or daughter to a strapping young Northman or Northwoman who'll keep those trade routes open and plug your family into the politics of Baltic Europe and beyond.

A Medieval manuscript showing the bloody aftermath of the Battle of Hastings.

Perhaps the most famous panel of the Bayeux Tapestry, believed to show Harold's death.
Harold Godwinson, and because he’s by far the strongest nobleman in England at the time, he had the power to take control of the throne.

**What happened after Harold came to the throne in January 1066?**

So Harold is given the throne, he says he has a claim to the throne, he’s by far the most powerful person in the country, and has strong support in lots of areas. He’s vital to the defence of England, and the council of noblemen in England agree that he takes the throne and becomes king. He rules for about a year, but during that period William and Harald are pretty put out by this, and they both start hatching plans to invade England.

**So Harold has to defend two fronts?**

Yes, in early autumn of 1066, Harald Hardrada invades. He lands on the north east coast and makes his way to York, and he very nearly takes it, until Harold marches north to meet him and defeats him at the Battle of Stamford Bridge [in September 1066].

**And then he has to race south to face off with William the Conqueror in the Battle of Hastings on 14 October 1066.**

**How did the battle play out?**

Although Harold had been marching south, there were more men he could call on and there’s enough of a force to get to the scene of the battle. They have the high ground at the top of a hill, William’s men are very tired as well, as they’ve been waiting all night on guard, and they meet him at the bottom of the hill. Harold is in a good position, the battle starts in the morning and takes up most of the day. The Normans are fighting uphill to try and break the English lines and it’s very difficult.

There’s a certain point where the Norman forces start to run away and, by luck or a deliberate ploy, the English forces chase them down the hill. The Norman cavalry turns and, because the English line is broken, they can infiltrate their lines and defeat them. That’s what turned the tide, and at some point in the ensuring melee Harold is killed.

**It’s said that Harold was expecting a reinforcement of Saxon troops in the evening. If he’d held out, could this have been a turning point?**

Yes I’d have thought so. It was really a touch and go thing. If Harold had held out to the end of the day, which would have been perfectly possible because he did have the higher ground, and [the English lines hadn’t broken, it would have been difficult for William to win the battle. So that was a really big moment.

**What would have happened if Harold had won the Battle of Hastings?**

He would have just defeated two very powerful enemies from two outside threats, so he would have been in a powerful position internally as well as externally. The pope had supported William’s claim to the throne and given him his banner in battle, but there’s no reason why [Harold] wouldn’t have carried on as king.

He would have been able to consolidate his rule over the winter and prepare against any future invasions.

**Is there a chance of a Godwinian dynasty if he had won?**

There’s no reason why there wouldn’t have been. There were rival earls in the country at the time, but they’d all acceded to his rule. So there’s no reason why he couldn’t have been an English king for a long time - and he already had five sons, so there were plenty of potential heirs.

**What is one way the Normans changed English culture, and how would it have been different under King Harold?**

It’s often been argued that the Normans completely changed how we used names, bringing in the use of hereditary surnames and so on. I don’t think this is the case. In reality, we’d probably be using the same system of naming, but with a very different set of given names and surnames. We’d almost certainly still have a lot of religious names like Mary, John and Michael. But we wouldn’t have many of the popular names that existed in England since like William, Robert and Alice. Many English surnames like Chamberlain and Gascoigne wouldn’t have made it into English.

Instead, there would almost certainly be more forms of Old English names in use today such as Godwin and Lefflet. And although the name ‘Harold’ wasn’t that popular in 1066, it might have made some headway in the decades after Hastings had he been successful.

**How would our language as a whole have been different?**

English would have been very different had Harold won at Hastings. English
passes from a prestige language to a lower status one for about 300 years, so we don’t have as much record of it as we would otherwise. The language of the elite is French, including the language of poetry and literature. And England was very much a part of the wider francophone literary world in this period. When it reappears as a written language of literature and poetry in the 14th century, it’s a very different language - but one that is hugely adaptable.

Without the Normans to create the Domesday Book, the survey of England and Wales in 1086, would we still know as much about our country’s history? The English were actually pretty good at keeping historical records, but if it wasn’t for the Norman conquest we’d know very little about Normandy.

There are very few written records about Normandy on the scale we see in England until 1066. The Domesday Book is a hugely important document, though, and we know a lot more about England and Normandy at this period because of it. And that wouldn't have happened without the Norman conquest.

It’s unprecedented.

Would England have been more closely tied to Scandinavia than mainland Europe if Harold had won the battle?

I think it’s very feasible that, in the short term, England would have continued to have been more closely linked to Scandinavia. Harold’s family was essentially Anglo-Scandinavian. Harold’s mother was Danish, he had a Danish name, and he had children called Ulf, Gytha and Magnus. His father, Godwin, owed much of his success and power to his patronage by Cnut (a Dane) and also his connections through his Danish wife.

So continued close connections seem likely, even though he had just been attacked by the King of Norway.

Many changes to England would have had a much less Norman flavour if Harold had won, and England may have stayed far more in a Scandinavian sphere of influence. That said, Scandinavia was in the process of being incorporated into the wider Christian and Latin culture that they had been on the edge of until this point. They became part of Christendom and joined the club as it were.

So in the long run, England would certainly have still be part of this wider European, Christian culture - but it would probably have looked different in terms of its buildings and its language.

Would Harold have been regarded as King Harold the Great?

The Godwins were a self-made family. They went from relative obscurity to ruling England, one of the most powerful states in Europe at the time.

So there’s no reason if he hadn’t lost the battle that he wouldn’t have been perceived as great. Whether he was great as a person, that’s very hard to say.
Among the samurai, there were none like the first, Taira Masakado, whose premature rebellion brought the imperial court to its knees.

Written by Hareth Al Bustani

A shadow emerges from the flames atop a horse. Digging his feet into the stirrups, he burns like a crazed dragon, over the corpses of his enemies and their houses. Before long, all of Japan will know the name of Taira Masakado, the greatest warrior in the realm, a New Emperor for a new era. And all of this could have been avoided.

Masakado was born in 903 CE, a great-grandson of Emperor Kammu, and a member of the powerful Taira clan. To ease the royal coffers, his grandfather, Prince Takamochi, renounced his royal lineage and settled in the eastern Kantō plain - the fertile lowland surrounding modern Tokyo - where his sons rapidly became powerful landowners. While the state had once held a monopoly on land, now most was privately owned - by temples, shrines, individuals and local clans. Due to high imperial taxes, most peasants preferred to work for private landowners - who, with property disputes on the rise, armed them with spears and taught them archery, hunting and horse riding. Among the new class of private landowners were absent noblemen, living the high life in the capital of Heian, or modern Kyoto, retired governors who had settled in their former postings, and local clans with historic roots to their land. To make up for a lack of soft power, clans trained their peasants with exceptional bravado, promising to protect them at all costs, in return for absolute loyalty.

Before the samurai code of bushido - the way of the warrior - Japan referred to warfare as kyuba no michi, 'the way of the horse and bow', or kyusen no michi, 'the way of the bow and arrow'. Armies were centred around a core of mounted archers, drawn from prominent families, who maintained their own horses and equipment. They wore scaled armour, and though they carried swords, hand-to-hand combat was reserved for the peasants, armed with spears and shields. Local clan leaders could boast up to 500 peasants, giving special privileges to blood relatives and those whose families had served for generations. Before long, the country's mass of soldiers was concentrated in the hands of distant landowners, rather than the emperor.

Despite this changing order, Masakado was raised to appreciate the prestige of imperial life. Boasting an honourable lineage, he spent his youth in the capital, a guard at the emperor's private residence, and even serving the future imperial reagent, Fujiwara Tadahira - a man of great standing. However, in spite of his immense
In the 12th century, the Taira and Minamoto clans went to war, with the Minamoto emerging the country’s pre-eminent power.

Early Japanese bushidō were centred around elite mounted cavalry, practising ‘the way of the horse and bow’

War & Conflict

Rise of the Samurai

Masakado’s uprising marked the rise of the samurai warrior class

After Taira Masakado’s death, members of the Minamoto and Taira clans - both stemming from the imperial family - continued to amass power. In 1028, another powerful Taira chieftain, Tadatsune, resigned as vice-governor of Kazusa and broke out in revolt, causing even more damage to the country than Masakado had - before surrendering to the powerful Minamoto Yorinobu, to whom the imperial court had appealed twice.

