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Princess Soraya (Iran)
Soraya Esfandiary (1932 – 2001) was the second wife and Queen consort of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, the last Shah of Iran.
Soraya Esfandiari Bakhtiari
Parents

Soraya and Bijan Esfandiari Bakhtiari were the children of Khalil Khan Esfandiari-Bakhtiari, and Eva Karl of Germany. Soraya was born in Isfahan on June 22nd, 1932 and Bijan was born 5 years later on 15th of October 1937 also in Isfahan. After the death of their grandfather, Esfandiar Khan (Sardar Asad), Bibi Maryam (Soraya’s grandmother) had sent Khalil to Berlin and her other son, Soltan Morad (later Montazem-Dolleh) to London to study. It appears that the decision to send children to different European countries to study were for political reasons. The family leaders needed to be close to the spheres of influence irrespective of which super-power came on top in any given period.

Khalil Esfandiari

Eva Karl in Berlin
On the trip to Germany, a stepbrother, Hormoz Khan, accompanied Khalil. They arrived in Berlin in autumn of 1924 and were immediately drawn to it. Most of Khalil Khan’s time in Berlin was spent however in pursuit of beautiful blonds with whom he had great success due to his looks and his aristocratic Eastern background. He was only 21 and a student of political science when he met and fell in love with 16 year old Eva Karl, daughter of Franz Karl who had been living in Czarist Russia for some years representing German manufacturers and had returned to Germany at about the same time as the beginning of the First World War. Franz Karl had three children; Eva, Barbara, and Franz. After one-year courtship, Khalil and Eva were married on the 22nd June 1926 and moved to Isfahan 2 years later.

Moving to Isfahan

Isfahan was the birthplace of Khalil khan and most of his family still lived there so he was no stranger to the city. Isfahan had a large German community and was also known to be the center of influence of German agents like Meyr and Wassmuss who had sought and secured the protection of some of the Bakhtiaris and had plotted subversive actions against the British interests especially in and around the oil installations. In such surroundings, Khalil and Eva were both comfortable and felt secure and far away from the troubles of Europe. They began building a beautifully designed house complete with an orchard.
On the 22nd of June 1932 Soraya was born in the English Missionary Hospital in Isfahan. A beautiful girl with blue/green eyes. In the Persian tradition, it is usually believed that the first-born should be a boy. It would win admiration to the mother and does honour to the father. But in the Esfandiary household such customs were not of great importance and birth of a healthy child was always a good omen for an enlightened couple especially when the child was born on the 6th wedding anniversary of her parents.

Back to Germany
Soon after Soraya was born, Khalil Khan and Eva decided that the child and Eva should go back to Germany to ensure that the baby would have good health care and return
when she was stronger. Khalil told his wife that he could not leave Iran at that time but Eva should take the child with her to Germany and that he would follow as soon as he could. So mother and daughter left Isfahan for Germany when Soraya was only 8 months old and considered fit to be taken on such a long journey. The trip took them to the Caspian Sea to the port of Enzeli, by boat to Baku, and then train to Berlin where they stayed with Eva’s parents.

Meanwhile the situation in Iran was getting very unhealthy for the Bakhtiaris as the new Shah began persecuting, imprisoning, and executing their leaders. The Shah had decided that the Bakhtiaris had to be crushed for several reasons. Their semi-autonomy was troubling to the central government and their agreement with the British over the protection of oil pipelines and shares in the oil profits were not in line with the new policies of the Shah in terms of consolidation of the shareholdings of the Anglo Iranian Oil. The Bakhtiaris were ordered to surrender their Arms to the representatives of the Government and the Khans were forced to sell or relinquish their shares in the oil companies. Bakhtiaris were also rounded up for conscription duties away from their territory. The strange bed-fellowship of the British and the Bakhtiaris was especially troubling to Reza Shah as he had become a great admirer of the Germans and had closed his eyes to the activities of the German agents in the country. He was convinced in his heart that the Axis powers would be victorious in the War. A belief that would eventually cost him his throne. An uprising by a small faction in the Bakhttiari territory gave the Shah the excuse to arrest the Khans and sentence some to death and others to
varying prison terms. Khalil khan felt it was time to be away from Iran for a while and decided to join his wife and daughter in Berlin; so it was after a 6 months separation that the young family was united again. The family rented a 4 room apartment in Nestorstrasse and Khalil khan registered with the police, much against his will, as a “farmer” because his family owned land and farms in Persia. His own claim to be registered as a Khan was brushed aside as there was no such “profession” in Germany!

Life in Berlin

During the family’s stay in Berlin, Soraya or ‘Raya as she was called, became inseparable from her grand father Franz Karl. He would come and fetch her every Sunday to take her to the zoo and go for walks. Franz Karl recalled that she was choosy and would not play with everyone. She would scrutinize especially the boys most carefully and it wasn’t long before she was ordering even the biggest and oldest ones about. He remembers that Soraya was quite fearless at that young age and gives an example “I remember a walk through the Grunwald, when a huge black dog pursued us. His wild looks and violent barking quite frightened me, but Soraya ran towards him and put her arms round his neck. I was terrified. There was no need to be. The dog and the little girl became friends immediately”. From her childhood Soraya had a great love for animals. In her home in Berlin she looked after a yellow canary and a mischievous black-and-white fox terrier. A new world had opened up for Soraya in Berlin. She always remembered and recalled her first children’s party outside of Berlin near one of the many lakes. There were a lottery, shooting gallery, sack racing and egg-and-spoon racing. There was also a little open-air theatre where she played the part of the Sleeping Beauty. Her part consisted solely in being awakened from her hundred-years sleep by the young prince’s kiss, an experience that even at that age she found extremely pleasant!

The stay in Berlin was uneventful and Khalil khan was constantly thinking of returning to Iran and waiting for the political climate for the Bakhtiaris to become tolerable. Nineteen thirty-six and thirty-seven were tough years for the young Esfandiary family. Hitler had announced general conscription and from him and Marshall Goring the talk was now of war.
Khalil khan was beginning to become aware of the political situation in Europe, which he had so far ignored. Now it suddenly affected him personally. It was becoming more difficult to get all the money he needed out of Persia and the family were headed for financial crisis for the first time and the likelihood of him being drafted into the Armed Forces was becoming real. So it was in the autumn of 1937 with Eva pregnant that they decided once more to leave Berlin and return to Isfahan. Tearfully, little Soraya said goodbye to her grandfather and her friends and her toys were given to a church.

After an arduously long journey, they reached Isfahan. This time however, they were not particularly welcomed and the parents were immediately put under supervision by the authorities and could not leave town without the permission of the police. This was due to the order of the king that all Bakhtiari movements be watched and reported. Apart from this inconvenience, they were left in peace. By the time of their arrival, the house in Isfahan was nearly ready for occupation and it was a short time later that Eva gave birth to a beautiful boy, Bijan, on the 15th of October 1937. Soraya was now a lovely little 5 year old when her brother Bijan was born. Bijan was chubby, blond and full of life. The family started working on the house to complete it and especially on the
gardens by planting more fruit trees and building a small round pond for dipping in
during the hot days of summer.

The design of the house was a mixture of both Persian and European. It was a
comfortable home for the young family and their German Sheppard dog and a
greyhound. It was equipped with wood-burning fireplaces and stoves. It also had bath
with running hot and cold water, which was a luxury in those days. Soraya attended the
German school in Isfahan run by a Mrs. Mentel and spent much time with the children of
other German families her own age.
The traditional Persian studies however were not ignored and a teacher would come to the house to teach both kids the school syllabus in Farsi. The German school remained open until June 1941 when the Allied forces closed it down and expelled the German citizens. Frauline Mentel however remained in Iran and continued her teachings in private at her modest home. It was in 1944 that the children began their schooling at the English Missionary School in Isfahan and continued until their departure for Europe in 1947. Whenever they could, the young family would spend time in the village of Ghahfe-rokh and stayed at Esfandiar Khan’s fort, play in the surrounding forest and fishing and swimming in the stream. They would also ride on horseback and Khalil khan would do some game hunting. Soraya was a pretty good rider but Bijan would get on a horse reluctantly.
Soraya, Eva, Bijan in Isfahan 1940

Soraya and Bijan at Esfandiar Rokh 1942
The Shah asks Soraya’s hand in marriage

When the 2nd World War ended, Eva who was longing to return to Europe after 10 years in Isfahan persuaded Khalil Khan that it was time to return. They moved to Switzerland in 1947 and rented an apartment in Zurich. Soraya was sent to “La Printaniere” in Montreux, a finishing school to polish up her French. A year later she was transferred to “Les Roseaux” near Lausanne, another finishing school. She became fluent in French.
and learned some English. To improve her English, it was arranged that she would spend the summer of 1950 in England. Some of her 2nd cousins also lived in London. Two of whom, Goudarz, a keen amateur photographer, and Malekshah were staying at a boarding house near St. James’s Park with Bibi Shoakat, Goudarz’s mother and attending a language school. Soraya was also enrolled in the same school and moved in with her cousins and Bibi Shoakat in order to enjoy the protection and supervision of these family members.

In Switzerland

At this time, the Shah after having divorced his first wife, Princess Fauzieh of Egypt, was looking for a wife and many candidates were being introduced to him either in person or through photographs. One day, the Queen Mother (Taj-ol-Moluk) asked her close friend and confidant Forough Zafar Bakhtiari, daughter of Sardar Zafar, that surely she could find a suitable bride for the Shah amongst the vast Bakhtiari family. Forough Zafar began her search and remembered that one of her nieces, Ghamar Ahmadi who had just returned from a trip to Europe, had mentioned that while in Switzerland, she was invited to Khalil Khan Esfandiari’s apartment and had met his daughter Soraya whom she found to be a very beautiful, well educated, and spoke several languages. Ghamar Ahmadi also added that Soraya was now studying in England to polish up her
English. When Forough Zafar mentioned Soraya to the Queen Mother, the Queen asked to see some photographs. Forough Zafar contacted Goodarz, in London and asked him to take some photos of Soraya and send them to her in Tehran as soon as possible. As it was just after the World War II, mail was not very fast or efficient so it took a while for the photos to arrive. Meanwhile, before the arrival of the photos, Princess Shams was traveling to London to see and interview two other candidates for the Shah. Forough Zafar asked the Princess, “while in London, perhaps you could also arrange to meet Soraya Esfandiari by inviting my nephew Malekhah. I will make sure he brings Soraya along with him so you could meet her personally”. The meeting took place at the Princess’s private suites and she was so impressed by Soraya’s beauty and personality that she dispatched an urgent message to the Queen Mother telling her that “Having met Forough Zafar’s cousin, I don’t need to see any other girl. This woman is born to be a Queen. She is beautiful, very well educated, and has excellent mannerism”. At this time the photographs from London also reached Forough Zafar who immediately took them to the Queen Mother who in turn passed them on to the young Shah. The Shah looked at the photographs and listened to the description that Princess Shams had given of her, and expressed his desire that they should meet. Message was sent to Princess Shams to bring Soraya to Tehran with her.
Soraya writes in her memoirs, “Le Palais de Solitudes” that “when Malekshah asked me to go to the reception with him, at first I was reluctant to meet any of the Pahlavi family because of what they had done to the Bakhtiaris but I had heard that Princess Shams was a nice and attractive women so my curiosity got the better of me”. Princess Shams and Soraya went to Paris from London to do some shopping at the fashion houses of Dior and Channel. Upon hearing the news of Soraya’s impending trip to Tehran, Forough Zafar wrote to Khalil Khan telling him what was happening and suggested that he should join the Princess and Soraya in Paris. The Princess and Soraya flew from Paris to Rome where they were joined by Khalil Khan and then on to Tehran. Coincidentally, Amir Jang was also traveling to Tehran on the same flight but unaware of what was happening. It was with a full wardrobe of the latest Parisian fashion that they arrived in Tehran. Soraya was pretty much exhausted after the long trip and wanted to rest but the Queen Mother and the Shah were so curious to see her as soon as possible that she was
summoned to the Queen Mother’s palace for a small dinner the same evening. The Royal family received her warmly and for a quarter of an hour, they exchanged small talk followed by the usual Persian custom of enquiring after her health and the health of her relatives! They all awaited the arrival of the Shah.

Princess Shams had told Soraya that her brother was not particularly handsome in order not to raise her expectations. At last someone announced the arrival of His Majesty the Shah. They all got to their feet and the Shah appeared in the dress uniform of a general of the Iranian Air Force which was evidently his favourite uniform. He embraced his mother and then Soraya was presented to him. The two were drawn to one another instantly and sparks began to fly. At the dinner table, Soraya sat next to the Shah and talked about Switzerland and the country around Montreux and Lausanne and her likes and dislikes. After dinner they played games and the family became more relaxed. Late that evening Soraya left to get some sleep but at 2 in the morning the Shah telephoned and asked to speak to Khalil Khan. When Khalil Khan came to the phone, the Shah told him that he is asking for Soraya’s hand and he wants to know how she felt about it. Soraya’s answer was of course yes as she too was smitten by the young handsome Shah. Next morning, the imperial Court informed the news media and Soraya’s photographs were distributed amongst the newspapers. The next day the Shah came to visit Soraya who was staying at Amir Hossein Khan Zafar’s villa, and began courting her. It was towards the end of that year on the 11th of October 1950, that they were officially engaged.

In the ensuing weeks, the Shah and his fiancée saw one another almost daily and with each meeting, they grew more intimate. They went riding in the foothills of Shemiran, played tennis, and went flying with the Shah at the controls. In the evenings the Shah’s sisters and brothers gave small parties for the couple that were lots of fun. They also inspected several of the Royal palaces in and around Tehran for their future residence. Soraya eventually chose one modest and small palace on Pasteur Ave as their future residence and decorators were hired to do the necessary work. The couple also set a date of December 26th as their wedding day. At this time, Soraya suddenly fell ill with typhoid and as her fever did not abate, the wedding was postponed.

The wedding Soraya recovered sufficiently for the wedding to take place on the date they had set in February although still very weak and shaky. On the 12th of February 1951 the couple were married. The wedding ceremony took place at the famed Hall of Mirrors at the Golestan Palace amidst much pomp and circumstance. The wedding guests numbered
1,600 according to some news reports. The bride wore a beautifully crafted wedding dress by Christian Dior consisting of 37 yards of silver lame with 20,000 feathers and 6,000 diamond pieces sewn on. Soraya was still very weak from her recent fight with Typhoid and was shivering in the cold that February night. The Shah draped a beautiful Dior mink jacket around her shoulders, which added to her difficulty in walking under such heavy load of the jacket and the dress with the long train. The Shah and Dr. Ayadi came up with a solution. A skillful lady-in-waiting was summoned with a pair of scissors who cut off yards of the petticoat and the trail without her having to take off the wedding gown.

In Rome
Shah and Soraya lived very happily and very much in love for the next two years without much event until the relationship between the King and the popularly elected and nationalistic Prime Minister, Dr. Mossadegh came to a head. The events that led to the events of 1953 have been well documented and many of the details have now been written about and no need to go through them in this article. It should however be mentioned that the Shah, the British, and the US had agreed that Mossadegh ought to be dismissed from his post and the Shah subsequently ordered his dismissal and remained in his residence by the Caspian awaiting news of Dr. Mossadegh’s reaction. First reports were not good and he decided to leave Iran with Soraya and his personal pilot. After a brief stop in Baghdad, the Royal couple arrived in Rome with mush anxiety and not sure of the next phase of their lives. The Shah and Soraya stayed at the Hotel Excelsior in Rome. The media was having a field day and one interview after another was being given. Soraya is well remembered in her dotted strapless dress and her large sunglasses. The Shah and Queen Soraya were staying in their suite most of the time with
ears pinned to the short wave radio tuned to Radio Tehran. What they heard on the radio was not encouraging and the Shah was getting desperate and losing his nerve. The young couple discussed their next move and the Shah turned to Soraya and said: “We shall have to economize, for I am sorry to say that I don’t have much money; enough perhaps to buy us a farm somewhere”. Soraya then asked where would they go and to her horror he replied: “probably America. My mother and my sister Shams are already there and I hope my brothers may be able to follow us. We could then all live together in order to live economically”. The Shah’s capital at that time consisted of the estate that his father had left him and the Shah’s allowance of $750,000 per annum out of which he had to meet all the expenses of the Court as well as providing for his family dependents.

In consequence he had been unable to put much aside.7
News of the Coup
It was two o’clock in the afternoon of 19th August 1953. The Shah and Soraya had just returned from a shopping spree and were having lunch at the hotel’s dining room when
a young reporter from Associated Press came to their table and triumphantly handed them a Teletype message. It read: “MOSSADEGH OVERTHROWN-IMERAL TROOPS CONTROL TEHRAN-ZAHEDI PREMIER”. The news had just come over the Teletype and while they continued with their lunch, the AP reporter hastened back and forth between his office and the hotel bringing them the latest breaking news and developments. Soraya was calm but the Shah had turned so pale that Soraya feared he might faint. The Shah and Soraya embraced and rushed downstairs where all the media had gathered. As the royal couple reached the lobby, the hotel manager rushed forward and handed the Shah a telegram, which had just arrived. The telegram read: “Your Majesty, the people of Iran have risen. We are all awaiting Your Imperial couple’s safe and speedy return to the capital” the telegram was signed: “General Zahedi, Prime Minister”. The CIA and the British Intelligence Services had pulled off the coup successfully the Shah returned to Tehran on the 21st August 1953 to a heart warming welcome. Soraya also returned shortly after.

Soraya liked having some of her family members around her at the Court. Rostam Amir Bakhtiar became her Private Secretary and Malekshah Zafar, Ghobad Zafar, Majid
Bakhtiar, Salar Bakhtiar and Jamshid Bakhtiar became frequent visitors to the Court and were nightly partners of the Shah in games of Poker and Bridge. General Teymour Bakhtiar, a distance cousin of Soraya, a brave and charismatic commander of an Armoured Brigade who had moved towards Tehran at the head of his brigade to back the Royalists, was rewarded and became the Military Governor of Tehran. He later became the most powerful man in Iran as the head of the newly formed Internal Security, SAVAK. The quiet days of marriage followed. The Royal couple were constantly together and they had time to travel. Amongst the trips were the state visit to Russia in 1956 to meet Mr. Khrushchev; other visits took them to India, the United States, Britain, Turkey, Spain, and Lebanon. These journeys also provided a sort of delayed honeymoon for the couple. Back in Tehran, Soraya busied herself with renovating and fixing up their residential palaces and attending to charity organizations formed under her patronage. “Queen Soraya Pahlavi Charity” was the principal charity of her patronage, which was formed and managed efficiently by Forough Zafar.

Meanwhile, the Shah had appointed Soraya’s father ambassador to Germany, a post he cherished even though he did not involve himself with the duties of an ambassador. He left that to the Minister and other Foreign Office professionals posted to the embassy.

The Divorce

When in 1949 an attempt was made upon the Shah’s life from which he escaped with only minor injuries, his advisers urged him to consider an heir for the sake of continuity of the monarchy. In many instances in other monarchies of the world, a brother or an uncle would be appointed as heir until a direct heir was born but the Shah always resisted such suggestion. He did however consider for a while, appointing Prince Ali Reza as his heir but when he died in an air crash, this subject became more troubling. With the political situation in Iran becoming quiet and more stable, the question of succession became a topic of everyday conversation and concern between the Soraya and the Shah. Soraya had been to every known specialist in the world to find a cure for her sterility but of no avail. Even during their December 1954 visit to the U.S. Soraya was seen by the best but the news was not encouraging. One doctor had suggested a very risky operation with a minimum chance of success but maximum risk, which the couple did not accept. One day in July 1957 the couple went for a long walk in the Palace grounds. The Shah talked about the dynasty’s survival and brought up the heir issue and the fact that they would soon have to make a decision no matter how painful. They talked about alternatives like the Shah taking a second wife and perhaps changing the constitution to allow one of his half brothers to become king after him. They couldn’t agree on any of these alternatives and found each one unacceptable. They
finally decided with tears in their eyes and with very heavy hearts, to separate. Before departure for Europe, Soraya burnt all her personal papers; packed her souvenirs and gifts she had received, and left Tehran on the 14th of February 1958 never to see her beloved country again. Soraya settled in the Shah’s Saint-Moritz villa for a while and during her stay, the Shah would call her every day, and then he decided to stop. From Switzerland she went home to stay with her parents in Germany for a while. Amir Jang, the elder of the family and a Senator was dispatched to see Soraya in order to try and persuade her to agree to the Shah taking a second wife but she refused. General Yazdanpanah accompanied by his wife and General Dr. Ayadi also traveled to Germany on two occasions to persuade Soraya to return. Eva received them but Soraya refused even to meet with them. The Shah and Soraya divorced on the 14th March 1958 after 7 years of marriage. They had already said their sad tearful good byes in private. Their love for one another remained until the end. Soraya began her grief in private and in dignity like a true Bakhtiari.

Soraya’s years away from Iran
The Shah had been intent on providing a life of comfort and dignity for his ex-Queen. He had settled a sum of money on her in addition to having made several settlements in her favor during the course of their marriage in the form of money as well as land and securities. Soraya under advise from her father, had invested well so at the time of the divorce, she had a modest fortune that together with the Shah’s final settlement would be enough to enable her to live in comfort. The shah also issued a special decree and bestowed upon Soraya the title of Imperial Princess for life accompanied by a diplomatic passport. She therefore became by rank, equal to Shah’s sisters and the Persian Embassies had to continue treating her as a member of the Royal family. Furthermore, in the European society, she took precedence over many members of the highest nobility. She enjoyed the diplomatic passport and the privileges that came with it until the 1979 Iranian revolution when King Hassan of Morocco ordered that a Moroccan diplomatic passport be issued to her. Eventually, she became a German citizen just a few years before her death.

Soraya lived in Rome for a while heart broken and a recluse. She rented a pretty villa located among vineyards, thirty minutes from Rome. Her old friends would come and keep her company but on the whole she lived quietly and slowly began to enjoy her new life but her restless soul could not settle down. Soon, she became restless and during the summer months when Rome became too hot, she traveled to Northern Europe and stayed in Cologne for a while with her mother with whom she felt secure. The period of sadness and aimless life seemed to have no end for her. Now alone and without any aids or protection of the Imperial court, she had to do everything herself, and even harder still was that she now had to learn how to
live the life of an ordinary citizen again. She was alone, frightened, and uncertain of her future. Her only security and comfort was in her immediate family. She began traveling extensively.

She moved from Rome to Cologne, to Munich, to Paris, to Rome to Monaco and eventually ended up in Rome again. She was allured by the movie industry as it had always been her dream to one day become a movie star. She met Dino de Laurentis at a party one evening in Rome. Dino offered her a role in a movie he was making. Soraya readily accepted. The movie’s title was “Three faces of a woman” and Mauro Bolognini, Michelangelo Antonioni and Franco Indovina directed it. The movie was a disaster. The rumor has it that when the Shah heard that Soraya was to appear in a movie, he was so infuriated that the whole world would now his ex-wife in romantic scenes that he ordered all the copies be bought and destroyed. Soraya kept one copy, which was eventually sold at the auction of her estate in Paris in May of 2002 together with all her personal effects.

Princess Soraya fell under the spell of Franco Indovina and found comfort in his expressions of love. A passionate love affair began to flourish between the two but the future was uncertain. Franco was married and had two children. Indovina told her that
he would divorce his wife and they would have a life together. Soraya left for Munich and came back 6 months later to join Franco who had just separated from his wife. The couple had a blissful 5 years of life together filled with love and happiness until that fateful day on the 4th of May 1972 when Franco’s plane crashed in Sicily and he was tragically killed.

With Indovina at the movie set

This second blow to her life and the tragedy of losing her loved one in such manner drove her at first into a period of total solitude. It took her several months to come out of the state of grief and moved to Paris where she was welcomed and embraced by the High Society of the European nobility most of whom found it a privilege to have the ex-Empress of Iran on their guest list. She also spent much time in her villa in Marbella, Spain. During this period of exile, Khalil Khan kept in touch with General Dr. Ayadi and Assadollah Alam in Tehran. Ayadi was the Shah’s personal physician and a great admirer of Queen Soraya. Through Dr. Ayadi, the Shah was also kept up to date with news of Soraya and her well being. Khalil khan would use this conduit to ask for financial assistance for Soraya every now and again. Soraya would also write to the Shah through Mr. Alam asking for financial assistance. For example, she wrote to Alam in 1976 asking the Shah to purchase for her an apartment she had seen in Avenue Montaign of Paris. Mr. Alam was instructed to act immediately and arrange the purchase. On another occasion in 1973, Soraya wrote to the Shah through the office
of Alam saying that due to the collapse of the share prices in the stock market, her income and standard of living had greatly suffered. The Shah ordered Alam to make the necessary arrangements to transfer money to her account.13

Soraya’s Death
Soraya continued her life in Paris and spent her summers at her Villa Maryam (named after her grandmother) in Marbella, Spain. She moved in the high society circles and spent her time with a select few friends. The sad end came at 2 PM Thursday 25th of October 2001. She was only 69. Her maid found her dead on the floor of her bedroom in her apartment at 46 Ave Montaign. Apparently a massive brain hemorrhage was the cause of Soraya’s death. The service at the American Church in Paris, a close walking distance from Soraya’s apartment was arranged for the 7th of November 2001 and her brother Bijan along with other family members and Paris dignitaries were to attend the services. Bijan, aided by a companion, traveled by car from Koln a few days earlier. Sadly while staying at Hotel George V in Paris, Bijan died suddenly before he could attend the funeral of his sister.

With her brother Bijan in later years

On the day of the service, “Cathedrale Americaine de la Sainte Trinite” in Avenue
George V filled up with approximately 400 friends, family and dignitaries including Count of Paris Henri d’Orleans, Prince Gholam Reza Pahlavi and his wife, Beatrix de Hohenlohe, Rixa de Oldenburg, Anne de Bourbon, some members of the Bakhtiari family and her friends. Outside the Cathedral, a large crowd of camera teams and photographers from all over the world had gathered looking for prominent faces. The memorial service began at 3 PM when the coffin was brought in draped in blue silk and adorned with a single rose carried by 6 pallbearers.

Canon Sharon Gracen gave the sermon. During her sermon, she recited some of Rumi’s writings; she was followed by some kind words and remembrance by the ex-ambassador of France to Iran, Francis Dore, followed by Alexandre de Villiers who had once been commissioned by Queen Farah to write a book about Iran and the Imperial family. A distinguished former cabinet minister of Iran, Dr. Majid Majidi spoke on behalf of the Iranian exiles in France and expressed his condolences to the Bakhtiari family for their loss. Iranian soprano, Darya Dadvar delivered a beautiful Ava Maria by Franz Schubert to the music of the organist. The body was taken to Germany on Friday 16th of November and buried in her family tomb in the cemetery of Westfriedhof, Munich.

As a young girl, Soraya had pictures of some movie stars framed, in addition to a photo of the young Shah. She would tell all her friends and cousins that one day she will either become an actress or marry the king. Both aspirations became realities but none brought her lasting happiness.
Soraya Esfandiari Bakhtiari

Orangtua


Khalil Esfandiari
Eva Karl di Berlin

Esfandiar Khan, kakek dari pihak ayah
Bibi Maryam, nenek dari pihak ayah


Pindah ke Isfahan

Isfahan adalah tempat kelahiran Khalil khan dan sebagian besar keluarganya masih tinggal di sana sehingga ia tidak asing dengan kota. Isfahan memiliki komunitas besar dan Jerman juga dikenal sebagai pusat pengaruh agen Jerman seperti Meyr dan

Soraya


Kembali ke Jerman

Segera setelah Soraya lahir, Khalil Khan dan Eva memutuskan bahwa anak dan Eva harus kembali ke Jerman untuk memastikan bahwa bayi akan memiliki kesehatan yang baik dan kembali ketika dia masih kuat. Khalil mengatakan kepada istrinya bahwa ia tidak bisa meninggalkan Iran pada waktu itu tetapi Eva harus membawa anak bersamanya ke Jerman dan bahwa ia akan mengikuti sesegera mungkin. Jadi ibu dan anak meninggalkan Isfahan untuk Jerman saat Soraya hanya 8 bulan dan dianggap cocok untuk dibawa pada suatu perjalanan panjang. Perjalanan membawa mereka ke Laut Kaspi ke pelabuhan Enzeli, dengan perahu ke Baku, dan kemudian melatih ke Berlin di mana mereka tinggal dengan orang tua Eva.

Kakek-nenek Jerman Soraya, Mr & Mrs Karl

Soraya usia 5

Sementara itu situasi di Iran menjadi sangat tidak sehat bagi Bakhtiaris sebagai Shah baru mulai menganiaya, memenjarakan, dan mengeksekusi para pemimpin mereka. Shah telah memutuskan bahwa Bakhtiaris harus dihancurkan karena beberapa alasan. Semi-otonomi mereka mengganggu kepada pemerintah pusat dan perjanjian mereka dengan Inggris atas perlindungan jaringan pipa minyak dan saham dalam keuntungan minyak tidak sejalan dengan kebijakan baru Shah dalam hal konsolidasi kepemilikan saham dari Iran Anglo minyak. Bakhtiaris diperintahkan untuk menyerah Senjata kepada perwakilan Pemerintah dan para Khan dipaksa untuk menjual atau melepaskan saham mereka di perusahaan minyak. Bakhtiaris juga ditangkap karena tugas wajib
militer jauh dari wilayah mereka. Tempat tidur persekutuan-anek dari Inggris dan Bakhtiaris itu terutama mengganggu ke Reza Syah saat ia telah menjadi pengagum besar dari Jerman dan telah menutup matanya untuk kegiatan agen Jerman di negara ini. Dia yakin dalam hatinya bahwa kekuatan Poros akan menang dalam perang. Sebuah keyakinan yang akhirnya akan membuatnya kehilangan tahtanya.

Pemberontakan oleh sebuah faksi kecil di wilayah Bakhtiari memberi Shah alasan untuk menangkap para Khan dan kalimat beberapa mati dan orang lain untuk berbagai penjara.

Khalil khan merasa sudah waktunya untuk pergi dari Iran untuk sementara waktu dan memutuskan untuk bergabung dengan istrinya dan anak perempuannya di Berlin; jadi setelah pemisahan 6 bulan bahwa keluarga muda itu bersatu lagi. Keluarga itu menyewa sebuah apartemen 4 kamar di Nestorstrasse dan Khalil khan terdaftar dengan polisi, banyak bertentangan dengan keinginannya, sebagai “petani” karena keluarganya memiliki tanah dan peternakan di Persia. Klaim-Nya sendiri untuk didaftarkan sebagai Khan menepis karena tidak ada “profesi” seperti di Jerman!

Hidup di Berlin


Tinggal di Berlin adalah lancar dan Khalil khan terus-menerus berpikir untuk kembali
ke Iran dan menunggu iklim politik untuk Bakhtiaris menjadi lumayan. Sembilan belas tiga puluh enam dan tiga puluh tujuh adalah tahun berat bagi keluarga Esfandiary muda. Hitler mengumumkan wajib militer umum dan dari dia dan Marshall Goring bicara itu sekarang perang.

Soraya dan teman di Berlin Zoo

Kembali ke Isfahan


Rumah di Isfahan

Desain rumah itu campurannya Persia dan Eropa. Itu adalah rumah yang nyaman bagi keluarga muda dan anjing Jerman mereka Sheppard dan greyhound. Ia dilengkapi dengan pembakaran kayu perapian dan kompor. Hal ini juga harus mandi dengan air panas dan dingin, yang merupakan kemewahan pada masa itu. Soraya menghadiri sekolah Jerman menjelang Isfahan oleh Mentel Ibu dan menghabiskan
banyak waktu dengan anak-anak dari keluarga Jerman lainnya sebayanya.


Soraya, Eva, Bijan di Isfahan 1940
Soraya dan Bijan di Esfandiar Khan di Fort Ghahfe-Rokh 1942

Isfahan 1947

Shah meminta tangan Soraya dalam pernikahan

Pada saat ini, Syah setelah menceraikan istrinya Putri Fauzieh Mesir, sedang mencari seorang istri dan calon banyak yang diperkenalkan kepada ia baik secara langsung atau melalui foto.


Forough Zafar


**Pernikahan**


**Di Roma**

Shah dan Soraya hidup sangat bahagia dan sangat mencintai selama dua tahun berikutnya tanpa acara banyak sampai hubungan antara Raja dan dipilih secara populer dan Perdana Menteri nasionalistik, Dr Mossadegh datang ke kepala. Peristiwa yang menyebabkan peristiwa tahun 1953 telah didokumentasikan dengan baik dan banyak rincian kini telah ditulis tentang dan tidak perlu pergi melalui mereka dalam artikel ini. Namun itu harus disebutkan bahwa Syah, Inggris, dan Amerika Serikat telah sepakat bahwa Mossadegh harus diberhentikan dari jabatannya dan Shah kemudian memerintahkan pemecatannya dan tetap di kediamannya oleh berita Kaspia menunggu...


Di pengasingan di Roma

Berita tentang kudeta


Sementara itu, Shah telah menunjuk duta besar ayah Soraya ke Jerman, sebuah pos ia dihargai meskipun ia tidak melibatkan diri dengan tugas-tugas seorang duta besar. Ia meninggalkan kepada Menteri dan para profesional Office lainnya Luar Negeri diposting ke kedutaan.

Perceraian ini
Ketika pada tahun 1949 upaya yang dilakukan pada kehidupan Syah dari mana ia melarikan diri dengan hanya luka ringan, penasihatnya mendesak dia untuk mempertimbangkan ahli waris demi kelangsungan monarki. Dalam banyak kasus di kerajaan-kerajaan lain di dunia, saudara atau paman akan diangkat sebagai ahli waris sampai ahli waris langsung lahir tapi Shah selalu menolak saran tersebut. Namun ia tidak menganggap untuk sementara waktu, menunjuk Pangeran Ali Reza sebagai ahli warisnya tetapi ketika ia meninggal dalam kecelakaan udara, hal ini menjadi lebih


Tahun Soraya dari Iran

Shah telah bertekad menyediakan kehidupan yang nyaman dan martabat bagi mantan Ratu-nya. Dia telah menetap sejumlah uang pada dirinya selain telah membuat beberapa pemukiman yang mendukung dia selama pernikahan mereka dalam bentuk uang serta tanah dan surat berharga. Soraya bawah menyarankan dari ayahnya, telah diinvestasikan baik sehingga pada saat perceraian, ia memiliki keberuntungan sederhana yang bersama-sama dengan penyelesaian akhir Syah akan cukup untuk...
memungkinkan dia untuk hidup dengan nyaman. Syah juga mengeluarkan keputusan khusus dan diberikan kepada Soraya judul Imperial Putri untuk hidup disertai dengan paspor diplomatik. Dia karena itu menjadi oleh pangkat, sama dengan saudara Shah dan Kedutaan Persia harus terus memperlakukan dia sebagai anggota keluarga kerajaan. Selanjutnya, dalam masyarakat Eropa, ia mengambil diutamakan daripada banyak anggota bangsawan tertinggi. Dia menikmati paspor diplomatik dan hak istimewa yang datang dengan itu sampai revolusi Iran tahun 1979 ketika Raja Hassan dari Maroko memerintahkan paspor diplomatik Maroko dikeluarkan padanya.

Akhirnya, ia menjadi warga negara Jerman hanya beberapa tahun sebelum kematianya.


Dengan Indovina di set film

Ini pukulan kedua untuk hidup dan tragedi kehilangan dia dintai dengan cara tersebut mengantarnya pada awalnya menjadi sebuah periode kesendirian total. Butuh waktu beberapa bulan dia untuk keluar dari keadaan kesedihan dan pindah ke Paris dimana dia disambut dan dianut oleh Masyarakat Tinggi kaum bangsawan Eropa yang sebagian besar merasa hak istimewa untuk memiliki Ratu mantan Iran dalam daftar tamu mereka. Dia juga menghabiskan banyak waktu di vilanya di Marbella, Spanyol.

Soraya Kematian
Soraya melanjutkan hidupnya di Paris dan menghabiskan musim panas nya padanya Villa Maryam (bernama setelah neneknya) di Marbella, Spanyol. Dia bergerak di kalangan masyarakat tinggi dan menghabiskan waktu dengan beberapa teman pilih.
1844-1903. “Sardar Asad” was a title given by the king. Sardar means, “Head of the Army, or a General”.


[4] As recalled by Marie Meghdadi, Forough Zafar’s daughter

[5] As recalled and told by Princess Soraya to her close friends


[10] Dr. Ayadi was a very powerful man who had the ear of the Shah. He was a wealthy landowner and had the concession for the export of Iranian shrimp from The Persian Gulf. He was a leader of the Bahai sect in Iran.


[12] Alam’s memoirs, volume 5

[13] Alam’s memoirs
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Russia: NAGAI TARTARS. Antique print. Bankes. c.1790

Stufa in maiolica, Russia, 1790

Three-part bibliotheque
Period: Russia, circa 1790-1800.

Material: mahogany veneer, mahogany burr; ormolu; verre églomisé (gilded glass).

Dimensions: 91 ½ in. high; 93 ½ in. wide; 19 in. deep

St Petersburg

The Imperial tapestry manufactory in St Petersburg is best known for the tapestries produced during the reigns of Catherine the Great and Paul I. However, tapestry carpets were also produced, some with Imperial marks and dates. A small group of knotted pile carpets were produced.

THE RELATED HISTORY

House of Romanov
Michael I
Maria Vladimirovna Dolgorukova
1624
one stillborn child

Eudoxia Lukyanovna Streshneva
5 February 1626

Alexis I the Quietest

Maria Ilyinichna Miloslavskaya

17 January 1648

Natalia Kirillovna Naryshkina

1 February 1671

Feodor III

Agaphia Simeonovna Grushevskaya

28 July 1680

Marfa Matveievna Apraksina

24 February 1682

Sophia (regent)

unmarried, no children
1682-1689

**Ivan V**
jointly with Peter I

**Praskovia Feodorovna Saltykova**
1684
5 daughters

1682-1696

**Peter I the Great**
jointly with Ivan V 1682–1696

**Eudoxia Feodorovna Lopukhina**
1689
3 children

1682-1721

**Marta Helena Skowro ska**
1707
9 children

28 June 1709

**POLTAVA**
28 June 1709

Forces Engaged

Russian: 44,000 men and 100 cannon. Commander: Czar Peter the Great.

Swedish: 17,000 men and 4 cannon. Commander: King Charles XII.

Importance

Sweden’s defeat marked their decline and the arrival of Russia as a serious European power.

Historical Setting

Sweden had expanded from a Scandinavian power to a major force in European politics because of the statecraft and military genius of Gustavus Adolphus. He died in 1632 at the battle of Leutzen in the Thirty Years’ War and was succeeded by Charles X. Charles expanded on Gustavus’s strong performance by taking Sweden to its greatest limits and power by 1655. During the First Northern War, Charles defeated Poland and Denmark, but the war ended with his death in 1660. Peace lasted for four decades, until the reign of Charles XII, when Poland began showing its traditional restlessness under foreign dominance. In 1700, Polish King Augustus II organized the Northern Union, made up of Poland, Denmark, and Russia. Russia was the most enthusiastic supporter of the Union, not because it desired Polish liberation but because Czar Peter I wanted his country to supplant Sweden as the dominant Baltic power.

Charles XII was but 18 years of age when he rose to the throne of Sweden in 1700, but he did not lack for military talent. He made the first move of what came to be called the Second, or Great, Northern War by invading Denmark, which he viewed as the weak link in the enemy chain. With Copenhagen threatened, the Danes concluded a quick peace, signing the Treaty of Travedal on 28 August 1700. Although the Danes promised to remain passive and not aid their erstwhile allies, the fact that they possessed a strong fleet worried Charles because it was a potential threat to his lines of communication when he faced Poland and Russia.
Charles quickly turned eastward and landed 8,000 men at Livonia with the intent of relieving the besieged city of Riga, but instead marched on Narva when he learned that the attacking Russian force outnumbered the defenders by a four-to-one margin. The Russians remained unaware of Charles’s approach until he attacked them in a driving snowstorm on 20 November. The Russians were badly beaten, losing 10,000 dead, wounded, or taken prisoner, while another 30,000 fled, abandoning all their artillery and supplies. Charles next marched on Poland, where a 4-year campaign against King Augustus finally ended in Swedish victory with the signing of the Treaty of Altranstadt on 24 September 1706. Poland pledged to remain quiet, accepting Swedish puppet Stanislas Leszczynski in place of King Augustus. Charles spent the winter reorganizing and resupplying for the campaign against Russia the following year.

While Charles was defeating Denmark and Poland, Czar Peter had spent his time reorganizing his own army after the embarrassment at Narva. He also built up his fleet in the Baltic at the same time that he was building his capital at St. Petersburg, at the mouth of the Neva River. By not marching to the aid of his allies, Peter had had the time to significantly upgrade his military strength. He needed it; Charles invaded out of Poland on 1 January 1708 with Moscow as his goal. As is so often the case, the Russians were able to slow the invading army by gradual withdrawals and a scorched-earth policy. Accomplishing the desired goal of depriving Charles and his army of supplies, the Swedish king marched his forces southward to join with his new ally, Ivan Mazepa, hetman of the Cossacks. That move meant that the supply line that Charles wanted to maintain became badly strained, and Peter took advantage of that. He attacked a force under Swedish General Carl Lewenhaupt at Lesnaia on 9 October 1708. Lewenhaupt commanded a force of 11,000 marching to reinforce Charles, but after the defeat at Lesnaia only 6,000 got through, and without artillery or supplies.

The Battle

The winter of 1708–1709 was spent in skirmishes between Peter’s army and the combined Swedish-Cossack force, during which time Charles’s force of 40,000 was cut almost in half because of combat and the severe cold. In the spring of 1709, Charles decided to press on to Moscow, rather than reinforce his army. Along the line of march lay the town of Poltava on the Vorskla River. Charles laid siege to Poltava on 2 May. Peter sent his cavalry commander Menshikov to distract and observe the Swedes, while he both put down a Cossack rising along the Dnieper River and convinced the Turkish government to stay aloof from this struggle. The Turks not only stayed out of it, temporarily at least, but also forbade Crimean Cossacks from aiding the Swedes. With
his rear covered, Peter marched on Poltava, arriving in early June. He established a camp on the west bank of the Vorskla, a few miles north of Poltava.

The Russians defending Poltava had held out much longer than Charles had anticipated, and the Swedish king was running low on both food and gunpowder. To make bad matters worse, on 17 June Charles was wounded in the foot, making it impossible for him to lead his troops in battle with his normal energy. With 40,000 Russians now in the neighborhood, he should have lifted the siege and withdrawn to Poland, but instead he decided to fight Peter. When Peter learned of Charles’s wound, he too thought that the time for battle had come. Much closer to Poltava he built a new camp, a fortified square with the east flank on the Vorskla and the south flank along a marshy wood with a stream running through it. That wood and stream separated the Russian camp from Poltava. Peter was sure this new camp would provoke Charles to attack, and he was correct.

Charles’s army began its march to battle at 0300 on 28 June 1709. They had to move west from Poltava and then turn north to enter a gap between the aforementioned woods and a marsh farther west. Between the woods and marsh, Peter had built six redoubts to slow any advance and then began building four more perpendicular to the six. The result was a T formation with the crossbar between the woods and marsh and the upright pointing at the oncoming Swedes, who had to divide their forces to either side. Charles left 5,600 men behind to cover Poltava and guard the base camp, leaving him with but 12,500 men for his attack. Although Charles moved his men in the dark of night, Peter learned of the operation and quickly established a line of mixed infantry and cavalry behind the line of six redoubts.

Charles was forced by the redoubts to split his force, half to the east and half to the west; he was carried on a litter with the left, western force. His plan was to rush past the fire of the redoubts to engage the Russians behind, who he was sure would not stand and fight; he remembered their shoddy performance at Narva and assumed nothing had changed. The problem with this plan was that he refused to share it with his subordinates for, like Alexander of Macedon, he was a hands-on, lead-from-the-front commander who liked to be in the midst of battle to act and react as circumstances dictated. Because he was on a litter, though, he could not do that, and his primary subordinate, General Rehnskjöld, was not allowed to act on his own initiative.

Overcentralized command doomed the Swedes.
On the left flank, the attacking Swedes soon swept past the redoubts and drove back the Russians on the far side. On the right, however, General Roos proceeded to attack the redoubts to reduce or capture them. That meant that he not only made slow progress, but he suffered lots of casualties. When, late in the morning, Charles was ready to press his attack on Peter’s camp, he had but half his army with him because Roos was bogged down and soon surrounded and captured. The troops in the center of the attack also managed to break through the line of redoubts and, driving Russian troops before them, were in a position to wheel right and storm the Russian camp. This force, under Lewenhaupt, received orders to retreat and join with Charles, however, thus losing their momentum and giving Peter time to prepare his army. Who sent the order to Lewenhaupt was hotly debated at the time, for both Charles and Rehnskjöld denied sending it, but, with the shifting fortunes of battle and the conflicting reports of success and failure, it could have been sent almost at any time in the previous few hours.

While Charles redeployed his forces on the plain behind the redoubts, Peter brought 40,000 men out of his camp, along with 100 cannon. Charles certainly should not have attacked this greatly superior force, at least until the artillery he had back at Poltava was brought up, but his disdain for the Russian troops over-rode good sense. Four thousand infantry and cavalry advanced across the open plain into the teeth of the Russian guns, and they were mowed down by the hundreds. Peter rode constantly through his own lines shouting encouragement and giving orders. Charles was unable to do so, and thus his uninspired men had no chance of breaking the Russian line. By noon, Charles was obliged to leave the field.

Results

Charles left behind 3,000 dead and 2,800 prisoners, including General Rehnskjöld and four other generals. Charles gathered up the troops that he had left at Poltava and they made their way east and south. At the junction of the Vorskla and Dnieper Rivers, he found all boats destroyed, but he built enough rafts to escape with 1,000 men. The remainder were captured on 30 June. Charles fled to seek refuge with the Turks, Russia’s traditional enemy, who granted him sanctuary.

Peter scored a major triumph at Poltava, but almost threw it all away. Rather than consolidating his victory, he pressed a campaign against Poland while demanding that the Turks surrender Charles to him. Instead of Charles, the Turks sent 200,000 troops to the Russian frontier. In the spring of 1711, Peter declared war on Turkey and soon found himself in command of 38,000 starving men along the River Pruth, with the region...
devastated by the Turks, who outnumbered him five to one. On 11 August, the Turks attacked and were beaten back. Their commander, Grand Vizier Baltaji Mehmet, entered into negotiations with Peter and soon granted him and his army parole. A few days’ siege would have brought Peter’s army to its knees, but instead he lived to fight another day.

War continued between Russia and Turkey on one front and Russia and Sweden on another, while Charles remained in Turkey arguing with his allies. Russia and Turkey signed the Treaty of Adrianople in 1713, but not until 1721 did Russia and Sweden sign the Treaty of Nysted; Charles XII had been killed in battle 3 years earlier. Thus ended the Great Northern War after 21 years, and Sweden, which entered the war as such an important power, exited it a broken country.

Russia, on the other hand, replaced Sweden as the major power in the Baltic region. In the Treaty of Nysted, Russia received Livonia, Estonia, and Ingermanland on the Baltic as well as the Finnish Karelia territory. Peter, who had long envied European progress, had access now to what the west could provide. He imported experts on almost everything to drag Russia into the modern world, and technical advisors as well as intellectuals stayed in St. Petersburg to fulfill his dreams. This brought a facade of western civilization to Russia, which the aristocrats were able to appreciate, but the mass of Russian peasantry remained poor, ignorant, and exploited. Peter’s wars and building projects killed tens of thousands; as much as 20 percent of the Russian population died during his reign. Many of them died in the military, which Peter was determined to make the equal of any European army or navy. When he died, the Russian navy possessed forty-eight ships of the line, and the army had more than 200,000 regulars and 100,000 reserves.

