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Welcome back to East Midlands History and Heritage, the magazine that uniquely caters for local history societies, schools and colleges, heritage practitioners and history professionals across the region, putting them in contact with you and you with them.

The first issue on the English Civil War seems to have touched a chord. We would like to thank all those who have contacted us offering help and congratulations. We plan to publish two issues per year, available as a pdf download from our website, www.eastmidlandshistory.org.uk, or in hardcopy from local libraries, archives and museums. Each year one issue will be themed, the other open. This issue, for example, contains stories on a variety of topics across a thousand years of East Midlands History.

Issue three, next June, will be themed around HIDDEN VOICES and we would very much like you to consider contributing an article for publication in the magazine. Hidden voices might include stories about those who are margined or newly arrived, as strangers or minorities, then or now. Or it might mean those who chose to keep their identities hidden or disguised for reasons of safety or mischief, or whose comments or activities are censored. Sometimes voices are not really hidden, it’s just that nobody outside is listening. We’d like to change that, if only in a small way.

Remember, too, if you have a forthcoming event or you’re running a school or community research project that you’d like us to help publicise, do please let us know. If you need advice on archival research or display we’d be happy to help. The EMHH is supported by universities, academic historians, archivists and museums specialists across the region.

Nick Hayes (Editor)

Welcome
Memories of a soldier and prisoner of the Great War

BY GEMMA CLARKE

Charles William Clarke was born on 29th September, 1895 at his grandparents’ house in Gainsborough. Charlie, as he was known, lived with his family at 2 Gladstone Cottages, Morton. He attended Morton School, which he left in 1909 at the age of 14. In 1912, Charlie started work at Marshall Sons & Co. Ltd, Gainsborough as a foundry apprentice. His apprenticeship, however, was put on hold when he enlisted into the 8th Battalion, Lincolnshire Regiment on the 1st September, 1914, a month after war had been declared. He became part of Kitchener’s New Army, one of nearly 1.2m new recruits who had volunteered by the end of the year. Only in January 1916 was conscription finally introduced.

Paid one shilling a day as a drummer, Charlie was sent to France with his Battalion in August 1915 and fought in the Battle of Loos and the famous Hill 60 engagement. Only a month later, on the 26th September, 1915, he was wounded and taken prisoner. After being released from hospital in Germany he was sent to work down a coal mine but due to health problems was later transferred to a farm. Charlie sent letters and postcards to his future wife, May Evelyn Wright, which sheds light on his daily experiences.

Young men volunteered for many reasons: out of a sense of patriotism and duty, pressure, for the adventure, because they were stuck in monotonous jobs or unemployed. Few predicted or could have imagined what was to follow. Initially the training provision was poor; weapons were in short supply. Many volunteers also thought the war itself was going to be short. Charlie was one of those young men. He wrote later from his training camp:

Dear May

… We have started firing with ball cartilage now and it gives you a nice black shoulder with the force that comes back from it … [It will] not be long before we are in France. We have finished all drills now we are firing we starte at half past 4 in the morning while seven at night and it make you nearly deaf. We are having some very nice weather down here now I … wish I was at home on Sunday so we could have a nice walk and enjoyin ourselfe like we use to do but never mind the time will come when the war is over. I think it will not be long now before it is all finished. I will close now with love

From your loving Sweetheart

Charles Clarke xxxxxxx

You are a long while sending me a photo

MY PARENTS, CHARLIE'S FUTURE WIFE, MAY EVELYN WRIGHT, AND HIS BROTHERS CHARLES AND GEORGE, OF THE GREAT WAR
Away from his family and future wife, he was young to be living the life that so many others lived also for this period of time.

There was comment aplenty on the state of the weather: "very bad weather again now," "some good weather after plenty of rain," "living some grand weather just now," and "we are having very funny weather just now," and a quick comment that "my hand is just about better," "Remember me to all," "I am quite longing to be home again and to be with you," and then finally, in November 1918, "I have arrived in Holland today and I am quite well. Look out for me in a few days times. Keep Smiling!"

But prolonged separation also brought problems, anxieties and tensions. Just before his release the news from home was less good, less comforting:

My dear May,

I received your welcome letter on the 28th June and was very pleased to hear from you. I wrote to you for this last six weeks and you say you were three months without a letter. I am very sorry to you and more than to anyone. I sent three photos home one is for you. I hope you will like it. I will close now.

Your's Truly Charles Clarke xx

And...

Dear May

I am writing these few lines hoping you are in the best of health. I received your letter dated the eleven of July and one of the 6th of August. The one for the eleven it quite upset me I can tell you. You wrote to Miss Hartley, and why not. She is a very good Lady, who is paying for my parcels and bread, her home is at Jersey, I have also got her photo, and when I come home I will let you see it, and you can see for yourself - which of you two I want. Well Dear you think I have forgotten you, but that I can never. I have sent you letters and cards regular, and I am very sorry if you have not received them. Well Dear you can see my next photo. I shall be very pleased to received it I can tell you. We are having some very changeable weather just at the present but I hope it will clear up a bit. Well Dear you keep smiling, the sun will shine someday, when I come home, and be with you I think I have told you all this time.

From Yours Ever Loving Charles.

Charlie returned to marry May, and to complete his apprenticeship at Marshalls on the 10th March, 1919. He worked in the foundry as a core maker until he was made a foreman at the age of 60. About two years later he was promoted to Apprentice Supervisor, a job he really loved and enjoyed. Unfortunately, he was taken ill in the August of 1920 just before his 65th birthday and died on New Year's Eve of that year. Just before he died he received a letter from the Queen awarding him the British Empire Medal. His son, Harold Clarke remembered that "he very seldom talked to the family about his experiences as a Prisoner of War but I do recall him saying that the farmer's wife was very good to him and fed him well."
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The trial of the three men on 14 March 1823 was unusual in taking up almost twelve hours—most cases even for serious offences like these lasted no longer than a few minutes.