The Minamoto clan went on to play a crucial role in quashing the Early Nine Years War, defeating the rebellious Abe clan to the north, and again in the Three Years War against the Kiyowara family in the province of Mutsu. By the 12th century, the Taira and Minamoto clans had emerged as Japan’s two greatest sources of military might, earning special privileges for their efforts. When tensions came to a head during the epic Genpei War of 1180-1185, the Minamoto emerged supreme, usurping power from the emperor and handing it to the clan leader, a military dictator, called the shōgun.

Though the emperor remained a figurehead, this feudal society was ruled by the warrior class - the samurai - who served local lords in return for a food stipend, while their lords collected taxes and governed fiefs on behalf of the shōgun. Promise, the young man failed to secure a post of esteem. Eager to take destiny into his own hands, in 931 he decided to return to his homeland of Kantō - which had become a snake pit in his absence. With his father recently deceased, his uncles were keen to secure his land for themselves. Things came to a head when Masakado married his cousin against her father, Yoshikane’s, wishes.

Sensing an opportunity, the powerful local landlord, Minamoto Mamoru, who had marriage ties to all of Masakado’s uncles, sent his three sons to ambush him in the province of Hitachi in 935. Despite the element of surprise, they not only lost the battle, but their lives. Enraged by this unprovoked attack, Masakado rampaged across their lands, burning down their residences and the houses of hundreds of their supporters. Among the battle-dead was another of Masakado’s powerful Taira uncles, Kunika. Though his death prompted his son, Sadamori, to return home from the capital, he lamented, “Masakado is not my original foe.” Sadamori had always been fond of his cousin - as fellow courtiers, they shared similar ambitions, and he had hoped to avoid conflict with him at all costs; perhaps even to ally with him.

In June 936, still bearing a grudge against his nephew, Yoshikane marched an army “as numerous as the clouds” to a fort in the southeastern district of Kazusa, linking up with his brother Yoshimasa. Senior clan leaders, they coerced Sadamori into joining their cause, leading a fresh-faced army of thousands, all clad in brand-new armour and equipment, atop well-fed horses to Hitachi. There, Masakado lay in wait with a few hundred poorly equipped mounted soldiers and the 1,000-odd peasants he was able to muster. Against all odds, Masakado routed the attackers, chasing Yoshikane to the provincial government headquarters in Shimotsuke. However, keen to avoid the scandal of killing a family member, he let his uncle go unscathed - instead reporting the unprovoked attack to the imperial government and his neighbours.

Months later, Masakado was summoned to the court, where he was handed a light punishment for arson - before being pardoned as a part of a general amnesty on New Year’s Day in 937, when Emperor Suzaku came of age. Although he disavowed the life of war, no sooner had he returned home, the bitter Yoshikane launched another attack at the River Kogai. During the battle, he had his army raise images of Masakado’s father and grandfather, supposedly to seek their protection, but most likely to deter his enemy from firing arrows at his men. Having beaten Masakado, who was rendered immobile by sudden illness, he defeated him again at Toyota. Shell-shocked,
Masakado and his family sought shelter among sympathetic clan members – but a traitor helped Yoshikane capture his wife and children.

Licking his wounds, after years of unprovoked assaults, Masakado had finally run out of patience. Raising an army, he marched on Hitachi, burning his uncle's residence to the ground, along with hundreds of his supporters' houses. He chased Yoshikane into the mountains, destroying his crops along the way. Desperate, Yoshikane again bribed one of Masakado's men into betraying where his nephew slept and led a group of 80 warriors “each worth a thousand”, to his camp. However, his nemesis was waiting for him, “with flaming eyes and clenched teeth”. After a brief, explosive charge, half of Yoshikane's men lay dead. Broken, the Taira kingpin faded into obscurity, dying a few years later.

Although his troubles were far from over, Masakado had begun to develop something of a Robin Hood persona. When the controversial Prince Okiyo found himself at odds with the governor of Musahi, Masakado offered him shelter. Simultaneously, a local landowner, Fujiwara Haruaki, had developed a reputation for dodging his taxes – a man who official records said “behaved worse than barbarians or beasts”. When the vice-governor put out a warrant for his arrest, Haruaki romped across Hitachi and Shimosa, robbing official granaries. As the region's constable, Masakado was ordered to arrest him, but instead offered him protection – claiming it his duty to protect the weak against the strong.

By June 939, Masakado's anti-authoritarian exploits had earned him an army of 1,000 mounted warriors, disenchanted with the established hierarchy. After defeating a large government army three times the size of his, Masakado seized the government's headquarters in Hitachi, before taking the provincial capital of Shimotsuke; along with its provincial seals and keys. Finally, after years of provocation, Masakado had broken out into full-blown rebellion. When Prince Okiyo pointed out that the punishment was equal whether he revolted in eight provinces or one, Masakado marched across Kantō, securing the entire region and appointing his own governors. After supposedly consulting an oracle from Hachiman – the patron deity of war – Masakado did the unthinkable, declaring himself the ‘New Emperor’. While his own brother admonished him for “acting without discretion” against the Mandate of Heaven, Masakado proclaimed, “Our age dictates that those who are victorious become rulers,” before spitting, “your counsels are absolutely meaningless.”

In January 940, he wrote to his former mentor, the regent Tadahira, justifying his actions, and claiming that his ambition lay only in Kantō. However, the court was understandably wary.

During Masakado's uprising, further north, the previously 'pacified' Emishi people had broken out in revolt - destroying settlers' property. Simultaneously, an even greater rebellion had broken out west, under the leadership of the 'Pirate King' Fujiwara Sumitomo. Formerly the governor of Iyo, on the southern island of Shikoku, Sumitomo had amassed a fleet of fishermen and petty seamen, and begun raiding the Inland Sea. Though the government offered him a senior post, he was not so easily appeased - instead capturing the vice-governor of Settsu, cutting off his ears, slitting his nose, murdering his son and taking his wife captive.

Terrified that the two had formed a secret, unholy alliance, the Heian court issued an edict demanding the eastern governors capture Masakado, with rewards of land and positions up for grabs, adding: “Since creation, this court has seen many rebellions, but none that compare to this.” Highlighting its desperation, it held elaborate services and prayers, and ordered rituals be committed across the country by the mystic cults - to destroy Masakado through black magic.

At this juncture, as the country's greatest tsuwamono, or warrior, Masakado had amassed an army of 5,000 - joined by family members, landowners and those drawn to his martial prowess. In doing so, he had essentially created the first of many bushidan, or warrior bands.

Though the country had known insurrection, Masakado was no distant barbarian – he was of the finest stock, fighting among his own blood. In this dawn of civil war, his followers, and those of his rivals, began to create a new culture, away from the elegance of the Heian court. While warriors like Sadamori still used powdered foetus to treat battle wounds, they also developed new customs; announcing their names with gusto,
Before the samurai, Taira Masakado was the country’s most renowned tsuwamono - a warrior, fighting with bow and arrow on horseback.
“Licking his wounds, after years of unprovoked assaults, Masakado had finally run out of patience”

before rushing into battle. Similarly, they introduced the curved swords, lacquered o-yoroi armour worn by commanders, and elaborate antlered helmets that would later become hallmarks of samurai warfare.

Having abandoned conscription, the imperial army had been made irrelevant by the new face of warfare. Instead, the court dealt out promotions, hoping to inspire private soldiers - like Minamoto Tsubomoto, the vice-governor of Musashi, Sadamori and Fujiwara Hidesato, the chief constable of Shimotsuke - to take matters into their own hands. While Sadamori had joined the war reluctantly, after Masakado’s men captured and raped his wife, their hatred was now mutual.

Unfortunately for Masakado, despite his heritage, ability and prestige, he lacked the structural organisation that his spiritual samurai successors would later herald to great success. While he led an army of 5,000 across Hitachi to search for Sadamori, he was dependent on allies, rather than direct retainers. Even among family members, many fought out of self-interest, rather than personal loyalty. So, when Masakado returned home, with winter approaching, so too did his allies - leaving him with an army of just 1,000. After the chief constable Hidesato announced his allegiance with Sadamori, Masakado’s men thoughtlessly launched a pre-emptive attack - only to be driven back in February 940.