Although Russians began to act like Europeans, their Asian heritage lingered on. Peter had to remedy that to build the empire he wanted. The only way to do that was to adopt European government administrative techniques and philosophies to provide the necessary regular taxation power he needed. The western administration, however, employed eastern ruthlessness in execution, and more dead Russians were the result as Peter suppressed any objections to his actions. Although he did introduce a number of western social reforms, they rarely applied to the masses, who continued to work and produce the labor and taxes, just as they had done for centuries. That resource, coupled with the land and mineral resources that Peter developed, brought Russia overnight into Europe as a country to be reckoned with. Although its power waxed and waned over the
following centuries, Russia was here to stay on the world scene. “A new threat to Europe had arisen; again Asia was on the move, but this time her Mongoloid hordes were girt in the panoply of the West” (Fuller, A Military History of the Western World, vol. 2, p. 186).

Had Peter lost at Poltava, it is certainly questionable if Sweden would have bent Russia to its will. If the Turks had not let Peter go from the River Pruth, Turkey may well have emerged as the major eastern power that Russia became because the struggle between those two countries never ebbed, and Russian military power certainly acted as a curb to Ottoman desires in eastern Europe.

References:


Russian Dragoon 1709

The accession of Peter the Great (1682-1725) to the throne of Russia marked a turning point in its history. At the beginning of his rule, he realized that Russia could not become a strong country economically unless it had access to the sea. His first aim was a foothold on the Black Sea coast, which meant war with Turkey, and the first clashes showed that the Russian army was not up to Peter’s nationalistic ambitions. He therefore reorganized it, modelling it largely on the west European armies, especially in matters of recruitment, administration, armaments and training. In 1689 he ruthlessly crushed an uprising by the Streltzi regulars, and disbanded their units. In 1699, the order was issued for the creation of a new Russian standing army, and eligible men aged between 17 and 32 were recruited for life-long military service. Twenty-seven infantry and two dragoon regiments were created.
The Russian army was traditionally cavalry-oriented; the reason why Peter recruited only two regular dragoon regiments was that he was counting on the numerous yeomanry militia (dvoriani) who reported for war with their own horses, armament and equipment, and formed cavalry units. However, after the serious defeat by the Swedes at Narva in 1700, Peter gave up the concept of irregular units and during his rule raised 32 dragoon regiments.

The first were called Schneewanz and Goltz, after their colonels. After 1708, regiments were named for their places of formation and recruitment. They were organized according to the infantry model, in 10 companies of 100 men. Every regiment also had three three-pound cannon. In 1704, an additional company of 100 grenadiers was added to the dragoon regiments; in 1711, these were organized in three regiments of mounted grenadiers.

Until the mid-eighteenth century, Russian cavalry rules envisaged units dismounting and fighting in infantry squares; this was a throwback to the dragoons’ infantry training. The reason for this was that Russia lacked large numbers of heavy horses, which were later bought from Germany for the forming of cuirassier regiments.

During the Great Northern War (1700-21), Peter introduced two large dragoon formations: one under General Menschikov, consisting of 11 regiments, the other under General Golitzin, 10 regiments strong. The king thus had at his disposal large corps of mounted infantry armed with artillery and all that was needed for independent action in Russia’s vast expanses.

Reputedly, in a conversation between Charles XII of Sweden and Peter the Great, Charles enumerated the virtues of his army, its many successes and captured standards. Peter retorted that Russia was a large country, and that his dragoons could sleep in their saddles. It is a fact that the Russian dragoons and their horses were tough, and that they suffered remarkably small losses from exhaustion, illness or cold during
military operations and long marches.

Emperors of Russia

Peter I the Great
1721-1725

Catherine I
Peter I of Russia
1707
9 children
1725-1727

Peter II
Unmarried
1727-1730
Anna

Frederick Wilhelm, Duke of Courland

November 1710

no children

1730-1740

Ivan VI (disputed)

Unmarried

1740-1741

Elizabeth

Alexey Razumovsky

1742

no children

1741-1762

Portrait of Tsar Vasily IV of Russia by Viktor Vasnetsov in 1897

The above portrait of Vasily IV of Russia, painted by Viktor Vasnetsov in 1897, depicts the tsar wearing the ceremonial robes, the Monomakh’s crown and the royal scepter in his right hand. Apart from colored stones, the upper part of the ceremonial robe is embroidered with four rows of pearls, two rows around the neck and two rows around its lower edge.
FALSE DMITRIY II, SECOND PRETENDER TO THE RUSSIAN THRONE, WHO CLAIMED TO BE TSAREVICH DMITRIY IVANOVICH OF RUSSIA

During the reign of Tsar Vasili IV around July 1607, there appeared at Starodub, a highly educated young man, with aristocratic skills, who spoke both Russian and Polish languages and an expert in liturgical matters. The man claimed to be the Muscovite boyar Nagoy, but later confessed under torture to be Tsarevich Dmitry, the youngest son of Ivan the Terrible. The young man was taken at his word and soon became the nucleus of an anti-Russian alliance, that included the Cossacks and Poles, and even ordinary muscovites who were attracted by the promise of wholesale confiscation of the estates of Boyars. As the popularity of False Dmitriy II increased, the ambitious Jerzy Mniszech, the father-in-law of False Dmitriy I, approached the new False Dmitriy and got his consent to marry his daughter Marina Mniszech, the widow of the first False Dmitry. The marriage of False Dmitriy II to the Polish princess, Marina Mniszech, earned the support of the magnates of the Polish Luthunian Commonwealth, who had previously supported False Dmitriy I. They made funds available for his campaign and gave him an army of 7,500 soldiers. False Dmitriy II’s army quickly captured many important towns in Russia, that was taken over and reinforced by the Polish-Lithuanian army, and in the spring of 1608 his army advanced towards Moscow, routing the army of Tsar Vasily Shuisky at Bolkhov. False Dmitriy II set up camp at the village of Tushino, just outside Moscow, where an army of over 100,000 men assembled, consisting of Polish, Cossack and other soldiers. He also won the allegiance of more cities, such as Yaroslavl, Kostroma, Vologda and Kashin. However, when the Polish king Sigismund III Vasa arrived at Smolensk, most of his Polish soldiers deserted his army and joined the forces of the king. Around this time, a strong Russo-Swedish army under the joint-command of Prince Mikhail Skopin-Shuisky and Jacob de la Gardie approached Tushino, and false Dmitriy II was forced to flee tushino, disguised as a peasant. He escaped to Kostroma where he was joined by his wife Marina Mniszech who was now pregnant with his child. False Dmitriy II made another unsuccessful attack on Moscow, and with the help of his Cossack forces held on to territory in south-eastern Russia. However, on December 11, 1610, after he had drunk deeply with his boyar friends, he was killed by a young Tartar prince, Peter Ursov, whom he had punished by flogging previously.

Marina Mniszech widowed for the second time gave birth to False Dmitriy’s son, Ivan Dmitriyevich, posthumously in January 1611. Marina Mniszech then married her third spouse Ivan Zarutsky, who took upon himself the task of supporting the nomination of her son, Ivan Dmitriyevich, for the Russian throne. However, by the summer of 1613, after the
Poles had been expelled from Moscow and Michael Romanov, the son of Patriarch Filaret had been elected as the new tsar, Marina Mniszech and Ivan Zarutsky, having lost their supporters fled to Astrakhan. The people of Astrakhan, did not like the pretender and his family staying in their city, and when they rose against them in 1614, they escaped into the steppes. Ivan Zarutsky failed to get support for another Cossack uprising, and was finally captured by the Cossacks around June 1614 and handed over to the government. Ivan Zarutsky and Marina Mniszech’s 3-year-old son, Ivan Dmitriyevich were executed in 1614, and Marina Mniszech died in Prison in Moscow soon afterwards.

The above sketch of False Dmitriy II by unknown artist, probably drawn around 1610, depicts him wearing a woolen cap, with a hair ornament affixed to it on the side. The hair ornament appears to be made up of a large oval-shaped pearl, with a smaller drop-shaped pearl hanging from it, and a plume of feathers rising from above.

NOMINAL RULE OF WLADYSLAW IV VASA AS TSAR OF RUSSIA FROM SEPTEMBER 6, 1610 TO NOVEMBER 4, 1612

After Tsar Vasili IV was deposed by the Council of Seven Boyars on July 27, 1610, they elected the 15-year-old Wladyslaw IV Vasa, the son of the Polish king Sigismund III Vasa, as the new Tsar of Russia, on September 6, 1610. The Poles entered Moscow on September 21, 1610, suppressing brutally riots that broke out in the capital city, which was set on fire. King Sigismund III Vasa refused to accept the suggestion of the Council of Seven Boyars to send his son Wladyslaw to Moscow to accept the throne after converting to Orthodox Christianity. This was because of the unsettled conditions in Moscow where anti-Polish feelings were running high, and King Sigismund III Vasa’s ultimate aim of converting Moscow’s population from Orthodox Christianity to Catholicism. However, the Council of Seven Boyars continued to recognize, Wladyslaw IV Vasa as the Tsar of Russia, and struck Muscovite silver and gold coins in the mints of Moscow and Novogrod, with his titulary, “Tsar and Grand Prince Vladislav Zigimontovich of all Russia.”

The Polish occupation of Moscow, provoked a national uprising against the invasion in 1611 and 1612. In opposition to the “Council of Seven Boyars” and the Poles, a “Council of All the Land” was formed in April 1611, headed by Prince Dmitriy Mikhailovich
A volunteer army was formed led by Prince Dmitriy Pozharsky and the merchant Kuzma Minin. This army fought with the occupying Polish forces and finally expelled them from the capital on November 4, 1612. The activities of the Council of Seven Boyars and the nominal rule of Wladyslaw IV Vasa ended with the expulsion of Poles from Moscow on November 4, 1612.

The above portrait of Prince Wladyslaw IV Vasa before he was elected king of Poland, depict him wearing a hat with a hat-ornament affixed to one side. The hat ornament incorporates a large drop-shaped pearl and several smaller spherical pearls. The prince also appears to be wearing another vertical pearl ornament just below the collar of his coat.

**Appreciation of pearls by the Tsars and Tsarinas of the Romanov dynasty**

The Time of Troubles in Russian History that began with the death of the heirless Feodor I Ivanovich on January 7, 1598, marking the end of the main line of Tsars of the Rurik dynasty, was actually a period of succession struggles, resulting in civil wars and foreign intervention, further compounded by the Russian famine of early 17th-century, caused by extremely cold summers that wrecked crops, and increased social disorganization. This period of instability finally came to an end in February 1613, with the expulsion of Poles from Moscow, and the election of the 16-year-old Michael Romanov, the son of Patriarch Filaret who was living in captivity in Poland, as the new Tsar of Russia, by a National Assembly constituted of representatives from around fifty cities in Russia. This marked the beginning of a new dynasty of Tsars in Russia, known as the Romanov dynasty, that ruled Russia until the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.

**TSAR MICHAEL FYODOROVICH ROMANOV – FIRST TSAR OF THE HOUSE OF ROMANOV FROM 1613 TO 1645**

Michael Romanov was crowned Tsar of All Russia on July 22, 1613. The new Tsar with the help of his counsellors immediately set about restoring law and order in the vast country,
and one of his first tasks was the elimination of gangs of robbers who devastated the country side. He then made peace with Russia's former enemies, Sweden and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, with whom he signed peace treaties in 1617 and 1619 respectively. The signing of the peace treaty with Poland, enabled the Tsar’s father, Feodor Nikitich Romanov (Patriarch Filaret) to return from captivity in Poland in 1619, and take over the affairs of the government, on behalf of his young son, Tsar Michael Romanov, a position which he held, until his death in 1633. Tsar Michael became famous as a gentle and pious Prince, who gave little trouble to anyone, preferring to rule from behind the scenes, effacing himself behind his counsellors.

Portrait of Tsar Michael I of Russia by unknown artist depicting him with the coronation regalia of the Tsardom of Russia

Coronation regalia depicted on the portrait –

Coronation robes heavily embroidered with rows of pearls.

The Orb set with pearls and colored stones.

Monomakh’s Cap or Crown, set with pearls and colored stones.

The royal scepter.

“Millennium of Russia” monument in Veliky, Novgorod depicting Michael I being offered the Monomakh’s Cap and scepter by Kuzma Minin and protected by Dmitriy Pozharsky

EUDOXIA STRESHNEVA – SECOND WIFE (1626-1645) OF TSAR MICHAEL FYODOROVICH ROMANOV (1613-1645)

Tsar Michael Romanov married twice. His first wife was Maria Vladimirovna Dolgorukova, whom he married in late 1624, but died four months later in 1625. His second wife was Eudoxia Streshneva, whom he chose himself from an array of fair noble maidens, and married on February 5, 1626. The marriage proved to be a very successful one, producing
10 children, out of whom only five survived into adulthood. The second surviving child, Tsarveich Alexis succeeded his father, as the second tsar of Russia of the Romanov dynasty. Eudoxia Streshneva died just five weeks after her husband in 1645.

Potrait of Eudoxia Streshneva second wife of Tsar Michael I

Ornaments worn by the Tsarina –

Robes embroidered with pearls.

Brooch used as a pin holding together ends of the outer robe.

Crown set with rows of pearls and colored stones.

Earrings probably set with pearls.

Tsar Michael I choosing his bride from several fair maidens in 1626

The above painting by Ilya Yefimovich Repin executed between 1884 and 1887, depict Tsar Michael I choosing his bride from an array of fair maidens in 1626. The tsar chose Eudoxia Streshneva as his second bride, whom he married on February 5, 1626. All the maidens assembled appear to be heavily bedecked with ornaments incorporating pearls, such as pearl drop earrings, pearl necklaces, brooches and stomachers, and bracelets. The tsar himself is depicted wearing some form of pearl ornament on the upper part of his robes.

TSAR ALEXIS MIKHAILOVICH ROMANOV – SECOND TSAR OF THE HOUSE OF ROMANOV FROM 1645 TO 1676

When Tsar Michael Romanov died on July 12, 1645, he was succeeded by his eldest and only surviving son, Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov who ascended the throne at the age of 16 as Tsar Alexis I. During the early years of his rule, Tsar Alexis I’s chief advisor and minister was boyar Boris Morozov, who adopted a cautious foreign policy, securing a truce
with Poland and avoiding any conflicts with the Ottoman empire. By abolishing many unnecessary and expensive court offices, and limiting privileges given to foreign traders he relieved the public burden. In 1648, Boris Morozov successfully procured the marriage of the 19-year-old tsar to his relative, the 23-year-old Maria Miloslavskya. In fact the Tsar was required to choose his bride from among hundreds of noble girls, but the selection was managed by Boris Morozov, who manipulated the selection to favour his relative, Maria Miloslavskya, whom the Tsar married on January 17, 1648. Ten days later, Boris Morozov himself married a sister of Maria Miloslavskya, a marriage that enhanced his power in the court. However, Boris Morozov soon became unpopular that led to the Moscow Salt Riots of May 1648, leading to his dismissal and exile to a monastery.

After a period of disturbances all over the Tsardom following the Salt Riots, patriarch Nikon who had displayed tact and courage during the disturbances at Novgorod, was appointed the Tsar’s chief minister in 1651. After peace was restored all over the tsardom, Tsar Alexis diverted his attention towards Russia’s neighbour and longtime enemy, the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth who had annexed Russian lands during the Time of Troubles. He took advantage of Poland’s weakness and disorder following the Khmelnitsky uprising, and having got the approval of the national assembly, ordered the Russian army to attack lands held by the commonwealth. The campaign led to a series of wars involving Russia, Poland and Sweden, that eventually led to the Treaty of Andrusovo in 1667, in which Poland accepted the loss of Left-bank Ukraine, Kiev and Smolensk to Russia. Tsar Alexis was outraged by the killing of King Charles I of England in 1649, by the Parliamentarians led by Oliver Cromwell. In retaliation, he broke off diplomatic relations with England, banned all English merchants from entering Russia, provided financial assistance to the widow of Charles I and accepted all royalist refugees in Moscow.

Portrait of Tsar Alexis I of Russia by unknown west European artist in the 17th-century

Royal regalia depicted on the portrait

The above portrait of Tsar Alexis I of Russia by an unknown west European painter, probably executed in the 17th-century, depict the tsar wearing his royal regalia, that includes the following :-

Royal robes heavily bedecked with pearls.
Monomakh’s cap or crown set with pearls and colored stones.

The royal scepter set with pearls and colored stones.

Portrait of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich in the Hermitage Museum by unknown artist

Coronation regalia depicted on the portrait

The above portrait of Tsar Alexis I by an unknown artist depict him with the following coronation regalia

Coronation robes heavily bedecked with colored stones and rows of pearls

A necklace with a cross hanging as pendant.

Monomakh’s cap or crown set with colored stones and rows of pearls.

The Orb set with colored stones and rows of pearls.

The royal scepter incorporating pearls at one end.

Tsar Alexis of Russia choosing his bride

The above painting of Tsar Alexis I choosing his bride, drawn by Grigory Sedov in 1882, over two hundred years after its occurrence, depicts the young Tsar Alexis choosing his bride before his marriage in 1648. Tsar Alexis I married Maria Miloslavskaya, who was four years his senior, and daughter of boyar Ilya Danilovich Miloslavsky, a relative of Boris Morozov. The six princesses depicted in the painting are all wearing a tiara or a headdress studded with pearls. At least two of them are depicted wearing multistrand pearl necklaces. Some of them are wearing drop earrings incorporating pearls. The dresses of at
least two of the princesses are studded with pearls. The 19-year-old tsar is also depicted wearing a necklace incorporating pearls and a cap lined with pearls. The artist Grigory Sedov has attempted to recreate the mode of dressing and the type of ornaments worn by princesses in Russia two hundred years earlier, in the mid-17th-century. The expressions on the faces of the princesses in the painting are perfectly natural, and speaks of the artist’s ability in depicting the true nature of things in a bygone era.

MARIA ILYNICHNA MILOSLAVSKYA – FIRST WIFE (1648-1669) OF TSAR ALEXIS I (1645-1676) AND TSARITSA CONSORT OF ALL RUSSIA

Maria Miloslavskya was the first wife of Tsar Alexis of Russia, whom he married in 1648. Maria was four years senior to the tsar at the time of the marriage. The marriage turned out to be a happy one and produced 13 children in 21 years of marriage, out of whom two sons and six daughters survived into adulthood. The eldest son became Feodor III of Russia and the second son, Ivan V of Russia, who co-ruled with his half-brother Peter I of Russia. The third surviving daughter, Sophia Alekseyevna acted as regent to Peter I during his minority. Maria Miloslavskya died a few weeks after her 13th childbirth in 1669.

Portrait of Maria Miloslavskya drawn by Ivan Saltanov probably in the 1670s

Ornaments worn by the Tsaritsa –

A crown or headdress studded with pearls and colored stones.

A broad collar lined by a single row of pearls at its edges.

Broad bands studded with pearls and lined by rows of pearls at its edges, wrapped around each hand.

NATALIA KIRILLOVNA NARYSHKINA – SECOND WIFE (1671-1676) OF TSAR ALEXIS I AND TSARINA OF ALL RUSSIA

Two years after the death of his first wife, Tsar Alexis I decided to marry again, and took as his second wife, the 20-year-old Natalia Kirillovna Naryshkina, whom he married on
February 1, 1671. Natalia was the daughter of a petty nobleman, Kirill Poluektovich Naryshkin, but was brought up in the house of the western-leaning boyar Artamon Matveyev who had married the Scottish-descended Mary Hamilton. The marriage produced three children, a son, who became Peter the Great of Russia and two daughters, out of whom only one survived into adulthood. Natalia was widowed when Tsar Alexis I died in 1676, but was treated with affection by her stepson Feodor, who ascended the throne as Tsar Feodor III of Russia. When Feodor III died in 1682, his brother Ivan V became co-Tsar with Natalia’s son Peter. Natalia acted as regent for Peter, who was still a minor, with her foster Artamon Matveyev serving as advisor. However, her regency was short-lived, as she was soon replaced by Feodor III’s elder sister, Sofia Alekseyevna, during the revolt of the Streltsy on May 15, 1682, in which two of her own brothers and her foster-father were killed, and her own father, Kirill Naryshkin was forced to take-up robes as a monk. Until August 1689, Natalia almost lived in poverty with her son, Peter the co-Tsar, in Alexei’s summer palace, about 5 km. from Moscow. Peter, who reached the age of 17 in August 1689, overthrew his half-sister Sofia, who had been ruling as an autocrat for 7 years in his name, and took control of his kingdom, and continued to rule as co-Tsar with his half-brother Ivan V. Sophia was forced to enter a convent, and Peter’s mother was restored to her rightful position as nominal leader of the court.

Portrait of Natalia Narishkina, second wife of Tsar Alexis I and mother of Peter the Great

In the above portrait of Natalia Narishkina drawn by an anonymous artist in the 18th-century, the former Tsaritsa is depicted almost dressed like a nun, and significantly without any ornaments decorating her person.

FEODOR III ALEXEVIICH – ROMANOV TSAR OF RUSSIA FROM 1676 TO 1682

Feodor was the eldest surviving son of Tsar Alexis I and his first wife, Maria Miloslavskya, and succeeded his father as Tsar in 1676 at the age of 15. Feodor was educated by the most learned Slavonic monk, Simeon Polotsky and thus possessed a fine intellect and noble disposition, eventhough he was disfigured and paralyzed by a mysterious disease from the time of his birth. Yet in spite of his physical disabilities he
soon demonstrated that he was capable of ruling on his own, just as any other normal human being. A remarkable feature of his court was the lack of an oppressive atmosphere, leniency in the application of penal laws and a new sense of liberalism that pervaded his court. His notable achievements included the founding of the Academy of Sciences, and merit being made the main criteria for all appointments to the civil and military services, that replaced the former system of mestnichestvo, in which special preference was given to people of noble birth. Fedor III's chief advisor in running the affairs of the state was Artamon Matveyev, foster father of Natalia Narishkina, mother of Peter I.

Tsar Feodor III took as his first wife an Ukrainian noblewoman, known as Agaphia Simeonovna Grushevskaya, whom he married on July 18, 1680. Feodor was 19 and Agaphia 17 at the time of their marriage. Agaphia was as learned as Feodor, and could speak and write languages like Polish, French and Latin. Agaphia turned out to be an angelic wife and Tsarina to Tsar Feodor, merciful and loyal to the disabled tsar and concerned about public welfare. She shared the radical views of her husband, and being well informed about western European life styles, she was the first to advocate beard-shaving and the use of western attire in the Russian court. She herself was the first tsarina to expose her hair and to wear a western dress in the Russian court.

She gave birth to her first child, a son, the expected heir to the throne on July 11, 1681, but unfortunately Agafya died three days later, due to complications of childbirth. Six days later, the nine-day old infant tsarevich also died, totally devastating Feodor III, who deeply mourned their passing away.

The above portrait of Tsar Feodor III of Russia, executed by an unknown artist, in the late 1600s depict the Tsar wearing coronation regalia. The components of the regalia, incorporating pearls are as follows:

- The Monomakh's cap or crown heavily studded with pearls.

The coronation robe with its upper flap going round the shoulders, heavily studded with
The Orb depicted on the lower right-hand end of the portrait, also studded with rows of pearls.

A cross hanging as pendant from a necklace, probably made up of a double-strand of pearls.

MARFA MATVEYEVNA APRAKSINA – SECOND WIFE (FEBRUARY 24, 1682 TO MAY 7, 1682) OF TSAR FEODOR III AND TSARINA OF ALL RUSSIA

Seven months after the death of his first wife, Feodor III took as his second wife Marfa Apraksina, daughter of Matvey Vasilyevich Apraksin, on February 24, 1682. However, just three months after this marriage, Feodor III died on May 7, 1682, at the age of 21, without a surviving issue, that sparked the Moscow uprising of 1682, as rumours spread that the Naryshkins in their desire to promote Natalia Naryshkin’s son Peter to the throne of Russia, strangled to death, the mentally and physically disabled Ivan, Tsar Feodor III’s younger brother, who was next in line of succession to the throne. The uprising subsided only when Ivan appeared in front of the rampaging crowds, to show that he was still alive and well.

Portrait of Marfa Apraksina by unknown author

Ornaments worn by the Tsarina:

Headdress studded with pearls.

Drop earrings incorporating pearls.

Several necklaces around the neck, one of which appears to be a single-strand choker necklace, and the longest a multistrand pearl necklace, with a zig-zag lower strand.

Rings incorporating pearls.
When the childless Feodor III died on May 7, 1682, a dispute arose between the families of his two wives, Miloslavsky and Naryshkin families, as to who should inherit the throne. Ivan, the second surviving son of Tsar Alexis I by his first wife, Maria Miloslavskya, was the next in line of succession to the throne, but was chronically ill and of infirm mind, and it was doubtful whether he had the mental ability for such a challenging task as ruling a vast country like Russia. Hence, the Boyar Duma (Council of Russian nobles) overlooked Ivan, and instead chose his half-brother, the ten-year-old Peter, Alexis I’s next son by his second wife, Natalia Narishkina, to be the next Tsar of Russia, with his mother appointed as regent. This arrangement was apparently ratified by the people of Moscow, but members of the Milolavsky family who were not happy with the decision of the Boyar Duma, spread the rumour that the Naryshkins had strangled to death, the mentally and physically disabled Ivan, in order to promote the chances of Peter, sparking off riots all over Moscow. The ambitious Sophia Alekseyevna, the third surviving daughter of Tsar Alexis I, then led a rebellion of the Streltsy, the Russian elite military corps, during which two brothers of Natalia Narishkina and her foster father, Artamon Matveyev were killed, and her own father, Kirill Naryshkin was forced enter a monastery. The ultimate outcome of the uprising was that Ivan and Peter were proclaimed as joint Tsars, with Ivan being recognized as the senior of the two, and Sophia Alekseyevna replacing Natalia Narishkina as Regent during the minority of the two tsars. Sophia ruled as an autocrat during the next seven years, in the name of both co-Tsars.

Ivan had a close relationship not only with his half-brother Peter, but also his stepmother Natalia Naryshkina. In fact he was not interested at all in becoming the Tsar, but was persuaded by his ambitious elder sister, Sophia Alekseyevna, who ruled as an autocrat in his name. In 1689, when Peter had turned 17, he planned to takeover power from his regent and half-sister Sophia, who was now unpopular due to two unsuccessful Crimean campaigns. When Sophia heard of Peter’s plans, she attempted to raise another riot, by misleading the Streltsy and the people of Moscow, that the Naryshkin’s had destroyed Ivan’s crown, and were about to set his room on fire. But the plan failed as Ivan himself declared his allegiance to his half-brother Peter, who had escaped in the middle of the night to the impenetrable monastery of Troitsky, from where he gathered his supporters and moved against Sophia, who was overthrown and forced to enter a convent. Peter I and Ivan V then continued there rule as co-Tsars, with Peter’s mother, Natalia Narishkina being restored to her former position in court, exerting power on
behalf of her son and stepson. Natalia died five years later in 1694, when Peter took complete control of his kingdom, with his brother Ivan V continuing nominally as a co-Tsar. When Ivan V died in 1696, at the age of 29 years, Peter became the sole ruler of his kingdom.

Portrait of Tsar Ivan V by unknown artist

Ornaments depicted on the portrait:-

A brooch rhomboidal in shape and studded with cabochon cut colored stones or black pearls.

A collar set with equally spaced large pearls in the center and lined at the edges by a single row of pearls.

PRASKOVIA SALTYKOVA – WIFE OF TSAR IVAN V AND TSARITSA CONSORT OF ALL RUSSIA FROM 1684 TO 1696

Two years after ascending the throne as co-Tsar, Ivan V married Praskovia Saltykova, the daughter of Fyodor Petrovich Saltykov, who was chosen by Ivan himself from an array of maidens parading before him. Ivan was 18 and Praskovia 20 years of age at the time of their marriage. Despite his physical and mental disabilities, Ivan’s marriage to Praskovia produced five robust daughters, one of whom would ascend the throne of Russia, as Empress Anna Ivanovna. However, by the age of 27, Ivan V was described by foreign diplomats, as senile, paralytic and almost blind. Ivan V died two years later, in 1696 at the age of 29 years.

After Ivan V’s death, Praskovia lived as a dowager Tsarina, holding court in Moscow and later Saint Petersburg, functioning as the first lady of the Russian court, as Peter had no legal wife at that time, until he officially married his second wife Catherine, at Saint Isaac’s Cathedral on February 9, 1712. Peter’s two daughters Elizabeth (future empress) and Anna (mother of future emperor, Peter III) were also educated at Praskovia’s court. Praskovia died in October 1723, a little over an year before Peter the Great’s own death in February 1725.
Ornaments worn by the tsarina:

- A headdress or hairdo, incorporating three rows of large white spherical pearls on either side, and a single row of pearls radiating on either side of a centerpiece, set with colored stones.

PETER I THE GREAT – TSAR OF ALL RUSSIA FROM 1682 TO 1721 AND LATER EMPEROR OF ALL RUSSIA FROM 1721 TO 1725

Peter I who was co-Tsar with Ivan V from 1682 to 1696, became the sole Tsar of Russia after Ivan V’s death on February 8, 1696. Peter, who grew to become the tallest monarch in Europe during his period, with a height of 6 ft. 8 ins. also became one of the greatest Tsars in the history of Russia, assuming the title of Emperor of All Russia during the latter part of his rule from 1721 to 1725. His policy of expansion and modernization, learning from west European countries, eventually transformed the tsardom of Russia into a great empire not only in extent but also in terms of political power.

Ornaments depicted on the portrait:

- A single-strand pearl necklace.

- A large oval-shaped brooch set with colored stones and pearls, at the end of a V-shaped black garland, at the point where the outer red cloak splits, revealing the inner black robe.

- Three smaller brooches on the red cloak in the space between the necklace and the black garland. These brooches are also set with colored stones and pearls.
Peter modernized the Russian army along western lines, and consolidated his authority by brutally suppressing all rebellions against his rule, going to the extent of disbanding the Streltsy, the Russian elite military corps, that always constituted a threat to any incumbent tsar. Russia had only one outlet to the sea, at the time he took control of the country, in the north on the White Sea at Arkhangelsk, whose harbour was frozen for nine months in a year. This was a serious limitation for the expansion of trade with the outside world and the setting up of a modern navy. Peter realized that possible outlets for his country were situated in the Baltic Sea in the north, which was under the control of Sweden and Black Sea in the south, controlled by the Ottoman Empire. After an unsuccessful attempt to capture the fortress of Azov from the Ottomans in 1695, he finally succeeded in July of 1696, and established the first Russian naval base at Taganrog in 1698.

In 1697 he undertook a journey to Europe with a large Russian delegation, visiting France, England, the Netherlands, Austria and cities such as Dresden and Leipzig, with the intention of forging a broad anti-Ottoman alliance, but received poor response, as there was little enthusiasm in Europe for such a move. However, Peter made use of this opportunity to learn first-hand about life in western Europe, and various skills such as shipbuilding in Amsterdam and the techniques of city building in Manchester, knowledge which he subsequently used in the building up of the Russian navy and the building of his new capital city at Saint Petersburg. During this tour he also engaged the services of shipwrights, seamen, builders of locks and fortresses, and others with useful skills, who would later follow him to Russia, and help build his country. Peter was forced to cut short his European tour and return to Russia, because of a rebellion by the Streltsy which was fortunately crushed even before he returned home. However, soon after his arrival in Russia, he executed over 1,200 rebels, disbanded the Streltsy and forced his half-sister Sophia, whom the Streltsy wanted to instal on the throne, to become a nun. It was during his visit to England in 1698, that Sir Godfrey Kneller painted Peter’s portrait in battle dress, that was subsequently presented to King William III of England.

Portrait of Peter the Great painted by Sir Godfrey Kneller during his visit to England in 1698

Ornaments depicted on the portrait : -
What looks like a single row of pearls, along the edges of a belt connecting the ends of the outer cloak, which too appears to be embroidered with rows of pearls.

Soon after his return from the West, Peter was determined to do away with age old Russian traditions and adopt west European customs. He ordered his courtiers and officials, either to trim their long beards or be clean shaven, and discard their robes and wear western attire. He abolished arranged marriages and encouraged men and women to select their own partners, resulting in more durable relationships. Towards the end of the year 1699, Peter ordered that new year should be celebrated in Russia not on September 1 but January 1, and that the old Russian calendar be replaced by the Julian Calendar with effect from January 1, 1700, which was year 7207 in the old Russian calendar.

Desirous of taking control of an outlet in the Baltic Sea, which was controlled by Sweden, Peter tried to forge an alliance with Sweden’s other enemies, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Denmark-Norway and Saxony. Peter’s first attempt to seize the Baltic coast ended in disaster in the Battle of Narva in 1700, in which the Russian army was badly defeated by the forces of Charles XII of Sweden. Having defeated the Russians, Charles XII directed his forces against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, giving Peter time to re-organize his army. As the war continued between Sweden and the Commonwealth, Peter began the construction of a new capital city known as Saint Petersburg, named after St. Peter, the Apostle, in 1703, in a province of the Swedish empire which he had captured earlier, known as Ingermanland. As construction of the new capital continued, in 1707, Peter secretly married Martha Skavronskaya, who converted to Orthodox Christianity and took the name Catherine. In 1706, after suffering repeated defeats at the hands of Charles XII, the Polish king August II abdicated. Charles then invaded Russia, hoping to march towards Moscow, and defeating Peter’s army on the way, at Golovchin in July, 1708. However, Charles’ army was stopped at the next encounter at Lesnaya, by Peter’s forces, who inflicted heavy losses on Charles’ forces, after stopping Swedish reinforcements from reaching them. Charles then abandoned his march to Moscow, and instead invaded Ukraine. Peter then made a tactical withdrawal to the south of Ukraine destroying everything that could assist the Swedes, along their way. Deprived of local supplies, in the winter of 1708-1709 the Swedish army was forced to halt its advance, but resumed again in the summer of 1709. On June 27, 1709, Peter’s
forces intercepted the Swedish army at Poltava, resulting in a battle in which the Swedish forces were routed, and forced Charles to seek refuge in the Ottoman empire.

Portrait of Peter the Great by artist Jean-Marc Nattier executed around 1710

Description of above portrait: -

Peter the Great is depicted on the above portrait, wearing battle dress and holding a staff in his right hand, that rests on his helmet, and his left hand holding the hilt of a gem-studded sword.

Having defeated Charles XII, Peter restored August II to his throne in Poland, and diverted his attention towards the Ottoman empire, initiating the Russio-Turkish war of 1710. However, Peter’s campaign in the Ottoman empire proved to be disastrous, forcing him to sign a treaty in which he had to return the Black seaports seized in 1697, and guarantee safe passage to Charles XII back to Sweden. Peter’s northern armies then captured the Swedish province of Livonia, driving the Swedes into Finland. The Russian naval fleet then inflicted a defeat on the Swedish fleet at the Battle of Gangut in 1714, and the Russians occupied most of Finland. In his confrontation with Charles XII, Peter also obtained the assistance of the electorate of Hanover and the kingdom of Prussia, but Charles XII refused to yield. In 1718, Charles XII was killed in battle, and Sweden which was at war with all its neighbours, made peace with them by 1720, except Russia. Peace with Russia finally came in 1721, by the Treaty of Nystad, that ended the Great Northern War, and Russia was granted four provinces south and east of the Gulf of Finland, and Peter secured the much wanted access to the sea.

Immediately after peace was made with Sweden, in recognition of his conquests, Peter was officially proclaimed Emperor of All Russia on October 22, 1721 and the Russian Tsardom officially became the Russian Empire. During the last years of his rule he introduced reforms in the Russian Orthodox Church, replacing the Patriarchate with a collective body known as the Holy Synod, a council of ten clergymen. He replaced the Council of Nobles, known as the Boyar Duma, with a nine member Senate, which became the supreme council of state. He divided the country into new provinces and districts, and enhanced tax revenues, by placing tax collection under the overall supervision of the
Peter the Great created the famous “Table of Ranks,” a new order of precedence, in which merit and service to the emperor were criteria instead of birth, that deprived most of the boyars of their high ranks and positions. He introduced compulsory education in the sciences and mathematics, for the children of nobility, and all government officials including clerical staff. In 1724, Peter had his second wife, Cahterine, crowned as Empress of All Russia, although he still remained the actual ruler. This was a move on his part to ensure a smooth succession after his death, as all his male issues had predeceased him, including his eldest son, Alexei by his first wife Eudoxia, who was tortured and killed on Peter’s orders in 1718, because the boy had disobeyed him and opposed his policies.

Peter the Great died on February 8, 1725 of Uremia, at the age of 52 years, having reigned for 42 years, 28 years as sole ruler and 14 years as co-ruler with his half-brother Tsar Ivan V.

Diamond Order of Peter the Great

The above Diamond Order of Peter the Great is studded with diamonds of different sizes, shapes and cuts, mostly preserving the original natural facets and characteristic octahedral crystalline shapes.

EUDOXIA LOPUKHINA – FIRST WIFE OF TSAR PETER I OF RUSSIA AND TSARITSA CONSORT OF ALL RUSSIA FROM 1689 TO 1698

Peter the Great married his first wife, Eudoxia Lopukhina in 1689, soon after he wrested power from his half-sister and regent, Sophia Alekseyevna in August of that year. The marriage was arranged by his mother, Natalia Naryshkina, who was restored to her former position in court by Peter, after being ignored and living in isolation for seven years during Sophia’s regency. Eudoxia was senior to Peter by two years, at the time of her marriage, and was chosen by Natalia mainly because of Eudoxia’s mother’s relationship to the well known boyar Fyodor Rtishchev. Eudoxia was crowned Tsarina of All Russia soon after her marriage. Eudoxia gave birth to her first child Tsarevich Alexi Petrovich in 1690. She gave birth to two more sons, Alexander and Paul in 1692 and 1693. Out of the three children only Tsarevich Alexi Petrovich survived into adulthood, and was the next in line of succession to the throne. However, their marriage soon ran into trouble, aggravated by Eudoxia’s conservative relatives, whom Peter hated. Peter
soon abandoned Eudoxia and took a Dutch beauty, Anna Mons as his mistress.

In 1697, just before Peter embarked on his European tour, he asked his Naryshkin relatives to persuade Eudoxia to enter a monastery, which she refused. However, soon after Peter returned from his European tour in 1698, he decided to end his unhappy marriage, by divorcing Eudoxia and forcing her to enter the intercession convent of Suzdal. Eudoxia who entered the convent, managed to live there as a lay person and even find a lover by the name of Stepan Glebov, who was executed by quartering when the tsar was informed of the relationship. Eudoxia and her son and heir apparent Tsarevich Alexi Petrovich, soon became the center of opposition to Peter’s reforms, around whom disgruntled Church officials rallied. Tsar Peter soon brutally suppresses this opposition, putting his son and former wife on trial, executing all bishops who supported them, and transferring Eudoxia to another convent in Ladoga. Tsarevich Alexi Petrovich suspected of plotting to overthrow his father, confessed on torturing, and was convicted and sentenced to be executed. But, Peter was hesitant in authorizing his execution, and the tsarevich died in prison, probably of injuries suffered during his torture.

when Catherine I, Peter’s second empress consort, ascended the throne after Peter’s death, Eudoxia was secretly moved to the Shlisselburg fortress in St. Peterburg, but in 1727, when Eudoxia’s grandson, Peter II ascended the throne, Eudoxia was released from incarceration, and returned to Moscow with great pomp and pagentry, where she kept her own court at the Novodevichy Convent, until her death in 1731.

Portrait of Eudoxia Lopukhina by artist Pintor Desconhecido in the 18th-century

MARFA SKAVRONSKAYA LATER CATHERINE I OF RUSSIA – UNOFFICIAL SECOND WIFE FROM 1703 TO 1712 AND OFFICIAL SECOND WIFE AND TSARITSA/EMPRESS CONSORT OF PETER THE GREAT FROM 1712 TO 1725. EMPRESS OF RUSSIA FROM 1725 TO1727

Peter the Great met his second wife, Marfa Skavronskaya, for the first time at the house of his best friend, Prince Aleksandr Menshikov, whom he was visiting, in 1703. Marfa was a mistress or housemaid to Menshikov, and probably served in the same capacity previously in the households of high-ranking officers of a victorious regiment of the
Russian Army, that captured Marienburg from the Swedes, such as Brigadier General Rudolph Felix Bauer and Field Marshal Boris Sheremetev. Marfa’s foster father, Johann Ernst Gluck, a Lutheran pastor agreed to work as a translator to the Field Marshall who took the pastor and his family to Moscow. Marfa was one of five children, whose parents Samuel Skavronsky and his wife had died in the plague, around 1689. Orphaned Marfa, who was just 3 years old was taken by an aunt and given to Pastor Gluck living in Marienburg, a border town near the Russian-Estonian border, for adoption. Whatever the origins or pedigree of Marfa, Peter the Great fell head over heels for the young and beautiful girl, and soon took her as his mistress. They lived in a three-room log cabin in St. Petersburg where the new capital city was taking shape. Marfa did the cooking and caring for the children, while Peter tended a garden, as though they were an ordinary couple. Their relationship turned out to be the most successful in Peter’s life, Marfa becoming a charming, compassionate and caring wife, calming Peter during his frequent rages and taking care of him during his epileptic seizures. In 1705, Marfa converted to Orthodox Christianity and took the name of Yekaterina Alexeyevna. So devoted was she to her husband, that she accompanied Peter, always on his military campaigns, and as reported by Voltaire in his book, “Peter the Great,” during one such campaign in 1711, Catherine was responsible for not only saving Peter’s life but also the Russian Empire. Peter’s army surrounded by overwhelming numbers of Turkish troops, was left with no option but surrender. It was then that Catherine gave Peter the invaluable advice, to negotiate a retreat with the Grand Vizier Baltagi, in return for a bribe in the form of jewelry adorning her person and those of other women in the group. Baltaji allowed the retreat that saved Peter’s life and the Russian Empire which he controlled. Peter credited Catherine for her life-saving suggestion, and immediately afterwards proceeded to marry her officially, at a ceremony which took place at St. Isaac’s Cathedral in St. Petersburg, on February 9, 1712. After the wedding, Catherine became Tsarina of All Russia, and later on October 22, 1721, when Peter elevated the Tsardom of Russia to an Empire, Catherine became its first Empress.

1717-portrait of Catherine I of Russia by Jean-Marc Nattier

The above portrait of Catherine I was executed by Jean-Marc Nattier in 1717, when she was the Tsaritsa-consort of Russia.

Ornaments depicted on the portrait :-
Hair ornament incorporating a row of six large spherical pearls, with a drop-shaped pearl hanging from it in the center.

A headband incorporating a single row of pearls behind the hair ornament in front.

Several drop-shaped pearls on the front bodice of her dress.

A brooch containing pearls at the center of a red bow, below the red band running diagonally across the bodice of her dress.

A single row of pearls incorporated along the edge of a purple-colored velvet-like cloak, placed carelessly on part of her lap in front and seen again behind her on either side.

Peter’s marriage to Catherine produced 12 children, out of whom only two survived into adulthood, Anna and Elizabeth, of whom the latter subsequently become empress of Russia. In 1724, Peter had Catherine crowned as Empress, and named her officially co-ruler of Russia, the first time a woman became a ruler of Russia, although Peter still remained the actual ruler. Peter’s intentions in doing so was quite clear, for he was determined to ensure a smooth succession in case of his sudden death, and wanted his wife to succeed him, the new appointment giving her the opportunity and experience in the techniques of ruling the nation. This is what exactly happened when Peter died several months later, on February 8, 1725, of uremia. Peter’s best friend Menshikov, who was a member of the Supreme Privy Council, and other members who were appointed by Peter, decided that Catherine should be the natural successor to Peter, as the late Emperor had intended, and proclaimed her the new Empress of Russia, supported by the Guards Regiments with whom she was very popular. Thus, Catherine became the first woman ever to rule Russia, paving the way for more women to ascend the throne subsequently. Apart from continuing with Peter the Great’s policies of modernizing Russia, her policies in general were cautious and reasonable. Her greatest achievement was reduction in military expenditure, that was consuming about 65% of the government’s annual revenue, as the nation was no more at war, and such an enormous expenditure was not justified. The cut in military expenditure enabled her to grant tax relief to the peasantry, a measure that increased her popularity. Catherine died at the age of 43, two years after her husband in 1727.
The above portrait of Catherine I was executed by Heinrich Buchholz in 1725, after she ascended the throne, as the first Empress of Russia, as her left hand placed on the crown, and her right hand carrying the royal scepter indicates.

**Ornaments depicted on the portrait:**

- Tiara set with pearls and a drop-shaped pearl hanging from the center.

- An elaborate stomacher set with pearls, with a central large drop-shaped pearl and a smaller drop-shaped pearl below it, along the median line, and a row of five drop-shaped pearls hanging from either side of perfectly matching motifs.

- A second circular brooch set with pearls, on the left side, just below the row of five pearls on the left side of the stomacher.

- A third brooch holding together the ends of a blue-colored sash across the right shoulder and left waist.

- The Empress is depicted placing her left hand on a crown set with rows of pearls, placed on an orange-colored cushion.

  An Orb, also set with rows of pearls, is depicted on one side of the crown and slightly behind it

---

**PETER II OF RUSSIA – EMPEROR OF ALL RUSSIA FROM 1727 TO 1730**

*After the death of Peter the Great’s co-ruler and wife Empress Catherine I, on May 17, 1727, the stage was now set for normal succession rules to take precedence in order to avoid a succession crisis. Accordingly, the next in line of succession to the Russian throne, was Peter the Great’s only male-line grandson, Peter Alekseyevich, the only son of Tsarevich Alexi Petrovich, the eldest son of Peter I by his first wife, Eudoxia Lopukhina, who married Princess Charlotte Christine of Brunswick-Wolfenbuttel, and later died in prison in 1718 due to injuries caused by torture. If not for Empress Catherine’s ascension to the throne, in 1725, who obviously was Peter the Great’s chosen successor, Peter*
Alekseyevich would have succeeded his grandfather, under the normal rules of succession of Russia. Peter Alekseyevich’s claim to the throne was supported by a majority of the Russian people, and the nobility, who detested claims by the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles VI, who was Peter’s uncle. Peter’s claim was also supported by the purported last will of Catherine I. Accordingly, Peter II was proclaimed Emperor of All Russia on May 18, 1727, rejecting the claims of Charles VI.

Peter II was just 12 years old at the time he ascended the throne of Russia, and first came under the care of Menshikov, who lodged him in his own palace on the Vasiliesky Island, and planned to get his daughter married to him. Menshikov played the role of a regent to Peter II, but soon became arrogant and domineering, and tried to dominate the emperor himself, which was resented by Peter, who got him arrested in September 1727.

Peter II then came under the influence of another Prince Vasily Dolgorukov, who persuaded Peter to transfer the seat of power back to Moscow, where he exerted total control over the young emperor. The coronation of Peter was held in Moscow on February 25, 1728. Prince Vasily then got Peter engaged to his niece, Princess Catherine Dolgorukova, and the wedding was eventually fixed for January 30, 1730. Unfortunately Peter II contracted smallpox and died coincidentally on the same day his wedding was originally scheduled to take place. With his death, the direct male line of the Romanov dynasty came to an end. Peter II was buried in the Kremlin, the only Romanov monarch not buried in the Peter and Paul Cathedral in Saint Petersburg.

ANNA IVANOVNA OF RUSSIA – EMPRESS OF RUSSIA FROM 1730 TO 1740

After the death of Peter II on January 30, 1730, the Supreme Privy Council of Russia decided that Anna Ivanovna, the 4th-daughter of co-Tsar Ivan V and his wife Praskovia Saltykova, should ascend the throne as the new Empress of Russia, thus overlooking the eligibility of two surviving daughters of Peter the Great, Anna and Elizabeth. The choice of the Supreme Privy Council was limited only to the surviving daughters of Ivan V and Peter the Great, as there were no surviving sons from either one of them. However, the Supreme Privy Council had already set a precedence by selecting Catherine as Empress and successor, to Emperor Peter the Great. Hence, they were only following a precedent set earlier, and Empress Anna Ivanovna became the second female monarch in the
history of Russia to rule the country. By selecting Anna Ivanovna as empress, if the Supreme Privy Council and the nobility had believed that they had only selected a figurehead to be the Empress of Russia, so that real power could be exercised by them from behind the scenes, they were sadly mistaken, as time passed, making use of her popularity with the Imperial Guards and the lesser nobility Anna Ivanovna established herself as a powerful autocratic ruler.

