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Welcome

Who were the Boleyn family? Opportunists? Manipulators? Radicals? So much has been said and examined in the relationship between Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII, but what of the rest of the clan whose fortunes were pinned, for good and ill, on Anne’s ascension to the throne? This issue we wanted to reexamine the story and not only explore the motivations and methods of the Boleyns as they climbed the social standing of Henry’s court, but also Anne’s part in those plans and to what extent she was a participant or driving force behind them. We welcome back Dr Nicola Tallis to take us through that journey of a Tudor dynasty being born and then brutally cut down in short order.

Elsewhere this issue we looked at the anniversary of the Peterloo Massacre and I couldn’t help but think of an old lecturer of mine, Professor Katrina Honeyman, who worked at the University of Leeds. It was her course in my final year at university that introduced me to this story, of Manchester men and women attacked by local authorities for having the temerity to stand up and ask for representation. It was a powerful event to learn about and one whose resonance I still feel today. Hopefully you’ll get some sense of its importance and influence in our feature this issue. I hope Prof. Honeyman would have approved and I hope, as ever, you enjoy the issue.

Jonathan Gordon
Editor
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Becoming the first pontiff to visit the continent of Africa while head of the Catholic Church, Pope Paul VI visited Uganda from 31 July to 2 August 1969. Despite resistance within the Vatican, the trip went ahead and Pope Paul VI was greeted by President Milton Obote of Uganda as well as heads of state from Tanzania, Zambia, Rwanda, Burundi and representatives from Nigeria and Zaire (now DR Congo) as well as massive crowds.
DEFINING MOMENTS

NIXON RESIGNS
In the wake of the Watergate scandal and more and more criminal or embarrassing details emerging about his tenure in the White House, President Richard Nixon resigned on 9 August 1974. Having lost the support of members of his own party, impeachment by congress was looking certain and Nixon left office before the process could reach a conclusion, but still did not accept (or apologise for) any wrongdoing.

1974
In July 1979 the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) overthrew Anastasio Somoza Debayle whose family had been ruling Nicaragua for almost 43 years. The movement was a coalition of communists, farmers, students and others. However, their victory would turn into over a decade of civil conflict as the US-backed Contras would lead a counter-revolution.
“I am the punishment of God. If you had not committed great sins, God would not have sent a punishment like me upon you”

Genghis Khan, quoted in Ta’Rikh-i-Jahan Gusha by ‘Ala-ad-Din ‘Ata-Malik Juvaini
ALL ABOUT
THE MONGOL EMPIRE

We explore life within a kingdom that stretched from China to the Czech Republic and the people who led its expansion across the globe.

Written by Mohammed Barber, David Crookes, Jonathan Gordon, Jessica Leggett, Kate Marsh, Miguel Miranda.
**MONGOL EMPIRE**

---

**The Mongols’ vast empire**

Legend has it Genghis Khan’s burial site was hidden by killing all those who knew about it.

Temüjin, as Genghis Khan, is proclaimed; as Genghis Khan Temüjin’s tactics make him an efficient commander and well-loved leader among the people. He brings together the Mongol and Turkic tribes who entitle him Genghis Khan (the Oceanic or Universal Ruler of all the Mongols), and so begins the Mongol Empire.

- **Temüjin proclaimed as Genghis Khan 1206**
  Temüjin’s tactics make him an efficient commander and well-loved leader among the people. He brings together the Mongol and Turkic tribes who entitle him Genghis Khan (the Oceanic or Universal Ruler of all the Mongols), and so begins the Mongol Empire.

- **Uyghur Turks join Mongol Empire 1206**
  The Uyghur Turks peacefully submit to Genghis Khan. Many of them became administrators of the new and growing empire.

- **Zhongdu captured 1215**
  Mongol army finally conquers the Jin Dynasty’s capital city, Zhongdu (modern day Beijing), thereby expanding the Mongol Empire into northern China.

- **Invasion of Southern China begins 1236**
  Ögedei continues his father’s conquest into China, invading the Song dynasty in southern China. Korea is also invaded.

- **Temüjin begins uniting Mongol tribes 1178**
  Between 1178-1206 Genghis Khan, born Temüjin, creates allies and starts the various Mongol tribes.

- **Khwarezmid Empire destroyed 1221**
  After the sultan killed the Mongol envoys, Genghis ends the Khwarezmid Empire (modern day Iran), a campaign that opens up the route into the Middle East.

- **Ögedei succeeds Genghis Khan 1229**
  Before his death Genghis Khan appoints his son, Ögedei, as his chosen successor, who is elected the Great Khan. At this point, the Mongol Empire comprises almost 24 million square kilometres, the largest contiguous empire in history.

- **Empire extends into Eastern Europe 1237**
  Between 1237-1242 the Mongols invade Eastern Europe, conquering Western Russia, Armenia, Poland, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary and Bulgaria.

**Genghis Dies 1227**

The man who almost single handedly created the Mongol Empire dies at the ripe age of 65. As per his tribe’s tradition, his grave was unmarked and remains unknown to this day, though he is likely buried in Khezii Aimag, his birthplace.
Invasion of Japan fails
Kublai Khan tries twice to conquer Japan (1274 & 1281) but both times is thwarted by the Kamikaze. In addition to Japan there are only handful of regions the Mongols fail to conquer, such as southeast Asia and the Mamluk Sultanate.

Ming Dynasty ends Mongol Empire
Zhu Chongba, a former monk born into poverty, is a militarily gifted and patient individual. His talents drives the Mongols out of Beijing, thus ending a century of Mongol rule in China and in the process establishing the Ming Dynasty.

Did you know?
Kublai Khan is believed to have made a social hierarchy based on race with Mongols at the top.

DEATH OF ÖGEDEI
Whilst on a hunting trip Ögedei dies. His wife, Töregene, becomes regent. Töregene has her eldest son, Güyük, elected as Great Khan in 1246.

EGYPTIAN MAMLUKS DEFEAT THE MONGOLS
Achieving the seemingly impossible, the Egyptian Mamluks defeat the feared Mongol forces in the battles of Ain Jalut and Homs.

CHINA CONQUERED BY KUBLAI KHAN
After first being invaded in 1236, the Song Dynasty finally falls to the Mongols, who now control all of China, forming the Yuan Dynasty.

GOLDEN HORDE TURNS TO ISLAM
Özbeg Khan adopts Islam as the state religion and encourages the Islamisation of the Horde. Modern day Uzbekistan is named after him.

Mongol Empire split into four Khanates
Upon the death of Kublai, the process of disintegration, which was already well underway by this point, becomes official and the vast empire officially splits into four khanates: the Golden Horde (Russia), Chagatai Khanate (central Asia), Il-Khanid (Persia), and the Yuan Dynasty (China).

TIMELINE

Did you know?
Baghdad was sacked again in 1401 by Timur (Tamerlane) who had nearly everyone killed.
When the wind howls through the Mongolian steppe, or the rain is beating down, Mongolian nomads have never really needed to worry. Sheltered inside their gers, they’re safe from the elements as they bunker down with the family in their homes.

Gers have been in use for over 2,000 years, and they have changed little in that time. Perfect for a nomadic lifestyle, the gers are easy to deconstruct, carry and then rebuild when Mongolians have needed to move to find better land for grazing. Always circular, the walls of the temporary buildings are made from lightweight wood that forms a lattice to make it easily collapsible, and this shell is then covered in felt and woolen covers before a layer of waterproof canvas is draped over the entire structure.

Inside, nomads have carried out their daily lives for centuries. There’s a stove for cooking and heat; an altar for shamanists and Buddhists to carry out their worship; and room for up to 15 people to live and sleep, with men in the western half and women in the eastern half. While gers have no windows, there is one door leading to the outside.

The striking and reconstructing of the ger has always been a family event. Taking between 30 minutes and three hours, the men build the walls, while everyone helps with the layering of the felts and canvas. Children learn from the elders in the community, just like in everything else.

The traditional craftsmanship it takes to build the Mongolian gers has recently become recognised as Intangible Cultural Heritage by UNESCO - a recognition of more than 2,000 years of cultural heritage on the Mongolian steppe. With around 30 per cent of Mongolians still living the nomadic lifestyle today, and cities all over the country having ger districts, the gers are still just as much in use as they were 2,000 years ago.
Decoration
Inside a ger was usually a brightly coloured place, with colourful textiles hung from the walls. The wooden poles were also often carved with intricate designs and passed down through a family until the time came for them to be replaced.

Pillars
Two pillars, or bagana, helped to keep the ger upright, and they sit either side of the fire in the centre. Tradition dictates that you should never pass between these two poles, instead entering the ger and walking around it clockwise.

Walls and insulation
The walls were divided into individual sections called khana, which were wooden poles made into a lattice shape so that the ger could be deconstructed easily. These lattices were usually made from light woods like willow, birch, poplar or bamboo, and then attached to each other using ropes made from leather or animal hair. These were then covered in three of four layers of animal hides and felt before the final layer of white canvas was draped over the top.

Stove
In the centre of the ger was a wood-burning fire. This would act as a stove for the nomads, while also providing extra heat in the colder winter months. Some gers also had a chimney that stretched right up through the roof to stop the ger from filling up with smoke.

Door
When gers were constructed, the door always faced south, the opposite side of the structure to the altar, which was in what was considered to be the most sacred area inside. Doors were the weakest parts of the gers, and were traditionally made of wood and painted red, although sometimes they were just flaps in the hides that covered the walls.
MONGOL EMPIRE

HEAD PROTECTION
Cone-shaped helmets were mostly made of iron. Slots allowed heavy iron neck guards to be inserted and these fitted around the warrior's neck for protection while still allowing for movement. With fur lining the interior for both comfort and warmth against the cold climate, the helmets would be topped off with a decorative ribbon made of horse hair.

LANCING A WOUND
Heavier Mongol cavalry would be armed with lances and they'd use them as they charged in to finish the job at close range. A hook close to its head would be used to drag a rider from their horse while wealthy cavalry would swing halberds at footmen. With a dagger or mace also close to hand, they were well-tooled.

PIERCING POINT
The warriors fought many of their battles on horseback and needed weapons that best suited this position. Curved swords proved highly effective, lending a balanced weight and providing momentum during a kill. It's more difficult for a curved scimitar to get stuck in a victim and they cut more easily than those that are straight.

PLATING UP
Mongols would use a type of armour called Lamellar made from small rectangular plates of steel that was punched with holes so that they could be sewn together in overlapping horizontal rows. Allowing for flexibility as well as protection, it was far more commonly used than a leather-based alternative.

SHIELDED FROM HARM
Light domed circular shields would be created using woven wicker or rattan and while some remained bare, others would be covered with leather. Held by two leather hand straps that would fit on the wrist, the shield offered precise control with a turn of the wrist. Human shields were also used!

NO WASHING
The armour would typically be worn over the top of an undergarment that was made of felt, hemp fibre material or animal skin. There is a suggestion that silk was used although there is little evidence so it was perhaps less common. It is also understood that the clothes were never washed either - there was a fear that doing so would anger God.

BAGGY TROUSERS
A warrior's heelless boots were made from felt and leather. They would need to withstand lots of walking and offer protection from the cold which is why they were lined with fur and worn with felt socks. Loose-fitting trousers that trapped warm air would always be tucked into the tightly-laced boots.
The British Aerospace Hawk is one of the most important British aircraft. A maximum of three new pilots are chosen each year to fly with the RAF Red Arrows. Having first flown as the Hawker Siddeley Hawk in Surrey in 1974, the Hawk is still in production in the UK today and is sold to many different countries all over the world. The Hawk is considered a “low-cost” combat aircraft. In 2003, one Hawk reportedly sold for approximately £18 million!

The Red Arrows Hawk is a British icon and you can recreate your own at home with an Airfix kit. QuickBuild kits give you the ability to recreate a wide variety of iconic aircraft, tanks and cars into brilliant scale models. No paint or glue is required, the push together brick system results in a realistic, scale model that is compatible with other plastic brick brands.

Collect them all! Check out the rest of the range online at Airfix.com and at good retail stockists.
Looking at the men who consolidated and expanded one of the largest empires the world has ever known, often through brutal means

TIMUR THE LAME 1336 CE-1405 CE
The warlord hailing from Samarkand embellished his reputation by claiming descent from Genghis Khan. This remains debatable, if not utterly false, but Timur did come from a clan of Turkic nomads who once served in the Khan’s armies.

Timur’s determination and ruthlessness allowed him to cobble together an empire spanning present-day Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Iran and Iraq. A particular low point was the butchery and plunder of Delhi in 1399. Always seeking lands to subdue, in 1405 he rallied his men and launched an expedition to China, but died from a mysterious illness.

Some 200 years later, another upstart named Zahiruddin Babur, who claimed descent from both Timur and Chagatay Khan, conquered India and founded the Mughal Empire.

MONGKE KHAN 1209 CE-1259 CE
The death of Genghis set the stage for long-running feuds between his descendants. Perhaps the most controversial was Mongke’s rise to the Khanate. Upon assuming the mantle of power, he put his uncle Ogedei Khan’s own children to the sword. He also set firm boundaries to the different Khanates. On his own, Mongke proceeded to carve up the stubborn Song Dynasty throughout the 1250s. But a spell of illness cut his life short, leaving the succession open to his youngest brother, Kublai.

KUBLAI KHAN 1215 CE-1294 CE
At its height, the Mongol Empire only held northern China but almost reached as far away as Central Europe. There was still the Han Chinese Song Dynasty to the south that resisted conquest for decades. Once Kublai Khan became the ruler of the Yuan Dynasty in 1280 CE another war against the Song was undertaken and they were defeated by 1276 CE. The Korean Peninsula was added to the empire soon after.

Kublai Khan was the only Mongol ruler to send his armies on naval expeditions. Although he was never involved in them, Mongol fleets did attempt at least two invasions of Japan and there was a successful raid on Java.

But Kublai Khan was a better administrator than general and his reign was marked by unparalleled prosperity that captivated Marco Polo and his companions.

ESEN TAISHI UNKNOWN-1455 CE
Esen Taishi followed in Genghis’ footsteps by assembling feuding tribes to once again invade China, now ruled by the nationalistic Ming Dynasty. Although the Ming were determined to subjugate the Mongol homeland, the superb discipline and fighting prowess of the Mongols was still unbeatable.

By 1451, Esen tried declaring himself the ruler of a unified Mongolia but this triggered a civil war instead. He was killed by his rivals in 1455. By the 17th century, the Qing Dynasty (1644 CE – 1912 CE) had reduced the once proud Mongols to willing vassals.
GUYUK KHAN 1246 CE-1249 CE
Being an empire founded by excellent horsemen and keen strategists, the Mongols had an overabundance of fine commanders. But least distinguished among them was Guyuk Khan, who was the third Great Khan after Genghis and Ogedei. Unfortunately, by the time Guyuk assumed his new title in 1246 CE there was such dissatisfaction among the Mongols that a civil war ensued between the faction that ruled China and the faction of Batu Khan, a grandson of Genghis Khan, whose armies overran Russia. Unlike other Mongol rulers, little is known about Guyuk Khan’s sudden death in 1249. He did not fall in battle.

CHAGATAI KHAN 1183 CE-1242 CE
The territories annexed by Chagatai’s armies were even greater than those held by his brother Ogedei in northern China. The immense pasture lands of Central Asia allowed the Mongols to thrive in this environment and trade routes were secured connecting China with the continent of Europe. The earliest instances of cultural mixing with Islam also occurred at the time as the Mongols assimilated into the societies under their rule.

Like his brother, the final years of Chagatai’s life were the Mongol Empire’s glory days. The distribution of plunder fuelled economic growth and a Pax Mongolica within the various Khanates attracted breathtaking wealth. Of course, further victories in Europe and the Middle East beckoned.

OGEDEI KHAN 1215 CE-1241 CE
A successor of Genghis earned his title by consensus under the kuriltai system, where the Mongol lords gathered in their capital to deliberate on who should be their supreme leader. Having spent his entire adult life on his father’s campaigns, Ogedei’s first priority as the next Great Khan was finishing off the Chinese. Ogedei then focused his attention on the Song Dynasty that still resisted the Mongols.

Elsewhere, his brother Chagatai was preoccupied with securing the vast plains of Central Asia, where the Khorasan Empire’s remnants kept fighting on. Ogedei’s reign lasted 12 short years and his untimely passing delayed the invasion of Western Europe, triggering a succession crisis among the Mongols.

BATU KHAN 1207 CE-1255 CE
Having led his armies across the Volga River and despoiled the Kyivan Rus, Batu Khan’s power loomed menacingly over Europe. But like his peers in China and Persia, Batu halted his campaigning to govern his immense realm, the Khanate of Kipchak, also known as the ‘Golden Horde’. Under the stern Mongol regime the realm prospered from the free movement of goods and people. But its longevity was tenuous. By the late 14th century the so-called ‘Golden Horde’ had fallen apart and a new Russian kingdom – Christian and feudal – arose in Muscovy.

SUBUTAI 1175 CE-1248 CE
Though not a blood relative of Genghis, Subutai was responsible for leading the Mongols on their European campaigns and had the great Khan’s own grandchildren under his command. In the span of just four bloody years, from 1236 until 1240 CE, Subutai’s army carved a path of destruction across Russia, clearing the way for the ‘Golden Horde’ that would rule it for almost two centuries.

It was also Subutai who led the Mongols towards the Danube as they sought to conquer Hungary and menaced Poland. Victorious in every battle, all of Europe learned to fear the Mongols.

HULAGU KHAN 1218 CE-1265 CE
Given most of Persia as a Khanate, Hulagu proceeded to expand his domain at a rapid clip. The rest of the Middle East, then under the Abbasid Caliphate, was unprepared to block the Mongol advance. As entire towns and cities were razed, Hulagu’s ferocity almost plunged the region into a dark age. The Ilkhanate he led was the most destructive force to ever assail the Muslim world. Two years after the assassins of Alamut were wiped out, the fall of Baghdad in 1258 CE marked an enormous loss of wealth and cultural artefacts. As the Mongol legions marched toward Jerusalem, an army of Mamelukes from Egypt led by a former Mongol slave blocked their advance in a place called Ain Jalut on 3 September 1260.

It was in Ain Jalut where the Mongols suffered a crushing defeat that marked the apogee of their empire-building. The Persianised Ilkhanate slowly lost its vigour and after a hundred years was crushed by the upstart Timur.
INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE RISE OF THE MONGOL EMPIRE

Professor Broadbridge is an associate professor of history at University of Massachusetts Amherst, and an expert in the Mamluk Sultanate, Mongol Empire, Ottoman Empire and Temür, as well as ideology, legitimacy, diplomacy and women in history. She has been nominated three times for the Distinguished Teaching Award, and in 2004 received an Outstanding Teacher Award.
IN YOUR BOOK YOU LOOK AT THE IMPORTANT AND INFLUENTIAL ROLES WOMEN PLAYED IN GENGHIS KHAN’S FAMILY AND IN THE MONGOL EMPIRE. WHAT WERE THESE ROLES?