The vengeful Sadamori burned down Masakado’s mansion, as well as the homes of his supporters, unleashing chaos in the ranks. The two sides picked the battleground of Kitayama, in Shimosa for their last showdown. Though both erected walls of wooden shields, to protect them from cavalry charges, a violent gust of wind blew from behind Masakado, throwing his defences forwards, and hurling Sadamori’s back into his soldiers. With the defences down, the coalition’s Fujiwara and Taira leaders launched a cavalry charge. Undeterred, Masakado hurled himself onto his horse and, with just 400 men, stormed into the enemy with such great ferocity, all but 300 fled. However, at this critical point, the wind turned against the New Emperor - and, as the enemy regrouped, he was hit by a stray arrow - killing him. Sadamori sent a lowly soldier to wrench his head from his body and took it to the capital, along with a certificate. Prince Okiyo was captured and killed just days later.

Meanwhile, the Pirate King Sumitomo, who had lost two chieftains and 2,500 men to bribes, was dealt a crushing blow after a turncoat surrendered to the government and led them to his base. Retreating to Kyushu, he sacked and raided all the way to Hakata, until he was surrounded and killed.

With both rebels dead, the emperor visited the Kamo shrine and prayed for the dead - ally and enemy alike - at Enryakuji monastery on Mount Hiei, overlooking the capital. Although peace had come, it had come at a high price. The nature of warfare, loyalty and rulership had been dealt a shocking blow - and though the emperor had won, it was not by the power of his state, but that of his provincial allies, and their private armies.

In the centuries to come, the Heian court blossomed into a centre of sophistication. Meanwhile, in the provinces, having cemented a stronger identity and honour code, the samurai would become the masters of Japan’s emerging feudal system. Though his rebellion was short-lived, Masakado was the harbinger of things to come, the personification of the new order. It was only a matter of time before the emperor lost his power; Masakado was simply 200 years too early.

Masakado’s Legacy

More than 1,000 years after his death, Japan still fears the wrath of Masakado

According to legend, after Masakado’s head was cut off and put on show in the capital, it flew off by itself, in search of its body, before landing at Kubizuka or ‘Head Hill’ - in a fishing village at the heart of modern Tokyo, right next to the Imperial Palace. Superstition has since surrounded it.

After the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923, when the Ministry of Finance attempted to replace the hill with an office building, 14 employees died, including the minister himself, and many others suffered ominous injuries. Then, in 1940, a lightning bolt sparked a fire adjacent to the hill, burning down nine government buildings - again, including the Ministry of Finance. It was one of the few sites in the area to survive Allied bombing in WWII and when the occupying forces tried to build over it, a bulldozer hit the foundation stone - killing its driver. Though he was declared an enemy of the emperor in 1874, Masakado was re-defined, by popular demand, in 1984 at Tokyo’s Kanda shrine. To this day, companies in the area pay donations to Kubizuka, making employees go on pilgrimage to it, and laying out their offices, so that no one sits with their back to Masakado’s grave.

The First Samurai

Masakado is enshrined at Tokyo’s Kanda Myojin shrine, where he is revered, and feared, to this day as a patron deity.
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Breaking Down Barriers

How a Jazz Age mega-star put racism under the spotlight

"You know, friends, that I do not lie to you when I tell you I have walked into the palaces of kings and queens and into the houses of presidents. And much more. But I could not walk into a hotel in America and get a cup of coffee, and that made me mad. And when I get mad, you know that I open my big mouth. And then look out, 'cause when Josephine opens her mouth, they hear it all over the world."

This is a small excerpt of the speech Josephine Baker gave to 250,000 people at the historic March on Washington on 28 August 1963. The only woman to address the crowd that day and wearing her military uniform, her words resonated with their fight for liberty, equality and dignity – a cause she had spent the last four decades fighting for in the face of adversity and controversy.

Josephine was a woman unlike any other. A trailblazer for African-Americans, her name has become synonymous with the Jazz Age that swept through the 1920s and 1930s. As one of the best entertainers in Paris, she dazzled audiences with her stage performances at a time when African and European cultures were merging to define an era of frivolity and razzmatazz, turning Josephine into a star.

This stardom was in stark contrast to Josephine's humble beginnings, which fuelled her crusade against racism. Born to stage performers in St Louis, Missouri, on 3 June 1906, Freda Josephine McDonald was thrown into a world of poverty, racism and discrimination. Living off meagre scraps of food, she worked as a waitress and as a live-in cleaner for white families – one of her mistresses beat her regularly and made her sleep in the basement.

By the time she was 15 years old, Josephine had dropped out of school and married twice, earning money by dancing steps that she had learnt in America's urban black centres. Later in life, Josephine would reflect on her childhood and confess: "I danced to keep warm."

Scouted for her dancing, she ran away to join a vaudeville troupe and got divorced again, although she kept her second husband's surname 'Baker' for professional purposes.

Moving to New York City, Josephine attracted attention during the Harlem Renaissance, considered the rebirth of African-American arts. Initially rejected from the chorus lines for being "too skinny and too dark", a determined Josephine learnt the routines anyway in case another dancer fell ill. When the opportunity came, she joined the chorus lines and stole the shows with her comedic performances. Wearing caricatured blackface, she appeared in the Broadway productions Shuffle Along and The Chocolate Dandies in 1921 and 1924 respectively.

Catching the eye of a recruiter for an all-black dance troupe in France, Josephine
left for Europe with an offer of $1,000 a month to join the Parisian stage. Arriving in the City of Lights, Josephine met other African-descended women celebrated for their erotic dances, a stark difference to the racial prejudice that she experienced in America.

Josephine’s big break came when she debuted in La Revue Nègre at the Théâtre des Champs-Élysées on 2 October 1925. Her seductive and funny dance moves entranced audiences who kept coming back for more, even after Josephine moved to performing at the Folies-Bergère.

When Josephine Baker was refused service because of her skin colour at New York City’s elite Stork Club in 1951, it left another diner instantly outraged. Walking over to Josephine’s table, the diner took her arm and voiced her support for her before the pair defiantly stormed out of the club together. It was none other than Hollywood superstar Grace Kelly, and this moment marked the start of her long and close friendship with Josephine.

Grace came to Josephine’s aid once again when the latter was swimming in debt and evicted from her Les Milandes estate in 1969. Grace had been married to Prince Rainier III of Monaco since 1956 and was now known as Princess Grace of Monaco. She offered Josephine a permanent home in Monaco along with financial assistance, even arranging for her to perform on the stage once again.

After embarking on a tour that saw her perform in locations such as New York, Paris and London, Josephine returned to Monaco in 1974. The following year, Princess Grace financed Josephine’s comeback revue, Josephine at the Bobino Theatre in Paris, a celebration of her 50 years in show business, along with her husband and Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. It was a great success and that evening, a dinner was held in Josephine’s honour, where the two women were pictured sat next to each other. This was the last time the pair were together as Josephine suddenly died four days later.

After Josephine’s funeral in Paris, Princess Grace arranged for her body to be brought to Monaco for a private family service and at the royal’s insistence, Josephine was buried in the Monaco Cemetery.

“Her seductive and funny dance moves entranced audiences who kept coming back for more”

However, when she performed the Danse Sauvage in her iconic banana skirt, she cemented her celebrity status for good.

The Danse Sauvage was the epitome of unbridled sexuality, resonating with the sexual freedom of the Jazz Age. It was set in the African jungle and Josephine never shied away from her African heritage, instead choosing to firmly embrace it by bringing traditional black dances.
such as the Charleston and the Black Bottom to Paris and incorporating African themes into her performances. Audiences loved Josephine's work because her dances indulged the stereotype that black people were primitive, exotic and foolish. She catered to this to propel her burgeoning career, pulling faces and crossing her eyes throughout her performances to make her dances goofy yet sexy. Her tactics worked because by the late 1920s, Josephine had become the highest-paid entertainer in Europe, touring the continent.

Josephine built a new life for herself in Paris, a place without the racial segregation of the Jim Crow laws, or abuse. When discussing her life in St Louis, Josephine commented, “It was one of the worst cities in America for racial discrimination... I have very bad memories of that time.” It is not a wonder that she fell in love with France, which offered her freedom and safety.