Anna married Frederick Wilhelm, Duke of Courland, in November 1710, a marriage that was arranged by Peter the Great. During the couple’s return trip to Courland from St. Petersburg in January 1711, Frederick Wilhelm died, and Anna was widowed just two months after her marriage. Anna never remarried after her husband’s death, but continued to rule as the Duchess of Courland from 1711 to 1730. Anna preferred to spend most of her time in Moscow, rather than the capital, St. Petersburg, and took a sadistic delight in cruel jokes, that sometimes humiliated the old nobility, and did not even spare entire populations of the city, who panicked at the ringing of fire bells that raised false alarms. Anna gave powerful positions in her administration to Baltic Germans instead of Russian nobles whom she always distrusted. One such Officer who gained her favour, and had considerable influence over her policies was Ernst Johann von Biron, whom she raised to the throne of Courland and was rumoured to be the lover of the Empress. In spite of her distrust of the nobility, she also granted them many privileges. Anna’s reign also marked the beginning of Russian territorial expansion into Central Asia, which was eventually realized fully by Catherine II. As Anna’s health declined, she made arrangements for her succession, excluding descendants of her uncle, Peter the Great, and trying to secure the line of her father, Ivan V, by declaring her grandnephew, Ivan VI as her successor, with her favourite, Biron as regent. Anna’s choice of successor, was not popular, because Ivan VI’s mother, Anna Leopoldovna was detested for her German counsellors and relatives. Yet, when Empress Anna died on October 28, 1740, the infant Ivan VI who was just two months old, was proclaimed Emperor, and Ernst Johann von Biron, became the regent.

Portraits of Empress Anna Ioannovna by Louis Caravaque in 1730

Ornaments depicted on the portrait: -

Crown studded with colored stones and rows of pearls.
An elaborate stomacher set with pearls and colored stones.

The Empress is depicted holding the Orb, placed on a velvet-covered cushion, with her left hand.

The Empress is holding the royal scepter in her right hand.

IVAN VI ANTONOVICH – PROCLAIMED EMPEROR AS AN INFANT ON OCTOBER 28, 1740 AND RULED UNTIL DECEMBER 6, 1741, WITH HIS MOTHER ANNA LEOPOLDOVNA ACTING AS REGENT.

Portrait of Ivan VI of Russia by unknown artist, when the infant Emperor was just above one year old

Ivan VI who was proclaimed as Emperor during his infancy, was born in St. Petersburg, on August 23, 1740, to the Duchess Anna Leopoldovna of Mecklenburg, niece of Empress Anna of Russia, and grand-daughter of Tsar Ivan V. Anna Leopoldovna’s husband was Prince Antony Ulrich of Brunswick-Luneburg. Ivan’s grand-aunt, Empress Anna adopted him when he was an eight-week-old infant, and declared him her successor on October 5, 1740, just three weeks before her death on October 28, 1740. Soon after Empress Anna’s death, Ivan was proclaimed Emperor and Ernst Johann von Biron became regent, in accordance with the late Empress’ wishes. However, Biron was removed just 12 days after he assumed the regency, and was replaced by Ivan’s mother, Anna Leopoldovna, with the actual running of the government being undertaken by the vice-chancellor, Andrei Osterman.

Anna Leopoldovna however, became very unpopular because of her German relatives and counsellors, and just 13 months after Ivan VI was proclaimed as Emperor, Elizabeth Petrovna, one of the two surviving daughters of Peter the Great, staged a coup d’etat and seized the throne on December 6, 1741, with the blessings of the population and the army, thus ending the short rule of Ivan VI and the regency of his mother. Ivan VI was then incarcerated for the rest of his life, being moved from one fortress to another, such as Dunamunde, Kholmogory and finally Shlisselburg, where he was killed by his guards, on July 16, 1764, in an attempt to free him during the rule of Catherine II.
Elizabeth Petrovna was the second of the two surviving daughters of Peter the Great and Catherine I of Russia, and was born on December 18, 1709, at the time her parents were secretly married and their marriage not yet publicly solemnized, which only took place subsequently at St. Isaac's Cathedral in St. Petersburg, on February 9, 1712. Though bright as a child, she did not have the benefit of a perfect formal education, yet under the guidance of her French governess, attained fluency in French, Italian and German, and also acquired the aristocratic skills of dancing and riding. Elizabeth turned out to become an extraordinarily beautiful and vivacious young lady, a leading beauty in the court of Peter the Great, as depicted in the portrait of Ivan Nikitin in the 1720s. Attempts by Peter the Great, to arrange a suitable match for Elizabeth before his death did not materialize. His first proposal to get the young French king, Louis XV, to marry Elizabeth was turned down by the Bourbons. Subsequently, Elizabeth was betrothed to a Prince of Holstein-Gottorp, Karl Augustus, like her sister Anna who married the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp. But, unfortunately Karl Augustus died few days after the betrothal. During the rule of her nephew Peter II and later her cousin Anna, Elizabeth kept a low profile, but took several young and handsome men as lovers, such as a sergeant in the Guards regiment, Alexis Shubin, who was later banished to Siberia by Empress Anna, a coachmen and even a waiter and finally a young and handsome Ukrainian peasant, who was a member of a church choir group, Alexis Razumovsky, who would subsequently become her morgantic spouse after she ascended the throne as empress.

Elizabeth, being the daughter of Peter the Great, was greatly respected by the Russian guards regiments. Elizabeth often visited the regiments, attending all their special events and functions, and acting a godmother to their children. After the death of Empress Anna, Elizabeth was kept out of her legitimate inheritance to the throne, which was instead given to a descendant of Tsar Ivan V, the infant Ivan VI with his mother Anna Leopoldovna as regent. The regency of Anna Leopoldovna became very unpopular, not only because of the high taxes imposed and other economic problems, but also because she was surrounded by several German relatives and counsellors. Elizabeth decided that the time was ripe to seize power, and staged a coup d'état supported by the Russian guards regiments. The coup succeeded without any bloodshed, and the infant Emperor and his parents were arrested and incarcerated in a fortress. Elizabeth ascended the throne as Empress of Russia on December 6, 1741, at the age of 33 years.

Immediately after ascending the throne, Elizabeth exiled most of the unpopular German advisers who were at the helm of affairs in the previous regime. During her reign her
hidden talents surfaced, and she became renowned for her keen judgement and
diplomatic tact, reminiscent of her father, Peter the Great. Elizabeth abolished the
cabinet council system introduced by Empress Anna, and re-constituted the Senate, as it
was under Peter the Great. She gave priority to settling all disputes with Sweden, and
opened negotiations, that led to the Treaty of Abo, in which Sweden surrendered to
Russia, territory in southern Finland, east of the River Kymmene, that became the
boundary between the two states. She took the country into the War of Austrian
Succession between 1740 to 1748 forming an Anglo-Austro-Russian alliance against the
Franco-Prussian coalition, dispatching 30,000 Russin troops to the Rhine, that
accelerated peace negotiations, and the signing of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748.
During the final years of her rule, she took Russia into the Seven-Years War (1756-
1763), forming an Austro-Franco-Russian alliance against Prussia, with the intention of
eliminating the danger posed by Frederick the Great of Prussia to the Russian empire.
Elizabeth’s sheer determination and firmness despite her failing health helped to hold
together the anti-Prussian alliance until her death in January 1762.

Elizabeth’s court was reputed to be one of the most splendid in all of Europe, holding
sumptuous balls and masquerades. She was proud of her dancing skills and wore the
most exquisite dresses to court. Her wardrobe included fifteen thousand ball gowns,
several thousand pairs of shoes and unlimited number of silk stockings. The empress
determined the styles of dresses and decorations worn by her courtiers, and imitating the
Empress’ hairstyle was forbidden.

Portrait of Empress Elizabeth Petrovna by Charles Van Loo

Ornaments worn by the Empress :-

Hair ornament set with pearls and colored stones.

Drop earrings incorporating pearls and diamonds.

Multistrand pearl bracelets on both hands.

Brooches on the right shoulder and near the hip, keeping in place a blue sash.

Another brooch attached to the left side of the bodice of her dress.
Elizabeth’s legacy include the establishment of the University of Moscow, the Academy of Fine Arts in Saint Peterburg, the Winter Palace and the Smolny Cathedral. She has gone down in history as one of the best loved Russian monarchs, for not allowing any Germans in government, and not executing anyone for any offence during her reign.

Elizabeth of Russia by V. Eriksen in the 18th-century

Ornaments worn by the Empress:

Hair ornaments incorporating diamonds.

Drop earrings incorporating diamonds.

Elaborate stomacher incorporating diamonds.

PETER III OF RUSSIA – EMPEROR OF RUSSIA FROM JANUARY 1762 TO JULY 1762

Empress Elizabeth was not officially married and did not have any legitimate children, to be made heir to the throne and succeed her after her death. Elizabeth’s elder sister Anna, who was married to the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, Karl Friedrich, had a son named Peter, who was born on February 21, 1728. Anna died less than two weeks after giving birth to Peter. In 1739, when Peter was 11 years old, his father died and Peter succeeded him as the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, assuming the name Karl Peter Ulrich. After Elizabeth became empress in December 1741, she got down her nephew Peter from Germany, converted him to Orthodox Christianity, and proclaimed him the heir-presumptive to the Russian throne, on November 7, 1742. She assigned Russian tutors to her nephew and also selected a suitable partner to marry the heir-presumptive. Her choice was Peter’s own second cousin, Sophia Augusta Frederica, daughter of Prince Christian Augustus and Johanna Elizabeth of Holstein-Gottorp. Like Peter, Sophia was converted to Orthodox Christianity and given the name Ekaterina (Catherine) Alexeievna in memory of Elizabeth’ mother, Catherine I. Their marriage took place on August 21,
1745. Peter was 17 and Catherine 16 years of age at the time of their marriage. The newly weds settled in the Palace of Oranienbaum, where they lived for the next 16 years. The marriage turned out to be an unhappy one, both of them taking lovers, yet producing two issues, Paul in 1754, the future emperor, and Anna Petrovna in 1757 who died two years later in 1759. Even though Catherine claimed subsequently, that Paul was not fathered by Peter, Paul physically resembled Peter in many ways, and many historians believe that Catherine’ claim of Paul’s illegitimacy was an attempt to cast doubt on Paul’s right to the throne, in order to prop up her own chances of succeeding to the throne.

When Empress Elizabeth died on January 5, 1762, she was succeeded by Peter, who ascended the throne, as Peter III of Russia, and Catherine became the Empress Consort of Russia. The new Emperor and his consort moved into the Winter Palace in Saint Petersburg. Even after ascending the throne, Peter continued his close relationship with his mistresss, Elizabeth Vorontsova, while Catherine too carried on with her liason with several men, like Sergei Saltykov, Grigory Grigoryevich Orlov and others. Peter III’s ascension to the throne saw a complete reversal in the foreign policies of his predecessor and aunt Empress Elizabeth. The anti-Prussian alliance which Elizabeth helped to maintain in the Seven Years War, until her death in January 1762, suddenly collapsed, when Peter III, who had a great admiration for the Prussian king, Frederick II, decided to extend a hand of friendship to the king, and made peace with Prussia, to the detriment of the relationship with Austria. Overnight Prussia turned from an enemy to an ally of Russia. Peter III gave up all Russian conquests in Prussia, and allied his troops with the Prussian army against Austria, leading to the re-capture of Silesia and forcing Austria to the negotiating table, that ended the Seven Years War. Peter also made an attempt to restore Schleswig, which was previously captured by Denmark, to his duchy, Holstein-Gottorp, by isolating Denmark politically and sending 40,000 Russian troops to Colberg in Russian Pomerania, in preparation for war with Denmark, but the attempt did not materialize, as he was dethroned by his wife Catherine on July 9, 1762, and subsequently murdered by her agents.

During Peter III’s short period of rule that lasted precisely 186 days, he had passed 220 new laws, that reflect the making of a great emperor in the future, had his monarchy survived. Some of the progressive laws he proclaimed, include freedom of religious worship, a move that had not even been dreamt of, at that time in the more advanced countries of Western Europe; laws to fight corruption in government; establishing public litigation; abolishing the much-hated and feared Secret Police, an organ of repression created by Peter the Great;
Peter III

Princess Sophie Friederike Auguste of Anhalt-Zerbst
16 August 1745
one son
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Catherine II the Great

Peter III of Russia
16 August 1745
one son

1762-1796

1790

Prison reformers: Howard

John Howard

Born September 2, 1726, Hackney, London, died January 20, 1790, Kherson, Ukraine, Russian Empire. He was an English philanthropist and reformer in the fields of penology and public health. On his father’s death in 1742, Howard inherited considerable wealth and travelled widely in Europe. He then became High Sheriff in Bedfordshire in 1773.

He spent the last years of his life studying means of preventing plague and limiting the
spread of contagious diseases. Travelling in Russia in 1790 and visiting the principal military hospitals that lay en route, he reached Kherson in Ukraine. In attending a case of camp fever that was raging there, he contracted the disease and died.

1791

Alexandra Pavlovna and her sister, Elena Pavlovna
by Marie Elisabeth Louise Vigee-Le Brun
1795-1797

Alexandra was very close to her younger sister, Elena. In 1795, the sisters were painted by the French artist, Marie-Élisabeth-Louise Vigée-Le Brun (1755-1842).

Alexandra Pavlovna

1796

In the late 1790s, her sister Elena Pavlovna was betrothed to Hereditary Prince Friedrich Ludwig of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (1778-1819). Alexandra Pavlovna was engaged to Archduke Joseph Anton Johann of Austria, Palatine of Hungary (9 March 1776 – 13 January 1847). He was the son of Maria Louisa of Spain (24 November 1745 – 15 May 1792) and Leopold II, Holy Roman Emperor (5 May 1747 – 1 March 1792). Elena Pavlovna and Friedrich Ludwig were married on 23 October 1799, at the Palace of Gatchina. Alexandra Pavlovna married Archduke Joseph of Austria on 30 October 1799, at the Gatchina Palace, in Gatchina. Elena moved to Schwerin with her husband, while Alexandra and Joseph settled in the Castle of Alcsút, in Hungary. Alexandra gave birth to a daughter, Alexandrine on 8 March 1801, in Budapest, Hungary. Sadly the baby girl died on the day of her birth.
The Child of Archduchess Alexandra and Archduke Joseph:
Archduchess Alexandrine of Austria (8 March 1801 – 8 March 1801)

Alexandra died of puerperal fever, aged 17, on 16 March 1801, in Wien, Austria. Joseph built a mausoleum dedicated to his wife, but the Austrian Court refused her burial in any Catholic Cemetery. She was interred in Hungary. Her sister, Elena Pavlovna died on 24 September 1803. She was buried in the Helena Paulovna Mausoleum in Ludwigslust, which was named in her memory. Archduke Joseph of Austria married his second wife, Princess Hermine of Anhalt-Bernburg-Schaumburg-Hoym (1797-1817) on 30 August 1815, at Schaumburg. They had two children, a daughter and a son. Joseph of Austria married his third wife, Duchess Maria Dorothea of Württemberg on 24 August 1819, at Kirchheim unter Teck. They had five children, three daughters and two sons.

Paul I

Princess Wilhelmina Louisa of Hesse-Darmstadt
29 September 1773
one stillborn daughter

Princess Sophie Dorothea of Württemberg
26 September 1776
ten children

1796-1801

19th Cent. Grand Duchess Alexandra Pavlovna of Russia, Archduchess of Austria

Alexandra Pavlovna was born on 9 August 1783, in Tsarskoye Selo. She was the
Maria Feodorovna, Empress Consort of Russia (25 October 1759 – 5 November 1828) and

Paul I, Emperor of Russia (1 October 1754 – 23 March 1801).

Her maternal grandparents were Friederike Dorothee Sophie of Brandenburg-Schwedt, Duchess of Württemberg (18 December 1736 – 9 March 1798) and Friedrich Eugen, Duke of Württemberg (21 January 1732 – 23 December 1797). Her paternal grandparents were Catherine II the Great, Empress of Russia (2 May 1729 – 6 November 1796) and Peter III, Emperor of Russia (21 February 1728 – 17 July 1762). Alexandra’s parents were married on 7 October 1776. Her siblings were: Alexander I (1777-1825), Konstantin Pavlovich (1779-1831), Elena Pavlovna (1784-1803), Maria Pavlovna (1786-1859), Catherine Pavlovna (1788-1819), Anna Pavlovna (1795-1865), Nicholas I (1796-1855) and Michael Pavlovich (1798-1849). Her mother was her father’s second wife.

Paul I married first Grand Duchess Natalia Alexeievna of Russia (25 June 1755 – 15 April 1776) on 29 September 1773. Natalia Alexeievna died shortly after she delivered a still born daughter on 15 April 1776.

Alexandra Pavlovna

by Dmitry Levitsky

READ MORE INFO

Pavel I Petrovich Romanov,
Tsar of Russia was born on 1 October 1754 at St. Petersburg, Russia. He was the son of Alexander I the Blessed

Princess Louise of Baden
28 September 1793
2 daughters
1801-1825

Constantine I (disputed)

Princess Juliane of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld
26 February
no children
1825

Nicholas I

Princess Charlotte of Prussia
13 July 1817
7 children
1825-1855
Alexander II the Liberator

Princess Marie of Hesse and by Rhine
16 April 1841
8 children
1855-1881

Alexander III the Peace-Maker

Princess Dagmar of Denmark
9 November 1866
6 children
1881-1894

Petr III Romanov, Tsar of Russia and

Catherine II Sofie Auguste von Anhalt-Zerbst, Tsarina of Russia.

He married, firstly, Wilhelmine Luisa Prinzessin von Hessen-Darmstadt, daughter of

Ludwig IX Landgraf von Hessen-Darmstadt and
Karoline Henriette Christine Pfalzgräfin von Zweibrücken-Birkenfeld, on 10 October 1773.

He married, secondly,

Sophia Dorothea Prinzessin von Württemberg, daughter of

Friedrich II Eugen Heinrich Herzog von Württemberg and

Friederike Dorothea Prinzessin von Brandenburg-Schwedt, on 7 October 1776

At

St. Petersburg, Russia.

Emperor Peter III Romanov died on 24 March 1801 at age 46 a

St. Petersburg, Russia, assassinated.³

He gained the title of Grand Duke Pavel Petrovich of Russia.³ He succeeded to the title of Tsar Pavel I of Russia on 17 November 1796.³

Child of
Pavel I Petrovich Romanov, Tsar of Russia and

Wilhelmine Luisa Prinzessin von Hessen-Darmstadt

1. **unnamed child Romanov** b. 26 Apr 1776, d. 26 Apr 1776

Children of Pavel I Petrovich Romanov, Tsar of Russia and Sophia Dorothea Prinzessin von Württemberg

1. **Aleksandr I Pavlovich Romanov, Tsar of Russia** b. 23 Dec 1777, d. 1 Dec 1825
2. **Konstantin Pavlovich Romanov, Grand Duke of Russia** b. 8 May 1779, d. 27 Jun 1831
3. **Aleksandra Pavlovna Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia** b. 9 Aug 1783, d. 16 Mar 1801
4. **Elena Pavlovna Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia** b. 24 Dec 1784, d. 24 Sep 1803
5. **Mariya Pavlovna Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia** b. 16 Feb 1786, d. 23 Jun 1859
6. **Ekaterina Pavlovna Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia** b. 21 May 1788, d. 19 Jan 1819
7. **Olga Pavlovna Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia** b. 22 Jul 1792, d. 26 Jan 1795
8. **Anna Pavlovna Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia** b. 18 Jan 1795, d. 1 Mar 1865
9. **Nikolai I Pavlovich Romanov, Tsar of Russia** b. 6 Jul 1796, d. 2 Mar 1855
10. **Mikhail Pavlovich Romanov, Grand Duke of Russia** b. 8 Feb 1798, d. 9 Sep 1849

House of Romanov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House of Romanov</th>
<th>House of Holstein-Gottorp-Romanov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tsardom of Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Russian Empire  
Kingdom of Poland  
Grand Duchy of Finland  
Grand Duchy of Oldenburg  
Duchy of Holstein  
Malta  

| Ancestral house | Romanov  
| Oldenburg, Holstein-Gottorp |

| Titles | Emperor of Russia (1721–1917)  
| Tsar of Russia (1613–1721)  
| King of Poland  
| King of Georgia  
| Grand Duke of Kiev  
| Grand Duke of Muscovy  
| Grand Duke of Lithuania  
| Grand Duke of Finland  
| Grand Duke of Oldenburg  
| Duke of Estonia  
| Duke of Livonia  
| Duke of Courland  
| Duke of Holstein-Gottorp  
| Grand Master of the Knights Hospitaller  

and so forth, and so forth, and so forth  

| Current head | Disputed:  
| Nicholas Romanov, Prince of Russia  
<p>| Maria Vladimirovna, Grand Duchess of Russia |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founding</th>
<th>1613 — <strong>Michael I</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissolution</td>
<td><strong>Russia:</strong> 1917 — <strong>Nicholas II</strong> abdicated as a result of the <strong>February Revolution</strong> in favour of <strong>Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich</strong>, who refused to accept the throne until it could be approved by the <strong>Russian Constituent Assembly</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cadet branches | ■ **Holstein-Gottorp-Romanov**  
■ **Yurievsky** |

The **House of Romanov** (Russian: Российская империя, IPA: [rəˈmʲɪnʲɪə]) was the second and last **imperial dynasty** to rule over **Russia**, reigning from 1613 until the **February Revolution** abolished the crown in 1917. The later history of the Imperial House is sometimes referred to informally as the **House of Holstein-Gottorp-Romanov**.

The Duke of **Holstein-Gottorp**, who was himself a member of a cadet branch of the **Oldenburgs**, married into the Romanov family early in the 18th century; all Romanov **Tsars** from the middle of that century to the **revolution of 1917** were descended from that marriage. Though officially known as the House of Romanov, these descendants of the Romanov and Oldenburg Houses are sometimes referred to as Holstein-Gottorp-Romanov. [citation needed] [edit] Origins

A 16th-century residence of the Yuryev-Zakharyin boyars in **Zaryadye**, near the **Kremlin**.

The Romanovs share their origin with two dozen other Russian noble families. Their earliest common ancestor is one **Andrei Kobyla**, attested as a **boyar** in the service of **Semyon I of Moscow**. Later generations assigned to Kobyla the most illustrious pedigrees. An 18th century genealogy book claimed that he was the son of the Prussian prince Glanda Kambila, who came to Russia in the second half of the 13th century, fleeing the invading Germans. Indeed, one of the leaders of the **Old Prussian** rebellion of 1260-1274 against the **Teutonic order** was named Glande.

His actual origin may have been less spectacular. Not only is Kobyla **Russian** for “mare”,
some of his relatives also had as nicknames the terms for horses and other domestic animals, thus suggesting descent from one of the royal equerries. One of Kobyla’s sons, Feodor, a boyar in the boyar duma of Dmitri Donskoi, was nicknamed Koshka (cat). His descendants took the surname Koshkin, then changed it to Zakharin, which family later split into two branches: Zakharin-Yakovlev and Zakharin-Yuriev. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible, the former family became known as Yakovlev (Alexander Herzen being the most illustrious of them), whereas grandchildren of Roman Zakharin-Yuriev changed their name to Romanov.

Rise to power

A crowd at the Ipatiev Monastery imploring Mikhail Romanov’s mother to let him go to Moscow and become their tsar (Illumination from a book dated 1673).

The family fortunes soared when Roman’s daughter, Anastasia Zakharyina, married Ivan IV in February 1547. When her husband assumed the title of tsar, which literally means Caesar, she was crowned the very first Tsaritsa. Their marriage was an exceedingly happy one, but her untimely and mysterious death in 1560 changed Ivan’s character for the worse. Suspecting the boyars of having poisoned his beloved, the tsar started a reign of terror against them. Among his children by Anastasia, the elder (Ivan) was murdered by the tsar in a quarrel; the younger Feodor, a pious and lethargic prince, inherited the throne upon his father’s death.

Throughout Feodor’s reign, the Russian government was contested between his brother-in-law, Boris Godunov, and his Romanov cousins. Upon the death of childless Feodor, the 700-year-old line of Moscow Ruriks came to an end. After a long struggle, the party of Boris Godunov prevailed over the Romanovs, and the former was elected new Tsar in 1599. Godunov’s revenge on the Romanovs was terrible: all the family and its relatives were deported to remote corners of the Russian North and Ural, where most of them died of hunger or in chains. The family’s leader, Feodor Nikitich Romanov, was exiled to the Antoniev Siysky Monastery and forced to take monastic vows with the name Filaret.

The Romanovs’ fortunes again changed dramatically with the fall of the Godunov dynasty in June 1605. As a former leader of the anti-Godunov party and cousin of the last legitimate Tsar, Filaret Romanov was valued by several impostors who attempted to claim the Rurik legacy and throne during the Time of Troubles. False Dmitriy I made him a metropolitan, and False Dmitriy II raised him to the dignity of patriarch. Upon expulsion of Poles from Moscow in 1612, the Assembly of the Land offered the Russian crown to
several Rurik and Gedimin princes, but all of them declined the honour of it.

On being offered the Russian crown, Filaret’s 16-year-old son Mikhail Romanov, then living at the Ipatiev Monastery of Kostroma, burst into tears of fear and despair. He was finally persuaded to accept the throne by his mother Kseniya Ivanovna Shestova, who blessed him with the holy image of Our Lady of St. Theodore. It is little known that he was spirited to Moscow on the donation from the Stroganov family of Perm. Feeling how insecure his throne was, Mikhail attempted to emphasize his ties with the last Rurik tsars and sought advice from the Assembly of the Land on every important issue. This strategy proved successful. The early Romanovs were generally loved by the population as in-laws of Ivan the Terrible and innocent martyrs of Godunov’s wrath.

[edit] The era of dynastic crisis

Mikhail was succeeded by his only son Alexei, who steered the country quietly through numerous troubles. Upon his death, there was a period of dynastic struggles between his children by his first wife (Feodor III, Sofia Alexeevna, Ivan V) and his son by his second wife Nataliya Kyrillovna Naryshkina, the future Peter the Great. New dynastic struggles followed the death of Peter. His only son Alexei, who did not support Peter's modernization of Russia, had previously been arrested and died in prison shortly thereafter. Near the end of his life, Peter managed to alter the succession tradition of male heirs to allow him to name his own heir. Power then passed into the hands of his second wife, the Empress Catherine. Within five years, the Romanov male line ended with the death of Peter II.

[edit] The Holstein-Gottorp-Romanov Dynasty

The Holstein-Gottorps of Russia retained the Romanov surname and sought to emphasize their matrilineal descent from Peter the Great, through Anna Petrovna (Peter I’s elder daughter by his second wife). Paul I was particularly proud to be great-grandson of the illustrious Russian monarch, although his German-born mother, Catherine II (of the House of Anhalt-Zerbst), insinuated in her memoirs that Paul's real father had been her lover Serge Saltykov. Painfully aware of the hazards resulting from battles of succession, Paul established the house law of the Romanovs—one of the strictest in Europe—basing the succession to agnatic primogeniture and requiring Orthodox faith from the monarch, the dynasts, the consort of the emperor and from those of first heirs in line. Later, Alexander I, facing prospect of a morganatic alliance of his brother and heir, added the requirement
that consorts of Russian dynasts had to be of equal birth (i.e., born to a royal or sovereign house).

Paul I was murdered in his palace in Saint Petersburg. Alexander I succeeded him on the throne and later died without leaving a male heir. His brother, crowned Nicholas I, succeeded him on the throne. Nicholas I fathered four sons and provided them with excellent education for the prospect of ruling Russia and successfully leading in military conflicts.

Alexander II, son of Nicholas I, became the next Russian emperor. Alexander was an educated, intelligent man, who held that his task was to keep peace in Europe and Russia. However, he believed only a country with a strong army could keep the peace. By paying attention to the army, giving much freedom to Finland, and freeing the serfs in 1861, he gained much popular support (Finns still dearly remember him). His family life was not so happy; his beloved wife Maria Alexandrovna had serious problems with her lungs, which led to her death and to the dissolution of the close-knit family due to his quick morganatic marriage to his long time mistress, Princess Catherine Dolgoruki. His legitimization of his children by Catherine, and rumors that he was about to crown his new wife Empress, ending the morganatic status of his second marriage, caused great tension with the entire extended Romanov family. In particular, the Grand Duchesses were scandalized at the thought of being made permanently subordinate to Catherine Dolgoruki, since as an Empress she would have precedence over all of them. (She wouldn’t have precedence over the next Empress Consort, however, as only mothers of Emperors had precedence over the wife of the reigning sovereign. On March 13, 1881, Alexander was killed after returning from a military parade. Slavic patriotism, cultural revival, and Panslavist ideas grew in importance in the latter half of this century, drawing the dynasty to look more ‘Russian’. Yet tighter commitment to orthodox faith was required of Romanovs. Several marriages were contracted with princesses from other Slavic monarchies and other orthodox kingdoms, and even a couple of cadet-line princesses were allowed to marry Russian high noblemen – whereas until 1850s, practically all marriages had been with German princelings.

Wedding of Nicholas II and Alexandra Feodorovna.

Alexander II was succeeded by his son Alexander III. Alexander III, the second-to-last Romanov tsar, was responsible for conservative reforms in Russia. Never meant to be emperor, he was educated in matters of state only after the death of his older brother, Nikolai. This lack of extensive education may have influenced his politics as well as those
of his son, Nicholas II. Alexander III cut an impressive figure. Not only was he tall (6’4 according to some sources), but his physique was proportionately large. Rumors spread about his incredible strength – a strength that was the size of his temper. In addition, the beard he wore hearkened back to the likeness of tsars of old, contributing to the aura of authority with which he carried himself.

Alexander, fearful of the fate which had befallen his father, strengthened autocratic rule in Russia. Many of the reforms the more liberal Alexander II had pushed through were reversed. Alexander, at his brother’s death, not only inherited the throne, but also a betrothed – Danish princess Maria Fyodorovna. Despite contrasting natures and size, the pair got on famously, was the first time a Tsar didn’t have a mistress, and produced six children.

The former Imperial Waiting Room at the main train station in Nizhny Novgorod.

The eldest, Nicholas, became Tsar upon his father’s sudden death (due to kidney disease) at age 49. Unready to inherit the throne, Nicholas reputedly said, “I am not ready to be Tsar....” Though an intelligent and kind-hearted man, lacking any preparation to rule, he continued his father's harsh polices. His Tsarina, the loving German princess Alexandra Fyodorovna, was also a liability. Like the Tsar, she was not a ruler. When the Tsar took control of the army in the front lines during World War I, he left his wife in charge of Russia for he trusted only her. Like Nicholas, she failed at ruling. She was indecisive and did not trust anyone’s advice. She was not intuitive in the ways of politics and not competent in this area. The fact that she was a German also lessened the Russian people’s faith in her.

Constantine Pavlovich and Michael Alexandrovich, although sometimes counted among Russian monarchs, were not crowned and never reigned. They both married morganatically, as did Alexander II with his second wife. Six crowned representatives of the Holstein-Gottorp-Romanov line include: Paul (1796–1801), Alexander I (1801–1825), Nicholas I (1825–55), Alexander II (1855–81), Alexander III (1881–94), and Nicholas II (1894–1917).

[edit] Downfall

Further information: Shooting of the Romanov family and Canonization of the Romanovs
One of the imperial Fabergé eggs presented by Nicholas II to his wife.

All these emperors (except Alexander III) had German-born consorts, a circumstance which damaged their popularity during World War I. Nicholas’s wife Alexandra Fyodorovna, although devoutly Orthodox, was particularly hated by the populace, largely because of her German origins.

Alexandra was a carrier of the gene for hemophilia, which she inherited from her maternal grandmother, Queen Victoria. Her only son, the long-awaited heir to the throne, Alexei inherited the gene and developed hemophilia. Nicholas and Alexandra also had four daughters (Olga, Tatiana, Maria, and Anastasia).

The February Revolution of 1917 resulted in abdication of Nicholas II in favor of his brother Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich. The latter declined to accept the crown, terminating the Romanov dynasty's rule over Russia. (Many believe that the crown did not technically pass to Michael, as Tsarevich Alexei would have automatically succeeded his father, Nicholas II. Thus Alexei would have been the only one who could renounce the crown, Michael could not abdicate, and the crown would still be in the Romanov name.)

After the February Revolution, Nicholas II and his family were placed under house arrest in the Alexander Palace. Several members of the Imperial Family, including Grand Duke Cyril Vladimirovich of Russia, managed to establish good relations with the interim government and eventually fled the country during the October Revolution.

Yekaterinburg’s “Church on the Blood“, built on the spot where the last Tsar and his family were killed.

[edit] Execution of Tsar & Family

On July 17, 1918, Bolshevik authorities, led by Yakov Yurovsky, shot Nicholas II, his immediate family, and four servants in the cellar of the Ipatiev House in Yekaterinburg, Russia.

The family was told that they were to be photographed to prove to the people that they were still alive. The family members were arranged appropriately and left alone for several minutes, the gunmen then walked in and started shooting. The girls did not die from the first shots, because bullets rebounded off jewels that were sewn into their corsets. The gunmen tried to stab them with bayonets, that failed, because of the jewels, the gunmen
then shot each girl in the head at close range.

Ironically, the Ipatiev House has the same name as the Ipatiev Monastery in Kostroma, where Mikhail Romanov had been offered the Russian Crown in 1613. The spot where the Ipatiev House once stood has recently been commemorated by a magnificent cathedral “on the blood.”

After years of controversy, Nicholas II and his family were proclaimed passion-bearers by the Russian Orthodox church in 2000. (In orthodoxy, a passion-bearer is a saint who was not killed because of his faith like a martyr but died in faith at the hand of murderers.)

[edit] Execution of Extended Family

On 18th July 1918, the day after the killing at Yekaterinburg of the last Tsar, Nicholas II and family, members of the extended Russian royal family, the Romanovs, including a nun, and servants met a brutal death by being thrown down a mineshaft near Alapayevsk by Bolsheviks. All except Grand Duke Sergei Mikhailovich of Russia survived the fall, hand-grenades were thrown down after them killing Grand Duke Sergei’s secretary, Fyodor Remez. Other victims died a slow death including Prince Ioann Konstantinovich of Russia, Prince Konstantin Konstantinovich of Russia, Prince Igor Konstantinovich of Russia and Prince Vladimir Pavlovich Paley, Grand Duke Sergei’s secretary Varvara Yakovleva and Grand Duchess Elizabeth Fyodorovna, a granddaughter of Queen Victoria. Grand Duchess Elizabeth had departed her family after the death of her husband in 1905 and donated all her wealth to the poor and became a nun, but was shown no mercy.[1]

The bodies were recovered from the mine by the White army in 1918, who arrived too late to rescue them. The bodies were placed in coffins and were moved around Russia during struggles between the White and the opposing Red Army. By 1920 the coffins were interred in a former Russian Mission in Beijing, now beneath a parking area. In 1981 Princess Elisabeth was canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, and in 1992 by the Moscow Patriarchate. In 2006 representatives of the Romanov family were making plans to reinter the remains elsewhere.[2] The town is a place of pilgrimage to the memory of Elizabeth Romanov.

[edit] Remains Of Tsar
In 1991, the bodies of Nicholas II and his wife, along with three of their five children and four of their servants, were exhumed (although some questioned the authenticity of these bones despite DNA testing). Because two bodies were not present, many people believed that two Romanov children escaped the killings. There was much debate as to which two children’s bodies were missing. A Russian scientist made photographic superimpositions and determined that Marie and Alexei were not accounted for. Later, an American scientist concluded from dental, vertebral, and other remnants that it was Anastasia and Alexei who were missing. Much mystery surrounded Anastasia’s fate. Several films have been produced suggesting that she lived on.

After the bodies were exhumed in June, 1991, they sat in laboratories until 1998, while there was a debate as to whether they should be reburied in Yekaterinburg or St. Petersburg. A commission eventually chose St. Petersburg, so they (along with several loyal servants who died with them) were interred in a special chapel in the Peter and Paul Cathedral near the tombs of their ancestors.

Empress Marie Fedorovna

In September 2006, Empress Marie Fedorovna, the consort of Alexander III, was buried in the Peter and Paul Cathedral beside her husband. Having fled Russia at the time of the Revolution, she had spent her remaining years in exile in her native Denmark, where she was initially buried in Roskilde Cathedral. The transfer of her remains was accompanied by elaborate ceremonies, including at St. Isaac's officiated by the Patriarch. For monarchists, the reburial of the Empress in the former Imperial Capital, so many years after her death, further underscored the downfall of the dynasty. Princes Dmitri and Nicholas Romanov were present at the ceremony, along with Princess Catherine Ioannovna of Russia, daughter of Prince Ioann Konstantinovich of Russia, Prince Nikita Kepta Romanoff, son of Kristina Tasha Romanova. Other members of the Imperial Family present included the descendants of the Dowager Empress Maria Feodorovna including Prince Michael Andreevich of Russia the senior direct male descendant. Princess Catherine who was 90 years old at the time, and died in Montevideo Uruguay the following year, was the last member of the Imperial Family to be born before the fall of the dynasty, and was ultimately to become the last surviving uncontested dynast of the Imperial House of Russia.

Alexei

Late summer of 2007, a Russian archaeologist announced the discovery by one of his...
workers. The excavation discovered the following items in the two pits which formed a “T”: (#1) remains of 46 human bones fragments; (#2) bullet jackets from short barrel guns/pistols; (#3) wooden boxes which had deteriorated into fragments: (#4) pieces of cermanic which appear to be amphoras which were used as containers for acid; (#5) iron nails; (#6) iron angles; (#7) seven fragments of teeth; (#8) fragment of fabric of a garment. The area where the remains were found were near the old Koptyaki Rd. under what appeared to be double bonfire sites which is about 70 km from the mass grave in Pigs Meadow near Yekaterinburg. The general directions were described in Yurovsky’s memoirs owned by his son, although no one is sure who wrote the notes on the page. The archaeologists said the bones are from a boy who was roughly between the ages of ten and thirteen years at the time of his death and of a young woman who was roughly between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three years old. Anastasia was seventeen years, one month old at the time of the murder, while Maria was nineteen years and one month old. Alexei would have been fourteen in two weeks time. Alexei’s elder sisters Olga and Tatiana were twenty-two and twenty-one years old at the time of the murder. The bones were found using metal detectors and metal rods as probes. Also, striped material was found that appeared to have been from a blue-and-white striped cloth; Alexei commonly wore a blue-and-white striped undershirt.

[edit] DNA Proof

On April 30, 2008, Russian forensic scientists announced that DNA testing proves that the remains belong to the Tsarevich Alexei and to one of his sisters. DNA information, made public in July 2008, that has been obtained from Ekaterinburg and repeatedly subject to independent testing by laboratories such as the University of Massachusetts Medical School, USA, and reveals that the final two missing Romanov remains are indeed authentic and that the entire Romanov family housed in the Ipatiev House, Ekaterinburg were executed in the early hours of 17 July 1918. In March 2009, results of the DNA testing were published, confirming that the two bodies discovered in 2007 were those of Tsarevich Alexei and one of his sisters.

[edit] Romanov family jewelry

On August 28, 2009, a Swedish public news outlet reported that Romanov family jewelry, found in 2008 in the archives of the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, was returned. The jewelry was allegedly turned over to the Swedish embassy in St. Petersburg in November 1918 by Duchess Marie of Mecklenburg-Schwerin to keep it safe. The jewelry’s
worth was estimated to 20 million SEK (about 2.6 million US dollars).\[31\]

[edit] Contemporary Romanovs

There have been many theories regarding the possible survival of members of Nicholas II’s family. However, recent research shows that all of the Romanovs, including Tsarevich Alexei and Grand Duchess Anastasia who had been thought to have escaped the Bolshevik attack, were killed.[4][5]

Many relatives survived, including Nicholas II’s two sisters, Grand Duchess Xenia Alexandrovna of Russia and Grand Duchess Olga Alexandrovna of Russia. Xenia’s and Olga’s descendants survive to this day. Cyril Vladimirovich, Grand Duke of Russia, a descendant of Alexander II of Russia, claimed the title Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias in 1924 and some of his descendants retain such claims. In addition the Romanov Family Association exists for most descendants of Emperor Paul I of Russia. Both branches of the Romanov family are feuding with one another over the question of succession. Other close family relatives include Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, who was a great-nephew of the last Tsaritsa. Prince Philip’s DNA was used by forensic scientists to identify the body of the last Tsaritsa and her children.[6]

[edit] Heraldry

| The Imperial Arms of the House of Romanov, which were restricted in use to the Emperor and certain members of the Imperial Family |
Tsar Peter III of Russia.

Catherine, along with her lover Grigori Orlov, planned to overthrow Peter, as she believed he would divorce her in order to marry his mistress Elisabeth Vorontsova. The Leib Guard, on which Peter planned to impose harsher discipline, revolted and Peter was arrested and forced to sign his own abdication; Catherine became Empress with the support of most of the nobility. Shortly thereafter, Peter was killed while in custody at Ropsha. While Catherine did not punish the responsible guards, doubts remain as to whether she ordered the murder or not.

Tsar Paul I of Russia.

A conspiracy was organized—some months before it was executed—by Counts Petr Alekseevich Pahlen, Nikita Petrovich Panin, and the half-Spanish, half-Neapolitan adventurer Admiral Ribas. The death of Ribas delayed the execution. On the night of the March 23 [O.S. March 11] 1801, Paul was murdered in his bedroom in the newly built St Michael’s Castle by a band of dismissed officers headed by General Bennigsen, a Hanoverian in the Russian service, and General Yashvil, a Georgian. They charged into his bedroom, flushed with drink after supping together, and found Paul hiding behind some drapes in the corner. The conspirators pulled him out, forced him to the table, and tried to compel him to sign his abdication. Paul offered some resistance, and one of the assassins struck him with a sword, after which he was strangled and trampled to death. He was succeeded by his son, the 23-year-old Alexander I—who was actually in the palace—and to whom General Nicholas Zubov, one of the assassins, announced his accession, accompanied by the admonition, “Time to grow up! Go and rule!”.
Tsar Alexander II of Russia.

On 13 March (1 March Old Style Date), 1881, Alexander fell victim to an assassination plot. The explosion, while killing one of the Cossacks and seriously wounding the driver and people on the sidewalk, had only damaged the bulletproof carriage, a gift from Napoleon III of France. The tsar emerged shaken but unhurt. Rysakov was captured almost immediately. Police Chief Dvorzhitsky heard Rysakov shout out to someone else in the gathering crowd. The surrounding guards and the Cossacks urged the tsar to leave the area at once rather than being shown the site of the explosion. A young man, Ignacy Hryniewiecki, standing by the canal fence, raised both arms and threw something at the tsar’s feet.

Tsar Nicholas II of Russia.

On the night of 16/17 July 1918, the royal family was awakened around 2:00 am, told to dress, and led down into a half-basement room at the back of the Ipatiev house; the pretext for this move was the family’s safety – that anti-Bolshevik forces were approaching Ekaterinberg, and the house might be fired upon. Present with Nicholas, Alexandra and their children were their doctor, and three of their servants, who had voluntarily chosen to remain with family – the Tsar’s personal physician Eugene Botkin, his wife’s maid Anna Demidova, and the family’s chef, Ivan Kharitonov, and footman, Alexei Trupp. A firing squad had been assembled and was waiting in an adjoining room, composed of seven Communist soldiers from Central Europe, and three local Bolsheviks, all under the command of Bolshevik officer Yakov Yurovsky (the soldiers are often described as Hungarians; in his account, Yurovsky described them as “Latvians”).
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Franco-Russian Diplomacy, 1810-1812

“I will not draw sword first, but I shall sheathe it last” – Alexander I

On June 24, 1812,

while Napoleon was standing on the shores of Niemen River and watching his Grande Armée crossing the Russian border,
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1812: Background for Napoleon’s Russian campaign

The two emperors Napoleon (left) and Alexander I (right) negotiating the Tilsit Treaty in a pavilion set up on a raft in the middle of the Niemen River, beginning 25 June 1807.

In 1806, Napoleon won a conclusive battle against Austria at Wagram. Austria was then forced to sign the treaty of Vienna, which reduced it to a state of powerlessness. From a military point of view, Napoleon had now gained control over most of Europe and was beginning to create a European Community, almost 200 years before it became a reality. As was the case for Adolf Hitler 129 years later, only two European nations stood between
him and the total political dominance: Britain and Russia.

In November 1806 the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church issued a denunciation of Napoleon, accusing him of conspiring with evil people against the Christian Faith, due to Napoleon's declaration of his regard for Islam. Russia therefore launched a military crusade against him. This initiative was cut short by Napoleon routing the Russian army at Eylau (January 1807) and at Friedland (June 1807). Tsar Alexander I of Russia the sensibly enough suggested peace and an alliance, which was negotiated and signed 7 July 1807 at Tilsit.

Cracks in this alliance, however, rapidly began to show. Especially Napoleon's creation of the Grande Duchy of Warsaw in 1807 had, in effect, introduced the first material renewed conflict of interest between France and Russia. This new political unit inevitably raised the possibility of a restoration of the Kingdom of Poland. Such a restoration would entail the loss of Russia of some if not all previous land acquisitions at the expense of Poland – an area of 463,000 km² with a population of more than seven million. Napoleon was beginning to fear that Russia would use the Polish question as an excuse to seek an understanding with Britannia. The French-Russian relationship began to deteriorate. By 1811, there was much open talk about the coming war in both countries, although probably both Napoleon and Alexander had no personal wishes to go down the road to war.

Caught up by the internal dynamics of this development, Napoleon decided to strike first, and began a relentless build-up of forces through the autumn and winter of 1811 and into the spring of 1812. The army Napoleon was assembling would be large by any scale, including soldiers from almost every nation of Europe. The largest non-French contingent were the Poles, who numbered some 95,000. In total, the 'Grande Armée' probably numbered around 450,000. Also Alexander did everything he could to prepare his armed forces for the expected confrontation, and in 1812 he had almost 600,000 men under arms. Napoleon's army, however, was fortified by the reputation of the French arms: The common belief that they were invincible made them almost invincible.

Click here to jump back to the list of contents.

1812: Napoleon's Russian summer campaign

22 June 1812 the Grande Armée invaded Russia, crossing the river Niemen. What officially
was proclaimed as the *Second Polish War* had begun. The Russian army had spent a year and a half deploying for an offensive, but instead began retreating the moment operations began. To add to the general confusion, issues like command and strategy had not been decided because of chaos and intrigue at the Russian headquarters. As nobody and nothing was prepared, the Russian army commanded by general Barclay therefore continued their retreat without major resistance, looking for a suitable position in which to make a stand. Apparently such a position was not easily found, so the retreat continued for weeks. This development left people in Moscow and St. Petersburg bewildered about what was going on, and Tsar Alexander found himself in a difficult position. Already on 28 June Napoleon entered Vilna, 170 km east of Niemen.

In western Russia the weather July 1806 turned out to be exceedingly warm with daytime temperatures reaching $36^\circ C$ (*Zamoyski 2005*). Many French soldiers who had previously campaigned in Egypt claimed that they had never marched in such a heat. Early July a heavy thunderstorm drifted across the area near Vilna, for a short time making all roads impassable. Worse, loses among the *Grande Armée’s* horses were horrific. This left Napoleon’s artillery in a difficult position, but the army’s supply organisation was even harder affected. After the rainstorm, the warm weather continued. The remaining horses were having a terrible time. Unused to the kind of diet they were exposed to, they suffered from colic and diarrhoea or constipation. The overall supply situation therefore rapidly deteriorated, and most soldiers had to find something to eat and to prepare it themselves. Not surprisingly, under these circumstances, many soldiers died of dehydration, malnutrition and hunger, while others got dysentery. When the *Grande Armée* 28 July reached Vitebsk 400 km into Russia, the whole army had already been reduced by a third, without fighting a single major battle. The summer weather was beginning to turn the whole campaign into a nightmare.