It’s critical to understand that in nomadic society, work was organised along gender lines. Since the Mongols were herders with flocks, for example, women tended cattle, men cared for horses and (Bactrian) camels, and women and men together managed sheep and goats. In the moveable camps in which the Mongols lived, men built the round, wood-and-felt homes (gers or yurts), and the ox-wagons for storage and transport, while women managed these gers, wagons and the camp itself, often with a considerable staff.

Politically, imperial women networked with other Chinggisids, religious men, bureaucrats, military commanders, vassal rulers and foreign dignitaries. When Chinggis (Genghis) Khan sat on his throne to hold court, his senior wife, Börte, sat on his left on her own throne, and the two received petitioners together. Women also attended the assemblies (quriltais) in which military invasions were planned and succession to the throne was determined.

WHAT ROLE DID WOMEN PLAY IN THE MONGOL CONQUESTS AND EXPANSION OF THE EMPIRE?

The division of labour by gender meant that women handled the home front (the nomadic camp and flocks), which freed men to specialise in war. Other than making the gers and wagons, men’s work was to care for the horses they rode in war; conduct hunting expeditions with hundreds or thousands of warriors to practise the techniques they used in war (communicating, encircling, trapping, shooting); make political alliances with other men to find allies for war, then after all this... go to war. During Chinggis Khan’s campaigns, Börte stayed in Mongolia with the imperial camp, but a junior wife accompanied him to run a travelling camp, from which military strikes were made. We can thus say that the Mongols were able to militarise nearly all of their male population because so many other activities were routinely handled by women. No other contemporary society managed anything like this.

HOW WOULD YOU SAY WOMEN’S ROLES IN THE EMPIRE COMPARE WITH THOSE OF WOMEN IN OTHER CONTEMPORARY EMPIRES?

Favourably. In Mongol society, both genders could act with real authority; an imperial woman could be a political actor in her own right, and also could hold great management responsibilities. If we contrast Börte with Eleanor of Aquitaine (d. 1204), we see that Eleanor was the wealthiest and most influential women of her century in Western Europe, but she was often hemmed in by the authority of her husbands - Louis VII of France and Henry II of England - even in her own territories of Aquitaine. By contrast, Börte’s responsibilities to her camp were greater than Eleanor’s, as were her independence and authority.

WHAT CHALLENGES DID WOMEN FACE?

In the lawless years before the empire’s rise, women faced abduction, rape and involuntary relocation. If Chinggis Khan’s father Yesügei had not kidnapped and forcibly married another man’s wife (his mother, Hö’elün), the Mongol Empire might never have come into existence. With Yesügei, Hö’elün bore Chinggis Khan (a title; his name was Temujin) then three more boys and a girl. If Hö’elün had had those kids with her first husband, how might Mongol history have been different? A generation later, that first husband’s family kidnapped Chinggis Khan’s wife, Börte, as revenge. Although Chinggis Khan rescued Börte; one of her nine kids was born shortly after her kidnap, and his paternity was always in question.

Once imperial women enjoyed the relative stability of the Empire, their greatest challenge may have been managing incredible wealth and a very heavy workload. The imperial camps could be very large: “Hundreds and thousands of wagons and tents,” said one Chinese observer of Börte’s camp in 1223. I doubt imperial women got much sleep.

YOU MENTION IN YOUR BOOK THAT SOME WOMEN ROSE TO SIGNIFICANT POSITIONS OF POWER. COULD YOU TELL US A LITTLE ABOUT THEM?

The best opportunities were for women in the Golden Lineage, meaning both those born into it (Chinggisid princesses), and those who married in (imperial wives). These include Chinggis Khan’s mother, Hö’elün, who kept the family going despite years of poverty after her husband was murdered when Chinggis was nine. Later, Chinggis’s senior wife, Börte, ran the camp so he could conduct his campaigns, advised him politically, and provided the nine children who established their dynasty. Thereafter, two of Chinggis Khan’s daughters-in-law influenced the empire tremendously, although not in good ways. Tøregene was the widow of Chinggis Khan’s son and heir, Ögedei. She single-handedly opposed her dead husband’s will and wrested the throne out of the hands of her grandson and into those of her son, Great Khan Guyük. Thereafter, another imperial widow, Sorqotani, conspired with her nephew to make one of her sons into the Great Khan, and helped bloody purge two branches of the family.

IT’S CLEAR FROM YOUR WORK THAT WOMEN WERE INTEGRAL TO THE MONGOL EMPIRE, SO WHY HAVE THEY SEEMINGLY BEEN LOST FROM THE HISTORY OF THE EMPIRE?

They have always been there, but historians didn’t see them, in part because they were not asking the right questions. The story of Temujin-turned-Chinggis Khan is a rags-to-riches tale, and the conquests also provide a thrilling triumphal narrative that captures attention. Plus, older historians (almost exclusively men) were trained by (other) men to focus on politics and the military, which were male-dominated topics. But as a woman myself, I learned the triumphal narrative, then began to wonder what women were doing while men were conquering. I had heard the names of the women I’ve mentioned, but not much more. Once I started looking into their activities, I discovered that women were making major, systematic contributions to the conquests and the empire. The answers to these (and other questions) became the book.

Q&A WITH...
**Mongol Empire**

**Places to Explore**

**Marco Polo's Silk Road**

Heading from Venice, Marco Polo travelled across a well-trodden route

1. **National Museum of Iraq**

   Hulagu Khan, grandson of Genghis Khan, led the Mongol's brutal siege of Baghdad in 1258, massacring and raping its people while destroying and looting some of its most precious buildings including mosques, palaces, hospitals and the Grand Library.

   Little wonder, then, that Marco Polo is said to have skirted the city as he headed East around 1272. It certainly remained a dangerous place and Polo would write of the unfortunate end suffered by a Muslim caliph who had converted to Christianity after supposedly seeing a man move a mountain. In his travelogue, *Il Milion*, he claimed the man had starved to death. Historians, however, believe he was rolled in a rug and had horses ridden over him.

   Unfortunately, Baghdad remains just as precarious a city today, but there is so much to see. The medieval school complex, Mustansiriya Madrasah, remains standing from that era and is part of Al-Mustansiriya. You can also visit the National Museum of Iraq that, despite a large amount of looting following the Battle of Baghdad, contains numerous priceless artefacts.

   Indeed, conservators have repaired damage to the museum's unique collection and restored its galleries. With 13,000 archeological sites in Iraq, the number of items displayed there will surely grow.

   The National Museum of Iraq reopened in 2015 and it can be visited between 8am and 2.30pm daily except Fridays.

2. **Balkh's Ruins**

   Although Marco Polo described Balkh as a "noble city and a great seat of learning", by the time he arrived at Balkh, Genghis Khan had already wreaked his destruction. His 100,000-strong army of horsemen had destroyed the city and its inhabitants in 1220, leaving a popular part of the major Silk Road routes in ruins.

   Balkh's capture by the Turkic-Mongol ruler Timur saw it rebuilt in the early 15th century and this led to the restoration of its walls and new, grand buildings being erected. It was eventually neglected in favour of the nearby town of Mazar-i-Sharif in the mid-19th century due to an absence of a drainage system and rising disease, but that doesn't mean Balkh isn't worth visiting.

   Indeed, some of those age-old structures remain and a wander around the ruins of Balkh as well as the city itself offers a great glimpse of the past - so long as the instability of Afghanistan doesn't put you off. The Balkh Museum - which has suffered looting - also contains historic relics of Islam and should be considered.

   There's no charge to visit the ruins and you can visit daily.
Kashgar came under Genghis Khan’s control in 1219 but the Mongols did not leave a major mark on the city. Khan looked favourably upon its inhabitants and this continued when the city came to be ruled by the heads of the Changatai Khangate. As such, the spirit of those times continues to shine.

Marco Polo was certainly taken by Kashgar, which he called Cascar after visiting in 1273. He said its people followed Islam and he noted “many Nestorian Christians who have churches of their own”. The inhabitants, he said, lived by trade and handicrafts, had “beautiful gardens and vineyards” and grew a lot of cotton.

You can get a good sense of the buzz that the silk road brought by visiting Kashgar’s bustling Sunday livestock market, which still sells Uyghur silks. The friendly streets of the old city district are also filled with Gaotai Ancient Homes built with earthed bricks and tied to the cliff. Times, however, are changing.

A lot of the old ‘Old City’ is being rebuilt to become more ‘tourist friendly’ and the local Uyghur people are being displaced. It is, therefore, best to visit sooner rather than later before the historical nature of the area is completely razed to the ground, ironically doing for the city what the Mongols didn’t do all those years ago (although hopefully the results won’t be as bad!).

Kashgar is a bustling city that comes alive day and night throughout the week. Ideally visit between June and September to sample the fresh fruit and enjoy the warm weather.

Once the capital of the Great Mongolian Empire and now a popular tourist destination, Karakorum was a centre of trade along the Silk Road and the seat of immeasurable power over Asian and Eastern Europe. By the time Marco Polo visited and met Kublai Khan, grandson of Genghis Khan, however, the empire’s capital had moved to Beijing.

That said, Karakorum remained of symbolic importance and Polo was fascinated by what he saw (“There are wild cattle in that country as big as elephants, splendid creatures”, he wrote). Chances are you will be too, for while the city lies in ruins today, it forms part of a World Heritage Site and excavations have been unearthing many a treasure.

A number of artefacts from the Great Mongolian Empire are on display at a small museum giving an eye-opening history of the area’s golden era. The collections include writings from the Khans along with religious statues, coins and bronzes and the exhibits are regularly updated. For a good sense of the empire, it takes some beating.

The museum is open between 9am and 6pm daily between April and October and from 10am to 5pm Monday to Friday the rest of the year.
A paiza (also known as a gerege) was a tablet and diplomatic passport issued as a mark of authority to officials or important guests, notably Marco Polo, to ensure their safe passage throughout the Mongol Empire. Derived from ‘paizi’, the Chinese word for both ‘plate’ and ‘sign’, a paiza also allowed the holder to use postal stations, request food, lodgings and bodyguards during their journey and even gave permission for their expenses to be paid.

Although Genghis Khan is often credited with developing the paiza, they were actually based on similar items used by the earlier Liao dynasty in Northern China, which were typically oblong in shape. However, round versions such as this one were made during the Yuan dynasty, established by Kublai Khan following his successful conquest of China. According to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where this particular paiza is currently held, it bears the ominous inscription “By the strength of Eternal Heaven, an edict of the Emperor (Khan). He who has no respect shall be guilty,” written in Phags-pa script.

Paizas could be made from wood, iron, copper, bronze, silver and gold, depending on whom it was intended for. For example, paizas featuring raised gold characters would be issued to messengers tasked with carrying urgent military orders from the court, while ones made from lesser materials would be given to officers in the provinces - the inscriptions that featured on these would usually be written in more than one language.

Made from cast iron and inlaid with silver, paizas such as this one would have been given to senior commanding officers and, interestingly, silver inlay on iron was very rarely used in Chinese metalwork before the start of the Mongol period.

There are a few contemporary descriptions of paizas that survive today, the most notable from Marco Polo, who described the paiza given to him by Kublai, which allowed him to travel the Silk Road under the Khan’s protection. Paizas were eventually adopted by Europeans and as a result, they are often cited as the ancestor to the modern passports.

**LEGENDARY CREATURE**
There is a Tibetan style lion mask head on the handle at the top of the paiza, which looks similar to a kirtimukha, a motif that originated in India and can be found in both South and Southeast Asian architecture.

**STAMP OF AUTHORITY**
This particular paiza is double-sided and the inscription is inverted on the other side. Since the characters are raised, it could be used to stamp documents if needed and therefore likely to have been given to a senior military officer.

**THE WRITTEN WORD**
The script used on this Paiza was named after its inventor, Phakpa, a Tibetan monk and scholar who was a close advisor of Kublai Khan during the 13th century.
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How greed and ambition brought a Tudor dynasty to destruction

Written by Nicola Tallis
On the morning of 19 May 1536, a woman mounted a scaffold that had been erected within the confines of the Tower of London: minutes later her head was struck from her body with a single blow from a French swordsman. This woman was no ordinary prisoner, but one who had until recently been revered as Queen of England: her name was Anne Boleyn. A decade earlier Anne had embarked on a courtship with the illustrious Tudor king, Henry VIII - a relationship that had altered not only the whole course of her own life, but also those of her family. The Boleyns had been raised to soaring heights before crashing to lows that were steeped in misery and despair - for Anne and her brother George, the result was death. The extraordinary rise and fall of Anne Boleyn and her family is one of the most controversial and intriguing stories of 16th century England; it is one that continues to enthral to this day.

Almost every aspect of Anne Boleyn's life is controversial, including the year of her birth. Now widely accepted to have been in around 1501, Anne was one of three surviving children born to Sir Thomas Boleyn by his wife, Elizabeth Howard. Thomas was a man whose family roots lay in trade, though his grandfather, Sir Geoffrey Boleyn, had once been Lord Mayor of London. His father was a Norfolk landowner whose primary estate was Blickling, and Thomas himself, born in the mid 1470s, had risen to prominence steadily under the Tudors. He had attended the wedding of Prince Arthur and Catherine of Aragon in 1501, been among the escort of Princess Margaret to Scotland in 1503, and created a Knight of the Bath at the coronation of Henry VIII in 1509. Thomas was well favoured by Henry, and was a frequent participant in all of the leisure activities of which the King was so fond. Thomas's marriage to Elizabeth Howard had also been advantageous, for she was the daughter of the second Duke of Norfolk. The couple raised their children, Mary, Anne and George, primarily in the peaceful surroundings of Hever Castle in Kent, a property inherited from Thomas's father.

During the early years of Anne's childhood, her father was often absent. Thomas was a well-educated man who would later be the dedicatee of two books by Erasmus, and was also fluent in French. His skills had not gone unnoticed by the king, and for this reason he was often employed in diplomatic service abroad. It was during his time in Mechelen at the court of Margaret of Austria, the regent of the Netherlands, that Thomas spied a glowing opportunity for his daughter Anne. Margaret agreed to take the youngster into her household, and in the spring of 1513 Anne arrived to take her place. Margaret was delighted with her decision, and wrote to Thomas expressing that Anne was “a present more than welcome in my sight”. So much so, that “I am more beholde
Cardinal Wolsey on his way to Westminster Hall

Anne blossomed during her time in Margaret’s service, continuing her education and perfecting her command of French, which she demonstrated in her letters to her father. She was extremely bright, and proved herself to be a skilled needlewoman who excelled in dancing and music and was fond of poetry. Anne had been in Margaret’s household for around 18 months when, in the autumn of 1514 her father – always ambitious – perceived a better opportunity for her elsewhere. Leaving Margaret’s court behind, Anne travelled to France to join the entourage of Henry VIII’s younger sister Mary, who had married the ageing King of France, Louis XII. Here she was reunited with her own sister Mary, who had accompanied the new Queen of France from England. The time that the Boleyn sisters spent as Mary’s ladies was, though, short-lived. After just three months of marriage, on 1 January 1515 Louis died, and it was probably in the middle of the following month that Mary secretly remarried Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. When the formerly disgraced couple returned to England in the spring, the Boleyn sisters remained in France where they joined the household of the new queen, Claude, wife of François I.

Anne spent the next seven years in France, during which time her personality took shape and she developed a grace and poise that were highly influenced by the sophistication of the French court. This was clearly in evidence when she returned to England in 1522, now a highly accomplished young woman. Before long a place had been found for both Anne and her sister in Catherine of Aragon’s household, and the sisters regularly participated in court entertainments.

Before long Anne’s sister had become embroiled in an affair with the king, and as a result her father’s favour continued to rise. In April 1522 he was appointed treasurer of the royal household, and further honours were soon heaped upon him. On 18 June 1525 Thomas’s ambitions appeared to have been recognised when he was raised to the peerage and created Viscount Rochford. His son George also seemed set to follow in his footsteps: in 1516 George had joined the royal household as a page, and in around 1524 had been admitted to the King’s Privy Chamber. He would later emulate Thomas’s example by travelling to France to embark on diplomatic service. It may also have been around this time that a marriage was arranged for him with Jane Parker, the daughter of Henry, Lord Morley. Sadly, it was not a happy match.

In 1526 everything changed for the Boleyns. The King had long since tired of Anne’s sister, and in February he appeared at a joust wearing a magnificent gold embroidered costume that – in the style of courtly love – sported the words ‘Declare I dare not’. Nobody was left in any doubt that he had a new love interest, but the object of his desire was as yet unknown. It was not long, however, before it became clear: Anne Boleyn.

Though with her swarthy complexion Anne was not considered beautiful by contemporary standards, Henry found her wit and charm irresistible. Neither was he the first to have been entranced by her, for she had earned other admirers including the poet Thomas Wyatt and Henry Percy, heir of the Earl of Northumberland. Anne had hoped to marry the latter, but the king’s chief advisor, Cardinal Wolsey, had broken off the match, earning him Anne’s enmity. But she now had an infinitely more powerful suitor.
Anne Boleyn was not the first member of her family to catch Henry VIII's eye, for his gaze had first landed upon her sister, Mary. Having been wed to William Carey in 1520 Mary was a married woman, but this did not deter the king. Their affair was, however, conducted with such discretion that it is uncertain precisely when it began, although 1522 is the likeliest date. It was almost certainly over by 1525 when Mary bore her second child, a son, but there is some doubt over the paternity of her daughter, Katherine, who was born in 1524. Could she have been the king’s child? It is certainly possible. In 1528 Mary’s husband died, and six years later she secretly remarried. Her second husband was the lowly born William Stafford, and by her own admission she claimed that when making her choice “love overcame reason.” So outraged was her sister Anne, now queen, that she banished Mary from court. But Mary had no regrets, and defiantly declared that she would “beg my bread with him than to be the greatest i queen christened.”

Conscious of the way in which her sister had been discarded and highly ambitious like her father, Anne steadfastly refused to become Henry’s mistress. Unused to such a rebuff, this left him both surprised and intrigued. But instead of retreating and pressing his advances elsewhere, it instead served to heighten his passion for Anne. He wrote her copious love letters in which he passionately poured out his feelings for her, declaring that “my heart shall be dedicate to you alone.” Anne though, had higher aspirations, and continued to spurn Henry.

In the spring of 1527 Henry’s feelings for Anne proved to be the catalyst in what became known as the king’s ‘Great Matter’, as he began an investigation into the validity of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. He had long since tired of his wife, and more crucially, Catherine had failed to provide him with a male heir: her only surviving child was a daughter, Mary. Henry became convinced that his lack of a son was God’s divine judgement on his marriage and was determined to have it annulled: what was more, Anne would be the ideal replacement. He was confident that if he were to marry her, Anne would provide him with...
Henry VIII appears to have written many love letters to Anne and was utterly captivated by her the son that he needed in order to secure his dynasty. Yet it was not destined to be a smooth or straightforward process.

The ‘Great Matter’ dragged on for more than five years, during which time Anne’s influence and that of her family grew, but she became increasingly frustrated. The king believed that Wolsey would be able to achieve an annulment for him, but when the case was referred to the Pope in Rome in 1529 the Boleyns became convinced that Wolsey was working against them. Anne’s father hated Wolsey as much as she did, and their faction plotted his destruction. In October 1529 he was stripped of his office of Lord Chancellor, and the following year he died at Leicester on route to the Tower and possible execution. When she heard the news, Anne celebrated the demise of her enemy.