Her success was unprecedented for an African-American woman at the time, with her popularity allowing her to move from the stage to the silver screen. In 1934, she became the first black woman to star in a major motion picture when she played the titular character Zouzou.

Just as captivating on screen as she was on stage, women flocked to emulate Josephine’s style through clothing, makeup and her famous *spit curls*. She even released a hair pomade called Bakerfix and a skin-darkening lotion called Bakerskin for her fans to buy.

Encouraged by her career in Europe, Josephine wanted to achieve fame in America. In 1936, she travelled to New York City to perform in the famous Ziegfeld Follies, her first performance in America since she had left for Paris. But she was shattered when newspaper critics published scathing reviews that laughed and ridiculed her. She stopped off with a barrage of racism from one stinging critic derogatorily referred to her as the negro wenches. Heartbroken, Josephine fled back to France and in 1937 she married French industrialist Jean Lion and began the process to become a French citizen, renouncing her US citizenship.

When World War II broke out two years later, Josephine wanted to help her adoptive country. In her own words, she stated, “France made me what I am, they gave me their hearts. Surely I can give them my life.” Putting her fame to good use, she worked for the French Resistance as her performances gave her the perfect cover to travel throughout Europe without suspicion. She attended glittering parties filled with Axis officials, charming them to gain information for the Resistance.

Of course, it is unlikely that charm alone would have persuaded the enemy to divulge their secrets. In fact, they supposedly trusted Josephine and...
Josephine performed for British troops on leave.

"To pass on confidential information undetected, she wrote it in invisible ink on her music sheets or concealed information in her underwear."
Protest & Activism

Desperate to get her aboard, Schuyler promised to desegregate his club and invite prominent African Americans to the show. Josephine agreed and her show in Miami was a big hit, particularly with African-American critics, who praised her efforts towards desegregation.

Encouraged by her success in Miami, Josephine toured the states and stepped up her demands. She refused to perform in segregated venues and stayed in the best hotels, a stark contrast to her hotel experience just a couple of years earlier. Thanks to her efforts, casinos across Las Vegas became desegregated. However, her efforts are not as widely known as those made by her male counterparts such as Martin Luther King or Sammy Davis Jr.

Josephine also encouraged white businessmen to hire African-Americans and spoke out against the trial of the Trenton Six: six men accused of murdering a white man, visiting them in jail during their second trial in April 1951. A month later, Josephine paid for the funeral of Willie McGree, an African-American who had been executed for allegedly raping a white woman.

For her tireless efforts, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People named 20 May Josephine Baker Day in her honour. Celebrations were held in Harlem with 100,000 people taking part in a parade, in recognition of Josephine's fight for equality.

However, circumstances changed when Josephine openly criticised the prestigious New York nightclub, the Stork Club, where she had been refused service during a dinner with friends. Outraged, Josephine filed charges against the Stork Club and called out journalist Walter Winchell, her one-time ally, for failing to come to her assistance.

Outraged, Josephine filed charges against the Stork Club and called out journalist Walter Winchell, her one-time ally, for failing to come to her assistance. She visited Havana, Cuba, and was said to have parted with the communist Castro brothers: Fidel and Raúl. Winchell used this as evidence for his accusations against Josephine, despite the fact that she had been distancing herself from the left side of politics for some time. In response, Josephine was briefly arrested and interrogated by Cuban police for being a suspected communist at the suggestion of the FBI.

She was released but a propaganda campaign initiated by the American government, persuading other countries to prevent her from performing, was successful and many of her contracts were subsequently cancelled.

Josephine's politically charged speeches about racism were highlighting an issue that the American government wanted to keep buried.

The situation worsened when Josephine conducted another tour across Latin America in 1952, escaping from her problems in America. During her visit to Argentina, Josephine made statements denouncing the racism prevalent in America that were subsequently published across the world. The American government was horrified as Josephine's popularity increased, with her words of discrimination resonating with many other races and ethnicities.

Josephine had gained exposure for her cause but Winchell used the tour against her. She visited Havana, Cuba, and was said to have parted with the communist Castro brothers: Fidel and Raúl. Winchell used this as evidence for his accusations against Josephine, despite the fact that she had been distancing herself from the left side of politics for some time. In response, Josephine was briefly arrested and interrogated by Cuban police for being a suspected communist at the suggestion of the FBI.

She was released but a propaganda campaign initiated by the American government, persuading other countries to prevent her from performing, was successful and many of her contracts were subsequently cancelled.

Josephine's politically charged speeches about racism were highlighting an issue that the American government wanted to keep buried.
Josephine was a renowned star but she suffered from serious financial difficulties. In June 1964, French actress Brigitte Bardot appealed on television for contributions to save Josephine's home, which was on the brink of being repossessed. Unfortunately, Josephine and her children were eventually evicted from Les Milandes and the estate was sold, but she refused to leave. Remaining sat on the steps outside of her home, pictures of Josephine's plight were plastered all over the world.

With her friend, Princess Grace of Monaco, helping her to get back on her feet, Josephine took up performing once again. Since the war, her days of performing in a banana skirt and indulging racial stereotypes had long gone. Now, Josephine graced her audiences by descending down long staircases in glamorous, sophisticated gowns that marked the transition of her lengthy career.

On 8 April 1975, Josephine held a performance in Paris to celebrate 50 years of her career and received a standing ovation with rave reviews to match. This was the last time she would star on the stage as just four days later, she sadly passed away following a cerebral haemorrhage, aged 68. She was given a funeral in France with full military honours, with thousands of people turning out to pay their respects to the woman who dedicated her life to breaking down barriers, both on and off the stage.

After a decade away, Josephine returned to America to give her speech at the 1963 March on Washington alongside Martin Luther King. When King was assassinated five years later, his wife, Coretta Scott King, offered Josephine the unofficial leadership of the Civil Rights Movement. Josephine was tempted but she ultimately refused, scared that as the head of the movement her children would be in danger. Her fears were justified considering that the FBI was still gathering information on her, even though they had determined that she was not a communist.

Breaking Down Barriers

By the mid 1960s, Josephine remained a renowned star but she suffered from serious financial difficulties. In June 1964, French actress Brigitte Bardot appealed on television for contributions to save Josephine's home, which was on the brink of being repossessed. Unfortunately, Josephine and her children were eventually evicted from Les Milandes and the estate was sold, but she refused to leave. Remaining sat on the steps outside of her home, pictures of Josephine's plight were plastered all over the world.

With her friend, Princess Grace of Monaco, helping her to get back on her feet, Josephine took up performing once again. Since the war, her days of performing in a banana skirt and indulging racial stereotypes had long gone. Now, Josephine graced her audiences by descending down long staircases in glamorous, sophisticated gowns that marked the transition of her lengthy career.

On 8 April 1975, Josephine held a performance in Paris to celebrate 50 years of her career and received a standing ovation with rave reviews to match. This was the last time she would star on the stage as just four days later, she sadly passed away following a cerebral haemorrhage, aged 68. She was given a funeral in France with full military honours, with thousands of people turning out to pay their respects to the woman who dedicated her life to breaking down barriers, both on and off the stage.
As the terror of Nazi rule gripped Europe, some risked life and limb to rise up against the oppression — here are the stories of just eight of those people.
On 27 February 1943, just over 100 people - mainly women - gathered on a street in Berlin. In the early hours of the morning, the Gestapo had pulled Jewish men out of their beds while they were sleeping next to their ‘Aryan’ wives. Around 2,000 of them were rounded up and held at a Jewish community centre on Rosenstraf, and the women were angry. They began to gather outside and they were there day after day, chanting, “Give us our husbands back.” By March, the crowd had grown to thousands.

One day, the guards had had enough. They pointed machine guns at the crowd and told the women to disperse, but it only bolstered their resistance. They began shouting, “Murderers!” Finally, Joseph Goebbels conceded and began releasing prisoners. Out of the 2,000 captured, only 25 were sent to Auschwitz. The women seemed to have won, but a day later the remaining 1,975 were rounded up and sent to labour camps.