The prosecution of homosexual offences like those was reasonably common in London—in the mid-1820s there were perhaps 50 to 60 more a year presented to the capital’s magistrates for various ‘unnatural offences’. Between 1805 (when reliable figures begin) and 1812, when the death penalty was abolished, 404 men were sentenced to death for sodomy, of whom 56 were executed (the rest were mainly transported). In county towns like Lincoln or Nottingham, such cases were common but not entirely without precedents. In 1771, a farmer named John Edisson, of Gatesford near Worksop, petitioned the Treasury at London for payment of expenses he had incurred in ‘prosecuting a notorious set of isomorphists, who had committed on their unlawful practices and meetings for many years past at Worksop in the said county.’ At the instigation ‘of anxiety of His Majesty’s judges of the Peace for the said county’, Edisson had arrested and prosecuted several of the offenders, one of whom was convicted at the Nottingham Lent Assizes of 1771 before Mr Justice Aston and sentenced to two years imprisonment. Edisson complained that many others had absconded and had been allowed to slip away which threw them into eternity. Lincoln cathedral’s clock ‘sounded their death knell, and their limbs were trembling with agony’ as the ‘meridian sound of Great Tom was heard and to persons convicted of such a crime, the Almighty had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. The Almighty had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.’

The links between them were discovered in September, when Hackett wrote a letter to Candler at Clumber. The events that led to Candler’s downfall began in the late summer of 1822. William Arden had been living in London, ‘an honest man, and had become acquainted in some unknown way with his two fellow defendants and a third man, Henry Hackett, an apprentice draper in that town. The links between them were discovered in September, when Hackett wrote a letter to Candler at Clumber. At that time, peers and MPs were allowed to receive letters without paying postage, and Hackett had aimed to avoid that expense by sending the letter under the Duke of Newcastle’s envelope specifically to Candler, with the result that Candler’s answers ‘being suspicious and inconsistent with their oaths, could have come to no other conclusion’ Hackett’s evidence ‘had been so confirmed in many essential points of his evidence, that the jury could not but give credit to the evidence given, and to persons convicted of such a crime, the Almighty had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. The Almighty had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.’

The song presented the insouciant Dougherty as someone turned away from a useful occupation, and worldly success, by the attractions of debauchery: ‘Oh what horrid shame! That he should condescend to do such crimes we do not name. A captain in the army too/A tradesman of renown/Who liv’d in Grantham town/To persons convicted of such a crime, the Almighty had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. The Almighty had destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.’
prosecutions, there were no others,
and Candler, Arden and Doughty remained
alone in Nottinghamshire's Georgian history
as monuments of infamy.

However, Candler's employer, the Duke of
Newcastle, appeared to take an interest in the
prosecution of 'sodomites' that extended beyond
the county. In 1826 he initiated a series of inquires
in London into "certain persons guilty of unnatural
practices". He went so far as to employ the
Bow Street officer Samuel Taunton in this
enterprise, but was less successful on that
case. This was partly owing to the difficulties
of evidence, which bedevilled most attempts to
prosecute homosexuality in the nineteenth century.

Most cases turned on evidence such as that
provided by Henry Hackett and, in its absence,
it was often difficult to prove any sexual acts had
taken place. In a letter to the Home Secretary,
Robert Peel, to whose attention he drew the
case, the Duke expressed his disappointment that
"the endeavour to obtain information amounting
to proof has hitherto failed". That did not mean
that there was not "still too much cause for
strong suspicion", but the difficulties of getting
information on the subject proved too great.

Two years later, Peel was instrumental in
redrawing England's criminal code and particularly
reshaping its capital offences. Part of that was
reducing the burden of proof in sodomy cases
to penetration only, instead of penetration plus
emission. That made it easier to prosecute
sodomy. However, whether that was the ultimate
result of Henry Hackett's misaddressed letter is
impossible to know.

Harry Cocks
University of Nottingham

The possession of 'fame', that is to be held in good repute by
the community, was an important commodity in early modern
society. Maintaining this reputation, however, was a challenge
in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, given the partiality
of many to trading insults and accusations of impropriety.

Defamatory allegations could severely damage one's standing in society,
triggering a range of punitive responses, from informal social penalties, the loss
of custom or employment, to legal sanction. Indeed, a person's reputation was
seen as most important. If someone engaged in such, the wronged party would
immediately seek recourse to justice and recompense from the authorities in an
attempt to secure the reinstatement of their good name.

One of the most frequent courses of action in these instances was to seek
redress through the court of the Archdeacon, which was the lowest level of
ecclesiastical courts. These archdeaconry courts had a limited yet varied
jurisdiction, dealing with all manner of moral and behavioural offences that
fell outside the remit of secular justice (that is, that did not break the law).

These included religious non-observance, non-conformity, sexual misconduct,
and the court's most common business - sexual deviancy.

The Archdeaconry of Nottingham oversaw an area roughly equivalent to
the county of Nottinghamshire. It was divided into five deaneries: Bingham,
Nottingham, Retford, Newark, and Southwell, though the latter, as a Peculiar,
fell under an external jurisdiction. Each deanery was sub-divided into parishes.
Nottingham's Archdeacon, however, was based many miles away at the
Episcopal chamber in York. As such he relied heavily on the apparatus within
the localities to manage the 295 parishes under his authority.