The delay in Henry’s annulment left Anne feeling increasingly vulnerable as her position...
remained insecure. However, Henry's passion for her had not wavered, and he showered her with an abundance of rich gifts, including jewels, clothes, money and fine apartments. It was not for nothing that one source observed that she became "very haughty and proud", and she was treated as queen in all but name. The fortunes of Anne's family rose as a result of her relationship with the king, and in 1529 George was admitted to the Privy Council. In December meanwhile, Thomas was created Earl of Wiltshire, an ennoblement that was followed by a celebratory banquet at the Palace of Whitehall. The following year he was appointed Lord Privy Seal.

When an annulment did not prove forthcoming, with the support of the Boleyns and Thomas Cromwell - a former servant of Wolsey's - Henry took matters into his own hands. He made the momentous decision to split from the Catholic Church and establish the Church of England with himself at its head, thereby enabling him to marry Anne. If Rome would not give him what he wanted, Henry was fully prepared to make his own rules. Many were appalled by the king's decision, but Anne and her family were supportive and she herself was a great advocate of church reform. This only served to exacerbate her unpopularity amongst the English people, many of whom were sympathetic to the plight of Catherine of Aragon. Indeed, Anne was so widely disliked that a progress in the summer of 1532 had to be cut short because, as the Imperial ambassador Eustace Chapuys reported, "the Lady is hated by all the world." Nevertheless, it was clear that it was only a matter of time before Anne was queen.

In September 1532 Anne partook in a glittering ceremony that saw her created Marquess of Pembroke in her own right. Just four months later she and Henry were secretly married, by which time - having finally capitulated to his advances - she was already pregnant. In May Thomas Cranmer, whom Thomas Boleyn had once made the family chaplain and was now Archbishop of Canterbury, officially declared Henry's marriage to Catherine to be null and
void. Instead, his marriage to Anne was affirmed to be good and valid. The following month Anne’s ultimate moment of triumph arrived, and it was one in which her family were there to share. On 1 June, bedecked in a sumptuous dress of crimson velvet lined with ermine, she was crowned in a magnificent ceremony in Westminster Abbey. She was the second commoner to be made Queen of England, and in a sign of the importance of the occasion she was crowned with St Edward’s Crown – usually reserved for the coronation of male monarchs. All that remained was for her to produce a son.

On 7 September Anne gave birth not to the long-desired prince, but to a girl, Elizabeth. In spite of the disappointment of her sex, the baby was healthy and there was every reason to hope for sons. Yet they were never to transpire, and several other pregnancies resulted in nothing but bitter disappointment.

Anne proved to be a very different kind of wife and queen to her predecessor. Though she distributed alms and gave money to other charitable causes, was both pious and a patron of learning, she remained unpopular with her subjects whose hearts lay with Catherine. Similarly, where Catherine had been obedient to her husband’s will and turned a blind eye to his infidelities, Anne was outspoken and was outraged when Henry was unfaithful to her. The result was inevitable: by the end of 1535 Henry was tiring of his wife, and sought solace in the arms of one of her ladies: Jane Seymour.

Following the example once set so successfully by her mistress, Jane employed the same tactics to the King’s advances. She refused to become his mistress, and instead held out for marriage. Once again, the game worked. On 29 January 1536 – the same day as the funeral of Catherine of Aragon who had died that month – Anne miscarried of a child that showed every appearance of being male. Chapuys observed that “she has miscarried of her saviour”, and her perceived failure gave her enemies an opportunity to move against her.

In the following months as the King’s ardour for Jane Seymour grew, so too did the coolness with which he treated Anne and her family. In April it had been expected that George would be admitted to the Order of the Garter, but in a clear sign of how far they had fallen, another candidate was chosen. Unbeknown to Anne, her former ally Thomas Cromwell was plotting her downfall and on 29 April laid his evidence – which most modern historians agree to have been falsified – before the king. Anne, he said, had committed adultery with four men, including a lowly born musician named Mark Smeaton. But there was worse, for Cromwell also claimed that Anne was guilty of incest with her own brother. Henry was furious and ordered the arrest of all of those involved, Anne included.

The court celebrated May Day with all of the usual revelry at Greenwich. George was the leading challenger at the customary jousts, and Anne sat beside her husband as they presided over the tournament. Yet the king left abruptly, causing Anne alarm and with good cause. The following day she was arrested and taken to the Tower, as were the five men – including her brother – accused alongside her. As she arrived at the fortress in a state of utter shock, she asked Sir William Kingston, the Constable, “Do I go into a dungeon?” She was taken to the Royal Apartments.

The imprisonment of the Boleyn siblings proved to be an upsetting and agitating experience for them both. Anne was placed in the custody of the constable, who made detailed reports of his prisoner’s every word. Bewailing her misfortune, on one occasion Anne cried, “Oh, my mother, thou wilt die with sorrow.” Her behaviour was erratic, and Kingston reported that “one hour she is determined to die, and the next hour much contrary to that.” On 12 May the four men with whom Anne had been accused of

“WHEN THE CASE WAS REFERRED TO THE POPE IN ROME IN 1529 THE BOLEYNS BECAME CONVINCED THAT WOLSEY WAS WORKING AGAINST THEM”
Rise And Fall Of The Boleyns

BOLEYN FAMILY TREE
A quick guide to Anne’s relations
that “there was no treasure in this world The children of a Wiltshire kni; to Anne's service, while two of her brothers, first appearance at court, where - like Anne increased”, and in order to prove his love to refused a gift of money, declaring to Henry “great presents” from the king. However, she resolved.” By January 1536 she was receiving her his queen, upon which the damsel is quite been “well tutored” and warned not to give in to the king's advances “unless he makes her his queen, upon which the damsel is quite resolved.” By January 1536 she was receiving “great presents” from the king. However, she refused a gift of money, declaring to Henry that “there was no treasure in this world that she valued as much as her honour.” Predictably, his ardour for Jane “marvellously increased”; and in order to prove his love to her he insisted on using her brother Edward as a chaperone. He even moved the apartments of Edward and his wife closer to his own to facilitate easier access. Anne's execution paved the way for Henry and Jane's marriage, but tragically Jane died just 12 days after her son's birth in 1537. In time her brothers attempted to seize control and influence their nephew, Edward VI, but in a similar manner as the Boleyns, both Edward and Thomas ended their lives on the executioner's block on Edward's orders. adultery were tried and condemned, and three days later she and George stood trial separately. Though both siblings defended themselves ably, the result was a foregone conclusion. Anne and her brother were both found guilty and condemned to death. Among the peers who sat in judgement upon them was their own father, whom Chapuys had heard was “quite as ready to assist at the judgement” as he had been to the other men who had stood trial.

There was no hope of a reprieve, and on 17 May George and the men condemned alongside him were executed on Tower Hill. Permitted to speak, in his final moments he stated that “I am come hither not to preach and make a sermon, but to die.” He met his end bravely. Two days after her brother's death it was Anne's turn. By means of a final favour to the woman who he had once loved so passionately, the king had sent to Calais for a French swordsman who was tasked with executing his former queen. Unlike George, a private execution within the confines of the Tower had been arranged for her, and a scaffold erected in front of the White Tower. Having made a short speech in which she implored “If any person will meddle with my cause, I require them to judge the best”, Anne's head was removed swiftly and cleanly with a deft blow from the sword. Her severed remains were interred within the Chapel of St Peter ad Vincula within the Tower. Eleven days after Anne's death, Henry VIII married Jane Seymour. It was through this marriage that he received that which he had so desperately craved: a son, Edward. Amongst those who attended the prince's christening at Hampton Court in October 1537 was Thomas Boleyn. Yet he no longer basked in royal favour or held the influence he had once enjoyed as a result of his daughter's exalted status. Moreover, the tragedy that he had been forced to endure had left him a broken man, and he retired to Hever to live quietly. On 3 April 1538 his wife died and was buried at Lambeth, and it would not be long before he followed her to the grave. Thomas died at Hever on 12 March 1539, and was interred in the church there. It was a sad end for the man whose family had once been raised to such staggering heights. Yet their moment of glory was not quite at an end.

The two decades following Anne's death left her mark on her daughter, Elizabeth, whose life was destined to run a less than stable course. She would never forget her mother's terrible end, and there is no doubt that it deeply affected her. Yet she was to be Anne's greatest legacy, for when Elizabeth succeeded to the throne on 17 November 1558, she did so not only as her father's daughter, but as her mother's too. For in this queen flowed the blood of the family who had once been the most ambitious in England - the Boleyns.
Anne was condemned to her fate because of the capriciousness of King Henry VIII. Anne would spend her last days in the Tower of London, where her daughter Elizabeth would also be briefly held. Henry's second wife was given the ultimate punishment in 1536 despite likely being innocent of all charges.
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Uncover the lives of the women who fell in love with one of the most hated men of the 20th century

Written by Kate Marsh

It was a Saturday morning when the body was found face down on the floor in the Munich apartment. A bullet wound near the 23-year-old’s heart had killed her, and the 6.35mm Walther pistol lay on the sofa nearby. It had belonged to the man who owned the apartment – a man who was known across Germany and who was beginning to garner attention around the world. His name was Adolf Hitler, and the apparent suicide of his half-niece would change him forever.

The young woman was Geli Raubal, and she had been full of life. A music student, she was known among Hitler’s inner circle as an ‘enchantress’ and a ‘princess’, and the burgeoning politician often had her on his arm at meetings and events, eager to show off his half-sister’s daughter to all who would pay attention. Neither had thought that their relationship would come to such an abrupt, violent end – after all, their affair had started inconspicuously enough.
In 1929, Hitler moved back to Munich, taking a flat on Prinzregentenstraße and bringing Geli along with him. The rumours of a relationship between the two of them skyrocketed, but neither party seemed to care for a while. Ernst Hanfstaengel, a close friend of Hitler’s, commented that Geli was the “one woman in [Hitler’s] life who went some way towards curing his impotence”, and the pair seemed good together. Hitler enjoyed showing his half-niece off, and Geli didn’t mind the attention. The soon-to-be politician even encouraged his paramour to receive weapons training, and insisted that she carried a loaded pistol with her for protection. Feeling like she was in a Western, Geli loved it. But what was lying underneath the surface of this seemingly loving relationship?

Violence, jealousy, aggression and perhaps sadism were all part and parcel. According to both Hanfstaengel and Otto Strasser, Geli had complained about strange and downright disgusting things she had been asked to do in the bedroom, and she was looking for a way out of Uncle Alf’s grip. Hitler wouldn’t let her see other people — although apparently that didn’t necessarily stop her when he was away. Rumours spread that she was sleeping with Emil Maurice, Hitler’s chauffeur. They weren’t far off the truth. Geli told her friend Henriette, daughter of Hitler’s official photographer Heinrich Hoffmann, “Being loved is boring, but to love a man, you know, to love him — that’s what life is about. And when you can love and be loved at the same time, it’s paradise.” She wasn’t speaking of her uncle — those words were all about Maurice.

But there were other whispers around Munich about what Geli was up to. Some evidence suggests that she was in a relationship with a man in Vienna, and that she planned to meet him there and they were to marry until Hitler put a stop to it, apparently with the support of his half-sister, Geli’s mother. Some said that the man was Jewish, and that she was pregnant with his child. In fact, the day before Geli’s body was found, that was what their latest argument had been about.

“You say you have to go to Vienna? Is it to see that filthy Jew, the one who claims to be a singing teacher? Is that it? Have you been seeing him secretly again? Have you forgotten I forbade you to have anything to do with him? Tell me the truth now. Why do you want to go to Vienna?” Hitler had roared.

Geli’s response was simple and to the point: “I have to go to Vienna, Uncle Alf, because I’m going to have a baby.”

Blazing rows weren’t out of the ordinary for the pair — the neighbours didn’t bat an eyelid. Hitler left for Hamburg that evening, off on the campaign trail, and Geli was desperate. She couldn’t leave, not with both her uncle and her mother so vehemently against the idea, but staying was torturous.

Residents in neighbouring flats apparently heard a short cry that evening, but they thought nothing of it. Why would they? The terrible truth would be uncovered the next morning when Georg Winter, the husband of the housekeeper, found the door to the room locked. He opened it with a screwdriver, only to find the 23-year-old, once so vivacious, face down on the floor. Near her was an unfinished letter addressed to someone in Vienna, detailing how she would meet them there. Only she would never make it.

Geli’s death is still a mystery today. Had she killed herself, as everyone believed? Nazi
propagandists came out in force claiming that she had killed herself because she was 'nervous' about an upcoming music recital, giving that as a reason for her actions. However, she was given a Catholic funeral, a rite that was denied to those who committed suicide, and was buried at the Zentralfriedhof Cemetery in Vienna on 23 September 1931. And why would she start writing a letter saying she'd meet someone in Vienna, only to end her life halfway through?

There are some who saw her death as an accident - perhaps she had been playing with her uncle's pistol when it suddenly went off, the bullet tearing into her chest. Maybe in the shock she had thrown the gun onto the sofa before sinking to the ground, her life slipping away from her. A few people came up with the idea that a jealous woman had come into the flat during the night, hellbent on killing her - the Nazi Party was particularly keen on this story.

Hitler was away that night, but that didn't stop rumours spreading that he had done it. He just couldn't let Geli go to Vienna, or have the baby she was supposed to be carrying. Others claimed that he had hired someone to murder her and make it look like an accident.

Whatever the truth, the aftermath of her death was certainly shady. Her body was taken for an autopsy but disappeared out of a side door and was shipped off to Vienna. The corpse was gone before the Monday morning papers. If Hitler's political career was to gather speed, he needed the scandal of a woman dying under his roof to rapidly shrink away into the background.

But despite public appearances, Hitler was distraught. Geli's death left him heartbroken - there was a hole in his life where the vivacious and confident young woman had been. After seeing her face splashed across every newspaper, he couldn't bear it any more and so headed to an

AN UNANSWERED QUESTION

Historians have speculated about Hitler's sexuality for years, but where's the evidence?

In the image Hitler created for himself he was a man married to the Fatherland. In his mind he had been put on this Earth to bring freedom to the German people, and there was no time for him to be having fun and frolicking around with women.

Hitler had his fair share of women in his life - Geli and Eva were the most famous, but there were others, too. However, as far as the bedroom was concerned, historians have differing opinions about what went on. There are some who put forward the argument that the dictator was actually asexual - that is, he didn't participate in sex. But it doesn't take much to disprove this theory; Geli was so disgusted by the sex acts she was made to perform that it put distance between her and her half-uncle, while Eva's biographer claims they had a very active sex life.

This isn't the only school of thought, though. There are a number of historians past and present who believe that the Fuhrer was homosexual, or at least repressing strong homosexual tendencies. Lothar Machtan, a German historian and writer, believes so. One partner he suggests is August Kubizek, who had lived with Hitler in Vienna in 1908, but this isn't mentioned at all in Kubizek's memoirs. Instead he talks about how they both fell for the same girl, Stefanie Rabatsch. Machtan doesn't stop there - he also claims that Hitler had an affair with a fellow soldier during World War I, although no evidence has been found. Perhaps we'll never know the whole truth - or perhaps we were simply a heterosexual man, whatever his individual sexual proclivities may have been.
isolated cottage on the shore of Tegernsee, Bavaria. There he ranted and raved to Rudolf Hess, yelling about how his political career was over and that his life was no longer worth living. According to one story, Hess had to grab a pistol out of his friend's hand before he killed himself. Geli may not have been Hitler's first infatuation, and certainly not the first of his lovers to attempt suicide (although very little is known about these earlier women), but it was her death that affected him the most, with some even blaming it for some of Hitler's darker policies. Nonetheless, time heals most wounds, and Hitler would soon move on. It just so happened that his next love would be someone he had already met.

In 1929, Heinrich Hoffman had a young assistant in his studio. Just 17, she was a keen worker and eager to please as both an assistant and a model. Then, on one November day, Eva Braun's life changed forever. There at the door of the photography studio was a man who introduced himself as 'Herr Wolf', and the rest, as they say, was history.

It's impossible to know much about the early years of their relationship as all of Hitler's personal correspondence was burned the week before his death in 1945. What we can infer, though, is that she became jealous - after all, she was only 17 and the man she wanted was obsessed with another woman: Geli. Her half-niece took up his spare time, but that didn't stop Eva from flirting with Hitler, and he brought her gifts when he visited the photography studio, and even sometimes took her to the opera.

In 1930, things seemed to be going Eva's way. Hitler invited her to dinners at Osteria Bavaria, his favourite restaurant, along with others from his inner circle, and it's thought that while Hitler was jealous of the company Geli was keeping, the feeling may have been mutual. Theirs was a strange, mixed-up relationship, after all. The man who was showering her with affection - however distasteful his bedroom requests may have been - was shifting his attention to a girl just one or two years her junior.

Hitler's 'type' was clear - he once commented: "A girl of 18 to 20 is as malleable as wax. It should be possible for a man ... to stamp his own imprint on her. That's all the woman asks for." He didn't like girls who argued with him, or who were more intelligent than him, and with both of his main relationships being with girls in their late teens and early 20s, it certainly seems that dominance was important to him. At the beginning, Geli didn't resist, and neither did Eva.

After Geli's death it seemed as though Hitler would never be able to get over her. Her room in Munich was never touched while the dictator lived, and his grief was deep and real. But it didn't last for long. Eva, still living in Munich, was about to turn 20, and she was eager to grow up. She spent her nights at cafes, nightclubs and the cinema, staying out until the early morning. She was enjoying everything the city had to offer, but there was just one problem - she was still obsessed with Hitler.

Eva never let up in her flirting, and eventually it paid off. An invitation to the Troubadour, one of Hitler's favourite cafes, turned into more nights at the opera. Then it was a full-blown affair - or so we think. Any primary evidence of their relationship - letters, documents, photographs - were destroyed in 1945, so figuring out what happened has been a lot of guesswork and interviews with Hitler's inner circle after the war. For instance, it's unclear if their relationship had a sexual element or not (although Eva's biographer claims they were definitely sexually active), and we'll never know just how emotionally attached they were to one another.

What we do know, however, is that while Eva didn't like to take money from her lover, she
The wedding certificate of Eva and Hitler shows the bride’s crossing out of her maiden name and instead signing as ‘Eva Hitler, born Braun’.

“He didn’t like girls who argued with him, or who were more intelligent than him”
THE OTHER WOMEN
Meet the others who supposedly caught the eye of the Fuhrer

A WOMAN SCORNED?

ERNA HANFSTAENGEL
Erna, the elder sister of one of Hitler's closest friends, was plagued by whispers. After the failed Beer Hall Putsch, it was said that she and the future dictator had hidden together in Uffing, with more rumours claiming they were to be married. While they were possibly lovers at this time, Erna was later involved in a plot to overthrow the Fuhrer.

Likes: Helping her brothers
Dislikes: War with the Allies

JUST NOT THAT INTO HIM

STEFANIE RABATSCH
A young Austrian woman, Stefanie caught the eye of Hitler around 1905. His heart soared whenever she smiled at him, but he was crushed whenever he was ignored. While the two never met, August Kubizek claims Hitler planned to kidnap her, and he sent her an anonymous love letter asking her to wait for him. Three years later, Stefanie married another man.