The Russian army was no happier than the French, and its troops were in a state of dejection as they retreated towards Smolensk, 380 km southwest of Moscow. Napoleon was convinced that the Russian army would have to fight in defence of the wholly city of Smolensk. The Russian forces and general Barclay were, however, in a state of tactical confusion, and no strong defence of the city was organised. Smolensk went up into flames, and fell to Napoleon 17 August. The burnt-out city represented neither an effective bastion nor a hard-needed resource for his army. According to his secretary Baron Fain (*Zamoyski 2005*), Napoleon himself was presumably feeling disheartened and disgusted at the turn events had taken, and did not quite know what to do next.

The battle of Smolensk had also demonstrated the unpleasant fact to Napoleon, that the
individual Russian soldier did not lay down his arms even in very difficult situations. 129
years later Adolf Hitler would make the identical observation. The French were dismayed by all this. This was not how war was supposed to be. In addition, these discomforts were added to by the fact that the Russians had adopted a new tactic now that the invaders were in the Russian homeland proper. They evacuated the entire population as they retreated, leaving towns and villages deserted and burnt down. It became increasingly difficult for the French army to find provisions.

Napoleon realised that he could not stop where he was, and as he would not retreat for political reasons, he could only advance in the hope of eventually obtaining a decisive military victory over the Russians. If not before, the Russians would surely make a stand in defence of their old capital Moscow. Based on existing knowledge on climate in western Russia, Napoleon at that time expected at least two months of decent campaigning weather ahead.

The mood at Russian headquarters was hardly better, even though the general situation was changing in their favour. The retreat was a good deal less orderly than before, and the Russian armies were now leaving behind them a trail of abandoned wagons and dead or dying men and horses. Like the French, the Russians were disturbed by the inhumane turn the campaign had taken. The ongoing retreat meant that discipline were fast breaking down, and everybody was on the lookout for traitors. All this was having a detrimental effect on the army and Barclay’s authority.

In St. Petersburg Tsar Alexander found the general mood depressingly defeatist, and decided that the Russian army needed a new commander instead of Barclay. He was hard pressed by the public opinion to choose Field Marshal Mikhail Ilarionovich Kutuzov as Barclay’s successor. Alexander himself was not to happy about this, as he considered Kutuzov both immoral and incompetent. His sister Catherine, however, urged him to bow to the inevitable, and Kutozov was appointed 20 August 1812. Kutuzov declared that he was going to save Moscow, and set off to find his headquarters.

After assessing the state of the Russian army Kutuzov suddenly felt that he could not face Napoleon, whose strength now was gauged at 165,000, down from the original 450,000. The Russian summer had taken its toll. Kutuzov therefore decided to continue the retreat initiated by Barclay two months before. Perhaps he also suspected Napoleon to be a superior general to himself. On 3 September Kutuzov inspected defensive positions found near the village of Borodino, about 100 km west of Moscow. Here he was going to make a
Kutuzov took up entirely defensive positions without any tactical possibility of gaining the initiative. Luckily for him, Napoleon had just caught a cold with an associated attack of dysuria, and was in anything approaching his usual form. In fact, Napoleon was going to deliver probably the worst performance of his entire military career. The invading French army was now down to 126,000, while Kutuzov had about 155,000 men under his command.

The Battle at Borodino 6 September 1812 (oil painting by Hess), with Napoleon watching from the Shevardino Redoubt (oil painting by Vereschagin).

The first large battle during Napoleon’s Russian campaign began in the morning of 6 September 1812. Before this battle, both armies had lost more than half their original strength during eight weeks of Russian summer. The battle of Borodino was a hard fought battle with several Russian counterattacks, but slowly the French was getting the upper hand due to its superiority on the tactical level, and the Russian army had to retreat. The battle of Borodino was the greatest massacre in recorded history, not to be surpassed until the first day of the battle at Somme in 1916. Recent estimates give a total of about 73,000 casualties, 45,000 Russian and 28,000 French including allies.

Kutuzov’s army was now in no condition to give battle on any positions, however strong. He therefore fell back to the village Fili west of Moscow, initially announcing that he would fight in front of Moscow to the last drop of blood. At the following council of war in Fili, however, he took the decision to abandon Moscow to Napoleon, to preserve the Russian army in being, a scene memorably portrayed in Tolstoy’s *War and Peace*. The Russian army therefore continued its retreat through the Moscow to the consternation of the inhabitants. Kutuzov then turned south and later southwest, setting up a fortified camp for his army near Tarutino, about 120 km SW of Moscow.

The village Fili (now a suburb of Moscow) reappears later in history. Somewhat ironic, this was the location chosen by Trotsky in 1922 for cooperation with the German Junckers aircraft company for secret German-Russian production of aircrafts and engines, at a time where the German Reichwehr by the 1919 Versailles treaty was limited to 100,000 men and the development of military aircraft, tanks, battleships and other top-of-the-range military assets was limited (*Bellamy 2007*). In early December 1941, Fili also marks one of the foremost position reached by the German Wehrmacht on their trust towards Moscow during *operation Barbarossa*. 
1812: Napoleon in Moscow

In the afternoon of 14 September, what was left of the Grande Armée entered Moscow. Napoleon took up residence at the Kremlin the following day. About two-thirds of the 270,184 inhabitants had left, and the remainder were hiding in their homes. Nobody with an official status was left to take care of a formal surrender and make arrangements for feeding the soldiers, as would normally be the case in a civilised war. To make things even worse, before leaving Moscow, the city commander Count Rostopchin had ordered his Police Superintendant Voronenko to burn not only the remaining supplies, but everything he could. Voronenko and his men set to work, presumably assisted by the city’s criminal elements. The fire raged out of control and spread to several districts of the city. In the morning of 16 September flames were lapping around the walls of Kremlin, and Napoleon had to evacuate himself and take up residence in the Petrovsky Palace, a few kilometres outside Moscow.

Moscow burning 15-18 September 1812. On the 18 September Napoleon returns to Kremlin after having evacuated himself to the Petrovsky Palace outside Moscow. Oil paintings by Vereschagin.

After three days the fire began to abate, and on 18 September Napoleon rode back into Moscow. Two thirds of the city was destroyed by the fire, robbing him of a wealth of material resources. And there was still no delegation formally surrendering Moscow to him. Even worse, Tsar Alexander still apparently did not understand that Russia was defeated, and therefore had no ambitions of making peace with Napoleon. It was all very frustrating.

Napoleon now had to consider taking up winter quarters in Moscow. Alternatively he would have to retreat with his back home, a move which for political reasons was difficult. So for the time being, he choose to remain in Moscow, hoping that Alexander finally would come to his senses.

Napoleon had studied the available weather information, which told him that it normally did not get really cold until the beginning of December, so he did not feel any sense of urgency. What he did not realise, was how sudden low temperatures may come if a high
pressure area settles over eastern Europe, pumping arctic air masses south across Russia, where the lack of high mountains leave the whole country open for arctic air masses. In addition, he had no experience of temperature being only one factor, but that the wind strength also had to be taken into account.

Early October 1812 the weather remained to be fine and warm, and Napoleon was teasing Armand Caulaincourt, his finest civilian aide, about his anxiety about the winter climate. On 13 October, however, the weather suddenly turned cold, and Moscow was covered in a blanket of thin snow. Presumably this was a meteorological surprise to Napoleon, and it rapidly made him make up his mind. The same day he declared that the army would leave as rapid as possible, and take up winter quarters further west, where well-stocked bases were at hand in Minsk and Vilna. Napoleons army left Moscow 20 October.

Click here to jump back to the list of contents.

1812: Napoleon’s retreat from Moscow

The actual armed forces at Napoleon’s disposal as he left Moscow numbered no more than 95,000, and probably less. Marchal Kutuzow was still camping passively SW of Moscow, reinforcing his army to about 97,000 men. He was, however, still in no hurry to engage in regular warfare. So while Napoleon was retreating west towards Smolensk along the Moscow road, Kutuzov did not seriously attempt to cut across their line of retreat, even though he was excellently placed to do so.

The French retreat was slow, mainly due to lack of horsepower. The shortage of fodder had debilitated the horses, and they were growing too week to pull the guns and wagons. Part of the problem was that Napoleon saw himself carrying out a tactical withdrawal rather than a retreat. Therefore he refused to abandon a proportion of their guns to liberate horses and thereby save time. This determination not to loose face would cost him dear. As well as slowing their progress, all this had a demoralising effect on the French troops, marching down a devastated road, seeing only abandoned equipment, human and animal corpses. Kutuzow was still following south of the French army, but resolutely opposed to any suggestions from his generals to make an offensive move.

The good news for the French was that the weather was magnificent, and that the early snow in Moscow presumably just was a meteorological mishap. On 31 October, at Viazma, Napoleon therefore ridiculed those who had been attempting to scare him with stories of the Russian winter. The weather remained fine during the first days of November 1812,
until 3 November, which was to be the last warm day. The wind turned north and the
night between 4 and 5 November brought with it a rapid drop in air temperature. On 6
November the French retreat was entering a new phase. It began to snow, and in short
time it lay half a meter thick on the ground. The drop in temperature had not been that
great, probably not exceeding -10°C. But the French army was not used to or dressed for
cold weather. There was no such thing as a winter uniform, since in those days armies did
not fight in winter. The cold also provided the last straw for many of the remaining horses.
The meteorological change early November 1812 had a profound effect on the whole
French army.

Napoleon and his army retreating in western Russia early November 1812.

Also the Russian army under Kutuzow was affected by the cold, and food and clothing was
equally scarce. The war now grow even more vicious than before, and captives had become
an unwelcome encumbrance to both sides. Many prisoners, French or Russian, were simply
despatched with a bullet to the head.

When Napoleon 9 November reached Smolensk, the wind was still northerly and air
temperatures were down to -15°C. On 14 November, they sank to -28°C. His army was
now reduced to about 35,000 men. Kutuzow made some attempts at intersecting
Napoleons further retreat towards Minsk, but without substantial success. 22 November
Napoleon reached Tolochin, where he was informed that other Russian forces just had
taken Minsk further to the west. What was left of the French army was surrounded.
Napoleon, nevertheless, managed to extricate himself from this impossible situation by
fainting an attack towards south, while his engineers at the same time was constructing
two bridges across the frozen river Berezina, which was crossed 27-28 November.

The following two days may have been among the worst of the entire retreat. When
Napoleon reached Pleshchenitse on 30 November, a temperature of -30°C was recorded be
Dr. Louis Lagneau (Zamoyski 2005). Frostbite was widespread among the tired and hungry
soldiers. Selfishness reached new heights. Now that Napoleon had managed to get beyond
his reach, Kutuzov felt even less inclined to force the pursuit than before. Also his army
was in a terrible condition. His main force, which has marched out of Tarutino 97,000
strong one month before, was now reduced to 27,000 men due to the cold, according to
his own figures (Zamoyski 2005).

Retreat of the French army in western Russia, mid- and late November 1812. Oil paintings by
On the evening of 5 December, at Smorgonie, Napoleon decided that it was time for him to go back to Paris, and take control from there. He called together his marshals and apparently apologised for his mistake of having remained in Moscow for too long. He then set off into the night. The Imperial Mameluke, Roustam, later reported that the wine in Napoleon’s carriage froze that night, causing the bottles to shatter. On 6 December the temperature fell even more, reaching -37.5°C according to Dr. Louis Lagneau.

This was the end. On 9 December the main mass of the French army turned up at the gates of Vilnia. Vilnia, however, could not be hold, and the retreat had to continue towards the starting point along the river Niemen. The weather continued bitterly cold, with daytime temperatures around -35°C. The French commander Murat realised that the line of Niemen could not be held, and had to retreat all the way to first Königsberg, and later Danzig and Küstrin much longer to the west. Eventually, the remnants of the French army were driven all the way back to Dresden.

It was only when the French retreat finally came to a stop towards the end of January 1813 that the true scale of the disaster began to emerge. June 1812 somewhere between 550,000 and 600,000 French and allied troops have been assembled along Niemen. Only about 120,000 came out of Russia in December 1812, including substantial reinforcements received after the invasion was launched 22 June. Presumably at least 400,000 French and allied troops died during the campaign, less than 100,000 in battle. On the Russian side is has been estimated that up to 400,000 soldiers and militia died, about 110,000 of them in battle.

The extremely cold winter November-December 1812, in combination with the previous warm summer July-August 1812 had been devastating for the whole military operation on both French and Russian side, and were to have lasting effects on Europe’s political future.

The catastrophic outcome of the Russian campaign sealed Napoleon’s fate. Not only did it cost him 300,000 of his best French soldiers (today this would compare to a loss of 700,000 men), but it also punctured the aura of superiority and being invincible that has been surrounding Napoleon’s person. Few saw this more clearly than the German patriots in Prussia, who had been suffering under the humiliation of French dominion. On 28 February 1813 an alliance was concluded between Russia and Prussia, and two weeks the latter declared war on France.
I was enjoying a ball arranged at the General Benningsen’s estate, near Vilna. It was late in the evening, when one of his ADC’s approached him. Only a few words filtered into hall, but it was enough to reveal what had happened: “The war has begun.” But when did the possibility of war between the two empires first assume a degree of reality? Diplomats began to think and talk about it early in 1810 and the general public, towards the end of the same year.

Czar Alexander I, the emperor of Russia from 1801-1825, was best known for his alternately befriending, then fighting Napoleon I. In the early 1810's (1813-1815) Alexander helped form the Big Four, which finally defeated the French emperor.

As a part of the Congress of Vienna, the czar played a big part in the agreement to balance power and to get along with one another. In this meeting, Alexander was determined to obtain the only spoil that he wanted, Poland. The allies (Britain, Russia, Prussia), afraid of the Asiatic Russians obtaining too much control, only gave Russia a portion of Poland. Disgusted and disillusioned by the cynicism of Metternich, Talleyrand, and Castlereagh towards the idea of all people getting along, the czar formed the Holy Alliance in 1815. With this
group, Alexander I tried to create a world based on the ideas of justice and charity.

Because of these radical and liberal ideas, czar Alexander I was thought to be foolish and almost childish in his goals. Alexander was an idealist, and towards his later year, the czar became even more involved in mystical and spiritual events. Alexander was also a very religious man. He had such liberal ideas as giving Poland a liberal constitution (this allowed Poland to be partially restored) and funding

INTERNATIONAL LAW – The Congress of Vienna, 1814-1815

(The founder of the Rothschild dynasty, Mayer Amschel Bauer, told the secret of controlling the government of a nation over 200 years ago. He said, “Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation and I care not who makes its laws)

In 1802, Europe was made up of several hundred states, which were dominated by England, Austria, Russia, Prussia and France, which was the most powerful country. In 1804, when Napoleon Bonaparte took over France, his military exploits had led to the complete control of virtually all of Europe. In 1812, when Napoleon moved against Russia; England, Spain and Portugal were already at war with France. They were later joined by Sweden, Austria; and in 1813, Prussia joined the coalition to end the siege of Europe, and to “assure its future peace by the re-establishment of a just equilibrium of the powers.” In 1814, the coalition defeated France, and in March of that year, marched into Paris. France’s borders were returned to their original 1792 location, which had been established by the First Peace of Paris, and Napoleon was exiled to Elba, a small island off the Tucson coast of Italy.

From September, 1814 to June, 1815, the four powers of the allied coalition, winners of the Napoleonic Wars, met at the Congress of Vienna, along with a large number of rulers and officials representing smaller states. It was the biggest political meeting in European history. Representing England was Lord Robert Stewart, the 2nd Viscount Castlereagh; France, with Foreign Minister Charles-Maurice Talleyrand de Perigord; Prussia, with King Friedrich Wilhelm III; and Austria, with Emperor Franz II.

(Left picture: Robert Stewart 2nd Marquess of Londonderry in the Peerage of Ireland on
“An unusual feature of the “Congress of Vienna” was that it was not properly a Congress: it never met in plenary session, and most of the discussions occurred in informal, face-to-face, sessions among the Great Powers with limited participation by delegates from the lesser states. On the other hand, the Congress was the first occasion in history where on a continental scale people came together in place to hammer out a treaty, instead of relying mostly on messengers and messages between the several capitals. The Congress of Vienna settlement, despite later changes, formed the framework for European international politics until 1914.

Throughout the 19th century, there was growing interest in establishing new national identities, which had a drastic impact on the map of Europe. These transformations also highlighted the failure of a certain ’European order’ which led to the outbreak of the First World War.

“….Besides, the decisions of the Congress were made by the Five Great Powers (Austria, France, Prussia, Russia and the United Kingdom), and not all the countries of Europe could extend their rights at the Congress. For example, Italy became a mere “geographical expression” as divided into eight parts (Parma, Modena, Tuscany, Lombardy, Venetia, Piedmont-Sardinia, the Papal States, Naples-Sicily) under the control of different powers, while Poland was under the influence of Russia after the Congress. The arrangements that made the Five Great Powers finally led to future disputes. The Congress of Vienna preserved the balance of power in Europe, but it could not check the spread of revolutionary movements on the continent.

(1815) Alliance between Britain, Russia, Austria, and Prussia first formed in 1813 to oppose France in the final phase of the Napoleonic Wars. It was officially renewed in 1815 to enforce the peace settlement concluded at the Congress of Vienna. The allies agreed to meet occasionally to keep European political development within terms of the 1815 settlement. This program was partially carried out by the Congresses of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), and Verona (1822).

Other representatives were: Frederick VI, King of Denmark; Maximilian Joseph, King of Bavaria; Friedrich I, King of Württemberg; Napoleon II, King of Rome; Eugene de Beauharnais, Viceroy of Italy; King Friedrich August I of Saxony; Count Leowenhielm of
Sweden; Cardinal Consalvi of the Papal States; Grand Duke Charles of Baden; Elector William of Hesse; Grand Duke George of Hesse-Darmstadt; Karl August, Duke of Weimar; the King of Bohemia; the King of Hungary; and emissaries from Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Holland, and other European States.

(Left picture: Ercole Consalvi (June 8, 1757 – January 24, 1824) was a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church).

The main concern of the Congress was to redistribute conquered territories, create a balance of power, restore the pre-Napoleonic order through King Louis XVIII, return the power to families who were ruling in 1789, and to return the Roman Catholic Church to its former power. Discussion revolved around the creation of a Federation of Europe that would establish a group of independent kingdoms which would be tied together through an administrative governing body that would, among other things, provide military defense. In their plan, Switzerland was made a neutral state that served as a repository for their finances.

Engraved portrait of Eugene de Beauharnais. Engraved with watercolors by Alix – c. 1805.

Prince Eugene was Joséphine’s only son, whom Napoléon made Viceroy of Italy. He is seen here in his official uniform. From the first time Napoléon met him, he was impressed by the young man’s modesty, sincerity and good looks).

In March, 1815, Napoleon left Elba,

because the pension promised him by
King Louis XVIII was discontinued, and he believed that Austria was preventing his companion, Marie Louise, and his son, the former King of Rome (who became the Duke of Reichstadt in Vienna) from being able to join him. Plus, he was made aware of the growing discontent with the King. Thus Napoleon returned, began the Hundred Days War, and was immediately labeled a “public enemy.” The coalition at the Congress put aside their diplomatic business, and joined in the battle.

Shortly before Napoleon’s defeat at Waterloo, negotiations at the Congress of Vienna were completed, and the treaty was signed on June 9, 1815. The Second Peace of Paris, in November, exiled Napoleon to St. Helena, an island 1,000 miles off the African coast, where he died in 1821.

On September 26, 1815, the Treaty of Holy Alliance was signed by Alexander I of Russia, Francis II of Austria, and Frederick William III of Prussia, while the allies were negotiating the Second Peace of Paris. The Treaty guaranteed the sovereignty of any monarch who would adhere to Christian principles in the affairs of State.

The Treaty made them a “true and indissoluble brotherhood.” Alexander claimed he got the idea from a conversation with Castlereagh. Castlereagh later said that the Alliance was a “piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense.” Prussia and Austria claimed they went along with it, out of fear of Russian retaliation. Although the Alliance had no influence on matters, it did indicate to other countries that they had banded together against them and it succeeded in temporarily crushing Europe’s growing liberal movement.
(Picture above: Alexander I of Russia (Russian: И, Aleksandr I Pavlovich) (23 December 1777 – 19 November 1825), also known as Alexander the Blessed (Russian: , Aleksandr Blagoslovlenyi) served as Emperor of Russia from 23 March 1801 to 1 December 1825 and Ruler of Poland from 1815 to 1825, as well as the first Russian Grand Duke of Finland).

Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prince Klemens Furst von Metternich, the most influential statesman in Europe, and a Rothschild agent, said that the purpose of his idea for a European Federation was only to preserve the social order, and he was convinced that Alexander was insane.

In 1916, the Senate Congressional Record (pg. 6781) reproduced a document known as the “Secret Treaty of Verona” which had been signed in November 22, 1822 by Austria (Metternich), France (Chateaubriand), Prussia (Bernstet), and Russia (Nesselrode); and was partially the reason for the establishment of the Monroe Doctrine. Its purpose was to make some changes to the treaty of the Holy Alliance, and Article One stated: “The high contracting powers, being convinced that the system of representative government is equally as incompatible with the monarchical principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right, engage mutually, in the most solemn manner, to use all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative governments, in whatever country it may exist in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced where it is not yet known.”

It was designed and proposed a form of collective and collaborative security for Europe, then called a Congress system. According to the Congress system the main signatory powers were to meet periodically (every two years or so) and collectively manage European Affairs. The following ten years saw 5 European Congresses where disputes were resolved with a diminishing degree of effectiveness. Finally, by 1822, the whole system had collapsed because of the irreconcilable differences of opinion between the United Kingdom, Austria and Russia, and because of the lack of support for the Congress
But long before this, subterranean currents had been undermining the Franco-Russian relationship. On 2 December 1805, at Austerlitz, Napoleon inflicted a crushing defeat on the combined Austrian and Russian armies. In 1806-1807 the Russian armies dispatched by the Tsar to save Prussia from final defeat fought Napoleon in the bloody battles of Pultusk, Eylau and, finally, on 14 June 1807, Friedland, after which Alexander I agreed to peace and concluded an alliance with Napoleon. The two emperors met personally at the town of Tilsit, on an elaborate raft moored in the middle of the Niemen River. Alexander did not forget these painful experiences. And he was not unaware of the widespread displeasure prevailing in Russia, particularly in the army, over the “ignominious peace of Tilsit.”

Humiliation was not the sole difficulty. Napoleon had forced Alexander to join him Napoleon’s Continental System: Russia had obligated herself not to buy anything from, or sell anything to, the English or to allow Englishmen into Russia. She also obligated herself to declare war on England. The blockade against England caused great suffering to Russian landowners and merchants. This Franco-Russian alliance, entered into force at Tilsit in 1807, manifested its first fissure in the following year during the September meeting of the two emperors at Erfurt. And the fissure widened in 1809 during Napoleon’s war against Austria. Let us dwell for a moment on the two years 1807-1809.

1807-1809

In the panic following the Russian Army’s rout at Friedland, Alexander decided not only on peace but also on a decisive, almost revolutionary turn in foreign policy. It is not our
purpose to give a complete picture of Alexander as a man and a sovereign, but a brief consideration is necessary.

In the course of his career, Alexander passed through several transformations. As heir to the throne he had exhibited one persona;

after the murder of his father, Paul I, another; before Austerlitz, a third; after Austerlitz, yet a fourth; now, after Tilsit, he unveiled a fifth. And how many more changes he was to go through in 1814 and the following years! Not only his moods changed, but his relationships to people, his opinions of people, his attitude towards life. Indeed, his whole character seemed to become transformed. One of his contemporaries likened Alexander to Buddha, who according to Hindu legends undergoes various “transformations”, “becoming” something anew over the course of his life, each time showing a wholly new face. What kind of men was he then? What were his aspirations? Alexander knew how to keep himself in hand as did no other among Russia’s Tsars and, indeed, as few autocrats anywhere.

In 1805 Alexander had suffered an ignominious rout at Austerlitz and it was absolutely impossible to throw the blame on anyone else. Everyone knew that the Tsar himself, against the will of Kutuzov, the senior Russian officer present, had led army to disaster and that when all was lost he publicly burst into tears and fled the bloody field. But the enemy was so dangerous, and the nobility which surrounded the Tsar so hated and feared this enemy, that they largely forgave Alexander for Austerlitz, merely because, in spite of everything, he refused to make peace with Napoleon and because a year after Austerlitz he again took the field against “the enemy of mankind”. This time the war was longer and bloodier.

With the peace made at Tilsit, it appeared that Napoleon would cease his warring, and Europe would have peace. It seemed to Russia’s elite that after Austria’s defeat in 1809, and after Napoleon’s marriage to the Austrian Emperor’s daughter, the power of the French Emperor had grown so strong on the Continent that England would soon consent to any peace, to avoid being made bankrupt by the blockade imposed by the Continental System.

Napoleon himself thought otherwise.
For him the Austrian marriage was the best means of securing his rear if he should again fight Russia. To his rapprochement with Austria, as to all political combinations in this period of his rule, he attached chiefly strategic significance. He saw clearly that his main task was to crush England—and this was impossible as long as the coasts of the Baltic, White, and Black Seas remained open to English goods. Even more clearly he realized that without a new and decisive defeat of the Russian armed forces, this aim could not be achieved. Moreover, without this defeat, he could not fully secure his power over the northern European coastline, he could not subjugate Spain, and he could not expect the Germans to give up all hope of national liberation.

The Provocations of 1810

For these reasons, he began in 1810 to pursue his famous policy of "the moving frontier"; more exactly, he did not begin it, but intensified it: by a mere stroke of his pen, he annexed a number of new lands to his Empire, sent his troops to garrison German fortresses, and gradually moved the spearhead of his power eastward, closer and closer to Russia. At the same time, he took the most stringent measures against violators of the Continental blockade. Silence reigned in Europe.…

Prince P. A. Vyazemsky, a friend of the great Russian author, Pushkin, was later to write,

"Napoleon was equally terrifying to kings and peoples. No one who has not lived in this epoch, can know, or even imagine, how stifling existence was at that time. The fate of every state, of nearly every person, depended more or less, in one way or another, if not today then tomorrow, on the whims of the Tuileries' cabinet or on the military dispositions of Napoleon's headquarters. Everyone lived as under the threat of an earthquake or a volcano. No one could act or even breathe freely."

The annexation of Holland to the French Empire in June 1810, the transfer of three French divisions from southern to Baltic Germany in August of the same year, the transport from the French Empire of 50,000 rifles to the Duchy of Warsaw and of an artillery regiment to the French-occupied Magdeburg—all menacing symptoms of an approaching storm-Russian diplomacy was directly related to the Austrian marriage and the Austrian alliance with Napoleon. Napoleon no longer needed Russia; his power over Europe had a new support in Vienna.

On 5 August and 17 September 1810, at Trianon, Napoleon established a new tariff
system, according to which taxes on colonial goods (sugar, tea, pepper, etc.) were significantly increased. All over Europe English goods were confiscated. Russia was gently asked to adopt similar measures, but the Russian government refused, explaining that this would be contrary to her independence and interests.

In December 1810, Napoleon annexed the Hanseatic cities Hamburg, Bremen, and Lubeck, and took advantage of the occasion to acquire the entire territory between Holland and Hamburg, including the Duchy of Oldenburg. Alexander’s sister, Ekaterina, was married to the son and heir of the Duke of Oldenburg. Alexander protested. But Napoleon “added a fresh humiliation”: he ordered his foreign minister, Jean-Baptiste de Nompere de Champagny, the Duke of Cadore, to reject the Russian note of protest without even reading it.

In reply Tsar approved on a new tariff (entered into force on 1 January 1811), increasing the duties on all luxury articles and wines, the very articles imported from France.

From then on, relations between the two emperors grew steadily worse. The more Napoleon’s troops poured into Poland and Prussia, contrary to the conditions of the peace of Tilsit, which stipulated their withdrawal from Prussia, the more vigilantly and zealously Napoleon insisted on the fulfillment of the blockade, the more did Russia’s secret hopes centre on England.

Consequently, in a report presented to Napoleon on 7 April 1810 by the Duke of Cadore, the Emperor read:

“The British Cabinet has not lost hope of a rapprochement with Russia and Turkey, thus securing on the Baltic Sea, in the Archipelago, and on the Black Sea more useful outlets for her manufactures than it might obtain by any peace, even if this peace should temporarily open up to her the ports of France, Germany, Holland, and Italy.”

The Duke of Cadore feared that the British might succeed in this stratagem. A struggle of interests was being fought round Alexander, he said, and England could achieve much “by promises, advantageous offers, and alluring guarantees.”

“The venality of the St. Petersburg Court had always been an established fact. This venality was quite open during the reigns of Elizabeth, Catherine, and Paul. If in the
present reign it is less public, if we still have in Russia a few friends inaccessible to English proposals, such as Count Rumyantsev, the Princes Kurakin, and a very small number of others, it is nevertheless true that the majority of the Tsar’s courtiers, partly from habit, partly from attachment to the Empress Dowager, partly from vexation at the drop in their incomes through lower exchange rates, partly as a result of bribery, are secret partisans of England.”

In this secret report, the Duke of Cadore frankly acknowledged the difficulty of preventing a possible rapprochement between England and Russia: “How will it be possible to rupture completely the secret relations between England and Russia, when their more or less weighty common interests impel both courts to renew these relations?” It is necessary to observe that Champagny was only an obedient tool of his sovereign. His mission, as he saw it, was to play up to the Emperor and to echo his passions and thoughts. For instance, he put it down to his own credit that his predecessors had sought to conclude a peace with England, while he, the Duke of Cadore, stood for the continuation of the war. It was only necessary to complete the conquest of Spain: then all the ports of Europe would be closed. “Once in Cadiz, Sire, you will be in a position either to break or strengthen the bonds with Russia.” Europe must be closed to English ships and goods from Cadiz to St. Petersburg.

In December 1810, after publication of the new Russian tariff, all Europe began to discuss the coming war between the two empires. In a letter to his beloved sister, Ekaterina Pavlovna, dated 26 December 1810, Alexander referred to it for the first time: “It seems that blood must flow again. But at least I have done everything that is humanly possible to avoid it.” This letter discussing the seizure by Napoleon of Peter of Oldenburg’s duchy (Peter’s son and heir, George was the husband of Ekaterina Pavlovna) contains no other important passages, except for a significant list of matters that Alexander wished to talk over with his sister at their next meeting. He was then preparing for a journey to Tver, where his sister lived, and he actually did appear there in March 1811. In this list a prominent place is given to military matters, such as the organization of the army, the increase of its effectives, reserves, etc. If, by the seizure of Oldenburg, Napoleon intended not only to secure the German Baltic coast, but also to vex Alexander, he certainly achieved his aim. But, more important, Alexander realized that this was only a beginning; it was clear that Napoleon was not insulting him for nothing.

Caulaincourt is Recalled
In May 1811, Napoleon recalled Caulaincourt, his ambassador to St. Petersburg. His reason was that Caulaincourt stood for peace with Russia and believed that Napoleon was provoking the Tsar deliberately and without justification. Caulaincourt left St. Petersburg on 15 May. “Should Emperor Napoleon start a war,” Alexander said to him during Caulaincourt’s leave-taking, “it is possible and even likely that he will beat us. But this will not give him peace. The Spaniards have often been beaten, but for all that they are neither conquered nor subjugated, and they are closer to Paris than we are, and they have neither our climate nor our resources. We shall enter into no compromises; we have vast spaces in our rear, and shall preserve a well-organized army. With all that at our disposal, we shall never be forced to conclude peace, no matter what defeats we may suffer. We may even force the conqueror to make peace. Emperor Napoleon expressed this idea to Chernishev after Wagram. He himself acknowledged that he would never have been willing to negotiate with Austria, if Austria had not preserved her army; and, with a little more stubbornness, the Austrians might have obtained better terms. Napoleon needs results as rapid as his own thoughts; he will not achieve them with us. I shall profit by his lessons. They are the lessons of a master. We shall let our climate, our winter, wage the war for us. The French soldiers are brave, but less enduring than ours, they are more easily disheartened. Miracles occur only in the presence of the Emperor, but he cannot be everywhere. Moreover, he will inevitably be in a hurry to return to his country. I will not draw sword first, but I shall sheathe it last. Sooner would I retreat to Kamchatka than yield a province or put my signature to a peace made in my conquered capital, a peace which would turn out to be a mere truce.”

Caulaincourt, to be sure, often over-idealized Alexander. In this instance, however, his testimony is extremely plausible, although one must bear in mind that the Caulaincourt’s memoirs were written well after events, and several incidents may have taken on a different light when seen in retrospect.

Caulaincourt feared a war with Russia. Upon his return to Paris on 5 June 1811, he was promptly received by Napoleon, to whom he conveyed the Tsar’s words. Caulaincourt insisted that the idea of restoring Poland would have to be sacrificed in order to preserve the peace and the alliance with Russia. At the same time, he maintained that under no circumstances would Russia start a war.

Napoleon contradicted him. As always during this period, Napoleon emphasized his own conceptions: the Russian nobility was dissolute, decrepit, self-seeking, undisciplined,
incapable of self-sacrifice, and, after the first defeats, following the beginning of an invasion, they would take fright and force the Tsar to sign a peace.

Caulaincourt objected strongly:

“You are mistaken, Sire, about Alexander and the Russians. Do not judge Russia from what others tell you about her. And do not judge the Russian army from what you saw of it after Friedland, crushed as it was and disarmed. Threatened with an attack for over a year, the Russians have made preparations and strengthened their forces. They have considered all possibilities, even the possibility of great defeats. They have made preparations for defense and resistance to the utmost.”

Napoleon listened, but soon changed the subject. He spoke of his Grand Army, the inexhaustible resources of his world empire, of his invincible Guard. In all history, he pointed out, no military leader had commanded such enormous forces, such troops, magnificent in all respects. At the same audience, Caulaincourt protested that it was unjust to demand that Russia fulfill in every particular the ruinous conditions of the Continental System, while Napoleon himself violated them in the interests of the treasury and French industry, by granting licenses for trade with England to individual merchants and financiers. Napoleon shut his ears to all these arguments. “One good battle,” he replied, “will put an end to all your friend Alexander’s excellent resolutions, and to all his fortifications built on sand.”

With a feeling of despair, Caulaincourt saw that he was accomplishing nothing. Napoleon’s confidence in victory was increasing month by month as his grandiose preparations took shape, and he refused to take any warning seriously. Russo-French relations were in a muddled state.

< > 1855

sp: Russian conservative Konstantin Aksakov (son of Sergei Aksakov and brother of Ivan Aksakov) wrote a memo to Emperor Alexander II, “On the Internal State of Russia”

[TXT | Raeff3:231-51]

*–This loyal and strong defense of freedom of speech could not be published until 1881
*–Collection of writings = Tribune of the Slavophiles: Konstantin Aksakov
Russian Emperor Alexander II reigned for 26 years

1) THE ERA OF GREAT REFORMS [LOOP] and
2) RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY SITUATIONS (The first and the second)


*–Aleksandr Nikitenko, The Diary of a Russian Censor (1975)

*–v1:1859-1880

British documents on foreign affairs–reports and papers from the Foreign Office confidential print. Part I, from the mid- nineteenth century to the First World War.
Series A, Russia, 1859 -1914 (1983)


[txt]

*–W. Bruce Lincoln, In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia’s Enlightened Bureaucrats, 1825-1861

*———. Nikolai Miliutin: An Enlightened Russian Bureaucrat

*–Daniel T. Orlovsky, The Limits of Reform: The Ministry of Internal Affairs in Imperial Russia, 1802-1881 (1981)

*–S. Frederick Starr, Decentralization and Self-Government in Russia, 1830-1870 (1972)


*–E. M. von Almedingen, The Emperor Alexander II (1962)

*–James Malloy, P. A. Valuev and his career in Nineteenth century Russian state service

*–Werner Eugen Mosse, Alexander II and the Modernization of Russia. London:1958

*–Website of Walter Moss, “Alexander II and His Times”

<> 1855:USA| Walt Whitman, Leaves of Grass [TXT]

\"
1855ja: Shimoda | After losing all but the ship Diana (1806:1812:GO) to needs of the Crimean War, and after great earthquake and tidal wave leveled Shimoda and shipwrecked Diana [Beasley, MHJ:61], in 1855fe07 Putiatin arranged Treaty of Amity (Nichiro Washin Joyaku). Modelled on Kanagawa treaty, recently signed by USA Commander Matthew Perry [KEJ,4:179. PHandG:782]. Lensen thinks Shimoda “provisions” are “more extensive” than Kanagawa [KEJ,6:270]. “Went beyond” by opening 3 ports [KEJ,6:341]. Opened Shimoda, Hakodate, and Nagasaki to Russia, but only for ship repairs and provisioning. BUT did allow posting of consuls at Hakodate or Shimoda Russia chose Hakodate and established reciprocal extra-territoriality. Kurils divided so that Japan held those islands south of Iturup (Etorofu); Russia, those north of Urup (Uruppu) [KEJ,6:270 Lensen. I think he means “S FROM” and “N FROM”. NB!: Kurils divided N of Etorofu (KEJ,2:238 Stephan)]. Sakhalin a “common possession” (Lensen) or “jointly occupied” (Stephan) [Harrison, Japan’s N.Frontier]. Lensen feels that “relations between Russian residents, mostly personnel of naval vessels wintering in Japan, and local inhabitants were on the whole amicable. As military men, Japanese officials could identify more readily with monarchist naval officers than with merchants or with missionaries [KEJ,6:341]. Lensen goes too far to put Russia in good light. Says 1st lessons in European shipbuilding from Putiatin’s stranded crew, but cf.PH&G:766 re.Adams “Anjin”

1855my08: Heda, NW coast of Izu Peninsula | Putiatin and 40 men were moved to Heda, built European-style schooner in partnership with Japanese craftsmen, and departed for Russia from Japan (took 2 wks) [KEJ,6:270]

*That year novelist Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov began serial publication of his Fregat Pallada (1858:book publication) about his experience with Putiatin in Japan *–Goncharov mocked and ridiculed Japanese in a most unfortunate manner. “It was difficult to look without laughter at these skirt-clad figures with their little topnots and their bare little knees”. Lensen says that G’s portrait of Japan as “ludicrous and effeminate” was very damaging

*–KEJ,3:46

*–Lensen”Historicity

1855je16: San Francisco Journal carried article by the German traveler Julius Frobel which stressed parallel rise of USA and Russia. Prognosis = three-way suzerainty over
globe, USA, Europe and Russia

*–Frobel later wrote memoirs of his travels to the New World, Frobel, Julius, 1805-1893
Seven years’ travel in Central America, northern Mexico, and the far West of the United States (London:1859) F1409.F92

<>1855oc13:1857my21; French intellectuals Edmund and Jules Goncourt kept diary of everyday life in Paris in which they reflected on the inferiority of women [P20:14]

<>1856:1870; Italian unification under the leadership of Camillo di Cavour and Giuseppe Garibaldi, a complex 14-year process of gathering widely different jurisdictions under single governmental administration, not complete until Rome and Vatican City brought under the authority of the new Italian liberal monarchy [MAP]
*–“Italy“, the nation-state, made its late appearance on the historical stage [DPH:187-91]

<>1856:Sergei Aksakov published Chronicles of a Russian Family, a remarkable tale of gentry family life in the time of serfdom on the Orenburg, trans-Volga frontier or Bashkir steppes [excerpts= KRR:352-4]
*1914:Mikhail Nesterov landscape portrait of area around Aksakov homestead in Olga’s Gallery
*–Sergei Aksakov’s UO bibliography
*–For Sergei’s famous sons, GO Konstantin and Ivan

<>1856mr18 (mr30 NS): Treaty of Paris ended Crimean War [VSB,3:606-7 | DPH:197-9 | DIR2:209-20 | ORW:118] France, England, Turkey, Sardinia, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Russia agreed to neutralization of Black Sea, open to all commercial fleets but closed to all military navies

*–Romania (till 1859 called Moldavia and Walachia) became semi-independent states under Ottoman Turkish suzerainty. Russia ceded to Romania the mouth of the Danube River and Bessarabia. All of lower Danube placed under international commission

*–Russian imperial advance in Ottoman Turkish Central Asia was hereby pushed back. Ottoman Turkey was now declared to be part of what was called the “European concert” and its integrity protected as such. Turkey became a part of Europe in the effort to keep its imperial domains from becoming a part of Russia

*–Russian imperialist ambitions were conspicuously damaged while the imperialist ambitions of “The West” were conspicuously advanced. The concept of “The West” (and the derivative expression “Westernization”) very possibly originated in Russia [LOOP on anachronistic use of the term “Westernization”]. Now these loose concepts were
increasingly used to describe powerful and rapidly modernizing (i.e., industrializing) northwestern European nation-states in their domineering or imperialist relationship to the rest of the world. The rest of the world was labeled over time with a series of progressively less slanderous adjectives = “savage”, “primitive”, “backward”, “undeveloped”, and (by the late 20th century) “developing”

*–It took Russia twenty years to bolster its military strength and prepare to reassert itself into the Black Sea and the Balkans. The first moves in “The Great Game” after Crimea went England’s way, but Russia waited its turn

*1856de:Caucasus Mountains, northern slopes. Chechen people shifted from imam leadership to Russian administration as General Evdokimov introduced program of receiving into Russian territory immigrants from Shamil’s Chechen and Daghestan territories [ID]

<>1856mr30:Russian Emperor Alexander II advised Moscow aristocrats gathered in their provincial noble assembly, “It is better to abolish serfdom from above than to await the time when it will begin to abolish itself from below” [VSB,3:589 | DPH:282]

- Noble assemblies were institutions created in the time of Catherine II [ID]
- These aristocratic “corporate” or soslovie-based institutions responded to Alexander’s dramatic announcement in hope and fear
- Russian landowning elites now entered into a brilliant, yet futile — perhaps we could say final — period of corporate or “class-conscious” political action
- Newspaper reports on this Moscow Noble Assembly alerted reading public to the immediate possibility of significant reform
- 1858su:Nizhnii-Novgorod and Moscow nobles heard addresses by Alexander II on same theme [VSB,3:591]
- Internal Ministry official Aleksei Levshin and Senator Yakov Solov’ev described the background to reforms [VSB,3:589-91]
- At the autocratic center, in Petersburg, the Main Committee and Editorial Commission laid the groundwork for abolition of serfdom [VSB,3:591-3]
- Landowning nobles (rural gentry political activists) distrusted the reformist state and were thus not at all certain that this “great reform” would be all that great
- What might this suggest about the status of the landowning aristocracy as a “ruling class” in Imperial Russia?

<>1856de01:USA WDC | Jefferson Davis, USA Secretary of War (1853-57) and future president of the rebellious Confederacy, addressed new challenge faced by a dispirited
and idle US military, scattered across the Great Plains in small, vulnerable forts without a specific mission appropriate to the size and ambition generated in the Mexican-American War [ID]

- Davis understood the close parallel of frontier and imperialist expansion =

The occupation of Algeria by the French presents a case having much parallelism to that of our western frontier, and affords an opportunity of profiting by their experience. Their practice, as far as understood by me, is to leave the desert region to the possession of the nomadic tribes; their outposts, having strong garrisons, are established near the limits of the cultivated region, and their services performed by large detachments making expeditions into the desert regions as required [Webb, Great Plains: 194-5 & ff.]

- 1855mr03: Davis had gotten $30,000 from Congress to experiment with camels in TX
- 1858: Davis was the first to propose construction of a railroad to the Pacific Ocean. He considered it a military necessity and thus a government project, that is, it required government subvention (monetary support) of private enterprise. Davis arranged for government survey of 4 possible routes
- Davis understood the military-industrial closeness of frontier (imperialist?) expansion and the development of railroads
- As USA was poised to open its own industrial era of railroad construction and to launch a campaign into the Great Plains against the Native Americans who lived there, it was temporarily diverted by the disasters of the great Civil War

<> 1857ja26: Russian Emperor Alexander II decree laid out plan for vigorous development of railroads [VSB, 3: 607]

<> 1857my10: 1858au02; India | Sepoy Rebellion ushered in brutal year of imperialist war which pitted England against an Indian independence movement

- Prominent English cultural figure, John Ruskin [ID], delivered a speech characteristic of British imperialist attitudes toward those who resisted their power = “Since the race of man began its course of sin on this earth, nothing has ever been done by it so significative of all bestial, and lower than bestial degradation, as the act [of] the Indian race in the year that has just passed by” [2011au19: TLS: 3]
- The rebellion forced abolition of 250-year-old English East India Co. and caused
imposition in India of direct administration by imperialist English crown

- Termination of the great English mercantilist corporation, followed in a decade by the demise of the Russian-America Company [ID], indicated that a 300-year phase of European overseas-corporate economic life was over
- And all this just as a new breed of industrial company moved to the center of European economic life, as epitomized by the new railroad companies [ID] and trans-national grain and petroleum corporations

<>1857oc11:Nagasaki | Putiatin back from China, where he was working to create a new generation of treaties more favorable to Russia than the old Nerchinsk Treaty. He found no word from Edo

*1857oc16:Nagasaki officials decided to move ahead in their dealings with Putiatin, using the Dutch proposal as prototype

*–Week later Putiatin signed similar treaty, w/promise that another port than Shimoda would be opened. USA diplomatic representative Townsend Harris wouldn’t accept this plan and proposed to force a greater opening of Japan

*– Putiatin soon had some imperialist success in China, and Russian imperialist ambitions in Asia mounted as the 19th century wound down

\`
*–Beasley,MHJ:65

<>1857:1870; In London political exile, the pundit Alexander Herzen was beyond the grip of Russian censorship and free to publish and circulate back in Russia his influential journal of opinion and political news, Kolokol [The Bell] for 13 years, until his death [KMM:165-90 | RRC2,2:321-31 | Excerpts: Edie,1:328-78 | VSB,2:582-4]

- 1849:1855; Various Herzen writings [DIR3:271-84]
- 1851:Paris | Six years before the appearance of Kolokol, Herzen explained to Europeans that Russia had a long and progressive revolutionary tradition, “Du développement des idées revolutionnaires en Russie” [KMM:158-64]
- 1851se22:Herzen letter to Michelet [Excerpts = TXT | DIR2:233-54]. Herzen defended Russia from standard west European clichés repeated in Michelet’s writing. Herzen insisted, “The time has come to show Europe that they cannot speak about Russia as of something mute, absent, and defenseless”
- Herzen’s critical and radical patriotism, his insistence that Russia was as able as Europe to reach for the better future, and especially his inclination to idealize Russian village political tradition, inspired the “populist” movement. [TXT on the
meaning of “obshchina” in Russian political discourse in the 1860s

- 1852: Herzen, with his close associate Nikolai Ogarev, founded “Free Russian Press”. The press issued a stream of information and opinion back into Russia where censorship constrained free expression. These publications were suppressed by Russian officials, but they were read in secret and with enthusiasm both by political opponents of autocracy and by the autocrat himself.

- 1852-1868; Herzen published, first in serial form, one of the great political/intellectual autobiographies of all times, My Past and Thoughts. These memoirs not only shed light on the early history of European socialism and the rise of the Russian intelligentsia [ID] but entered into the Russian literary canon.

- 1856: London | Voices from Russia [Golosa iz Rossii] began to appear. It contained examples of the a growing body of thoughtful essays sent to Herzen from Russia, where official censorship prevented free deliberation on significant national issues.
  - The lead article was critical of political extremism and was signed “A Russian Liberal” (written jointly by Konstantin Kavelin and Boris Chicherin).
  - Chicherin also published a piece on the weaknesses of the Russian aristocracy, “Ob aristokratii, v osobennosti russkoi” [GRV:189-93].
  - That very year, back in Russia, Kavelin’s MS critique of serfdom circulated = “Gosudarstvennoe krest’yanstvo pravo v Rossii” [GRV:194-7].