Key to this process were the churchwardens, members of the local parish
who served as officers within the church court. They were charged
with monitoring the community and presenting regular reports (bills) to the
Archdeacon detailing incidences of problems and transgressions occurring
in the locality. As members of the community in which they served the
churchwardens were ideally placed to observe and report, but this also meant
they held ties to family and friends which could impact on the way in which
they made the required presentments.

DESTROYING REPUTATIONS: DEFAMATION IN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE 1580-1640
BY HELEN DREW
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Sexual slurs were not the only form of defamatory attack used in Nottinghamshire

Jacks emphasised that many people, including gentlemen, heard the defamation and that "in the meane a scar remayneth upon my integrity and my good name is tossed and wounded in the Alehous by such a one who in manifold respect doth oweth me his minister the performance of better duete".

With sexual defamation immensely damaging – which is why it was a popular form of attack – the victim was often required to prove the rumours incorrect, demonstrating their innocence whilst contesting the claims made against them.

This is evident in the case of Alexander Smith, the minister of Elkesley, in 1618, for whom an accusation of being a "homestiter" required months of negotiations with his parishioners in the attempt to clear his name. Victims could suffer in a variety of ways following defamatory comments made against them. In 1626 in the parish of Balderton, for example, the churchwardens concluded that the Margaret Grab "was, or might have been, hindered in her preemonition in marriage" as a consequence of being targeted by malicious gossip, a baint that may have remained with her the rest of her life.

While defamation may have been one of the less frequent social offences dealt with by the church court, the presentment process reveals that it was both a problematic and emotive issue for the community. Parishes were disrupted by such behaviour, and unsettled by the results of feuds and defamation. Victims often turned to the Archdeacon court for support, but the parish could also be a source of assistance. The victim’s community had the power to save or condemn reputations, and could assist in the informal condemnation and punishment of the accusers who caused offence. For example, in 1624 the parish community of Kellam gave to the defence of a man and woman who had been falsely accused of defamation by the curate. The churchwardens asserted that they and others were sufficiently able to testify in court if necessary to the good character and honesty of those concerned.

Sexual slurs were not the only form of defamatory attack used in Nottinghamshire. Many defamers used accusations of immorality and moral laxity. Churchwardens and ministers alike were easy targets for this type of attack, particularly serious as false accusations threatened their position within the church, and thus their very livelihood. In 1611, Anthony Yates attempted to discredit William Walhed, a churchwarden, by claiming that he was both immoral and corrupt in the office he held. Yates claimed that Walhed was a drunk, a perjured person, and a forger of writing in the church book. Both behaviours were punishable under the Archdeacon’s court, and so put Walhed at risk of official sanctions and loss of reputation. The other churchwardens, however, identified the accusations as untrue and so were able to present Yates as a defamer, rather than Walhed as a drunk and problematic churchwarden.

The details provided in presentments varied on the commitment of the churchwardens involved. Often, the details relating to the person, place, and those present were included, and it was the particulars relating to the audience that revealed the scale of the defamation. Simon Jacks, minister of Staunton, described how he was defamed in the alehouse in 1612. Jacks emphasised that many people, including gentlemen, heard the defamation and that "in the meane a scar remayneth upon my integrity and my good name is tossed and wounded in the Alehous by such a one who in manifold respect eveneth me his minister the performance of better duete".
The Battle of Waterloo and Nottinghamshire’s ‘chosen men’

By Richard A. Gaunt

Over the course of the last twenty-five years, the television adaptation of Bernard Cornwell’s Sharpe novels has familiarised viewers with the heroic exploits of British soldiers during the Peninsular Wars and at Waterloo. The recent bicentenary commemorations of the Battle of Waterloo (18 June 1815) provides a fitting opportunity to re-visit Nottinghamshire’s real-life ‘chosen men’.

The Battle was fought by a multi-national army of Netherlanders, Germans and British, under the command of the Duke of Wellington, to rid Europe of the menace of Napoleon Bonaparte once and for all. It was the only occasion upon which Napoleon and Wellington faced one another on the battlefield. The outcome determined the course of European history for the rest of the nineteenth century.

Some Nottinghamshire veterans of Waterloo, like George Madin (1790-1874), a sergeant in the 33rd Regiment of foot, lie all-but-forgotten except for the bare facts recorded on their gravestones. Madin served in the same regiment as another ‘chosen man’, Richard Waplington (b.1787), until 1815. Waplington enlisted in the 7th Hussars. Wildman acted as the aide-de-camp to Lord Uxbridge, who famously had his right knee shot out in the closing stages of the battle. In a letter to his mother afterwards, Wildman remarked to Wellington, “I've lost my leg!” to which Wellington replied, “By God, sir, so have I!”

There was no memorial to Shaw, nor his fellow ‘Cossall Giant’ Richard Waplington (1787-1835), until 1877. Waplington enlisted in the Lifeguards in 1809. One story relates that, on being reviewed by King George III, Waplington was asked what county he came from. When told, the King is supposed to have remarked to Wellington ‘he’s a very fine soldier, but he comes from a roughish county’. Waplington died on the battlefield, having reported captured one of the prized French standards (or ‘voggles’) before enduring the hands of French cuirassiers.

The initiative to memorialise Shaw and Wildman was only taken up after the death of Cossall’s third Waterloo veteran, Thomas Wheatley (b.1769). Wheatley survived Waterloo, going on to work as a blacksmith at Babbington Colliery. As a resident of one of Lord Middleton’s estate villages, Wheatley formed part of the militia that helped to defend Wolston Hall from assault during the Reform Bill Riots of 1831. Today, all three Cossall men are memorialised by a splendid obelisk at St Catherine’s Church in the village.