Likes: Long strolls
Dislikes: Voyeur totalitarianism

ARYAN FAN GIRL

UNITY MITFORD
A Brit known for her support of fascism, Unity was delighted to be accepted into Hitler's inner circle. It is unclear if they had a sexual relationship—some claim they did, while others state that Unity was jealous of Eva—but Hitler extolled Unity's Aryan virtues and was happy to show off the fascist Englishwoman.

Likes: Standing out
Dislikes: Religious tolerance

BROKEN HEARTED

MARIA REITER
She was 16 when she met Hitler while the soon-to-be Fuhrer was 37. They began to date and the relationship seemed to be getting serious—until Hitler broke it off in February 1927. Sinking into depression, Maria attempted suicide only to be saved in the nick of time.

Likes: Traditional marriage
Dislikes: Being strung along

BEARER OF A LOVE CHILD?

CHARLOTTE LOBOJOIE
The story goes that Charlotte, the daughter of a butcher, met the Fuhrer when he was posted to France during World War I. However, the parentage of her son, Jean-Marie Loret, was cast into doubt after her death.

Likes: Dancing
Dislikes: Naming a dad
did end up with a house in Munich as well as apartments at the Berghof and the Old Reich Chancellery. We also know that she wasn't a member of the Nazi Party, although she must have agreed with their ideas as she had been photographed at least one rally.

But the relationship did cause one problem - Hitler had a very specific image that he had cultivated, and that was one of a lonesome and god-like man who had sacrificed his personal life for the good of his country. He was married to the Fatherland, not a 20-something-year-old Bavarian. As such, they were never seen together in public. Hardly any pictures were taken of the two of them together, unless they were away from the public eye in places like the Berghof.

The Eva we remember today was a happy, blonde-haired girl who enjoyed the frivolous things in life, but her diary spins another story. The only part that survives covers 6 February to 28 May 1935, but it tells the tale of a woman who had given everything to the man she loved, only to receive nothing in return. It tore her apart, and she spiralled deeper and deeper into despair. Leaving Hitler wasn't an option - as far as we know, it didn't really occur to her - but she saw another way out.

It wasn't the first time that Eva had attempted suicide - there had been an attempt in 1932, although the event had been covered up - but the seriousness of the situation cannot be understated. Eva was clearly reaching the end of her patience with Germany's chancellor, and it seemed as though the overdose of sleeping pills provided a wake up call for him. They became closer, even though Hitler disapproved of her smoking and use of make-up.

Eva stayed away from politics, which suited Hitler just fine - he had never wanted a woman to interfere with his work. However, since the end of World War II there has been some discussion about just how much the Fuhrer's mistress knew about the policies and atrocities that took place under the Nazi government. Did she know about the Holocaust? Did she realise what was going on in Germany and beyond? Regardless, her loyalty to her lover was absolute, even when their final test came.

As Berlin crumbled around him, Hitler and his inner circle took refuge in the Fuhrerbunker under the Reich Chancellery. There they commanded the final weeks and days of the war effort as the Soviets closed in on the city. Hitler had ordered Eva to leave Berlin, make a break for freedom, but she refused. Instead, she joined the Fuhrer in his underground hideout, unwilling to leave him, even at the cost of her own life.

In the early hours of 29 April 1945, Eva's dream was finally realised - she married the man she loved as they sheltered from the enemy. The ceremony was conducted by Walther Wagner, a minor official from the Propaganda Ministry, with the marriage certificate signed by Joseph Goebbels and Martin Bormann. It was a reward for

“Eva had made it clear that she'd follow her lover to the ends of the Earth”

Eva's near-unwavering loyalty, and as she signed the marriage document, she wrote 'Eva B' before crossing it out and writing 'Eva Hitler, born Braun'.

The intent had always been that the newlyweds would die in a double suicide after the wedding; Hitler wrote in his will that "at her [Eva's] own desire she goes as my wife with me into death". They had one day together as man and wife before they made their way to their private room. There, they took cyanide, and the Fuhrer shot himself in the head with a 7.65mm Walther pistol.

Eva had made it clear that she would follow her lover to the ends of the Earth, and she did do. Hitler had a pull on her that she couldn't deny, no matter how toxic their relationship may have been in the beginning, or indeed at all. What mattered to them was that they left the world together, believing in the dream of the Third Reich. But it does make one wonder - if Geli had still been alive, would it have been her lying next to the Fuhrer? Hitler's hold over these two women was extraordinary, even if it was for the worse.
We speak with historians, curators and campaigners about why it’s so important we never forget the 200-year old tragedy of this protest for voting rights.

August 1819: between 60,000–80,000 men, women and children assembled in St Peter’s Field in Manchester to protest for their right to parliamentary representation. Not long after Henry Hunt, the famed orator, took to the hustings the local magistrates ordered the arrest of Hunt and those leading the protest, and the Manchester and Salford Yeomanry charged the field, attacking with sabres as they met resistance from the crowd. With tensions rising they were followed by the 15th Hussars who also charged, having been ordered to disperse the assembly. What they seemingly didn’t know is that exits had been blocked and most in the field were now trapped.

It’s believed that 18 people died in the attack, including one two-year-old child, with over 500 injured. It was a shocking event that the press nicknamed “Peterloo” as an ironic reference to the Battle of Waterloo. John Lees, a former soldier and textiles worker, died from wounds he sustained and is reported to have told a friend before his death, “At Waterloo there was man to man but there it was downright murder.” It’s an event that echoed through the years that followed, but it would not be until 1832 and the Great Reform Act that anything close to what protestors called for would be put into law, and over 100 years before universal suffrage would be achieved in the UK.

As we mark the 200th anniversary this year we spoke with some of the people looking to keep the memory of this event alive and why they think it is such an important moment in British history.
How long have you been working on the various events you have planned for the anniversary?
Manchester Histories and partners, which include both large cultural organisations and small community groups across Greater Manchester, have been working over the past four years on the programme that has led to Peterloo 2019. This has included running regular network and planning meetings to shape what activities take place and to develop the different strands of work such as the learning resources and the new website (peterlool819.co.uk), which will also form part of the legacy for the project.

Did you have a particular mission statement for what you wanted to achieve for the anniversary?
Despite the scale of the Peterloo Massacre and the impact that it had at the time, both nationally and internationally, awareness levels have remained low. Peterloo is a chapter of our history that links directly to our present, and events that followed like the Chartist and suffragette movements, with ordinary people campaigning for change. Our mission has been to make people more aware of the story and the relevance of Peterloo, to bring this to life and to explore the impact on society both then and now.

You’ve approached this anniversary in a multitude of ways, one of which is a broader series of events around protest and freedom of speech in the 200 years since Peterloo. Why did you choose to do that?
We want to make sure Peterloo has relevance to today and to influence people’s future thinking in terms of finding out about their own and others’ histories and heritage. The themes were chosen so that people could talk about their own interests today in parallel to Peterloo.

By also looking more broadly at protest, it’s given the opportunity to not just focus on the story of Peterloo, but also other important events that have shaped our society today, like the Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp that peacefully protested for nuclear disarmament.

What does Peterloo mean to the city of Manchester?
I think the commemorations to date have been very emotive. The Peterloo story unleashes a rawness; it stirs deep feelings of pride, anger, and highlights people’s struggles to be represented. People have really connected to this and to each other through discussions and attending different events. It means Manchester is still a city that has lots to say and is proud of its radical roots and spirit!

Manchester Histories is hosting events through July and August, most of them free to attend. Visit manchesterhistories.co.uk for more information and peterlool819.co.uk for an interactive experience.
On 27 September 1884 an extraordinary photograph was taken of 11 elderly survivors of the Peterloo Massacre. Aged between 79 and 83 these protestors were still campaigning for better voting rights. A copy was discovered by historian and television presenter Michael Wood in a collection of old history books that belonged to his father. He recently gave a lecture about the image called 'The Peterloo Photograph' as part of Manchester Histories' bicentenary commemorations. We spoke to Wood about the massacre's powerful legacy in the city and beyond.

**What did the march to St Peter's Field say about the condition of Manchester at the time?**

There were massive divisions emerging with poverty and unemployment. The Industrial Revolution was underway and there were a lot of stresses and strains on society. Manchester was also a really difficult place to operate in. There was no civic order and it was still under a manorial ownership.

**How important was the massacre as a political event?**

One historian said that Peterloo was "up there with Magna Carta" so it was a massive moment and everybody recognised it. The leadership had instructed the protestors that there was to be absolutely no violence used or any semblance of rioting. There were a large number of women present and Samuel Bamford described many of them as wearing white dresses and frocks with hats and garlands of flowers. The whole atmosphere was like Wakes Week with the festive summer entertainments that they put on in rural districts.

Everybody was therefore totally stunned by what happened. The government moved against reforming newspapers as often as it could but everybody was writing about it. Alison Morgan has just published a collection of Peterloo songs and ballads and she's retrieved about 80 to 90 of them! These were written in the immediate aftermath and sung in pubs, clubs and taverns. The Manchester Guardian (now The Guardian) was also founded in the aftermath of Peterloo.

**How was Peterloo remembered when you were growing up in Manchester?**

Everybody knew about Peterloo in our neck of the woods. Certainly when I went up to Manchester Grammar School when I was 11 the history teacher made a speech on the first day. He gave us his pen-portrait of Manchester, which was a city of free trade, the Industrial Revolution and the heroes and heroines of Peterloo.

It was definitely something that we all knew about and in my particular case my father came...
from Failsworth, which played a quite a role in the Peterloo story. It was a famous centre of radicalism and it was a really well-known story in our family because we’ve got ancestors tracing back there to at least the 1790s.

**How did a copy of the ‘Peterloo Photograph’ come into your family?**

These were 11 veterans who were youngsters at the time and they were all part of the Failsworth story. Our families were linked to a pool of people, including a few of the veterans, who went to Peterloo who were all neighbours, friends and related by marriage.

I should say that I’m no expert and these are simply family stories. As I was clearing out my mum’s house after she died three years ago, I found a box of books belonging to my dad that included photos and other odd and ends. We wondered why there were these old, obscure local history books of Failsworth among them and they all carried the photograph of the Peterloo veterans. My dad had kept three or four books that contained the picture because it was taken in Failsworth at a prominent event.

**What do we know about the photograph?**

The account of the meeting from 1884 says that they carried a banner that they’d carried with Samuel Bamford’s detachment to Peterloo. However, the two banners that you can read were from a demonstration for the vote that they had attended in 1884. There they are in their 80s and they are still fighting! They were still activists and that night they went round to a local house for tea where they told stories and sang songs.

**How important are the bicentenary events for Manchester?**

I think they are important and Manchester has always had a unique place in history. When you travel in on the train from Stockport it doesn’t have the vibe of a great city of history or a place of destiny.

However, because of what happened from the Industrial Revolution onwards, it was no mistake that so many movements began there. This included the suffragettes and Chartism was really big in Manchester. It was a great centre of radical and liberal politics and Friedrich Engels lived there which is why Karl Marx came up.

It was really the experience of Manchester that led Engels and Marx to construe the nature of capitalism in the way that they did. If Engels had lived in Birmingham, Marx would have seen a completely different kind of industrial society. It was made out of thousands of small workshops and it was a different kind of industrial economy altogether. Their interpretation of history was really influenced by Manchester.

Peterloo is ultimately a symbol: an electric moment after which nothing can be quite the same again. Mancunians still feel that and I think that’s reflective of the pride they have in their city as a crucible of history where things are hammered out.

**How important are photographs like this as historical records?**

Photographs sometimes open an amazing window. There is quite a famous photograph in the British Library of a Chartist meeting in 1848 in Kennington and when you have photos like that it’s staggering. They are beyond price as a record of what people were actually like at that time during the early development of photography.

Photos can therefore be absolutely stunning and it’s why I called my talk ‘The Peterloo Photograph’. This is because you may think, “Peterloo? 1819? Photography wasn’t invented then!” But there they are and we know who they were and what they did. They’re no longer anonymous weavers who don’t have any background or can’t be placed.
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The Disrupt? Peterloo and Protest exhibition at People’s History Museum (PHM) is putting the Peterloo Massacre at the heart of a conversation about protest and collective action. Why was that important?

At People’s History Museum (PHM) we wanted to remember the Peterloo Massacre as a critical event in modern Britain. But we also wanted to connect Peterloo with the present and future of protest and collective action — rather than just a history lesson we wanted to think about how Peterloo influenced and inspired a much longer history of protest and resistance.

Did Peterloo set the stage for further protests for voting rights in the years that followed?

In the years following the massacre the government cracked down on protest. When Percy Bysshe Shelley heard of the massacre, he penned the poem The Masque Of Anarchy, powerfully indicting those who were responsible. Yet Shelley could not find a publisher brave enough to print his words, with the genuine threat of imprisonment hanging over radicals in this period. It was only in 1832, after Shelley’s death, that the poem was first published. Out of the ashes of Peterloo and following the Great Reform Act of 1832 a new working class movement emerged with the Chartists and they would continue the struggle for voting rights that had been violently repressed at Peterloo.

Did the crackdown have a lasting effect on the memory of Peterloo?

Ordinary people continued to keep the memory of Peterloo alive. There were a huge number of protestors, around 60,000, who had witnessed the massacre and they refused to forget. In our collections and galleries at PHM, and now on show in our exhibition Disrupt? Peterloo and Protest, we hold many of these commemorative artefacts: handkerchiefs, jugs, flags and medals all made to continue the memory of Peterloo. But the repression that followed the massacre certainly means that many of these objects from the reform movement have now been lost or destroyed.

What do you feel Peterloo can teach us about modern protest?

The protestors who met at St Peter’s Field powerfully represented the real communities of Manchester and its surrounding towns and villages. There were many women on the demonstration, and they often led their sections into the march. Women were critical to the reform movement yet, just as now, they were mocked and targeted as they stepped out of their role as wives and mothers.

Peterloo teaches us that the campaign for women’s rights did not simply begin with the suffragettes. But the Peterloo Massacre also tells us that rights we have today, like the vote, were never simply given to us by enlightened governments. Instead, these rights were campaigned for by ordinary people, sometimes in dangerous circumstances amidst the brutality of the British government.

“Peterloo teaches us that the campaign for women’s rights did not simply begin with the suffragettes”

Disrupt? Peterloo and Protest is running at PHM until 23 February 2020 with artefacts brought together for the first time. The museum is open seven days a week, entry is free with a suggested donation of £5.

Thanks to Manchester being at the heart of the economic transformation of Britain it was also a hotbed of energised citizens looking to make their voices heard.
What can visitors expect to find at the Parliament & Peterloo exhibition?
The Parliament & Peterloo exhibition, which opens on 4 July at Westminster Hall really tells the story of how Parliament and Peterloo are connected. We look at the background of Peterloo and the state of the country immediately after the Battle of Waterloo. We also reference the beginnings of people campaigning for the right to vote.

One of the features we’re having in the exhibition is an audiovisual presentation. We’ve been working in partnership with Royal Holloway University of London and they supplied us with some videos that bring to life some of the testimony of people who were around at the time. For instance we have a video of someone who speaks the words of a woman called Mary Fildes who was actually one of the people on the platform with Henry Hunt at Peterloo.

What do we know about Westminster’s understanding of what was happening in Manchester?
Because it was August, parliament wouldn’t have been sitting at the time. Parliament as a body wasn’t immediately aware of what was happening, but what happened subsequently was a series of reports and copies of letters from people who were there at the time.

Between 1819 and at least 1832 there were several hundred petitions sent into parliament from people who were there demanding an inquiry.

Has the process of digitising your archive shed any new light on the response of parliament to Peterloo?
I think the papers we’ve found that are in the bundle marked ‘papers relating to the internal state of the country’, have possibly been overlooked by historians in the past, simply because of the way they’ve been catalogued here. There’s a lot of personal testimony that I think sheds light on the way people were treated at the event.

Are there any examples of testimony that spring to mind?
Mary’s is the testimony that I’m most aware of and hers is that she was struck by someone, treated very badly by a member of the Yeomanry and they were the ones who charged into the meeting. She describes how that happened and how other people around her were basically hit and injured by the action of the Yeomanry and the cavalry. And it took her several days, if not weeks, to recover from the experience.

Remembering Peterloo

“BETWEEN 1819 AND AT LEAST 1832 THERE WERE SEVERAL HUNDRED PETITIONS SENT INTO PARLIAMENT FROM PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE DEMANDING AN INQUIRY”
How did the campaign for a permanent memorial to the victims of the Peterloo Massacre get started?

I'm a professional political cartoonist, and was drawing a cartoon that used Tiananmen Square as a metaphor about the rise of capitalism and consumerism in China, and kept getting this weird feeling that it reminded me of something... but what?

Then the penny dropped. It's Peterloo. I very quickly began asking why Manchester has no memorial to an event that changed the UK and the world. We know why the regime in China wouldn't commemorate Tiananmen, but what excuse did my home city have?

About the same time some delegates at the Labour Party annual conference, which was being held very near the site of the massacre, were wandering about in a break, seeing if they could find any indicators of what happened there, and couldn't. We ended up joining forces with them after our launch.

What have been the biggest challenges to getting approval for the memorial?

It was a nightmare of anger and frustration. They exerted a really shocking level of control over it, and despite our efforts to pressure them, they revealed the design and held a token consultation in late 2018, too late for any serious objections or revisions. Since then we've all been drowning in bitter irony at how undemocratic the process of choosing a memorial to democracy has been. It's all very telling, eh?

How was the final design concept for the memorial decided upon?

We pushed hard for an open design competition, but ultimately it would seem very few people in the Council hierarchy had a yes or no say about artist Jeremy Deller's design. We did, however, manage to get our 'RIP' criteria for the memorial incorporated into the process: Respectful, Informative and Permanent/Prominent, and I think those have been met. But it seemed to take a formal Freedom of Information demand to pry that inner door open.

How well known are the events of Peterloo to the people of Manchester?

Until recently, it was the norm not to know about it in the city. There really has been a 200-year whitewashing of its memory. We hope our persistence over the years has helped combat that, and that Mike Leigh's film does the same.

You've just published a graphic novel about Peterloo. What can you tell us about that project?

Yeah, it's all come round in a circle regarding my 'day job!' Myself, Eva Schlunke and historian Professor Robert Poole recently finished Peterloo: Witnesses To A Massacre. We deeply hope it'll prove a very accessible and populist way for people to find out more. Just researching it was an amazing experience.

Much of the text is actually from reporting and government correspondence from the day. Why did you choose this approach?

Everything in it, in a white narrative or speech bubble, is simply 100 per cent accurate, and taken from the huge range of sources that exist; courtroom transcripts, spy's reports, journals, diaries and so on. They alone, without the images, make for an astonishing and moving read, with deeply contrasting attitudes from the huge range of characters. We think this may be the world's first 'verbatim' graphic novel!

