How did a teenager turn the tide of war and make herself an icon?

Giving Peace A Chance
How nonviolent protests have changed the world

The Real Mr Hyde
Who was the man who inspired a monster?
A strong and disciplined Roman Army was the key guarantee of that!
In towns, forts and camps throughout the Empire Rome's many Legions manned the ramparts, fought the battles and led the way in extending the borders of the Empire to the farthest reaches of the then-known world.

ON THE MARCH

BY THE REIGN of the EMPEROR HADRIAN (117-138AD) the Roman Empire encircled the whole of the Mediterranean Sea and large areas of Europe, the Near East and parts of Africa.

For its many peoples and races it provided a stable and peaceful society, plenty of opportunities for trade and commerce and, most of all, security from attack from outside its borders... and law and order within.

KING & COUNTRY is proud to announce the launch of a major new series based on the military exploits of one of Rome's most famous military Legions... The Legio XX Valeria Victrix (the Twentieth Victorious Valeria Legion).

For more details about our new figures and the Roman Fort contact your favorite Authorized King & Country Dealer or... K&C Direct.
Welcome

The tale of Joan of Arc is one that has reverberated through the ages, retold and reimagined with each generation. But it is so often a tale, not a history. Her story is so compelling, so rich with religious belief, heroism and betrayal it’s easy to see why the reality of her life might be lost in the face of such compelling drama. The details become obscured by the wonder and horror that quite naturally draw the eye.

Even so, we wanted to cut through the legend and look at how it was that a young French peasant woman was able to convince a nation she was the one to lead them to victory (and find some success). To that end we welcome historian Pamela Toler to examine the story and pick apart the events as they really happened. She offers a wonderful ground-level view of events.

Continuing a theme of national heroism we also mark 30 years since the collapse of the Berlin Wall, and look at it from multiple angles, from the circumstances that saw its construction to the stories of resilience on both sides of the city as two ideologies clashed in a single, divided metropolis. The story of Berlin really is an extraordinary one and proved to be fascinating to research, particularly from the perspective of those who opposed it despite the forces in their way.

I hope you get as much out of it as we did writing about it. And that goes for the rest of the issue too.

Jonathan Gordon
Editor
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Japanese monster movie Gojira (Godzilla) made its premiere in Nagoya, Japan, on 27 October 1954. The movie was inspired by an American monster movie called The Beast From 20,000 Fathoms released the previous summer, along with the Daigo Fukuryu Maru incident that saw a fishing boat contaminated by nuclear fallout from the Bikini Atoll weapon tests of March 1954. The film proved to be a massive success.
THE GREAT CRASH

Starting on 24 October with Black Thursday and running on to 29 October with Black Tuesday, the Wall Street Crash of 1929 was a catastrophic financial event that precipitated the Great Depression that would last for around 10 years, affecting all the industrialised powers of the day. The crash marked the final straw in a year of warning signs that the market’s gains were based on speculation and overconfidence of investors.
DEFINING MOMENTS

RUMBLE IN THE JUNGLE

In probably the most famous boxing match in history, defending champion George Foreman took on former champion Muhammad Ali in Kinshasa, Zaire, (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo) on 30 October 1974. Watched by an estimated 1 billion worldwide, underdog Ali employed what has come to be known as the rope-a-dope technique, tiring out Foreman before knocking him out in the eighth round.

1974
“Freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have never had to put a wall up to keep our people in, to prevent them from leaving us”

John F Kennedy, Berlin Wall speech, 26 June 1963
ALL ABOUT THE BERLIN WALL

To mark 30 years since its collapse, we look at the circumstances that saw the Wall built, how it was brought down, and life inside West Berlin.

Written by Jessica Leggett, Jonathan Gordon, David Crookes
The Berlin Wall

**The Wall’s lifespan**

A second parallel fence was built in June 1962 creating the ‘death strip’ between East and West Berlin. Guards shot anyone caught there.

**A barrier arises** 13 August 1961
The East German borders into West Berlin are closed and barriers, such as barbed wire and concrete blocks, are erected overnight to stop foot traffic from the communist zone into the Western portion of the city. Gradually this barrier will be built up into the Berlin Wall, spanning over 140km around West Berlin. East German leader Walter Ulbricht calls it an anti-fascist protection barrier.

**INTERZONENPASS** 29 October 1946
A new pass, valid for 30 days only, is introduced called the Interzonenspass that allows movement between East and West Berlin. It’s the first sign that movement between sectors will be challenging.

**CURRENCY WAR** 23 June 1948
The Western Allies introduce a new currency to West Germany and West Berlin, the Deutsche Mark. The new money quickly outvalues the Mark in East Berlin creating a stark contrast in buying power between citizens of the city.

**BRANDENBURG GATE CLOSED** 14 August 1961
Originally built in the 18th century, the Brandenburg Gate was and remains a massive landmark of Berlin and Germany as a whole, but was a crossing point between East and West Berlin. Its closure makes it a flashpoint location for future protests.

**A NATION DIVIDED** 8 May 1945
In accordance with the London Protocols agreed upon by the Allied powers the previous year, Germany and Berlin are each divided into four blocs, each to be overseen by one of the Allied forces.

**TWO NATIONS** 24 May 1949
The Blockade is finally ended on 12 May 1949 and not long after the Western zones unify to form the Federal Republic of Germany. In response the Soviet zone becomes the German Democratic Republic from October 1949.

**The Berlin Airlift** 25 June 1948
In response to growing tensions between the USSR and Western Allies, all land and water routes from the Western Zones to Berlin are cut off by Soviet forces, beginning a Berlin Blockade. In response the Allies start an airlift program, dropping supplies into West Berlin from the air, bypassing Soviet restrictions.

**Workers revolt** 17 June 1953
Beginning with the demand for better working conditions by building workers in East Berlin, a larger protest emerges that is soon put down by Red Army tanks rolling into the city. The protesters are calling for free elections and unification with West Germany. The street Straße des 17. Juni will be named after this event.

East German border guard Konrad Schumann is photographed leaping over barbed wire to escape into West Berlin having seen an opportunity to reach the West. The photo becomes iconic.
Timeline

**Ich bin ein Berliner**

26 JUNE 1983

US President John F Kennedy gives a speech on the steps of the Rathaus Schöneberg, the home of the West Berlin state senate, proclaiming his support for the causes of a reunited Berlin and reunited Germany. He places Berlin at the front line of a fight for freedom from tyranny around the world saying “Ich bin ein Berliner” meaning I am a citizen of Berlin.

**The Wall falls**

9 NOVEMBER 1989

Plans to open travel between East and West Berlin are started prematurely by a press conference spokesman. As the news breaks, East Germans begin flocking to the Wall checkpoints demanding the gates be opened. Amidst administrative dithering and pressure on guards, the gates are opened and East Germans flock through to West Berlin, greeted by a mass of celebrating Berliners with flowers and champagne.

**Lives Lost**

24 AUGUST 1961

East German guards are given orders to use lethal force on anyone attempting to escape into West Berlin. Günter Litfin is the first victim of this order as he is shot after swimming across the Spree river.

**The Start of détente**

3 SEPTEMBER 1971

The former Allied nations gather together and sign the Four Power Agreement on Berlin, reaffirming their commitments to Germany as well as opening up some communication and travel between East and West Berlin.

**The Power of AMEX**

13 SEPTEMBER 1984

Martin Luther King Jr visits West and East Berlin giving speeches in both halves of the city. The US embassy confiscates his passport to prevent him travelling to churches in East Berlin, but he uses his American Express card as ID to pass through.

**Tear down this wall!**

12 JUNE 1987

In another famous speech by a US President, Ronald Reagan stands at the Brandenburg Gate and calls for General Secretary of the USSR Mikhail Gorbachev, then in the midst of his policy of glasnost (openness), to “Tear down this wall!” The speech is given to mark the 750th anniversary of Berlin.

**Bowie in Berlin**

6 JUNE 1987

Having lived in West Berlin for three years, inspiring the song 'Heroes', David Bowie returns to perform a three-day open-air concert in front of the Reichstag, broadcast via radio so that it could also be heard in East Berlin. Further western artists would follow, putting more pressure on East Berlin authorities.

**The Curtain Falls**

10 SEPTEMBER 1989

Reformist movements in Poland and Hungary have begun. Opening its borders with Austria, Hungary becomes a tourist destination for East Germans to cross into Austria to seek their freedom.

**Germany Reunified**

3 OCTOBER 1990

Germany is formerly reunited with the newly unified Berlin chosen as the expanded nation's new capital. 3 October continues to be celebrated as German Unity Day.

**Gorbachev toppled**

4 OCTOBER 1989

Mass protests in Dresden, Leipzig and East Berlin force the resignation of Erich Honecker, Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR, who had previously overseen the Berlin Wall's construction.
For 15 years, officials in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) had watched with growing anger as more than two million people fled for a better life in West Germany. Worried about the ongoing brain drain of the mainly young and educated defectors who were fleeing over the border between East and West Berlin, the Soviet Union - which had administered and occupied the GDR since its formation in 1949 - was asked to build a wall and it finally relented in 1961.

Residents in Berlin woke to find their city physically divided. Barbed wire ringed the border of West Berlin, effectively creating a city-based island within the GDR. Days later, the wire was ripped down and replaced with concrete. Families and friends were being torn apart and kept separated by the Wall but the governing Marxist-Leninist Socialist Unity Party of Germany set about fortifying it further.

Buildings bordering the Wall on the East side were torn down to create a strip that could afford guards uninterrupted views of anyone looking to escape. A second wall was later built providing even more of a barrier. The 155-kilometre (96 miles) strip of land it created around West Berlin became an area where fewer and fewer people would dare tread for fear of death. Dozens were fired upon for trying to escape and mistrust between East and West was at an all-time high.

The communist party played down the Wall, saying it had been built to prevent Western attack. But it could see the damage it was causing. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, many of the fortifications were removed or at least hidden and there were attempts to present a friendlier image to tourists. Some obstructions were gone by the time the Wall fell in 1989. Yet the foreboding steps that had been taken to curtail freedom highlighted the communist government’s moral bankruptcy.

**Shot on sight**
Defectors attempted to get from East to West just two days after construction began, starting with East German border guard Hans Schumann, but as many as 136 were killed by border guards. The Stasi was found to have told guards they must “stop and liquidate” anyone trying to cross. “Do not hesitate to use your firearm even when the border is breached in the company of women and children,” an order in 1973 said.

**Czech hedgehogs**
Thousands of anti-tank obstacles called Czech hedgehogs, which were commonly used during World War II, were used to line sections of the Berlin Wall. They helped to protect entrance points of East Berlin from Western advances while also posing yet another perilous challenge for anyone heading the other way.

**Lots of graffiti**
As if to highlight the vastly different living conditions on both sides of the Wall, the concrete that faced West Berlin was covered from top to bottom with graffiti. It became a magnet for artists and a huge canvas, and yet the Wall on the side of East Berlin was bare. A lack of freedom meant GDR inhabitants simply couldn’t get close enough to whip their spray cans out.

**Wall to the West**
The Berlin Wall was made up of two concrete walls. The Western barrier, or Last Wall, ran along the agreed border between West and East Berlin, beginning life as a barbed wire fence before being replaced by a concrete wall 3.6 metres (11.8 feet) high. It ringed the entirety of West Berlin in order to cut it off from the German Democratic Republic.
**Well-lit area**
Understanding that many potential defectors would try and head West under the cover of darkness, the area was floodlit using a string of lamps. To further aid visibility for the guards, there were searchlights on top of the watch towers that could be swivelled remotely. The inside of the walls were also painted white to better show anyone fleeing.

**Tall watch towers**
A staggering 302 watch towers were used to help secure the border. The most common was the octagonal, mushroom-shaped type BT 6, one of which remains in Potsdamer Platz. Guards would work around the clock in cramped conditions, looking out through small window hatches for anything suspicious. Some watchtowers would also have holding cells.

**The patrol strip**
As well as having guards watching from above and a concrete path for them to move along, there were patrol dogs on the ground, each of which were tied to a five-metre long chain that was, in turn, attached to a suspended line running along a length of the Wall. Conditions for these dogs were tough: they were kept hungry and cold to keep them fearsome. When the Wall fell, many were abandoned or put down.

**The Death Strip**
Up to 145 metres (160 yards) of land lay between the two walls, deliberately open so that guards could get a good view of GDR defectors. Closest to the Eastern side was the so-called Death Strip that was packed with defences. Its raked sand or gravel was smooth so that footprints could be spotted and followed. There were also tripwire machine guns and beds of nails referred to as Stalin’s Carpet.

**A vehicle trap**
Behind the Western wall were anti-vehicle trenches just in case someone managed to get this far from the East on two or four wheels. This deep ditch ran the length of the wall and it was also preceded by a well-raised control strip that would allow guards to spot any tell-tale footprints.

**The Backland Wall**
Another simple concrete wall was created in parallel to the Last Wall during the 1970s. This inner section faced the inhabitants of East Berlin and the German Democratic Republic, providing a further barrier to the border strip to better halt westward migration. A smooth asbestos concrete pipe lined the top of the walls to make scaling difficult. An electrified signal fence was situated behind the Eastern side which would alert the guards to any potential intrusion.
**THE BERLIN WALL**

**MILITARY UNIT**
The border guard for the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) went through a number of command changes from its creation in 1946, starting as a police unit reporting to the Interior Ministry and evolving to a military unit under the Defence Department, wearing the standard NVA (National People's Army) uniform.

**DATA GATHERING**
While there were 47,000 Grenztruppen at the peak of the force, they still had a lot of ground to cover with the Berlin Wall and national borders to patrol each day, so they headed out with everything they could need. That included a camera for capturing evidence of any issues or changes on their route or of any citizens deemed to be loitering around the Wall.

**EAGLE EYES**
Roles of the border patrol would vary in whether they would be stationary, in a watch tower or on patrol, but the expectations to spot and report activity were always the same. Binoculars were issued to all guards to catch activity at a distance and even larger binoculars were fixed in the towers to look out even further.

**SOVIET ISSUE**
Given the direct influence of the Soviet Union on East Germany it should come as no surprise that the equipment of the Grenztruppen was largely of Russian design, although it was made in East Germany. The standard issue assault rifle, for instance, was a MPKEM based on, but distinct from the famous Kalashnikov of the USSR.

**STANDING ORDER**
The Wall was built to prevent migration to the Federal Republic of Germany, known as Republikflucht and to enforce this, troops had a standing shoot order called Schießbefehl, authorising the use of lethal force to stop people escaping to West Germany. At least 140 people were killed as a result and after the fall of the Wall, many Grenztruppen were convicted of manslaughter for their role in deaths at the Wall.

**CONSTANT CONTACT**
All guards were issued with a portable radio so that they could reach back to their superiors with updates and be contacted if activity required guards to be repositioned somewhere else along the Wall. Grenztruppen were also always sent out in pairs to keep an eye on each other.

**CAREFULLY CHOSEN**
Given the sensitive nature of the Wall patrol, troops in the Grenztruppen were very carefully chosen. They were typically recruited from outside Berlin to minimise the chance they had contacts in West Berlin; those with relatives in the West were passed over and the service became voluntary, even for conscripts to minimise the chance of defection or hesitation to kill.
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BUILDERS AND BREAKERS
Ten key figures who play a significant role in the division and reunification of Germany

WALTHER ULBRECHT GERMAN 1893-1973
As the Secretary of the SED (the Socialist Unity Party), Ulbricht was the head of the German Democratic Republic. Frustrated with the hundreds of citizens who were fleeing daily to the West from the GDR through Berlin, he discussed closing the city's Western borders with Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. Despite this, Ulbricht famously denied that a wall was going to be built in Berlin at a press conference on 15 June 1961, just two months before construction began. After 21 years in power, the failure of his economic policies sparked Ulbricht's downfall and he was forced to retire as leader of the SED in 1971.

WILLY BRANDT GERMAN 1913-1992
Three days after construction began overnight on the Berlin Wall, Brandt – the Mayor of West Berlin from 1957 to 1966 – delivered a speech to the 300,000 West Berliners who had gathered in protest. Not only did he ask the Western allies to send reinforcements to West Berlin, but Brandt also addressed the East Germans and implored “above all, don’t shoot your fellow countrymen.” In 1969, he was elected as the chancellor of West Germany and he tried to improve relations with East Germany while also concluding agreements with both Poland and the Soviet Union, as part of his ‘Ostpolitik’ foreign policy.

NIKITA KRUSCHEV RUSSIAN/SOVIET 1894-1971
Khrushchev was the leader of the Soviet Union from 1955 to 1964 and in 1961, he gave the GDR approval to build the Berlin Wall. The issue of the mass emigration from the GDR to the West caused a lot of political tension between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies. In November 1958, Khrushchev issued an ultimatum demanding that the Allies either sign a peace treaty with East Germany and the Soviet Union or remove their troops from West Berlin. This marked the beginning of a three-year crisis over the city and eventually led to the construction of the Wall.

HARALD JÄGER GERMAN 1943-PRESENT
Jäger was the lieutenant-colonel who was in charge of the checkpoint at Bornholmer Straße in East Berlin. Concerned about the safety of his guards, as well as the thousands of citizens who had gathered at the Wall, Jäger chose to disobey the orders he was given by his superiors to turn people away. Instead, he opened the border crossing and became the first border guard to let East Berliners into the West on 9 November 1989.