- Russian liberalism stood forth here at mid-century, promoted in the publication Herzen and Ogarev, who are always thought to be more nearly “socialists” than “liberals”.

- 1857: Herzen letter to the novelist Turgenev compared Russia, America and Europe [VSB,3:634-5]

- 1858: Herzen wrote of Russia and America: “Both — from different direction — reached across awesome expanses, building towns, settlements, and colonies, to the shores of the Pacific Ocean, the ‘Mediterranean of the future’”.

- 1859: “Russian Germans and German Russians” offered more critique of “The West” [VSB,3:635-6].

- 1867: Herzen portrait painted by Nikolai Gay and in Olga’s Gallery

*–Martin Malia, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism
*–VRR, ch.1 & ch.3 on Herzen & Kolokol
*–Alexander Kucherov, “Alexander Herzen’s Parallel between the United States and Russia”, in Curtiss, ed., Essays…:34-47
*–English playwright Tom Stoppard on Herzen [TXT] Review of Stoppard’s dramatic trilogy, “The Coast of Utopia” [TXT]
1858: London exile, as a result of unsuccessful radical republican political activism in Italy, provided Giuseppe Mazzini the opportunity to publish a theoretical and political journal, Pensiero ed Azione [Thought and Action]

1858: Leipzig | Russian priest and advocate of greater independence of the Russian Orthodox Church from state control and for general church reforms, I. S. Belliustin, published Description of the Clergy in Rural Russia: The Memoir of a Nineteenth-Century Parish Priest [Excerpt= KRR:336-9]

- The Church, as institution, was largely put outside the range of tsarist reform planning. The Petrine subordination of church to state [ID] was given little official attention.
- However, the newly aroused public and energized seminary teachers and students, as well as certain activist clergy (such as Belliustin), subjected the Russian Orthodox Church to critical scrutiny.


- In the late 1850s and early 1860s, the monthly journal Sovremennik [Contemporary], in which Dobroliubov and Nikolai Chernyshevskii played leading roles, gained great popularity because of its broad-ranging “muckraking” journalism and advocacy of a “modern” secular, science-based world view.
- Because of censorship, philosophical, political-economic and social issues had to be disguised as literary criticism.
- Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobroliubov: Selected Criticism.
- Chernyshevskii wrote on leading issues in the life of the struggling Russian agrarian order =
  - 1857: “On the Ownership of Landed Property”
  - 1858: “A Critique of the Philosophical Prejudices against Communal Possession” [SLM | Q.PSS#05:357-92]

- He also developed a deep interest in contemporary European political-economic thought and its efforts to understand the geographically expanding industrial transformation of traditional agrarian civilization, the rise of the historically unprecedented social formation wage-labor.
  - He wrote “Capital and Labor” (1860) [VSB,3:637]
  - He translated into Russian and extensively annotated John Stuart Mills’
He also wrote engagingly on philosophical issues, as in “The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy” [Edie, 2:29-60 | VSB, 3:638]

Chernyshevskii, Selected Philosophical Essays

Chernyshevskii was an outstanding example of the new “public intellectual” in European life, filled with confidence in science and progress and the need to propagate their virtues among the educated public, and this in order to solidify or promote the growth of a modern civil society

Mid-century pundits or journalists put themselves in competition with secular and Church censorship, the traditional institutions of control and maintenance of prevailing world views at that interpretive taxonomic level of historical experience [ID]

*–Wagar on world view of the Russian 1860s [TXT]
*–Vladimir Nabokov, The Gift [short novel lampooned Chernyshevskii and the epoch of Russian positivism]
*–William Woehrlin, Chernyshevsky: The Man and the Journalist
*–N. G. O. Pereira, The Thought and Teachings of N. G. Cernysevskij
*–VRR, ch.5 & ch.6

<>1858my28:China and Russia signed Aigun treaty; 1858je13:Tientsin treaty [DIR2:257-70 | DIR3:296-304]

<>1858au19:Japan, Edo | Putiatin signed 1st Russian/Japanese treaty of Friendship and Commerce w/Nagai Naomune (1816:1891) Inoue Kiyono etc

The two hitherto remote territorial-states exchanged ministers and began trade
Putiatin later signed 1860no14:Peking treaty with China
Putiatin’s slow starting, fifteen-year diplomatic mission to China and Japan ended in success
Russian-Japanese friendship seemed solid as Japan positioned itself for its great internal transformation which would later have immense impact on its foreign policy = Japanese Meiji Restoration

<>1859:1862; Prussian [north German] Ambassador to St. Petersburg court was future architect of German unity, Otto von Bismarck
The 1860s have been called “The First Russian Revolutionary Situation” which was provoked when Alexander II and his administration decided they could no longer allow themselves to govern as they had in the past.

Failure in the Crimean War exposed glaring Russian weaknesses.

Serfdom over the long run and the legacy of Nicholas I more recently made the status quo unacceptable even to highest authorities.

Promotion of Imperial interests required extensive change.

The state came to see the need for extensive change, and the people of Russia, the subjects of the tsar, agreed.

The situation in which old regime authorities and their subjects agreed on the need for significant change was revolutionary.

First because authorities and subjects did not agree about what changes needed to be made.

Second, two forces — state bureaucrats and various social groups — were ready to mobilize themselves to promote their own various and clashing ideas about change. Different ideas were rooted in different interests. Social formations, individuals and institutions act according to interests.

A new and recognizably modern political opposition arose =

Radical-left pro-reform and radical-right anti-reform factions arose in the ranks of civilian and military state servitors and attenuated official reform energies.

Peasants wanted more land under better conditions.

Gentry thought they were invited to help design the reform when the tsar asked noble assemblies to form gentry committees to deliberate on serfdom.

Some gentry political activists decided to resist reform.

Some gentry political activists decided to push reform to the limit.

An emerging “civil society” sought political and social reforms well beyond anything the state could accept, simply because the causes that inspired civil society were not the causes that inspired official reform.

A lively new print medium weighed in, from abroad and on the domestic scene.

Poland rose up in rebellion against Russian rule.

Reformist authorities (who promoted reform) and reactionary authorities (who opposed reform) could agree on this =

Political activism (self-generated public mobilization) on the part of either...
peasants, gentry, “intelligentsia” [ID], or national minorities was unacceptable

- But reactionary authorities proved wrong on their one essential do-nothing position because tsarist government could not rule as in the past, and significant changes had to be made

- An emerging Russian “public” agreed, but an increasingly mobilized public, for a brief and intense period of crisis, rejected changes proposed by reigning authorities

- That was the essence of the mid-century revolutionary situation, but no revolution followed

- The state temporarily restrained its own radical reformers and reactionary resistance and pushed through compromised but authentic reforms

- The state prevailed over peasants with its army

- The state prevailed over the gentry and the fledgling civil society with harsh police measures and subtle policies of cooptation

- A second revolutionary situation nonetheless arose 15 years later at the end of the reign of Alexander II

*–Alan Kimball, “Tsarist State & Origins of Revolutionary Opposition in the 1860s“
*–VRR, ch.4-13 (90-315)
*–Jonathan Daly, Autocracy Under Siege: Security Police and Opposition in Russia, 1855-1905 (1998)

Saint Nicholas II

Princess Alix of Hesse and by Rhine

26 November 1894

5 children

1894-1917

1905
The Bolsheviks

played little role in the revolution of 1905. Lenin only returned to Russia from exile in September and the revolution was stamped out by early December. Again Lenin went into European exile. But he believed that his views had been vindicated by the experiences of 1905. In particular, he came to believe even more fervently in non-cooperation with liberal parties or even with socialists who cooperated with liberals.

So Lenin kept the Bolshevik faction together in the years before World War I. During the war most European socialists supported their national governments in the war effort. Only a tiny minority, Lenin among them, called for the transformation of the war among nations into a war among classes. By this time Lenin had come to believe that Russia was the weakest link in the chain of capitalist countries. Under the pressure of war, he expected the Russian link to snap and to see the establishment of the first socialist country in the world in Russia. Other, more advanced capitalist nations would soon follow the Russian example and join the socialist family of nations.
Russia: CAUCASUS: Hunting party. Old Vintage Print. 1913

Russia: NOVGOROD. Nuns haymaking. Old Vintage Print. 1913

Russia: RICH TARTARS. Costume. Old Vintage Print. 1913

Russia: Farming. Blessing the ground. Vintage Print. 1913

Russia: BLESSING THE WATER. Old Vintage Print. 1913

Russia: COSTUME. Turcoman + Wife. Old Vintage Print. 1913
Russia signalled her withdrawal from World War One soon after the October Revolution of 1917, and the country turned in on itself with a bloody civil war between the Bolsheviks and the conservative White Guard. Jonathan Smele charts this turbulent episode in the forging of post-tsarist Russia.

During the war

Background

Conditions in Europe in 1914 made it virtually inevitable that war would break out.
sooner or later. Intense nationalism, militarism, a precarious balance of power resulting from the division of the major powers into two rival alliances, and competition for overseas empires all played a part in creating a situation in which war could occur at almost any time.

Nationalism

Throughout the 19th century, nationalism (a strong patriotic feeling of loyalty to one’s people or county) flourished. By the 20th century, it had become chauvinism: national pride had been exaggerated to such a degree that it meant not only love for one’s country but contempt for the peoples of other nations.

Militarism

Though there had not been a major war in Europe since 1815, all the Great Powers (Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Russia) had amassed huge arsenals, far beyond the needs of national defense, prior to World War I. The sense of power derived from military strength helped swell national pride. However, in time of international crisis, these arsenals tended to make European leaders think in terms of military rather than diplomatic solutions.

Alliances

The Great Powers had arranged themselves into two rival alliances, producing a balance of power that, it was hoped, would prevent war. Actually the alliances led to a state in which the slightest disturbance of the existing political order or military situation caused a crisis, and each crisis increased the tension that would eventually lead to war. The alliances also made it certain that war, once it began, would involve all the Great Powers.

The alliance system that existed at the outbreak of World War I was developed after the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71). Otto von Bismarck, chancellor of Germany, knew that France would someday seek to avenge its humiliating defeat in that war. To reduce this threat, Bismarck entered into various alliances with the goal of isolating France from the other countries of Europe. In 1879 Bismarck concluded the Dual Alliance, a mutual defense pact with Austria-Hungary. He expanded this agreement in 1882 to include Italy, forming the Triple Alliance.
Bismarck realized that an alliance between France and Russia would be a fundamental threat to German security because in the event of war with either power Germany would be forced to fight on two fronts. Bismarck arranged the Emperors’ Alliance (1881) and the Reinsurance Treaty (1887) with Russia, agreements that guaranteed Russian neutrality in the event of a Franco-German conflict.

In 1890 Bismarck was dismissed by the new German kaiser (emperor), William II. William thought that Germany should not be allied with both Austria and Russia because of their rivalry for dominance in the Balkans. Though he wanted to remain on friendly terms, William allowed the agreements with Russia to lapse.

To offset the threat of the Triple Alliance, France and Russia formed their own Dual Alliance in 1894. France also improved relations with Great Britain by entering into an informal understanding with the British known as the Entente Cordiale (1904). This was expanded into the Triple Entente in 1907 with the inclusion of Russia.

Imperialism

The most impressive display of the power of the European states in the 19th and early 20th centuries was the expansion of their political and economic influence to areas outside Europe. Imperial expansion provided new sources of raw materials, new markets for goods produced in the mother country, and national prestige.

Several times in the decades preceding the war, conflicting colonial ambitions in Africa threatened to lead European powers to war. Britain and France, in the Entente Cordiale, ended years of rivalry by pledging to cooperate in the colonization of Africa. Germany, which was the newest imperial power, tried to compete with the more established imperial nations (Britain and France). Twice, in 1905 and 1911, Germany attempted to undermine French authority in Morocco. Both times Germany’s gains were negligible, but the German actions caused French leaders to consider war to defend their imperial interests.

The situation in the Balkans was even more explosive: it was, in fact, the competition there between Russia and Austria-Hungary that eventually triggered World War I. Austria wanted to incorporate some of the smaller Balkan states into its empire. Russia’s Balkan policy was based on Pan-Slavism, a movement to achieve cultural and political unity in a confederation of Slavic states dominated by Russia. The situation was further complicated by the rival territorial claims of various ethnic groups in the Balkans.
In the Balkan Wars (1912-13), the Turks were pushed out of most of the Balkans by Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro, and Greece. When disputes arose among the victors over how the former Turkish territories were to be divided, Austria and Russia proposed conflicting settlements. Only mediation by the other European powers prevented a general war in southern Europe.

These countries also had other territorial ambitions. Serbia was seeking an outlet on the Adriatic. France and Great Britain wanted to extend their influence in the Middle East. Also, German, French, and British business interests were seeking concessions and markets in various countries, and each success brought an envious outcry from competing nations. British industrialists were particularly worried by German competition in their home market.

The Assassination of the Archduke

On June 28, 1914, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Hapsburg throne, was assassinated by a 19-year-old student, Gavrilo Princip, in Sarajevo (in the Austro-Hungarian province of Bosnia-Herzegovina). Princip, a Serb living in Bosnia, was assisted in the preparations for the assassination by a Serbian revolutionary society that was trying to overthrow Austrian rule in Bosnia.

All of Europe awaited Austria-Hungary’s response to the assassination. The chief of the Austrian general staff, General Franz Conrad von Htzendorf, and the foreign minister, Count Leopold von Berchtold, both wanted to use the assassination as a pretext to absorb Serbia into the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Before any action could be taken against Serbia, however, they had to secure German support, to deter Russian intervention. The kaiser promised to support the Austrian government in any action it took because he did not believe that Russia would intervene.

Ultimatums and Declarations

Htzendorf and Berchtold could now act. Berchtold drew up an ultimatum with terms that he knew would be unacceptable to Serbia. He also set a 48-hour time limit for Serbia’s response. In a carefully worded reply, Serbia agreed to all of the conditions of the ultimatum, except for the Austrian demand to conduct an investigation and trial in Serbia. The Serbians proposed that if this reply was unsatisfactory, the question of
Serbia’s guilt in the assassination should be submitted to the Hague Tribunal for arbitration. Austria-Hungary, declaring that Serbia’s reply was unacceptable, severed diplomatic relations with Serbia and ordered mobilization.

Russia pledged full support for Serbia and ordered mobilization on July 25. The next day, Sir Edward Grey, the British foreign minister, proposed a conference of the Great Powers to resolve the crisis, but Austria-Hungary was unwilling to attend. On July 27 France ordered mobilization in support of Russia. On July 31 Germany gave Russia an ultimatum that threatened mobilization if Russia did not rescind its mobilization orders within 12 hours.

Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on July 28 and then began shelling Belgrade (the capital of Serbia). Russia did not respond to Germany’s ultimatum. Germany declared war on Russia on August 1, and on France on August 3. France and Britain declared war on Germany on August 3 and 4, respectively. Austria-Hungary declared war on Russia on August 6.

The Plan of Campaign

To some extent, every major power had developed military plans for a continental war. Germany had the most detailed plans. Count Alfred von Schlieffen, chief of the German general staff from 1891 to 1905, had developed a strategy for the invasion of France and had set up a timetable for troop movements and operations.

The Schlieffen Plan, as it came to be known, called for a large force to march west through Belgium and then south, to Paris. A small force would be deployed at the French border to lure the French forward, causing them to expose their west flank and rear. Schlieffen calculated that Russia would mobilize very slowly, thus not posing a threat to Germany’s eastern frontier until after operations in the west were concluded. Then, Germany could turn its forces toward Russia.

Austria-Hungary’s plan was to mount a coordinated Austro-German offensive in the east to knock Russia out of the war. However, the High Command accepted the Schlieffen Plan and agreed to contain Russia while Germany sought to gain a quick victory in the west.

France’s plans were much less detailed than Germany’s. The French generals planned a series of offensives along the Franco-German border to reclaim Alsace and Lorraine,
territories seized by the Germans in the Franco-Prussian War. When this plan was executed, however, the attacks were not well coordinated and were easily repelled by the Germans.

Unlike the other powers, Great Britain did not have any detailed military plans in the event of war. When the war broke out, Britain sent a small expeditionary force to hold the position on the west flank of the French army.

Russian strategy called for the defeat of Austria-Hungary before engaging Germany. However, the Russians abandoned their plan when they were prodded by the French into an invasion of East Prussia, in order to help relieve the German pressure on the Western Front.

The Opposing Forces

When the war began the Central Powers had 11,000,000 men (counting reserves) opposing the Allies’ 9,500,000 (also counting reserves). The Central Powers’ armies were better equipped. In training and morale, the two sides were about equal.

The Central Powers

Germany was the best prepared of any country. It had an excellent system of military training and its army was well-supplied and confident. At the beginning of the war, Germany mobilized an army of 2,500,000 and had reserves totaling 4,500,000.

At the beginning of hostilities, Austria immediately mobilized about 1,000,000 men. By the middle of October, 1914, this number had been increased by another 500,000. Bulgaria and Turkey mobilized their forces shortly after the outbreak of hostilities, but their armies were poorly equipped and poorly trained.

The Allies

France had the strongest army among the Allies. Not only was it well trained, but many of the troops on active duty were veterans of combat in Africa. The French had an excellent general staff and the morale of the soldiers was high. However, the French were not as well equipped as the Germans. At the start of hostilities, France mobilized 2,000,000 men and had another 2,000,000 in reserve.
The British had a strong navy but a small army. The regular army numbered only 250,000. There were also 700,000 reserves in various stages of training. Britain alone of the belligerents had never adopted peacetime conscription or universal military training.

Russia had a regular army of about 1,000,000 men with 3,000,000 more in reserve. Serbia had an army of some 250,000, with an equal number in reserve. Both Serbia and Russia were poorly equipped. The Belgian army totaled about 263,000 and had no reserves.

World War I was the great armed conflict of 1914-18. Until World War II, it was often called the Great War because it was the most destructive and widespread war the world had ever seen.

World War I began as a local conflict over a minor issue. Eventually it engulfed much of Europe and drew in, directly or indirectly, all the major powers of the world. The first declaration of war was made by Austria-Hungary against Serbia on July 28, 1914. Before the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, 28 nations (counting the British Empire as one nation) were directly engaged in the conflict.

World War I saw many innovations in military technology.

On one side were France, Belgium, the British Empire, Russia, and Serbia; and, later, Japan, Italy, the United States, and 16 other countries. They were called the Allied and Associated Powers, or the Allies. The opposing side consisted of Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire (Turkey), and Bulgaria. They were known as the Central Powers.

After the war, there were numerous boundary changes in Europe and the Middle East. Four empires the Austro-Hungarian, German, Russian, and Ottomancollapsed.

Austria and Hungary were reduced to small separate states and Czechoslovakia was created from Austro-Hungarian territory in Central Europe. The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (which became Yugoslavia in 1929) was established, comprising Austro-Hungarian lands in the Balkans and the kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro.
Poland, which had been partitioned among the Germans, Austrians, and Russians in the 18th century, was reestablished along its historical borders, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were freed from Russian domination. In the Middle East, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Hejaz (a territory within modern Saudi Arabia), Transjordan (modern Jordan), and Palestine were carved out of the Ottoman Empire.

France’s quick defeat in World War II has been attributed, at least in part, to the devastation it suffered in World War I. The vast system of overseas holdings of Great Britain began to change from an empire to a commonwealth. The war was at least partly responsible for the success of the Russian Revolution and the rise of Communism.

The United States, after the war, its first experience of being involved in European affairs, declined to take a role as a world leader and retreated into isolationism, refusing to join the League of Nations. Many people thought of World War I as “the war to end all wars,” fought “to make the world safe for democracy.” Because of an overly harsh peace treaty, the weakness of the League of Nations, a worldwide economic depression, and the rise of fascism, the war had the opposite effect. It made the second World War almost inevitable.

Important dates during World War I

The auguries for war

In 1913, Tsar Nicholas II celebrated the tercentenary of Romanov rule in Russia. He and his dynasty ruled over a huge empire, stretching from central Europe to the Pacific Ocean and from the Arctic to the borders of Afghanistan.

the events that took place on the Eastern Front...would have a profound impact upon world history for the remainder of the century

This mighty imperium covered one-sixth of the land surface of the globe, and was populated by almost 150 million people of more than a hundred different nationalities.

However, the Russian Empire was riven by many tensions. Just five years after the celebrations, Nicholas and his family would be dead, executed by the Bolsheviks, while his empire would be defeated in the World War and wracked by revolutions, civil wars and foreign interventions.
By 1921, after a period of great unrest, the Bolsheviks triumphed in Russia, and largely reunited the old empire (formally constituted as the USSR in 1923). The repercussions of the events that took place on the Eastern Front, from 1914 to 1921, however, would have a profound impact upon world history for the remainder of the century and beyond – although it was the battles of the Western Front that eventually achieved greater fame.

Campaigns and crises: 1914-1916

Russian prisoners after defeat in East Prussia, 1915 © In 1914, Russia was hardly prepared for war. Just nine years earlier she had been defeated in a war with tiny Japan. The Revolution of 1905, when revolts and uprisings had forced the Tsar to concede civil rights and a parliament to the Russian people, had also shaken the empire.

The subsequent reforms and rebuilding were far from complete, but as workers and land-hungry peasants rallied to the Russian flag and marched off to fight against the Central Powers, the initial auguries for both war and national unity were not bad.

This failed Russian advance...signalled the beginning of an unrelenting Russian retreat

National unity, however, could only be built on victory and, in that regard, Russia’s hopes were dashed early in the Great War. At Tannenberg and the First Battle of the Masurian Lakes, in 1914, Russia lost two entire armies (over 250,000 men).

This failed Russian advance into East Prussia did disrupt Germany’s Schlieffen Plan and thus probably prevented the fall of Paris, but it also signalled the beginning of an unrelenting Russian retreat on the northern sector of the Eastern Front. By the middle of 1915 all of Russian Poland and Lithuania, and most of Latvia, were overrun by the German army.

Many factors – including the militarisation of industry and crises in food supply – threatened disaster on the home front

Fortunately for the Russians, they did better in 1916. The supply of rifles and artillery shells to the Eastern Front was vastly improved, and in the Brusilov Offensive of June
1916, Russia achieved significant victories over the Austrians – capturing Galicia and the Bukovina – and she was also more than holding her own in Transcaucasia, against Turkey.

However, the country’s political and economic problems were greatly exacerbated by the war. Many factors – including the militarisation of industry and crises in food supply – threatened disaster on the home front.

Added to this cocktail were rumours that the tsarina, Alexandra, and her favourite, the infamous Rasputin, were German spies. The rumours were unfounded, but by November 1916 influential critics of the regime were asking whether Russia’s misfortunes – including 1,700,000 military dead and 5,000,000 wounded – were a consequence of ‘stupidity or treason’.

This was a rabble-rousing exaggeration, but certainly the outdated strategies of Russia’s General Staff had cost hundreds of thousands of lives, while the regime seemed careless of such appalling losses.

1917: From February to October

Aleksandr Fyodorovich Kerensky, leader of the Provisional Government, 1917 ©

Food riots, demonstrations and a mutiny at the Petrograd Garrison in February 1917 forced Nicholas II to abdicate as war still continued. A Provisional Government led by liberals and moderate socialists was proclaimed, and its leaders hoped now to pursue the war more effectively.

Real power in Russia after the February Revolution, however, lay with the socialist leaders of the Petrograd (later All-Russian) Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, who were elected by popular mandate (unlike the ministers of the Provisional Government).

Anarchist and Bolshevik agitators played their own part in destroying the Russian Army’s ability to fight
The Soviet leaders rather half-heartedly supported a defensive war, but were more committed to an unrealistic programme of ending the conflict, through a general peace ‘without annexations or indemnities’ – a formula that neither the Allies nor Germany would ever accept.

Against this background, the war minister (later Prime Minister) Kerensky of the Provisional Government hoped to strengthen Russia’s hand with a new Russian offensive on the Eastern Front in June. But by then the ability of Russia’s officers to induce their men to obey had been entirely negated by the hopes of social transformation and an end to the war that the February Revolution had unleashed in the trenches – leading to what historian Alan Wildman has termed ‘trench bolshevism’.

Anarchist and Bolshevik agitators played their own part in destroying the Russian Army’s ability to fight. Many anti-war radicals, along with the Bolshevik leader, Vladimir Lenin, were ferried home from exile in Switzerland in April 1917, courtesy of the German General Staff (which had spent roughly 30 million marks trying to foment disorder in Russia by the end of 1917).

most of the generals and forces of the political right threw their weight behind a plan for a military coup

The summer offensive was a disaster. Peasant soldiers deserted en masse to join the revolution, and fraternisation with the enemy became common. Meanwhile, in an attempt to restore order and resist the German counter-offensive, most of the generals and forces of the political right threw their weight behind a plan for a military coup, under the Russian Army’s commander-in-chief, General Kornilov.

The coup failed, but had two important consequences: on the one hand, the generals and the conservatives who had backed Kornilov felt betrayed by Kerensky (who arrested Kornilov after having appeared to have been in agreement with him) and would no longer defend the government; on the other, Kerensky’s reputation with the moderate left and with the population at large plummeted when it became clear that he had initially supported Kornilov’s plans for the restoration of the death penalty and for the dissolution of soldiers’ revolutionary committees.

The only winners were the Bolsheviks, with Lenin at their head, who were able to topple Kerensky and take power in the October Revolution of 1917- without significant resistance from either the government or the army.
Delegates at negotiations for the Brest-Litovsk treaty, March 1918 © After taking power, the Bolsheviks promised to deliver ‘Peace, Bread and Land’ to the beleaguered people of Russia. With regard to the first of these, a ‘Decree on Peace’ (26 October 1917) was dashed off by Lenin, calling upon all belligerents to end the slaughter of World War One.

Not that Lenin was a pacifist: rather, his hope was to transform the world war into an international civil war, when the ‘imperialist’ powers refused to cease fighting and thereby revealed their rapacious ambitions.

However, the Central Powers responded to the Bolsheviks’ appeal by agreeing to an armistice on the Eastern Front, and Lenin’s lieutenant, Trotsky, found himself in the uncomfortable position, during the winter of 1917-18, of negotiating a separate peace treaty with Imperial Germany and her allies at the Polish town of Brest-Litovsk.

Trotsky tried to delay matters and to inculcate revolution in central Europe by refusing the harsh terms presented to him. When Germany, however, merely resumed its invasion of Russia on the Eastern Front, pushing further east in five days of February 1918 than it had in the previous three years (the German soldiers, to Trotsky’s consternation, continued to obey their officers), the Bolsheviks were forced to sign the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on 3 March 1918.

This punitive treaty effectively handed over Finland, Poland, the Baltic provinces, Ukraine and Transcaucasia to the Central Powers, together with one-third of the old empire’s population, one-third of its agricultural land and three-quarters of its industries.

Outraged by this, the anti-Bolshevik Russians who had remained loyal to the Allies now took up arms...
took up arms in earnest against the Bolsheviks. They were actively assisted by Allied forces in Russia, who hoped to rebuild the Eastern Front. Notable in this regard was the Czechoslovak Legion, a 40,000-strong army made up of former POWs, who in 1918 seized the entire Trans-Siberian Railway, from the Volga to Vladivostok.

Civil War: Whites v Reds

Leon Trotsky saluting in the street, October, 1917 ©

During the civil war thus unleashed by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk the Bolsheviks (Reds), who controlled Petrograd, Moscow and the central Russian heartland, soon found themselves surrounded by hostile forces (Whites) – made up of the more conservative elements in Russia – who launched a series of campaigns in 1919 that threatened to crush the revolution.

During these campaigns Admiral Kolchak, the ‘Supreme Ruler’ of the Whites, attacked across the Urals from Siberia; General Denikin advanced on a broad front up the Volga, into Ukraine and to the town of Orel (within 250 miles of Moscow); and General Iudenich’s North West Russian Army, based in Estonia, twice reached the outskirts of Petrograd.

The Reds, however, rebuffed these attacks, and survived, and by late 1920 had driven the Whites back into the Black Sea, the Baltic and the Pacific – causing hundreds of thousands of White soldiers and civilians to emigrate.

The Reds were able to take advantage of internal lines of communication and could utilise the railways, arsenals and the economy of the most populous provinces of the former empire. In this way they managed to arm, man and manoeuvre an army that by 1921 had grown to almost five million soldiers.

The Whites, in contrast, never commanded forces totalling more than 250,000 men at one time, were separated from each other by huge distances, and were based around the
less developed peripheries of Russia. Also, crucially, the Whites underestimated the Bolsheviks’ capacity to resist.

The White armies, in contrast, exhibited only brutality, venality, disorder...

It still seems surprising that Trotsky was able to fashion a Red Army more effective than that of the experienced White generals ranged against him. He, however, enjoyed the material advantages mentioned, and he also introduced some revolutionary innovations: notably the network of Political Commissars – devout Bolsheviks who offered political guidance to the Red Army and who watched over the loyalty of the 50,000 imperial army officers the Reds employed to help command their forces. He also used terror most ruthlessly.

The White armies, in contrast, exhibited only brutality, venality, disorder and a lack of political and military direction. Even their most effective fighters, the Cossacks, were more interested in booty and in securing their own regional autonomy than in driving Lenin from the Kremlin.

Allied intervention

Despite their strength in Russia itself, the Reds were internationally isolated, but neither did the Whites enjoy unlimited Allied support. The liberal British leader Lloyd George, the socialist French prime minister Clemenceau and the American Democratic president Woodrow Wilson were no friends of Lenin – but neither were they particularly enamoured of the White generals, whom they suspected of reactionary aims.

In fact, although anti-Bolshevik sentiments were not altogether absent from Allied leaders’ minds when they made the decision to intervene in Russia in 1918, their main interest was in the Great War, not the Russian civil war, and their desire was to try and reconstitute the Eastern Front, to ease the pressure on the Western Front. That motivation disappeared on 11 November 1918.
after the armistice, most Allied efforts were directed towards finding an honourable way out of Russia.

Moreover, none of the western powers had any great interest in helping to build a united Russia – they preferred to keep that huge country weak – and in any case, they had enough on their plates in 1919. With domestic war weariness, the Paris Peace Conference, the division of the German and Ottoman Empires, and the economic crises of central Europe to contend with, they had no wish to sink further into the Russian quagmire. The only power with the capacity to intervene effectively in Russia was Japan, but with memories of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 still fresh, her intervention was unlikely to be welcomed by the Russians.

Consequently, although the matériel the Allies sent to Russia was crucial in allowing the Whites to mount the campaigns they did in 1919 (the British alone sent one hundred million pounds-worth of equipment to Kolchak and Denikin), only a few thousand British, French and American troops ever set foot in Russia, and few of them saw action. And after the armistice, most Allied efforts were directed towards finding an honourable way out of Russia, rather than a means of more forcefully intervening.

It was this victory that helped forge post-tsarist Russia’s self-image

Nevertheless, the Red Army’s victory over what became characterised under Stalin as ‘The Three Campaigns of the Entente’ (a loaded reference to the efforts of Kolchak, Denikin and Iudenich, who were portrayed as being ‘puppets’ of western capitalism), in a civil war that cost perhaps ten million lives, assumed a hallowed place in Soviet and Russian history.

It was this victory that helped forge post-tsarist Russia’s self-image as a strong country that had stood up to the bullying of the west, and that lay at the root of the Cold War. Even Gorbachev, often seen as a friend of the west, was prone to mentioning it; and it cannot be far from President Putin’s mind as events unfold in the Middle East.

After the war

World Without End was a global phenomenon, a work of grand historical sweep, beloved by millions of readers and acclaimed by critics. Fall of Giants is his magnificent new
historical epic. The first novel in The Century Trilogy, it follows the fates of five interrelated families—American, German, Russian, English, and Welsh—as they move through the world-shaking dramas of the First World War, the Russian Revolution, and the struggle for women’s suffrage.

Thirteen-year-old Billy Williams enters a man’s world in the Welsh mining pits…Gus Dewar, an American law student rejected in love, finds a surprising new career in Woodrow Wilson’s White House…two orphaned Russian brothers, Grigori and Lev Peshkov, embark on radically different paths half a world apart when their plan to emigrate to America falls afoul of war, conscription, and revolution…Billy’s sister, Ethel, a housekeeper for the aristocratic Fitzherberts, takes a fateful step above her station, while Lady Maud Fitzherbert herself crosses deep into forbidden territory when she falls in love with Walter von Ulrich, a spy at the German embassy in London.Continue reading ...

These characters and many others find their lives inextricably entangled as, in a saga of unfolding drama and intriguing complexity, Fall of Giants moves seamlessly from Washington to St. Petersburg, from the dirt and danger of a coal mine to the glittering chandeliers of a palace, from the corridors of power to the bedrooms of the mighty. As always with Ken Follett, the historical background is brilliantly researched and rendered, the action fast-moving, the characters rich in nuance and emotion. It is destined to be a new classic.

In future volumes of The Century Trilogy, subsequent generations of the same families will travel through the great events of the rest of the twentieth century, changing themselves—and the century itself. With passion and the hand of a master, Follett brings us into a world we thought we knew, but now will never seem the same again.

**Historical Vignette 116 – Engineers in Russia**
With the passing of the living history of the First World War, many of its significant events will fade from memory. Despite this loss, some still can name a few of the American experiences in this war, such as Belleau Wood or the “The Lost Battalion.” There was, however, one theater in which American soldiers and engineers served and fought that was forgotten long ago, even though it influenced the later events of the Cold War.

Shortly before the end of World War I, American and other Allied troops were deployed to Russia. Ostensibly, their mission was to protect donated war supplies in northern Russia and Siberia from German troops, to help Russia remain in the war, and to assist Allied prisoners of war in a chaotic, revolutionary Russia. In reality, the mission was never clear to American troops; even at the highest levels there was confusion. Secretary of War Newton Baker handed Maj. Gen. William S. Graves, commander of the American troops in Siberia, his orders with the words: “This contains the policy of the United States in Russia which you are to follow. Watch your step; you will be walking on eggs loaded with dynamite. God bless you and good-bye.”

Accompanying the soldiers when they landed at Archangel, northern Russia, on August 2, 1918, and at Vladivostok, Siberia, on August 16, 1918, were Army engineers. In the case of northern Russia, the engineers were from the 310th Engineer Battalion. They served a crucial role in what became known as the Russian Expedition.

In the vast spaces of northern Russia and Siberia, railroads were critical, and Army engineers repaired and maintained them. They also constructed defensive fortifications, often using unique designs adapted to the bitter winter weather. In northern Russia, for example, engineers of the 310th constructed 316 log blockhouses and 273 machine gun emplacements. They also had to maintain equipment that was never meant to function in such harsh winters. Of course, they were also required to do battle in these same brutal conditions as fighting escalated between the Bolsheviks and supporters of the provisional government.

After World War I ended in November of 1918, the justification for maintaining a presence in Russia weakened and shifted. Ultimately, the lack of mission and domestic pressure led
to the withdrawal of the 5,000 American soldiers in northern Russia in June of 1919. The following April, the 7,950 Americans in Siberia went home. When this obscure and little understood operation ended, it faded in American memory. Crucially, however, the Russians never forgot that American troops once fought on their soil. The experience, for them, very much influenced the direction the Cold War took in the aftermath of World War II.

The Office of History has in its collection a scrapbook of photos taken of the 310th Engineers while in Russia and a collection from William M. Black of the Allied Expeditionary Force, Siberia. This page presents some of those images that illustrate the conditions in Russia. Hover cursor over the images for captions.

This shot was one of the most famous shots made by Russian photographers during World War 2. It was made in the ruins of Stalingrad city – the place where the most heavy city battles took place. Some historians say that after those battles near Staliningrad the Nazi invasion of Russia broke down.

The monument itself depicts Russian children dancing around a crocodile, looking so unreal with the traces of bullets on the sculptures and the burning ruins on the background.

Later, after the war the monument was rebuilt, even earlier than surrounding buildings.
Pretenders to the Russian throne since 1917

- **Nicholas II** (1917–1918)

- Vacant (1918–1924)
- **Cyril Vladimirovich, Grand Duke of Russia** (1924–1938) of the Alexandrovichi Branch

- **Michael II** (disputed)

  **Natalia Brassova**
  15 October 1911

  one son (born before his parents’ marriage) **Vladimir Cyrillovich, Grand Duke of Russia** (1938–1992)

- **Maria Vladimirovna, Grand Duchess of Russia** (1992–Present) of the Vladimirovichi branch

  - **Grand Duke George Mikhailovich of Russia**, heir apparent and son of Maria Vladimirovna, of the Vladimirovichi branch.
  - **Nicholas Romanov, Prince of Russia** (1992–Present) of the Nikolaevichi branch
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THE AUNG SAN HISTORY COLLECTION

Aung San
Statue of Aung San on the northern shore of Kandawgyi Lake in Yangon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Buffalo General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>13 February 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natmauk, Magwe, British Burma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>19 July 1947 (aged 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangoon, British Burma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegiance</td>
<td>Burma National Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Fascist People’s Freedom League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communist Party of Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Major General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battles/wars</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Burma
- **Prehistory** 11,000–200 BCE
- **Pyu city-states** 200 BCE–1050 CE
- **Mon kingdoms** 825?–1057
- **Arakanese kingdoms** 788?–1406

- **Pagan Dynasty** 849–1298
  - **Pagan Empire** 1044–1287
  - **Mongol invasions** 1277–1301

- **Warring states period**
  - Upper Burma 1298–1555
    - **Myinsaing** 1298–1313
    - **Pinya** 1313–1364
    - **Sagaing** 1315–1364
    - **Ava** 1364–1555
    - **Prome** 1482–1542
  - **Ramanya** 1287–1539
  - **Shan states** 1215–1557
  - **Arakan** 1430–1785

- **Toungoo Dynasty** 1510–1752 **Restored Hanthawaddy** 1740–1757
  - **Toungoo Empire** 1530–1599
  - **Nyaungyan period** 1599–1752

- **Konbaung Dynasty** 1752–1885
  - **Anglo-Burmese wars** 1824–1885

- **British colonial period** 1824–1948
  - **Nationalist movement** 1900–1948
  - **Japanese occupation** 1942–1945
  - **State of Burma** 1943–1945
Bogyoke (General) Aung San (Burmese: ဗုံးချင်း အင်းဆန်; MLCTS: bui hkyup aung hcan:, pronounced [bòd o à s á]); 13 February 1915 – 19 July 1947) was a Burmese revolutionary, nationalist, and founder of the modern Burmese army (Tatmadaw), and considered to be the Father of (modern-day) Burma.

He was a founder of the Communist Party of Burma and was instrumental in bringing about Burma’s independence from British colonial rule in Burma, but was assassinated six months before its final achievement. He is recognized as the leading architect of independence, and the founder of the Union of Burma. Affectionately known as “Bogyoke” (General), Aung San is still widely admired by the Burmese people, and his name is still invoked in Burmese politics to this day.

Aung San is the father of Nobel Peace laureate and opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi.
Youth
Aung San was born to U Pha, a lawyer, and his wife Daw Suu in Natmauk, Magway District, in central Burma on 13 February 1915. His family was already well known in the Burmese resistance movement; his great uncle Bo Min Yaung fought against the British annexation of Burma in 1886.

Aung San received his primary education at a Buddhist monastic school in Natmauk, and secondary education at Yenangyaung High School. He went to Rangoon University (now the University of Yangon) and received a B.A. degree in English Literature, Modern History, and Political Science in 1938.
Names of Aung San

- **Name at birth:** Htein Lin (နှစ်ထောင်)
- **As student leader and a *thakin***: Aung San (ဗိုးဗိုလျက်)
- **Nom de guerre:** Bo Tayza (မွန်တော်)
- **Japanese Name:** Omoda Monji (/ofu)
- **Chinese Name:** Tan Lu Sho (Ten Lou Shou)
- **Resistance period code name:** Myo Aung (မြောက်အောင်), U Naung Cho (ဦးနောင်ချွဲ)
- **Contact code name with General Ne Win:** Ko Set Pe (ကွဲစစ်ဖြူ)

**Struggle for independence**

After Aung San entered Rangoon University in 1933, he quickly became a student leader. He was elected to the executive committee of the Rangoon University Students' Union (RUSU). He then became editor of their magazine Oway (Peacock's Call).

In February 1936, he was threatened with expulsion from the university, along with U Nu, for refusing to reveal the name of the author of the article *Hell Hound At Large*, which criticized a senior University official. This led to the Second University Students' Strike and the university authorities subsequently retracted their expulsion orders. In 1938, Aung San was elected president of both the Rangoon University Student Union (RUSU) and the All-Burma Students Union (ABSU), formed after the strike spread to Mandalay. In the same year, the government appointed him as a student representative on the Rangoon University Act Amendment Committee.

In October 1938, Aung San left his law classes and entered national politics. At this point, he was anti-British, and staunchly anti-*imperialist*. He became a *Thakin* (lord or master – a politically motivated title that proclaimed that the Burmese people were the true masters of their country, not the colonial rulers who had usurped the title for their exclusive use) when he joined the *Dobama Asiayone* (Our Burma Union), and acted as their general secretary until August 1940. While in this role, he helped organize a series of countrywide strikes that became known as ME 1300 Revolution (ဗားမြောက် ဗိုလျက်), named after the Burmese calendar year. *Htaung thoun ya byei ayeidawbon*, the 1300 Burmese calendar year.

He also helped found another nationalist organization, the Freedom Bloc (ညွှန်ကြား-ဖျင်စည်း, *Bama-htwet-yat Gaing*), by forming an alliance between the
Dobama, the ABSU, politically active monks and Dr Ba Maw’s Sinyètha (Poor Man’s) Party, and became its general secretary. What remains relatively unknown is the fact that he also became a founder member and first secretary-general of the Communist Party of Burma (CPB) in August 1939. Shortly afterwards he co-founded the People’s Revolutionary Party, renamed the Socialist Party after the Second World War. In March 1940, he attended the Indian National Congress Assembly in Ramgarh, India. However, the government issued a warrant for his arrest due to Thakin attempts to organize a revolt against the British and he had to flee Burma. He went first to China, seeking assistance from the government there (China was still under nationalist government during World War II), but he was intercepted by the Japanese military occupiers in Amoy, and was convinced by them to go to Japan instead.

**World War II period**

Whilst Aung San was in Japan, the Blue Print for a Free Burma, which has been widely but mistakenly attributed to him, was drafted. In February 1941, Aung San returned to Burma, with an offer of arms and financial support from the Fumimaro Konoe government. He returned briefly to Japan to receive more military training, along with the first batch of young revolutionaries who came to be known as the Thirty Comrades. On 26 December 1941, with the help of the Minami Kikan, a secret intelligence unit formed to close the Burma Road and to support a national uprising and headed by Colonel Suzuki, he founded the Burma Independence Army (BIA) in Bangkok, Thailand (which was aligned with Japan for most of World War II).

The former capital of Burma, Rangoon (now Yangon), fell to the Japanese in March 1942 (as part of the Burma Campaign in World War II). The BIA formed an administration for the country under Thakin Tun Oke that operated in parallel with the Japanese military administration until the Japanese disbanded it. In July, the disbanded BIA was re-formed as the Burma Defense Army (BDA). Aung San was made a colonel and put in charge of the force. He was later invited to Japan, and was presented with the Order of the Rising Sun by the Emperor.

On 1 August 1943, the Japanese declared Burma to be an independent nation. Aung San was appointed War Minister, and the army was again renamed, this time as the Burma National Army (BNA). Aung San became skeptical of Japanese promises of true independence and of Japan’s ability to win the war. He made plans to organize an uprising in Burma and made contact with the British authorities in India, in cooperation...
with Communist leaders Thakin Than Tun and Thakin Soe. On 27 March 1945, he led the BNA in a revolt against the Japanese occupiers and helped the Allies defeat the Japanese.[2] 27 March came to be commemorated as ‘Resistance Day’ until the military regime later renamed it ‘Tatmadaw (Armed Forces) Day’.

### Post-World War II

After the return of the British, who had established a military administration, the Anti-Fascist Organisation (AFO), formed in August 1944, was transformed into a united front, comprising the BNA, the Communists and the Socialists, and renamed the Anti-Fascist People’s Freedom League (AFPFL). The Burma National Army was renamed the Patriotic Burmese Forces (PBF) and then gradually disarmed by the British as the Japanese were driven out of various parts of the country. The Patriotic Burmese Forces, while disbanded, were offered positions in the Burma Army under British command according to the Kandy conference agreement with Lord Louis Mountbatten in Ceylon in September 1945.[2] Aung San was offered the rank of Deputy Inspector General of the Burma Army, but he declined it in favor of becoming a civilian political leader and the military leader of the Pyithu yèbaw tat (People’s Volunteer Organisation or PVO).[2]

In January 1946, Aung San became the President of the AFPFL following the return of civil government to Burma the previous October. In September, he was appointed Deputy Chairman of the Executive Council of Burma by the new British Governor Sir Hubert Rance, and was made responsible for defence and external affairs.[2] Rance and Mountbatten took a very different view from the former British Governor, Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith, and also Winston Churchill, who had called Aung San a ‘traitor rebel leader’. A rift had already developed inside the AFPFL between the Communists and Aung San, leading the nationalists and Socialists, which came to a head when Aung San and others accepted seats on the Executive Council, culminating in the expulsion of Thakin Than Tun and the CPB from the AFPFL.[2][3]

Aung San was to all intents and purposes Prime Minister, although he was still subject to a British veto. On 27 January 1947, Aung San and the British Prime Minister Clement Attlee signed an agreement in London guaranteeing Burma’s independence within a year; Aung San had been responsible for its negotiation.[2] During the stopover in Delhi at a press conference, he stated that the Burmese wanted ‘complete independence’ not dominion status and that they had ‘no inhibitions of any kind’ about ‘contemplating a violent or non-violent struggle or both’ in order to achieve this, and concluded that he hoped for the best but he was prepared for the worst.[3]
Two weeks after the signing of the agreement with Britain, Aung San signed an agreement at the Panglong Conference on 12 February 1947 with leaders from other national groups, expressing solidarity and support for a united Burma. Karen representatives played a relatively minor role in the conference and, as subsequent rebellions revealed, remained alienated from the new state. U Aung Zan Wai, U Pe Khin, Major Aung, Sir Maung Gyi and Dr. Sein Mya Maung and Myoma U Than Kywe were among the negotiators of the historical Panglong Conference negotiated with Bamar representative General Aung San and other ethnic leaders in 1947. All these leaders unanimously decided to join the Union of Burma.

In general elections held in April 1947, the AFPFL won 176 out of 210 seats in the election for a Constituent Assembly, while the Karens won 24, the Communists 6 and Anglo-Burmans winning 4. In July, Aung San convened a series of conferences at Sorrenta Villa in Rangoon to discuss the rehabilitation of Burma.

Assassination

On 19 July 1947, a gang of armed paramilitaries of former
Prime Minister U Saw[citation needed]

broke into the Secretariat Building in downtown Rangoon during a meeting of the Executive Council (the shadow government established by the British in preparation for the transfer of power) and assassinated Aung San and six of his cabinet ministers, including his older brother Ba Win, father of Sein Win leader of the government-in-exile, the National Coalition Government of the Union of Burma (NCGUB). A cabinet secretary and a bodyguard were also killed. U Saw was subsequently tried and hanged. During his trial a number of middle-ranking British army officers were implicated in the plot; they also were tried and imprisoned. Rumours of higher-level British involvement, and/or involvement by Ne Win, Aung San's long-term rival for leadership within the AFPFL, are unproven and probably unfounded.[8]
General Aung San, the leader of Burma’s independence movement, was assassinated on 19 July 1947. Burma’s first constitution was established in 1948. Therefore Mr Yeo’s incoherent comments were completely incorrect.

The Burmese military did not rule the country “since independence”, as Mr Yeo said.

Chronologically, Burma was a fully democratic republic from 1948 to 1962. On 4 January 1948, the nation became an independent republic, named the Union of Burma, with Sao Shwe Thaik as its first President and U Nu as its first Prime Minister.