Aside from Shaw, the most famous Nottinghamshireman to serve at Waterloo was undoubtedly Captain Thomas Wildman (1787-1859) of the 7th Hussars. Wildman acted as the aide-de-camp to Lord Uxbridge, who famously had his right knee shot out in the closing stages of the battle. In a letter to Wellington, Uxbridge exclaimed, “By God, sir, I’ve lost my leg!” to which Wellington replied, “By God, sir, so you have!”

In a letter to his mother afterwards, Wildman observed, “Lord Uxbridge told me immediately that he must lose his leg and they began conversing about the action and seemed to forget his wound in the exultation for the victory.” Uxbridge was removed from the battlefield to Wellington’s headquarters in the village of Waterloo. Here, his leg was amputated and subsequently buried in the garden of the inn where the operation took place. Today, it is one of the more eccentric stops on the Waterloo tourist trail.

After Waterloo, Napoleon was intercepted at Rochefort and, after considerable dispute over his future destination, was transported to the remote island of St Helena, deep in the South Atlantic. Here, the former Emperor may well have encountered a Keyword man, Thomas Church (b.1773), of the 53rd Regiment of Foot, who was posted on the island from 1815-1817. Napoleon died on St Helena in 1821. Meanwhile, Wellington went on to hold almost every office, title and honour of distinction that it was in the power of the victorious European powers to bestow and lived out his life (until 1852) as a distinguished elder statesman and as the victor of Waterloo.

Richard A. Gaunt

A contemporary engraving of Shaw’s exploits at Waterloo courtesy Nottingham University Mansfield Manuscript Collection
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Rustic and Riotous?
The Reformatory at Mount St. Bernard

Through the nineteenth century the virtues of the English countryside were held in high esteem. The polar opposite of the artificial, man-made town and city, rural society was portrayed as wholesome, healthy, and natural, a place where the poor accepted their lot and engaged in honest toil on the land. In contrast towns and cities, with their “teeming, anonymous populations”, were regarded as “dangerous and dirty” breeding grounds for the crime wave said to be afflicting English society, fomenting the moral degradation of young delinquents particularly.

Many reformers felt that the answer to combating juvenile crime lay within the restorative environment of the countryside. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that rurally-based reformatory institutions were advanced as a solution to the burgeoning problem of urban juvenile delinquency. The years after 1850 saw the widespread establishment of such institutions across the United Kingdom. One such was Mount St. Bernard Reformatory School at Whitwick, Leicestershire.

The Victorian period also witnessed a shift in the nature of the criminal justice system. Rather than the “disabling spectacle... shocking to humanity”, the Victorian era moved to making criminal justice a more private, institutional, and reformative affair. This was a new option upon penal servitude within a structured environment in order to bring about a reorientation of the mind and, consequently, of the character. Industrial and reformatory schools for young offenders became a new system in England and became regarded as “an exemplar in its particular field”.

One rurally-based reformatory undoubtedly influenced by the example of Redhill was the Mount St. Bernard Reformatory School at Whitwick. Established by Abbé Burder and the Catholic monks at Mount St. Bernard Abbey in 1856 in a remote location in the Leicestershire countryside, it took in Catholic boys from major cities including Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool. Here the boys were separated into simulated “families”, each in separate “houses” to allow the house master or “father” to have a close and positive relationship with the inmates. The farm school embedded its inmates into simulated families, each with a house mother and father, as “a means of supplying some substitute, however imperfect, for the parental relation”.

Redhill quickly gained a reputation as being a pioneer of the reformatory system in England and became regarded as “an exemplar in its particular field”.

Further Reading:
influence over their charges and promote the familial values regarded by reformers as “the great moralising agent of the human race”. The reformatory regime at Mount St. Bernard was also structured around hard agricultural labour, putting boys to work (mainly) on the reformatory farm, which, at its peak covered some 500 acres and gained a reputation “second to none in the district” for the quality of its produce. Inmates were able to learn a variety of skills: from livestock care, blacksmith work and field labouring, to carpentry, shoe-making and tailoring. The shoes and tailored items were sold commercially across the Midlands. The boys also received a basic education, which for many was their first opportunity of gaining any kind of formal schooling. The inmates were given moral and religious instruction to encourage them “to look into the fold of worshippers that their souls might escape eternal damnation because of their neglect of their faith and unlawful practices”. The reformatory thus aimed to provide an all-encompassing regime that incorporated education and rehabilitation.

Yet the school was beset for much of its existence by disorganisation, chaotic management and ultimately by the insubordination and dissent of its inmates. It, therefore, never fully realised its objectives of providing a carefully controlled rural environment through which to reform young criminals. Sydney Turner, in his capacity as government inspector of reformatory and industrial schools, encapsulated the early failings at Mount St. Bernard in his 1862 report, which firmly placed the blame on financial difficulties and “the want of concentration of authority in the hands of one efficient and responsible manager”. The period 1856-1864, for example, saw the coming and going of five different managers, all of whom wielded little control over the inmates. This led to increasing levels of insubordination and eventually to several riots.