While the ending was nowhere near as happy as it could have been, it showed the citizens of the Third Reich something - rising up could make a difference. People could combat the terror that Hitler’s henchmen bestowed on the towns and cities, and they did. Members of the clergy preached against Hitler from the pulpit, while pockets of resistance opened up all over German territory. Hundreds if not thousands risked their lives to fight against the Führer’s reign of terror - here are just eight of their stories.
SOPHIE SCHOLL
One of the most famous rebels was only 21 when she was killed

After joining the Hitler Youth as a teenager, Hans Scholl co-founded the anti-Nazi White Rose movement in Munich in 1942 and his sister, Sophie, soon joined, disseminating leaflets advocating passive resistance. One read “We will not be silent, we are your guilty conscience!” while another condemned the defeat at Stalingrad that had cost 2.2 million German lives.

18 February 1943 would be the day Sophie’s crusade ended. Caught with a suitcase full of pamphlets, she was arrested and spent 17 hours being interrogated. Four days later her trial was held, but it was a sham. Not given a chance to speak, Sophie interrupted the judge. “What we said and wrote are what many people are thinking. They just don’t dare say it out loud!” she yelled. It wouldn’t be enough - she was convicted of treason and sentenced to death by guillotine. But her protest lasted until her last moments as she addressed the crowd, “Such a fine, sunny day, and I have to go. But what does my death matter, if through us thousands of people are awakened and stirred to action?”

“What we said and wrote are what many people are thinking. They just don’t dare say it out loud!”

DIETRICH BONHOEFFER
Some people made their stand in the only way they knew - through religion

When theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer returned to Germany after studying in the US, he was disappointed - Adolf Hitler had become chancellor and was spreading anti-Semitic sentiments. He had to do something. With some fellow clergymen and theologians, Bonhoeffer founded the Confessing Church in 1934, its allegiance first to God, not the state.

Bonhoeffer didn’t stop there. In an underground seminary, Finkenwalde, he taught other pastors his ways until it was uncovered and shut down.

It was time for a change of strategy - Bonhoeffer signed up to the secret service but while he travelled the country reporting on church conferences, he was helping Jews escape the Nazis.

In 1943, he was finally caught. One afternoon in April, a black Mercedes pulled up. Bonhoeffer was bundled into it and sent to prison where he spent two years. He was later transferred to Buchenwald concentration camp and then Flossenbürg. On the morning of 9 April 1945 he was escorted from his bed and had his verdict read to him. He knelt on the floor and prayed to God. Before he climbed the gallows he prayed once more and then the noose was placed around his neck. He died within seconds, but his theology and reputation lived on.

“Looking on is not Christian behaviour. Christians are called to compassion and to action.”
Providing information to the enemy will often cost you your life

“Our death must be a beacon”

Not everyone who signed up as a member of the Nazi Party stayed affiliated with it. In 1937, Libertas Schulze-Boysen and her husband, Harro, left - they’d finally fallen out of love with the regime. However, not wanting to sit back, they formulated a plan.
Libertas began collecting photographs that documented violent crimes committed by members of the Nazi Party while her husband recruited for the German resistance organisation that they had called the Red Orchestra. Then in 1941 an opportunity fell into their laps that they couldn’t resist.
Harro managed to pass intelligence to someone at the Soviet embassy about Hitler’s plans to invade the Soviet Union. At last their work had achieved something. But the Soviets ignored them and the human cost was high.
Meanwhile, Harro was arrested - he’d been rumbled. Eight days later they came for the pregnant Libertas but they didn’t put her on trial right away. Instead they waited until she'd given birth and then on 19 December 1942 she was sentenced to death for high treason. The last sound she heard was the guillotine hurtling towards her neck.

Hitler probably never expected resistance against his rule from his head of the Central Department of the Counter Intelligence Office, but Hans Oster was to disappoint him. As part of the German Resistance, he made sure to be a part of every attempted coup and headed up the underground organisation’s intelligence.

In 1940, Oster gave the Netherlands a heads-up that Germany was planning an invasion and no one had any idea - in fact, a year later he was promoted to major general and made chief of staff of the Office for Foreign Affairs/Counter Intelligence of the Armed Forces High Command. But things started to go south for him in 1943.
Forced to resign because of alleged foreign currency dealings, the Gestapo kept an eye on him and with good reason - in the event of Hitler’s death, he was to become presiding judge of the Reich Military Court. After the failed 20 July plot of 1944, Oster was finally arrested and Hitler himself ordered on 8 April 1945 that his former intelligence chief be sent to Flossenbürg concentration camp to be killed. He was murdered one day after his arrival.

“It is both my purpose and my duty to liberate Germany, and with her the world, from this”
Maria von Maltzan

Even members of the nobility did their bit in the resistance against Hitler.

Countess Maria von Maltzan was always one to go against the grain. In a time when certain things were expected of women, she studied veterinary science and got her doctorate in natural sciences in 1928. That wasn't when she would stop breaking down boundaries.

As early as 1933, von Maltzan was part of the German resistance, and when she realised the true extent of Hitler's anti-Semitic policies, she knew what she had to do. Whenever she received a call for help, she opened her home to the persecuted, feeding and protecting them with the German authorities none the wiser. As time went on, she got more bold, securing fake visas so that Jews could escape the country and sometimes driving them out of Berlin herself. She even created a special hiding place inside her sofa for Hans Hirschel, a Jewish author.

Maria and Hans eventually had a child together, but after the baby was placed in an incubator in the hospital, the building was bombed. Maria was devastated but she did have more children - she would come to adopt two girls from a children's camp.

“I prefer to be in a tough situation than to go to bed with a bad conscience”

Life: 1878-1946
Fate: Imprisoned

“Howver hard the hammer strikes, the anvil stands quietly and firmly in place”

Clemens August Graf von Galen

One man managed to halt Nazi euthanasia in an almost saint-like way.

At first, the bishop of Münster thought that the Nazis would be able to restore Germany to its glory days of the early 1900s - Clemens August Graf von Galen had total faith in the political party. However, it didn't last long.

Easter 1934 seems to have been Galen's turning point when he wrote a pastoral letter criticising the "neopaganism of the National Socialist ideology". He found their anti-Catholic propaganda overbearing and he couldn't bring himself to support the Nazis' ardent racism, but he didn't hide his feelings. In fact, he often complained directly to the Führer himself. Somehow, he didn't even seem to get demoted.

November 1936 saw more rebellion from Galen - when the Nazis began removing crucifixes from schools in Oldenburg, Galen started a protest that spiralled into a public demonstration. But it was his actions in 1941 that have earned him renown. From his pulpit in Münster he delivered three sermons that summer admonishing the state's confiscation of church property and demonising a regime that carried out programmatic euthanasia. Copies of the sermons circulated around Germany and the T4 programme, which was the systematic murder of those deemed an embarrassment to the 'Aryan race', was formally ended.

As punishment Galen was put under house arrest - Hitler couldn't make a martyr of him - but documents revealed after the war showed that he was nearly hanged for his rebellion. In the end Galen lived a full life and was beatified by the Catholic Church in 2005.

Life: 1909-97
Fate: Survived
“Love is larger than the walls which shut it in”

CORRIE TEN BOOM

Even in the darkest times her faith never wavered

While the Gies family is possibly the best known for hiding Jews from the Nazis in the Netherlands, they weren't the only ones. In Haarlem the house of the Ten Boom family became a safe haven for several people escaping persecution because of their race. Five to six refugees would stay in the house on a temporary basis, with others sheltering there for only a couple of hours or days before moving on.

In 1944 the Ten Boom family - Casper and his daughters Betsie and Corrie - were betrayed. On 28 February their home was raided and over 30 people were arrested. However, the Nazis never found six people who had been hidden behind a false wall. Corrie spent time in Scheveningen Prison before being transported to Ravensbrück Concentration Camp with her sister. Betsie unfortunately died there, but Corrie managed to survive and upon her release she travelled the world, preaching the love of God despite the terrible times that she lived through. But she couldn’t have known how lucky she was at the time - a clerical error meant that she was released just before all of the female prisoners her age at Ravensbrück were executed.

“If you are arrested you are no good. If you are shot and killed you are stupid”

GUNNAR SØNSTEBY

The hero of the Norwegian resistance was Europe’s most effective saboteur

From the moment the Germans took control of Norway, many resistance movements were born. The most prominent was Milorg and one of those who signed up with Gunnar Sønstebý. His first act was to enlist in the pro-Nazi forces so that he could gather intelligence, and over the next few years he'd evade the Gestapo by forging German papers, steal banknote-printing plates to help fund the Special Operations Executive, and undergo special saboteur training in England.