Why does Mr Yeo owe an apology to Aung San Suu Kyi? Mr Yeo said “that it was also General Aung San who created the rule that a Burmese who married a foreigner cannot rule the country and that now Aung San Suu Kyi is married to a foreigner.”

Mr Yeo is thoroughly mistaken.

The 1948 Constitution stated: “No person shall be eligible for election to the office of President unless he is a citizen of the Union who was, or both of whose parents were, born in any of the territories included within the Union.” Aung San Suu Kyi’s parents were both Burmese. She was born in Burma and she is still a Burmese citizen. Therefore she can be President of Burma, as stated in the Constitution.

Mr Yeo’s comment is thus a great insult to Aung San Suu Kyi and her family. Also, Mr Yeo, who is Singapore’s Foreign Minister, has insulted over 52 million Burmese who hold the highest respect for General Aung San.

As Burma’s first constitution was established only in 1948, after General Aung San had
been murdered, it is impossible for General Aung San to create a rule to ban any Burmese who married a foreigner from ruling the country. The military junta only introduced the rule in 2008, deliberately aimed at preventing Aung San Suu Kyi’s participation in the 2010 elections.

Mr Yeo would have Burmese adhere to the Constitution which was first suspended when General Ne Win came to power through a coup, and which was later amended by the junta for political purposes. Equally, should not Mr Yeo be demanding that the Burmese junta adhere to the results of the 1990 elections which Aung San Suu Kyi’s NLD won overwhelmingly?

Mr Yeo’s comments, which shows his ignorance of Burmese history, has added fuel to the fire, especially at a time when Aung San Suu Kyi is in a politically-motivated mock trial for breaking the conditions of her house arrest. The charges were laid after an American man paid an uninvited visit to her home. It is widely expected she will end up in jail. The verdict of her trial is expected to be delivered on Friday.

Mr Yeo said: “It was because her husband is a foreigner and from the ‘western world’ that the ‘western world’ has come to support Aung San Suu Kyi and have failed to recognise the rule of the military”.

In 1972, Aung San Suu Kyi married Dr Michael Aris, a scholar of Tibetan culture, in Bhutan. The following year she gave birth to their first son, Alexander Aris, in London; their second son, Kim, was born in 1977. Following this, she earned a Ph.D. at the School
Mr Yeo denigrated not only Aung San Suu Kyi’s personal life, his comments also cast aspersions on her family and her supporters. Mr Yeo’s labeling of Dr Aris as someone from the ‘western world’ shows his lack of sympathy for Aung San Suu Kyi, her husband and their children.

Dr Aris died of cancer on his 53 birthday on March 27, 1999. He had requested to see his wife one last time in Burma but his request was denied by the military junta.

The fact that the ‘western world’ supports Aung San Suu Kyi has nothing to do with her husband being a foreigner. The support for the Burmese cause and for Aung San Suu Kyi comes from all parts of the world, including Asean countries.

Mr Yeo added that “the problem in Burma is actually a very deep family dispute and the road to democracy for Burma is long and that the elections next year is but a small step towards that goal.”

Burma’s political imbroglio is created by neither Aung San Suu Kyi nor her party, the National League for Democracy (NLD). The NLD had won a landslide victory in the 1990 elections organised by the military junta which, till today, has refused to hand power over to the NLD. Burma’s problems are created by the military regime itself such as forcing millions of ethnic minorities to flee to neighboring countries, ignoring humanitarian aid to cyclone Nargis’ victims and killing monks and protesters. The military regime imprisons thousands of political prisoners. News are now emerging that the regime is also seeking to build nuclear reactors with help from North Korea.

Mr Yeo said that “ASEAN has worked well in keeping the peace in this region, in subjecting the member nations to peer pressure and
Ironically, Mr Yeo’s statement is contradicted by Singapore’s Senior Minister, Mr Goh Chok Tong, who had said that “Singapore investors will likely wait until after Myanmar’s elections next year before pouring any more money into the country”. His comment came at the end of a four-day trip to Burma in June where he met with Burma’s top generals, including Senior Gen Than Shwe.

To conclude, Singapore’s Foreign Minister insulted Aung San Suu Kyi, her husband Dr Michael Aris and Burma’s independence leader, General Aung San.

Given the fact that Mr Yeo has gotten his facts wrong, Does he not owe Aung San Suu Kyi – and the Burmese people – an apology?

——

John Moe is a Burmese pro-democracy activist who had lived and worked in Singapore for eleven years. He was expelled from Singapore for his involvement in a protest in Singapore in 2007. John can be reached at jmoekt@gmail.com

Family

While he was War Minister in 1942, Aung San met and married Khin Kyi, and around the same time her sister met and married Thakin Than Tun, the Communist leader. Aung San and Khin Kyi had four children. Their youngest surviving child, Aung San Suu Kyi, is a Nobel Peace Prize laureate and leader of the Burmese Opposition, the National League for Democracy (NLD), and was until 13 November 2010, held under house arrest by the military regime. Their second son, Aung San Lin, died at age eight, when he drowned in an ornamental lake in the grounds of the house. The elder, Aung San Oo, is an engineer working in the United States and has disagreed with his sister’s political activities. Their youngest daughter, Aung San Chit, born in September 1946, died a few days after her birth.[9] Aung San’s wife Daw Khin Kyi died on 27 December 1988.

[edit] Legacy
A statue of Aung San in Mandalay

His place in history as the Architect of Burmese Independence and a national hero is assured both from his own legacy and due to the activities of his daughter. Aung San Suu Kyi was only two when her father died. A martyrs’ mausoleum was built at the foot of the Shwedagon Pagoda and 19 July was designated Martyr’s Day (Azani nei), a public holiday. His literary work entitled “Burma’s Challenge” was likewise popular.

Aung San’s name had been invoked by successive Burmese governments since independence until the military regime in the 1990s tried to eradicate all traces of Aung San’s memory. Nevertheless, several statues of him adorn the former capital Yangon and his portrait still has pride of place in many homes and offices throughout the country. Scott Market, Yangon’s most famous, was renamed Bogyoke Market in his memory, and Commissioner Road was retitled Bogyoke Aung San Road after independence. These names have been retained. Many towns and cities in Burma have thoroughfares and parks named after him. His portrait was held up everywhere during the 8888 Uprising in 1988 and used as a rallying point.[2] Following the 8888 Uprising, the government redesigned the national currency, the kyat, removing his picture and replacing it with scenes of Burmese life.
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**Books on Burma**

*Letters from Burma by Aung San Suu Kyi*
“In these fifty-two pieces, originally written for a Japanese newspaper and begun soon after her release from house arrest, she paints a vivid, poignant yet fundamentally optimistic picture of her native land. These letters were awarded the prestigious Japanese Newspaper Association’s Award for 1996. They are illustrated with pencil drawings by the Burmese artist Heinn Htet.” ~ Penguin Books

The Voice of Hope by Aung San Suu Kyi and Alan Clements

“The Voice of Hope is a rare and intimate journey to the heart of her struggle. Over a period of nine months, Alan Clements, the first American ordained as a Buddhist monk in Burma, met with Aung San Suu Kyi shortly after her release from her first house arrest in July 1995. With her trademark ability to speak directly and compellingly, she presents here her vision of engaged compassion and describes how she has managed to sustain her hope and optimism.” ~ Barnes and Nobel
“This collection of writings, now revised with substantial new material, including the text of the Nobel Peace Prize speech delivered by her son, reflects Aung San Suu Kyi’s greatest hopes and fears for her people and her concern about the need for international cooperation, and gives poignant and humorous reminiscences as well as independent assessments of her role in politics.” ~ Barnes and Noble

Named for a courageous Russian freedom fighter of World War II, Zoya Phan was born in the remote jungles of Burma to the Karen ethnic group, who since the 1960's has struggled for freedom and democracy against the brutal Burmese military dictatorship. Even though her family constantly lived in hiding, her parents educated her and
her siblings to understand the importance of resisting the repressive, to hold their dreams of living in a free society, and to survive myriad relentless attacks.

**Burma: Insurgency and the Politics of Ethnicity by Martin Smith**

With unparalleled command of largely inaccessible Burmese sources and interviews with many of the leading participants, Martin Smith charts the rise of modern political parties and unravels the complexities of the long-running insurgencies waged by opposition groups, including the Communist Party of Burma, the Karen National Union and a host of other ethnic nationalist movements. In this revised and updated edition, the author vividly explains how one of the most fertile and potentially prosperous countries in Asia has collapsed to become one of the world’s poorest.

**Than Shwe: Unmasking Burma’s Tyrant by Benedict Rogers – coming soon**
Than Shwe is one of the world’s most brutal dictators, presiding over a military regime that persists in repressing and brutalizing its own people. Until now, his story has not been told. Than Shwe: Unmasking Burma’s Tyrant provides the first-ever account of Than Shwe’s journey from postal clerk to dictator, analyzing his rise through the ranks of the army, his training in psychological warfare, his belief in astrology, his elimination of rivals, and his ruthless suppression of dissent.

The Lizard Cage by Karen Connelly

In her long-awaited first novel, Karen Connelly recreates the world of a Burmese prison, and of the country’s tumultuous years in the late 1980’s, when millions of people rose up to protest against the brutality of their military government. This is a story of human resilience, love and humour — a potent act of empathy and witness.
Twenty-eight-year-old James Mawdsley spent much of the past four years in grim Burmese prisons. The Iron Road is his story, and the story of the regime that jailed him, the way it jails, tortures, and kills hundreds of Burmese each day. Mawdsley was working in New Zealand when he learned about the struggle of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Burmese Nobel laureate who is under house arrest. Outraged, he went to Burma, staged a one-man protest, and was jailed.

Pascal, a member of the Kayan Padaung tribe, was the first member of his community to study English at a university. Within months of his meeting with Dr. Casey, Pascal’s world lay in ruins. Burma’s military dictatorship forces him to sacrifice his studies, and the regime’s brutal armed
forces murder his lover. Fleeing to the jungle, he becomes a guerrilla fighter in the life-or-death struggle against the government. In desperation, he writes a letter to the Englishman he met in Mandalay. From the Land of Green Ghosts unforgettably evokes the realities of life in modern-day Burma and one man’s long journey to freedom despite almost unimaginable odds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aung San Suu Kyi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
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**Leader of the** National League for Democracy

**Incumbent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumed office</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 September 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preceded by** Position established
Aung San Suu Kyi, AC (Burmese: အိန္ဒိယ ကြက်ကလေး; MLCTS: aung hcan: cu. krany, Burmese pronunciation: ['à s á t ì]; born 19 June 1945) is a Burmese opposition politician and the General Secretary of the National League for Democracy. In the 1990 general election, her National League for Democracy party won 59% of the national votes and 81% (392 of 485) of the seats in Parliament.[1][2][3][4][5][6][7] She had, however, already been detained under house arrest before the elections. She remained under house arrest in Burma for almost 15 of the 21 years from 20 July 1989 until her most recent release on 13 November 2010,[8] becoming one of the world’s most prominent (now former) political prisoners.[9]

Suu Kyi received the Rafto Prize and the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 1990 and the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991. In 1992 she was awarded the Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding by the government of India and the International Simón Bolívar Prize from the government of Venezuela. In 2007, the Government of Canada made her an honorary citizen of that country,[10] one of only five people ever to receive
the honor. In 2011, she was awarded the Wallenberg Medal.[12]

On 1 April 2012, her opposition party, the National League for Democracy, announced that she was elected to the Pyithu Hluttaw, the lower house of the Burmese parliament, representing the constituency of Kawhmu,[13] when the party claimed to have swept the election in a landslide victory;[14] however, the election results must be confirmed by the official electoral commission which has yet to release any outcome, and may not make an official declaration for days.[15]

Suu Kyi is the third child and only daughter of Aung San, considered to be the father of modern-day Burma.

[edit] Name

Aung San Suu Kyi derives her name from three relatives: “Aung San” from her father, “Suu” from her paternal grandmother and “Kyi” from her mother Khin Kyi.[16] She is frequently called Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. Daw is not part of her name, but is an honorific, similar to madame, for older, revered women, literally meaning “aunt.”[17] She is also often referred to as Daw Suu by the Burmese (or Amay Suu, lit. “Mother Suu,” by some followers),[18][19] or “Aunty Suu”, and as Dr. Suu Kyi,[20] Ms. Suu Kyi, or Mrs. Suu Kyi by the foreign media. However, like other Burmese, she has no surname (see Burmese names). The pronunciation of her name is approximated as “Awn Sahn Sue Chee,” although the “ch” in “Chee” is unaspirated.[21]

[edit] Personal life

Part of a series on the

Democracy movements in Burma
The fighting peacock flag

**Background**

- Post-independence Burma
- Internal conflict in Burma
- Burmese Way to Socialism
- State Peace and Development Council

**Mass protests**

- 8888 Uprising · Protests of 2007

**Concessions and reforms**

- Roadmap to democracy
- New constitution
- Reforms of 2011

**Elections**

- 1990 · 2010 · 2012

**Organizations**

- National League for Democracy · 88 Generation Students Group · Burma Campaign
- UK · Free Burma Coalition · U.S. Campaign for Burma · Generation Wave · All Burma Students’ Democratic Front · The Irrawaddy · Democratic Voice of Burma · Mizzima News

**Figures**

- U Nu · Aung Gyi · Tin Oo · Aung San Suu Kyi · Min Ko Naing · Thein Sein

**Related topics**
Aung San Suu Kyi was born in Rangoon (now named Yangon). Her father, Aung San, founded the modern Burmese army and negotiated Burma’s independence from the British Empire in 1947; he was assassinated by his rivals in the same year. She grew up with her mother, Khin Kyi, and two brothers, Aung San Lin and Aung San Oo, in Rangoon. Aung San Lin died at age eight, when he drowned in an ornamental lake on the grounds of the house. Her elder brother emigrated to San Diego, California, becoming a United States citizen. After Aung San Lin’s death, the family moved to a house by Inya Lake where Suu Kyi met people of very different backgrounds, political views and religions. She was educated in Methodist English High School (now Basic Education High School No. 1 Dagon) for much of her childhood in Burma, where she was noted as having a talent for learning languages. She is a Theravada Buddhist.

Suu Kyi’s mother, Khin Kyi, gained prominence as a political figure in the newly formed Burmese government. She was appointed Burmese ambassador to India and Nepal in 1960, and Aung San Suu Kyi followed her there, she studied in the Convent of Jesus and Mary School, New Delhi and graduated from Lady Shri Ram College in New Delhi with a degree in politics in 1964. Suu Kyi continued her education at St Hugh’s College, Oxford, obtaining a B.A. degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics in 1969. After graduating, she lived in New York City with a family friend and worked at the UN for three years, primarily on budget matters, writing daily to her future husband, Dr. Michael Aris. In 1972, Aung San Suu Kyi married Aris, a scholar of Tibetan culture, living abroad in Bhutan. The following year she gave birth to their first son, Alexander Aris, in London; their second son, Kim, was born in 1977. Subsequently, she earned a PhD at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London in 1985. She was elected as an Honorary Fellow in 1990. For two years she was a Fellow at the Indian Institute of Advanced Studies (IIAS) in Shimla, India. She also worked for the government of the Union of Burma.

In 1988 Suu Kyi returned to Burma, at first to tend for her ailing mother but later to lead the pro-democracy movement. Aris’ visit in Christmas 1995 turned out to be the last time that he and Suu Kyi met, as Suu Kyi remained in Burma and the Burmese
dictatorship denied him any further entry visas. Aris was diagnosed with prostate cancer in 1997 which was later found to be terminal. Despite appeals from prominent figures and organizations, including the United States, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and Pope John Paul II, the Burmese government would not grant Aris a visa, saying that they did not have the facilities to care for him, and instead urged Aung San Suu Kyi to leave the country to visit him. She was at that time temporarily free from house arrest but was unwilling to depart, fearing that she would be refused re-entry if she left, as she did not trust the military junta’s assurance that she could return.

Aris died on his 53rd birthday on 27 March 1999. Since 1989, when his wife was first placed under house arrest, he had seen her only five times, the last of which was for Christmas in 1995. She was also separated from her children, who live in the United Kingdom, but starting in 2011, they have visited her in Burma.

On 2 May 2008, after Cyclone Nargis hit Burma, Suu Kyi lost the roof of her house and lived in virtual darkness after losing electricity in her dilapidated lakeside residence. She used candles at night as she was not provided any generator set. Plans to renovate and repair the house were announced in August 2009. Suu Kyi was released from house arrest on 13 November 2010.

Political beginnings
Coincident with Aung San Suu Kyi’s return to Burma in 1988, the long-time military leader of Burma and head of the ruling party, General Ne Win, stepped down. Mass demonstrations for democracy followed that event on 8 August 1988 (8–8–88, a day seen as auspicious), which were violently suppressed in what came to be known as the 8888 Uprising. On 26 August 1988, she addressed half a million people at a mass rally in front of the Shwedagon Pagoda in the capital, calling for a democratic government. However in September, a new military junta took power.

Influenced by both Mahatma Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence and more specifically by Buddhist concepts, Aung San Suu Kyi entered politics to work for democratization, helped found the National League for Democracy on 27 September 1988, but was put under house arrest on 20 July 1989. Offered freedom if she left the country, she refused.

One of her most famous speeches was “Freedom From Fear”, which began: “It is not power that corrupts, but fear. Fear of losing power corrupts those who wield it and fear of the scourge of power corrupts those who are subject to it.”

She also believes fear spurs many world leaders to lose sight of their purpose. “Government leaders are amazing”, she once said. “So often it seems they are the last to know what the people want.”

[edit] Political career

Suu Kyi meets with Edgardo Boeninger of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs in 1995.

[EDIT] 1990 GENERAL ELECTION
In 1990, the military junta called a general election, in which the National League for Democracy (NLD) received 59% of the votes, guaranteeing NLD 80% of the parliament seats. Some claim that Aung San Suu Kyi would have assumed the office of Prime Minister;[39] in fact, however, as she wasn’t permitted, she did not stand as a candidate in the elections (although being a MP isn’t a strict prerequisite for becoming PM in most parliamentary systems). Instead, the results were nullified and the military refused to hand over power, resulting in an international outcry. Aung San Suu Kyi was placed under house arrest at her home on University Avenue ( ) in Rangoon, during which time she was awarded the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 1990, and the Nobel Peace Prize the year after. Her sons Alexander and Kim accepted the Nobel Peace Prize on her behalf. Aung San Suu Kyi used the Nobel Peace Prize’s 1.3 million USD prize money to establish a health and education trust for the Burmese people.[40] Around this time, Suu Kyi chose non-violence as an expedient political tactic, stating in 2007, “I do not hold to non-violence for moral reasons, but for political and practical reasons,”[41] however, nonviolent action as well as civil resistance in lieu of armed conflict are also political tactics in keeping with the overall philosophy of her Theravada Buddhist religion.

[EDIT] 1996 ATTACK

On 9 November 1996, the motorcade that she was traveling in with other National League for Democracy leaders Tin Oo and U Kyi Maung, was attacked in Yangon. About 200 men swooped down on the motorcade, wielding metal chains, metal batons, stones
and other weapons. The car that Aung San Suu Kyi was in had its rear window smashed, and the car with Tin Oo and U Kyi Maung had its rear window and two backdoor windows shattered. It is believed the offenders were members of the Union Solidarity and Development Association (USDA) who were allegedly paid 500 kyats (@ USD $0.5) each to participate. The NLD lodged an official complaint with the police, and according to reports the government launched an investigation, but no action was taken. (Amnesty International 120297)[42]

[EDIT] HOUSE ARREST

Aung San Suu Kyi has been placed under house arrest for 15 of the past 21 years, on different occasions, since she began her political career,[43] during which time she was prevented from meeting her party supporters and international visitors. In an interview, Suu Kyi said that while under house arrest she spent her time reading philosophy, politics and biographies that her husband had sent her.[44] She also passed the time playing the piano, and was occasionally allowed visits from foreign diplomats as well as from her personal physician.[45]

The media were also prevented from visiting Suu Kyi, as occurred in 1998 when journalist Maurizio Giuliano, after photographing her, was stopped by customs officials who then confiscated all the reporter’s films, tapes and some notes.[46] In contrast, Suu Kyi did have visits from government representatives, such as during her autumn 1994 house arrest when she met the leader of Burma, General Than Shwe and General Khin Nyunt on 20 September in the first meeting since she had been placed in detention.[25] On several occasions during Suu Kyi’s house arrest, she had periods of poor health and as a result was hospitalized.[47]

The Burmese government detained and kept Suu Kyi imprisoned because it viewed her as someone “likely to undermine the community peace and stability” of the country, and used both Article 10(a) and 10(b) of the 1975 State Protection Act (granting the government the power to imprison people for up to five years without a trial),[48] and Section 22 of the “Law to Safeguard the State Against the Dangers of Those Desiring to Cause Subversive Acts” as legal tools against her.[49] She continuously appealed her detention,[50] and many nations and figures continued to call for her release and that of 2,100 other political prisoners in the country.[51][52] On 12 November 2010, days after the junta-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP) won elections conducted after a gap of almost 20 years, the junta finally agreed to sign orders allowing Suu Kyi’s release,[53] and Suu Kyi’s house arrest term came to an end on 13
[EDIT] UN INVOLVEMENT

The UN has attempted to facilitate dialogue between the junta and Suu Kyi. On 6 May 2002, following secret confidence-building negotiations led by the UN, the government released her; a government spokesman said that she was free to move “because we are confident that we can trust each other”. Aung San Suu Kyi proclaimed “a new dawn for the country”. However on 30 May 2003 in an incident similar to the 1996 attack on her, a government-sponsored mob attacked her caravan in the northern village of Depayin, murdering and wounding many of her supporters. Aung San Suu Kyi fled the scene with the help of her driver, Ko Kyaw Soe Lin, but was arrested upon reaching Ye-U. The government imprisoned her at Insein Prison in Rangoon. After she underwent a hysterectomy in September 2003, the government again placed her under house arrest in Rangoon.

The results from the UN facilitation have been mixed; Razali Ismail, UN special envoy to Burma, met with Aung San Suu Kyi. Ismail resigned from his post the following year, partly because he was denied re-entry to Burma on several occasions. Several years later in 2006, Ibrahim Gambari, UN Undersecretary-General (USG) of Department of Political Affairs, met with Aung San Suu Kyi, the first visit by a foreign official since 2004. He also met with Suu Kyi later the same year. On 2 October 2007 Gambari returned to talk to her again after seeing Than Shwe and other members of the senior leadership in Naypyidaw. State television broadcast Suu Kyi with Gambari, stating that they had met twice. This was Suu Kyi’s first appearance in state media in the four years since her current detention began.

The United Nations Working Group for Arbitrary Detention published an Opinion that Aung San Suu Kyi’s deprivation of liberty was arbitrary and in contravention of Article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, and requested that the authorities in Burma set her free, but the authorities ignored the request at that time. The U.N. report said that according to the Burmese Government’s reply, “Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has not been arrested, but has only been taken into protective custody, for her own safety”, and while “it could have instituted legal action against her under the country’s domestic legislation ... it has preferred to adopt a magnanimous attitude, and is providing her with protection in her own interests.”

Such claims were rejected by Brig-General Khin Yi, Chief of Myanmar Police Force.
On 18 January 2007, the state-run paper *New Light of Myanmar* accused Suu Kyi of **tax evasion** for spending her Nobel Prize money outside of the country. The accusation followed the defeat of a US-sponsored **United Nations Security Council** resolution condemning Burma as a threat to international security; the resolution was defeated because of strong opposition from China, which has strong ties with the military junta (China later voted against the resolution, along with Russia and South Africa).[63]

In November 2007, it was reported that Suu Kyi would meet her political allies **National League for Democracy** along with a government minister. The ruling junta made the official announcement on state TV and radio just hours after UN special envoy **Ibrahim Gambari** ended his second visit to Burma. The NLD confirmed that it had received the invitation to hold talks with Suu Kyi.[64] However, the process delivered few concrete results.

On 3 July 2009, UN Secretary General **Ban Ki-moon** went to Burma to pressure the junta into releasing Suu Kyi and to institute democratic reform. However, on departing from Burma, Ban Ki-moon said he was “disappointed” with the visit after junta leader **Than Shwe** refused permission for him to visit Suu Kyi, citing her ongoing trial. Ban said he was “deeply disappointed that they have missed a very important opportunity.”[65]

[EDIT] **PERIODS UNDER DETENTION**

- **20 July 1989**: Placed under house arrest in Rangoon under **martial law** that allows for detention without charge or trial for three years.[54]
- **10 July 1995**: Released from house arrest.[16]
- **23 September 2000**: Placed under house arrest.[43]
- **6 May 2002**: Released after 19 months.[43]
- **30 May 2003**: Arrested following the **Depayin massacre**, she was held in secret detention for more than three months before being returned to house arrest.[66]
- **25 May 2007**: House arrest extended by one year despite a direct appeal from U.N. Secretary-General **Kofi Annan** to General **Than Shwe**.[67]
- **24 October 2007**: Reached 12 years under house arrest, **solidarity** protests held at 12 cities around the world.[68]
- **27 May 2008**: House arrest extended for another year, which is illegal under both **international law** and Burma’s own law.[69]
- **11 August 2009**: House arrest extended for 18 more months because of “violation” arising from the May 2009 trespass incident.
13 November 2010: Released from house arrest.[79]

[EDIT] 2007 ANTI-GOVERNMENT PROTESTS

Main article: 2007 Burmese anti-government protests
Protests led by Buddhist monks began on 19 August 2007 following steep fuel price increases, and continued each day, despite the threat of a crackdown by the military.[71]

On 22 September 2007, although still under house arrest, Suu Kyi made a brief public appearance at the gate of her residence in Yangon to accept the blessings of Buddhist monks who were marching in support of human rights.[72] It was reported that she had been moved the following day to Insein Prison (where she had been detained in 2003),[73][74][75][76] but meetings with UN envoy Ibrahim Gambari near her Rangoon home on 30 September and 2 October established that she remained under house arrest.[77][78]

[EDIT] 2009 TRESPASS INCIDENT

Main article: Suu Kyi trespasser incidents

U.S. Senator Jim Webb visiting Suu Kyi in 2009. Webb negotiated the release of John Yettaw, the man who trespassed in Suu Kyi’s home, resulting in her arrest and conviction with three years’ hard labour.

On 3 May 2009, an American man, identified as John Yettaw, swam across Inya Lake to her house uninvited and was arrested when he made his return trip three days later.[79] He had attempted to make a similar trip two years earlier, but for unknown reasons was turned away.[80] He later claimed at trial that he was motivated by a divine vision requiring him to notify her of an impending terrorist assassination attempt.[81] On 13 May, Suu Kyi was arrested for violating the terms of her house arrest because the
swimmer, who pleaded exhaustion, was allowed to stay in her house for two days before he attempted the swim back. Suu Kyi was later taken to Insein Prison, where she could have faced up to five years confinement for the intrusion.[82] The trial of Suu Kyi and her two maids began on 18 May and a small number of protesters gathered outside.[83][84] Diplomats and journalists were barred from attending the trial; however, on one occasion, several diplomats from Russia, Thailand and Singapore and journalists were allowed to meet Suu Kyi.[85] The prosecution had originally planned to call 22 witnesses.[86] It also accused John Yettaw of embarrassing the country.[87] During the ongoing defence case, Suu Kyi said she was innocent. The defence was allowed to call only one witness (out of four), while the prosecution was permitted to call 14 witnesses. The court rejected two character witnesses, NLD members Tin Oo and Win Tin, and permitted the defense to call only a legal expert.[88] According to one unconfirmed report, the junta was planning to, once again, place her in detention, this time in a military base outside the city.[89] In a separate trial, Yettaw said he swam to Suu Kyi’s house to warn her that her life was “in danger”.[90] The national police chief later confirmed that Yettaw was the “main culprit” in the case filed against Suu Kyi.[91] According to aides, Suu Kyi spent her 64th birthday in jail sharing biryani rice and chocolate cake with her guards.[92]

Her arrest and subsequent trial received worldwide condemnation by the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, the United Nations Security Council,[93] Western governments,[94] South Africa,[95] Japan[96] and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, of which Burma is a member.[97] The Burmese government strongly condemned the statement, as it created an “unsound tradition”[98] and criticised Thailand for meddling in its internal affairs.[99] The Burmese Foreign Minister Nyan Win was quoted in the state-run newspaper New Light of Myanmar as saying that the incident “was trumped up to intensify international pressure on Burma by internal and external anti-government elements who do not wish to see the positive changes in those countries’ policies toward Burma”. Ban responded to an international campaign[100] by flying to Burma to negotiate, but Than Shwe rejected all of his requests.[101]

On 11 August 2009 the trial concluded with Suu Kyi being sentenced to imprisonment for three years with hard labour. This sentence was commuted by the military rulers to further house arrest of 18 months.[102] On 14 August, U.S. Senator Jim Webb visited Burma, visiting with junta leader Gen. Than Shwe and later with Suu Kyi. During the visit, Webb negotiated Yettaw’s release and deportation from Burma.[103] Following the verdict of the trial, lawyers of Suu Kyi said they would appeal against the 18-month sentence.[104] On 18 August, United States President Barack Obama asked the country’s
military leadership to set free all political prisoners, including Aung San Suu Kyi. In her appeal, Aung San Suu Kyi had argued that the conviction was unwarranted. However, her appeal against the August sentence was rejected by a Burmese court on 2 October 2009. Although the court accepted the argument that the 1974 constitution, under which she had been charged, was null and void, it also said the provisions of the 1975 security law, under which she has been kept under house arrest, remained in force. The verdict effectively meant that she would be unable to participate in the elections scheduled to take place in 2010 – the first in Burma in two decades. Her lawyer stated that her legal team would pursue a new appeal within 60 days.

[EDIT] 2009: INTERNATIONAL PRESSURE FOR RELEASE, AND BURMESE GENERAL ELECTION 2010

It was announced prior to the Burmese general election that Aung San Suu Kyi may be released “so she can organize her party,” However, Suu Kyi was not allowed to run. On 1 October 2010 the government announced that she would be released on 13 November 2010.

Burma’s relaxing stance, such as releasing political prisoners, was influenced in the wake of successful recent diplomatic visits by the US and other democratic governments, urging or encouraging the Burmese towards democratic reform. U.S. President Barack Obama personally advocated for the release of all political prisoners, especially Aung San Suu Kyi, during the US-ASEAN Summit of 2009.

Democratic governments hoped that successful general elections would be an optimistic indicator of the Burmese government’s sincerity towards eventual democracy. The Hatoyama government which spent 2.82 billion yen in 2008, has promised more Japanese foreign aid to encourage Burma to release Aung San Suu Kyi in time for the elections; and to continue moving towards democracy and the rule of law.

In a personal letter to Suu Kyi, UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown cautioned the Burmese government of the potential consequences of rigging elections as “condemning Burma to more years of diplomatic isolation and economic stagnation”.

The Burmese government has been granting Suu Kyi varying degrees of freedom throughout late 2009, in response to international pressure. She has met with many heads of state, and opened a dialog with the Minister of Labor Aung Kyi (not to be
Suu Kyi was allowed to meet with senior members of her NLD party at the State House,[115] however these meetings took place under close supervision.

[EDIT] 2010 RELEASE

Aung San Suu Kyi addresses crowds at the NLD headquarters shortly after her release.

Aung San Suu Kyi meets with US Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton in Yangon (1 December 2011)

On the evening of 13 November 2010, Aung San Suu Kyi was released from house arrest.[116] This was the date her detention had been set to expire according to a court ruling in August 2009[117] and came six days after a widely criticized general election. She appeared in front of a crowd of her supporters, who rushed to her house in Rangoon when nearby barricades were removed by the security forces. The Nobel Peace Prize laureate had been detained for 15 of the past 21 years.[118] The government newspaper New Light of Myanmar reported the release positively,[119] saying she had been granted a pardon after serving her sentence “in good conduct”. [120] The New York Times suggested that the military government may have released Suu Kyi because it felt
it was in a confident position to control her supporters after the election. The role that Aung San Suu Kyi will play in the future of democracy in Burma remains a subject of much debate.

Her son Kim Aris was granted a visa in November 2010 to see his mother, Aung San Suu Kyi, shortly after her release, for the first time in 10 years. He visited again in 5 July 2011, to accompany her on a trip to Bagan, her first trip outside Yangon since 2003. Her son visited again in 8 August 2011, to accompany her on a trip to Pegu, her second trip.

Discussions were held between Suu Kyi and the Burmese government during 2011, which led to a number of official gestures to meet her demands. In October, around a tenth of Burma’s political prisoners were freed in an amnesty and trade unions were legalised.

In November 2011, following a meeting of its leaders, the NLD announced its intention to re-register as a political party in order contend 48 by-elections necessitated by the promotion of parliamentarians to ministerial rank. Following the decision, Suu Kyi held a telephone conference with U.S. President Barack Obama, in which it was agreed that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton would make a visit to Burma, a move received with caution by Burma’s ally China. On 1 December 2011, Suu Kyi met with Hillary Clinton at the residence of the top-ranking US diplomat in Yangon. Suu Kyi also held an hour long interview for a class of 3000 students at Virginia Tech via Skype on 5 December 2011. During the interview, Suu Kyi answered questions from students, sharing her wisdom in her fight for democracy.

On 21 December 2011, Thai Prime Minister Yingluck Shinawatra met Suu Kyi in Yangon, becoming Suu Kyi’s first-ever meeting with the leader of a foreign country after her release from house arrest.

On 5 January 2012, British Foreign Minister William Hague met Aung San Suu Kyi and his Burmese counterpart. This represented a significant visit for Suu Kyi and Burma. Suu Kyi studied in the UK and maintains many ties there, whilst Britain is Burma’s largest bilateral donor.

[EDIT] 2012 BY-ELECTIONS

In December 2011, there was speculation that Suu Kyi would run in the 2012 national
by-elections to fill vacant seats. On 18 January 2012, Suu Kyi formally registered to contest a Pyithu Hluttaw (lower house) seat in the Kawhmu Township constituency in special parliamentary elections to be held on 1 April 2012. The seat was previously held by Soe Tint, who vacated it after being appointed Construction Deputy Minister, in the 2010 election. She is running against Union Solidarity and Development Party candidate Soe Min, a retired army physician and native of Twante Township.

On 3 March 2012, at a large campaign rally in Mandalay, Suu Kyi unexpectedly left after 15 minutes, because of exhaustion and airsickness.

In an official campaign speech broadcast on Burmese state television’s MRTV on 14 March 2012, Suu Kyi publicly campaigned for reform of the 2008 Constitution, removal of restrictive laws, more adequate protections for people’s democratic rights, and establishment of an independent judiciary. The speech was leaked online a day before it was broadcast. A paragraph in the speech, focusing on the Tatmadaw’s repression by means of law, was censored by authorities.

Suu Kyi has also called for international media to monitor the upcoming by-elections, while publicly pointing out irregularities in official voter lists, which include deceased individuals and exclude other eligible voters in the contested constituencies. On 21 March 2012, Aung San Suu Kyi was quoted as saying “Fraud and rule violations are continuing and we can even say they are increasing.”

When asked whether she would assume a ministerial post if given the opportunity, she said the following:

“"I can tell you one thing – that under the present constitution, if you become a member of the government you have to vacate your seat in the national assembly. And I am not working so hard to get into parliament simply to vacate my seat.""

On 26 March 2012, Suu Kyi suspended her nationwide campaign tour early, after a campaign rally in Myeik (Mergui), a coastal town in the south, citing health problems due to exhaustion and hot weather.

On 1 April 2012, the NLD announced that Suu Kyi had “easily” won the vote for a seat in
Aung San Suu Kyi has received vocal support from Western nations in Europe,[146] Australia,[146] and North[147] and South America, as well as India,[3] Israel,[148] Japan,[149] the Philippines and South Korea.[150] In December 2007, the US House of Representatives voted unanimously 400–0 to award Aung San Suu Kyi the Congressional Gold Medal; the Senate concurred on 25 April 2008.[151] On 6 May 2008, President George Bush signed legislation awarding Suu Kyi the Congressional Gold Medal.[152] She is the first recipient in American history to receive the prize while imprisoned. More recently, there has been growing criticism of her detention by Burma’s neighbours in the
Association of Southeast Asian Nations, particularly from Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines and Singapore. At one point Malaysia warned Burma that it faced expulsion from ASEAN as a result of the detention of Suu Kyi. Other nations including South Africa, Bangladesh and the Maldives have also called for her release. The United Nations has urged the country to move towards inclusive national reconciliation, the restoration of democracy, and full respect for human rights. In December 2008, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution condemning the human rights situation in Burma and calling for Suu Kyi’s release—80 countries voting for the resolution, 25 against and 45 abstentions. Other nations, such as China and Russia, are less critical of the regime and prefer to cooperate only on economic matters. Indonesia has urged China to push Burma for reforms. However, Samak Sundaravej, former Prime Minister of Thailand, criticised the amount of support for Suu Kyi, saying that “Europe uses Aung San Suu Kyi as a tool. If it’s not related to Aung San Suu Kyi, you can have deeper discussions with Myanmar.”

Aung San Suu Kyi greeting supporters from Bago State in 2011.

Vietnam, however, does not support calls by other ASEAN member states for Myanmar to free Aung San Suu Kyi, state media reported Friday, 14 August 2009. The state-run Viet Nam News said Vietnam had no criticism of Myanmar’s decision 11 August 2009 to place Suu Kyi under house arrest for the next 18 months, effectively barring her from elections scheduled for 2010. “It is our view that the Aung San Suu Kyi trial is an internal affair of Myanmar”, Vietnamese government spokesman Le Dung stated on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In contrast with other ASEAN member states, Dung said Vietnam has always supported Myanmar and hopes it will continue to implement the “roadmap to democracy” outlined by its government.
Aung San Suu Kyi was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991. The decision of the Nobel Committee mentions:

The Norwegian Nobel Committee has decided to award the Nobel Peace Prize for 1991 to Aung San Suu Kyi of Myanmar (Burma) for her non-violent struggle for democracy and human rights....Suu Kyi's struggle is one of the most extraordinary examples of civil courage in Asia in recent decades. She has become an important symbol in the struggle against oppression......In awarding the Nobel Peace Prize for 1991 to Aung San Suu Kyi, the Norwegian Nobel Committee wishes to honour this woman for her unflagging efforts and to show its support for the many people throughout the world who are striving to attain democracy, human rights and ethnic conciliation by peaceful means.

—Oslo, 14 October 1991

Nobel Peace Prize winners (Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Dalai Lama, Shirin Ebadi, Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, Mairead Corrigan, Rigoberta Menchú, Prof. Elie Wiesel, U.S. President Barack Obama, Betty Williams, Jody Williams and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter) called for the rulers of Burma to release Suu Kyi in order to “create the necessary conditions for a genuine dialogue with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and all concerned parties and ethnic groups in order to achieve an inclusive national reconciliation with the direct support of the United Nations.” Some of the money she received as part of the award helps fund London-based charity Prospect Burma, which provides higher education grants to Burmese students.

**EDIT ORGANIZATIONS**

- **Freedom Now**, a Washington, D.C.-based non-profit organization, was retained in 2006 by a member of her family to help secure Aung San Suu Kyi’s release from house arrest. The organization secured several opinions from the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention that her detention was in violation of international law; engaged in political advocacy such as spearheading a letter from 112 former Presidents and Prime Ministers to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon urging him to go to Burma to seek her release, which he did six weeks later; and published numerous opeds and spoke widely to the media about her ongoing detention. Its representation of her ended when she was released from house arrest on 13 November 2010.

- Aung San Suu Kyi has been an honorary board member of International IDEA and...
since her detention, and has received support from these organisations.

- The Vrije Universiteit Brussel and the Université catholique de Louvain, both located in Belgium, have granted her the title of Doctor Honoris Causa.[172]
- In 2003, the Freedom Forum recognized Suu Kyi’s efforts to promote democracy peacefully with the Al Neuharoth Free Spirit of the Year Award, in which she was presented over satellite because she was under house arrest. She was awarded one million dollars.[173]
- In June of each year, the U.S. Campaign for Burma organizes hundreds of “Arrest Yourself” house parties around the world in support of Aung San Suu Kyi. At these parties, the organizers keep themselves under house arrest for 24 hours, invite their friends, and learn more about Burma and Aung San Suu Kyi.[174]
- The Freedom Campaign, a joint effort between the Human Rights Action Center and US Campaign for Burma, looks to raise worldwide attention to the struggles of Aung San Suu Kyi and the people of Burma.
- The Burma Campaign UK is a UK based NGO (Non Governmental Organisation) that aims to raise awareness of Burma’s struggles and follow the guidelines established by the NLD and Aung San Suu Kyi.
- St. Hugh’s College, Oxford, where she studied, had a Burmese theme for their annual ball in support of her in 2006.[175]
- Aung San Suu Kyi is the official patron of The Rafto Human Rights House in Bergen, Norway. She received the Thorolf Rafto Memorial Prize in 1990.
- She was made an honorary free person of the City of Dublin, Ireland in November 1999, although a space had been left on the roll of signatures to symbolize her continued detention.
- In November 2005 the human rights group Equality Now proposed Aung Sun Suu Kyi as a potential candidate, among other qualifying women, for the position of U.N. Secretary General.[176] In the proposed list of qualified women Suu Kyi is recognised by Equality Now as the Prime Minister-Elect of Burma.[21]
- The UN’ special envoy to Myanmar, Ibrahim Gambari, met Aung San Suu Kyi on 10 March 2008 before wrapping up his trip to the military-ruled country.[177]
- Aung San Suu Kyi is an honorary member of The Elders, a group of eminent global leaders brought together by Nelson Mandela.[178] Her ongoing detention means that she is unable to take an active role in the group, so The Elders place an empty chair for her at their meetings.[179] The Elders have consistently called for the release of all political prisoners in Burma.[180]
- In 2008, Burma’s devoted human rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize, was welcomed as Club of Madrid Honorary Member.
- In 2011 Aung San Suu Kyi is the Guest Director of the 45th Brighton Festival.
In June 2011, the BBC announced that Aung San Suu Kyi was to deliver the 2011 Reith Lectures. The BBC covertly recorded two lectures with Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma, which were then smuggled out of the country and brought back to London.[181] The lectures were broadcast on BBC Radio 4 and the BBC World Service on 28 June 2011 and 5 July 2011.

In November 2011, Suu Kyi received Francois Zimeray, France’s Ambassador for Human Rights.

[edit] Books

[EDIT] AUTHORED


[EDIT] EDITED


[edit] Awards
Thorolf Rafto Memorial Prize (1990)
Sakharov Prize (1990)
Nobel Peace Prize (1991)
Simón Bolívar International Prize (1992)[182]
Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding (1993)[183]
Prize For Freedom of the Liberal International (1995)[184]
Honorary Companion of the Order of Australia (1996)[185]
National Democratic Institute for International Affairs W. Averell Harriman Democracy Award (1996)[186]
Doctor of Laws Honorary degree from the University of Bath (1998)[187]
Freedom of Dublin City, Ireland (1999)
Presidential Medal of Freedom (2000)[188]
UNESCO-Madanjeet Singh Prize for the Promotion of Tolerance and Non-Violence (2002)[189]
Gwangju Prize for Human Rights (2004)[190]
Doctor of Laws (honoris causa) from Memorial University of Newfoundland (2004)[191]
Olof Palme Prize (2005)
Freedom from Fear award (2006)[192]
Honorary Canadian citizenship (2007)[193]
Honorary President of the LSESU (2007)[194]
Doctorate of Letters (honoris causa) from Colgate University (2008)[195]
Congressional Gold Medal (2008)[196]
Premi Internacional Catalunya (2008)[197]
Honorary Member of the Club of Madrid (2008)
Freedom Of Glasgow (2009)[198]
Mahatma Gandhi International Award for Peace and Reconciliation (2009)[199]
Honorary Doctor of Laws from University of Ulster in recognition of her services to human rights (2009)[200][201]
Ambassador of Conscience Award (2009) from Amnesty International[202]
Freedom of Newcastle Upon Tyne (2011)[203]
Chatham House Prize (2011)[204]
Commandeur of the Légion d’Honneur (2012)[205]
Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Award for Democracy (2012)[206]
Doctor of Laws Honorary degree from The University of Hong Kong (2012)[207]

[edit] Popular media
She was portrayed by Adelle Lutz in John Boorman’s 1995 motion picture Beyond Rangoon, which takes place during the 8888 Uprising.

Jazz saxophonist Wayne Shorter composed in her honor the piece “Aung San Suu Kyi”, which appeared on 1+1 (1997), a duet album with pianist Herbie Hancock.

In a list compiled by New Statesman in 2006, she was voted as number one among the “50 Heroes of Our Time”. [208]

The 2000 song “Walk On” by U2 is about her, according to Bono.[209] Suu Kyi was regularly mentioned as the song was played during 2001’s Elevation Tour. During the 2009 leg of the 360° Tour, the band invited fans to wear masks of Suu Kyi’s face (printable from their website) during the song “Walk On”. [210]

The Lady Of Burma, a play written by Richard Shannon and staged in the London Old Vic, dealt with the life of Aung San Suu Kyi and received rave reviews in the UK press, including The Independent. [211]

She was voted as number 34 among “The World’s 50 Most Influential Figures 2010” by the British magazine New Statesman. [212]

“Unplayed Piano” by Damien Rice was released in Ireland on 17 June 2005 and in the UK on 20 June 2005 to coincide with Aung San Suu Kyi’s 60th birthday. The song was written for Suu Kyi following a visit by Damien to Burma in July 2004. Proceeds from the sale of the single go to the Burma Campaign UK. Rice and Hannigan recorded a charity song, campaigning for her release, called “Unplayed Piano”, which they performed at the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize Concert in Oslo.

Actress Michelle Yeoh portrays Aung San Suu Kyi in the 2011 film The Lady, directed by Luc Besson.

A 2m x 2m portrait of her was painted for the 54th Venice Biennale by Gavin Rain, working with the Burma Campaign UK in an attempt to highlight her current plight. The painting was also on display at the Italian premier of the 2011 film The Lady in Rome in October 2011, attended by both Yeoh and Besson. [213]
INTRODUCTIONS

I have just found several Zulu war antique pictures,
how amizing pictures which many seeking by the antique picture collectors and many use for the war games.

After made study, I have found that the Zulu War consit two episode, firast the zulu-boer war and then the anglo-zulu war.

I hove antique pictures collectors, the historian and the war gamer will enjow to look at this CD-ROM.

This Information still not complete that is why corrections, comment and new info still need,

Jakarta April 2012

Dr Iwan suwandy, MHA
The Zulus were one of the most important tribes in the history of South Africa. They were originally only one among many other like tribes in the region, sometimes called Bantu, or Kaffir, but in the early 1800’s a leader named Chaka united a great many African tribes into a Zulu empire, by fairly brutal means. Chaka was succeeded by his brother Dingan. Shortly after this, a great many Boer Voortrekkers moved into the region, and tried to negotiate the purchase of some land from the Zulu king. After an exchange of gifts and demonstrations of friendship, Dingan suddenly ordered a massacre of the ambassadors and a nearby group of several hundred Voortrekkers. He
then attacked the remaining Voertrekkers, who by this time, were prepared to defend themselves. At the Battle of Blood River, a group of less than 500 Boers held off over 10,000 Zulus, with great slaughter.

The Boers then allied themselves with Mpane, one of Dingan’s enemies, and helped him drive Dingan out and assume the Zulu throne. For many years afterward, the relationship between Boer and Zulu was moderately peaceful, although there were a number of disputes. When the British laid claim to the coastal area of Natal, Mpane made a treaty with them, and allied himself with the British against the Boers. The British did not want to settle most of the region, however, it merely wanted to limit Boer influence, and took the side of the Zulus in border disputes to oppose the expansion of Boer territory.

Beside them stood the women qu
Battle / Outcome

Battle of Blood River
Boers defeat Zulus

Fought December 16, 1838, between the Boers of the Transvaal, and the Zulus under Dingaan. The Zulus were totally routed, with heavy loss. The Boer losses were small.