The most dramatic examples of this were two major disturbances in 1863 and 1864. The first saw many of the inmates attacking reformatory staff, brutally knocking out the teeth of one supervisor, before pouring urine over and seriously assaulting the police officers who attended the incident. A year later a second riot saw 36 boys again assaulting reformatory staff. Whilst out working in the fields the boys refused to continue with their labour and ran off into the adjacent woodland. Three of the reformatory staff attempted to retrieve them but as the Report of the Inspector of Reformatories (1864) records: “upon these men attempting to exclude their return to their work [the boys] armed themselves with stones and pelted them.” The next day “the same misconduct occurred”, this time involving 30 inmates, who broke the windows of a local inn, in order to take revenge upon one of the men who had helped to recapture their companions the previous day, and who was drinking in the public house at the time, such that, according to the local press, “is state of siege resulted”. Although Sydney Turner attempted to play down the severity of the incident in his report, he was forced to admit that these repeated breakouts and the violent conduct of the inmates, along with “the apparent absence of all control” on the part of the officers caused “great alarm” and “terror stricken” the institution experienced a period of relative calm in the nine years following these incidents, upon his resignation the reformatory experienced more chaos and two further serious incidences. The first in 1875 saw some of the older boys pelt “terror-stricken” staff with lumps of coal, before gathering over 100 of their brethren to join them in making their escape into neighbouring villages. The second incident in 1878 saw 60 boys who had been gathered on the playground attacking the master in charge. They then escaped towards Loughborough. The Mount St. Bernard Reformatory eventually had its certificate relinquished in 1881.

Although under the leadership of Thomas Carroll - a new and more experienced manager - the institution experienced a period of relative calm in the nine years following these incidents, upon his resignation the reformatory experienced more chaos and two further serious incidences. The first in 1875 saw some of the older boys pelt “terror-stricken” staff with lumps of coal, before gathering over 100 of their brethren to join them in making their escape into neighbouring villages. The second incident in 1878 saw 60 boys who had been gathered on the playground attacking the master in charge.

The general chaos that ensued at this institution for much of its existence may seem surprising given the relative success of other farm schools such as the highly regarded Mettray and Redhill. Both seemed to demonstrate the curative powers of rurally-based reformatory regimes and the salutary notions that inspired them. Yet Clive Emeley has suggested that such notions were mythical; that the vision of “a contented rustic England” in which the “stability and tranquillity of rural society” prevailed tended to ignore the dissolute and disorderly aspects of rural life. Nevertheless there was a genuine belief amongst contemporaries such as Sydney Turner and Mary Carpenter that rural society was more wholesome and closer to God than its urban counterpart; that it could be a source for moral transformation. The reported success of Mettray and Redhill seems to demonstrate that reformatory inspired by such ideals were at least capable of being functional. Redhill, for example, was “regarded by the official reformatory inspectors as one of the best organised and most successful British reformatories” of the Victorian period. Furthermore, the limited comparable statistical evidence in the Report of the Inspector of Reformatories and Industrial Schools for the period 1854-1865 for example, suggests that the rurally-based Catholic reformatories at Whitwick, Leicestershire and Market Weighton, Yorkshire, realised lower rates of recidivism, 12.4 and 10.5 per cent respectively, than some of their urban counterparts. Although the institution at Mount St. Bernard appears to dispose of the notion of the remedial value of rural life and labour, the failures at this institution were much more to do with the financial constraints (due to lack of funding and overstretched budgets) and ineffective management. Thus, when under the effective supervision of Thomas Carroll the institution enjoyed a period when according government inspectors “the necessary discipline and order were maintained without interruption.”

Deficiencies of this kind are apparent in the troubled history of Mount St. Bernard Abbey, Leicestershire.
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Magna Carta and the Uffington Connection

BY NICHOLAS SHEEHAN

Further reading

Information concerning the relationships between William de Albini and his fellow sureties was collated from multiple sources.

The signing of Magna Carta by King John on 15 June 1215 at Runnymede was a landmark event in British history.

Two months earlier, on 13 April 1215, a group of powerful nobles, revolting against the king's abuses of feudal customs and extortionate military and financial demands, had mustered with a large well-equipped army at Stamford, under the leadership of Robert FitzWalter. By mid-May they had captured London and, just four weeks later, the king was forced to accede to their demands as set out in the Articles of the Barons.

One of the barons who joined the rebel group shortly after the fall of London was William de Albini (d'Aubigny) III (aft.1146-1236). De Albini had shortly after the fall of London was William de Albini (d'Aubigny) III (aft.1146-1236). De Albini had served under Richard the Lionheart in Normandy in 1194 and been a surety in the peace between King John and the French king in 1211. He had held the office of sheriff in the counties of Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Rutland, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, and had served intermittently as an itinerant justice. He was a great-grandson of Robert de Todeni (d 1088), a Norman nobleman whom he fought with William the Conqueror in 1066. As well as his principal estate on the border of Lincolnshire and Leicestershire, the site of his chief seat Belvoir Castle, his lands included a manor in the parish of Uffington in the south-west tip of Lincolnshire, two miles to the east of Stamford.

In setting his seal on Magna Carta, King John undertook to enact reforms which would curb his powers and commit him to govern the country by the old English laws that had prevailed before the invasion of the Normans. A security clause in the charter empowered the insurgents to elect any twenty-five barons of the realm to enforce its principles and obtain redress in cases of abuse by the monarch. Three guarantees, or sureties, of the charter were drawn almost exclusively from the rebel faction (Fig 1) and included William de Albini III. Many were interred through blood or marriage.

Although it had taken place only a short distance from his Uffington home, de Albini had not attended the gathering of the barons at Stamford during Easter week. His subsequent decision to join the rebellion may have been partly influenced by ties of kinship as he was related to several of the other sureties of the charter. His closest relatives were Robert FitzWalter (c.1215-1243), who was his 1st cousin, and Robert de Ros (c.1170-1227), who was his 1st cousin once removed and Hugh Bigod (c.1175-1235), who was his 2nd cousin.