He returned to Norway in style, parachuting into Oslo ready to sabotage Nazi operations. Heading a group of resistance members, he destroyed official records to stop young Norwegian men from being sent to Russia. He blew up arms factories and German aircraft, and sank German merchant ships. When the Nazis wanted to reduce the rations that were already low, Sønstebý destroyed 75,000 ration books so that they couldn't, and when he realised that he could stop armaments from moving south, he blew up the railways. After the war, he was awarded medals from Britain and the United States, but Norway remained the most appreciative of his efforts. He was given the War Cross with three swords, Norway's highest military honour.

Life: 1892–1983
Fate: Righteous Among the Nations

Life: 1918–2010
Fate: Survived
Diving into the archives of the New York Public Library, Love and Resistance: Out of the Closet into the Stonewall Era, edited by curator Jason Baumann, offers a collection of over 100 powerful images capturing the LGBTQ civil rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s, and the protests that surrounded the pivotal Stonewall riots.

In a moving introduction, renowned author Roxane Gay states that the images, taken by leading photojournalists Diana Davies and Kay Tobin Lahusen, record “a time when queer people were emerging from the margins and asserting their right to do so”. Both were pioneering activists, with Davies documenting gay, lesbian and trans liberation and Lahusen capturing key moments, while also helping to found the Gay Activists Alliance in 1969.

Baumann emphasises that their images “seem as timely now as when they were first taken” because of “the deep divides and fierce debates currently taking place in the United States regarding gender, sexuality, race and power”. Divided into four sections - Visibility, Love, Pride and Protest - Love and Resistance explores the progression of the LGBTQ movement and the presence of love, humanity and resistance in the face of widespread persecution and entirely senseless oppression.

## LOVE AND RESISTANCE
OUT OF THE CLOSET INTO THE STONEWALL ERA

Around the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall riots, take a look back at the early years of the LGBTQ movement

Love and Resistance edited by Jason Baumann with photographs by Kay Tobin Lahusen and Diana Davies is out now (WW Norton. £17.99)
LESBIAN FEMINISM

Pictured at the Christopher Street Liberation Day in 1971, the marchers hold high a “Women’s Liberation is a Lesbian Plot” banner, a slogan which was used by the Lavender Menace. The original Stonewall Inn was located on Christopher Street and the street subsequently became the centre of the LGBTQ movement in New York.

FIGHTING FOR EQUALITY

Aside from personal portraits, Lahusen also took photographs of Gittings at political demonstrations. Taken in 1969, Gittings was protesting against the discrimination of homosexuals from federal employment – the men and women who took part were smartly dressed, to emphasise that their sexuality made no difference to their ability to work.

PPA

LOVE IS LOVE

Lahusen took this photograph of an unidentified couple at the 1977 Integrity Conference in Philadelphia. A number of activists were known to use pseudonyms to protect their identities, although some chose different names as a better expression for themselves.
Davies took this iconic portrait of photographer Donna Gottschalk, holding her “I Am Your Worst Fear I Am Your Best Fantasy” sign, at the Christopher Street Liberation Day march in 1970. Gottschalk was an active member of the Radicalesbians, the Gay Liberation Front and even some separatist communities.
This intimate photograph was taken by Lahusen of her partner, Barbara Gittings, who was also a pioneer of the LGBTQ movement in her own right. Candid images such as this one emphasised that lesbians were indeed happy, normal human beings.

AN ICONIC FIGURE

Judy Carusino and Stephanie Myers, members of the GLF, are pictured at a demonstration in New York City in 1970. Myers is holding a “Sappho Was A Right-On Woman” sign in reference to the ancient Greek poet who lived on the island of Lesbos, from which the term lesbian is derived.
Bluffer's Guide
The Peterloo Massacre
ENGLAND, 16 AUGUST 1819

Did you know?
At the time the protesters were calling for reform, only three per cent of the population in England and Wales had the right to vote.

Timeline

1789
The French Revolution shocks Europe, as radicals – partly inspired by the American Revolution – overthrow the monarchy in the name of “liberty, equality, fraternity”.

1815
Economic and agricultural depression in Britain after the Napoleonic Wars that lasted several years, leading to public dissatisfaction.

16 AUGUST 1819
A peaceful campaign for reform turns deadly as the gathered crowds at St Peter's Field are violently dispersed, culminating in Henry Hunt's arrest.

MARCH 1820
Hunt is tried and sentenced to two and a half years in prison unlawful and seditious assembling for the purpose of exciting discontent – many others are also imprisoned.
The Peterloo Massacre

What was it?
Around 18 peaceful protesters were killed and hundreds seriously injured when the authorities broke up a political meeting calling for universal suffrage. Around 60,000 to 100,000 men, women and children from across North West England had converged on St Peter’s Fields in Manchester for the event. Some walked up to 30 miles to hear famous campaigner Henry ‘Orator’ Hunt speak. Despite the seriousness of the cause, there was a festive atmosphere, with bands playing music and people dancing. Hunt and his fellow campaigners were calling on parliament to extend the vote to working men. This was at a time when only those who owned property of a certain value were enfranchised. Local magistrates feared that the protesters were actually violent revolutionaries and sent in the Manchester and Salford Yeomanry - a local force of volunteer soldiers - to arrest Hunt and disperse the crowd. While soldiers targeted those waving banners, many more were crushed in the panic as the yeomen rode in.

What were the consequences?
The yeomen’s actions made newspaper headlines. Journalist James Wroe coined the name ‘Peterloo Massacre’ comparing the violence to the Battle of Waterloo. An account detailing the brutality of the yeomanry in The Times shocked the country. Outrage only grew once it emerged that the regiment had sharpened their weapons beforehand, suggesting the attack was premeditated. A petition demanding political change garnered over 20 pages worth of signatures. However, while public fury led to the yeomanry’s disbandment in 1824, the government’s first response was to introduce the so-called Six Acts. These laws restricted the press and public meetings, so that they couldn’t agitate for radical reform. But demands for suffrage continued and the Peterloo Massacre became a rallying point for the subsequent and more successful campaigners, including the Chartists and Suffragettes. All British men finally gained the vote in 1918, all women in 1928.

Who was involved?

Henry Hunt
1773-1835
A pioneer of working-class radicalism, Hunt survived the massacre and continued to be an advocate for reform for the rest of his life.

Captain Hugh Birley
1778-1845
Birley was a magistrate and the commander of the yeomanry, and he reportedly led the charge that sparked the massacre.

Samuel Bamford
1788-1872
A witness to the massacre, Bamford was imprisoned for inciting a riot even though he was not involved in the violence.
Ten of the incredible men and women who helped to organise and shape the fight for racial equality in the USA in the age of Jim Crow, segregation and beyond

Written by Jonathan Gordon
The civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s still resonates with us today, giving us some of the most inspirational figures of the 20th century in the face of some of its most egregious injustices. There were many hundreds and thousands of people who played a part in achieving major legislative and legal victories in those years, but we’ve attempted to chronicle the impact of some of the most important. Some were great leaders and speakers, others great organisers and community activists, more still great thinkers and writers, but they all played a part.

In an era when the fight for racial equality and justice in the face of institutional discrimination remains at the forefront of political debate, the heroic efforts of these individuals are an inspiration. And to get further insight into their contribution, we asked University of Virginia professor Kevin K Gaines to offer his thoughts and insights on the role these figures played as an expert on civil rights and social justice.
ELLA BAKER

Just how important would you say Baker was to the civil rights movement?

**KG:** Ella Baker represents two major advances in the study of the civil rights movement: the recognition of the indispensable role of African-American women in the movement, and a “bottom-up” emphasis on grass-roots organising, as opposed to a prior “top-down” emphasis on charismatic leadership. Baker’s decades-long career as a civil rights activist began when she left her North Carolina home for the politics of Harlem during the 1930s.

A gifted organiser, Baker has been called the ‘Mother of the Movement’ for her tireless and dangerous work during and after World War II. Her efforts away from the limelight are credited with providing a key foundation for the modern civil rights movement in the south.