Peterloo: Witnesses To A Massacre is available now. Visit peterloo.org for details. For more info on the under construction Peterloo memorial go to peterloomassacre.org.
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Akhenaten
The Heretic Pharao

By replacing a pantheon of gods with the Aten, himself and his queen, this Egyptian king threw his nation into turmoil

Written by Dr Charlotte Booth

The pharaoh Akhenaten ruled Egypt during the 18th dynasty and is one of the most written about rulers of ancient Egypt. This infamy is due to his religious overhaul where he replaced the rich pantheon of deities with the Aten - the sundisc. However, despite this post-mortem fame, Akhenaten was not an important king in the grand scheme of Egyptian history and he ruled for a mere 17 years (1350-34 BCE). This period of Egyptian history is known as the Amarna period, named for the new capital city during his reign, Tell el Amarna in Middle Egypt.

Throughout the modern era he has been referred to as the world’s first monotheist, a pacifist, an alien and the heretic king. Additionally he has been compared to Moses, Martin Luther, Oliver Cromwell, Adolf Hitler, Stalin and Christ. Eminent Egyptologist, Margaret Murray commented in 1949, “The Tell el Amarna period has had more nonsense written about it than any other period in Egyptian history ... in the
case of Akhenaten the facts do not bear the construction often put on them.

So many theories abound about this king due to the lack of tangible archaeological evidence about his reign and we can thank the ancient Egyptians themselves for this fragmentary survival rate. Following his reign, Akhenaten's contemporaries tried to erase his very existence from history. His name was erased from the monuments and his temples, his city was razed to the ground and the stones reused as building material.

So who was Akhenaten? Peaceful, religious activist or a heretic?

Akhenaten was the second son of Amenhotep III and queen Tiye. He was born with the name Amenhotep, which he changed during the early years of his reign to Akhenaten, in honour of his newly revered god, the Aten.

As a second son, young Amenhotep was never expected to be king, but between year 16 and 27 of his father's reign, his older brother Thutmosis died leaving him as sole heir to the throne.

Just before Amenhotep IV, as he was crowned, came to the throne he married an unknown woman named Nefertiti. Her parentage is one of the many things about the Amarna period that is hotly debated. One prominent theory is that she was a cousin of Amenhotep IV. Her father is thought to be Ay, the brother of queen Tiye and the king who followed Tutankhamun onto the throne.

Together they had six children, all girls: Meritaten, Meketaten, Ankhesenepaten (the future wife of Tutankhamun), Nefertenefruaten, Nefertenefure and Setepenre.

Nefertiti however was not the only wife of Akhenaten, and written evidence shows he had at least four wives: Nefertiti, Kya (the mother of Tutankhamun), Tadukhipa, a Babylonian princess, and his own daughter Ankhesenepaten, who later married Smenkhkare and Tutankhamun.

Akhenaten and Ankhesenepaten also possibly had a child together called Ankhesenepaten Tasherit (The Younger).

Nefertiti is depicted here leading a ceremony, likely to honour the Aten.

"The Tell el Amarna period has had more nonsense written about it than any other period in Egyptian history"

The Aten

There was nothing remarkable about Amenhotep before he became king – nothing to suggest he would utterly reject traditional religion and culture. He grew up at Memphis and was raised within the traditional religious culture that comprised a rich pantheon of gods. However, once he became king, Amenhotep IV (Akhenaten) abandoned all of these deities, replacing them with the Aten - the solar disc.

The Aten, however, was not a new god. Aten was already part of the traditional Egyptian pantheon and was recorded as early as the twelfth dynasty (1991 - 1782 BCE) in the Coffin Texts. Aten was traditionally depicted as a man with the head of a falcon surmounted by a sun disc, very similar to images of Re-Horakhty. Akhenaten abandoned this imagery and depicted the god as

It's believed that Nefertiti may have ruled briefly as pharaoh after Akhenaten's death.
a solar disc with sun rays emanating from it, each ending in hands holding ankhs to the mouths and noses of the royal family.

However, even this imagery is not new and is depicted on Amenhotep II's stela at Giza (1453-1419 BCE). Akhenaten didn't even start the reverence of the deity. This was started by his father Amenhotep III, as part of a campaign to restrict the ever-growing power of the priesthood of Amun located at Karnak temple. Akhenaten simply continued his father's work but with more fervour.

Many modern writers believe that Akhenaten's religion was monotheistic but this does not seem to be the case. One of the first acts of Akhenaten after he became king was, in year three, to write Aten's name in a pair of cartouches. This presented the divine name as part of a royal titulary and Aten was also given regnal years that were in line with those of the king. The king and the god were therefore closely intertwined, to the extent that the royal heb-sed festival showing the prowess of the king, was celebrated together as two gods/two kings.

It could be questioned whether Akhenaten was elevating his position to that of a god, or reducing the god's position to that of king. Either way, they were equal.

This equality was further emphasised with Akhenaten's control over the personal religion of the Egyptian people. The only people able to worship Aten directly were the royal family. Everyone else in Egypt was expected to worship Akhenaten, who would converse with the Aten on their behalf. This suggests there were in fact two gods of equal divinity - Akhenaten and Aten.

It wasn't until year nine of his reign that Akhenaten's religious fanaticism went to extremes. He closed all other temples in Egypt and diverted all their revenue to the temples of the Aten at Tell el Amarna. Some years later he started a hate

---

The Heretic Pharaoh

AKHENATEN'S HYMN TO THE ATEN

This text is thought by many to show Akhenaten's monotheism was a forerunner to Christianity

---

One text that has led to many comparisons between Akhenaten's religion and Christianity is the Great Hymn to the Aten, which is recorded in his vizier, Ay's tomb at Tell el Amarna. It has been compared to Psalm 104 from the Book of Psalms in the Christian Bible. There are eight points of comparison between this and Psalm 104, although the full text runs to dozens of lines. For example The Hymn to the Aten states:

"The land is in darkness, in the manner of death...
Every lion is come forth from his den; All creeping things, they stung."

Verse 20 from Psalm 104 similarly writes:

"Thou makest darkness and it is night: wherein all the beasts of the forest do creep forth. The young lions roar after their prey and seek their meat from God."

Another verse from the Hymn to the Aten states:

"At daybreak, when thou arisest on the horizon, When thou shinest as the Aten by day, Thou drivest away the darkness and givest thy rays. The Two Lands are in festivity every day, Awake and standing upon (their) feet, For thou hast raised them up...
All the world, they do their work."

This is compared to verse 23 from Psalm 104:

"The sun ariseth, they gather themselves together and lay them down in their dens. Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening."

This verse from the Hymn to the Aten is often compared with verse 12 of the Psalm. It states:

"The birds which fly from their nests, Their wings are (stretched out) in praise to thy ka.
All beasts spring upon (their) feet.
Whatever flies and alights, They live when thou hast risen (for) them."

The Psalm comparatively states:

"By them shall the fowls of the heaven have their habitation, which sing among the branches."

These comparisons seem convincing of the religion of the Aten being the origin of the Psalm and Christian thought but for the eight comparable points there are many other verses that do not compare. Additionally the Hymn to the Aten was not new at the time it was penned and much is adapted from the Middle Kingdom Coffin Texts (2040-1782 BCE) and earlier hymns to Amun. Akhenaten had taken well-known elements of the traditional religion and re-branded them to fit his new god; as did later religions.

Nefertiti is believed to have worked hand in hand with her husband to reform Egypt.
SICKLY KING
Can the unusual depiction of Akhenaten tell us about his health?

The unusual way in which Akhenaten is represented in art has led to decades of discussion as to whether the style represents pathology, or whether it is purely artistic creation. Images of Akhenaten – and subsequently, his wife Nefertiti, his children and top courtiers – depict him with short spindly legs and arms, heavy thighs and stomach and elongated facial features. The princesses are also depicted with elongated, egg-shaped skulls which had led to suggestions of artificial head deformation although there is no conclusive evidence that this was practiced in ancient Egypt.

Due to this unusual artistic representation Akhenaten is thought to have suffered from a variety of conditions:

LIPODYSTROPHY
A disturbance of the fat metabolism, where subcutaneous fat disappears from some areas of body whilst other areas are unaffected.

KLINEFELTER’S SYNDROME
Causes the male sufferer to develop breasts, small testes and very long legs.

HYPERPITUITARISM
A condition of the pituitary gland which can cause excessive growth in the lower jaw, cheekbones, hands and feet, growing at an accelerated rate.

MARFAN’S SYNDROME
Causes the sufferer to grow very tall and thin with elongated extremities, wide pelvis, abnormally elongated skull, a localized distribution of subcutaneous fat.

FROLICH’S SYNDROME or DYSTROPHIA ADIPOSOGENITALIS
A condition of the pituitary gland that can lead to obesity and is used to explain his large hips and pendulous breasts.

Fortunately, Akhenaten’s body was identified in 2010 as being the body found in the Valley of the Kings tomb known as KV55. DNA test shows that he was the son of Amenhotep III and the father of Tutankhamun. Studies show he had suffered no appearance-changing pathologies. This therefore indicates that the representations of Akhenaten (his wife, family and courtiers) was merely artistic convention and not a depiction of illness or his general appearance.
campaign against the cult of Amun. He began destroying temples and statues of Amun, including the name. Wherever the name of Amun appeared it was chiselled out, even from his own birth name Amenhotep and his father’s cartouches.

Tell el Amarna

The royal capital through Amenhotep III’s reign was at Memphis, in the north of Egypt, with the religious capital situated at Thebes. Memphis was associated with the creator god Ptah and Thebes was the seat of the king-of-the-gods Amun. Akhenaten would have been raised at one or both of these cities.

Akhenaten decided in the early years of his reign to build a new capital dedicated to his favoured deity on a site that was untouched by any previous religious practice. He chose the barren site of Tell el Amarna in middle Egypt due to a dip in the cliffs, between which the sun rose, which resembled the hieroglyphic sign for ‘Horizon’. He called the city, Akhetaten - the Horizon of the Aten. The modern name for the site is Tell el Amarna and gives its name to this whole period of history.

Work started in year four of his reign where the boundaries were marked out by a series of stelae carved from the cliff faces surrounding what was to be the outline of the city. By year six, there were 14 boundary stelae, all of which show Akhenaten, Nefertiti and two of their daughters (Meritaten, and Meketaten) worshipping the Aten. These inscriptions made it clear that Akhenaten did not intend for the city to expand and develop past these stelae.

In year nine the royal court moved to the new city. The whole city was designed as a cult centre devoted to serving the Aten, Akhenaten and his family. The only people who lived there served a function within Akhenaten’s wider plan.

Evidence shows that people were invited to live at Amarna, but only if they had a skill required for the administration of the cult of the Aten. There were numerous temple officials, artists, temple scribes and police officials, but only one vizier and no other civil administration.

Of the 50,000 to 100,000 people who lived at Tell el Amarna, ten per cent were the elite and the rest were middle classes. It seems unlikely there was a poor underclass. Officially the city was not fortified but it was well-protected by the cliffs and a strong military presence. The new city was planned around an official centre dominated by palaces, temples and military barracks. There is no archaeological evidence for shops, taverns or schools although they may have been temporary structures leaving little evidence. Tell el Amarna was a functional city, with no room for natural growth or expansion.

Changing religion is not an easy task

One of the prevailing theories about Akhenaten was that he was a pacifist who was more interested in his religion than in war. This is often assumed due to the changing artistic style because he depicts himself worshipping the Aten rather than charging into battle as was traditional before and after his reign.

However, we need to think carefully about what Akhenaten achieved. He single handedly, altered the religion of the entire country replacing hundreds of gods who had been worshipped in the homes and temples for thousands of years with the Aten and himself. For perspective, imagine if a modern prime minister announced as of next month we are all to worship them and not to hold any religious beliefs other than the ones they permitted. There would be riots. The Egyptians were no different in this respect.

The only problem is we don’t have any evidence of protests but there is enough evidence to suggest the religious upheaval was not a peaceful one. Excavations at Tell el Amarna have uncovered a large portion of the city was actually occupied by military barracks and police headquarters. There was clearly a large military presence here, and the royal family is often depicted with a guard. These were often of Asiatic or Nubian origin - as they would not have been affected by his religious changes.

This heavy military presence was clearly felt to be necessary. It has been suggested that the move from Thebes to Amarna was instigated by a rebellion against Akhenaten, and the guards were there to protect the heretic king from personal attack.

Surrounding the city there was also an intricate network of roads, which was probably a military patrol route in place of an enclosure wall. These patrols picked up anyone outside the city who should not be there, as well as monitoring those

“It seemed there was some backlash - the likes of which no king had seen”
WHO WAS SMENKARA?
Was the shadowy co-ruler of Akhenaten really Nefertiti taking on the role of king?

One of the most popular theories is that Smenkhare was in fact Nefertiti. This is based on nomenclature – essentially following Nefertiti’s name changes. In year 12 of Akhenaten’s reign Nefertiti disappears from the records as the Great Royal Wife, Nefernefruaten-Nefertiti. This led some scholars to believe she had fallen from grace and had been banished from Tell el Amarna. However in year 13, a co-ruler appears called Ankhkheperure-Nefertiti, with the title of Great Royal Wife being transferred to Akhenaten’s oldest daughter Meritaten. Further evidence that this co-ruling king was Nefertiti was found in the form of bezel-rings bearing the feminine form of the name, Ankhkheperure rather than the masculine Ankhkheperure.

Then another figure appears as co-ruler, known as Ankhkheperure-Smenkhare, who was co-ruler for two to three years before Akhenaten died, and then ruled alone, dying a few months later. He was also married to Meritaten as his Great Royal Wife, although it is thought she predeceased him. He then married the only surviving daughter of Akhenaten, Ankhesenpaaten, who had already been married to her father and bore him a child.

Upon the death of Smenkhare, the throne passed to Tutankhamun who married Smenkhare’s widow Ankhesenpaaten.

who were leaving. So was this apparent fear justified or was Akhenaten paranoid?
To answer this we have to turn to an extraordinary part of the inscription on one of the boundary stelae that marked the boundaries of Tell el Amarna. Amidst the hyperbole about why Amarna was chosen as the city to the Aten, it states,

“It was worse than those things I heard in regnal year 4
It was worse than those things I heard in regnal year 3.
It was worse than those things I heard in regnal year 2
It was worse than those things I heard in regnal year 1”

It was worse than those things Nebmaatra Amenhotep III heard
... It was worse than those things Menkheperure Thutmosis III heard
And it was worse than those things heard by any kings who had ever assumed the white Crown (i.e. ruled the south of Egypt).”

It is clear the motivation to move the capital city from Thebes to Tell el Amarna was more than religious inspiration. It seemed there was some backlash – the likes of which no king had seen. What this backlash was, however, will remain a mystery. It is possible it was a potential challenge to wrest the throne from him, or there had been audible criticism to his religious changes. Whatever it was, it was disturbing enough for
Akhenaten to record this on the stelae for eternity, and surround himself with the military in his new city with the carefully chosen inhabitants.

Rebellion
So did the Egyptian population change its religious fidelities on the behest of the king? The short answer is ‘no’.

People, certainly paid lip service to the new religion, probably out of self-preservation but in their own homes they maintained their traditional religious practices.

Evidence from all over Egypt, and even at Tell el Amarna, shows that the general population were still worshipping household gods such as Bes, the dwarf god, Taweret, the pregnant hippo, and state goddess Hathor. These deities were worshipped quite openly, and in some of the houses at Tell el Amarna, images of the god Bes were painted onto the walls.

Further signs that Akhenaten’s religion was losing traction, even at his religious city can be seen in the naming of his two youngest daughters. Despite these girls being born when the Aten was the primary deity, and their father was equal status to the god they had names dedicated to Ra/Re and not the Aten.

Such public lip service to the religion of Akhenaten, made it all the easier for Tutankhamun to revert back to the traditional pantheon once he became king following the death of Akhenaten and Smenkhare.

Tutankhamun was born as Tutankhaten, so the first thing he did when he came to throne at aged eight or nine was to change his name to honour Amun. He then moved the capital city back to Thebes, and re-established the cult of Amun.

As one would expect, once the king, royal court and power moved away from Tell el Amarna, everyone else also drifted away and moved back to their home villages and towns. Life then pretty much carried on as normal for the people of Egypt.

Akhenaten died in 1334 BCE and evidence suggests he was buried in the royal tomb in Tell el Amarna. However it seems unlikely that this was his final resting place, and Petrie discovered broken fragments of his sarcophagus, canopic jars and shabti figures around the city. He was clearly considered a public enemy after death and his burial was in danger of reprisal.

It is thought that Tutankhamun may have brought his father’s body to the Valley of the Kings in Thebes in order to prevent the body being defiled by his enemies. For many years the body in KV55 was thought to be the body of the re-interred Akhenaten, and this was proven to be the case through DNA testing. Tutankhamun appears to have placed his father into the unfinished tomb of KV55. Since this reburial, KV55 had been attacked numerous times over the years, and the poor condition of the tomb had damaged the burial even further.

Many of the funerary goods in KV55 originally had belonged to a woman but had altered by the addition of a uraeus to the canopics and coffins, making them suitable for a king. These were later removed when the tomb was ransacked and the names on the equipment were also hacked out and the gold removed from the coffin.

Akhenaten, the peaceful, monotheist had clearly made enemies throughout his short reign who believed his crimes were enough to justify the destruction of his funerary assemblage that would eliminate any chance of him having an afterlife.

“Such public lip service to the religion of Akhenaten, made it all the easier for Tutankhamun to revert back to the traditional pantheon”
WOMEN OF APOLLO

We speak to Poppy Northcutt and JoAnn Morgan about their time working on the NASA Moon missions

Written by Jessica Leggett
How did you get involved with the Apollo program and what was your role?
I majored in mathematics at college and after I graduated, I got a job with a space contractor called TRW. I was hired as a computress and after a few months, I was assigned to a project that involved developing a family of computer programmes that calculated the trajectories that would be used in the Apollo program. I started working on the return to Earth programme, developing the manoeuvres to come back from the Moon, in 1966 and when the schedule for the Apollo 8 mission was accelerated I was asked, along with some of my team members, to go over to the control centre and work during the mission.

What was it like to be the only woman working in a male-dominated environment like that?
I pretty much experienced the same as what every woman who worked in an isolated environment did. You always felt like you stood out because you were different and that you would be noticed more if you didn’t perform well, so you always felt pressure to perform better than average. I was fortunate the company that I worked for was very progressive for the time and I didn’t experience overt discrimination.

Was it frustrating to receive attention from the press because of your appearance and the fact that you were a young woman?
I increasingly found that frustrating because it had a cumulative effect. At the same time, I knew it was really important to continue to speak to the press, even if they were going to be dismissive and talk about how I was wearing my hair or whatever, because I thought it was very important that some women were doing these jobs.

The calculations made by you and your team were put to the test with Apollo 8, the first crewed mission to reach the Moon’s orbit. How did it feel waiting for Apollo 8 to regain communication after it passed behind the Moon?
Well, that was very nerve-wracking because when you lose communication with them, you don’t know whether the engine had fired or not, whether the burn that they did was too long or too short. Apollo 8 was the first time that we had ever lost communication with a spacecraft in flight for long.