Ommander

Pieter Retie

Leader of Boers during the Great Trek. Murdered by Dingaan during negotiations
Natal, as we know, was given its name by Vasco da Gama from the fact that his ships passed its shores on Christmas day. But from that day on for over three hundred years the only white men who landed on its soil were an occasional slave-trader or ivory-hunter, or sailors driven thither by the dreadful circumstance of shipwreck. We have many pitiful tales of such castaways forcing a path through the swamps or over the mountains to Delagoa Bay, some even making for the Cape, and usually perishing from hunger or thirst or by the savagery of the natives. There was, to take only one case, the wreck of the Stavenisse in 1687, when the crew might have died of starvation were it not that several English sailors, wrecked some time before, came to their aid with beads by means of which they purchased food from the natives. How some of them made a vessel and sailed to Table Bay is like a chapter of Robinson Crusoe. “John Kingston, the
Englishman, made a saw out of the ring of the ‘luijk.’ We made one trip to the wreck, and picked whatever would serve our purposes; we found three anchors among the rocks, or thrown up on the beach, among them our best bower, with the piece of the cable to which the ship had ridden. We broke the shank in two; one part served for an anvil; the rest, with the arms and ring, were beaten into nails and bolts.” Many sailors were murdered owing to the belief of the natives that (as Henry Fynn tells us) “white men were not human beings, but a production of the sea, which they traversed in large shells, coming near the shore in stormy weather, their food being the tusks of elephants which they would take from the beach if laid there for them, and placing beads in their room which they obtained from the bottom of the sea.” etc........

The Boer of To-Day

The wholesale slander and misrepresentation with which the Boers of South Africa have been pursued can not be outlived by them in a hundred years. It originated when the British forces took possession of the Cape of Good Hope, and it has continued with unabated vigour ever since. Recently the chief writers of fiction have been prominent Englishmen, who, on hunting expeditions or rapid tours through the country, saw the object of their venom from car windows or in the less favourable environments of a trackless veldt.

In earlier days the outside world gleaned its knowledge of the Boers from certain British statesmen, who, by grace of Downing Street, controlled the country’s colonial policy, and consequently felt obliged to conjure up weird descriptions of their far-distant subjects in order to make the application of certain harsh policies appear more applicable and necessary. Missionaries to South Africa, traders, and, not least of all, speculators, all found it convenient to traduce the Boers to the people in England, and the object in almost every case was the attainment of some personal end. Had there been any variety in the complaints, there might have been reason to suppose they were justifiable, but the similarity of the reports led to the conclusion that the British in South Africa were conducting the campaign of misrepresentation for the single purpose of arousing the enmity of the home people against the Boers. The unbiased reports were generally of such a nature that they were drowned by the roar of the malicious ones, and, instead of creating a better popular opinion of the race, only assisted in stirring the opposition to greater flights of fancy.

American interests in South Africa having been so infinitesimal until the last decade, our own knowledge of the country and its people naturally was of the same proportions.
When Americans learned anything concerning South Africa or the Boers it came by way of London, which had vaster interests in the country, and should have been able to give exact information. But, like other colonial information, it was discoloured with London additions, and the result was that American views of the Boers tallied with those of the Englishman. etc........

Interview with President Kruger
As is the rule with them everywhere, Englishmen in South Africa speak of Mr. Kruger with contempt and derision. Unprejudiced Americans and other foreigners in South Africa admire him for his patriotism, his courage in opposing the dictatorial policy of England’s Colonial Office, and his efforts to establish a republic as nearly like that of the United States of America as possible. My desire to see Mr. Kruger was almost obliterated a week after my arrival in the country by the words of condemnation which were heaped upon him by Englishmen whenever his name was mentioned. In nearly every Englishman’s mind the name of “Oom Paul” was a synonym for all that was corrupt and vile; few gave him a word of commendation.

When I came into the pretty little town of Pretoria, the capital of the Transvaal, where the President lives and where he mingles daily with the populace with as much freedom and informality as a country squire, there was a rapid transformation in my opinion of the man. The Boers worship their leader; to them he is a second George Washington, and even a few Englishmen there speak with admiration of him.
The day before my arrival in the town John McCann, of Johannesburg, who is a former New-Yorker and a friend of the President, informed Mr. Kruger of my intention to visit Pretoria. The President had refused interviews to three representatives of influential London newspapers who had been in the town three months waiting for the opportunity, but he expressed a desire to see an American.

“The Americans won’t lie about me,” he said to Mr. McCann. “I want America to learn our side of the story from me. They have had only the English point of view.” I had scarcely reached my hotel when an emissary from the President called and made an appointment for me to meet him in the afternoon. The emissary conducted me to the Government Building, where the Volksraad was in session, and it required only a short time for it to become known that a representative from the great sister republic across the Atlantic desired to learn the truth about the Boers etc.........

Preparations for Defence

Ever since the Jameson raid both the Boers and the Uitlanders have realized that a peaceful solution of the differences between the two is possible but highly improbable. The Uitlanders refused to concede anything to the Boer, and asked for concessions that implied a virtual abandonment of their country to the English, whom they have always detested. The Boers themselves have not been unmindful of the inevitable war with their powerful antagonist, and, not unlike the tiny ant of the African desert, which fortifies its abode against the anticipated attack of wild beasts, have made of their country a veritable arsenal.

Probably no inland country in the world is half so well prepared for war at any time as that little Government, which can boast of having less than thirty thousand voters. The military preparation has been so enormous that Great Britain has been compelled,
according to the colonial secretary’s statement to the British Parliament, to expend two and a half million dollars annually in South Africa in order to keep pace with the Boers. Four years ago, when the Transvaal Government learned that the Uitlanders of Johannesburg were planning a revolution, it commenced the military preparations which have ever since continued with unabating vigour. German experts were employed to formulate plans for the defence of the country, and European artillerists were secured to teach the arts of modern warfare to the men at the head of the Boer army. Several Americans of military training became the instructors in the national military school at Pretoria; and even the women and children became imbued with the necessity of warlike preparation, and learned the use of arms. Several million pounds were annually spent in Europe in the purchase of the armament required by the plans formulated by the experts, and the whole country was placed on a war footing. Every important strategic position was made as impregnable as modern skill and arms could make it, and every farmer’s cottage was supplied with arms and ammunition, so that the volunteer army might be mobilized in a day.

In order to demonstrate the extent to which the military preparation has been carried, it is only necessary to give an account of the defences of Pretoria and Johannesburg, the two principal cities of the country. Pretoria, being the capital, and naturally the chief point of attack by the enemy, has been prepared to resist the onslaught of any number of men, and is in a condition to withstand a siege of three years. The city lies in the centre of a square, at each corner of which is a lofty hill surmounted by a strong fort, which commands the valleys and the surrounding country. Each of the four forts has four heavy cannon, four French guns of fifteen miles range, and thirty heavy Gatling guns. Besides this extraordinary protection, the city has fifty light Gatling guns which can be drawn by mules to any point on the hills where an attack may be made. Three large warehouses are filled with ammunition, and the large armory is packed to the eaves with Mauser, Martini-Henry, and Wesley-Richards rifles. Two extensive refrigerators, with a capacity of two thousand oxen each, are ample provision against a siege of many months. It is difficult to compute the total expenditures for war material by the Boer Government during the last four years, but the following official announcement of expenses for one year will serve to give an idea of the vastness of the preparations that the Government has been compelled to make in order to guard the safety of the country:

<p>| War-Office salaries | $262,310 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War purposes</th>
<th>4,717,550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg revolt</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>3,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,429,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc........................

The Defense Of Rorke’s Drift

Come listen for a moment, All ye, whose peaceful life
In even flow is ne’er disturbed
By scenes of blood and strife;
Who sit around your hearth fires, Secure from war’s alarms;
This humble lay sets forth to-day a British deed of arms. Left on the wild,
Lone border a small but fearless band,
Guarding the watery entrance to savage Zululand;
On the warm midday breezes, Like thunder’s distant sound,
Came the long roll of cannon Far o’er the hostile ground,

And we wondered that our column

So soon the foe had found.

Then came two flying horsemen

Riding with loosened rein,

And the powdery dust like a whirlwind rose

As they scoured across the plain;

A few more rapid hoof strokes,

And we heard the news they bore—

“In yonder glen nigh half our men
Lie weltering in their gore.

“Our men, too soon surrounded,

Were slaughtered as they stood,

Facing their slayers to the last,

Dying as soldiers should.

How we escaped we know not,

From that fierce whirlwind’s frown,

But on this post a conquering host

E’en now is marching down.”

We set to work undaunted

To raise a barricade,

With mealie bags and scattered stores

A breastwork soon was made;

And scarcely was it finished,

When burst upon our sight,

Dark as the lowering storm-cloud

Sweeps the blue vaulted height,
Moving along the fair hill-side,

In vast black lines extending wide.

Rank upon rank of warriors tried,

In panoply of savage pride

Advancing to the fight.

Yes, on they came in thousands—

One hundred strong we stand,

Against the very pick and flower

Of warrior Zululand:

And how may we resist them,

Or hope to hold our own,

Flushed as they be with victory—

The greatest e’er they’ve known?

And eyes with lust of carnage,

Like coals through the darkness gleamed,

And bayonets crashed with stabbing spear,

Thick the red torrent streamed:
Drowning the roar of battle—

Drowning the deafening clang—

Each demon yell like a blast of hell,

FIERCER AND HIGHER RANG.

Again and again we met them

Through the long fearful night,

WE FOUGHT AS NE’ER WE FOUGHT BEFORE

And ne’er again may fight,

TO ‘VENGE OUR SLAUGHTERED COMRADES,

To guard our solemn trust,

And to reclaim our country’s name

Trampled in savage dust.

Piled high against our breastwork,

And scattered o’er the plain,

FOUR HUNDRED OF THEIR WARRIOR STRENGTH

Lay stark amid the slain

Lay where their fierce hot life-blood
The greedy earth had wet

Still terrible, in threatening scowl,

Each grim dead face was set.

And twelve from out our number

Their brave career had run,

Their final muster-roll had passed,

And their last duty done;

So carefully we laid them

Deep in the green earth's breast,

An alien sod above them trod;

Peace with their ashes rest!

Yes, for old England's honour

And for her perilled might,

We strove with vast and whelming odds,

From eve till morning light;

And thus with front unflinching,

One hundred strong we stood,
And held the post ‘gainst a maddened host

Drunken with British blood.

Her sons in gallant story,

Shall sound old England’s fame,

And by fresh deeds of glory

Shall keep alive her name;

And when, above her triumphs,

The golden curtains lift

Be treasured long, in page and song,

The memory of Rorke’s Drift.

BERTRAM MITFORD.
Thus did a hundred men keep three thousand savages at bay.
terms included the standard mix of British imperial demands, such as agreeing not to take up arms without British consent, and allowing a British “resident” to live permanently at court, along with a few humanitarian demands, such as the ending of forced marriages.

When the Zulus entirely failed to respond to their entreaties, the British followed their standard course of diplomacy in such situations, and sent in troops. They were at first unopposed in their march through Zulu territory. Eventually the lead column advanced to Isandhlwana on its way to the Zulu capital of Ulundi. At this point they were surrounded and attacked by 10,000 Zulus and massacred almost to a man. Among the few survivors was a reconnoitering party under the command of Lord Chelmsford which was absent from the camp at the time. A few survivors managed to travel back to the base camp at Rorke’s Drift and warn them of the approach of the Zulus, so the garrison had time to prepare. A force of 4000 Zulus attacked Rorke’s Drift in the afternoon, but the garrison was able to drive them back, and at dawn the Zulus withdrew.

The British took months to recover from this disaster, but by late March returned to the field, and attacked an entrenched Zulu kraal at Inhlobane. The offensive maneuver failed, but this time when the Zulus attacked the British at Kambula they were routed with great loss. The British followed up this success a few months later by marching on the Zulu capital of Ulundi and driving Cetewayo, the last independent Zulu King, into exile. The British placed a Zulu ally of theirs on the throne, carved up the Zulu kingdom
into regions, and in 1887 annexed Zululand under direct British control.

### Battle / Outcome

#### Battle of Isandhlwana

**Zulus defeat British**

Fought January 22, 1879, when six companies of the 24th Regiment, with two guns and a small force of Natal volunteers, under Colonel Durnford, were overwhelmed and massacred by the Zulus, under Matyana. Of the regulars, 26 officers and 600 men were killed, in addition to 24 officers, and a large number of men in the Colonial force.

#### Battle of Rorke’s Drift

**British defeat Zulus**

On the night of January 22, 1879, after the disaster of Isandhlwana, this outpost, held by a company of the 24th Regiment and details, in all 139 men, under Lieutenants Bromhead and Chard, R.E., was attacked by a force of Zulus, estimated at 4,000. After a most heroic defence, in which many acts of heroism were performed, especially in the removal of the sick from the hospital, which was fired by the Zulus, the assailants were beaten off, leaving over 400 dead on the field. The little garrison lost 25 killed and wounded. Eight Victoria Crosses and nine Distinguished Conduct medals were awarded for this affair.

#### Battle of Inhlobane Mountain

**Zulus defeat British**

Fought March 28, 1879, when a British force of 1,300 men, under Colonels Buller and Russell, attacked a strong Zulu kraal, and after severe fighting, were repulsed with considerable loss.

#### Battle of Kambula

**British defeat Zulus**

Fought March 29, 1879, when Colonel Wood, with 2,000 British and native auxiliaries, was attacked in his lager by three Zulu impi. The Zulus were repulsed with very heavy loss, and pursued for seven miles. The British lost 81 killed and wounded. The defeat practically broke Cetewayo’s power.
Battle of Ulundi
British defeat Zulus

The last battle of the war, fought August, 1879, between 5,000 British, under Lord Chelmsford, and about 20,000 Zulus. The Zulus were routed with a loss of over 1,500, the British losing only 15 killed and 78 wounded.

Commander

**Cetewayo**

Leader of the Zulus during the Anglo-Zulu War.

**Lord Chelmsford**

British commander during the Anglo-Zulu War. Survived Isandlhwana, and later, led the march on Ulundi.
I noticed this piece in the latest NOVAG NEWS written by a long time enthusiast of one Harry Paget Flashman, central character of the FLASHMAN SERIES by George MacDonald Fraser. The list was generated by a fellow Flashy fan and may have appeared somewhere on the Royal Flashman Society pages (see sidebar).

Born in 1822 – one Sir Harry Paget Flashman, whose collection of medals includes the following as worn on his chest.
Click on the hyperlinks to see the illustrations of the medals.

First Row

Victoria Cross Indian Mutiny
Knight Commander of the Bath for services during the Indian Mutiny 1858

Second Row

Knight Commander Indian Empire
Queen's Medal for Afghanistan 1841-42 (ribbon very faded)
Cabul 1842

J. B. Backhouse, Lieutenant-Colonel, East Kent Regiment (1888)
b. 1854 Deal, Kent
Julius Batt Backhouse *made sub-lieutenant May 15, 1872

South Africa War 1879 – Zulu Campaign – medal with clasp…Captain Backhouse served with the Buffs in the Zulu war of 1879, and was present in the engagements at Inyezane and Ginginhlova (Medal with Clasp)

South African War 1899-1902 – In command of 2nd Battalion of the East Kent Regiment from October 17, 1900. Queens Medal with 4 clasps. King’s medal with 2 clasps.

There was a book written by him called “With the Buffs in South Africa” Gale & Polden 1903

(there is a website [http://www.1879memorials.com](http://www.1879memorials.com) with a picture of the gravestone and a memorial tablet to him and his father)

Backhouse, J. B. Lt.-Col. E. Kent R.


J. B. Backhouse, Lieutenant-Colonel, East Kent Regiment

The photo’s have been loaned from a Buff’s enthusiast, along with the information “thank you”

The Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 was fought between Britain and the Zulu nation in South Africa. The war remains one of the most dramatic in both British and southern African history during the colonial period. It marked the end of the independence of the Zulu nation and the entrenchment of British colonialism in South Africa.

The Zulu kingdom emerged early in the nineteenth century along the eastern seaboard of southern Africa under its legendary ruler Shaka Zulu (1787–1828). The background to the war must be located in contestations over land between the Zulu, the Boers, and the British. British adventurers were attracted to Zululand in search of trade and by the 1840s the British colony of Natal had sprung up on the southern borders of Zululand. The expansion of the Boer into the southern African interior from 1835, the attempt by the Zulu to defend their own independence, and the aggressive policy of the British to control South Africa by imposing their authority over the Boer and the Zulu led to a chain of events that resulted in the war of 1879, in which the British suffered humiliating defeat before they eventually subdued the Zulu.

The prelude to the war was the dispute that emerged between the Zulu king, Cetshwayo (ca. 1836–1884), and his brother Umtonga. In 1861 Umtonga fled to the Utrecht district. Cetshwayo offered the Boer farmers a strip of land along the border if they would surrender his brother. But he later rescinded his endorsement of the deal after his
The contestation over this ceded land and the boundary issue that developed attracted the British into what could be regarded as a local dispute. Indeed, by the 1870s the British began to adopt a policy that would bring the various British colonies, Boer republics, and independent African groups under common British control. The British high commissioner in South Africa, Sir Henry Bartle Frere (1815–1884), believed that an independent and self-reliant Zulu kingdom was a threat to this policy. Frere was convinced that economic development and peace in South Africa could only be achieved by curtailing the power of Cetshwayo and the Zulu nation.

To achieve this goal, the British pursued a policy of unwarranted aggression. In 1878, Cetshwayo was presented with an ultimatum as part of the British plan to bring about the confederation of states in South Africa, including Zululand. One of the demands made of Cetshwayo was that he disband his armies within one month and accept a British resident commissioner as co-ruler. This ultimatum was rejected. On January 20, 1879, British troops under the command of Lt. Gen. Lord Chelmsford (1827–1905) invaded Zululand in a three-pronged attack. The initial outcome was a humiliating defeat of British forces by the Zulu army at Isandlwana Mountain. Over 1,300 British troops and their African allies were killed. In the aftermath of one of the worst disasters of the colonial era, the Zulu reserves mounted a raid on the British border post at Rorke’s Drift, but the Zulu were driven off after ten hours of ferocious fighting. The
British collapse at Isandlwana left the flanking columns at Nyezane River and Hlobane Mountain vulnerable. But the success at Isandlwana exhausted the Zulu army and Cetshwayo was unable to mount a counteroffensive into Natal. The British rushed reinforcements to South Africa from various parts of the British Empire.

The war entered a new phase in March when Lord Chelmsford assembled a column to march to the relief of the other embattled commands. On April 2, Lord Chelmsford broke through the Zulu cordon around Eshowe at kwaGingindlovu, and relieved Pearson’s column. The defeat of the Zulu king’s forces in two battles demoralized the Zulu. British troops continued to advance toward the Zulu capital, Ulundi, which they reached at the end of June. Chelmsford defeated the Zulu army in the last great battle of the war on July 4, 1879. The Zulu capital of Ulundi was burned and Cetshwayo became a fugitive. But it took several weeks for the British to suppress lingering resistance outside the capital. Cetshwayo was captured on August 28, and exiled to Cape Town. The end of the war had many implications for the Zulu and for the British. The British divided the Zulu kingdom among pro-British chiefs—a deliberately divisive move that resulted in a decade of destructive civil war among various Zulu chiefdoms.

Anglo-Zulu War
The Anglo-Zulu War was fought in 1879 between the British Empire and the Zulu Empire. From complex beginnings, the war is notable for several particularly bloody battles, as well as for being a landmark in the timeline of colonialism in the region. This was a decisive six-month war in eastern South Africa, which resulted in a British victory over the Zulus. Before the war the Tugela River formed the boundary between Zululand and the British colony of Natal. Cetshwayo became king of the Zulus in the early 1870s. Unwilling to submit to British hegemony, he assembled a well-disciplined army of 40,000 to 60,000 men. Late in 1878 he received an ultimatum from Natal to disband his army and pay reparations for alleged insults. When he did not respond, British troops invaded under the leadership of Lord Chelmsford. Although the January 1879 rains impeded travel and the tall grasses of Zululand blocked their view, the invaders advanced into Zululand without taking normal precautions (such as scouts and sentries). The Zulu army attacked and annihilated the central British column at Isandhlwana, killing 800 British soldiers and taking nearly 1,000 rifles, with ammunition.

Later, British reinforcements arrived and Cetshwayo fled. The British advantage met a setback in April with the unsolicited arrival of a French prince, Napoleon III's son, in search of adventure. He joined a British expedition, underestimated the enemy, and was killed in a surprise attack in May. His death was an embarrassment for the British, who had been unable to protect him. Their victories continued, nevertheless. In July Cetshwayo was decisively defeated at Ulundi. Zululand then came under informal British control. It was annexed to Natal in 1887.

The underlying motive that gave rise to the Anglo-Zulu war of 1879 was the fact that Great Britain regarded the Zulus and the "Voortrekker boers" as British subjects.

It made no difference to them that the "Voortrekkers" had moved away from the Cape Colony into the interior of South Africa in their quest for independence.

As a result the territory they occupied was considered as belonging to the British crown. And so Great Britain felt it had to do something about the two independent "Boer" republics and several independent African territories including a very powerful Zulu
Kingdom.

91st Highlanders Infantry Officer Zulu War

British in Zululand

To support the coming HaT British Zulu War infantry and to encourage me to paint my birthday gift figures...

I thought I’d dig through my bank of Zulu War materials and post some further information on the British infantry who took part in the campaign.

This is the first of many info posts I will upload on the Zulu War...hope you find them useful!

Officer of the 99th in Zululand 1879

A great Article on the 99th in Zululand

Battery Sgt Major Royal Artillery

An other great article – Campaign uniforms of the Zulu War

Riflemen of the Kings Royal Rifle Corps 1879

Infantryman 2nd Battalion 21st Regt 0f Foot (Royal Scots Fusiliers)

Officer 2nd Battalion 21st Regt 0f Foot (Royal Scots Fusiliers)
1st Highlanders Infantry Officer Zulu War 1879

91st Highlanders Infantrymen Zulu War 1879

An interesting article on the Gatling Guns of the Zulu War...

Officer Royal Artillery in Undress Patrol Jacket and Navel Brigade Officer

Last item...an interesting set of plates...should keep the fans busy

91st (Princess Louise’s Argyllshires) Highlanders

24th (2nd Warwickshire) Regt of Foot – Rorkes Drift

24th (2nd Warwickshire) Regt of Foot – Isandlwana

3rd battalion 60th Kings Royal Rifles 1879

... 

1st-battalion 13th Regt (Somersetshire) Light Infantry

The Battle of Gingindlovu
A Royal Navy Gatling Gun Team

Combatants: British and Natal colonial troops against the Zulus.

Generals: Lieutenant General Lord Chelmsford against Somopho kaZikhala

Size of the armies: 5,250 British and colonial troops against 11,000 Zulus.

Uniforms, arms and equipment: The Zulu warriors were formed in regiments by age, their standard equipment the shield and the stabbing spear. The formation for the attack, described as the “horns of the beast”, was said to have been devised by Shaka, the Zulu King who established Zulu hegemony in Southern Africa. The main body of the army delivered a frontal assault, called the “loins”, while the “horns” spread out behind each of the enemy’s flanks and delivered the secondary and often fatal attack in the enemy’s rear. Cetshwayo, the Zulu King, fearing British aggression took pains to purchase firearms wherever they could be bought. By the outbreak of war the Zulus had tens of thousands of muskets and rifles, but of a poor standard, and the Zulus were ill-trained in their use. The Zulus captured some 1,000 Martini Henry breech loading rifles and a large amount of ammunition. Some of these rifles were used at Rorke’s Drift. All the British casualties, few though they were, were shot rather than stabbed.

Winner: the British

Zulu War medal: Thanks to Historik
Orders of Greenwich, Conn, USA.

British Regiments:
Royal Artillery
3rd Regiment, the Buffs: now the Princess of Wales’s Royal Regiment.
57th Regiment: later the Middlesex Regiment and now the Princess of Wales’s Royal Regiment.
3rd Battalion, 60th Rifles: later the King’s Royal Rifle Corps and now the Royal Green
Jackets.

91st Highlanders: now the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders.

99th Regiment: later the Wiltshire Regiment and now the Royal Gloucestershire, Berkshire and Wiltshire Regiment.

Account:

The Zulu War was among the most savage of Britain’s colonial wars: Isandlwana saw the massacre of a battalion of British infantry (1st Battalion, 24th Foot): At Rorke’s Drift 140 British troops slew 500 Zulus with their breech loading rifles, firing from inside the fortified post. At Khambula, Evelyn Wood’s column killed 2,000 Zulus with its volley fire and probably mortally wounded a further 1,000.

At the end of March 1879 Colonel Pearson’s Number 1 Column lay isolated in a fortified position at Eshowe deep in eastern Zululand. Lord Chelmsford’s desperate worry was that this force would succumb before he could relieve it.

Following the disaster of Isandlwana, the British government rushed reinforcements to Natal: 2 regiments of cavalry, 2 batteries of Royal Artillery and 5 battalions of Foot.

Sailors from HMS Shah defending one wall of the British square against the Zulu attack at the Battle of Gingindlovu

On 29th March 1879 Chelmsford’s column crossed the Tugela River and began its march to the relief of Pearson’s force. The country was covered by Zulu scouts and signals flashed from Pearson’s camp at Eshowe. It was clear to Chelmsford that his advance would be fiercely contested, progress further impeded by the terrible weather.

The Battle of Gingindlovu

On 1st April 1879, Chelmsford’s column reached the Royal Kraal of Gingindlovu and laagered for the night. A heavy rain came on. Chelmsford had taken careful note of the lessons from Isandlwana. At every encampment the wagons were carefully positioned to create an unbroken laager wall and the troops required to dig sections of trench around the laager. Every camp was rendered fully defensible in case of sudden attack.
Chelmsford’s chief scout, John Dunn, a pre-war inhabitant of Zululand for many years, scouted across the Nyezane River. Beyond the river he encountered the Zulu Army, some 11,000 warriors. Dunn returned to the British camp and reported to Chelmsford that the Zulus would attack in the morning.

British troops crossing the Tugela River during the advance into Zululand

Chelmsford’s column was laagered on the top of a hill, the sides sloping away in each direction, as good a position as any for the battle. In accordance with the new standing orders, the laager was entrenched in a square.

The north face of the square was held by the 3rd Battalion, the 60th Rifles; the left by the 99th Regiment and the Buffs (3rd Foot) and the right face by the 57th Regiment. The corners of the square were reinforced by Gatling Guns, conventional artillery and rocket troughs.

Chelmsford’s force advancing to relieve Eshowe

As the sun rose, Irregular Horse and infantry piquets patrolled towards the Nyezane River, scouting for the Zulu advance.

The regiments in the camp stood to at 4am. Shortly before 6am, reports came in from the advanced piquets of the Zulu approach. A native soldier pointed to the skyline. “Impi” he declared. The officers stared at the hill top before realising that what they had taken to be a long smudge of vegetation was the mass of the advancing Zulu “chest”. Zulu skirmishers opened fired from cover as they rushed forward.

The Battle of Gingindlovu; the British square attacked by the Zulus; 91st Highlanders and a Gatling Gun

The first attack was received by the 60th Rifles. One of the newly arrived regiments, the young soldiers of the 60th found the ordeal of the Zulu attack trying in the extreme and it took all the leadership of the battalion’s officers to keep the line steady and firing, the Gatling guns at the ends of the line providing much needed support.
Under heavy fire from the British line the Zulu charge faltered and flowed around to the west flank of the square, where the attack was renewed against the 99th Regiment. In the face of the volley firing from the two sides of the square the Zulu “chest” finally went to ground in cover.

3rd Battalion, 60th Kings Royal Rifles Corps
Illustration courtesy of Tim Reese

The “horns” of the Zulu advance rushed around the British position expecting to find the rear open, as at Isandlwana, only to meet the volley firing of the 91st Highland Regiment. Here too the Zulus were forced into cover.

The 91st Highlanders in Zululand

In the face of the sustained fire from the 91st, the attack on the rear of the laager ebbed away and Chelmsford ordered his mounted units out of the square to complete the victory. The mounted attack was premature and it was some time before the Zulu withdrawal took hold.

Soon after 7am the battle was over and the Zulus in full retreat, pursued by the mounted troops and the native contingent. Large numbers of Zulu warriors were killed in the long pursuit.

The Final Repulse of the Zulus at Gingindlovu

As at Khambula the Zulus wounded on the battlefield were massacred. The Zulu army was effectively dispersed.

The outcome of the battle was a great relief to Chelmsford, showing him that his army’s confidence was re-established and enabling him to continue his advance to Pearson’s camp and on to defeat the Zulu King, Cetshwayo, at the Battle of Ulundi.

Royal Navy sailors during the attack by the Zulus on the Gingindlovu camp
Casualties: British casualties were 6 officers and 55 men; among the dead was Lieutenant Colonel Northey of the 60th Rifles. Zulu casualties were calculated at 1,000.
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A fantastic piece by James McConnell showing an engagement in the battle for Spion Kop. The battle took place in 1900, the Kop being a hill defended by the British and attacked by 12,000 Boers in the hills beyond.

About 1750 British troops died on the hill which became immortalised when Kop became the nickname for a stand in Liverpool’s football ground. Many of the dead soldiers had come from Lancashire so it’s adoption is a form of gallows humour.

This is the original artwork for cover of Look and Learn issue no 648 (15 June 1974).
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In simple terms imperialism pertains to a desire to rule over the entire world. It can prop up in the mind of an individual or a group or a nation. Though imperialism is a hated concept in modern times its value as a perfect tool for propagation of any ideology cannot be overlooked. But for imperialism, Christianity, Islam and Communism would not have spread even a few square kilometers beyond their places of origin.

Image of South Africa, 19th century, Anglo Zulu War (1879), The Battle of Isandlwana

Ideologies adopted by imperialism are carried by its physical and psychological components to unimaginable destinations in no time. If the physical components comprise of armies of warriors and missionaries who enforce and coerce
unquestioned acceptance by fear or fraud, the psychological part is made up of mythology or make-belief stories.

In India we are witness to this unending phenomenon even today in the form of Missionary proselytization, Jihadi terrorism, Maoist rebellions etc.

One thing is common in all these ‘forcible propagation by imperial forces of the core ideology.

Forces of imperialism operate in similar fashion throughout the world. Rather it is the very nature of imperialism than the design of its users. Imperialism is usually the essential offshoot or necessary component of any ism or dynasty that has become powerful without enough fundamental strength in its foundations.

Such ideological shortcomings are offset by shear strength of the forces of imperialism that come to be associated with them. And how do the imperial forces get associated with such weak ideologies? It is always the handiwork of some clever and shrewd individuals who will hide in history forever. Their reasons may be private and quite unconnected with the known highlights of the
ideologies. As a very revealing example, we can cite the example of Communism that is being propagated by Maoists. If their real intention is Communism and Socialism we can never imagine the land of Mao ending up in its present form. But the imperative need for a dose of imperialism in defending and propagation of ideologies can never be overlooked.

Red-Roman-Arab Imperialism

We in India came face to face with imperialism when Alexander’s army knocked at our doors. Though Romans lost the battle and failed miserably in their mission, the fact that they saw the splendor of India with their own eyes resulted in a saga of never ending desire to conquer India by any means. I believe that the half-cooked mythology about St. Thomas coming to India and existence of Christianity in India anytime before the advent of subsequent European colonizers are products of some highly imaginative minds of very recent generation of Indian Christians with such hidden designs. We gained nothing from these Roman imperialists but have consistently been targeted by the descendents of Roman empire. India is really writhing under Christian proselytization even today. The amount of money pumped into their harvesting business in India was about $ 400 million for the year 2008 alone. Our North East has already been overrun and missionaries are aggressively stalking the entire South India with victory in sight.

Arab and Communist imperialism came to India much later. Unlike their Roman counterparts, the strength of Arab and Communist imperialism is of very recent origin. Wealth of Arab imperialism is only one century old and Communist imperialists have never been rich. But their impact on India is increasing daily by leaps and bounds. All imperial forces want to have a piece of the Indian cake and they are playing their games well. While Communist forces are forcing in through Nepal, Arab imperialism has already gained much grounds in the coastal areas, especially Kerala. Billions of gulf money are being pumped into India for gaining grounds legally and illegally. The stake of Arab institutions in Indian companies and real estate is so high that they will soon be able to dictate the administration in several states of India. Emasculated Communism is already in power in a couple of Indian states and they can always join their masters if and when a Chinese manipulated revolution can work out in Indian soil.

Dharmic Imperialism
In the absence of a formidable imperial force backing an ideology it is almost impossible to survive the current century. This is true even if the ideology is fundamentally strong and can claim to have survived all these ages. Sanatana Dharma is one such religious ideology that has always been under threat and it is more so in the 21st century. There is nobody who has seen the whole universe with inner eyes than an Indian Rishi and there is nobody who has actually seen universe than a European adventurer. Yet when the European adventurers came in contact with the creations of Indian Rishis (in the form of scriptures and classics) their surprise was incredible.

Thus started the advent of Roman and Arab imperialism in India which is aimed at nothing less than hijacking our heights of cultural heritage (they have already taken most of our material wealth). And the third one (Red Imperialism) wants to wipe out our heritage altogether so as to perpetuate poverty for Communism to feed on. So much has been willfully destroyed and much more smuggled out so far, but the fundamental strength remains same. I have no doubt that the current versions of these imperial forces will not back off till their goals are achieved.

In a way the weakening of Sanatana Dharma began at the battlefield of Kalinga War.

When Arjuna was confused and felt diffident at the Kurushetra battlefield, Bhagawan himself could clarify his doubts and re-activate him to carry out his Dharma. Arjuna was categorically told that elimination of all obstacles in the path of Dharma is his duty and he has nothing to worry about. Bhagawan’s entire advice was recorded in Bhagavad-Gita Gita and made available to all future generations to live by.

Yet Emperor Asoka failed to get the message properly and ended up repenting his doings as a Kshatriya. Degeneration of a society which was flourishing on the basis of Sanatana Dharma started at this moment. If only he had understood the real spirit behind the unparalleled advice from Bhagawan, the history of India would have been much different and glorious.

It is still not too late to change course and work towards regaining our past glory. The basic tenets of Sanatana Dharma remain rigidly intact and entire stock of its intellectual assets is still not completely unraveled. At any level of comparison,
our Sanatana Dharma is indeed way above its competing religious ideologies. All that is required for its domination over the entire world is a vehicle of imperialism. It is not necessary to kill anyone or even apply any force. It is absolutely not necessary to deceive and coerce converts like the missionaries. The only effort that is required is unrelenting commitment to reiterate the concepts and ideals of Santana Dharma to as many people and as many lands as possible. So many agencies are already involved in this process. What is lacking is an imperial mindset to re-convert and convert as many as possible so as to re-establish the rule of Sanatana Dharma over the entire world.
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ARTILLERY IN THE ZULU WAR – 1879

by Major D.D. Hall

INTRODUCTION

Guns played an important part in the Zulu War, but, as in many colonial wars, their use was one-sided. The Zulus had no artillery, and they made no use of the two guns they captured at Isandlwana.

All the main British columns had their guns, and they played a prominent part in the battles and sieges of the war. Some of the guns were obsolete by British Army standards. Nevertheless, the artillery used in the Zulu War tells an interesting story of the changes then under way from breech to muzzle loading, in the use of rockets, and of rapid fire weapons as illustrated by the Gatling.

The intention of this article is to outline the use of artillery only, and not to describe any of the battles in detail. A description of the equipment will explain some of the developments taking place in the second half of the 19th Century. The subject will be dealt with in three parts:
1. 1. The deployment of batteries.
2. 2. Artillery in the major battles.
3. 3. The guns.

PART 1 – THE DEPLOYMENT OF BATTERIES

In 1879, the Royal Artillery was divided into horse, field and garrison batteries. Batteries were organised in brigades, and it was possible to identify the type of battery by its letter or number designation, or both.

For example, horse artillery had lettered batteries and brigades. Field artillery batteries were lettered whereas their brigades were numbered. Garrison batteries and brigades were both numbered.

N/5 Battery (or N Battery 5th Brigade) was therefore a field battery. 11/7 Battery (or 11th Battery 7th Brigade) was a garrison battery.

The summary which follows outlines the deployment of batteries in the main campaigns of the war. It will be seen that not only the Royal Artillery manned guns in Zululand but the Naval Brigades were also prominent in this respect.

Apart from the guns, all batteries carried rockets – one 9 pr trough per section of two guns. The Naval rockets were 24 pr tubes. Finally, there were the Gatlings – once again, Army and Naval versions.

The equipments will be mentioned below, and described in more detail in Part 3. Full designations of guns will only be given in Part 3, and in the sections ‘At the outbreak of war’ and ‘Reinforcements after Isandlwana’ which follow. At other times, for brevity, guns will simply be described as ‘7 pr’, ‘9 pr’ etc.

At the outbreak of war

The artillery available consisted of:

N/5 Battery – Six 7 pr 200 lb Rifled Muzzle Loading (RML) guns on Colonial or Kaffraria carriages.

Two rocket troughs.

This field battery arrived in the Cape Colony in 1878, and took part in the closing stages of the war against Sandili. The battery then marched to Pietermaritzburg with a column under Col E. Wood VC. Field batteries were normally equipped with 9 prs at this time, but this battery had 7 prs. These were thought to be more mobile and better suited to South African conditions. N/5 only appears to have had two rocket troughs. Rockets are not always mentioned in contemporary accounts when the armament of batteries is
detailed, so they will only be mentioned below where accounts of the war have specifically mentioned their presence.

11/7 Battery – Six 7 pr 200 lb RMLs, mule drawn.

Three rocket troughs.

Garrison batteries manned coast defence, heavy and siege guns, and, at the other extreme, mountain guns. Some batteries were deployed in such stations as Gibraltar, Hong Kong and the Cape in a coast defence role. 11/7 Battery had a field role and was stationed in Natal. The 7 prs were probably on mountain carriages but there is no specific evidence on this point.

Naval Brigade (HMS Active) – Two 12 pr Armstrongs, Sea Service (SS)

Two 24 pr rocket tubes.

One Gatling.

HMS Active had supplied a landing party for operations in the Cape Colony in 1877 and 1878, and so was experienced in active service conditions in South Africa. It included a Royal Marine detachment among its numbers. At this time, Naval Brigades were equipped with 9 prs and 12 prs, and some, if not all these guns were experimental guns used in the trials of 1863-65. These trials led to the adoption of Rifled Muzzle Loaders (RMLs) in place of Rifled Breech Loaders (RBLs). Technically, the guns used by the Naval Brigades in South Africa are very interesting – more about them later.

Miscellaneous – Two 7 pr 200 lb RMLs

Two 6 pr 3 cwt Armstrong RBLs

One 4 pr Krupp RBL

Three rocket troughs

Other artillery pieces were available in South Africa. Some had been used, and were being used, in military operations in the Cape. Some guns were retained in Durban and other towns in Natal. The annexation of the Transvaal in 1877 had made artillery equipment belonging to the republic available for use by British forces – notably the 4 pr Krupps of Battery Dingaan. Gun detachments were often found by infantry or other volunteers. The only guns which need be mentioned here are those which were made available to Lord Chelmsford at the beginning of the war, and which are listed above.

First phase

This artillery had to be spread between the five columns which were formed for the invasion of Zululand. The organisation was as follows:
No 1 Column (Col C.K. Pearson)
  Section 11/7 (Lt W.N. Lloyd)
    Two 7 prs
    One rocket trough
Naval Brigade (Cdr H.J.F. Campbell)
    Two 7 prs
    Two 24 pr rocket tubes
    One Gatling
The Naval Brigade’s 12 prs had been exchanged at Fort Pearson for 7 prs.

No 2 Column (Lt Col A.W. Durnford)
  Rocket Battery (Maj F.B. Russell)
    Three rocket troughs

Maj Russell of 11/7 Battery was detailed to organise a Rockety Battery. Personnel consisted of Maj Russell and one Bombardier of 11/7, and eight men of 24th Regiment.

No 3 Column (Col R.T. Glyn)
  N/5 Battery (Lt Col A. Harness)
    Six 7 prs
    Two rocket troughs
The rocket troughs accompanied N/5 during the campaign, but they were seldom mentioned in contemporary accounts.

No 4 Column (Col E. Wood, VC)
  11/7 Battery (less one section)
    (Maj E.G. Tremlett)
      Four 7 prs
  Rocket Section (Lt A.J. Bigge)
    Two rocket troughs
  Section (Lt F. Nicolson)
    Two 7 prs
11/7 Battery was represented in all columns except No 5.

No 5 Column (Col H. Rowlands, VC)
  Detachment 80th Regiment
    One 4 pr Krupp
    Two 6 pr Armstrongs
In 1878, three Gunner subalterns were specially selected for service in South Africa, in order to train and command some of the gun detachments provided by infantry or Cape volunteers. They were Lts Bigge and Nicolson (already mentioned), Lt F.G. Slade. Originally with No 5 Column, Lt Slade was then transferred to No 4 Column. His two 6 pr Armstrongs were handed over to men of 80th Regiment.

Reinforcements after Isandlwana
The disaster at Isandlwana produced a rapid reaction in England, and reinforcements were soon on their way to South Africa.

From home
M6 Battery – Six 7 pr 200 lb RMLs
N/6 Battery – Six 9 pr 8 cwt RMLs
O/6 Battery – Ammunition Column

Note that N/6 Battery had 9 prs, which most field batteries had at the time. O/6 Battery did not bring its guns, and was employed as an Ammunition Column. In this role, it was concerned with ammunition supply for all arms, not just for the artillery.

From Mauritius
Half 10/7 Battery – Three 7 pr 200 lb RMLs

On arrival, this half battery was re-equipped with four Gatlings, and organized as the British Army’s first mounted Gatling battery. Its commander, Maj J.F. Owen, has recently been a member of the Commission which investigated an accident aboard HMS Thunderer, where a 12 in 38,5 ton RML gun burst, killing two officers and eight men, and wounding ten others. The accident was one of the reasons for the eventual discarding of the RML system, and a final return to breech loading in the British service.

From St Helena
Section 8/7 Battery – Two 7 pr 200 lb RMLs

On hearing of Isandlwana, Captain R. Bradshaw, RN, of HMS Shah, on his own initiative, loaded part of 8/7 and one company of Connaught Rangers, for Durban. At the time, HMS Shah was under orders to return to England. Captain Bradshaw’s decisive action received the approval of Parliament and the Admiralty. From HM Ships Shah, Tenedos and Boadicea
Two 9 pr 6 cwt RML (SS) Experimental guns
Four 24 pr rocket tubes
Two Gatlings
This was Naval issue equipment. A third 9 pr and two more Gatlings were added later. The 9 prs will be discussed at length in Part 3 where the ‘Experimental’ qualification will be explained. While it is known that this Naval force was equipped with 9 prs, it must be admitted that the specific type of 9 pr quoted above is an assumption. Gatlings were on smaller carriages than those of Maj Owen’s Gatling Battery.

Relief of Eshowe

Two brigades were formed for the column which was to relieve Eshowe. The artillery for this force came entirely from the Naval Brigades which had been landed from HM Ships Shah, Tenedos and Boadicea. It was allocated as follows:

1st Brigade – Two 9 prs
Two 24 pr rocket tubes
One Gatling

2nd Brigade – Two 24 pr rocket tubes
One Gatling

Second phase

An impressive amount of artillery was now available to Lord Chelmsford. With the reorganization of the forces under his command, the artillery deployment was:

Commander Royal Artillery – Col W.E.M. Reilly,
then Lt Col J.T.B. Brown
1st Division – Maj Gen H.N. Crealock
RA – commanded by Lt Col F.T.A. Law
M/6 Battery (Maj W.H. Sandham)
Six 7 prs
Half O/6 Battery (Maj A.W. Duncan)

Ammunition Column
Section 8/7 Battery (Maj H.L. Ellaby)
Two 7 prs
Section 11/7 Battery (Lt W.N. Lloyd)
Two 7 prs
Naval Brigade (Cdr J.W. Brackenbury)
Three 9 prs
Four Gatlings
Four 24 pr rocket tubes

O/6 Battery was divided between 1st and 2nd Divisions, to provide ammunition columns for both. Note the increased armament of the Naval Brigade.

2nd Division – Maj Gen E. Newdigate
RA – commanded by Lt Col J.T.B. Brown, then Lt Col A. Harness

N/5 Battery (Lt Col A. Harness)
Six 7 prs

N/6 Battery (Maj F.S. le Grice)
Six 9 prs

Half O/6 Battery (Capt R. Alexander)

Ammunition Column

N/5 Battery received a reinforcement of two guns under Capt Vibart in May 1879, to replace the two lost at Isandlwana.

Flying Column – Brig Gen E. Wood, VC

11/7 Battery (less one section) (Maj E.G. Tremlett)
Four 7 prs

Gatling Battery (half 10/7 Battery) (Maj J.F. Owen)
Four Gatlings

After the Battle of Gingindlovu, the Relief of Eshowe, and the Battle of Ulundi, the artillery detailed above was used as required with the various columns in the different skirmishes and engagements which followed until the end of the war.

PART 2- ARTILLERY IN THE MAJOR BATTLES

There were several engagements in the war. The major battles are listed below, with some notes on the artillery participation in each. An interesting point is that 11/7 Battery was represented in all the battles except Gingindlovu – a remarkable achievement.

Inyezane – 22nd January, 1879

Section 11/7 Battery
Two 7 prs
One rocket trough

Naval Brigade (HMS Active)
Two 7 prs
Two 24 pr rocket tubes
One Gatling

Before leaving Fort Pearson on the Tugela River, the 12 prs of the Naval Brigade were exchanged for 7 prs. On the march, the column was split into two divisions. The two Naval 7 prs brought up the rear of the second division and took no part in the battle.
The two 7 prs of 11/7 Battery and the two Naval Brigade rocket tubes were placed together on a knoll at the foot of the pass and performed well. In his report on the action, Commander Campbell praised Boatswain Cotter’s handling of the rocket tubes. Mention is made of one well-directed rocket which exploded in a kraal, instantly expelling the enemy. Eleven rockets were fired in the battle.

Midshipman L.C. Coker, 19 years old, was also praised for the handling of his Gatling, which was further back in the column. He had his problems, and in his report said: ‘Through the clumsiness of my driver, my distle-boom carried away. I repaired it as quickly as possible…. Owing to the distle-boom I was very much delayed.’ Colonel Pearson ordered Coker to bring his Gatling into action opposite a hill where the enemy had taken up position. Three hundred well-aimed rounds drove them into the bush.

Eshowe – 23rd January to 3rd April, 1879
Artillery as for Inyezane.
The Zulus made only one attack on Eshowe during the siege, and that was half-hearted. The garrison made one sortie, in which one of the guns took part.
The guns were well placed in emplacements in the walls of the fort. Ammunition was in good supply (150 rounds per gun), except for case shot. This problem was solved when it was noticed that Morton’s jam tins exactly fitted the bore of a 7 pr. The men were ordered to give their empty jam tins to the Gunners, who were then able to make more case shot for their guns.

Isandlwana – 22nd January, 1879
Section N/5 Battery
Two 7 prs
Rocket Battery
Three rocket troughs

N/5 Battery (less one section) accompanied Lord Chelmsford on his abortive reconnaissance in force, and took no part in the battle. The Rocket Battery, with its equipment carried on mules, then accompanied Col Durnford’s force when it also moved out of camp; but the battery was unable to keep up with the remainder. When firing was heard to their left, the Rocket Battery and its escort turned in that direction, but they were almost immediately engulfed by the Zulus. There was only time to get off one rocket before the enemy was upon them.

Maj Stuart Smith, the Captain (or second in command) of N/5 Battery, returned from Lord Chelmsford’s force before the Zulus attacked, and took command of the artillery left behind. This only amounted to one section of two guns-and fifty men left in camp. The Zulus advanced very rapidly when they attacked. The guns opened fire, but it was
soon necessary to change to case shot, which is not normally used at ranges greater than 300 m. The two guns were quite incapable of stopping the Zulu masses. After a round or two, the order was given to retire. Maj Stuart Smith was wounded, and there were other casualties as well. There was no time for the men to take their seats on the guns and limbers when the guns moved off, and they had to run alongside the guns. The intention was to take up another position at the camp, but the Zulus were there first. The guns went straight through the camp, losing more men on the way. Eventually, they became stuck in a ravine, and the drivers, who now alone remained, were pulled off their horses and killed. There was no time to spike* the guns.