As executive director of the SCLC, Baker clashed with that organisation’s male-dominated leadership, including Martin Luther King. When African-American college students launched the sit-in movement throughout the south in 1960, desegregating lunch counters by using the nonviolent tactic of sitting down and remaining there with the intention of being served, Baker advised the student activists to form their own organisation. Baker was thus instrumental in the founding of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), serving as an advisor for the organisation. As detailed in historian Barbara Ransby’s definitive biography, Baker influenced SNCC’s young organisers to implement her radical democratic vision of group-centred leadership, which held that the most disadvantaged members of society were capable of leading themselves. Today, Black Lives Matter activists cite Ella Baker as a key influence and inspiration.

Bayard Rustin was involved in organising many protests, but was his biggest contribution the March on Washington?

**KG:** Bayard Rustin was a prominent organiser before and during the civil rights movement. He started out as a peace activist, and had participated in the first sit-in protests, in which an interracial group of activists in the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) desegregated “whites-only” restaurants in northern cities during the late 1940s. Rustin was a charismatic speaker who garnered a reputation in the African-American press touring college campuses promoting his vision of nonviolent direct action as a vehicle for confronting racism and segregation.

Rustin was fearless in confronting violent segregationists. He was also a black gay man, his sexuality largely unknown to the public until his arrest in California in 1953 for violating the state law criminalising homosexuality. During that deeply homophobic era, Rustin’s arrest made him, to some, a liability for the movement, even as he remained a formidable civil rights advocate.

When Martin Luther King became leader of the Montgomery movement in 1955, it was Rustin who instructed the young minister on the philosophy of nonviolence, and served, off and on, within King’s circle of advisors. When A Philip Randolph, the venerable labour and civil rights leader, tapped Rustin to return to the spotlight, so to speak, as the leading organiser of the March on Washington in 1963, pro-segregation US officials, including Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, made public reference to Rustin’s sexuality to discredit the march. Martin Luther King and the civil rights establishment staunchly defended Rustin, and the march’s success led to the eventual passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Rustin’s story is beautifully told in the documentary *Brother Outsider,* which highlights tensions within the movement and US society provoked by Rustin’s sexuality.

Mr March On Washington has a lot more to his name than just that one event in 1963. While being openly gay and briefly a member of the communist party meant he was sometimes forced to stay out of the limelight, he was an incredibly effective and respected organiser. The 1963 march, for which Rustin was deputy director, saw 200,000 people protest in the US capital and hosted Martin Luther King’s most famous speech.
Martin Luther King probably the best known of the civil rights leaders, but are there any moments of his life that you think aren't talked about enough?

After King’s assassination in 1968, his widow, Coretta Scott King, and civil rights activists campaigned to make his birthday a national holiday. President Ronald Reagan, who had initially opposed the holiday, relented, signing the bill into law in 1983. Those who spent years campaigning for the bill celebrated.

But conservatives opposed to civil rights may have had the last laugh.

Conservatives soon distorted the legacy of the martyred civil rights leader. Emphasising King’s “I Have a Dream” speech, conservatives usurped his ideal of a colour-blind society to delegitimise the enforcement of race-conscious civil rights remedies. At the same time, conservatives were loathe to acknowledge King’s radical advocacy for economic justice for poor people, and his opposition to the costly and immoral American war in Vietnam.

Had he lived, King would have continued to pursue his revolutionary agenda for economic justice for all poor people, regardless of race. King had become a pariah to US officials when he declared his anti-war position, and called for a radical restructuring of society. He never wavered in his commitment to nonviolence as younger militants were recklessly calling for armed struggle. Unlike the militants, King was threatening to the establishment because he combined his moral and rhetorical clarity about society’s ills with a truly radical agenda for racial and economic justice.

Can King’s contribution to enacting change to laws and in changing mindsets in the US be overstated?

Not at all. King was an erudite intellectual with the eloquence of a traditional black folk preacher. He was unmatched in his ability to portray the demands and goals of the civil rights movement and condemn segregation and racism to US audiences in a manner that resonated with core American ideals and values. He equated his dream for racial equality with the American Dream. Later, King was a courageous leader and social critic unwilling to shy away from harsh realities about racial and social injustice.

He was responsive to the changing conditions created by black urban rebellions, challenges from young militants, and the war in Vietnam. When King and Southern Christian Leadership Conference met with welfare rights activists in Los Angeles, expecting them to sign on to his Poor People’s Campaign, the women activists educated King on the inadequacy of state welfare allotments, and helped bring black women into focus for him as a group uniquely disadvantaged by poverty.

“I may not get there with you, But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land”
Rosa Parks is best known for her part in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Can you tell us a little about how much more she was involved in the movement?

Rosa Parks was a veteran civil rights activist and longtime member of the NAACP. The focus on Parks’s heroic action obscures the fact that the Montgomery Bus Boycott was the result of a team effort with local organizers planning a mass protest against racial discrimination in the Montgomery, Alabama, bus transit system.

One of the most enduring myths of the civil rights movement was that Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat in December 1955 because she was tired, and her lone action was the catalyst for the movement that eventually desegregated public buses in Montgomery. In fact, Parks’s action was planned well in advance, coordinated with brilliant organizing that got the word of the boycott out to the city’s 50,000 African-Americans. Black people of all walks of life remained unified in staying off the buses, remaining nonviolent in their protest, and gaining international attention with their successful mass movement.

Rosa Parks wasn’t necessarily the first to challenge segregation laws in Alabama around that time, so why do you think her story was so impactful?

We remember Rosa Parks and her story for the right reasons, and for reasons that are problematic. To all appearances Parks was not destined for leadership. But she was an ordinary person—a dressmaker and a housewife—who did something extraordinary, providing the catalyst for a mass movement that achieved nonviolent social change. Her willingness, and that of other leaders in Montgomery, to be arrested and jailed, stiffened the resolve of the local black community to stay the course. More problematically, the emphasis on Parks obscures prior, everyday challenges to segregation on the city’s buses, and the collective agency of the black community—meaningful change comes from the actions of many, not a single individual. Some months before Parks, Claudette Colvin, a black Montgomery teenager, had been arrested for violating segregation ordinances on a city bus. But Colvin was of working-class background, unmarried and pregnant; organizers of the movement feared white officials would seize on Colvin’s vulnerabilities to discredit the movement. Parks, by contrast, was middle-class, married, and thus, deemed respectable enough to serve as a public symbol of the movement. Colvin’s story represents our modern view that rejects victim-blaming, and that inalienable human rights should be paramount, and not contingent on moralistic notions of social status.

“We are not in a struggle of black against white, but wrong and right, right against wrong”
James Baldwin

How important was it to have a voice like Baldwin’s that could be factual and artful, to reach new ears?

K: Though not a civil rights leader in the sense of being active in the movement, as a writer, journalist and public spokesman, Baldwin effectively mediated opposing black and white perspectives on the nature and depth of racism in the north as well as in the south. In his most influential essays, Baldwin expressed African-Americans’ aspirations for change, and their frustration at its glacial pace.

He refused to let self-styled northern white liberals off the hook, puncturing their illusions of moral superiority over white racists and their atrocities down south. Baldwin reminded the nation that whites in the north, whether they knew it or not, had condemned their black brothers and sisters to a less exposed, but physically and psychologically violent system of institutionalised racism, its harms inflicted by white police, landlords, judges, and employers. Baldwin told difficult truths to both African-Americans and whites about the depth and tragedy of racism in America, its violent denial of the shared, brutal history of black and white people, and the intimate, blood connections between them since the days of slavery. Baldwin’s novel Another Country (1961) explored a group of young blacks and whites struggling, often failing, to love each other, despite the alienation imposed by white supremacy and social segregation.

Thurgood Marshall

What do you consider to be Thurgood Marshall’s biggest legal victory?

K: He would be legendary simply for his role as lead attorney in the landmark Brown decision of 1954. But later, as the first African-American appointed as a Supreme Court Justice, Marshall also made history with his dissents, as the Court, reflecting the conservative tilt of the nation, rendered decisions against civil rights. In his dissent in Milliken v Bradley (1973), Marshall held that the majority, in striking down a desegregation plan covering Detroit, had taken “a giant step backwards”. Marshall prophetically argued, “The very evil that Brown I was aimed at will not be cured, but will be perpetuated for the future.” Today Detroit and other big city school districts are among the most segregated in the nation.