Did it hit you in that moment that you were making history?
It didn’t hit me at that moment because you’re so involved in what you’re doing and making sure that everything is working, you can’t be thinking about those extraneous things. Fortunately, the reason they were late was not because there was a problem with the manoeuvre, but because there are mass concentrations on the Moon that had not been previously mapped. So, every orbit they went around the Moon and collected data to build the profile of the mass concentrations, so in future missions they would come out pretty much dead on time.

Where were you when Apollo 11 successfully landed on the Moon?
I was at home resting! I was a return to Earth specialist and you're not going to bring them back from the Moon to the Earth whenever you got two astronauts on the surface of the Moon. In the end, I probably did worse than everybody else because at the time, I had like an 11 inch little portable black and white TV!

What can you remember from the moment of the landing?
Well, the images at the time were pretty terrible, I don't really remember very much about what I saw. I was mainly listening to the audio. It was sitting there holding your breath, wondering if they were going to land or not because they were having a little bit of fuel problems going down. President Kennedy said we were to land on the Moon and return back to Earth - I never disconnected those. I only considered it a success if we did both of those things, it wouldn't be a success if they landed and they didn't get home.

You also helped to bring the astronauts of Apollo 13 safely home after one of their oxygen tanks exploded. What was the atmosphere like during that time?
It was a very tense time at the control centre for everyone because we had a mission that was definitely endangered. I think the biggest concern was that no one knew how serious the damage to the spacecraft was. When you've had a major loss like that, you don't know what else might have been affected and that suspense was certainly a concern to everybody. But again, when you work on a mission, part of what you learn to do is you learn to focus and compartmentalise, you've got to do your job and do your job correctly. In terms of the return to Earth, our program worked great, it did everything it was supposed to do.

It must have been a great feeling to know your program worked successfully?
It was a great feeling to know that we knew how to deal with that problem. I think Apollo 13 was the most successful lunar mission because it showed even though we didn't accomplish all of the mission goals, we accomplished the main goal, which was to get them home safely.

Do you have any advice for young girls and women thinking of going into the STEM fields today?
I still talk to girls that tell me a lot, 'I'm not good at math.' I hope they take part of what President Kennedy said to heart, because I think it's truly the overriding lesson from Apollo, which is to do it because it's hard, not because it's easy.
What was your role during the Apollo 11 mission and what did it entail?

My job as instrumentation controller in the Launch Control Center firing room was associated with the ground systems that supported the launch phase of Apollo 11, understanding and following the health and welfare of all the instrumentation systems.

Did you know beforehand you would be the only woman in the firing room?

In later years I learnt that my director, Karl Sendler, had decided that he wanted me there and he said to me, "You're my best communicator and I want you on the console." I listened to 21 channels and I had to discern who was working what, if the systems were going well, if there were problems and when they were going to be resolved. It meant a lot to me because moving into the senior engineering ranks was an acceptance thing, I felt accepted as part of a really large team that was doing a very important and historic job.

It must have been extremely validating for you to get that recognition?

It truly made my career. The fact that I was there and seen by all of the managers, the contractors, the other NASA centres and Washington, that picture of me was in Life magazine and the New York Times, although it never said my name. The public affairs officer said, "Oh, can you do an interview," but I didn't do any interviews throughout the whole Apollo programme because they didn't ask the man next to me or the man four seats down. If they didn't ask them, then they were only asking me because I was a woman and I just wanted to be part of the team. I didn't want to be singled out.

Poppy Northcutt expressed her frustrations being singled out by the press. How was your experience of that?

So - unlike Poppy, I remember when she did those interviews - I turned them down. The only ones that I ever did all throughout the 1960s and '70s was when they were going to talk about all the women in NASA. There was one or two of those magazine articles from France and Russia that showcased women and it was kind of strange to me how the foreign print media were more interested in giving a holistic story about women scattered throughout NASA, whereas I didn't experience that with any of the US magazines.

Is it surprising that it was not of more interest on home soil?

I think it was just the times that we were in. When they selected a class of women astronauts, the attention turned towards them and they became the centrepiece of women's achievements in space exploration, that was such a big thing and so important that they be given the opportunity to be astronauts. It was okay for me because by that time, I was moving into being a division chief and into management, going to graduate school and getting my master's degree and I really didn't want the attention on me, I just wanted to work and do what I was interested in.

What was it like to be the only woman working in a male-dominated space?

The men in the room were very respectful and easy to work with because we were on television.
and so people could watch me. In earlier missions, I received obscene phone calls and I never knew where they came from. After the third time, I did report it to a man who saw the look on my face and saw me slam the phone down, and I concluded that he must have taken action because those calls stopped. I just tried to stay focused on getting my job done and that was what really buoyed me.

**What was the atmosphere like in the firing room during the launch?**

Things are fairly quiet in the firing room, the noise dampens down and you're listening. There is nobody pushing a button to go, it was an automatic, final countdown. In Florida, we did not have that same 'go' system as mission control, so our whole strategy was that you only said something if you needed to cut off the launch. There were a thousand people listening who could make that request, but we all wanted to go and if there's no reason, you're not going to call for a cut off.

**Where were you when Apollo 11 successfully landed on the Moon?**

The firing room in Florida is not needed at landing and so most of the launch team were getting a little bit of a break and I was actually on vacation. Like everybody else on planet Earth I watched the landing on TV. My husband said, "Jo, you're going to be in the history books someday," and that's the first time I really thought about it from the perspective of history. I knew from a scientific standpoint, because my personal hook in desiring to work in the space program was the new knowledge, and so the idea that it was going to be so historic really hadn't struck me until the landing and then boy, it just walloped me!

**Did you see yourself as a trailblazer at that time?**

In the 1960s, I did not see myself as a trailblazer. I was so intensely passionate and focused on my desire to be part of that space exploration and the fact that I was a young woman doing it really was not relevant in my mind, not until the 1970s. When I got my master's degree at Stanford University, it was really my professors there who opened my eyes to the trailblazer aspect.

**Do you have any advice for young girls and women in STEM?**

Well, I certainly want to encourage all girls and women to learn to be fearless about math and science. I'm lucky I was fearless because I had a father who gave me a chemistry set and encouraged me, even though I cracked the concrete on our patio with it he never fusses, he just wanted to know how I did it! In some of the sciences, we're doing better but worldwide, we need women to care about science and engineering because the future of people on this planet is important. We're over half the population and if we don't care, we're not going to get it right.
In the first hours of the morning on 26 April 1986, a safety test at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station went array and triggered a massive explosion. The blast lifted the cover off of one of the power station’s nuclear reactors, Reactor 4, followed by another huge explosion that left the reactor’s core exposed and spewing radioactive material. Debris from the successive blasts rained down on the plant, as a fire spread from Reactor 4 to nearby buildings. The fire raged for days, as firefighters tried to contain the blaze. Pilots ran thousands of flights overhead, dropping sandbags onto the burning reactor in the hopes of putting out the fire.

Two days later, on the morning of 28 April, scientists at a Swedish nuclear power plant hundreds of miles away from Chernobyl and the plant town of Pripyat, in the Ukrainian SSR, picked up unusual high readings of radioactivity. Swedish officials, after some investigating, concluded that the radioactive materials had originated in the Soviet Union. In subsequent days, similar reports of unusually high levels of radioactivity came from across the globe.

But Soviet officials acknowledged nothing in the first hours and days, at one point going so far as to deny outright that an accident had occurred. In part, the minimal information coming from Soviet sources reflected the fact that they, too, were trying to figure out what exactly had taken place at Chernobyl. Finally, on 28 April, the Soviet government issued a brief statement acknowledging that an accident had occurred at the Chernobyl power plant. It took until 14 May, over two weeks after the disaster, for the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, to make a public statement about Chernobyl.

By that point, those living around the nuclear power plant had already been evacuated. Within 24 hours of the explosion, local officials in Pripyat had received notice to prepare residents to evacuate the town. Some of the town’s residents had fled already on that first day.

Exploring the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster and how the cleanup ultimately opened up the Soviet Union to the rest of the world

Written by Susan Colbourn
Chernobyl's impacts were vast and wide-ranging, though the sheer degree of devastation continues to be hotly contested decades later.

The catastrophe did immediate damage as it contaminated portions of the western Soviet Union, concentrated in what became Russia, Ukraine and Belarus after the Soviet Union's collapse in December of 1991. Estimates from the United Nations put the number of individuals affected by the nuclear accident at the Chernobyl power station at some 8.4 million across Russia, Ukraine and Belarus alone. Some 600,000 people were involved in - and impacted - by efforts to clean up the nuclear power plant.

Around Chernobyl, trees in the nearby forest turned a sickly reddish-brown as a result of high radiation, in what became known as the 'Red Forest'. The crew that cleaned up the accident ended up exposed to high degrees of radiation; 28 of the plant's workers died within months of the explosion, while another 106 suffered from acute radiation sickness thanks to high radiation exposure during the clean-up process.

Food supplies, too, were contaminated as radioactive isotopes fell on crops, farms and grazing areas for livestock. A slew of new regulations and orders tried to grapple with the enormity of the problem. Soviet officials introduced new mechanisms to monitor contamination, distributing new advice to farmers across the contaminated areas. Often, these attempted solutions merely hid the problem. One group of KGB officers, for instance, found four train cars of radioactive meat in 1990. For the past four years, the contaminated meat had criss-crossed railroads, trying in vain to find any takers willing to accept it.

The devastating effects of the accident were hardly contained in and around Chernobyl or kept within the confines of the exclusion zone set up by Soviet authorities. Radioactive particles travelled far and wide, carried by weather systems and wind patterns. After all, it was precisely these weather patterns that made it possible for Swedish scientists to figure out – and inform those around the globe – that a nuclear accident had taken place in the Soviet Union.

In the days after the explosion, Soviet officials tracked the radioactive clouds emanating out of the explosion. A large accumulation, over Belarus, was headed toward Moscow where meteorologists anticipated a sizeable spring storm in the days to come. Rather than see it rain radioactive droplets over Moscow, Soviet pilots chased the clouds and peppered them with silver iodide to make it rain. Seeding the clouds brought down a heavy, radioactive rain across swaths of Belarus in order to spare the Soviet capital from those same rains.

Spikes in radioactivity could be found, too, in the United Kingdom. Scientists tested sheep, only to discover that the animals possessed radioactive isotope levels far too high for human consumption. Again, it was the rain as storms in early May of 1986 contaminated farmland, as pools seeped into the water table. Farmers in Wales faced restrictions on their livestock; their sheep were classed as radioactive, monitored and restricted for years after the 1986 disaster.

Across the globe, the catastrophic accident at Chernobyl inflamed anti-nuclear sentiments. Individual citizens and national governments demanded that Moscow take steps to prevent another such accident. Some 40,000 demonstrators showed up to protest a nuclear power plant in Brokdorf, a small town in the northern parts of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The West German foreign minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, demanded nothing short of the closure of all Soviet nuclear reactors. The disaster at Chernobyl horrified Mikhail Gorbachev, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. For Gorbachev, the damage done by Chernobyl drove home the dangers of the atomic age and of nuclear annihilation. Countless of Gorbachev's advisers later recalled that the horrific accident encouraged the General Secretary to seek dramatic nuclear reductions in negotiations with his American counterpart, Ronald Reagan.

Chernobyl also spurred on Gorbachev in pursuing a policy of glasnost - or openness - in Soviet society. In the years that followed, that same policy of openness made it possible for citizens in the affected areas of the Soviet Union to express their frustration with how the government had handled (or mishandled) Chernobyl.

By 1989, there were mass demonstrations taking place in Ukraine and Belarus, as residents of the two republics tried to lift the veil of secrecy about the degree of damage caused by the accident. Demonstrators decried a Soviet cover-up of the dangers, as concerned citizens produced documents that showed that Soviet officials had pushed on with a May Day parade in Kyiv, just days after the accident, despite knowing that radiation levels were extremely high. Chernobyl became a rallying cry in the Ukrainian push for independence.

**TIMELINE OF DISASTER**

The lead-up and aftermath of the terrible Chernobyl reactor accident

- **01:00** Preparations for a safety check on reactor no. 4 begin with power being reduced
- **14:00** Emergency core cooling on reactor no. 4 is also disabled so it won’t interfere with the test
- **23:10** Permission for the test to continue is given even though the less experienced nightshift takes over
- **00:28** Power drops below stable limits. Operators break safety guidelines by removing the control rods in hopes of raising the power output
- **01:00** Test is given permission to proceed once power stabilizes. Emergency shutdown and safety features are deactivated
- **01:23:04** A power surge occurs as the test begins on reactor no. 4

Contemporary pictures show the damage to the plant.
Ghosts Of Chernobyl

HOW THE RADIATION SPREAD

Nuclear fallout moved through the environment in the days, weeks and months after the disaster.

Surface dust
Radioactive particles coated buildings, roads, rivers, lakes, parks and gardens.

Surface deposits
Deposition of radioactive dust.

Runoff water
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Sand and sediment
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Water bodies
External irradiation.

Aquatic plants
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Aquatic animals
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Drinking water
Drinking water.

Food and drink

Particles on plants
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Plants and crops
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Animals
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Topsoil/subsoil
Deposition onto skin or clothing.

Root uptake
Plants took up radioactive caesium-137, strontium-90, iodine-131 from the soil.

In the water
Radioactive particles dropped to the bottom of lakes and ponds, building up in the sediment.

Particles on plants
Rain washed radioactive particles onto leaves, stems and leaves.

In the water
Radionuclides were washed into the water.

Density
The fallout started as particles thrown up into the air.

Contaminated air
For ten days after the disaster, clouds of radioactive particles billowed into the air.

Root uptake
Plants took up radioactive caesium-137 and strontium-90 from their roots.

Deposition
Deposition onto skin or clothing.

Inhalation
Inhalation of radioactive dust.

Irradiation
Radiation from radioactive particles.

Situation

01:23:40
The emergency shutdown button is pressed, but the control rods jam as they enter the core.

01:23:58
A steam explosion occurs as the coolant water is vaporised in the pipes, blowing the roof off the reactor.

01:28
With the reactor’s exposure to air starting fires, firefighters arrive, but wear no protective clothing for radiation.

02:15
An emergency meeting of Soviet officials gathers, closing roads in and out of the nearby town of Pripyat.

06:35
The firefighters have successfully put out the fires except for the one in the reactor core, which burns for several days.

10:00
Sand, clay, boron, lead and dolomite is dropped onto the burning core in attempts to extinguish the fire.

36 hours after the disaster, officials begin an evacuation of 115,000 people from Pripyat and nearby towns and villages. They’re told it’s temporary.

19 APRIL 1986

The US gets its first look at the disaster from satellite photos and sees the full devastation of the incident.
Numerous international organisations have been involved in addressing the ongoing effects of the Chernobyl disaster, much of it focused on the safety of the site itself.

Despite the devastating accident in April of 1986, the other three reactors at the Chernobyl plant remained in operation. At the beginning of 1990, the Ukrainian parliament voted in favour of closing the plant by 1995. These timetables were sped up in the fall of 1991, after a fire broke out at unit 2 and destroyed part of the roof of the turbine hall. Unit 2 would be closed effective immediately, with the remaining two slated to be closed in 1993. But, before that could be done, parliament reversed its 1990 decision in the autumn of 1993. The reactors would remain in use.

European governments tried to make the closure of the plant a crucial issue in the early 1990s, linked to broader development assistance for Ukraine. These attempts failed: the plant remained in operation until December of 2000.

Starting in 1990, the United Nations took on a more active role in addressing the consequences of the disaster, a role made possible by the Soviet government’s growing acceptance that international assistance was needed. The General Assembly called for international cooperation to deal with the ramifications of Chernobyl.

A vast array of initiatives received support from the United Nations, dealing with all aspects of the issue. Since 1986, according to the UN’s estimates, various UN bodies and major non-governmental organisations have started some 230 research and assistance programs to address issues arising out of the Chernobyl accident.

The most visible sign of international cooperation to deal with the aftermath of Chernobyl, however, is the vast engineering project to contain the radioactive remains of the nuclear reactor. In 1986, in the months following the accident, the Soviet Union constructed a shelter to seal off Reactor 4. But this initial structure, known as the sarcophagus, began to crumble, threatening the release of new radioactive contaminants.

An international effort supported the construction of a new structure to surround Reactor 4, a project known as the New Safe Confinement. A massive metal half-cylinder, measuring 109 metres high and 257 metres in length, the New Safe Confinement covers both the old, crumbling sarcophagus and the damaged reactor. It was installed in late 2016, some 30 years after the initial accident. And the project’s cost is immense: the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, responsible for coordinating the funds, estimates the total cost at some €1.5 billion.

When one thinks of the so-called ‘ghosts’ of Chernobyl, the most immediate connection is to the exclusion zone ringing the nuclear power plant. Chernobyl, as the site is often summed up, is a ghost town. Tourists and journalists flock there to see an abandoned site, the latest batch inspired by HBO’s hit television series, Chernobyl.

Seemingly frozen in time, the buildings of Pripyat show signs of life from a state that no longer exists, that of the Soviet Union. It is hardly surprising, then, that it is tempting to see Chernobyl as something of the past, maybe even as a relic unique to the Soviet era.

Historians, scientists and activists, however, all remind us that the high-profile accident continues to be a pressing issue, decades after the initial accident. News reports detail the ongoing impact of high radioactivity levels on agriculture across Europe, not just in the three countries most affected by the disaster. Others continue to debate how disease rates are linked to Chernobyl. Ongoing international cooperation, like the immense project to build and install a new structure to confine the radioactive rubble remaining, is a stark reminder that the ghosts of Chernobyl remain. We’re still living with the fallout.
Launched on July 16, 1969, the spacecraft carried Commander Neil A. Armstrong, Command Pilot Michael Collins and Lunar Module Pilot Edwin “Buzz” Aldrin. On July 20, at 4:18 pm EDT, while the entire world held its breath, the lunar landing craft named Eagle 1 safely touched down. Several hours later, Armstrong and Aldrin became the first humans to stand on the moon while Collins orbited above.

To commemorate this great event, Fisher Space Pen Co. has issued **500** Limited Edition AG-7 Space Pens, each one featuring actual, authenticated material from the Apollo 11 Spacecraft. The space flown material is “Kapton” foil, and it served as a protective thermal insulation for the Command module Columbia. This rare artifact floats in a water-clear acrylic dome sealed into the pen’s cap. This exquisite collectible is further distinguished with a black titanium nitride finish complemented with fine engravings plated with 24 karat gold. The diamond cut engraving includes an American Eagle landing on the moon, historic dates, Apollo 11 50th Anniversary text, and the serial number for each of the **500** issues.

Since 1968, the Fisher Space Pen has been issued to astronauts for NASA manned space flights and is still used today. Now, 500 people have the rare opportunity to own both the pen that went to the moon and a genuine artifact from the most historic of all space events.
The blue-coated Prussian soldiers marched south over hard frozen ground blanketed with a light dusting of snow towards the nondescript village of Sagschutz at midday on 5 September 1757. A string of low hills masked their march from the watchful eyes of their Austrian foe arrayed for battle less than two miles to the west.