HELMLUT KOHL GERMAN 1930-2017
Kohl was the chancellor of West Germany from 1982 to 1990 and subsequently of the reunified Germany from 1990 to 1998. After the collapse of the Berlin Wall, Kohl seized the opportunity to reunite Germany, eventually persuading the leaders of United States, France and Britain to give their support, as well as Mikhail Gorbachev, leader of the Soviet Union. For his role in reunifying Germany and the peaceful transition that followed, Kohl is remembered as the ‘Chancellor of Unity.’
Widely celebrated as the architect of German reunification, Genscher was Germany's longest-serving foreign minister, holding the position for 18 years. Genscher believed in Gorbachev's reforms and in a show of support, he pursued a policy of détente with the East. Although this caused concern amongst the Western Allies, Genscher's faith in Gorbachev was substantiated following the fall of the Berlin Wall and ultimately the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Genscher also worked hard to gain support for Germany's reunification in the face of opposition, notably from British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, believing that peace could be achieved through European Unity.

Hans-Dietrich was a member of the Hitler Youth during World War II and became an aircraft gunner.

GÜNTHER SCHABOWSKI
GERMAN 1929-2016

As the spokesman for the East German Politburo, Schabowski announced the government's decision to allow the citizens of the GDR the freedom to travel to the West, at a press conference on 9 November 1989. However, he had only received the information shortly beforehand and did not realise that the new regulations were not supposed to be released until 4am the next day - asked when they would come into effect, Schabowski paused and said: 'As far as I know... immediately, without delay.' Consequently, thousands of Berliners from both sides converged on the Wall demanding to be let through, hastening the fall of the Iron Curtain.

HANS-DIETRICH GENSCHER
GERMAN 1927-2016

Widely celebrated as the architect of German reunification, Genscher was Germany's longest-serving foreign minister, holding the position for 18 years. Genscher believed in Gorbachev's reforms and in a show of support, he pursued a policy of détente with the East. Although this caused concern amongst the Western Allies, Genscher's faith in Gorbachev was substantiated following the fall of the Berlin Wall and ultimately the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Genscher also worked hard to gain support for Germany's reunification in the face of opposition, notably from British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, believing that peace could be achieved through European Unity.

ERICH HONECKER
GERMAN 1912-1994

Replacing his mentor, Walter Ulbricht, as the head of the GDR, Honecker was a hardliner who resisted the reforms that Mikhail Gorbachev wanted to implement in the Soviet Union and its satellite states. He was the main organiser behind the building of the Wall in 1961 and he was also responsible for giving border guards permission to shoot citizens if they attempted to escape. Just ten months before the fall of the Berlin Wall, Honecker stated that it "will be standing in 50 or a hundred years!" - it fell just three weeks after he was removed from power.
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MIKHAIL GORBACHEV
RUSSIAN 1931-PRESENT

The last leader of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev's domestic reforms of glasnost and perestroika helped to pave the way for the events that eventually led to the fall of the Berlin Wall. While he supported the East German government's decision to open its borders to the West, he had hoped in vain that the reunification of Germany would be a slow process, fearing that it would become the dominant power in Europe.

RONALD REAGAN
AMERICAN 1911-2004

As president of the US, Reagan travelled to Berlin in 1987 to celebrate the city's 750th anniversary. Stood in front of the Brandenburg Gate in West Berlin, he delivered his famous speech in which he challenged Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to put an end to the Berlin Wall. Thirty years later and Reagan's powerful words to his Soviet counterpart, declaring "Mr Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" remain a key moment in 20th-century history.

Reagan's second and final term as president ended in January 1988, just ten months before the Berlin Wall fell.
Q&A With...

IAIN MacGREGOR

Reflecting on the lives the wall touched and destroyed, the city it helped forge and the legacy it created.

Iain MacGregor has 25 years of experience as an editor and publisher of non-fiction work from names like Melvyn Bragg and Simon Schama. Through extensive interviews with citizens, soldiers, journalists and agents of the governments involved, MacGregor has compiled an impressive new oral history of the Berlin Wall.

Checkpoint Charlie: The Cold War, The Berlin Wall And The Most Dangerous Place On Earth is out on 24 October 2019 from Constable.
IN YOUR EXTENSIVE INTERVIEWS WITH RESIDENTS OF WEST AND EAST BERLIN – SOLDIERS, OFFICIALS AND OTHERS – WERE THERE ANY RECURRING THEMES OF THEIR RECOLLECTIONS OF THIS PERIOD?

There was, naturally, a heavy dose of nostalgia. From those serving, or living, in West Berlin through the Cold War years they loved the city, the unique atmosphere it had as an ‘international oasis’ where young West Germans could flee to in order to escape conscription. I suppose the fact that it was surrounded by the imminent threat of invasion by the forces of the Warsaw Pact held an element of thrill-seeking to many, too. Every military personnel serviceman and woman (from Britain, France and the USA) I interviewed told me it was the best posting they ever had. Similarly, the Soviet personnel I spoke with loved their time in East Germany, providing them a standard of living undreamed of back home.

Allied to this, one must remember how brutal the regime of the GDR was; its rule reinforced by the state’s secret police the Stasi. Over the life of the Berlin Wall, ten thousand East Germans attempted to escape, with nearly 200 dying in their attempts. The majority of the interviews touched upon this, with some Germans who had escaped to the West becoming emotional when recounting their experiences. Equally, some members of the Allied garrisons still harboured a deep-seated hatred of what the Wall represented, and the toll it took on the Berliners themselves.

WERE THERE ANY INSIGHTS INTO LIFE IN BERLIN FROM 1961 TO 1989 THAT PARTICULARLY SURPRISED YOU?

The camaraderie of the military was something that surprised me, and just how much they loved their work and the city itself. Meeting various units at reunions reminded me of the hit television series Band Of Brothers. Also, how normal a ‘highly abnormal situation became for the people who resided there. In August 1961, over one hundred streets were dissected by the Berlin Wall, railway stations closed down, canals blocked off, windows of houses on the border blocked up and larger public buildings cleared. Yet on both sides family life continued and the city settled down within a few years into a pattern of coexistence. A harmony periodically disrupted by East German border guards shooting to kill would-be escapers, as well as the daily sound of Soviet artillery exercises taking place just outside the city. The everyday routine and the absurdity of life resided cheek by jowl.

WHAT WOULD YOU SAY WERE THE PRIMARY UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF THE WALL BEING BUILT?

That it would cement the Allied desire to defend their right to be in West Berlin, even if that meant armed conflict, and that the Wall itself would become a symbol of failure for the Communist cause worldwide. Walter Ulbricht had wanted to construct a barrier to stop his country haemorrhaging a skilled workforce, whereas Nikita Khrushchev desired to drive the Allies out of Berlin altogether. The former drew a line in the sand for President Kennedy’s administration that one could argue paved the way for their hardline stance during the Cuban Missile Crisis a year later. The latter may have succeeded but would ultimately prove to be a finger in the dam as by 1989 the regime collapsed via ‘people power’.

YOU SPEND A CHAPTER LOOKING AT THE STORY OF HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR ESTRONGO NACHAMA. WHAT DREW YOU TO HIS STORY?

As a student of modern European history, as well as a publisher of books in this genre, I was intrigued as to how he had not only survived the Holocaust, but then chose to set up a new home in a devastated Berlin in order to establish his faith in a city where it had once thrived. Almost 80,000 Berlin Jews had been murdered by the Nazis. To then witness such seismic changes over the following years and wish to help his fellow Jews in the Soviet sector who numbered only in the hundreds was an act of unique courage and compassion. His life followed the arc of Berlin and Germany itself as it rose from the ashes of World War II and the stalemate of the Cold War.

THE FALL OF THE WALL IS REMEMBERED AS A MOMENT OF RELIEF AND JOY IN THE WESTERN WORLD. IS THAT TRUE ALSO IN THE FORMER EAST GERMANY AND EAST BERLIN?

‘Ostalgie’ is a term I heard repeatedly whilst interviewing Berliners in the city. Yes, it was a glorious moment when the Wall was opened and subsequently destroyed, piece by piece. Over the past three decades, however, arguments rage as to whether the old East Germany has benefited economically from reunification. Equally, the older generation who remember life in their communist state see the loss of free health care, a university education and a ‘job for life’. I would argue nothing is more precious than freedom of political thought, act and expression and ultimately to enjoy freedom of travel. None of this was possible in the German Democratic Republic. Yet with today’s Germany seeing the rise of far-right political groups in the eastern half of the country there must be concern that more work is needed to deliver more benefits the West has enjoyed since the end of the 1950s. Berlin itself, however, has changed for the better since 1989. Money poured in after reunification, the eastern half has been reconstructed and renovated, the population has increased and it is now one of Europe’s ‘must see’ cities to visit.
REMEMBERING THE WALL
Discover the complex history of Berlin’s division and reunification

1. THE ALLIED MUSEUM
CLAVALLEE 135
Located in the centre of the former American sector of West Berlin, the Allied Museum tells the story of the Western powers in Berlin during the Cold War, from the defeat of Germany in 1945 to the final withdrawal of Allied troops in 1994. The museum, which includes the historic American Outpost Theater and the Nicholson Memorial Library, delves into the conflict between the Allies and the Soviet Union with its permanent exhibition 'How Enemies Became Friends', which is split into two parts. The first section explores the occupation of Berlin following the Allied victory in WWII as well as the Berlin Airlift of 1948-1949 while the second section examines the Cold War from 1951 onwards, which includes the military confrontations between the East and the West, their respective intelligence services and the process of German reunification. The museum occasionally holds temporary exhibitions and it also has the original white booth used at Checkpoint Charlie on display for the public.

Open Tues-Sun, 10am-6pm. Free admission. www.alliertemuseum.de/en/home

2. CHECKPOINT CHARLIE
FRIEDRICHSTRASSE 43-45
Considered one of the most important historical landmarks in Berlin, Checkpoint Charlie was one of the crossing points between West and East Berlin and the main entry point for foreigners allowed to enter the East. Also known as 'Checkpoint C', it was notably the site of the standoff between the troops of the Western Allies and the Soviet Union during the Berlin Crisis of 1961, with tanks lined up on both sides ready for a confrontation. Numerous escape attempts were made at the checkpoint from citizens trying to flee the East, including the one made by 18-year-old Peter Fechter in 1962, who was shot by East German border guards and slowly bled to death in front of witnesses on both sides, symbolising the inhumanity of the Wall. Next door to Checkpoint Charlie is the Mauermuseum, which is perfect for visitors who want to learn more about the inventive methods used by those who tried to escape, ranging from fake travel documents to a mini-submarine and even a hot air balloon!

The Mauermuseum is open Mon-Sun, 9am-10pm. Adult tickets €14.50, concessions available. www.mauermuseum.de/en
Places To Explore

3 THE BRANDENBURG GATE
PARISER PLATZ

Without a doubt, the Brandenburg Gate is Berlin’s most iconic landmark. For decades, the gate symbolised the division between West and East Germany during the Cold War, and attracted both West Berliners and tourists who climbed the viewing platform near it in order to catch a glimpse into the East. It was at the gate, which was constructed between 1788 and 1791, that President Ronald Reagan famously demanded “Mr Gorbachev - tear down this wall!” in his speech to West Berliners on 12 June 1987, a speech which could also be heard by those in the East. Around 100,000 people gathered at the gate when it was officially opened on 22 December 1989 and just over a week later, citizens from both sides of the city flocked to the monument to celebrate the new year together. Today, the gate stands as a symbol of peace and unity and although it is one of the most popular - and therefore busy - tourist attractions in the city, it is a must-see for visitors interested in the history of the Wall. It is also worth noting that just a five-minute walk away from the Brandenburg Gate is the Reichstag building, another one of Berlin's historic buildings, and the site of the German reunification ceremony in 1990.

www.visitberlin.de/en/brandenburg-gate

4 THE STASI MUSEUM
RUSCHESTRASSE 103/HAUS 1

The Stasi Museum is a research and memorial centre that explores the role and operations of the German Democratic Republic’s Ministry for State Security. Located inside the former headquarters of the Ministry, the museum has a permanent exhibition on state surveillance and visitors will get to see the original technology and methods used by Stasi operatives to spy on citizens, including bugs and weapons, as well as stories shared by the ordinary people about their lives under observation. Of particular interest is the office of Erich Mielke, the head of the Stasi from 1957 to 1989, which is open to the public and has items on display including Mielke’s red briefcase, in which he kept sensitive intel such as documents on his own boss, Erich Honecker. Large parts of the building remain untouched from the days of the Stasi, including the entire second floor, so visitors will really be stepping back in time.

Open Mon-Fri, 10am-6pm, Sat-Sun, 11am-6pm. Adult tickets €8, concession available. www.stasmuseum.de/en/index.htm

5 THE WALL MUSEUM
MOHLENSTRASSE 78-80

Recently opened in 2016 and located in former East Berlin, the Wall Museum offers a different history of the Wall told by those who were living in Berlin at the time. Cited as the only museum to tell the full history of the Wall and Germany’s reunification, it offers visitors over 100 interactive displays spread across 13 rooms that explore the historical milestones of the Wall and cover a range of topics, including the various escape attempts, the families who were torn apart by the Wall and the reaction to it being ripped down. On display, there is newsreel footage discussing the political situation at the time, alongside interviews with the border guards and even images from the Leipzig demonstrations, the peaceful protests that precipitated the fall of the Wall just weeks later. It also has audio-visual exhibits featuring interviews with some of the key political figures associated with the Wall, including former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the former vice-chancellor of West Germany who is widely remembered as a ‘Master of Diplomacy’ for his role in the reunification of Germany. The museum is right next to a long section of the Wall known as the East Side Gallery, the longest open-air gallery in the world, which features some of the most famous Berlin Wall murals.

Open daily, 10am-7pm. Adult tickets €12.50, concessions available. thewallmuseum.com
THE BERLIN WALL

Historical Treasures
THE FRATERNAL KISS
THE STORY BEHIND THE BERLIN WALL'S MOST ICONIC MURAL
GERMANY, 1990

PAVING THE WAY
Known for its satirical nature, the ‘Fraternal Kiss’ has since been parodied on numerous occasions in recent years, notably with a Lithuanian mural depicting Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin, as well as one in Bristol in the UK featuring Trump and Boris Johnson.

THE TITLE
Although the mural is commonly known as the ‘Fraternal Kiss’, its real name is ‘My God, Help Me to Survive This Deadly Love’, which is written in Russian along the top and the bottom of the image.

From February to September 1990, over 118 artists from around the world were invited to Berlin to paint the east side of the Wall. Flocking to the city, the artists adorned the Wall with more than 100 murals that not only commented on the recent political changes but celebrated them, with both the division of Germany and the Cold War in Europe finally coming to an end.

The murals of the East Side Gallery, the longest stretch of the Wall to remain standing today, serve as a symbol of democracy, peace and unity, attracting millions of tourists every year. Some of the most popular images of the Gallery include Birgit Kinder’s ‘Test the Rest’ (formerly called ‘Test the Best’), which features an East German Trabant car breaking through the Wall, and Kani Alavi’s ‘It Happened in November’, which shows thousands of East Germans flooding through to West Berlin when the Wall fell.

However, the most famous mural is a depiction of Leonid Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Union, and Erich Honecker, the General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, kissing during the 30th anniversary celebrations of the founding of the German Democratic Republic in 1979. Painted by Russian artist Dmitri Vrubel, the mural is a reproduction of a photograph taken by French photographer Régis Bossu that was widely republished across the globe. This socialist fraternal kiss was a form of greeting in socialist states that traditionally involved kissing on the cheeks, although a kiss on the mouth reflected the closeness of the Communist leaders. There was no homosexual desire behind it.

In November 1991, the Gallery was declared a national monument and five years later, efforts were made to preserve the murals after they started to deteriorate. Controversially, they were removed in 2009 so that sections of the Wall damaged by vandalism and exposure to the weather could be repaired. The decision angered many of the original artists and although they were invited to repaint their murals, eight of them refused. Nevertheless, the remaining artists — including Vrubel — did agree to recreate them but the fight for preservation continues in the face of increasing construction work in Berlin.
Our newly developed part-time online MA Public History and Heritage programme combines critical academic study of the role of history in the public sphere with practical experience and advanced training designed to prepare you for leadership roles in the heritage sector.

Delve into the world of virtual and augmented reality and see how these new technologies are applied to the Heritage sector like never before.

You will be taught by a team of academic historians and heritage industry experts who can share cutting-edge practice in their fields. They include renowned researchers and authors, who work regularly as consultants on restoration projects and major exhibitions.

Apply now and see what you can achieve: derby.ac.uk/heritage
How did a teenager turn the tide of war and make herself an icon?

Written by Pamela D Toler

Joan of Arc had three counts against her: she was young, she was a peasant, and she was a woman. How did she convince anyone that God had sent her to save France? In 1429, France was ready for a champion, or perhaps a miracle.

Since France’s unexpected defeat by England at the battle of Agincourt 14 years before, the Valois dynasty’s claim to the French throne, and indeed the dynasty’s control of France itself, had been badly compromised. The English army and its Burgundian allies occupied much of northern France. The Dauphin Charles, who remained uncrowned although his father, King Charles VI, had died seven years previously, had taken refuge in the city of Chinon. The English army had besieged the town of Orléans, which was the gateway to southern France. If it fell, England’s armies would have easy access to Chinon and to Charles—who from the English perspective was a rebel, not the heir to the throne of France.