For his part, de Albini remained true to his sureties and remained in the rebel faction and included William de Albini. de Albini's approach was in line with the wider strategy of the rebel leaders to make the king more vulnerable by weakening his connection with the Barons of the Realm. This was achieved by ensuring that the charter was not only signed by the monarch, but also included a list of the barons who were responsible for its enforcement. This list included William de Albini, one of the principal commanders of the king's army at the Second Battle of Lincoln in 1217. Three revisions of Magna Carta were issued over the next decade and William de Albini was one of the counselors who witnessed the final and definitive version in February 1225, which was ultimately confirmed by Edward I in 1297.

During his retirement in Uffington, de Albini founded a hospital at Newstead, which later became a priory. Following his death at Newstead in February 1225, which was ultimately confirmed by Edward I in 1297.

The site of de Albini's tomb is unknown, but it is believed that he was buried at Belvoir Castle, his chief seat in Leicestershire. His heart was interred under the wall opposite the high altar at Belvoir Castle.

Nicholas J Sheehan
Stamford and District Local History Society

Name |
------|
William de Albini  | Lord of Belvoir |
Roger Bigod  | 2nd Earl of Norfolk |
Hugh Bigod  | 3rd Earl of Norfolk |
Henry de Bohun  | 1st Earl of Hereford |
Richard de Clare  | 3rd Earl of Hertford |
Gilbert de Clare  | 4th Earl of Hertford |
John FitzRobert  | Lord of Warwick |
Robert FitzWalter  | Lord of Dunmow |
William de Forz  | Count of Aumale |
William Hardell  | Mayor of London |
William de Huntingfield  | Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk |
John de Lacy  | 1st Earl of Lincoln |
William de Lanvallei  | Lord of Walkern |
William Malet  | Lord of Curry Malet |
Geoffrey de Huntingfield  | 4th Earl of Essex |
Mandeville  | 2nd Earl of Pembroke |
William Marshal  | the younger |
Roger de Montbegon  | Baron of Hornby |
Richard de Huntingfield  | Sheriff of Essex |
Montfichet  | |
William de Mowbray  | Baron of Thirsk |
Richard de Percy  | 5th Baron Percy |
Saer de Quincy  | 1st Earl of Winchester |
Robert de Ros  | Lord of Hemsley (Hamleake) |
Geoffrey de Saye  | 2nd Lord of W Greenwich |
Robert de Vere  | 3rd Earl of Oxford |
Eustace de Vesci  | Lord of Alnwick |

Figure 1: The Twenty-Five Sureties of Magna Carta.
During the war the estate was used as a training camp and later to house Italian Prisoners of War. Nottinghamshire County Council bought the estate in 1952, but it laid the land to furrows to renovate and the house was then partially demolished in 1956, leaving standing what we see today (see image one).

Although there is a wealth of information available from written documents and old photographs, archaeological work on the site has thus far been limited. Geophysical surveys have been carried out around the remaining medieval buildings and in the abbey meadow near the main park, showing the remains of early subsurface garden features. One excavation was undertaken by Gilyard-Beer in the 1950s, which produced medieval pottery, coal and fragments of wall plaster, recovered underground unroofed in situ in medieval masonry. This has thus far been developed to produce a conjectural layout of the central monastic complex, with the gaps filled in using the standard Cistercian layout seen elsewhere.

The remains of two medieval mills have also been discovered and it is thought there are several others. There are also fonts, channels and dams. Many of these we also think are medieval in origin, mainly because of the presence of long-term land holding encouraged monastic orders to embark on large scale landscape projects, particularly involving water management.

This still leaves many questions as to the wider layout of medieval Rufford. The monastic layout remains speculative and the location of many other buildings such as the Abbot’s lodging, guest house and infirmary remains unknown. As the country house and grounds have been subject to significant alteration and landscaping from the 16th century onwards, it is likely that medieval remains have been disturbed and consequently covered over.

With this in mind, the Nottinghamshire County Council Community Archaeologists have undertaken three seasons of small scale excavation at various points around the park in close consultation with Historic England, the Nottinghamshire Monastic Archaeologist and the park management. The purpose of the investigations was to assess the condition of any buried remains, to establish a date for any material or connected to the house, to feed into a new Conservation Management Plan and to develop any future investigative strategy for Rufford.

Previously unknown medieval remains were found at two locations. The first was in October 2014 in the Abbey meadow near a likely medieval well, consisting of large quantities of roof tile. Below a rough wall foundation was constructed with re-used medieval stone packed together with clay and slates and clay-lag surfacing. The surface the floor produced medieval pottery, coal and fragments of an object made from woven copper alloy wire.

The second medieval building was found in 2015 in the main trench near an ornamental stream in the Drangery garden. The walls have been altered and robbed through numerous different phases of work relating to the gardens. There is one area in particular that stood out as being genuine medieval origin, the likely remains of a priest’s house. There was an internal channel running through the structure which is now filled and overgrown. A few metres from the standing run of a course of substantial walling was uncovered. The wall was approximately 1m wide with a rough stone infill. A large medieval roof tile-lay discarded nearby amongst the rubble of a later building. A smaller green glazed tile was also found at the foot of the standing remains giving further evidence of a medieval building. A trench across the water channel uncovered stone lining each side. The upper course was now later, but the lowest courses were of substantial size and from a much earlier period (see image two).