Prussian King Frederick II 'The Great' believed his army had a strong chance for success in the coming battle that would decide whether Prussia retained Silesia or lost it to the Austrians. He intended to send his well-trained infantry against the Austrian flank in what was known in military lexicon as an 'oblique order of attack.' Simply put, the Prussians would advance diagonally against the southern end of the Austrian line.

When Frederick had completed making his final adjustments for attack at 1.15pm, he rode over to two corporals who would carry the colours into battle for the first battalion of the 26th Infantry Regiment. Frederick wanted to make sure they knew exactly where to lead their battalion. The 45-year-old Prussian king told them to march straight towards...
the enemy whose troops were on a low rise a short
distance to the northeast. It was imperative that the
three battalions spearheading the attack drive the
enemy from its position at all costs, he told them.

"It's a case of do or die!" he said. "You've got the
enemy in front, and all our army behind. There is no
space to retreat, and the only way to go forward is to
beat the enemy!"

When Great Britain and France went to war
again in May 1756, the major powers in Europe
quickly took sides. Austria, Russia, Sweden and
Saxony sided with France, while Prussia and
Hanover sided with Great Britain. Austrian Empress
Maria Theresa had a score to settle with Prussia.
Frederick had taken the wealthy province of Silesia
from Austria during the so-called Silesian Wars
of the 1740s. He did so in order to improve the
economy of his largely agrarian realm, which lacked
minerals and industry. The empress desperately
wanted Silesia back.

Frederick invaded Saxony on 29 August 1756 to
secure the region for his forces and deny it to the
Austrians. After a six-week campaign, the Saxons
surrendered. The Austrian-led Holy Roman Empire
declared war on Prussia on 17 January 1757.

Frederick followed up his Saxon campaign by
invading the Austrian province of Bohemia adjacent
to Saxony on the south. Although he defeated an
Austrian army led by Prince Charles of Lorraine, the
empress' brother-in-law, at Prague on 6 May, Austrian
Marshal Leopold von Daun handed Frederick his
first defeat at Kolin on 18 June.

Frederick then turned his attention to a Franco-
Imperial army approaching from the west. Leaving
Prussian Lt Gen Augustus William, Duke of
Brunswick-Bevern, in Silesia with 41,000 troops to
defend the province against the Austrians, Frederick
marched east to engage the Franco-Imperial army.
He soundly defeated French and Imperial forces on
5 November at Rossbach in Saxony.

The Austrians moved quickly against Bevern
while Frederick was addressing the threat posed
by the Franco-Imperial army. Lorraine and Daun
defeated and captured Bevern on 22 November
on the outskirts of Breslau. Frederick knew that
the Austrians were rampaging through central
Silesia, but he was unable to reach Breslau in time
to stave off disaster. Three days later the Breslau fell
to the Austrians.

The Prussian king wanted revenge for the
defeat of his troops at Breslau. After assimilating
the remnants of Bevern's army with his own at
the Silesian town of Parchwitz 30 miles north of
Breslau, Frederick marched against the Austrians
on 4 December. The Austrians deployed for battle
the following day in a five-mile line just west of
Breslau. The Austrian line stretched from Nippern in
the north to Sagschutz in the south. The villages of
Frobelwitz and Leuthen fell within the Austrian line.

Frederick was with the Prussian advance guard
when it collided with an Austrian cavalry screen
outside Borne early on 5 December. The Prussians
won the clash, and they captured 600 Saxon
Chevaulegers fighting with the Austrians. The
Prussians had so intimidated the Austrian light
horses that it would not interfere with the Prussian
deployment at midday. In this way, Frederick
deprived Lorraine and Daun of their reconnaissance
arm when they most needed it. As the morning
Austria badly wanted Silesia back, not least because it was abundant with minerals and industry.

Captain Wichard Mollendorf leads the Prussian Guard in a spirited charge against the well-defended courtyard of the Catholic Church in Leuthen.

“Shells ripped gaping holes in the Prussian lines, but the Prussian troops did not waver.”

dragged on, Lorraine and Daun, who had their command post at a cluster of hilltop windmills just north of Leuthen, had no idea where Frederick was or even if he was going to attack them that day.

Frederick surveyed the Austrian battle lines at mid-morning from the Schonberg a mile and a half from the Austrian position. He quickly determined that his best opportunity for success lay in attacking the Austrian left flank. Frederick set off at 11.00am at the head of his army on a three-mile flank march to Sagschutz.

While Frederick was leading the bulk of his army south to assail the Austrian flank near Sagschutz, Austrian right wing commander Lt Gen Giuseppe Lucchese sent urgent requests to Lorraine at noon demanding reinforcements against an imminent Prussian attack. Without making a personal assessment of the situation, Lorraine ordered Lt Gen Karl Leopold von Arenberg to reinforce the right wing with his reserve infantry corps. Committing his reserve in such a manner defied military norm.

Shortly afterwards Lorraine received another urgent request for reinforcements. This one came from Lt Gen Franz Leopold von Nadasdy, the Hungarian commander of the Austrian left wing. He insisted that the Prussians were about to attack his troops. For reasons unknown, Lorraine did not even reply to Nadasdy’s request.

Nadasdy’s flank rested on the low rise known as the Kiefenberg just south of Sagschutz. Facing south on the Kiefenberg were 13 inexperienced battalions of Wurttembergers, who were posted behind abatis. At a right angle to the Wurttembergers facing west were a total of 20 battalions of Bavarians and Austrians.

To carry out his oblique order of attack, Frederick put three infantry battalions in the front as an advance guard. The first line behind them consisted of 20 infantry battalions, and the second line was composed of 11 more infantry battalions. Frederick directed his subordinates that each battalion was to follow at 50 paces behind the battalion to its right. The echeloned formation meant that the units would strike the enemy line a series of successive blows over a 15-minute period. Maj Gen Karl von Wedel’s three veteran battalions, one from the 13th regiment and two from the 26th regiment, constituted the advance guard.

Stationed to the right of the main battle line were six battalions whose sole purpose was to protect the Prussian right flank. The flank was further protected by Lt Gen Hans Joachim von Zieten’s 53 squadrons.
of cavalry. On the opposite end of the line, Lt Gen Georg Wilhelm von Driesen had 55 squadrons. His troops were hidden behind the Sophienberg.

The three veteran regiments that led the Prussian main attack began their advance at 1.00pm. The Prussian infantrymen swept forward, the Austrian gunners went into action. Shells ripped gaping holes in the Prussian lines, but the Prussian troops did not waver.

Frederick had ordered his artillery corps to bring along ten 12-pounder siege guns from the fortress of Glogau. These thick-barrelled fortress guns, known as ‘brummers,’ were brought along to make up a deficiency that Frederick’s army had in long-range artillery. He ordered the crews manning the brummers to go into action on the Glanzberg to support the attack. Prussian shells slammed into the German musketeers on the Kirchberg, shattering torsos and severing limbs.

Unable to withstand the storm of iron, the German and Austrian infantry fled towards Leuthen with the Prussian infantry in pursuit. After just 20 minutes of fighting, the Prussians had overrun the Kiefenberg and driven all of Nadassy’s infantry north towards Leuthen. In an attempt to stave off disaster, Nadassy ordered his cavalry to charge the right flank of the Prussian line; however, Zieten’s troops disrupted and defeated the charge.

A lull occurred at mid-afternoon as Lorraine and Daun scrambled to form a new battle line facing south behind Leuthen. Some of the first reinforcements to arrive took up positions in the buildings of Leuthen in an effort to buy time for the rest of the army to redeploy into a new battle line. The struggle for control of the fortress-like churchyard of the Catholic Church became a focal point of the battle for both sides from 3.30 to 4.30pm. Despite a valiant resistance by the Roth-Wurzburg Battalion, the Prussians ultimately carried the position.

General Lucchesi, who was responsible for the right flank of the new line, hustled his 65 fresh cavalry squadrons against the Prussian left flank at 4.30pm in an attempt to drive the Prussians back. As the Austrian white-jacketed cuirassiers with their black metal breastplates and Austrian dragons in their red and green coats thundered towards the vulnerable left flank of the Prussian infantry,
Prussian left wing cavalry commander Driesen waved his first line into action. Driesen's first line consisted of 10 squadrons of the vaunted Bayreuth Dragoons. Although they intercepted the Austrians, they soon became hard-pressed. Driesen's second line, consisting of cuirassier squadrons, rode to the dragoons' assistance. The cavalry melee tipped in favour of the Prussians when Prince von Wurttemberg added his 30 Prussian hussar squadrons to the fight.

At that point, the Austrian horsemen fled the field, but not before some of them collided with the Austrian infantry, disrupting their formations. In the meantime, Frederick had massed his guns on the Butterberg. The massed artillery shelled the Austrian infantry on the plain north of Leuthen. When the Austrian foot began fleeing the field, Prussian cuirassiers and hussars rode them down.

The Prussians lost 20 per cent of their army at Leuthen, but the Austrians lost 33 per cent of their army. The Prussians suffered 6,300 casualties. The costs for the Austrians was significantly higher. They lost 10,000 men on the battlefield, and 12,000 more were captured. By the end of December, Lorraine had withdrawn his army to Bohemia.

Frederick's twin victories at Rossbach and Leuthen prevented Prussia from being defeated early in the war and also compelled the British to sign a formal alliance with Prussia in January 1758. The hard campaigning had taken its toll on the Prussian war effort, though. Frederick's war chest was depleted and his regiments were severely under strength.

British Prime Minister William Pitt assured Frederick that he could expect generous financial aid from the British to purchase equipment and provisions. Many of Frederick's best soldiers had died on the battlefields of Saxony and Austria. The new recruits would require extensive training if they were to be counted on to carry out Frederick's complex tactics.

Frederick had the audacity to approach Austrian Empress Maria Theresa after his victory at Leuthen with a proposal that they discuss peace terms. But the empress had assurances from the French and Russians that they remained committed to the war against Prussia. Her advisors assured her that as long as the coalition against Prussia remained intact it would ultimately defeat the enemy.

The empress believed that under the proper circumstances Austrian arms could once again vanquish the Prussians on the battlefield. To increase the likelihood of this happening, she made Daun the new Austrian supreme commander.

Frederick contemplated an invasion of Moravia in 1758. Yet before Frederick could pursue operations against the Austrians, he had to confront the Russians who were advancing against him.

In January 1758 the Russian Imperial Army captured Königsberg in East Prussia. The Prussians and Russians subsequently collided at Zorndorf in Brandenburg in August 1758. The outcome of the battle was inconclusive. But a pattern had emerged. Frederick would have to put out one fire after another as long as the war lasted.
Battle Of Leuthen

**Heroic rearguard action**
Several squadrons of Austrian cavalry and a handful of infantry regiments conduct a fighting retreat that keeps the Prussian cavalry from cutting off the Austrian army's escape.

**Austrian line dissolves**
The swirling cavalry melee in the late afternoon disrupts the right flank of the Austrian infantry line. Many of the Austrian musketeers cast aside their weapons and flee for their lives. Prussian cuirassiers run down many of them.

**Mounted melee**
Sixty-five squadrons of cavalry posted on the Austrian right wing charge the Prussian left flank at 4.30pm, but their advance is disrupted by 55 squadrons of cavalry from the Prussian left wing cavalry. Some of the Austrian horsemen fight with great determination, but others ride away believing the day is lost.

**Defence of the Sunken Road**
The Austrian infantry that survive the street fighting in Leuthen withdraw after an hour-long battle to a sunken road on the north side of Leuthen. When Prussian musketeers attempt to push north from the town, they are greeted by heavy volleys of musketry. In addition, Austrian guns on the high ground near the windmills north of Leuthen shell the Prussians, producing heavy casualties. The pinned-down Prussians await artillery support and reinforcements before they can resume their advance.

**Sabre fight**
The cavalry posted on the Austrian left wing counterattacks the Prussian infantry. Before they can inflict casualties on the Prussian foot soldiers, Prussian cuirassiers and dragoons posted on the far right intercept them. A series of mounted melees unfolds over the next hour on the low-lying ground south of Leuthen.

**Austrians reform at Leuthen**
Austrian senior commanders realise that the Prussian main attack is coming from the south. They issue orders for the infantry and cavalry posted to the north to march immediately to Leuthen to establish a new defensive line facing south. Some Austrian infantrymen have to march three miles to reach Leuthen. Because the new line is only two miles long, the Austrians are crowded together.

**Spirited defence of the Churchyard**
The musketeers of the Rot-Wurzburg battalion man the walls and turrets of the Catholic Church in Leuthen. Six Prussian battalions are committed to the assault on the fortified church. The Austrians repeatedly hurl back the attackers, but the elite Prussian guards eventually fight their way into the churchyard. Some of the Prussian guards fight their way through a breach in the walls made by the Prussian artillery.
Local leaders look to make peace with new power in the region, but Charles V vows to reconquer the Austrian capital for Christendom.

What was the situation leading up to the Siege of Vienna in 1529?
You have this period of enormous build-up. [There was] a significant period of build-up under Mehmed II, who reigned from 1451 to 1481, and then after him his son Bayezid II, and then you have following him this important period of development with Selim I and his main area of interest [being] Egypt and the Holy Land, the Levant, Syria, that region. And that provided an enormous amount of new territory for the Ottomans and a new source of income and taxes and such. And then when you get to Suleiman, he inherits all of that and starts his reign in the 1520s. And he's looking again with greater interest at Eastern Europe. And one of the things that he does that is seen as important to the lead up is his attempt to conquer Hungary. So the Battle of Mohács takes place in 1526 and he's able to conquer roughly half of Hungary. But of course the other half...

Many Christian citizens of Vienna may have panicked at the arrival of so-called 'infidel' Muslims of The Exalted Ottoman State, but its leaders are working hard to dispel such misinformation now they control the city. A festival of cultural exchange has been announced where food vendors, entertainers and small business owners can share the goods of both Europe and the Middle East.
Suleiman I was Sultan of the Ottoman Empire from 1520 to 1566.
of the country continues to resist and they're working with the Habsburgs and others to try to throw them out, trying to push them out. So that's seen as one of the reason why Suleiman decides to attack Vienna.

**Why was the Siege of Vienna ultimately unsuccessful?**

There are a few factors that played into it. One is that they were very far from their centre of supply. They had marched out much farther west than they had before. They were in constant threat of being cut off from their supply lines. It was also an incredibly rainy period, so moving the troops under these conditions was very difficult. Keeping them together and keeping up morale was very hard. They faced issues like the gunpowder getting wet. It didn't have as many factors in its favour as some of the other sieges that ultimately were more successful.

**What was the outcome of losing the siege?**

One big theory is that this caused the Ottomans to shift their focus away a little bit from Eastern Europe. That they were going to try to expand their empire very much in that region after that. It made them look a little more toward the Mediterranean. They're much more active in that area, as far as North Africa and other places like that, so that's one aspect. But the other aspect is you could say that arguably, if Suleiman's goal was to protect Hungary, it achieved that goal. There weren't any serious threats to it, certainly coming by way of Central Europe or the Habsburgs after that. That did help stabilise the region for him for quite some time.

**What if the Ottomans had successfully conquered Vienna?**

It would have been seen as an incredible victory, but also it would have added to some of their challenges, because of the distance from the centre of the empire. I think they would have always been worried about being surrounded, being cut off from their supplies, from regular access to replenishment of troops and other resources from the centre of the administration. So I think they would have had to work very hard to secure the area around Vienna, and all the routes leading back toward the East. That would have cost them a lot, in addition to the outlay of the conquest itself. The maintenance would have been very high. That, plus all of the pressures they were facing from the Safavids [in Persia] and others, that could have led to a lot of fragmentation. They might have found that they had overstretched if they'd won.

**What would Ottoman victory have meant for Europe?**

One thing the Ottomans were doing, that Christian cities weren't, is the Ottoman cities were more integrated. You had not just Muslims, but Christians and Jews, and they were all an active part of these towns in Europe. That might have been very eye-opening for Europeans to experience that, for central Europeans in particular. You could make the argument, had they held on to Vienna and other areas around it, it might have created a greater acceptance of who the Ottomans were, and allowed more people to see them as fellow rulers in the area, to understand their strategies a little bit better. The anti-Ottoman rhetoric just kept getting stronger and stronger. It's easy to do that once someone is located a distance away from you, right? It's easier to vilify them and to indulge in a lot of stereotypes and such, but when they're living much closer by and you're dealing with them, as fellow rulers, as neighbours in your own town, as trade associates, it often times is much more eye-opening.

**What implications does that have in the longer term?**

It would have made the Ottoman Empire more of a familiar partner in European politics. There are two kinds of tracks that you see in the way that people were dealing with the Ottomans in Eastern Europe. One was to be outraged that this foreign power, that this Muslim power, was ruling over formerly Christian areas and to say this was unacceptable and they had to be expelled and they didn't belong there. The other was to deal with them, and to accept them to open up diplomatic lines, which most governments did immediately. Once you get behind some of the rhetoric about the Ottomans as being 'the infidel', or 'the barbarian', as they were also called at this time, they're treated like other local princes. So it might have lessened a lot of the fear, that sense of distance that developed about Islam and about Muslims. It might have reduced a lot of that sense of othering that you see toward Islam, and this sense of there being a divide between East and West. I think it could have really softened that, if they
had a much stronger presence in central Europe. That I think is very possible.

Would the Ottomans have tried to conquer the whole of Europe?
I'm sceptical about that. I think they would have run out of steam. I think they would have been hard-pressed to really keep going on, given how greatly the Ottoman Empire had expanded all over the place. I don't know if they would have had the wherewithal to keep going, because I think the resistance would have been enormous. Even if some people did cooperate with the Ottomans, there would have been just tremendous push-back. I mean, Charles V [the King of Spain] would not have settled for letting Vienna go. He'd have worked very hard to get it back, so I think that that would have been one immediate response.

Would there have been a lot of additional conflict?
I think the Ottomans were an aggressive state. They were expansive. They wanted to continue to expand their empire. I don't think it makes a lot of sense to say they were completely peaceful rulers. So I think they had very clear goals in mind. It's a different question as to whether they could have kept going, but if they had all the resources, given their past history, I think there's a lot of reason to expect they would have. That was kind of part of what they did.

Would Europe have been better or worse off if they had won?
I think it certainly would have been bad for a lot of the rulers in Europe. They would have lost a lot of power, they would have lost direct control. The Ottomans ruled over multicultural, multi-religious empires, so many people continued to practise their faith. They kept their own sense of local culture and practices. They had a lot of autonomy under the Ottomans in many areas. They could run a lot of their own businesses and [set] agendas on their own. I don't know if you were to ask somebody, a Christian living in the Ottoman Empire in Eastern Europe, if they felt like it was a great hardship, if you would have gotten the answer of yes. They probably looked at it more in terms of this was an empire that, once they established their goals, was pretty well-run, was well-maintained. The roads were protected. They brought a lot of peace after war, so the argument's been made by a lot of historians that in some cases people thought they lived as well, if not better, under the Ottomans.