Then Joan of Arc appeared on the scene: a 17-year-old peasant girl who claimed three saints—Catherine, Margaret and Michael—had given her the mission of driving the English out of France and placing the Dauphin on the throne. If her claim was true, Joan might be the miracle France needed.

In order to understand why Joan was able to convince people of the truth of her mission, we need to look at her claim from the perspective of her contemporaries. Visionaries who claimed to bring messages from God were familiar figures in 15th century France. The question for her contemporaries was not whether Joan heard supernatural voices, but whether those voices came from heaven or hell.

In May 1428, Joan travelled with her uncle to Vaucouleurs, a fortified town ten miles north of her home village of Domrémy, located in northeastern France near the border between the Duchies of Lorraine and Burgundy. Her voices had told her Robert de Baudricourt, the
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“THE QUESTION FOR HER CONTEMPORARIES WAS NOT WHETHER JOAN HEARD VOICES, BUT WHETHER THOSE VOICES CAME FROM HEAVEN OR HELL”
captain of the French garrison at Vaucouleurs, would help her deliver her message to the Dauphin in Chinon. Baudricourt not only refused, he told her uncle to take her home and box her ears for her impertinence.

Joan was not dissuaded. When she came back to Vaucouleurs in January 1429, she was more insistent, but de Baudricourt initially refused to help her travel through the war-torn countryside to reach Charles in Chinon. In February, inspired perhaps by the fact that the duke of Lorraine had displayed interest in her claims, de Baudricourt ordered the parish priest perform an exorcism on Joan to determine whether she was possessed by evil spirits. She passed this test of her spiritual purity to the priest's satisfaction. Evidently de Baudricourt was also satisfied, since he agreed to provide Joan with an escort to Chinon. The girl who arrived in Chinon on 6 March with an escort of six armed men did not look much like the peasant girl who first demanded de Baudricourt's help. Joan arrived in Vaucouleurs in a homespun red dress. She left for Chinon dressed in doublet, tunic, hose and breeches, with her hair cropped short and a sword at her side. It was a practical choice for an 11-day ride through 350 miles of mostly hostile Burgundian territory. It was also a statement that Joan was in Chinon on a mission. The Dauphin Charles kept her waiting for several days before he agreed to see her. When he sent word for her to present herself at court, he disguised himself in plain clothes and hid among his courtiers, reasoning that if she were truly sent by God she would be able to identify him. Once again, Joan passed the test, picking Charles out of the crowd with no difficulty.

It was a positive sign, but Charles was not prepared to accept she was a true prophet without seeking expert advice.

Joan was not the first person to hear voices or receive a special revelation of God's will in 15th century France. In fact, the situation was common enough that there was an established process for determining whether such visitations were heavenly or demonic. Known as 'discernment of spirits', this process had been laid out in detail by the great theologian Jean Gerson in a work titled On The Proving Of Spirits, written in 1415.

Even within the context of other medieval prophets and visionaries, Joan's case was an extreme one. Previous prophets claimed revelations, but called on others to act on their messages from God. Joan demanded the right to take action herself—to lead French troops
against the British and to see the Dauphin crowned - as an essential part of the message.

Joan was interrogated by two panels of clerics in examinations that were remarkably similar in form to the trial for heresy that she would face at the end of her brief career. Both followed Gerson's principles, which he summed up in a Latin verse: “Ask who, what, why, to whom, what kind, from where.” In other words, clerics should consider both the nature of the revelation and the nature of its recipient in order to determine its ultimate source.

The first examinations took place at Chinon, where the theologians at the Dauphin's court subjected her to a good deal of both physical and spiritual testing.

The examination began with a test of Joan's physical virtue. Joan claimed to be a pious woman, but the fact that she arrived wearing men's clothing - a practical solution to travelling with a troop of soldiers - raised questions about her virtue and modesty. Two high-ranking ladies of the court confirmed her status as an untouched maid.

We know her as Joan of Arc. At least one of her contemporaries, the great theologian and scholar Jean Gerson, named her the Maid of Orléans. She called herself Jeanne la Pucelle, Joan the Maid.

Proving that Joan was a virgin was an important part of the tests she submitted to at Chinon and Poitiers. An unsullied virgin was less apt to have been corrupted by the devil. The noblewomen of Chinon and later no less a personage than Yolande of Aragon, the queen of Sicily and the Dauphin's mother-in-law, proclaimed her a maid. The theologians at Poitiers took that statement of purity one step further and called her the Maid.

Joan, a peasant girl with no family name operating in a world where men were known by titles like Robert de Baudricourt or Jean, the Count of Dunois, recognised a good title when she heard it and claimed it for her own.
“FOR THREE WEEKS, THE LEARNED CLERICS PRAYED FOR A SIGN THAT THIS YOUNG GIRL WAS AN EMISSARY OF GOD’S WILL”
Once her physical purity was established, Archbishop Gelu and the other theologians at Chinon questioned her on her faith and her habits. They found her to be devout and virtuous. But even after several days of examination and prayer, they weren’t prepared to make a decision about the validity of the Maid’s claims. Too much was at stake. Charles could not afford to follow the revelations of a false prophet or reject those of a true prophet. Either choice would be a disaster for France, which already teetered on the brink of destruction at the hands of the British.

On 10 March, Charles sent Joan 40 miles south to Poitiers, the administrative centre of Armagnac France, for more extensive questioning by a panel of 15 theologians, presided over by Regnault de Chartres, Archbishop of Reims and Chancellor of France.

For three weeks, the learned gathering questioned Joan about her life, her beliefs and her revelations. They prayed for a sign that would tell them that this young girl was in fact an emissary of God’s will. Her questioners reported that they found no evil in her, only “goodness, humility, virginity, piety, integrity, and simplicity.” Her belief that it was her mission to lead the Dauphin to Reims to be crowned and drive the British from France held firm through all their examinations. And yet, like their counterparts at Chinon, they were unwilling to reach a definitive verdict.

The churchmen wanted a sign that would prove Joan’s claims were truly a message from God. Joan herself gave them a clue as to what form that sign might take. When informed that it would be difficult to lead the Dauphin to Reims because the besieged city of Orléans lay in the path between Chinon and Reims, Joan saw no difficulty; she would raise the siege.

From the point of view of the theologians in Poitiers, an attempt to raise the siege of Orleans was the perfect test of the validity of Joan’s mission. Success would vindicate her claims; failure would be an indictment of the same.

Raising the siege of Orléans, which we now think of as Joan’s first major achievement, became the ultimate test of the truth of her claims.

Around 22 April, outfitted with a suit of custom armour made by the king’s master armour and a personal standard, she joined the royal army at Blois. She marched out of Blois with an army of 4,000 soldiers who had rallied to her cause, foreboding that she would raise the siege.

The army arrived at Orléans on 29 April. Joan entered the city with the food convoy, as if no siege were in place. She was greeted with excitement, not only because she brought much-needed supplies but because rumours regarding her mission had given them hope.

On 5 May, Joan and the town’s commander, Jean, Count of Dunois, the Bastard of Orléans, met the Dauphin and a month later arrived at Orléans. She was met with rejoicing in the city and he made regular visits to the people, handing out supplies to boost morale. Assaults on St Loup and the southern bridge in May turned the tide of the siege, the latter including support from a militia rallied by Joan from the town itself.

The churchmen wanted a sign that would prove Joan’s claims were truly a message from God. Joan herself gave them a clue as to what form that sign might take. When informed that it would be difficult to lead the Dauphin to Reims because the besieged city of Orléans lay in the path between Chinon and Reims, Joan saw no difficulty; she would raise the siege.

From the point of view of the theologians in Poitiers, an attempt to raise the siege of Orleans was the perfect test of the validity of Joan’s mission. Success would vindicate her claims; failure would be an indictment of the same.

Raising the siege of Orléans, which we now think of as Joan’s first major achievement, became the ultimate test of the truth of her claims.

Around 22 April, outfitted with a suit of custom armour made by the king’s master armour and a personal standard, she joined the royal army at Blois. She marched out of Blois with an army of 4,000 soldiers who had rallied to her cause, foreboding that she would raise the siege.

The army arrived at Orléans on 29 April. Joan entered the city with the food convoy, as if no siege were in place. She was greeted with excitement, not only because she brought much-needed supplies but because rumours regarding her mission had given them hope.

On 5 May, Joan and the town’s commander, Jean, Count of Dunois, the Bastard of Orléans, met the Dauphin and a month later arrived at Orléans. She was met with rejoicing in the city and he made regular visits to the people, handing out supplies to boost morale. Assaults on St Loup and the southern bridge in May turned the tide of the siege, the latter including support from a militia rallied by Joan from the town itself.
Syndicate ga:

rode into battle with the French cavalry. Dunois was the official commander, but no one doubted that Joan was in charge. She carried her standard as if it were a weapon and urged her soldiers into battle. They fought for two long days, taking one British fortification after another. By the end of 6 May, the British had retreated into the Tourelles, a massive twin-towered stone structure that controlled access to the city across the Loire River. The former besiegers were themselves under siege by Joan and her army.

On 7 May, French forces assailed the Tourelles at dawn, in what would be the bloodiest battle of the Hundred Years’ War since Agincourt. Toward the end of the day, a crossbow arrow penetrated Joan’s armour between her neck and her shoulder. The French army briefly faltered when she was carried from the field, covered in blood. Joan refused to rest. Once the wound was bandaged, she put her armour back on and returned to the battle, where she urged the army forward once more. By day’s end, the Tourelles was under French control.

The fall of the Tourelles meant the siege of Orléans was effectively over, but the English still had garrisons in the small forts they had built to the west and north of the city. At dawn the next morning, sentries reported that the English were arming for battle once more. The defenders of Orléans mustered. At Joan’s orders, they drew close to the English position, but they did not attack. For an hour the two armies faced each other without either side taking action. Then, “discomfited and in confusion”, the English army withdrew, leaving behind any armaments that could slow their retreat. The siege was over.

Orléans had been besieged for six months. It took Joan and her men four days to raise the siege. The learned churchmen at Poitiers had received the sign they asked for. Who could argue now that Joan’s voices were anything other than a message from God?

The siege of Orléans was over, but Joan wasted no time savouring her victory. Her mission was not yet complete. Three days later, Joan reported to the Dauphin Charles and demanded that he go to Reims to be anointed and crowned as the divinely sanctioned king of France.

Many of Charles’ advisors felt they should build on the success at Orléans and begin an offensive against the English. But Joan insisted that the Dauphin must be legitimately crowned. And Joan was the woman of the hour.

Travelling to Reims was not a simple task. The city was deep in English-held territory and the Dauphin’s purse was thin. It took almost a month to raise the money and muster the troops that Joan needed to drive out the remnants of the English army, from their garrisons at Langeais, Meung and Beaucourt.

On 11 June, Joan and a force of some 2,000 men, under the nominal command of the duke

“By the end of 6 May, the former besiegers were themselves under siege by Joan and her army”
 WHAT SOURCES DO WE HAVE FOR JOAN OF ARC’S STORY? 

Unlike most women of the medieval period, Joan of Arc’s story is well documented. Joan of Arc left her mark in many historical sources, including chronicles, fiscal accounts, official records and letters (we even have letters that she dictated to some of the movers and shakers of her world). She shows up on the records of the town clerk at La Rochelle and the letters of an Italian merchant stationed in Bruges. Christine de Pizan, the first woman we know of to earn a living as a writer, wrote a hymn of praise to her. Theologian Jean Gerson wrote two treatises on her career.

But the main source for her story is the record of her trial, conducted between 9 January and 30 May 1431. Each day the court’s chief notary and his two assistants recorded the trial in French. Every evening, they compared and corrected their work.

Notarised copies of both the original and final transcripts exist. As a result, we have the actual words of both Joan and the witnesses who spoke for and against her. Even filtered through the male clerics who recorded and translated from Joan’s native French into the Latin that was the language of law and government at the time, her words leap from the page.
Even though we have a great deal of material written about Joan of Arc by her contemporaries, we don’t know much about what she looked like. She cropped her hair like a boy’s. It may have been dark. (The evidence for this is a single strand of hair caught in the sealing wax of one of her letters.) She wore men’s clothing. But we can be pretty sure that she didn’t look like the only contemporary ‘portrait’ of her that survives. It was drawn by a man who never saw her, a clerk named Clément de Fauquembergue, who worked for the Parlement of Paris. Clément doodled an image of the Maid of Orléans in the margins of his report on the relief of the siege of Orléans, written two days after the event. His version of Joan has dark, shoulder-length hair and wears a dress, which makes him wrong on at least two out of three counts.
Joan from the ditch against her will and carried her to safety. When she woke up in camp the next day, she learned Charles had given the order to retreat. The assault on Paris was over. She had been given one day to take the most heavily fortified city west of Constantinople. As far as Charles and his advisors were concerned, the assault on Paris was no different than the attempt to raise the siege of Orléans: a gamble that Joan could produce a miracle. If it failed, nothing was lost. The military position remained unchanged. From Charles’ perspective it was time to pursue peace with Burgundy, with the hope of uniting France against the English.

Faith in Joan and her mission deteriorated after her failure to take Paris. Charles honoured her for her service by conferring nobility on Joan and her family, but he clearly considered that her active value to France was at an end. For the last seven months of her freedom, Joan was reduced to leading a small band of soldiers on small campaigns.

On the evening of 24 May 1430, 13 months after her victory at Orléans, Joan led her last campaign. A Burgundian army had besieged the town of Compiègne. Joan rode out with a small force to mount a surprise attack against the besiegers, but was herself caught in an unexpected pincer movement between English soldiers from the south and Burgundians from the north. She stayed with the rear guard, allowing most of her men to escape, then surrendered to Jean of Luxembourg-Ligny, a vassal of the Duke of Burgundy.

As a new member of the nobility and a soldier in the French army, Joan had every reason to expect to be ransomed. Instead, Charles left her to her fate. The Burgundians turned her over to the English, who in turn surrendered her to the Inquisition.

Her capture raised questions once again about the nature of her voices. The success of Joan’s mission had contained within it the seeds of her fall from the beginning. Each battle was a test of the truth of her mission. Her final failure and capture could be seen as a failure of belief on the part of Charles, resulting in the loss of heaven’s aid. The English were sure it was proof that her inspiration came not from heaven but from hell. She was tried at Rouen on charges of witchcraft, heresy and dressing like a man by a panel of 42 clerics, led by the Bishop Pierre Cauchon, who was not an impartial jurist. He had lost his episcopal see (or diocese) at Beauvais when the town surrendered to Joan and King Charles after his coronation at Reims.

The very beliefs that allowed Joan to convince French authorities that she was in fact a true seer shaped the conclusions of the Anglo-Burgundian clerics who conducted her final trial. Like their counterparts at Poitiers, they asked “who, what, why; to whom, what kind, from where”. They considered both the nature of the revelation and that of the recipient. And, perhaps inevitably, they reached very different conclusions.

Joan was burned at the stake as a heretic in Rouen on 30 May 1431.
Dr Helen Castor on
THE TRUE
JOAN OF ARC

The historian and author delves into the misconceptions behind the Maid of Orléans and the challenges she faced

Interview by Jessica Leggett
What was it about Joan of Arc's story that drew you into writing about her?

I started thinking about Joan as a direct result of talking about my previous book, She-Wolves. 'One of the biggest problems female rulers faced,' I kept saying, 'was that medieval women couldn’t lead armies on the battlefield - apart from Joan of Arc, and we all know what happened to her.' Eventually I realised I didn’t know what happened to her. Or at least, I knew the outline of her story, as we all do - but I didn’t know exactly how and why she came to do the extraordinary things she did. Once I started investigating, I was fascinated.

What would you say are the biggest misconceptions about her life?

That she was ‘saintly’ in the sense of wanting peace and reconciliation. She didn’t: she wanted victory and her enemies’ submission. That the cause for which she fought was straightforwardly nationalist resistance to foreign invasion. It wasn’t: the conflict was a civil war within France, in which Joan fought for the Armagnacs against not only the English but the Burgundians - the ‘false French’, in her eyes - who had allied themselves with the invaders. And that she never faltered in her faith in her mission, and wasn’t otherwise physically sick or intellectually incoherent - interpreted her experiences, whatever they were, in the way that she did.

Are there any particular elements from your research of Joan that really helped to flesh her out as a person for you?

Like everyone else who has worked on it, I think, I found myself endlessly absorbed by the transcript of her trial for heresy in 1431, at which she was the only witness. It’s a complex and multilayered document, and Joan’s voice is heavily mediated through the process of translation and transcription - but all the same it’s unmistakably hers. I see new things in the text every time I look.

Do you have a sense of when the myth-building around Joan’s story began?

Immediately. You could argue that Joan started it when she called herself La Pucelle, ‘the Maid’ - a name that put the unlikely facts of her youth and her sex at the centre of her claim to a unique relationship with God. It was well under way 25 years after her death, when witnesses from both sides of the previous divide in France gave evidence at the hearings held to overturn her conviction for heresy. Of the men who had been with her at Orléans, two remembered a ‘miracle’ that had allowed her to enter the besieged town: one said the wind had suddenly changed to allow her boat to cross the Loire; the other, that the river had been too low until Joan arrived, and then the waters rose. Of those who’d taken part in her trial and been present at her death, many now claimed to have wept; two said they’d rushed to fetch a crucifix to hold before her eyes as she died; one,
that a white dove had fluttered from the flames as she took her last breath, and that her heart wouldn’t burn, no matter what the executioner did. These days, the myth is so vast that she’s almost become all things to all people.