The area of excavation on the Abbey lawn which took place in July 2014 was designed to locate precisely the west and south walls of the church. Out of all the trenches, this one seemed the most likely to produce in situ medieval walls. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Two intersecting wall foundations were uncovered at a shallow depth beneath the turf, in places only 25cm deep. One ran north-south and the other east-west. The walls were 1.4m wide constructed of faced stone with rubble infill and several courses still existed. Yet the alignment of the walls and the quantity of 16th century and later pottery suggest that these were not the church walls.

The two walls could even be of differing dates. It is very likely that the cosmetic material was reused so the walls probably represent part of the house built by George Talbot in the 1630s, possibly the lower ground floor levels beneath the lawn gallery described in the auction catalogue of 1838. Unfortunately no floor plan was provided for these rooms. This still leaves the question as to the location of the church.

Further evidence of post-medieval remains was discovered during the 2013 excavation at the end of the Broad Road towards the current Rufford Hall. As part of the garden landscaping by the Savile family, a wilderness and rides were laid out in about 1725-30. An elaborate set of wrought iron gates was commissioned in 1734 from James Foulgham, a Nottingham ironmonger. These gates probably stood at the main entranceway from the road but were at some point moved to a subsidiary drive, where they remained until the 1960s. They were dismantled and are currently held by the Nottingham County Council in a disassembled condition. The excavation uncovered brick walls which once held railings and the other side of the gates. The walls were surprisingly deep, up to 23 courses in places. Beneath the surface the walls were in very good condition and they may be used to re-erect an elaborate entranceway in this location (see image three).

A driveway leading down towards the house was investigated in 2014. An earthwork can be seen curving towards the house and a trench across it showed that it was constructed of compacted sand. This old driveway is shown on a map of 1835, but unfortunately the post-medieval sequence at this location is still largely obscure.

Evidence for some thousands of years human occupation lies beneath Rufford Abbey Country Park, from a 12th century monastery to its replacement mid 16th century grand country house. The land was initially granted to the Cistercian order by Gilbert de Ghent, Earl of Lincoln, in 1146, and the building of the monastery started soon after. Initially prosperous, by the late 14th century its fortunes began to decline. The Abbey was an early victim of the Dissolution, although the buildings were systematically dismantled rather than violently destroyed in 1536. The land was granted to George Talbot in 1537. It was George’s grandson who built the first country house on the estate, work commencing in 1560. This incorporated some of the remaining medieval fabric into the new building. The estate then passed by marriage to the wealthy Savile family, who held it until the 1730s when rising costs led to its sale. The estate, house contents and many of the garden sculptures, were auctioned off in 1938. The house and estate, house contents and many of the garden sculptures, were auctioned off in 1938. The house and grounds have been subject to significant alteration and landscaping from the 16th century onwards, it is likely that medieval remains have been disturbed and consequently covered over.

The estate, house contents and many of the garden sculptures, were auctioned off in 1938. The house and grounds have been subject to significant alteration and landscaping from the 16th century onwards, it is likely that medieval remains have been disturbed and consequently covered over.

The estate, house contents and many of the garden sculptures, were auctioned off in 1938. The house and grounds have been subject to significant alteration and landscaping from the 16th century onwards, it is likely that medieval remains have been disturbed and consequently covered over.
November 2015 sees the start of a five year countdown to 2020, and the 400th anniversary of the sailing of the Mayflower to America. And what has this to do with the East Midlands, you might ask?

Some of those who made that momentous voyage 400 years ago originally came from Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire and nearby South Yorkshire. These people are known today as the Mayflower Pilgrims.

To mark the event, Bassetlaw Christian Heritage (BCH), in association with Bassetlaw District Council, hosted a special exhibition telling the Mayflower story in its local context. The Pilgrims’ story will feature as one among many about people and their faith over the next five years. BCH plan also to gather, assemble and analyse histories from the churches within and around the Bassetlaw region, and to collect, store and present oral histories from local residents from the Bassetlaw region.

Sixteenth Century Europe was ruled by the religious tensions of the Reformation. The English Church was now Protestant, not Catholic, and in 1603, James VI of Scotland also became King James I of England.詹姆斯一世拒绝了来自东米德兰兹地区的要求。1607年，一群分离主义者在Scrooby聚会，在那里成立了五月花教团。在17世纪上半叶，他们继续进行改革，强调圣经的权威，并在1607年庆祝了第一个圣餐礼。在1607年，五月花教团在普利茅斯登陆。他们签署了一个重要的法律文件，称为五月花公约。因为他们已经登陆在错误的地方，他们的殖民开始合法化。

The Separatists – later known as the Pilgrims – decided to fly in an attempt to follow their own religious consciences elsewhere – attempting to escape first from Boston, only to be arrested. They eventually fled from Amsterdam to England in 1608. After a year there they moved to Leiden, where they lived until 1620. They then sailed for Southampton in the Speedwell to rendezvous with other sponsored passengers on the Mayflower. The ships departed only to have to pull in to Dartmouth to fix the leaking Speedwell. They left once more but were forced to return to Plymouth and abandon the Speedwell – and so the Mayflower made the voyage alone. Heading for Virginia, they instead drifted off course, ending up further north and finally landed late in winter 1620. Of 122 people on the Mayflower, the Separatists made up 43 passengers.

It has been said that Bassetlaw is the birthplace of the USA because many of the most well-known Mayflower Pilgrims came from places in and around here, and they were responsible for devising a signing an important legal document called the Mayflower Compact. Because they had landed in the wrong place, their permission to start a colony was no longer valid. They were thus forced to make a new legal agreement to ensure the whole group’s survival, declaring their allegiance to the crown and to “solutely and mutually in the Presence of God and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation” The Compact, it was later claimed, was the forerunner of ideas expressed in the Constitution of the United States.