Ottoman interest in Europe began long before its attempts to seize Vienna from the Holy Roman Empire. Prior to this they had fought over Hungary and even successfully installed their own king to the region. John Zapolya. Descended from a noble Slavonian family, Zapolya was already rich and powerful having inherited land in what is now Slovakia from his father, yet he still had his eye firmly on the throne. When King Louis II was killed at the Battle of Mohacs, Zapolya attempted to step into the void left by the heirless king, but faced competition from Archduke Ferdinand of Austria for the position. When Ferdinand's brother the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V invaded Hungary, Zapolya was forced into exile. He turned to Suleiman I for support, promising Hungary as a vassal state to the Ottoman Empire in return, which lead directly to Suleiman laying siege to Vienna.

After an uncharacteristic amount of rainfall this May that nearly saw the great Ottoman army bogged down on its way to Vienna, clerics are warning that such whether is a warning of God's displeasure at recent events.
Maps do not solely give a sense of location or an idea of how to get from one place to another. They can also be used to tell a story, not only about the places they depict and how they have changed over time, but of the interpretations laid upon the world by map makers - whether real or imaginary.

In Talking Maps, published by the Bodleian Library, you can gain a fascinating insight into these tales. Some maps, for example, are steered by religion rather than geography, guiding people towards spiritual fulfilment. Others reflect the prejudices of the maker or merely exist to deliver specific information.

It is certainly interesting to note that cartography - the art and science of making maps - dates back to ancient Greece and yet only became predominantly factual from the 17th century. More so that, in Europe, a scientific approach by the early 19th century was criticised for becoming an instrument of ideology for colonial powers.

As the book explains, maps can become key tools in politics, warfare or commerce. Yet there can be light relief as maps explore fantasy worlds or provide the backdrop for adventurous conversations. As we will see, they give direction to history and take us down paths that would otherwise be lost.
A VIEW OF THE WORLD

Ancient Muslim maps were primarily defined by theology as Muhammad al-Istakhri's representation of the Islamic empire in 1297 CE shows. It places south at the top and shows land encircled by sea. But aside from depicting the Indian Ocean left and the Nile flowing vertically to the Mediterranean, Mecca and Medina are central and Arabia detailed.

MATERIALS TO HAND

Drawn on the hide of a sheep and a lamb, the Gough map pinpointed the location of Great British settlements for the first time. Dated between 1390 and 1410 CE, it has east at the top, with Scotland to the left. It marks more than 600 toponyms, 200 rivers, red-marked routes with distances and trees to depict forestry.

BIOGRAPHY OVER TOPOGRAPHY

An anonymous Muslim scholar working in Fustatr Cairo compiled The Book Of Curiosities Of The Sciences And Marvels For The Eye between 1020 and 1050 CE. It included this detailed, abstract, north-oriented maritime map of the Mediterranean with 118 islands and 121 harbours, marked with sea-faring information.
English land surveyor and cartographer Ralph Agas is known for his large-scale town map of Oxford. Surveyed in 1578 and published in 1588, it's the earliest surviving map of the university city. Although south is at the top, it gives a solid insight into Oxford's medieval street pattern and key landmarks, many of which remain exactly the same today.
Believing maps orientate geographically and spiritually, this 16th or 17th century J Ain map represents the terrestrial world and puts the holy mountain of Meru at the centre of the universe. Either side are 16 human provinces, with India below. The Indus and Ganges rivers flow into an encircling symbolic ocean.
On the Menu
MARLBOROUGH PIE

Did you know?
The first record of an apple custard pie is from 1660 in The Accomplisht Cook.

Ingredients
- Shortcrust pastry
- 2 large tart apples, peeled and cored
- 2 large sweet apples, peeled and cored
- 3 tbsp lemon juice
- 3 tbsp dry sherry
- 30g salted butter
- 140g granulated sugar
- 3 large eggs
- 240ml single cream
- 1/4 tsp ground cinnamon
- 1/4 tsp grated nutmeg
- 1/4 tsp salt

ENGLISH CLASSIC WITH NEW WORLD CRED ENGLAND, 16TH CENTURY

Seasonal eating would have been essential in the court of Henry VIII, but just as important would have been making sure those seasonal ingredients all got used up. A classic workaround for fruits, for instance, was to bake them into pies if they risked going off before being served in some other form. So, something like this apple pie with a custard form to it would have been ideal.

The Marlborough Pie later became a Thanksgiving favourite in America thanks to immigrants from England bringing it with them and facing many similar challenges of preserving food in the New World as they had done at home before.

What follows then is a recipe for a pie that has spanned eras and continents.

Did you make it? Let us know! www.historyanswers.co.uk /AllAboutHistory @AboutHistoryMag

METHOD
01. Preheat the oven to gas mark 6 (200°C/400°F) with a rack in the centre. Whether store-bought or homemade, roll out your shortcrust pastry to a ten-inch circle about 1/8 inch thick.
02. Transfer to a nine-inch pie plate lined with baking parchment, pressing the dough into the sides lightly to form your crust. Prick holes in the base with a fork. Line with foil, weigh down (pie weights, oven-safe ball bearings will do) and bake for eight minutes. Remove weights and foil, cook for further five minutes. Set aside to cool.
03. Reduce oven to gas mark 4 (180°C/350°F).

Grate the apples into a medium bowl, stir in lemon juice and sherry. Add butter to a skillet, melt on medium heat and then add the apple mixture and sugar. Keep stirring until liquid begins to boil, then reduce heat to simmer, stirring occasionally for about ten minutes. Remove from heat and let cool for ten minutes.

In large bowl whisk the eggs, cream, cinnamon, nutmeg and salt. Stir in the apple mixture once done. Pour mixture into pie crust and place in oven to bake for 35 minutes or until custard has set, but before it takes on too much colour. Cool on rack for 30 minutes and serve warm.
The books, TV shows and films causing a stir in the history world this month

**MADAME FOURCADE’S SECRET WAR**

The thrilling tale of the French resistance’s only woman chief

**Author** Lynne Olson  **Publisher** Scribe  **Price** £22  **Released** Out now

Inside the crowded shelves of Second World War histories lie a number of now-iconic women who served as spies from Noor Inayat Khan and Violette Szabo to Krystyna Skarbek. In this thrilling account of a French resistance movement, Lynne Olson introduces us to another. Marie-Madeleine Fourcade was la patronne (the boss) of Alliance, the only woman to hold such a role. Her network aimed to strike against Vichy France and its Nazi occupiers through gathering intelligence on German troop movements, U-boat schedules, weapons and more, and passing it on to the Allies.

Their work was hugely important and gleaned valuable information, but at a terrible personal cost to Fourcade and her colleagues – hundreds of Alliance’s 3,000 agents were captured, interrogated, tortured and executed by the Nazis’ secret police, the Gestapo, who referred to the network as Noah’s Ark because of its animal-themed aliases. Two years into Fourcade’s leadership of the Alliance barely any of the original agents had survived and many of the ‘second wave’ had been imprisoned or killed. Olson discusses how the lax precautions on the part of Alliance agents coupled with the growing abilities of Gestapo agents to accurately detect their locations from their radio transmissions created an ever more perilous environment.

Within the pages of this thrilling narrative, Fourcade’s spirit shines through. As a woman – and an upper-class woman at that – la patronne’s contemporaries could not have conceived that she could be a spy. But she was no stranger to carving her own path despite what others thought. She had for many years been separated from her conservative first husband, who disapproved of her independence and social life, and pre-war she had acquired a pilot’s licence, drove a car, and worked as an entertainment producer on France’s first commercial radio station Radio-Cité. During the fraught years of the war, Fourcade never lost her dedication to Alliance despite the very real hardships she faced including long separations from her children Christian and Béatrice, giving birth to her third child while on the run, escaping arrest and captivity, and coping with the grief of her agents being caught and killed. Much has been written about spies, intelligence agencies and resistance networks of the Second World War but Madame Fourcade’s Secret War stands out from a crowded field by chronicling the experiences of an inspiring woman who has been somewhat neglected by history. In documenting Alliance’s triumphs and despairs during the conflict, the book also engagingly portrays the network’s story as a whole and the breadth of intriguing and eclectic personalities that made up its ranks – ranging from military officers, fishermen and housewives, to architects, aristocrats and students. Olson skilfully depicts this large cast in all the poignancies of their situations, and in Marie-Madeleine we have an inspiring protagonist who put her life on hold, and on the line, to help bring her country back from the brink.

“**She was certainly no stranger to carving her own path despite what others thought**”
**BARBARIANS AT THE WALL**

A fast-paced and fascinating chronicle of nomadic life in ancient Asia

**Author** John Man  
**Publisher** Bantam Press  
**Price** £20  
**Released** Out now

**BARBARIANS AT THE WALL** begins with the sighting in 204 BC of a comet, a portent heralding the emergence of a new dawn for China. The teenage King of Qin state, Zheng, interpreted its appearance as a sign of great change to come, and so it was when he waged war against China's other remaining states and emerged as its first Emperor: Zheng - who is best known today for the Terracotta Army - founded a powerful empire but its rise coincided with that of another. The Xiongnu, nomadic peoples of the Eurasian steppes, were to be a thorn in the side of China's rulers for 400 years, and they are worthy subjects of this engrossing blend of narrative storytelling and archaeological analysis. Through raids across the Great Wall which was built to bar them, to the receiving of sumptuous gifts in Chinese attempts at mollification, the Xiongnu amassed a wealth that enabled them to imprint their culture on swathes of land in Central Asia, creating a heritage which has been linked to Attila's 'Huns' and Genghis Khan's Mongol Empire. The book's erudite and evocative pages examine themes such as the currency of legends in nation-building and how far it is possible to reconstruct the minutiae of an ancient people's existence. A cast of intriguing characters coupled with fascinating archaeological discoveries and Man's amiable style makes for an enjoyable read that does justice to the significant impact of the Xiongnu on Chinese and Asian history.

**INDIA: A SHORT HISTORY**

An insightful trip through the many histories of India

**Author** Andrew Robinson  
**Publisher** Thames & Hudson  
**Price** £8.99  
**Released** Out now

India: A Short History sets out to achieve what might seem to be an almost impossible feat, to write a history of India that is comprehensive, accessible and appealing. It succeeds admirably.

The history of India is vast and complex. From Chinese pilgrims seeking the birthplace of Buddha to modern flourishing economy via Alexander the Great, the Mughal empire and British colonisation, it is a country that has lived many lives. In his latest work Andrew Robinson, a scholar of the history of India, aims to retell all of these histories in order to better understand India, as well as the future it faces.

It’s a tall order. With approximately 4,000 years of stories to tell, it might seem an almost impossible feat to construct a tight, focused narrative in the space of just 200 or so pages, but Robinson’s book does so with aplomb. Though obviously not able to cover every aspect of India's fascinating past in great detail, India: A Short History instead distills the history of the nation into a narrative that cracks along at a fair speed yet is still able to recreate not only the lost scenes of eras past, but the people who lived in them.

India: A Short History is accessible, insightful and packed with wit and understanding. Though this isn’t a book for scholars of India, for anyone looking to learn more about India and better understand not only its past but its present too, this is the perfect place to start.
GREAT CITIES THROUGH TRAVELLERS' EYES

A curious global journey with some historic names

Author Peter Furtado (editor) Publisher Thames & Hudson
Price £24.95 Released Out now

Great Cities Through Travellers' Eyes, edited by Peter Furtado, is the perfect read for armchair travellers. Within its pages Furtado has assembled some of the best historical writing about nearly forty cities, from Alexandria to Washington DC. It seems as though all human life is here from soldiers heading into an uncertain fate to artists looking for their muse and simple tourists, off to explore the globe.

In nearly 200 extracts taken from across the millennia, Furtado assembles some famous - and infamous - names, as well as some who may be less familiar.

There are clearheaded descriptions of cities that readers may recognise and at the other end of the spectrum, flamboyant, personal collisions with them that left indelible marks on the travellers.

This anthology offers readers a chance to join the likes of Marco Polo on voyages of discovery that shaped the history of the world, or to meet a medieval Chinese holy man who was shown around Sainte-Chapelle by none other than the King of France. What emerges as much as portraits of the cities are portraits of the travellers themselves. Within these short extracts there is humour and pathos and a good deal of excitement.

Great Cities Through Travellers' Eyes is a perfect read both for those who like to travel and those who prefer to let others do the work for them. Its bite-sized extracts and vast variety of authors will appeal to readers, who are bound to learn something from this entertaining volume.
Apollo 11

To infinity and beyond! Well, to the Moon and back at least

Certificate U Director Todd Douglas Miller Cast Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Mike Collins Released: Out Now

It’s estimated 650 million people worldwide turned on their television sets to see and hear astronaut Neil Armstrong step foot on the Moon and utter what must surely count as among the most famous sentences in human history: “One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.” As NASA’s pioneering Apollo 11 mission closes in on its 50th anniversary, Todd Douglas Miller’s awe-inspiring documentary is a fine reminder of our capacity for endeavour and ingenuity, recounting a moment in time when what seemed impossible, the realm of science fiction, was made possible.

Assembled from recently unearthed 70mm footage taken in 1969, 35mm and 16mm film, audio recordings amounting to thousands of hours, as well as closed-circuit video clips, live television broadcasts and photographs, Apollo 11 is impressively put together and made in what is known as the ‘direct cinema’ style. This documentary format discards traditional voiceover narration and talking heads interviews in favour of source material. The effect is an immersive viewing experience closer to that of an arthouse movie, but, given the subject, one boasting the towering spectacle and high-octane thrills of a Hollywood blockbuster.

The film ingeniously puts us right in there with Mission Control techs, the astronauts in their tin can hurtling through outer space, among the thronging crowds gathered to see the launch at Cape Canaveral, the navy crews in the Pacific, binoculars at the ready, awaiting the re-entry of the Columbia. Constructing the documentary in this fashion invites the viewer to share the range of emotions felt by those directly involved in the project at the time, as well as the feverish public mood of witnessing history in the making.

Most strikingly of all, we get to hear the wonderful sense of humour Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Mike Collins (who manned the craft and didn’t set foot on the Moon) possessed as they journeyed into the unknown. When Collins’ heart monitor malfunctions, NASA report their concern, only for the astronaut to quip, “I’ll let you know if I stop breathing.” The ultimate zinger, though, belongs to Aldrin, as he clammers out of the Eagle to join Armstrong on the surface of the Sea of Tranquillity, joking that he’d better not accidentally lock the door from the inside or they’ll be in a bit of a pickle. You’d expect these men to be deadly serious and humourless, given the fact they’re literally hundreds of thousands of miles from home and disaster could strike at any second.

The direct cinema approach, however, does mean politics and social history take a backseat. Cold War aspects to the Space Race are muted entirely, in favour of an intense focus on the main event and the delivery of a hymn to American genius and memorial to slain 35th president, John F Kennedy (director Miller uses JFK’s stirring 1962 speech about putting a man on the Moon, at the very end, adding further emotive oomph).
The annual Historic Photographer of the Year Awards is back, searching for the finest photographic talent, inspired by historical sites around the globe. Embarking on the third year of the awards, online historical travel guide Trip Historic will be taking both professional and amateur entries that celebrate the very best historic places and cultural sites across the globe.

From grand, iconic architecture, to quiet, lesser-known locations, this year’s judging panel will be looking for not only stunning, technically brilliant photography, but also an engagement with the story of the subject and its importance in our past. By taking part, entrants will get the chance to win an array of prizes including a money-can’t-buy behind-the-scenes heritage experience from Historic England and the opportunity to have their short film broadcast on the television channel HISTORY™ for all the world to see!

This year the Awards will include specialist categories focusing on crucial periods and regions of history, including the Historic England category and the HISTORY™ Short Filmmaker award. Official partners include History of War’s sister title, All About History magazine, as well as HISTORY®, Historic England and The Association For Historical And Fine Art Photography.

Mont Saint-Michel
BY DANIEL BURTON – OVERALL WINNER 2018

WWW.HISTORICPHOTOGRAPHEROFTHEYEAR.COM
The Kid

Director Vincent D'Onofrio Starring Dane DeHaan, Ethan Hawke, Chris Pratt, Jake Schur Country USA Released 2019

The legendary last days of a notorious outlaw reimagined through the eyes of a bystander

01 While much of The Kid is true to history, the core plot following a young boy named Rio Cutler and his older sister Sara is fictional. They’re escaping from their uncle and happen to cross paths with Billy the Kid as he’s on the run from Pat Garrett.

02 Speaking with Rio at one point, Billy explains he was orphaned as a 13-year-old. This is true, although it’s thought he was 14 or 15 in reality. His mother died of TB shortly after marrying for the second time. Billy fell into a life of crime quickly after that.

03 Garrett and his men are blocked from their journey to Santa Fe by local marshals, as happened in Las Vegas after Billy the Kid was captured. In both the film and reality, they leave Dave Rudabaugh behind to be tried locally while the others move on.

04 It’s accurate that Billy made his escape by claiming to need the outhouse, and tricking his sole guard, James Bell. The exact details differ slightly, but Billy then attacked Bell as they climbed some stairs, took his gun and shot Bell in the back as he tried to escape.

05 The final showdown between Garrett and the Kid is close to testimony of the event. Garrett was investigating rumours of Billy’s location around midnight and managed to shoot and kill the outlaw. In the film this happens outside; in reality they were indoors.
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LARGER THAN LIFE
Military Vehicles

Thousands of military vehicles gather from around the world representing the armies of the 20th century. Look out for tanks, artillery, armoured and amphibious vehicles, cars, jeeps, bicycles and motorbikes, emergency and commercial vehicles — and so much more!

TRENTHAM VILLAGE
Home Front

Our Home Front area is the largest and finest of its kind in the UK. Trentham Village Home Front is the best place to truly experience what life was like for families back at home during the Second World War. The Home Front is a dedicated area for all things vintage and an exciting focus to the peace element of the show’s title. Visit the Home Front to see vintage fashion, animal farm, 40’s village, vintage tractors, RAF encampment and so much more!

STUNNING
Living History Displays

Living History scenes will provide a unique picture of life in conflict with depictions from WW1 to the present. See the British living in the trenches, GIs in Vietnam, Russians relaxing with an accordion after a hard day in battle, or Germans plotting their next moves! At all times our re-enactors will adhere to a strict moral code in their displays.

23rd - 27th July 2019
AT THE
Hop farm
Paddock Wood, Kent

Save The Dates
23rd - 27th July 2019

Venue
The Hop Farm
Paddock Wood
Kent, TN12 6PY.

Opening Times
Show gates open from 9am - 6pm every day!
Booking in is open from 8am - 8pm.

Tickets
Tickets are available at a discounted rate online and also available to buy on the day when you arrive. Head over to the website for more information.

Get in Touch
Email: info@warandpeacerevival.com
Call: +44 (0) 1258 857700
Visits: warandpeacerevival.com

Follow Us
Search for The War And Peace Revival on social media to stay up to date!
ASHMolean Museum of Art and Archeology University of Oxford

Last Supper in Pompeii

BOOK NOW
25 Jul–12 Jan
www.ashmolean.org
Free for Members

Supported by:

INTESA SANPAOLO

With additional support from:

The William Deliafield Charitable Trust
The Stockman Family Foundation
Patrons of the Ashmolean
And other generous donors

In collaboration with Parco Archeologico di Pompei, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli and Parco Archeologico Di Paestum.