*To what degree did the circumstances of the time create a perfect storm for Joan to make her entrance and be heard by the Dauphin?*

A perfect storm is a good way of putting it. Contemporaries believed that God’s hand lay behind everything that happened in the world - but, at the same time, that direct intervention from heaven was likely only when all human help had been completely exhausted. By late February 1429, after many years of war and with little hope of stemming the Anglo-Burgundian tide, the Dauphin - who’d always been looking for someone else to lead his armies, because he clearly couldn’t do it himself - must have felt he’d reached that point. And, if God were going to work a miracle, a teenage peasant girl might be a particularly miraculous way to do it.

*Was there anything particularly unique about her message in an era when messengers from God would have been generally more accepted?*

Joan wasn’t the first or last person in medieval Europe - not even in 15th-century France - to claim they brought a message from God. But most messengers did just that: brought messages, about what God wanted kings and popes to do. Joan was different because she said God had sent her on a personal mission, to drive the English from France and to lead the Dauphin to his coronation. She brought the message, and wanted to carry it out too.

*Would Joan have faced prejudice based on her social standing and age on top of being a woman?*

Yes. In all three ways she was unqualified, in contemporary eyes, for the role she claimed. To her enemies, that made her a witch. To her own side, it made her a miracle, at least while she was winning apparently miraculous victories. When she stopped winning, it meant she could be cast aside because she’d become too proud reached too far beyond her station - and God had abandoned her.

*How politically savvy was Joan?*

I wouldn’t say she was savvy. She didn’t have the subtlety or experience to be an effective politician - but then she wasn’t trying to be a politician. She wanted the politicians to stop politicking and listen to God, through her. Her certainty and clarity of purpose were just what was needed in the political and military stalemate of 1429. But they meant that she was left baffled and sidelined when the politicians took over again after her failure to capture Paris that September - an attack for which they’d allowed her only a single day of fighting. She couldn’t understand why they no longer listened to her - nor, when she was captured in 1430, why they didn’t seek to ransom her. The truth was that by then, politically, she’d become a problem rather than a solution.

*Were there any women of this time that Joan would have sought support from?*

One in particular, though I wish we could say more about their relationship: Yolande of Aragon, duchess of Aragon and the mother-in-law of the Dauphin, was a powerful woman who likely influenced the decision to recognise Joan’s claims.
Dr Helen Castor

Seeing the Dauphin crowned in Reims was a big part of Joan's prophecy — in person. Otherwise, Joan's response to other women wasn't always positive. When a woman named Catherine de la Rochelle came forward to claim she'd been sent by God to make peace between the Dauphin and the Duke of Burgundy, Joan said her visions were false and she should go back to her housework.

**Did Joan have any sympathisers on the Burgundian/English side of the war?**
Not many, at least while it was going on. The soldiers she fought against called her a whore and a witch, and the theologians who tried her believed her a heretic. But it's clear from the trial transcript that some of the clerics involved were impressed by the blazing certainty of her faith and her courage, even if they weren't won over to her position. So, sympathy if not support. And then, once the war was over and Joan's Dauphin had won, most of the newly reconciled Burgundians fell over themselves to make clear that they had always known she was right about the identity of the true king of France, and that the conflict - and Joan's death - had been entirely the fault of the English. Hindsight's a remarkable thing.

**Did you find any common traits between Joan of Arc and the medieval she-wolves you've written about previously?**
Charisma. Intelligence. Resourcefulness. Purpose. Bravery. Maybe above all a belief in their own agency, in a world where that wasn't easy for women to claim for themselves.
At its height, the Roman Empire was sprawled out over more than five million square kilometres. It was the main state on the Mediterranean Sea, and reached as far north as Scotland. It stretched down into North Africa and came to dominate the Middle East and beyond. A nation that big never really disappears - its culture and traditions seep into the people and the landscape, leaving a legacy that can never truly be scrubbed out.

A lot of Roman ways did disappear over time: paganism died out, with temples being converted into churches or falling into disrepair; gladiators stopped battling it out in the arenas; and phalluses stopped being used as lucky charms. But the Romans had been around so long, and their customs proved to be impossible to leave behind. It’s nigh on impossible to count the ways in which the Romans shaped modern Europe both physically and culturally, so here are just ten of the multitude of things that they left behind after the fall of the Western Roman Empire.

Written by Kate Marsh

They came, they saw and they conquered - and they shaped modern Europe at the same time
Not all roads lead to Rome, but some made by the Romans are still in use today. While building materials differed across the empire, the formation was always the same: the road itself was raised, built up in layers of rocks, stones, gravel and sand, with ditches on either side for drainage. Roads were incredibly important in such a vast territory – they sped up movement, allowing troops to get around quicker, and they boosted trade and communication.

Perhaps the most famous example of this in Britain is Watling Street, a name derived from what the Saxons called it. Stretching from modern Dover, though London and up Wroxeter, it connected the port closest to mainland Europe with the rest of Britannia. It also saw its fair share of history – it was the site of Boudicca’s final defeat to the Romans, and it’s thought that the pilgrims in Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales used it, too. Today it exists as the A2 between Dover and London, and the A5 from London to Wroxeter.

**Language**

*You’re probably already talking like a Roman*

Spoken by the majority of Romans, Latin was the foremost language of the empire and is often referred to as dead. Really, it’s anything but. Europe’s Romance languages – French, Italian, Portuguese, Romanian and Spanish, among others – have all stemmed from Latin, thanks to the widespread Roman occupation. Thanks to their common root, there are a lot of similarities between them, meaning that if you know one, it’s easier to learn and understand another. Of course, Germanic languages like German, Dutch and English have also been influenced by Latin.

But Latin itself was widely used across Europe until the Middle Ages as the administrative language for states like the Holy Roman Empire and the kingdom of France. It was also, and still is, the language of the Roman Catholic Church, with services conducted in Medieval Latin. The Renaissance didn’t stop this, with theological and scientific tomes being written in Latin. Latin is still used today – animals all have Latin classifications, and bones in the body often have Latin names, like scapula and coccyx. But one country still uses Latin as its official language: the Vatican City. In fact, it’s the only country in the world where you can use an ATM in Latin.
What Have The Romans Done for Us?

FAST FOOD
Ancient Rome’s answer to Burger King

If you enjoy your food and you like it quick, you should thank the Romans. In Pompeii alone, more than 80 thermoplia (literally cook shops) have been found, each one a stone counter with earthenware jars, or dolia, slotted into them to help food and drink stay warm. Often located in marketplaces, they provided a place to grab a quick bite to eat on the go, much like McDonald’s or KFC do today.

A Roman thermopolium often sold spiced wine, meats, cheese, fish, lentils and nuts. Classicist and ancient historian Mary Beard has commented that these fast food bars lined the streets in Pompeii - they were the alternative to a meagre diet of bread, cheese and fruit for the poor, as they didn’t really have the facilities to cook anything else. While some thermoplia just provided food, others had outdoor seating areas for those who wanted to take their time.

LARGE-SCALE CONSTRUCTION
The Romans were more innovative than people realise

If there’s one thing the Romans are remembered for today, it’s their buildings. Palaces and theatres already existed before them, but what the Romans added to architecture was astounding. Amphitheatres were born for the infamous gladiator bouts (which the Romans actually adopted from their Etruscan predecessors). Triumphal arches and columns sprang up all over the empire, commemorating the victories of emperors like Trajan and Titus. Aqueducts carried water to towns and cities that didn’t have their own water sources. Hadrian built a wall across northern England as a barrier against the barbarian Picts in modern-day Scotland.

One understated achievement, though, was the Pantheon, which still stands in Rome today. Completed in 125 CE, it is possible that it was the first building ever created where the inside is deliberately designed to outshine the outside. The rotunda stretches 43.2 metres in diameter, and is a perfect hemisphere. At the very top is an 8.8-metre-wide oculus, or opening, and the whole dome is crafted from pumice and concrete. It stands as a testament to Roman architecture and building prowess.
Laws
Time to update the legal system?

It seems crazy that we still use laws created over 2,000 years ago, but it’s the truth. The Twelve Tables, which is usually cited as the foundation of ancient Roman law, was a heavy influence on the Bill of Rights at the founding of the United States, and both South Africa and San Marino still base their legal systems on the idea of Jus Commune, or civil law. Fragments of the Twelve Tables still survive today, and we can see that it covered family law and torts, both of which are still extant.

Rome boasted the world’s first advanced legal system, and thanks to its far-reaching influence, it’s no wonder that it has affected so many others. Law students today can still study it, and it often helps them to understand our own complex legal system.

The Julian Calendar
We’ve got one man to thank for leap years

Calendars already existed by the time Julius Caesar came to power - the Greeks had created their version, while other civilisations had theirs. Rome had its civic calendar, but it was out of sync with nature, so Caesar decided to change that. He added one extra day every four years because of a calculation that showed it took 365 and one-quarter days for Earth to go around the Sun, not 365. So it was that the so-called Julian calendar had created leap years.

However, the calculations were slightly off - it actually takes us a further 11.5 minutes to go around the Sun each year, so Caesar’s calendar was over-correcting to the tune of eight days each millennium. This was finally fixed in the 16th century with the introduction of the Gregorian calendar, named after Pope Gregory XIII, but the idea of leap years stayed. Unfortunately for historians, different countries adopted it at different times, making it very confusing to date some events.

Julius Caesar, the man responsible for the Julian calendar
**Central Heating**

Keeping your house warm isn’t a new idea

How to keep warm in the Roman Empire? With central heating, of course. The Romans were pioneers, and they invented an ingenious way to keep their buildings warm with underfloor heating. A fire or furnace heated the air below the floor in a room, and the air then escaped up the walls. Under the ground floor was a basement hypocaust, which saw stacks of terracotta tiles piled up in a bed of concrete.

Baths across the Roman Empire used this method to heat their hot rooms, or caldaria, and houses in the northern provinces employed it to keep them warm in the colder winter months. The rooms that needed the most heat would be placed closest to the furnace, but it was by no means a cheap option. Only the wealthy could really afford it as it required skilled engineers to build it, and slave labour and copious amounts of fuel to keep the furnaces burning. When the Western Roman Empire fell, central heating in the western provinces fell out of use - it’s only been in the past 100 years or so that it has come back.

**Concrete**

The reason 2,000-year-old structures are still standing

It may not be the most interesting item on this list, but its importance can’t be overstated; Roman concrete was nothing short of fantastic. While our concrete has a lifespan of about 50 years before it begins crumbling, the Roman version has lasted for over 1,000 years and is still going strong. Made to a recipe whipped up by the architect and engineer Marcus Vitruvius around 30 BCE, it’s comprised of volcanic ash, lime and seawater, all mixed together with volcanic rocks and spread into wooden moulds, before being plunged into more seawater.

While concrete was used for buildings, it was also used to create piers and harbour walls for one very important reason: it got stronger over time. As seawater reacted with the volcanic ash, it created new minerals that reinforced it. It’s for this reason that people have recently started suggesting that we should go back to this ancient concrete - after all, why fix something that hasn’t broken for a millennium?
Sanitation and Public Health

Keeping clean was an important task

While the Romans weren't the first to build sewers in Rome - that credit goes to the Etruscans - the Romans were happy to take them over and keep them in use, even building their own in the city and beyond. But contrary to popular belief, Roman sewers weren't to do with sanitisation; they removed water from the streets to prevent flooding. The Romans also had public toilets: dank and dirty, they weren't pleasant to use, but they served in a pinch. Unlike toilets at home, these were connected to the sewers.

But the most impressive example of public health comes from the Roman baths. Situated in most towns and cities, it was the weekly, or sometimes daily, trips to the thermae that kept Roman citizens clean. A trip included traipsing around rooms of different temperatures and a good scrub, and an exercise ground was attached. This could perhaps be the precursor of the modern gym, with its exercise rooms, swimming pool and sometimes steam rooms and saunas.

Books

The Romans probably created the first page-turners

We wouldn't necessarily have recognised Roman books as books. Until around the 1st century BCE they were papyrus scrolls that measured anything from 4.5 to 16 metres in length, but they were difficult to read properly and in colder climates they tended to deteriorate. So a new book was created: the codex. A codex had pages, with text running from the front to the back, and these pages were made from parchment. Invented by the Greeks a few centuries prior, parchment was ideal to write on. These pages were then bound between wooden covers, and they could hold more information than the scrolls. It was now easier to disseminate a hefty amount of information in one go, and these new books would last much longer than their predecessors.

But that wasn't the only Roman innovation to do with writing - they've also been credited with creating the first newspaper. Acta Diurna, or Daily Events, was also made from papyrus and distributed around Rome so that citizens could keep up to date with weddings, births, deaths, crimes, trials and even the adventures of the rich and famous. Newspapers today haven't really changed that much.
HMS Victory
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Mould Tools made in 1965
Pack illustration by Brian Knight, 1965.

Launched on May 7th 1765, HMS Victory gained its fame by becoming Admiral Nelson's flagship during the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805. The victory at this battle ended Napoleon's bid for mastery of the sea, but cost Admiral Nelson his life. She is now the oldest serving Royal Naval ship still in service.
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A contemporary Japanese depiction of Commodore Perry
How Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry of the United States Navy opened Japan, secluded for centuries, to the world

The United States of America grew by leaps and bounds across the North American continent during the 19th century. The discovery of gold in California in the 1840s helped drive American settlers to the Pacific Coast to make their fortunes. By mid-century, though much of the land in between the coasts remained to be settled, the US had become a Pacific nation.

This opened new horizons for the US and its people. Among the most prominent was the desire to possess a share of the lucrative China trade. Hitherto, the Chinese market had been dominated by European powers, such as Britain and Holland, that had been trading in Asia for centuries.

Japan came to figure in American plans. The US sought to strengthen its presence in the Pacific through the creation of government-subsidised mail steamship lines that would compete with British firms for dominance of the international mail trade. American mail steamers would need to pass by Japan, a mysterious and closed island nation of which relatively little was known, and it was clear that the island nation would be an excellent place to obtain coal, if only the Japanese would allow foreign ships into their harbours.

Another important American reason for seeking to ‘open’ Japan was the treatment of shipwrecked
American seamen by the Japanese. American whaling ships had in recent years begun hunting prey in the northern Pacific, and unfortunate seamen who had washed ashore in Japan had run afoul of severe laws that forbade foreigners, especially Christians, from its shores. Those that had been stranded in Japan were often roughly handled by Japanese authorities, who sought to insulate their country from all foreign contact.

Japan in the middle of the 19th century was ruled by a military government of samurai, called the bakufu, under the leadership of the Tokugawa dynasty of shoguns in Edo (modern Tokyo). The shoguns had closed off Japan for over two centuries, refusing to have anything to do with the 'barbarians' beyond. Japan had developed culturally in the intervening period, but would soon learn that it had fallen drastically behind the West, technologically speaking.

The Japan Expedition
Top-ranking figures in the US government, including President Millard Fillmore, wanted to open Japan to trade. Several earlier attempts to open Japan had failed, for various reasons, primarily because of the unwillingness of the Japanese to have anything but the most limited, carefully controlled intercourse with the outside world. This did not deter the Americans, who thought that a more determined, though peaceful, approach could achieve the results they wanted.

The US Navy chose Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, one of its leading officers, to command the Japan expedition. Perry was one of the best officers that the Navy could have picked to conduct the delicate diplomacy required for its success. During his long career Perry had conducted negotiations with numerous foreign potentates on behalf of the US government, including in Europe, Africa and Mexico.

Perry had been instrumental in getting the ball rolling for the Japan expedition, having written to Secretary of the Navy William Alexander Graham over the winter of 1851-52 about the desirability of sending an expedition to conclude a treaty with Japan. Once he had been given this assignment, he set about organising his expedition.

Perry was to carry a letter from President Fillmore addressed to his 'Great and Good Friend' the 'Emperor'. The Americans were at this point only dimly aware of the position of the figure they would be dealing with in Edo, who was actually the shogun, Tokugawa Ieyoshi, ensconced in Edo Castle. The true emperor of Japan lived in Kyoto at this date. The letter expressed the 'kindest feelings' and requested an opening to trade and that shipwrecked US sailors be treated humanely.

Perry's First Visit, July 1853
Perry departed Norfolk, Virginia, in the steam frigate USS Mississippi on 24 November 1852, heading eastward across the Atlantic Ocean. Along the way, Mississippi rounded South Africa, taking on coal at Cape Town, then called in at Mauritius, followed by a stop at Ceylon (Sri Lanka).

Mississippi then sailed through the Straits of Malacca and called at Singapore on 25 March 1853, where she took on coal again. The Mississippi consumed coal at a prodigious rate during the voyage, underscoring the need to have numerous coaling stations distributed around the globe, of which Japan, the US hoped, would be one.

Passing next through the South China Sea, she stopped at Macao on 6 April, and later that day moved on to Hong Kong where Perry rendezvoused with the other ships of the US Navy's East India Squadron that he would lead to Japan. Perry's expedition would be the biggest that the US Navy had ever deployed overseas.

The squadron moved on to Shanghai and then left for Japan on 16 May 1853. Perry's command
A Japanese, speaking Dutch, next told the Americans that a high-ranking official was in his boat and wanted to come aboard. The Americans replied that he would not be allowed to confer with Perry directly because, as the representative of the US president, the commodore would only meet with the loftiest of Japanese government officials. The Japanese official present, Nakajima Saburonosuke, was only a lesser one, a mere aide to Urage's vice-governor.