2 July 1908 - 24 January 1993

Thurgood Marshall used the legal system as his means of change. As deputy counsel and later chief counsel of the NAACP, he would fight landmark discrimination cases, most famously Brown v The Board of Education in 1954, which forced desegregation of schools and tore apart the concept of separate but equal. Since he preferred to use the legal system over protest, he was not always supportive of the wider civil rights movement, but his contribution was immense. He won more cases in front of the Supreme Court than any other American and was appointed to the court in 1967.

Rosanell Eaton

What can you tell us about Eaton’s life and contribution?

K: Her example reminds us that tenacious foot soldiers like her were the backbone of the movement. At age 21, Eaton went to the county courthouse and informed three white male registrars that she was there to register to vote. They demanded that she recite the preamble to the US Constitution, a sort of literacy test intended to disqualify unlettered black people. “We the people of the United States,” Eaton began, and when she finished, she was registered, becoming one of the first African-Americans to vote in her state since Reconstruction. In 2015, Republicans in her state passed a Voter ID law intended to restrict access to the polls. When Eaton’s efforts to comply with the law fell short, she became the lead plaintiff in an NAACP lawsuit, which led to the US Fourth Circuit of the Court of Appeals overturning the law, ruling that it was blatant in its discriminatory intent.

2 August 1924 - 1 December 1987

While others were foot soldiers of the civil rights movement, Baldwin was one of its great thinkers. He moved to Paris to write in 1948 in part to escape the prejudice he faced at home, but returned to America in 1957 as the movement gained momentum to publish essays on race relations. Baldwin spoke candidly about his experiences and continued to write about race and identity until the later years of his life.

14 April 1921 - 8 December 2018

Rosanell Eaton shot to prominence more in her later years when she was part of a lawsuit against new voter ID laws in North Carolina that stripped her of her ability to vote 74 years after she originally registered. In the years between these two events she estimated she helped to register 4,000 voters in her home state. Eaton achieved further acclaim when President Obama made her the lead plaintiff in a NAACP lawsuit, which led to the US Fourth Circuit of the Court of Appeals overturning the law, ruling that it was blatant in its discriminatory intent.
FANNIE LOU HAMER

Fannie Lou Hamer was involved in several political organisations, including challenging whites-only rules in the Mississippi Democratic Party. How important was she to the movement?

KG: Mrs Fannie Lou Hamer epitomised the confidence of Ella Baker and SNCC activists that the potential for leadership and self-government existed among the rank and file of African-American communities. As SNCC leader James Forman once said, there's only one Dr King, but many Fannie Lou Hamers. Point taken, but it doesn't do justice to Mrs Hamer's indelible presence. Hamer's plain-spoken testimony before the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City in 1964 provided a deeply personal account of the systemic mistreatment of African Americans in Mississippi. Speaking on behalf of SNCC's appeal to

In her televised remarks, which the major networks re-broadcast in their entirety on their national news programs, Mrs Hamer broke important silences, not only regarding the sexualised violence of segregationist jailers against black women, but also the violence and psychological trauma routinely inflicted on female activists. Mrs Hamer continued her efforts to open the political system to African-Americans in Mississippi, serving as a delegate to the Democratic Convention in 1968. She headed an organisation, the Freedom Farms Corporation, a non-profit group to help poor families produce food and livestock for both subsistence and economic empowerment.

JOHN LEWIS

John Lewis was able to take his activism from the streets into Washington by running for office. How would you assess his overall importance in the fight for racial equality in America?

KG: John Lewis was a key figure in SNCC, which was the younger, more radical counterpart to such established civil rights organisations as the NAACP and the SCLC. An aspiring minister, Lewis grew up in Georgia, like many of his generation observing the accommodation of his elders to the indignities of Jim Crow segregation. While attending Fisk University in Nashville, Lewis encountered the Rev James Lawson, a local African American minister who preached a message of Gandhian nonviolence as a tool to fight injustice. As a SNCC leader, Lewis participated in the Freedom Rides, an initiative by black and white activists to test a new federal law desegregating interstate travel. Attacks on the Freedom Riders by white vigilantes, with the collusion of local police departments made international headlines, embarrassing the Kennedy administration. Lewis was hospitalised along with fellow riders after being attacked by a mob in Birmingham. Lewis recovered, and as one of the speakers at the March on Washington, voiced impatience at the Kennedy administration's non-enforcement of civil rights. Lewis is perhaps best remembered as leading a march of campaigners for voting rights in Selma, Alabama in 1965. That peaceful assembly was violently dispersed by baton-wielding state troopers, some mounted on horseback. Beaten unconscious, Lewis was hospitalised and the shocking televised news footage of the Bloody Sunday attack galvanised the nation, leading eventually to the Voting Rights Act passed by Congress in 1965.

Lewis's courage and sacrifices as a civil rights activist contribute to his stature and moral authority as a congressman representing Atlanta in the House of Representatives. Lewis has been an outspoken critic of escalating attacks on voting rights by conservatives since 2010. He is a powerful symbol of racial reconciliation as well, in public encounters with men who sought forgiveness for having brutalised him during the movement.
How much has public perception of Malcolm X changed since his death?

Since his assassination in 1965, the public perception of Malcolm X has changed dramatically. After his ousting from the Nation of Islam (NOI), Malcolm emphasized that his views on race, religion and the black struggle for equality had become more pragmatic and less dogmatic. He renounced the racism of the NOI that called white Americans devils. Instead, he understood that for the sake of black unity, it was unrealistic to expect most African-Americans to become Muslims. And Malcolm worked to forge political unity among black people, pledging his support for civil rights leaders and organizations that he previously disparaged. Much to his frustration, the mainstream media continued to portray him refusing to acknowledge his changed outlook.

Since his death, the shift in Malcolm's views and his linking the African-American freedom movement with the liberation struggles of peoples in Africa, Asia and Latin America are much better known. Thanks to recent books such as Stephen Tuck's The Night Malcolm X Spoke at Oxford Union and the revival of popular interest in Malcolm's life by Spike Lee's 1992 film biography, we have a more complete and complex understanding of Malcolm as a global icon of resistance to oppression, but crucially, a unifying figure, rather than a divisive one.

Malcolm X is often painted as a counter-point or mirror to Martin Luther King. Is that fair?

African-Americans have long debated among themselves, sometimes fiercely, the merits of alternative strategies for freedom. Much of this comes from their pragmatic understanding that there are multiple paths to freedom, more than one way (let us hope) to resist past and present racial injustice. At the same time, the tendency to hold up Malcolm X and Martin Luther King as symbols of competing strategies during the civil rights movement was shaped by the US political establishment and media, which clearly preferred King as the advocate of nonviolent social reform, while casting Malcolm X as an exponent of wanton violence and civil disorder.

In effect, this dominant framing of the issue of civil rights and black leadership was rooted in the fears of white racists and moderates, refusing to acknowledge his changed outlook. Since his death, the shift in Malcolm's views and his linking the African-American freedom movement with the liberation struggles of peoples in Africa, Asia and Latin America are much better known. Thanks to recent books such as Stephen Tuck's The Night Malcolm X Spoke at Oxford Union and the revival of popular interest in Malcolm's life by Spike Lee's 1992 film biography, we have a more complete and complex understanding of Malcolm as a global icon of resistance to oppression, but crucially, a unifying figure, rather than a divisive one.

“We want freedom now, but we’re not going to get it saying ‘We Shall Overcome’. We’ve got to fight to overcome.”

19 May 1925 – 21 February 1965

After becoming a ward of the state and falling into crime, Malcolm X ultimately went to prison aged 20, where he was introduced to the messages of self-actualization and empowerment promoted by the Nation of Islam. In 1952, he became a minister for the NOI, took the surname X and started his rise. He rejected the doctrine of nonviolence believing that the institutional violence African-Americans were facing should be met in kind. However, after leaving the NOI in 1964 and going on a pilgrimage to Mecca, he returned with a moderated view of racial cooperation a little closer to King. He smartly used his notoriety to drive more entrenched racist authorities to open dialogue with King rather than have him “agitate the community” such as in Selma after Bloody Sunday. Just a few weeks later he was killed while making a speech by three members of the NOI. He was 39 years old.
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