*To spike a gun, a spike (like a nail) was hammered into the vent, thus preventing the firing of the gun.*

N/5 Battery had lost Maj Stuart Smith, 61 NCOs and men, two guns, 24 horses, 30 mules and 534 rounds of ammunition. The Rocket Battery lost Maj Russell, six men and all its equipment.

Hlobane – 28th March, 1879
Rocket Section (from No 4 Column)
Two rocket troughs

This was 11/7 Battery’s Rocket Section. One report mentions that Lt Bigge had a rocket tube with him, whereas others state that he had troughs under his command. This is more likely to have been the case. Whichever it was, there is no report of their actually having been used at Hlobane. The Battery Commander, Maj Tremlett, was there – and, in the action, he rescued an officer of the Frontier Light Horse.

Kambula – 29th March, 1879
11/7 Battery (less one section)
Four 7 prs
Rocket Section
Two rocket troughs
Section 7 prs
Two 7 prs

Lt Nicolson’s 7 pr section was in the redoubt, while the four guns of 11/7 were in action outside. Nicolson was mortally wounded early in the action. With a muzzle loading gun, it was necessary for one of the men to ‘serve the breech’ by placing his thumb on the vent during the sponging out after each round was fired. This prevented a draught which could cause the smouldering fragments of the previous cartridge to burst into flame. The Zulu attack at Kambula was so fierce and the guns, as
they poured forth shrapnel and case, became so hot that water had to be poured over them to allow the breeches to be served. After his capture, Cetewayo said that it was only with the greatest difficulty that his men could be forced to face the guns. One round of case killed ten headmen of his own regiment, in addition to wounding others.

Gingindlovu – 2nd April, 1879
Naval Brigade (HM Ships Shah, Tenedos and Boadicea)

Two 9 prs
Four 24 pr rocket tubes
Two Gatlings

The 9 prs, rockets and Gatlings were posted at the corners of the British camp. Fire was opened by one of the Gatlings at 1000m and, as the Zulus approached, they were engaged by all the artillery weapons. They played their part in winning the battle.

Ulundi – 4th July, 1879
N/5 Battery
Two 7 prs
N/6 Battery
Six 9 prs
Half O/6 Battery
Ammunition Column

11/7 Battery (less one section)
Four 7 prs

This was the artillery of the 2nd Division and the Flying Column, less four guns of N/5 Battery, and two of the Gatlings. One section of two 7 prs was at Fort Marshall, and the other section was at Fort Evelyn. The Gatlings were left at Fort Newdigate. For the battle, the guns were placed on all sides of the British square, in order to meet the Zulu attack, from whatever direction it might come. They were in action just outside the infantry line, or in gaps left for them. When the Zulus attacked, the cavalry moved clear, and fire was opened at a range of over 2000m.

Although the action was short, and ammunition expenditure was low, some guns used all their case and had to fall back on reversed shrapnel, which had a similar effect. Later, Zulu dead were counted in groups at less than 30m from N/6 Battery’s guns. The Gatlings achieved considerable success, although they jammed several times. The London Standard reported: ‘When all was over and we counted the dead, there lay, within a radius of five hundred yards, 473 Zulus. They lay in groups, in some places, of fourteen to thirty dead, mowed down by the fire of the Gatlings, which tells upon them
more than the fire of rifles.’

The battle was over in half an hour. The mounted troops were sent out in pursuit and, when there were signs of a rally, a section of N/6 soon dispersed the gathering.

PART 3 – THE GUNS

The guns, rockets and Gatlings used in the Zulu War were as follows:

Guns
- 6 pr 3 cwt RBL
- 9 pr 6 cwt RML (SS)
  (Experimental)
- 12 pr Armstrong (SS)
  - 7 pr 200 lb RML
  - 9 pr 8 cwt RML
  - 4 pr Krupp RBL
Rockets
- Trough – 9 pr and 24 pr
- Tube – 24 pr
Gatlings
- .45 in 10-barrelled
- .65 in 10-barrelled (SS)

The guns are described in the order of their appearance in the British service. In describing these guns, artillery development of the period will be outlined. Rockets and Gatlings are also included as, in the Zulu War, they came under artillery control.

6 pr 3 cwt RBL

In 1859, Mr William Armstrong introduced his rifled breech loaders. The 6 pr 3 cwt RBL was originally intended for mountain service, but it was found to be too heavy. 7 prs were accordingly introduced for this purpose, and the 6 pr was restricted to normal colonial service, as opposed to mountain.

In the Armstrong system, guns were loaded through a hollow breech screw. The breech was closed by means of a vent piece, which was dropped into a slot or opening in the top of the breech. The vent piece was then pressed home against the chamber by means of a breech screw.

The shell was lead coated. On being fired, this soft coating was compressed into the 38 rifling grooves of the bore, and these gave it the required spin.

The Durban Volunteer Artillery (later Natal Field Artillery) took two of these guns to Cetewayo’s coronation in 1873. 6 pr RBLs were used in the campaigns of 1877 and 1878.
Although two were with Col Rowlands’ column at the beginning of the Zulu War, they do not appear to have been used in the war.

6 pr 3 cwt RBL

The breech closing arrangement was the weak point of the Armstrong RBL design, particularly with the larger calibres, where the vent piece was unreliable, heavy and unmanageable. Not many years after the introduction of the RBL system, the authorities were looking for an alternative.

9 pr 6 cwt RML (SS) (Experimental)

Trials were held from 1863 to 1865, between Armstrong and Whitworth guns, to find something more suitable than the Armstrong RBL system. For these trials, Armstrong produced a steel RML gun, rifled with three grooves in the shunt system. The gun illustrated, made in 1864, is such a gun.

The shell had projecting lugs which slotted into three grooves in the bore. In the shunt system, each groove was stepped, with a deeper and a shallower part in the groove. On loading, the lugs of the shell ran easily down the deeper parts of the grooves. At the chamber, the shell was ‘shunted’ across to a stepped up part of the grooves which produced a tighter fit. The idea was that this would mean greater accuracy on firing, but it was not a success and was soon discarded.

The guns produced by Armstrong for these trials were ‘built up’ in construction. In this system, wrought iron coils were shrunk on to an inner tube. The same system was used for Armstrong’s earlier RBL guns.

This 9 pr can be seen today in Ladysmith. Its carriage is makeshift, but parts of the original carriage can be identified. It is said to have been used in the Zulu War but, if so, it was definitely not used by N/6 Battery, the only Royal Artillery unit with 9 prs. They had standard 9 pr 8 cwt RMLs, which will be described later.

9 pr 6 cwt RML (SS) (Experimental).

Part of the original wooded carriage can be seen. The unusual wheels and trail were
The only other 9 prs were those with the Naval Brigade which accompanied the Eshowe relief column, and which was present at the Battle of Gingindlovu. A drawing of this column shows the Naval Brigade with a 9 pr which does not appear to be of the standard Army pattern.

The possibility is that the Navy were given some of these ‘experimental’ guns for their landing parties. It is understandable that they were not given to the Royal Artillery, who would have received standard equipment, and not experimental models, especially those which were of a rejected design. Nevertheless, being still serviceable, it is reasonable to assume that the authorities would have wanted some use to be made of these guns. Similarly, the Naval Brigade’s 12 prs, to be described next, were also of an old pattern. So guns like this 9 pr could have been used at Gingindlovu. It is even possible that the Ladysmith gun was one of those guns. But after Gingindlovu the Naval Brigade received a third 9 pr – is this that third gun? Anyway, this 9 pr 6 cwt RML is an interesting example of one of the systems produced as an alternative to RBL guns at a time of change in Britain’s artillery.

12 pr Armstrong (SS)
HMS Active’s Naval Brigade landed with two 12 pr Armstrongs. They were exchanged for 7 prs at Fort Pearson before the invasion of Zululand, and took no active part in the campaign. Records do not show what type of guns these were – RML or RBL? The photographs that do exist are not clear. The best is a drawing copied from a photograph, and this may not be accurate. It shows a gun on a low carriage, similar to that of a Naval Gatling. In construction, the gun is of the Armstrong type, similar to that of the 9 pr just described. The gun has no vent piece, and looks like a rifled muzzle loader. However, another drawing shows a rifled breech loader with the forces at Eshowe, whilst a despatch published in the London Gazette of 7 Dec 1879 refers to the guns as breech loading.

12 pr Armstrong (SS).
This drawing was copied from a photograph taken on the day the Ultimatum was delivered. No vent piece can be seen so, if the drawing is correct, the gun is a muzzle loader. Note the small carriage. In the background are men of HMS Active’s Naval
Details of the armament of HMS Active merely mention ‘2 boat and field guns’ without giving any other details. All that can be said is that there were two 12 pr Armstrongs with HMS Active’s Naval Brigade when it landed, but no details of type and performance can be given with certainty.

7 pr 200 lb RML
Mountain guns were widely used in India, where 7 prs first saw service in 1865. The 7 pr replaced the 6 pr cwt RBL which, largely because of its weight, was not acceptable as a mountain gun.
The gun used in South Africa was the Mk IV steel gun of 200 lb, which was introduced into service in 1873. It was an RML, with three rifling grooves, but these were plain (the French system), and not stepped as in the shunt system.
The 7 pr’s mountain carriage was low with a narrow track. This had the disadvantage that it turned over easily on rough ground if towed, but, on the other hand, an advantage was that it was possible to negotiate narrow bush paths which would have been quite impassable for vehicles with a normal track. When towed, the guns were drawn by three mules, tandem fashion. The guns could also be stripped down and carried on mules.
Colonial, or Kaffraria carriages were also introduced for use in South Africa. These were a lightened version of the 9 pr 8 cwt RML carriage – that is, the Army’s standard 9 pr, not the Navy’s experimental model. These carriages were suitable for horse-drawn movement. However, it was felt that, as there was little difference in weight compared with the 9 prs, the 9 pr might just as well have been used as its fire was more effective.
7 prs saw service on both carriages in the Zulu War but they found little favour.
Shrapnel had little effect, because of the low muzzle velocity. The small bursting charge of common shell made its destructive power insignificant. Double shell could only be carried in small quantities, and its range was short.

7 pr 200 lb RML on colonial carriage – a lightened version of the 9 pr 8 cwt RML carriage.

9 pr 8 cwt RML
Mention has already been made of the trials which followed the failure of the RBL system, and of the experimental guns produced for these trials. In 1871, the 9 pr 8 cwt
RML was introduced as the new field gun of the British Army.
The main characteristics of Armstrong construction had been maintained. The gun was made of wrought iron; it was 'built up' but, in appearance, not at all like the Armstrong RBLs and experimental RMLs. It fired an elongated shell, but it was muzzle loading; and it was rifled with three grooves.

In trials, these RMLs had produced a quicker rate of fire than the RBLs, and the breech problem was eliminated. A 9 pr 6 cwt RML was produced for horse artillery, similar to this new 9 pr 8 cwt RML. This was later adopted for field use as well, and remained the standard British field gun until 1878, but many field batteries still had the 8 cwt model in 1879.

9 pr 8 cwt RML – the standard Royal Artillery field gun in the 1870s.

Nothing has yet been said in this article about the horses – of vital importance to all, and, in particular, to Gunners. Some comments about N/6’s English horses may be of interest.

They landed in March 1879 in Durban. From then until the end of hostilities, only eight were lost, of which two were killed in action. When the battery was ordered to embark for India, it marched the 512 km (320 miles) from Heidelberg to Durban in fourteen days, and was particularly complimented on the good condition of its horses on arrival in Durban. N/5’s colonial horses were said to be useful and handy for the light 7 pr equipment, and ‘could be driven to water in a mob’. At the end of the war, N/6’s guns and horses were left behind when the battery embarked for India. They were taken over by N/5 who later used them in the First Boer War.

4 pr Krupp RBL

In 1874, President Burgers bought four Krupp 4 pr guns for the Transvaal Republic. They were the first modern guns which the Republic had possessed, and the artillery unit formed under Captain Otto Riedl was its first permanent artillery formation, and was known as Battery Dingaan.

Britain acquired these guns when the Transvaal was annexed in 1877. One or more were used in the Sekukuni and other campaigns of 1878, Colonel Rowlands had one with his column at the beginning of the Zulu War, but it does not appear to have been used. No details of the gun are available but, from the photograph it can be seen that this gun has the standard Krupp wedge or sliding block breech. At this time, there was a 5 cm Krupp
mountain gun which fired a 1,85 kg (4 lb) shell. It may be this gun. The four guns were used by the British garrison in the Defence of Pretoria in the First Boer War.

4 pr Krupp RBL. This photograph was taken during the Siege of Pretoria in 1881. (With acknowledgement to the Africana Museum, Johannesburg.)

Rockets

By the time of the Zulu War, rockets had been in service with the British Army for many years. In 1879, there were two types in use in the British service – 9 pr and 24 pr rockets of Hale’s pattern. These were an improvement on the earlier Congreve’s type, which were stabilized in flight by a long stick. Hale’s rockets were spin-stabilized by rotation effected by three metal vanes in the exhaust nozzle. Rockets were fired from tubes and troughs. Troughs were used by both the Army and the Navy, and they fired both 9 pr and 24 pr rockets. Troughs were merely open ‘drain pipes’ on simple stands. Rockets were fired by means of a friction tube in one of the exhaust nozzles; or a slow fuze. In South Africa, Army troughs will have been 9 pr. Tubes were more common with the Navy. They were less dangerous to use aboard ship, where care had to be taken to prevent uncontrolled sparks and flames from setting light to rigging and inflammable stores in confined spaces. Naval tubes fired 24 pr rockets.

The rocket’s effective range was not more than about 1200m. The zone in which a rocket might land was large, and accuracy was poor. Rockets were unsafe on firing, and very susceptible to wind. The steadying effect of rapid rotation only appeared some time after firing, by which time the damage was done, as far as accuracy was concerned.

Manuals stated that rockets could be used for bombarding towns, and firing shipping, buildings etc. They could also be used against troops and cavalry, as they frightened the horses. In the same way, they were thought to be useful against ‘savages’, and other unsophisticated opponents – but Zulus treated them with contempt.

Headlam, in his ‘History of the Royal Artillery’ mentions the Navy’s enormous 24 pr rockets, fired from tubes which, he said, caused as much anxiety to friend as foe. Rockets were known to turn round in flight, and head back towards the men who had fired them. While possessing great potential, rockets were very unreliable. Before leaving them, though, it is well to remember Boatswain Cotter’s well-aimed rocket at Iny ezane, and that rockets were used with much success by Germans and Russians in World War II, and that a rocket blasted man to the moon.
9 pr rocket trough and rocket, with a 24 pr rocket below. This incomplete trough is in the Natal Museum, Pietermaritzburg. The missing arm A is shown on the sketch below. Elevation was altered by moving the upright B along the arm A.

Sketch showing the missing arm of the 9 pr rocket trough.

Gatlings

The Gatling was an invention of an American, Richard Joseph Gatling. His guns were used in the American Civil War, improved afterwards, and sold around the world. If Custer had taken his four Gatlings with him in 1876 the outcome of his battle with Sitting Bull’s warriors at the Little Big Horn would have been very different.

Gatlings were considered to be artillery weapons by many, and they therefore came under artillery control in the Zulu War. In this respect, Britain followed the French lead. The French had deployed their mitrailleuses as artillery pieces in the Franco-Prussian War, but with poor results.

In Britain trials had been conducted between Gatlings, 9 pr RML and 12 pr RBL guns, the Montigny mitrailleuse, and infantry sections firing Snider and Martini Henry rifles.

The inclusion of artillery pieces in these trials illustrates the thinking of the time. The Gatling came out of this remarkably well, and in reports dated 1870 and 1871, the War Office recommended that ,65 in (16,5 mm) Gatlings be adopted for the Navy and for coast defence, and the ,45 in (11,4 mm) Gatling for the Army.

The first Gatlings were delivered by Sir W.G. Armstrong and Co. in January 1874, and by the end of 1875, forty guns had been produced. The Navy took twelve of the ,45 in guns originally destined for the Army, in addition to their ,65 in guns which followed soon afterwards.

Army Gatlings were on carriages similar to those of field guns, and were manned by a Royal Artillery battery under Major J.F. Owen, in the Zulu War. Naval Gatlings were on
smaller carriages, but accounts of the war do not mention the calibre of these guns.

Gatlings for British service were destined to take the Boxer cartridge of 1866. These were not suitable, and early trials invariably led to the guns jamming as the empty case stuck in the chamber, and the extractor tore through the rim. Changes were made, but ammunition problems remained.

The nature of the war in Zululand meant that Gatlings were used against massed Zulu charges at close ranges, and they were very effective. Their part in the Battle of Ulundi illustrates this fact.

CONCLUSION

The rockets and guns at Isandlwana were overwhelmed and had little or no effect on the battle. But at Inyezane, Kambula, Gingindlovu and Ulundi, artillery played an important part in the British victories, and consequently, the defeat of the Zulu nation.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guns</th>
<th>Weight of gun</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Calibre</th>
<th>Weight of shell</th>
<th>Ammunition</th>
<th>MV (ft/sec)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 pr</td>
<td>3 cwt (152 kg)</td>
<td>RBL</td>
<td>2,5 in (6,35 cm)</td>
<td>5 lb 7 oz (2,5 kg) 5 lb 9 oz (2,5 kg)</td>
<td>Segment Case</td>
<td>1046 (322 m)</td>
<td>3000 yds (2769 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 pr</td>
<td>8 cwt (406 kg)</td>
<td>RBL</td>
<td>3 in (7,62 cm)</td>
<td>10 lb 11 oz (4,8 kg) 11 lb 4 oz (5,1 kg)</td>
<td>Shrapnel Common Segment Case</td>
<td>1239 (381 m)</td>
<td>3400 yds (3138 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pr</td>
<td>6 cwt</td>
<td>RML</td>
<td>3 in</td>
<td>9 lb 13 oz</td>
<td>Shrapnel Common Case</td>
<td>3000 yds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2769 m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 pr</td>
<td>200 lb</td>
<td>RML</td>
<td>3 in</td>
<td>7 lb 11 oz</td>
<td>Shrapnel Common Double Case</td>
<td>914 yds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(91 kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,62 cm)</td>
<td>(3,5 kg)</td>
<td>7 lb 5 oz</td>
<td>(281 m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,3 kg)</td>
<td>12 lb 3 oz</td>
<td>(2862 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,5 kg)</td>
<td>6 lb 4 oz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,8 kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pr</td>
<td>8 cwt</td>
<td>RML</td>
<td>3 in</td>
<td>9 lb 13 oz</td>
<td>Shrapnel Common Case</td>
<td>1330 yds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(406 kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,62 cm)</td>
<td>(4,5 kg)</td>
<td>9 lb 1 oz</td>
<td>(409 m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,1 kg)</td>
<td>10 oz</td>
<td>(3231 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pr Krupp</td>
<td>RBL</td>
<td>2 in (?) (5 cm)</td>
<td>4 lb approx (1,85 kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Guns are described in the same order as Part 3.
2. 12 pr Armstrong details are not known, as there is doubt whether the guns with HMS Active's Naval Brigade were RBL or RML. The details here are for the RBL gun.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rockets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Troughs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum elevation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range at 15 degrees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of trough:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the large zone in which rockets fired at 15 degree elevation could fall.

**Tubes**

Tube details are not known, but will have been about the same as for troughs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Naval and Coastal services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calibre:</strong></td>
<td>.45 in (1.14 cm)</td>
<td>.65 in (1.65 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of barrels:</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight of gun complete:</strong></td>
<td>8 cwt 6 qtr 6 lb (485 kg)</td>
<td>14 cwt 4 qtr 27 lb (775 kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum range:</strong></td>
<td>2400 yds (2215 m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective range:</strong></td>
<td>Up to 1200 yds (1108 m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate of fire:</strong></td>
<td>300 to 400 rounds per minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these details it can be seen that the Naval .65 in Gatling was much heavier than the Army .45 in version, but Naval Gatlings in South Africa were on smaller and presumably lighter carriages. As explained in Part 3, the Navy also had some .45 in Gatlings and Naval Brigades in South Africa may have been equipped with this version, on the lighter carriage.
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Anglo-Boer-Zulu Battlefields

4 Day (3 nights) Anglo-Boer-Zulu Battlefields:-

The siege town of Ladysmith, Winston Churchill’s train ambush site, the Anglo-Boer Battlefields of Spionkop, Colenso, Talana, with the Anglo-Zulu Battlefields of Isandhlwana, Rorkes Drift & Fugitives Drift

7 Day (6 nights) Anglo-Boer-Zulu Battlefields & Safari:-

The siege town of Ladysmith, Winston Churchill’s train ambush site, the Anglo-Boer Battlefields of Spionkop, Colenso, Talana, Zulu Battlefields of Isandhlwana, Rorkes Drift, Ulundi, Ondini Zulu Royal residence site, Kwa-Mondi mission station, & Durban.

10 Day (9 nights) Anglo-Boer-Zulu Battlefields, Safari & Durban:-

The siege town of Ladysmith, Winston Churchill’s train ambush site, the Anglo-Boer Battlefields of Spionkop, Colenso, Talana, Anglo-Zulu Battlefields of Isandhlwana, Rorkes Drift, Ulundi, Ondini Zulu Royal residence site, Kwa-Mondi mission station, & Durban.
South African Battlefields – Zulu Battlefields Tours of KwaZulu Natal of 19th century British Africa

Africa Battlefields Anglo-Boer-Zulu Battlefields and Military History of British colonial Africa of the 19th century. The early Dutch pioneers who in 1838 confronted the mighty Zulu empire under King Dingaan at the Battle of Blood River. In January 1879 the British first invasion under the command of Lord Chelmsford crossed the Buffalo’s River at Rorkes Drift into Zululand leading to the biggest single defeat of a modern British army against the spears of the Zulu impi at the battle of Isandhlwana, a few hours later 11 VC’s where won at the mission station at Rorkes Drift and the 2 VC’s at Fugitives Drift the first to be awarded posthumously. On the 1 June 1879 Chelmsford started his second invasion of Zululand with yet another set back, Prince Imperial (Napoleon) of France was killed in a Zulu skirmish while on patrol, due to his previous set backs Chelmsford doubled his efforts to reach the Zulu capital of Ulundi without further incidents. On the 4 July 1879 the mighty Zulu empire of the old order had been defeated within half hour of giving battle. Although there was the “Transvaal war” of 1880/1 which lasted 3 months, the British managed to take a rest for 18 years before the second South African war broke out against the Boers.

In the words of Rudyard Kipling the Anglo Boer war of 1899 – 1902 “taught the British no end a lesson”. In October 1899 the Boer forces where mobilized and assembled at Sandspruit on the Transvaal border and the British colony of Natal with a bold plan to strike at the seaports of Durban and Cape Town, if the plan had succeeded it would have caught the main British forces still at sea and unable to land hopefully returning the British to the negotiating table. It wasn’t to be and war lasted for a further 30 months costing the British tax payer £220 million. Some of the famous towns like the siege towns of Ladysmith, Mafekeng & Kimberley, and people with a young Winston L S Churchill and his train ambush, Gandhi who offered to help with his ambulance brigade known as the “body snatchers” and Conan Doyle who wrote his account of the war during the time in South Africa. The peace accord was finally signed at the British HQ of Melrose House in Pretoria on 31 May 1902.

We have tours to KwaZulu-Natal, the old Western & Eastern Transvaal and the Northern Cape, with the Siege Towns of Ladysmith, Mafekeng of Baden Powell, the diamond fields
of Kimberley with the Magersfontein Battlefield of the Highland Regiments, and the Free State Capital of Bloemfontein with Sannaspos, Queens Fort and the vrou memorial with the final resting place of Emily Hobhouse.

**African Battlefields** is a South African based specialist operator located in Pretoria, we supply you with a one stop operation from collecting you at the airport or Hotel using luxury transport, quality accommodation on and near the battlefields and "**Walking the Battlefields**" to re-live the history of some of the most well preserved Battlefields available from the **British Africa colonial conflicts of the 19th century**.

South Africa's Battlefields of the British, the Boers & the Zulu's

Battle of Blood River 1838
KwaZulu-Natal

Bringing to life South African history and Battlefields of the early Voortrekker's and the battle of Blood River of 1838 when Andries Pretorius confronted the Zulu King Dingaan.

Anglo-Zulu Battlefields 1879
KwaZulu-Natal

The Anglo-Zulu Battlefields of Isandhlwana – the biggest single defeat ever inflicted on a
modern British army against the spears of the Zulu impi, Fugitives Drift of Melville and Coghill who died while trying to save the Queens colours, the 11 VC’s at Rorkes Drift of the 24 “B” coy Welsh Borderers & the Ulundi Battlefield and the final defeat of King Cetshwayo and the mighty Zulu Empire on the 4 July 1879

Anglo-Boer Battlefields 1899 – 1902
KwaZulu-Natal

On the 11 October 1899 the day after Paul Kruger’s birthday, the little Boer Republic of the Transvaal declared war against the Might of the British Empire. the Battlefields of Talana, Colenso, Spioenkop, the siege town of Ladysmith, armoured train ambush and capture site.

Anglo-Boer-Zulu Battlefields Tours
KwaZulu-Natal

The combined Battlefields of Blood River, Anglo Zulu and Anglo-Boer wars, combined with the Kruger National Park game reserve.

Anglo-Boer Battlefields 1899 – 1902
Old Eastern Transvaal

After the fall of Pretoria on the 5 June 1900 we trace Botha’s retreat into the old
“Eastern Transvaal” with the Battlefield of Dalmanutha, being recognized as the last of the formal battles and the beginning of the Guerrilla phase, Belfast and the grave yard, Lydenberg, Long Tom Pass and the “Long Tom Gun” site as well as Paul Kruger’s last residence in South Africa, the Kruger Hof later became the British HQ. The tour can be extended to include Game drives in the famous Kruger Park

Anglo-Boer Battlefields 1899-1902
Bloemfontein, Kimberley and Mafekeng

Tours to the two siege towns of Mafekeng of Baden Powell, Sir Charles Warren’s 1884 expedition & Kimberley with the Magersfontein Battlefield of the Highland Regiments. The tour includes the Free State Capital of Bloemfontein with Sannaspos, Queens Fort and the woman’s memorial

Historical Pretoria

A tour of the Capital City of Pretoria with the Voortrekker Monument, old Boer Fort of Schanskop 1896, Winston Churchill’s prison, Breaker Morant’s final resting place, Sammy Marks Victorian House, the British HQ of Melrose House – the signing of the peace accord of 31 May 1902
The related Story

Facing Fearful Odds

But while the Orange Free State was prospering, the South African Republic was full of strife and trouble. The country was badly ruled. The Boers quarrelled among themselves, and were often at war with the natives. They had no money, they had no trade. The farmers, indeed, had enough to live on, but the government had no money to spend on the country. They had nothing with which to make roads or railways or bridges, for no one paid their taxes, some because they could not, others because they would not. The country became a refuge, too, for wild, bad men who wanted to live without law or restraint, and they made the confusion worse.

News of the wild turmoil of the South African Republic at last reached England. There it was said that the Boers had shown that they could not govern themselves, that they ill-treated the natives, that slavery was allowed. All sorts of stories were told, until people began to believe that the Republic was not only a disgrace to civilised people, but a danger to peaceful neighbours. It was also said that the Republic was trying to get a port on Delagoa Bay. That, of course, might hurt British trade.

So Sir Theophilus Shepstone was sent to talk to the Boer people and see what could be done. Many of the Boers were very tired of misrule, and Sir Theophilus was received with great rejoicing, although the people did not know what he had come to say or do. After a little time, however, he told the President that if he did not govern his country better he would be obliged to declare it a British possession.
To this, of course, most of the Boers objected. They wanted to have nothing to do with British rule. But they were weak, they were not united, and so on 12th April 1877 the South African Republic was declared to be at an end. The Union Jack was hoisted at Pretoria, and the name of the country was changed to the Transvaal, which means across the Vaal. Then at once British troops poured into the country, and took possession of the chief towns.

The state of the Transvaal had been bad enough, but in spite of that the farmers would not have British rule. They wanted to be left alone to govern their own country well or ill as they liked. Twice they sent messengers to England begging that Sir Theophilus Shepstone’s proclamation might be recalled and their freedom given back to them. But the British Government would not listen, and the Union Jack continued to float over Pretoria.

One of the reasons that Sir Theophilus had given for annexing the Transvaal was that the Zulus were ready to fight the Boers—that indeed they were only kept in check by British power. The Boers did not believe that, but very soon a Zulu war did break out. It was, however, more against Natal than against the Transvaal.

Panda, you remember, had been recognised as king of the Zulus by the Boers after Dingaan’s death. He too was now dead, and his son Cetywayo ruled. Cetywayo was a clever and warlike savage, more like Tshaka and Dingaan than like Panda, and under him the Zulu army grew great and well disciplined. It was more dangerous, too, than Tshaka’s army had ever been, for by this time many of the natives had succeeded in getting guns.

For some time, however, Cetywayo lived quietly at peace with the British. But as time went on it became more and more plain that he wanted to fight. His young braves were anxious to “wash their assagais in blood,” and as Zululand was shut in between the sea, the Transvaal, and Natal, it was only against white people that he could fight.

For a long time Sir Bartle Frere, who was now Governor of the Cape, tried to keep peace. But at last Cetywayo became so daring and insolent that it was no longer possible. Sir Bartle then gathered an army of soldiers, colonists, and friendly blacks, and sent them to fight the Zulu king.

The Transvaal Boers were asked to help too; but they were still too angry about the loss of their freedom, and only a very few joined. But even without their help, it was believed...
that the army was quite strong enough to crush the savages. Unfortunately, however, Sir Bartle did not know how strong Cetywayo’s army was.

About ten days after the war began, the British were encamped at the foot of a hill called Isandlwana, which means the Little Hand. Here part of the army was left while the commander-in-chief with another part went forward a few miles to examine a native fortress.

The British had been warned by the Boers to be careful how they trusted themselves in the land of the Zulus. But no one listened to the warning. The camp was not fortified in any way, the baggage-wagons even were not laagered in the usual Boer fashion, for the British did not believe that there were any Zulus near.

But meanwhile a great army of twenty thousand savages was swiftly and silently closing round the camp. Too late the British awoke to their danger. They were surrounded by black, exulting hordes. It was a fearful fight. The British stood to their posts and fought till they could fight no more. They fought till they had no powder or shot left, and it became a hand-to-hand struggle with bayonets and clubbed rifles against the short stabbing assagais of the savages. Hundreds had fallen beneath the British fire, but hundreds more came on. In wave after wave the Zulus broke upon the British camp, and above the crash of guns rose their fearful war hiss, their shouts of triumph.

To a man the foot-soldiers fell where they stood. A few mounted men made a dash through the swarming savages. But most of them were shot down even as they fled. In an hour all was over, and the camp of Isandlwana was in the hands of the plundering, rejoicing Zulus, and eight hundred white men lay still and silent on the ground, with at least six hundred friendly blacks. In an hour the camp at Isandlwana had been wiped out.

Meanwhile two horsemen who had escaped galloped madly back to carry the awful news to Rorke’s Drift, where another part of the army was stationed with the stores and a hospital for the sick. Drift means ford, and Rorke’s Drift was a crossing or ford over the Buffalo River.
“THUS DID A HUNDRED MEN KEEP THREE THOUSAND SAVAGES AT BAY.”

Isandhlwana And Rorke’s Drift

A Story of Tragedy and Heroism

At the end of 1878, Cetewayo got into trouble with England, and as he refused to make reparation for certain offences, war was declared, and on January 12th a British army crossed the Tugela and met and forced the Zulus back at Inyezane.

On January 10th the centre column of the British force, under Colonel Glyn, had encamped at Rorke’s Drift, on the right bank of the River Buffalo. Two days later a portion of the army moved off to reconnoiter, found the enemy at Sirayo, and put them to flight. On the 20th Lord Chelmsford and Colonel Glyn led the greater part of their force on to Isandhlwana, leaving two companies of the 1st battalion of the 24th Regina and two of the 2nd battalion to hold Rorke’s Drift. Isandhlwana had been chosen because there was plenty of fuel in the neighbourhood, besides which it was a fairly strong position.

To the west the hill is precipitous, but on the east it slopes down gradually to a watercourse. “At both ends are ridges or spurs that connect it with the smaller undulations of which the more level part of the landscape consists. Over its western ridge passed the track from Rorke’s Drift. On the immediate right was a kopje, or group of small hills, and others, covered with huge grey boulders, were seen rising in succession away to the Buffalo River. To the left of the camp, at a mile’s distance, a long ridge ran southward, and towards the east opened an extensive valley.”

On the 21st Chelmsford sent out a couple of parties under Major Dartnell and Commandant Lonsdale to attack the Zulu chief Matyana, who was in a good position about twelve miles from Isandhlwana. Dartnell had with him mostly mounted Natal Volunteers and Police, while Lonsdale’s force was composed of two native battalions, which were by no means to be depended upon. Dartnell decoyed Matyana from his
position, but found him so overwhelmingly strong that it was considered advisable to fall back to where Lonsdale was awaiting him and send for reinforcements.

As soon as the Commander-in-Chief received the news of the Zulus’ strength, he ordered the 2nd battalion of the 24th, the mounted infantry, and four guns to be ready for the march in the morning, and at daylight the column, commanded by Chelmsford himself, moved off to join Dartnell.

In order to strengthen the camp, Colonel Durnford, who had been lying between Rorke’s Drift and Isandhlwana, was ordered to move on to the latter place, bringing the Basuto horse and the rocket battery. Pending the arrival of Durnford, the camp was left in the hands of Lieutenant-Colonel Pulleine, who had with him six companies of the 24th, about eighty mounted men, two guns of the Royal Artillery, and four companies of the Native Contingent.

An hour or so after the main army had left the camp, outposts rode in to report that the enemy were approaching from the north-east, less than a mile away. Without loss of time, everything was put in battle order, and by the time this was done Durnford arrived with his reinforcements, and took over command of the camp.

The guns had been placed in position on the left of the camp, the Native Contingent had been sent off to the hills on the left, and the remainder of the troops waited for the coming of the foe.

Though they knew it not, for the reports which kept coming in from the outposts contradicted each other, the little body of men were slowly but surely being surrounded by the enemy. Durnford, however, took the precaution of sending out a troop of the Natal Native Contingent to bring up his baggage-guard, sent out Captains Barton and Shepstone to take up position on the hills to the left, and he himself with two troops and the rocket battery rode off to the left front. The rocket battery could not keep up with the mounted men, and was soon left behind, but Durnford went on for about five miles, and then fell in with a large body of Zulus. A dozen men deep, they pressed on towards the little party, firing as they came. Man after man of the British force dropped, and Durnford at last saw that his only hope was to fall back on his rocket battery, and there make a stand. So, inch by inch, his troops retreated, pouring in a heavy fire as they went, and making their way back in good order.

The battery was reached; but too late! All around it lay the dead gunners, and a goodly
number of Zulus. With startling rapidity the foe had fallen upon the battery, surrounding it so that escape was impossible, and rushing upon the gunners with cruel ferocity. Hand to hand they fought, but the British were appallingly outnumbered, and at last not a man of them remained alive; rifles and assegais had done their work.

Thus did Durnford find the battery; it was ominous of what was to come. Still back and back he fell, followed by the Zulu horde, who, with battle-shouts ringing through the air, pressed forward to complete the work they had begun.

Meanwhile, what of Chelmsford?

About nine o’clock in the morning, while the column was on the march away from the camp, an orderly rode up and reported that the Zulus were advancing on the camp. A couple of officers, deputed to view the camp from the top of an adjoining hill, reported that all was quiet, and the army marched forward again, driving Zulus before them.

It was a tragic mistake. As events proved, the retirement of the Zulus before the army had been part of a prearranged scheme to lure Chelmsford away from the camp, but at last the general noticed the mass of Zulus gathering on the plain behind him, and determined to fall back, leaving part of his force encamped. He still did not realise the necessity for hurrying, and so the march back was rather leisurely.

At about half-past three, however, when Chelmsford was still some six miles away from the camp, a solitary horseman was seen riding as fast as his jaded horse would carry him.

“The camp is in possession of the enemy, sir!” he cried as he approached, and the story he had to tell sent consternation throughout the force.

Returning to the camp, he had been staggered to hear a shot ring out, and to feel a bullet whiz past his head. Looking up, he caught sight of the Zulu who had fired upon him, and then—then, going in and out of the tents went men in red uniforms—but with black faces, blood-dripping assegais in their hands. In a moment the officer grasped the situation, wheeled his horse round, and flew like the wind, dozens of bullets singing past him, but all missing their mark. He was going to warn Chelmsford, who, unless warned, must undoubtedly fall into the trap which had been cunningly laid for him.
On receipt of the news, Chelmsford immediately sent back and ordered the guns and the 24th to come up. It was six o’clock when they arrived, and then the little force, travel-worn from marching under a broiling sun, battle-worn from fighting the Zulus in their path, commenced their sadly late march on camp.

“Men,” said Chelmsford as the soldiers shouldered their rifles and fell into step, “whilst we were skirmishing in front the Zulus have taken our camp. There are ten thousand in our rear, and twenty thousand in front. We must win back our camp to-night, and cut our way back to Rorke’s Drift to-morrow.”

“All right, sir, we’ll do it,” was the answer, followed by a ringing cheer which boded ill for Cetewayo and his hordes.

Night came on, and they were within half a mile of the death-strewn camp. The guns immediately opened fire; no answering shots came. The British were dead; the Zulus were gone.

And Isandhlwana—what of Isandhlwana, the tragedy spot of the Zulu war?

After finding the corpse-surrounded battery, Durnford had fallen back step by step until he reached a donga (or stream) about half a mile from the camp, and there, reinforced by about forty Natal Volunteers, he made his last great stand.

The Zulus had formed their line of attack in their usual manner, that of a half circle, the left horn of which faced Durnford, and the right attacked Cavaye, Mostyn, and Younghusband, drove them back, and so pushed on to the road leading to Rorke’s Drift, thus effectually cutting off the direct line of retreat from Isandhlwana.

On came the Zulus at Durnford’s devoted little force. The two guns flung out shells which whistled through the air and swept through the crowding horde, as a scythe sweeps through the gold-touched corn; and hundreds of Zulus bit the dust. Still they came on, heedless of the death-dealing shells; heedless, too, of the bullets the infantry scattered amongst them; heedless, also, of the case-shot which, when the blacks were at close quarters, the guns poured in upon them.

“Fire away, my boys!” cried Durnford; and the boys fired till their rifles became jammed and ammunition ran short. Then men were sent to the camp for more, but never brought it, and at last Durnford gave the word to fall back on the camp.
The Native Contingent had fled, and the camp was held by the 24th and the remnants of Durnford’s horse. Well nigh ammunitionless, they kept the fight going as well as they could while the enemy held off; but suddenly with a shout that curdled the blood, the Zulus slung their rifles, poised their assegais, and dashed in on the camp through the gap left by the cowardly Native Contingent.

The British line kept steady, dropping in their volleys; dozens of the Zulus crumpled up, but the rest came on through the hail of bullets, bang into the ranks of the doomed men. So sudden had been the rush, that but few of the soldiers had time to fix their bayonets.

They clubbed their rifles instead. And then—confusion!

Mostyn’s and Cavaye’s companies of the 24th were killed to a man; Younghusband’s managed to fall back on a ridge to the left, where, back to back, they faced the surging foe, faced them till they had not a shot left, and then, fixing their bayonets, charged. They charged as did the men of old, but they charged in ones and twos, and fought the foe hand to hand, fought from the wagons, fought them on the ground; and died like valiant men.

Meanwhile, in the centre of the camp the fight was going on with just as little hope. The guns had been limbered up, useless because of the thronging Zulus; the gunners were assegai’d to a man. Trampling horses, stabbing blacks, clubbing whites, mingled together in a scene the like of which has seldom ever taken place. “Kill the white men!” yelled the Zulus. “Hurrah!” cried the British, whole companies of whom fell where they stood, refusing to turn their backs on the foe.

Those who did try to escape, pressed on with their faces to the foe, hewed their way through with bayonet, sword, and butt of rifle. To reach Rorke’s Drift and Helpmakaar was their object now; some sought Rorke’s Drift by the track which they had come; others tried to get to Helpmakaar by crossing the Buffalo River. The former found their way blocked by the foe, and were slaughtered on the spot. The latter, mounted and foot, were hotly pursued by the Zulus, who, fleet of foot, quickly caught up the unmounted men and assegai’d them before they reached the river. As for the horsemen, many were shot as they attempted to swim across, and but few of them managed to reach Helpmakaar, some miles in the rear of Rorke’s Drift.
So the carnage, the massacre went on, the 24th standing their ground like stones, piling up the Zulus around them, but with ever-diminishing ranks.

Colonel Pulleine, realising that all was lost, thought of the colours; the honour of the regiment was at stake, the colours must be saved.

“You as senior officer,” he said to Lieutenant Melvill, “will take the colours and make the best of your way from here.”

With a shake of the hand he dismissed Melvill on his perilous journey, turned to the men around him, and cried:

“Men of the 24th, here we are, and here we stand to fight it out to the end.” And to the end they fought it out.

Melvill, obeying orders—though who knows, he might have wished to stay and fight to the finish?—took the colours, cased in their waterproof covering, and setting spurs to his horse dashed through the foe, followed by Lieutenant Coghill and Private Williams. Off in the direction of the Buffalo they tore, fighting their way through by sword and revolver.

They reached the river almost by a miracle, plunged in, Melvill still gripping the precious colours. Williams was swept away by the current and drowned, but Coghill reached the further bank in safety. Turning to see how Melvill fared, to his horror he saw that the latter’s horse had been carried away, and that, cumbered with the flag, he too was being gradually swept down the stream.

Another officer was also in the water helpless. Back into the river went Coghill to their aid—his horse was shot as soon as he entered the river—but ere he could reach Melvill the colours had been carried away by the current. Panting and blowing, struggling against the stream, the three men managed to reach the further side and then set out on foot.

Up the adjoining hill they tore, but behind them came the Zulus in a pack. Exhausted, the three men turned and faced their foes. They could go no further. Two of them only had revolvers; the third was weaponless. The Zulus were within twenty yards now; the revolvers spoke—two Zulus died. They spoke again—two more black fiends bit the dust.

And so, with their backs to a rock, the heroes stood—and died.
Later their bodies were found—pierced through and through, from the front, and the Queen’s colours they had tried so hard to save were picked up down the river.

The tragedy of Isandhlwana was over; Durnford lay dead, surrounded by scores of his valiant men and hundreds of Zulus. Over eight hundred soldiers of the Queen died that dreadful day, while the colonial volunteers had suffered a no less terrible loss.

To such a scene did Chelmsford return. He had left a camp filled with hale and hearty men; he came back to find it tenanted with their mutilated corpses.

About three o’clock the same day a couple of horsemen dashed down to Rorke’s Drift, were ferried across, reported the disaster at Isandhlwana, and warned Lieutenant Chard, in charge of the pontoon across the river, that the Zulus were advancing on Rorke’s Drift.

The messengers were Lieutenant Alendorff, of the Native Contingent, and a Natal Carabineer. The latter dashed off to give the warning at Helpmakaar; the former stayed to bear his share of the fighting at Rorke’s Drift; every man was going to tell.

Meanwhile, Lieutenant Bromhead, in command of the garrison in Rorke’s Drift, had also received tidings of the coming of the Zulus. The first idea was to fall back on Helpmakaar, but after consultation it was decided to fortify the place and hold it against the Zulu hordes, and so for a while check their advance into Natal.
A Swedish mission station, a quarter of a mile away from the Drift, had been turned into a military depot. The church was now a storehouse; the missionary’s house a hospital; there were also a couple of stone kraals, and a cookhouse, and in front of the post was an orchard.

As soon as it was decided to hold the station, the work of fortifying it was begun. With the force at his command Bromhead knew that it was useless to attempt to hold it all, and the outer kraal was left outside the line of fortifications. But the inner kraal, just to the right in front of the storehouse, was included. The hospital and the storehouse were loop-holed and barricaded, the windows barricaded with mattresses and blankets, and, as the two buildings were about thirty yards apart, a barricade connecting them was made of mealie bags, wagons, biscuit-boxes, and meat-boxes. This improvised wall was but four feet high, though it proved of priceless value to the heroic little band.

The pontoon guard was called in, and at 3:30 p.m., an officer and about a hundred of Durnford’s Native Horse, who had managed to escape from Isandhlwana, appeared on the scene. They were sent off to act as outposts, but on the appearance of the enemy fled like the cowards they were, as also did Captain Stephenson and a detachment of his Native Contingent—followed by a volley from the disgusted defenders of the Drift.

At half-past four the foe came on. Five or six hundred of them swooped round a hill and dashed down upon the mealie bag wall, on the south.

Within the little fort were a hundred and thirty-nine men, thirty-five of them being sick and in hospital, where half a dozen men were stationed to guard it and to attend to the sick.

The Britishers were ready, and as the Zulus hove in sight let fly at them a heavy fire which bowled over man after man. Not a shot was wasted; not a man bungled his job, but, steadily and coolly, each picked off his man. So pitiless was the hail, so sure the aim, that when within fifty yards of the wall the Zulus broke their ranks, scampered away in all directions, and took cover in ditches, behind bushes and in caves—wherever shelter was to be found. Then, reinforced by over two thousand of their comrades, they surrounded the fort, for a while contenting themselves with firing volleys at short range.

Then they were up and at it again, this time swooping down upon the north-west wall below the hospital. Down they came, and down they went, for the fire of the defenders was fast and furious, and again the rush was broken—but only for a time, for, rallying...
together, the Zulus made a determined dash which carried them up to the parapet.

Then a fierce hand-to-hand conflict took place; on one side a great mass of Zulus, on the other a determined little knot of British fighting for dear life.

And how they fought! Few though they were, they wielded their bayonets with force and usefulness; rifle-bores spat forth their leaden messages; clubbed rifles crashed into many a Zulu skull, while all around fell native assegais, and Zulu bullets sang, and the deadly broad-bladed bangwana flashed.

Boldly daring were the Zulus—perhaps numbers made them so; they even grabbed the bayonets and wrenched them from the rifles.

Boldly daring, too, were the defenders—British pluck made them so; they leaped upon the parapet, and bayoneted Zulus who ventured near.

But the numbers of the attackers were too overwhelming to allow of the defence of the somewhat lengthy line of the wall, which, besides being attacked in front, was exposed to a fire from the Zulus on the hill lying to the south.

Fortunately, a biscuit-tin entrenchment had been erected from the corner of the store to the mealie-bag wall on the north, and about six o’clock the order was given for the men to retire behind this. Step by step they went back, potting at the Zulus who climbed on the parapet as their foes retired, and then, with a rush, they were through the gap which had been left.

Like a devouring wave the Zulus crossed the parapet and prepared to rush across the enclosure. But the fire from the Martinis was hot—so hot that the enemy were compelled to fall back for a while.

The result of the retreat to the inner enclosure was that the half-a-dozen men left to guard the hospital were now all alone, face to face with an overwhelming horde of natives. All during the fight the Zulus had concentrated on the hospital, and many were the stirring charges which Bromhead led against the attackers. Some of the patients left their beds and took part in the defence, but there were some who could not do so.

These men handicapped the defenders; but the latter were there to guard them and to
save them if possible, and right bravely did they fight, But one idea obsessed them; they must reach the inner entrenchment, thirty yards away. To go out by the door, where the Zulus were pressing in large numbers, was to court disaster. From their quickly-made loopholes the British picked off the natives as they rushed towards the devoted little place; but fire though they did till their arms ached, and their rifles scorched the hands that held them, they could not keep the Zulus off. Presently they reached the walls, set fire to the thatched roof, and so made things decidedly uncomfortable for the defenders.
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