Contee told Nakajima that Commodore Perry had come to Japan bearing a letter from President Millard Fillmore to the emperor. Nakajima said that the expedition should instead go to the Dutch trade factory at Nagasaki and send the letter through that. Contee said no, insisting that the US expedition had arrived at Uraga precisely to be close to Edo. Contee also told Nakajima to withdraw the guard boats clustering around the American ships, or they would be made to back off. Most of the guard boats pulled back, and Nakajima departed, saying that he would return the next day, after conferring with his superior.

With Perry off Uraga, the Tokugawa bakufu tried to delay to gain time. Its diplomatic effort was in the hands of Abe Masahiro, the chief senior adviser to the shogun. Perry was to be told that the Japanese government would receive President Fillmore's letter at Uraga and that a response would be made in the spring of 1854. In the meantime, Abe started to devise a strategy to deal with the newcomers.

Another official, Kayama Eizaemon, arrived the next day, 9 July. Though Kayama was of a somewhat higher rank than Nakajima, Perry correctly deduced that he was still only a minor official, being just another aide to the vice-governor of Uraga, as was Nakajima. Perry refused to meet with Kayama directly, and conferred with him via

---

**The Closing of Japan**

Early modern Japan had followed a very different trajectory from that of the United States. Where the US had grown rapidly, incorporating new lands and peoples as it surged westward, Japan had shut itself off from the outside world in the early 17th century. The cause of this enforced seclusion ultimately came down to the Tokugawa military government's desire to prevent the conquest of Japan by foreign powers. Christianity, and in particular, Roman Catholicism, had made great inroads among the Japanese people after Portuguese missionaries had arrived there in the 16th century. At the height of its appeal, there were some 750,000 converts in Japan, representing about one-tenth of its population.

Japan's shoguns, the supreme warlords who ruled Japan locked in their internecine wars with the feudal lords, or daimyo, were not initially troubled by the Christian religion. Over time, however, their attitude towards it hardened. The shoguns worried that the conversion of the people by Catholic priests would soften up the country for European conquest later on. To forestall potential foreign subversion, Christianity was ferociously persecuted and largely extinguished as a result.

In 1638, the shoguns closed Japan. Priests were forbidden entry, and to ensure that they did not arrive, the ships that might bring them were likewise refused access to Japanese ports. All other foreigners were denied entry except for Chinese, Koreans and Dutch, the last of whom were permitted to have a trading enclave in Nagasaki. Further, Japanese themselves were refused permission to travel abroad and banned from building ships that could make overseas voyages. The inhabitants of Japan were to be cut off from the world for good.

Control over the country and its population lay at the core of the Tokugawa shoguns concerns. To prevent rebellions by feudal daimyo, each lord had to spend a certain portion of his time in Edo, in the shogun's presence. When the daimyo returned to his domains in the countryside to tend to his lands, he was compelled to leave behind his family members as hostages to his good behaviour.

---

A Japanese print depicting Edo Castle, the shogun's residence.
hiss own subordinate officers. Perry's unwillingness to deal with anyone but a suitably high-ranking official was not mere stuffiness: it was imperative that he be seen as important by the Japanese.

The message from Abe was delivered to Perry, who was told that a high-ranking official would receive the letter from the American president and that an answer would be made via Dutch or Chinese interlocutors at Nagasaki in the spring.

Perry objected to this, and said that he would take it as an insult if the 'emperor' would not issue a reply directly to the US president's own representatives. Perry insisted that the letter must be delivered to an appropriate dignitary in Edo Bay. If it was not, he threatened to land an armed party and take it to Edo Castle directly. Kayama said that it would be eight days before a reply would be sent. Perry answered that he would wait only three or four days before he tried to deliver the letter on his own.

Thus motivated, the Japanese agreed to a formal ceremony for the reception of the letter. On 14 July, Perry and a party of around 250 American sailors and marines went ashore at Kurihama, a village nearby to Uraga, where Perry handed over President Fillmore's letter in a wooden box to sufficiently exalted Japanese officials, a pair of aristocrats named Toda Izu and Ido Iwami.

Once the letter had been formally received, Perry was told that he could now depart. Perry replied that he would return in the spring for an answer from the Japanese government, informing the Japanese that he would probably be bringing more ships with him.

The Commodore Returns, February-March 1854

Perry spent the intervening months in Asian waters before commencing his return voyage to Japan, which he reached on 13 February 1854. As he had suggested the previous summer, Perry brought with him more ships to better overwhelm the Japanese with a show of American naval might. A new shogun now reigned in Edo Castle. Shogun Tokugawa Nariyori had died soon after Perry's departure, and had been succeeded by Tokugawa Iesada, his son. The Japanese had spent the past seven months since Perry's first visit attempting to devise a viable strategy to deal with the Americans. Abe Masahiro had sounded out leading Japanese opinion on the matter. Some wanted to maintain Japan's isolationist stance no matter what. Others wanted to open up a bit to Perry while they used the breathing space to build up a modern military, and the Japanese had by the spring already contracted with builders in the Netherlands for two modern warships. Still others thought that international trade would be a good thing for Japan.

With Perry back in Japanese waters, two weeks were spent negotiating over a place to hold talks. They at last agreed on Yokohama, a fishing village not too distant from Edo.

Perry and his landing party of 500 men rowed ashore in 27 boats on 5 March 1854. A reception hall was specially built by the Japanese for the negotiations. Some 500 sailors, marines and musicians accompanied Perry ashore, where he was met by a delegation of five Japanese commissioners. Simply speaking to each other was extremely cumbersome, since Perry's English first had to be translated into Dutch, and then into Japanese. The Japanese had to have their words translated into Dutch, and then into English.

An official reply was delivered to Perry by the delegation's chief commissioner, Hayashi Naburo. The Japanese were willing to provide fuel, food and water to American ships and give aid to distressed seamen. An opening of trade was not possible, however, but in five years time a port would be opened to American ships. Until then, American ships could resupply with coal at Nagasaki. The Japanese then informed Perry that they were ready to sign the treaty the next day. But Perry wanted to have ports open to American ships designated forthwith. Meeting with the Japanese again on 17 March, the Japanese commissioners agreed to allow the use of Hakodate and Shimoda. Perry also pressed for a commercial treaty akin to the one that the United States now had with China, but the Japanese resisted. By 31 March 1854, the Treaty of Kanagawa, after the prefecture where Yokohama was located, was officially signed by representatives of both nations, establishing friendly relations between the two nations, the use of Japanese ports by American ships, and guarantees of aid to shipwrecked American sailors.

Japan Opened

Perry was acclaimed for his success in opening Japan upon his return to America in January 1855, and he published three volumes of his memoirs.

Perry's health failed him not many years after his return from Japan, and he died, aged 63, on 4 March 1858. The legacy of his voyage would long outlive him, both for good and ill. Spurred by the visit of the Black Ships and their inability to deter Perry, the Japanese acknowledged the technical superiority of the West. Subsequently, Japan undertook a rapid national modernisation program. During the Meiji Restoration of 1868, the shoguns were overthrown, to be replaced by a government with the emperor at its head. Japan industrialised, and by the 20th century had emerged as a major power. Memories of Western superciliousness nonetheless still rankled.

There would also be a dark side to this modernisation. Having avoided being colonised by Western powers, Japan embarked upon a career of imperial conquest of its own, with China and Korea becoming its earliest victims, with vast amounts of blood shed by its armies. By 1941, Japan would find itself at war with the United States in a brutal struggle for dominance in the Pacific, culminating in its calamitous defeat in 1945. Since then, Japan has become an enormously prosperous nation, and has been at peace ever since.
The Commodore

Perry was one of the US Navy's finest officers and a good choice to lead the Japan expedition.

Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry was a member of a famous American naval family. His father, Christopher Perry, of Rhode Island, had served aboard privateers during the American War of Independence and Perry himself had joined the Navy as a 15-year-old midshipman in 1809. His older brother, Oliver Hazard Perry, won glory for his 1813 victory over a British squadron at the Battle of Lake Erie during the War of 1812.

After the war's end in 1815, Perry found himself engaged in hostilities with Algiers and suppressing pirates in the Caribbean. During the Mexican-American War (1846-1848), Perry had commanded the American flotilla that had bombarded Vera Cruz, assisting in its capture by American troops. Perry earned the reputation of being a stern disciplinarian, but also that of an officer who was much concerned with the health of his crew, taking pains to protect them from the ravages of scurvy, malaria and yellow fever.

Perry possessed a keen intellect, and his skills went beyond the merely military. He was an avid student of nautical science and botany, and conducted diplomatic missions on behalf of the US in Africa, Turkey and the Caribbean during his many years at sea. He would be tapped by his superiors to run the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the 1840s.

Perry's diplomatic skills would be tested to the utmost by the Japan Expedition. He had to be conciliatory to the Japanese, since his mission was peaceful, but still firm and resolute in pressing the American position with the reluctant Japanese negotiators. It was a difficult balance, but one that Perry struck, a crucial reason for his ultimate success.
The Real Mr Hyde

Pillar of the Edinburgh establishment Major Thomas Weir turned out to be rather more devil than angel

Written by Catherine Curzon

As the 16th century ticked over into the 17th, the world was a place of suspicion and fear. The Age of Enlightenment had yet to dawn and just like the rest of the British Isles, Scotland was a place where the good feared God and cowered at the unseen wickedness that dwelt in the shadows, hoping to tempt the weak or greedy. It was a place where magic might just be real and witch trials convinced some people that witchcraft lurked in the most unexpected places, its practitioners scheming to snare even decent souls and drag them into the grip of evil and all the way down to hell itself. In the first half of the 17th century one man came to embody immorality, evil and the blackest magic imaginable to the residents of Edinburgh. He was Major Thomas Weir, the notorious Wizard of West Bow, practitioner of devilish arts, summoner of demons and notorious fornicator with his own sister and beasts alike. Major Thomas Weir died for his supposed crimes, but was he truly an emissary of the devil, or might he have been a mentally ill man who lost his life to a tragic miscarriage of justice? Perhaps there was a third possibility and Major Weir was actually the heartless brother who subjected his own sister to unimaginable torments for decades, driving her mad.

Thomas Weir was born in 1599 in Carlisle, a town in the Scottish central Lowlands county of Lanarkshire. He was born to privilege as a descendent of the Weir-de Vere family, an influential and ancient family who had made their home at Stonebyres, an imposing Lanarkshire estate. Here they grew rich and powerful, presiding over the lands they ruled for generations. Thomas Weir's father, also named Thomas Weir, was the Laird of Kinkton. The laird was married to Lady Jean Somerville,
Major Weir's house stood empty for decades. It was the site of all sorts of strange reports and a place where few dared to tread. Tales of Major Thomas Weir's cavorting with the devil became bestsellers for a scandal-hungry public.

Thomas Weir's the younger's mother, and Lady Jean had a few talents of her own. Regardless of how well she had married and how much power her family wielded, gossip about her was rife. Some whispered that she had clairvoyant powers, rumours that her own daughter would later swear to in the midst of her own rambling, hysterical confession.

The son, Thomas, however, made no such claims to other worldly powers, nor did he wish to. Instead he was raised as a strict Covenant and Presbyterian, famed for the strength and passion not only of his unshakeable faith, but the long and fiery speeches he gave to his religious followers. So pious and godly was Weir that when he took up residence with his wife, Isobel, alongside other devout Presbyterians at the top of the West Bow, off Edinburgh's Grassmarket, the group was given the nickname, the Bowhead Saints. They were morally unimpeachable, the godliest of the godly, and they were fiercely anti-Royalist in their beliefs.

Weir enjoyed a celebrated and well-rewarded career as a soldier, serving in Ireland during the Irish Rebellion of 1641 before he returned to Scotland. As a committed and passionate anti-Royalist, Weir proudly added his signature to the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643. This document was an agreement between the English Parliamentarians and the Scottish Covenanters in which each swore their allegiance to the other, creating a force that would eventually overwhelm the Royalist forces. Weir served in the Army of the Covenant under James Graham, Marquis of Montrose, where his loyalty to his land and people was unquestioning. As he rose through the ranks of the army, so too did he rise in prominence amongst Edinburgh covenanters, who revelled in the passion and strength of his spoken prayers. In fact, so famed was Weir for his religious fervour that Presbyterians made pilgrimages to his home in the West Bow from across Edinburgh and beyond, hoping to hear him speak.

When Weir's military career reached its natural end with the Parliamentary victory in the English Civil War, he returned home to Edinburgh permanently. By now a major, he was given command of the city guard of Edinburgh, a position to which a loyal, sober and serious man such as Thomas Weir seemed particularly well-suited. In fact, Weir's loyalty to his anti-Royalist beliefs was proven still further when his former commander, Montrose, was imprisoned in Edinburgh after he changed sides to fight for the monarchist cause. As Montrose languished in his cell awaiting his date with the executioner, a merciless Weir made his captive's life miserable. To him, a traitor was the lowest of the low, but Major Thomas Weir was to fall further than even that.

Major Weir eventually retired from his position and devoted himself full time to his religious preachings, by now regarded by his followers as something close to a saint. When his wife passed away he was joined in West Bow home by his unmarried sister, Jane, or Jean, who was known to her friends as Grizel, who became her brother's housekeeper and, as was later revealed, much more besides. Major Thomas Weir was a striking figure when glimpsed about the city, always dressed in black and carrying an imposing black staff that was topped by the carving of a fearsome human head. The staff was one of the most important props of his preaching and he brandished it during his blood and thunder prayers, striking fear into the hearts of sinners. The life of the Weir siblings should have been one of respectable and genteel retirement, uneventful days interspersed with the prayers that had become so renowned, but it was not to be.
The Weir siblings were taken to the fearsome Tolbooth in Edinburgh jail to await trial. It was claimed that at one point Weir had been abducted by a stranger in a coach made of fire.

In 1670, a lady was walking past Weir’s home with her maid when she was alerted to some strange goings on by the sound of shouting and cackling from inside. This wasn’t exactly what one expected to hear when one passed the home of a Presbyterian so-called Bowhead Saint and as the women picked up their pace, things got even stranger. An immensely tall woman burst from within, hooting with laughter and twisting her body into hideous shapes. The hellish figure pushed roughly past the women and disappeared down Anderson’s Close, where she apparently disappeared into thin air.

Days later, Major Weir took the stand at a packed Presbyterian meeting and quite suddenly, with no prompting, made an unexpected confession. He and his sister were lovers, he claimed, and they practised bestiality too. He went on to confess that he had sexual relations with innumerable servants and his own stepdaughter, as well as all sorts of other ungodly acts.

Attendees at the prayer meeting who had been expecting prayers and breast-beating were shocked by Weir’s outburst and blamed the confession on ill health. They put it down to mental strain and tried to hush it up, fearing the irreparable damage it might do to the church. For some time they were successful, but Weir wouldn’t be silenced no matter how hard his followers tried. He took his bed with ill health and there continued to confess to incest and bestiality until the story, inevitably, got out.

The Real Mr Hyde

Literature is full of types who were inspired by real life villains

The Witchfinder General
The villain of both the novel and film Witchfinder General was Matthew Hopkins, the English Civil War’s infamous witchfinder responsible for hundreds of executions. Though usually portrayed as an older man who met his death on the gallows, Hopkins was only in his late twenties when he died in his bed of pleurisy.

Dracula
Though Bram Stoker’s Dracula might have been fiction, the man who inspired it was very real. Vlad Tepes, aka Vlad the Impaler, was a mighty and brutal warlord in 15th century Wallachia. Tepes’ impaled enemies lined the roads to his fortress and he achieved notoriety for his vile cruelty.

Long John Silver
Whilst he provided Robert Louis Stephenson with the inspiration for Long John Silver, William Ernest Henley was certainly no pirate. In fact, Stevenson’s friend was a poet. This popular fellow had lost one leg to tuberculosis and was a noted storyteller and raconteur who boasted an enormous beard!

Hannibal Lecter
Dr Hannibal Lecter, the memorable psychopath of Thomas Harris’ The Silence Of The Lambs was based on Alfredo Balli Treviño, an upper class physician who murdered and mutilated a friend. Journalist Harris met Treviño whilst researching a story on death row in the 1960s.

Professor Moriarty
Arthur Conan Doyle’s legendary Napoleon of Crime took his inspiration from Adam Worth, a criminal mastermind of the Victorian era. Worth sat at the head of a vast criminal empire that stretched across Europe. Ironically, his son later became a detective!
The Villainous Heroes

History is full of heroes who turned out to be anything but!

The Thief-Taker General

In Georgian London few men were more respected than Jonathan Wild, Thief-Taker General. Wild seemed to have a particular gift for finding stolen goods and returning them to their wealthy owners in return for rich rewards. In fact, Wild was the mastermind behind the robberies and when he handed over the so-called burglars to face punishment, they were usually his enemies.

Wild was the most powerful godfather in the city but when his double life was discovered, he went to the gallows. His hanging was so popular that tickets were issued to witness the spectacle.

Robert Knox

Scottish physician Robert Knox was noted for his anatomical expertise. He was also the man for whom Burke and Hare obtained bodies by murderous means when the supply of fresh cadavers proved too slow to satisfy demand.

When the murders were uncovered and the body snatchers were put on trial, the genteel Knox faced no charges. The people of Edinburgh were outraged and his career was ended by the scandal. Even a move to London didn't help and Knox devoted himself to writing for several years until he made a return to practice as an anatomist at London's Free Cancer Hospital.

Gilles de Rais

Baron Gilles de Rais was one of 15th century France's most celebrated heroes. He fought alongside Joan of Arc and rose to the pinnacle of military achievement, whilst amassing a vast fortune.

Baron de Rais' extravagant lifestyle came crashing down when he was accused of occultism and the murder of innumerable children. In a trial that shocked France, the respectable soldier was found guilty and hanged in 1440. Debates still rage about whether Gilles de Rais was guilty of the crimes for which he was convicted or was a victim of religious persecution. His story inspired Charles Perrault's bloody fairy tale, Bluebeard.

Weir refused to accept that he would face no punishment for his sins and told them that he didn't want a pardon, he wanted to be punished. Eventually both Weir and Grizel were taken into custody at the Edinburgh Tolbooth and there, to everyone's surprise, it was found that Thomas wasn't alone in his confessions of sin.

Grizel admitted that, years before, a stranger in a coach made of fire had taken Weir to Dalkeith and there he had been given supernatural knowledge of the Scottish defeat by the English that had happened that day and had yet to be made known. She told them that she had been having sexual relations with her brother from her teens and had, in the decades that followed, practised all manner of sexual deviancy at his command. When they asked for evidence she showed them the horseshoe-shaped mark on her brow, a witch mark she had inherited from their mother, so she claimed. The source of Weir's power was the staff he always carried, claimed the terrified woman. Unless the authorities wanted him to cast evil spells on them, they had better take the staff from him. Not wanting to take any chances, they did just that.

Grizel and Weir confessed to meetings with the devil himself and refused to see any priest or other member of the clergy. When their house was searched large sums of money were found wrapped in cloth and accompanied by an unknown root. When the cloth was thrown on the fire it exploded and the magistrate given responsibility for the money claimed, rather unbelievably, that the notes themselves were bewitched and flew about his house in a manner so ferocious that he feared they might damage the fabric of the building!

Though Major Weir's lone confession had been dismissed as the ranting of a madman.
when taken in concert with that of his sister, the Edinburgh authorities decided that there must be something in it. They put the siblings on trial on 9 April 1670. Major Weir was charged with incest and bestiality, whilst Grizel was charged with witchcraft. With no lawyer willing to defend the siblings, a guilty verdict was swiftly handed down. Weir was to be strangled and his body burned whilst Grizel would be hanged.

When the noose was put around Major Thomas Weir's neck and he was told to repent, he refused. Instead he claimed, "I have lived as a beast and must die like a beast," resisting all efforts to pray. His body was cut down into the fire and the fearsome black staff hurled in after him where, according to terrified witnesses, it twisted and withered like a serpent. Both Weir and the staff took an uncommonly long time to be reduced to ashes.

In her cell, Grizel wouldn't believe that her brother was truly dead until she was assured that the staff had been burned with him. It was this staff, she said, that gave Weir this hellish power. Only when she knew that it was no more did she confess that their mother had been a witch who had taught her children black magic. She claimed that she and her brother shared the mark of the devil with their mother and that it was this mark, shaped like a horseshoe, that allowed them to see the future. When Grizel was taken to the place of execution on the Grassmarket she became hysterical, screaming of her shame and tearing at her clothes. She slapped the face of her executioner and fought fiercely, spitting and cursing all the way. The remains of Major Weir and Grizel were buried at the base of the Shrub Hill Gallows, but they were far from forgotten.

Though the Weirs were dead, their spirits lived on in Edinburgh, according to witnesses who lived near the house where they had resided. For years the building remained uninhabited and reports were made of mysterious lights and the sound of screams and laughter. Some even claimed to have seen the major himself, the black staff in his hand as he galloped through the city on a black horse, leaving a trail of flame in his wake. On other occasions a coach was heard to thunder up and down the road outside Weir's home after dark, but when his neighbours dared to peer around their shutters, the street was empty and no such coach was in sight.

The house stood empty for nearly a century until a former soldier rented it at a bargain price. He stayed there for just one night before he packed up and left, claiming to have been tormented by the strange vision of a calf that rose up on its hind legs. The house was demolished during improvement works during the 1870s but to this day, ghostly happenings are occasionally reported on the site where it once stood.

But what was the truth behind the strange case of Major Thomas Weir and his sister, Grizel? At first glance it appears to be a story of mental illness and delusion that, amidst the 17th century fervour for witchcraft trials, led an innocent brother and sister to their deaths. Yet what are we to make of Grizel's claims that she had been her brother's lover for years? Was Thomas Weir's guilty conscience caused not by his dealings with the devil, but his guilt at the abuse of his own sister? Might this, after all, be why he was so keen to blame his sexual misconduct on Satanic influences rather than himself? Of course this doesn't explain Grizel's own confession, but years of abuse or shared delusion might well have played its part. The truth of the strange case of the Weirs appears to have perished with them.

When Robert Louis Stevenson was growing up in Edinburgh, the local tale of Major Weir was one of the most popular of all the city's many legends. In fact Stevenson's own father had been urged by his parents to avoid the neighbourhood in which the empty Weir house still stood, lest they encounter the spirit of the major on his devilish steed. In the tale of Doctor Jekyll and Mister Hyde we see the ghost of Thomas Weir again, the pious man of God who lives a secret life of debauchery and deviance.

To the people who knew him, Major Thomas Weir was a warlock and his sister a witch, but to modern eyes, both were suffering from mental illness and in need not of the noose, but treatment. To Robert Louis Stevenson, Weir was one of several inspirations for his most famed creation and he remains fascinating to this day, his story one that chills as much as it intrigues. What Major Thomas Weir would have made of that is anybody's guess.
The Civil Rights Movement in America sought to break down the social barriers of segregation by championing non-violent and passive resistance inspiring many movements to come.
Hate begets hate; violence begets violence; toughness begets greater toughness. We must meet the forces of hate with the power of love... Our aim must never be to defeat or humiliate the white man, but to win his friendship and understanding.” These words from Dr Martin Luther King Jr eloquently summed up the intentions of the majority of civil rights campaigners in America; namely, that their goal of equality was to be met through non-violent and peaceful protest, a stark contrast to the violence and hate levelled against black communities over the previous few centuries. One of the crowning achievements of the movement was its effectiveness in promoting these ideals and affecting real change in the country while hardly ever raising a hand in anger.

“Love thy neighbour” was a biblical verse that King took to heart. He, and other activists, believed that love was the force that would win equality and end the racist and segregated laws that infested the USA. Love in their mind didn’t have to be a literal, emotional bond, but a powerful force that could be used for good.

The 20th century had revealed just how effective mankind had become in waging war, with his violent tendencies playing out through a multitude of wars, genocides and civil inequality, backed up by brutal repression. In contrast, there was also a rise in peaceful, non-violent protest that sought to enforce positive
change without the need for bloodshed. The genesis of non-violent protest in the American Civil Rights Movement lay in King's teachings and actions.

One of the biggest influences on King's philosophy came not from what was happening in America, but rather from actions that occurred on the other side of the world. Mahatma Gandhi, the driving force behind India's independence from the British Empire, had championed non-violent protest as a way to fight oppression and win his people's freedom. In King's own words, Gandhi was the person who had the most influence on the actions he took during the struggle to gain civil rights for black people in America. Having heard of Gandhi's work from his training as a minister, King became deeply influenced by the Indian activist's teachings after hearing an old university professor talk about his experiences shortly after visiting the country. King did not expect that his interest in Gandhi's work would ever have practical application in his life, never mind forming the core of his ideals and actions during the Civil Rights Movement.

The major practitioners of non-violent resistance were beginning to communicate directly and share their philosophy. Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy were in correspondence and once the American movement got off the ground, King began to add his own thoughts to the mix. In 1959, King travelled to India in order to learn more of how the independence movement had operated. After the visit, he was "more convinced than ever before that the method of non-violent resistance is the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for justice and human dignity."

The Civil Rights Movement had already made successful use of non-violent protest in the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which had proved the effectiveness of this 'passive' form of protest. King and the other leaders of the movement met hate with love in their efforts to dismantle the institutionalised racism, inequality and discrimination that came with segregation. Many years of Jim Crow laws had shown that those who supported segregation would go to any lengths to maintain the status quo and keep control over the black population.

The goal of the resistance was an end to segregation, and one of the ways to achieve that was to ensure that the long history of violence used against the black community in the South was shown to the world. Two organisations that were created following the success of the bus boycott were the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Both of these groups were made up primarily of students who had been inspired by a conference in April 1960 sponsored by King. They hoped to use the momentum gained by the actions in Montgomery to drive the cause nationwide. The students were looking for a way to have their actions directly impact people's lives without being detrimental to their cause.

The sit-in movement, first making national headlines on 2 February 1960, in Greensboro, North Carolina, was started by four college students.

During the lunchtime rush, the four students sat in the white-only designated seating at the lunch counter and were refused service. Instead of leaving, they quietly waited to be served. The store was chosen specifically as the Woolworth chain was known throughout the country and the demonstrators wanted a location that clearly separated people based on colour alone. The men wanted to highlight the hypocrisy of a store that would accept their money while buying school supplies but wouldn't have them
The tenure of United States Attorney General Robert Kennedy is remembered for its advocacy of the Civil Rights Movement.

With their main voter base in the South, the Democrats were initially unwilling to speak out against segregation.
sitting at the lunch counter. The Greensboro Four, as they became known, vowed that they would continue this protest in greater numbers. With more and more volunteers joining them, they worked in shifts to stay at the counter all day, simply waiting for service. These actions often made these men and women the targets of abuse, and they were shouted at, pelted with food or drink, threatened, beaten or forcibly removed. Never responding in anger, the protesters were usually arrested and as they were escorted out, a new group would be ready to take their place.

Sit-ins had been used since the 1940s, and were now an integral part of the non-violent protest in the Civil Rights Movement. When the media got wind of the protests, they quickly spread across the South, taking 54 cities' lunch counters by storm. Six months after the initial protest, the store finally pulled its segregated counters, allowing people of any colour to eat free from molestation. These protests aimed to highlight the inequality and hit a store's finances; if their seats were filled with protesters not being served, this would drastically reduce the income from the lunch rush. This simple form of protest was extremely effective and brought the ugly face of American segregation into the national consciousness.

Following the sit-ins, Freedom Riders were an example of a hopeful, and some think naive, form of non-violent protest that gained traction in the early 1960s. Its participants were made up of both black and white activists who were organised by CORE. Their objective was simple - to travel from Washington, DC, to the Deep South in small groups via bus to periodically break the strict segregation laws on the way. Their objective was to raise awareness of these laws and discover and showcase which towns and cities actively supported the Jim Crow laws. The timetable planned for a two-week trip through the Southern states to arrive in New Orleans on 17 May 1961, the anniversary of the historic Brown v Board of Education ruling. This plan was a controversial one, with even members of the Civil Rights Movement thinking it was too confrontational. Segregation was a fact of life in the South and the entire post-Civil War culture was built on its support. White segregationists would and did view it as an attack on their very way of life. There was a very real possibility that the Freedom Riders would be arrested, attacked or even killed as they made their way to New Orleans.

The Riders had their trail laid for them by a woman named Irene Morgan. In the 1940s, she successfully fought against segregation on interstate buses, much like Rosa Parks had fought against segregated city buses in Montgomery a decade later. Unfortunately, the Southern states overruled this federal law by enforcing the segregation that existed in the Southern state laws. The Riders were not sent in without instruction, however, and received training in Washington, DC, on how to deal with confrontation and the inevitable violence they would encounter. The riders were even warned by King in Atlanta that the KKK were planning a welcoming committee for the buses in Alabama and encouraged the Riders to turn back. The buses were heckled, stopped, attacked and one set on fire as they entered Alabama. Local police forces, along with the FBI, were also turning a blind eye to planned KKK attacks on the Riders. The Klan was given 15 minutes without any police intervention and the sickening pictures taken of the mass brawl that ensued were widely circulated around the world. In this way, the Freedom Riders had achieved their objective: for the simple act of riding on a bus, they had almost been killed by mobs of locals and had embarrassed the USA - a country that prided itself on civil liberties - on the world stage. Even so, the Riders became stranded in

**For the simple act of riding on a bus, they had almost been killed by mobs of locals**

The Nation of Islam, an organisation that Malcolm X was once part of, called for a separate black US nation

**PREPARE FOR THE WORST**

When meeting aggression with pacifism, it may seem like training would be slightly redundant, but the Civil Rights Movement offered its activists two kinds of non-violent training. Philosophical training aimed to shape a person's attitude and mental response to violence, whereas practical training gave demonstrators tips on how to organise and lead peaceful demonstrations. It also covered the basics of how to respond to physical attacks and protect oneself from serious injury or even death. As activists, and especially the Freedom Riders, saw, they could be subjected to anything from physical blows with fists, feet or objects to getting spat on, ran over or stabbed. Training sessions would consist of role play, where members would experience being insulted, threatened or attacked in a controlled environment.

The training helped to form a sense of camaraderie among groups of activists and while the training was taken seriously, many believed they would never have to put it to use. The first Freedom Rider volunteers were convinced that they wouldn't need to use their physical training, but soon found out they would have to employ this vital knowledge on a daily basis as they travelled south. Participants in training sessions were required to first have a very serious and committed attitude to the cause. Calm confidence was thought to be the best defence in the face of aggression. With training came discipline, and the goal was to present an organised, unbreakable front that would absorb violence and be able to continue the protest regardless, rendering the opponents' force worthless.
After years of peaceful resistance, the Civil Rights Movement had many of the Jim Crow laws abolished in 1964 with the Civil Rights Act.

Birmingham when the bus drivers refused to drive them any further. After a tense standoff in the airport, the government had to intervene to fly the battered and bruised Riders down to New Orleans. The next chapter of the Freedom Ride is one of the best examples of what the non-violent protest stood for. A second wave of Freedom Riders was on its way from Nashville to Birmingham, and the feeling was that if the ride stopped now, it would prove that segregation could be upheld by brutal violence. This second wave of riders knew the danger they were putting themselves in, and went so far as to write up their wills the night before they departed. By 17 May, pressure from the Kennedy administration, who had been scrambling to defuse the situation since the worldwide backlash, granted the Freedom Riders full police protection. This came none too soon as tensions in Birmingham between the Riders and the KKK had reached breaking point. This police presence disappeared as soon as the bus hit the Montgomery city limits, and the Riders and accompanying journalists were again subjected to horrific beatings. King again intervened for the Riders, this time asking an armed mob of black taxi drivers, who had formed up to protect them, to stand down for fear that they would escalate the situation even further. The group’s total dedication to non-violent protest, even in the face of death, showed the commitment and bravery of all involved. The Riders’ actions were starting to see results on a national level.

Both King and Malcolm X were assassinated, King by a white supremacist and the latter by Nation of Islam members.

After years of peaceful resistance, the Civil Rights Movement had many of the Jim Crow laws abolished in 1964 with the Civil Rights Act.
originally been planned as a 14-day excursion, had been drawn out over many months and gained worldwide news coverage. The violence was condemned at every turn and the actions of the Freedom Riders helped greatly to showcase the rampant inequality in the USA and show the power of peaceful, non-violent protest.

The policy of “love thy neighbour” and pacifism shown in all circumstances was not accepted by all of the Civil Rights Movement or the black community. Some leaders thought that non-violent protest was only adopted because of the overwhelming force of the opposition. There was no way black communities could go toe-to-toe with local police departments or hate groups like the KKK and come out on top. Community leaders like Malcolm X saw King’s passive resistance as leaving black people defenceless against white aggression. He even went so far as to call King a modern-day ‘Uncle Tom’, a derogatory and antiquated term used to describe a black person who sided with their white oppressors against other black people. Malcolm X and others who agreed with his more violent approach to combating segregation could not comprehend a non-violent approach, when black communities had so frequently been the target of state-sanctioned violence and discrimination. Despite his powerful rhetoric, there is a school of thought that believes leaders like Malcolm X incited or condoned violence in order to make the peaceful protests stand out more. Segregationists would be more willing to work with a moderate like Dr King when faced with the alternative of Malcolm X and organisations like the Black Panthers.

Being targeted by the authorities and organisations like the KKK, black communities took their protection into their own hands. This need led to groups like the Deacons for Defense and Justice being formed in 1964. Mostly made up of veterans from World War II and the Korean War, the Deacons provided armed guards to protect the homes and residences of activists. It was one of the first self-defence forces to make itself known in the Civil Rights Movement, and its creation was met with scepticism by the non-violent majority, who either stayed silent over its actions or spoke out against them. Despite the resistance against them from both camps, the Deacons were effective in curbing KKK activities and violence against black communities, and providing security for the March Against Fear that occurred in Tennessee and Mississippi in 1966. Other communities also found that displays of force or the threat of violence were enough to stop attacks by the KKK and protect their families.

The Civil Rights Movement contained a fluid spectrum of thoughts and opinions, but mostly focused on non-violent practices. These were the actions that saw the most positive change in both society and law. While it did not end the struggle for equality, it proved that love, bravery and determination could win out over hate and violence.

Martin Luther King Jr. and the Civil Rights Movement as a whole, were influenced by other international peace protests and leaders. Dr King was outspoken in his influence by and agreement with Indian peace activist Mahatma Gandhi, and the writings of author and spiritual pioneer Leo Tolstoy. Gandhi and Tolstoy began discussing the nature of non-violent protest in a series of letters after the Indian activist asked for permission to print one of the author’s letters in his South African newspaper, where he was stationed at the time. The letters called “A Letter to a Hindu,” sparked a passionate correspondence that would continue until Tolstoy’s death. In these letters, they discuss how violence seems unnatural for the human spirit and advocate for the return to the most basic natural state for a human: love. All three men, especially Gandhi and King, saw love as the driving factor that could end oppression and was the only answer to violence. Both Gandhi and King agreed that meeting violence and hate with love was not a sign of weakness, but rather of strength and didn’t have to refer to feelings or sentiment but rather a powerful force that could be used for good.

Taking both the teachings of Tolstoy and Gandhi, King said, “Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is power correcting everything that stands against love” and sought to break down the barriers that he saw society had placed on the combining of love and power.

One of the letters Gandhi sent to Tolstoy from his residence in Johannesburg
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Even the main proponent only gave this desperate military gamble a one in 5,000 chance for success, but it turned the tide of a war that still shapes today's world.

The legacy of the Korean War (1950-3) still stands as a stark feature on the global landscape, with the fluctuating relations between the Communist north (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea - DPRK) and the democratic south (the Republic of Korea - RoK) having far-reaching repercussions across the world. The partition of Korea dates back to 1945 when the country was liberated from over 40 years of Japanese rule and was divided along the 38th Parallel. The Soviets had occupied the north, establishing a Communist government, while the USA had occupied the south and established a highly corrupt but at least nominally democratic rule. The state of affairs was recognised by the United Nations in August 1948, and at the end of the
year the Soviets had withdrawn their occupation forces, leaving behind an established military and considerable amounts of hardware. The US forces withdrew in June 1949, leaving a small and poorly equipped RoK army.

For the North Koreans, it made sense to strike as soon as possible to 're-unite' the country under their rule. The north was much larger - 48,000 square miles against the south's 37,000 - but had a far smaller population - just 9 million against the south's 21 million. However, the DPRK's military at that time was the larger of the two, with 223,000 trained and experienced troops (albeit at insurgency and irregular warfare), large numbers of T-34 tanks and over 100 former Soviet aircraft. The South's army was a ramshackle 98,000 poorly trained troops with little heavy weaponry. The North seized its chance, and at 4am on 25 June 1950, its forces swept south.

The DPRK's army shattered the RoK's. On 3 July, Seoul, the capital of South Korea, fell to Northern forces. Only around 40 miles from the 38th Parallel, the city stood in the north-western corner of the country, and the remains of the South's army began to stream towards Pusan (now known as Busan) in the south-eastern corner of the Korean peninsula.

The United Nations immediately moved to condemn the North's actions and (due to the Soviets having walked out of Council meetings earlier) a resolution was passed to send forces to defend South Korea. Many countries would send troops and other resources to support the action, including British and Commonwealth forces, but the vast majority of the military muscle would be American, as would the senior commanders.

The US forces in the Far East were in a deplorable state, as were those in America itself. Only in Germany were full-strength divisions maintained, and elsewhere units from divisional level downwards were kept at well below their wartime strength. Training had also lapsed, with a focus on general education rather than weapons or tactical skills. The four divisions on occupation duties in Japan were quickly stripped to start making up full-strength units to throw into the fight; initially a single battalion (which was quickly overwhelmed) was sent and then a division, supported by further units, including a composite US Marine brigade and the British 27th Infantry Brigade. A fighting retreat developed that eventually led to a solid perimeter being formed around Pusan in the first week of August. With a front of 258 kilometres (160 miles), held by around 45,000 United Nations and South Korean troops of the US 8th Army, the line finally held. The Communist forces, exhausted and scattered after their rapid advance south, could not break through.
The question for the UN forces was, what to do now? It was only a matter of time until their numerical and technological strength grew to the point where they could counter-attack, but how should they, and where? Breaking out of Pusan could be hard work, and would lead to a 300-kilometre (200-mile) slog over mountainous terrain to liberate Seoul. Two elements immediately in their favour were air superiority and absolute control of the sea. The North's tiny navy had been neutralised, leaving the UN master of the long, vulnerable Korean coastline. Already aircraft carriers and commando forces were striking against the North's lines of communications.

Commander of the UN forces was General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, whose actions throughout an eventful career had made him a controversial figure. Strong-willed and opinionated, he held his military and (especially) political masters in contempt. He wanted to be bold and land deep behind enemy lines. He believed that only this would lead to swift re-conquest of the south, a landing to threaten the enemy's rear and force them to pull forces back, allowing the forces in Pusan to break out. They would then become a hammer to smash the enemy on the anvil of the beachhead, wherever it was decided that would be.

Opinions varied as to where the 'anvil' should be landed. MacArthur dismissed most as being too close to Pusan, but became fixated on Inchon (now Incheon). It was in many ways a ridiculous choice. To reach it, a naval force would need to approach along a channel 13 kilometres (eight miles) long and only 1.6 kilometres (one mile) wide, and then land their forces on beaches where the tidal range was around 9.5 metres (31 feet). Expansive mudflats close to land meant that LCTs and other craft could only reach the shore at the very peak of highest monthly tides. Any landing would have to be made by one wave landing at the dawn high tide, and the next wave at the dusk one. The beaches were lined with high sea walls, and high ground overlooked the whole area. An isthmus ran 800 metres (half a mile) out into the sea, leading to a large island called Wolmi Do, with another smaller island, Sowolmi Do beyond it. These encircled most of the harbour area. Militarily, it seemed lunacy, and even MacArthur, who had to argue for the idea against not only his superiors but also most of his own subordinates, only gave it a one in 5,000 chance of success.

However, MacArthur was also a born self-publicist, ever aware of his image and how it could be bolstered by his defeating such odds. In truth, he knew that the operation had several factors in its favour. The sheer unlikeliness of Inchon as a target, for all the above reasons, meant it was thinly defended. It was also only 16 kilometres (ten miles) from Kimpo (now known as Gimpo) Airfield, the largest and best airfield in the country, and as far again beyond that was Seoul. A fast seizure of the airfield would help his forces immensely, while the swift liberation of Seoul would be an incredible boost to morale.

With Inchon decided, MacArthur set about organising the landing - the first major seaborne operation since 1945. Much of the vast amphibious infrastructure that had won the Pacific campaign had been dismantled, but the experienced staff were still there. Landing craft were gathered (including ones sold to Japan as coastal shipping, to replace hulls sunk during the war) and a supporting fleet assembled. Troops were harder to find. The US Marine Corps (USMC) was being downsized almost out of existence, reduced to shipboard contingents instead of expeditionary forces. However, enough were gathered from the US and the forces already in Korea to form the Ist US Marine Division. As in the army, training had suffered, but (also as in the army) the senior NCO and officer ranks contained a core of experienced, battle-hardened men who began to whip their troops into shape. The US 7th Infantry Division was also gathered, and together the two divisions would form the US 10th Corps, under the command of a relatively inexperienced officer who was a protégé of MacArthur.

Over 250 ships and boats of all sizes (nearly all of them American) were gathered, and set course for Inchon. The US 1st Marine Division would make
UN naval power was crucial to the landing’s success. After only a month’s preparation, the fleet entered the channel of Inchon. At 5.45am on 15 September 1950, warships began to bomb the landing beaches and rear areas, while carrier-launched aircraft also joined the fray. The fire focused on the first objective - the island of Wolmi Do. At 6.30am, the morning high tide, 3rd Battalion 5th Marine Regiment (3/5th) landed on Beach Green, on the north-western corner of Wolmi Do near the isthmus to the mainland. Supported by ten tanks, they secured the island and Sowolmi Do by midday. Bombardments of the mainland continued while the fleet waited for the next high tide.

Towards 5pm the shelling intensified. Two Regimental Combat Teams (RCTs - three battalions totalling over 1,000 combat troops plus heavy weapons companies) prepared themselves. At 5.30pm the main landing was made. At Beach Red, on the shorefront of the town of Inchon itself, the 5th Marines RCT (less the 3/5th on Wolmi Do) had to use scaling landings to clamber from their landing craft up over the high sea wall. They advanced rapidly through the harbour and into the city streets, desperate to reach their objectives before dark. A line of high ground - Cemetery Hill, British Consulate Hill and Observatory Hill - were stormed and taken against light resistance, and a line established just over a kilometre inland, about halfway through the initial landings, although one third of it (the 7th Regiment) was still en route, their place being taken by the 1st Korean Marine Corps Regiment. The 7th Division would follow (with the missing Marine regiment) a week behind. During the days before the landings, UN aircraft and ships attacked the defences at Inchon and elsewhere. The controversial leader of the UN forces was a man of strong convictions, with a very chequered track record. Experience, and the courage to make bold decisions.

Little is known about Wan Yong except his name, but he commanded the 1st Air Force Division at Kimpo Airfield. Most DPRK leaders were Chinese-trained and experienced. The DPRK were slow to react and poorly co-ordinated.

The US Marines had a legendary reputation for amphibious warfare, although post-war cuts had left them hollow. Strong ethos and solid core of experienced officers and NCOs. Thrown together units with little training time together.

The Soviet WWII classic with an upgraded 85mm gun. Tough, powerful and robust, resistant to many US anti-tank weapons. Vulnerable to the newest bazookas, and inflexible on the rough terrain.
Inchon town. Behind them, eight LCTs beached themselves, each carrying 500 tons of supplies to keep the Marines fighting until the next high tide.

Further south, on Beach Blue, the 1st Marines RCT landed on the far side of the salt pans and tidal basins, some four kilometres (three miles) from Beach Red. Smoke drifting south from fires in Inchon and a growing fog limited visibility, and units became mixed up both off-shore and after landing, but again resistance was light. MacArthur’s assessment that Inchon would be lightly guarded was correct, with only around 2,000 North Korean troops in the area. Their responses were ill-coordinated and easily dealt with piecemeal, and by dark the US Marines had established two solid, but separated, beachheads, while casualties had been remarkably light. The gamble had worked.

On the following day, the Marines continued their advance, linking their beachheads and pushing on towards Kimpo Airfield. Although garrisoned by around 3,000 troops from the DPRK 107th Security Regiment and 42nd Tank Regiment, resistance was again poorly co-ordinated. By the evening of 17 September Kimpo was secured, and two days later a USMC air group was operating from it. Communist resistance was still limited to local counter-attacks, and on 20 September the 1st Marine Division crossed the River Han, a major obstruction on the way to Seoul. With the US 7th Division and the 7th USMC RCT now landing and coming up into the line, the UN forces began to surround Seoul. DPRK forces amounted to an estimated 33-35,000 troops in the area, but many of these were raw recruits, logistics troops or exhausted combat formations.

On 16 September, the UN forces at Pusan had begun their breakout, finally forcing the Communists into retreat on 22 September. With the hammer of the US 8th Army coming up from the south, the North Korean forces were surrounded and in disarray. On 25 September the attack on Seoul opened, and the following day the 8th Army linked up with 10th Corps. On 27 September, Seoul was officially liberated. The advance now began to push the North Koreans back across the 38th Parallel, which was achieved by the end of the month.

On 15 September 1950 the 1st US Marine Division landed on the shoreline of the city of Inchon itself. Marines have to use scaling ladders to climb from the landing craft onto the top of the sea wall, where only isolated resistance is met. Several pillboxes hold up attacks locally, but these are quickly outflanked and destroyed. The Marines push into the city, towards the high ground at its centre.
Closer ties with France and the Catholic church as well as an end to parliamentary reform as William of Orange is defeated.

**What was happening in the build-up to the Glorious Revolution in 1688?**

The Glorious Revolution was mostly the result of James II coming to power in 1685. The problem with James was that he was a Roman Catholic king in a country that had deep Protestant prejudices and a considerable amount of suspicion to any sorts of Popish prince. All of this came to a head in the summer of 1688 when his wife gave birth to a male heir. Up until the summer of 1688 when his son was born, the heir to the throne had been his daughter, Mary, who was married to William, Prince of Orange, the stadtholder in the Netherlands who was a Protestant champion in Europe and an opponent of Louis XIV. The birth of a son in 1688 meant that the heir was now a male who James would be able to raise as a Catholic and perhaps as somebody with strong views of monarchical power. At that point people began to think what they could do to avoid that situation.

**POPE TO MAKE HISTORIC VISIT TO ENGLAND**

After James II's victory over the treasonous rebels of parliament and the overthrow of the Protestant hegemony that has clouded England for decades, it has been announced that his holiness Pope Innocent XI will be visiting our humble kingdom. This will be the first time that a sitting pope has ever set foot on our shores and marks the beginning of a new age of cooperation and fealty between the English crown and our mother church.
William III led the invasion of England.

James II's short reign lasted from 1685 to 1688.
The ‘What If’ Newspaper

How was James actually deposed?
Leading nobles, aristocrats, bishops, and so on, contacted William asking if he would intervene and he agreed, to secure the rights of his wife to inherit the English throne, and also because he wanted to bring England into the war against Louis XIV that was just beginning in the summer of 1688. William agreed to intervene, assembled an invasion force in the Dutch ports, landed in Devon on 5 November [1688] and advanced towards the capital. James did come out to meet him at Salisbury Plain but seems to have suffered some sort of psychological breakdown and in fact ran off to France rather than facing William’s forces, which allowed the Prince of Orange to occupy London and ultimately, after a constitutional convention, became king in a joint monarchy with his wife.

This is known as the ‘Bloodless Revolution’ owing to the lack of conflict. Was that unusual?
Well it’s only pretty bloodless in England. It has consequences which are quite violent both in Scotland and Ireland because it takes those countries rather longer, months or years, to accept William. I think everybody was astonished that it was bloodless [in England] because there were two very large armies facing each other on Salisbury Plain when William is invading.

What were the major outcomes of the Glorious Revolution?
First of all, the establishment of parliament at the absolute heart of the English constitution. Up to this point parliament had been called rather occasionally for short periods when monarchs felt they needed advice or money or changes in the law, and when they didn’t need any of those things they could rule for long periods quite legitimately without consulting parliament. After the Glorious Revolution, though, William had promised in his manifesto that he would work closely with parliament. He was used to consulting legislative bodies in the Netherlands. So he’s somebody who’s very happy to work with representatives of the people. But, most importantly, parliament is enshrined in the centre of power because William’s great cause is his European war against Louis XIV, and the only way the king can get that sort of money in 17th century England for a long war is if parliament votes for that finance. As a result of that you get a quite dramatic change in the role of parliament within the English Constitution.

Was the birth of his son the key turning point that led to the deposition of James?
I think it had become clear by the summer of 1688, even without the birth of his son, how deeply unpopular James’ policies were. He had also prosecuted seven bishops at the Church of England who had petitioned him against his policy of granting religious toleration to his Catholic subjects. The jury refused to convict them and there were vast celebrations across England when that happened. So I think, although the birth of his son was a key turning point, I think it is clear that a great deal of public opposition had been building to James before that.

What if James had managed to stay in power?
What was absolutely clear is that England would not have fought a war with Louis XIV at that point. And that would have had substantial effects. What happened in the 1690s under William because of the effects of this war is a transition to a parliamentary and modern state England. And I just cannot see that happening if James had been able to hold on in 1668. He would have probably been on the more pro-French side of the great battles of the late 17th century in Europe. He wasn’t necessarily a very close ally of Louis XIV; I think he would’ve probably pursued a policy of benevolent neutrality in Louis XIV’s wars on the continent. He would have kept England out of it. That would have probably trapped England in its rather undeveloped state with a rather smaller set of armed forces, rather smaller influence in Europe than it was to have in the 18th century. The changes under William as a result of this war are what laid the foundation for England’s rise to global pre-eminence in the 18th century.

What would have become of parliament?
Parliament would not have had this opportunity to become that central institution that it did. That has all sorts of political consequences for the sort of state that England would have been, but also possibly economic consequences, as well. There are numbers of people who have argued that the Glorious Revolution
is quite important in the economic development of England and Britain in the 18th century, such as the industrial revolution, these sorts of advances that England made. Those are founded on the Glorious Revolution.

**Would there still have been a Bill of Rights in 1689?**

That is a little bit controversial amongst historians. People have argued about whether this is a significant radical document or not. What it did was to confirm the limitations on royal power that many people in 17th century England before the Glorious Revolution had thought were there. Although it was iconic in many ways and it settled constitutional debates which had been happening in the 17th Century, it didn’t in itself do anything very radical. If you want to understand how the shift in the balance of power between the monarch and parliament happened, it’s not because of the Bill of Rights. It is because of the central role that parliament comes to play under William III with the war and with its role in consenting to the expansion of government and voting the funds for that war.

**Would James staying in power have begun a Catholic dynasty for the Stuarts?**

If he had won, he would certainly have raised his kid as a Catholic and maybe as an absolutist. So, yes, the dynasty would’ve carried on. My problem is I’m not entirely sure how it could have been successful. Before the changes of the 1690s the English state was very, very rudimentary and it absolutely depended on the collaboration and the cooperation of elites in localities. It’s governed by private individuals, members of the gentry and of the city and town elites who give up their time voluntarily to take offices. That actually leaves the English state very, very vulnerable because if these people get annoyed and effectively go on strike, the whole thing collapses. That happened to James II in 1688 in the summer. So James might have won the Battle of Salisbury Plain, but if he was now so unpopular amongst the vital people he had to work with that they’re not working with him, I’m not sure that the military victory would have been worth too much to him. In terms of there being a different Catholic dynasty going on, he would’ve had to have found some other way to build up a central government authority and I’m not sure what resources he had.

**Would a possible Anglo-French alliance have threatened William back home in the Dutch Republic?**

Very much so. The Dutch were vulnerable. One of the consequences of William not becoming king in 1688 is that you would have got a completely different balance of power in Europe. It is quite possible that you would have had the successful implementation of a French hegemony over all of Western and central Europe. And that, I think, would have made for 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries that looked extremely different from what we had. I think the whole course of European history over centuries would have been different.
This upcoming exhibition explores the legend of the golden king and marks the final London appearance of his priceless treasures.

The world was captivated when British explorer Howard Carter and financier Lord Carnarvon unearthed Tutankhamun’s tomb in 1922. Ever since, the young pharaoh’s life and death have been a source of fascination, with two previous exhibitions held in London featuring his tomb of treasures, in 1972 and 2007, drawing over a million visitors each time and displaying some stunning ancient artefacts.

To celebrate the coming 100th year anniversary of this sensational discovery, the Saatchi Gallery in London will have over 150 items on display - the largest collection to ever leave Egypt. Through nine galleries, the exhibition explores the meaning behind the items in the royal tomb and how they prepared the pharaoh for his journey to the afterlife, as well as the tale behind its remarkable discovery.

Visitors will be able to interact with digital content, contextual material, audio and custom soundscapes to really immerse themselves in the life of Tutankhamun. These striking artefacts are travelling around the world before they are permanently returned to Cairo to join Tutankhamun’s full collection at the new Grand Egyptian Museum. This is the last time they will ever be in London so seize this opportunity while you can!
AFTERLIFE AMUSEMENTS

This composite bow is covered in sheet gold and elaborately decorated with glass and calcite inlay. Bows were an important weapon to the ancient Egyptians and Tutankhamun was buried with plenty of them, allowing him to enjoy sport in the netherworld.

FUNCTIONAL FASHION

There is evidence that gloves were used in Egypt from the reign of Tutankhamun’s father, Akhenaten. It is likely that the young king would have worn these tapestry-woven linen gloves during the winter and also to give him better grip while driving a chariot in the desert.

TREASURED KEEPSAKE

This statuette, previously believed to represent Tutankhamun’s grandfather Amenhotep III, is now seen as a depiction of the young pharaoh because of its pierced ears and squatting position, similar to child gods such as Horus. Discovered in a small gilded coffin, the figure was found alongside a lock of hair belonging to Queen Tiye, Tutankhamun’s grandmother.
THE EGYPTIAN SOUL

This pectoral is made of gold and inlaid with glass, designed to mimic turquoise, lapis lazuli and carnelian. The human-headed bird represents the ba, the part of the soul that flies from the body at death. The deceased’s ability to reach the afterlife depended on the ba reuniting with the akh, the physical body, and the ka, the life force.

PROTECTING THE PHARAOH

Two of these life-sized guardian statues stood outside the entrance of Tutankhamun’s burial chamber. With its black skin, golden clothing, mace and staff, the statue represents the pharaoh’s passage from the Netherworld to his resurrection at the dawn of a new day.
ETERNAL SLUMBER

Tutankhamun's tomb contained furnishings associated with daily life, including this ceremonial gilded bed, which was probably made for his funeral. The ancient Egyptians believed that the dead were merely sleeping and the carvings of gods on the bed's headboard provided the pharaoh with protection from dark forces.

HEAVENLY SYMBOLISM

This gilded solar disk was discovered in the southeast corner of the Antechamber behind the chariot. The image on the disk, which includes a depiction of the scarab god Khepri, illustrates Tutankhamun's throne name, Neferneferuaton, while the falcon represents the god Horus who embodies the king.

DIVINE DUTY

This ceremonial shield, travelling outside of Egypt for the first time, depicts Tutankhamun as a sphinx, trampling on Nubian prisoners and driving away his enemies. It symbolises the pharaoh's responsibility as the guarantor of world order, maintaining stability of the universe and preventing disorder.
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BERLINER

Did you know?
Interestingly, the citizens of Berlin choose to call the doughnuts Pfannkuchen, not Berliners.

TRADITIONAL PASTRY AT THE CENTRE OF AN URBAN MYTH GERMANY, 15TH C – PRESENT

During a visit to West Berlin in 1963, President John F Kennedy said “Ich bin ein Berliner” as a show of solidarity with the citizens whose lives had been upended by the Wall. While Kennedy had expressed himself correctly, a misconception arose in the 1980s that he had actually declared “I am a jam-filled doughnut” (Berliner being a type of doughnut) because of a grammatical error, a myth which still persists today.

The earliest known recipe for something resembling a Berliner was found in the German cookbook Küchenmeisterei, published in 1485. While the origins of the name ‘Berliner’ are disputed, the most commonly cited tale involves a baker from Berlin, who was turned down for the Prussian military service in 1756. Allowed to remain as a field baker but with no access to an oven, he took to frying doughnuts over an open fire, with the soldiers naming them ‘Berliners’ after his home.

Did you make it? Let us know!

www.historyanswers.co.uk /AllAboutHistory @AboutHistoryMag

Ingredients
Makes 12 - 14 doughnuts:
— 500g all-purpose flour
— 85g unsalted butter, melted
— 75g granulated sugar & extra for coating
— 6g dry active yeast
— 175ml lukewarm milk
— 2 eggs
— 1 tsp salt
— ½ tsp vanilla extract
— 170g flour
— Vegetable/canola oil for deep frying
— 1 jar of jam or marmalade of your choice

Method

01 In a small bowl, combine the lukewarm milk and melted butter and then stir in the sugar and yeast. Leave to sit for 5-10 minutes until it bubbles, which means that the yeast has activated.
02 Sift the flour into a separate mixing bowl and add the salt, vanilla and eggs. Pour in the milk, butter and yeast once it is ready and then combine to form a sticky dough.
03 With your hands, knead the dough for roughly 5 minutes until it is smooth. Place it in a lightly greased bowl, cover with cling film and leave it to rise in a warm place for around 1 hour until it has doubled in size.
04 On a lightly floured surface, roll the dough until it is 4cm thick. Cut out the rounds of dough using a 7.5cm round cutter and place them on a tray. Cover and allow to rise for another 30 minutes.
05 Fill a large saucepan with the vegetable or canola oil, making sure that it is around 5-7cm deep. Heat the oil over medium heat until it is 190°C and place some paper towels nearby ready for your fried doughnuts. Prepare a bowl with the leftover sugar for coating.
06 Carefully fry 2 or 3 doughnuts at a time until they are golden brown on both sides, around 3-4 minutes on each side. Remove them with a slotted spoon onto the paper and after a few minutes, roll the doughnuts in the bowl of sugar.
07 Using a piping bag with a small or medium tip, fill it with your jam or marmalade. Once the doughnuts have mostly cooled, use the tip (or a toothpick if you have one) and poke a small hole in one side of the doughnut. Pipe in the filling and once you’ve finished, tuck in!
CRUSADE

Fresh from the success of his bestselling 2017 book The Templars, author and broadcaster Dan Jones returns with an ambitious account of the medieval Crusades, which saw Christian kings, knights and pilgrims alike take the cross - often at the beckoning of an eager papacy - to wage war against the Islamic rulers of the Holy Land. These conflicts, the after-effects of which still ripple across the globe today, caused the deaths, wounding and displacement of an incalculable number of people as rulers, warriors and members of religious orders sieged and sacked cities and toppled regimes across the space of hundreds of years, in an ever-changing context of alliances and enmities.

Once the scene is set, the book begins with the First Crusade of the 1090s, urged by Pope Urban II and led by an assortment of western counts and dukes followed by thousands of pilgrims. It was to these armies that Jerusalem fell in 1099. From here, Jones charts the similarly tumultuous events of crusades over the following centuries, where the only constant was violence.

Crusaders excels not only in narrating this complex history in such a readable and immersive manner, but also in setting events in their wider contexts, as Jones describes, crusading was not unique to the Holy Land - Popes sanctioned crusades against Muslim-ruled territories in Spain, and against pagans in the Baltic, and eventually wars between rival Christian princes who sought to extend their power and lands were conducted under the guise of crusading.

The book's pages chronicle both crusades that are well known among general readers and those that are more obscure, from the Third Crusade of the early 1190s, which Richard I of England fought in, and which was launched in response to Jerusalem's fall to the forces of Saladin, sultan of Egypt and Syria, in 1187, to the best part of a decade that Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Hohenstaufen spent at war with the papacy until his death in 1250, with his enemies encouraged to wear crusader crosses as they endeavoured to depose him. An impressively varied cast of people feature in Crusaders as it moves through the centuries, including fascinating women such as Anna Komnene, the author of the Alexiad and daughter of Byzantine emperor Alexios I Komnenos; and Margaret of Beverley, who was caught up in Saladin's siege of Jerusalem while she was in the city on pilgrimage, and helped attempts to defend the city, launching missiles from a slingshot in between fetching water for others.

Narratives of medieval knights in combat and conquest can run the risk of romanticising their actions through efforts to spark further interest from the reader, but Jones's treatment of the source material is measured under the engaging prose.

In Crusaders, Jones has drawn together a compelling work that is weighty in pages but always highly readable, which will no doubt be enjoyed by readers of his previous books and by others enthusiastic about medieval history.
James Bond is famous, and so is his creator Ian Fleming. However, it is the latter’s older brother who takes centre stage in this latest book by Alan Ogden.

Peter Fleming was a noted writer and journalist, married to the actress Celia Johnson. Though while the wider details of Fleming’s life are explored, the primary focus of this account is his military career. From planning ‘stay behind’ guerrilla units in Sussex and Kent in the event an invasion, to running deception operations against Japan, Master Of Deception offers a comprehensive relationship between individuals, departments and the Allied nations.

Fleming’s own words, and the words of his colleagues and contemporaries, fill the pages. And Fleming’s analysis of the process by which intelligence was gathered and utilised - presented in chapter ten - makes for compelling reading. However, these words are also emotive. An extract of a letter from Fleming to his wife, written at the close of the war, is especially poignant.

The text is additionally supported with appendices and a detailed index, making for compelling reading. An extract of a letter from Fleming to his wife, written at the close of the war, is especially poignant.

In chapter ten, the text is additionally supported with appendices and a detailed index, making for compelling reading. An extract of a letter from Fleming to his wife, written at the close of the war, is especially poignant.

The text is additionally supported with appendices and a detailed index, making for compelling reading. An extract of a letter from Fleming to his wife, written at the close of the war, is especially poignant.

The text is additionally supported with appendices and a detailed index, making for compelling reading. An extract of a letter from Fleming to his wife, written at the close of the war, is especially poignant.
From the opening shots of September 1939, to the Balkan campaign up until June 1941, each stage of Nazi Germany’s lightning offensives is beautifully detailed in this new title from historian Robert Kirchubel. With 98 highly detailed graphical maps, readers can follow the physical and strategic challenges faced by commanders on both sides. In the front of the tome, there is also a handy legend of unit symbols, for those less literate in military maps and abbreviations.

“Considering that the time span within the book is so broad, there is something to interest any reader”

RISE AND FALL
A succinct look at some of history’s greatest empires

**Author** Paul Strathern  **Publisher** Hodder & Stoughton  **Price** £16.99  **Released** Out now

"Rise And Fall: A History Of The World In Ten Empires" takes us on a journey through some of the most famous empires to have ever existed, such as the Akkadian Empire and the Ottoman Empire, right up to the modern ‘empires’ of the 20th-century superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States.

Charting the course of 5,000 years of global history and breaking it down into ten digestible chapters is no easy feat, but Paul Strathern manages to do so successfully. It is interesting to discover how these empires operated and what they achieved, but it is arguably more fascinating to learn about their eventual collapse and how this was often triggered by problems that lay within their structures.

Throughout the book, Strathern also explores common threads, including the development of empire-building and the similarities between the different empires, for example, the building of pyramids in places such as Babylon, Egypt, Mexico, China and Mongolia, which helps to make the whole thing feel more cohesive.

Considering that the time span within the book is so broad, there is something to interest any reader or even spark curiosity in a part of history that you have never considered exploring before. For anyone who wants to learn about empires, this book is a great start and provides a nice amount of context. While it is intended to be concise, Strathern has also included a helpful further reading section at the end of each chapter, for those who wish to deepen their knowledge.

GENTLEMEN OF UNCERTAIN FORTUNE
An eye-opening examination of the life of young Georgian men

**Author** Rory Muir  **Publisher** Yale  **Price** £19.99  **Released** Out now

"Gentlemen Of Uncertain Fortune: How Younger Sons Made Their Way In Jane Austen's England" is an in-depth examination of an area that has been somewhat neglected. Though readers are well aware of life for the sort of young ladies who populated Jane Austen’s books, similar attention has rarely been paid to the men of the household. Rory Muir’s book corrects that omission and examines exactly what choices were available to the younger brothers - the spares who came behind the heir.

In his analysis of the professions that were available to these younger brothers, Muir draws on some fascinating stories such as Sydeney Smith, who entered the clergy because his father refused to fund his ambitions to become a barrister. Smith married a wealthy woman, established a school for poor girls and eventually became a noted and influential JP. Of course, Jane Austen’s own brothers make extensive appearances too, alongside William Wordsworth and a host of other names.

Muir’s work serves as a social history too, examining changing roles and opportunities in a world that seemed to be constantly in flux. After all, if a gentleman had to work for his living, could he really be called a gentleman at all?

"Gentlemen Of Uncertain Fortune" is an utterly fascinating book that will be of interest to scholars as well as casual historians. For those with any interest whatever in the complexities of life in Jane Austen’s England, it is as indispensable as it is entertaining.
A forensic and epically detailed examination of Richard Nixon's downfall

Certificate 15 Director Charles Ferguson Cast Carl Bernstein, Bob Woodward, Pat Buchanan, John Dean Released Out now

Charles Ferguson's engrossing history lesson clocks in at a whopping four hours and 21 minutes. Offering a comprehensive exploration of the Watergate scandal, how the most powerful individual in the free world abused his seat of authority and colluded with others to hoodwink the nation, as with Oliver Stone's 1995 biopic of 37th President of the United States Richard Nixon, the mixture of political downfall and psychological portrait appears, by sheer weight and force of the drama, to be America's take on the Shakespearean tragedy. This documentary certainly demands a lot of your time and attention, but with access to surviving members of Nixon's inner circle willing to talk on camera and the crusading journalists who refused to back down, the wealth of candid first-hand accounts proves invaluable.

Ferguson's behemoth draws canny thematic parallels with more contemporary administrations. Nixon went after real and imagined enemies - the press, the Democrats, the CIA, the FBI, remnants of the counterculture - with gusto and venom. Tricky Dicky and his administration partook in exercises we'd recognise today as 'fake news', all done in order to avert attention away from what was really going on, throwing dust in the eyes of onlookers while shifting their forces elsewhere.

Watergate - Or: How We Learned To Stop An Out Of Control President, as a title, undoubtedly serves as a clarion call to remember. George Santanyana's line, "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it," has never felt so relevant (Ferguson ends his film with this very quote). Nixon looks like a great statesman, when placed next to other less politically savvy and trained leaders, but all it takes to deal with corrupt types is moral courage and recognising power is as illusory as it is real.

Incorporating talking-heads interviews, Watergate also peppers in scenes with actors playing Nixon and his goons. It's a clever way of livening up the material with a thriller-style ambience. Dialogue from Oval Office gatherings is delivered verbatim from Nixon's infamous tapes, though edited for conciseness. Yet it's strange the director does not place Nixon's recordings in historical context. It was Franklin Roosevelt who installed audio equipment in the office, for rather benign purposes (so he could take notes from press conferences and meetings). Other presidents continued to secretly record official appointments and phone calls, but it reached an incriminating apotheosis thanks to Nixon, who taped over 15,000 hours-worth of conversations and kept the fact hidden from even his closest associates.

The tapes provide Watergate with eye-popping shock factor and revelations for those who do not know the whole story, as well as raw doses of reality. The recordings blew away any notion Nixon's motives were honourable or misguided in the belief he was doing the right thing. Nixon was a bitter and paranoid bully, a racist and a crook.
THE MESSENER: THE STORY OF JOAN OF ARC


When it comes to accuracy, this lengthy epic is the stuff of nightmares.

01. Towards the beginning of the film, Joan (played by Milla Jovovich) witnesses the murder and the rape of her sister at the hands of English soldiers raiding their village. While her village was attacked in real life, Joan's sister was not murdered.

02. When Joan meets the future King Charles VII (John Malkovich), he decides to test whether she is a real messenger from God by having her virginity examined. This is accurate and Joan was known as the 'Maid of Orleans' due to her virginity.

03. In the movie, Joan appears to be mentally unstable as she descends into screaming and crying, perhaps unhinged by her sister's death. However, whether you believe Joan had visions or not, she was known for her bravery and strength—not hysteria.

04. Joan's conscience (Dustin Hoffman) makes her question her messages from God, leading her to believe that she was motivated to avenge her sister's death. In reality, Joan never wavered from her conviction that she was following God's words.

05. In the end, Joan is burnt at the stake after it is falsely claimed that she used magic to make male clothing appear. In reality, Joan was executed in part for wearing male clothing (not through magic) which she wore to protect herself from molestation.
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