This, however, is a story not just of the Pilgrim Fathers but also of the Pilgrim Families. The group consisted of men, women, children, servants, and the ship’s crew – who all shared the risks and fought to establish the colony in Plymouth. And, it’s a story full of young people – William Bradford, who became the second Governor of the colony – was only 18 when he fled Bassetlaw, then England, and 30 when he traveled on the Mayflower.

Bremen was a ‘Master of the Post’ in the village of Scrooby, which was eight miles north of Retford. Scrooby was located on the Great North Road, which crossed the country from north to south, Edinburgh to London. So it was a key route for travellers and for the inland post. Brewster was an important official who worked as bailiff for the Archbishop of York, taking over his father’s job in the mid-1540s. He was in charge of monitoring the financial interests of the diocese (a religious administrative area) in 17 villages. Farmers and millers had to pay the Church rent and other fees.

Bassetlaw’s first Illuminate 400 events to launch their five year countdown to 2020 were held on the 20 November – America’s Thanksgiving holiday associated with the Pilgrim’s first harvest in America. A successful pop-up exhibition in the town Hall, a newly scripted theatre performance of the story by Talegate Theatre for an audience of school children, and a talk by local historian Adrian Gray, were well received. A civic service and evening reception included an address by the Bishop of Southwell andNottingham, with students from Retford’s Post-16 Centre performing a new drama based on the story and music from Ryton Chorale. Students and volunteers from five locations with a connection to the story walked to Retford carrying lanterns to mark the Illuminate theme, which is based on a quote from Bradford’s diary, “as one small candle may light a thousand so the light from another kindleth unto many”.

Soon, plans will begin for next year’s Illuminate 400 and sharing other Bassetlaw stories.
ELLERSLIE HOUSE, GREGORY BOULEVARD, 1923 (COURTESY NOTTINGHAM ARCHIVES)

The beds in the home were occupied by "lower-middle-class worthies and the representatives of organised labour", who battled for the "scrap of what once was a vibrant urban culture."

Feferow now takes this view, suggesting instead that local giving and engagement, particularly in areas where hospital provision remained vibrant and connected, actively supported by all sectors and by all classes of the urban population. Nottingham’s and Leicester’s major hospitals, for example, significantly increased their charitable incomes during the inter-war years. It’s worth noting, too, that major new charitable organisations grew at this time. Some, like the British Legion, sought specifically to address the legacies of the war; others, like Toc H, although specifically to address the legacies of the war; others, like Toc H, although

Not all the news was bad. For example, friends of the house wasted no time in establishing a "team of muckeux" who played on a "jolly opposite the house, on the Foss" so that those patients "who were unable to get out would be able to witness matches from the verandah of the home."

Doctors gave their time for free – their income probably came from patients' families. It started with money raised via private subscription by the Nottingham Sports Club. Its chief benefactor, however, was the Duke of Portland, who, persuaded by his wife, bought a large Victorian villa which he then gifted in 1917 to become the Home. It was a gift made, it was later revealed, on the understanding that the county and city should equip, maintain and manage the Home until it was no longer required. In practice, however, suppliers billed the Portlands directly, causing "quite a little trouble" and consternation. Nonetheless, both were to remain closely associated with the institution, acting as patrons, providing extra funding, a weekly hamper, plus game, meat and fish from their estate.

Complaining about the lack of public interest in this "most deserving of charities", Sir Frank Bowden, the founder of Raleigh Cycles and another of the "most deserving of charities", Sir Frank Bowden, the founder of Raleigh Cycles and another of the

"The question of income and expenditure must be taken up very severely", he continued, "I heard it the other day in Nottingham that there are a great number of rich and well-to-do men who, as far as I am concerned, never give a halfpenny to anything." “Those men”, he continued, "want a home, have a visit, and don’t put their hands in their pockets to help the good work, then their hearts must be as hard as flints.”

More serious were cases of rampant drunkenness amongst the patients. Nursing staff complained that they ‘had to put up with everything, their rudeness and swearing, and having to put them to bed when they come home drunk and sick.’ ‘One day M ... was brought home fully drunk in the care of a small boy, and collapsed on the verandah.’ Even the local pubs were beginning to complain. ‘Notton said his honorary sisters have told him that they leave the patients in the bar to drink for hours and hours.’ Friends of the Home had had to exert influence to stop such reports getting into the newspapers.

Another patient, it was reported, ‘goes out practically all the day long, whether it is raining, or otherwise.’ One weekend he asked permission to go to the football match. The Matron refused because of the weather.

‘The next morning on Matron going through the ward, I ... called out “Myself and Orderly” meaning he required the usual tea money allowance. He had been to the match ignoring Matron’s “No.”

There were other occasions, too, when the nursing staff complained bitterly about the way they were treated by the patients. One remembered a patient arrive late from a matinee performance, after he had been skinned alive, who simply called out: “I go to the match, and I Orderly “in a very rude way. Nurse would have got him a cup of tea if he had asked in a polite way.”

The reality was that many of the patients had not only suffered severe physical injury, but mental trauma also. The medical staff agreed that these men were mentally unstable: seldom certifiable but to a lesser or greater degree seriously distressed. One, for example, attempted to drown himself in the bathroom, barricading the door and filling the bath with hot water. He was subsequently transferred to the local asylum.

One key question was whether Ellerlie House was primarily a home or a hospital. Initially, at least, informality was the guiding principle. Replying to one potential donor representing ex-servicemen, the Secretary stressed its home-like credentials.

“If they wish to invite anyone to tea, they do so, on any day, at any time. We do not control them on the clock or by the calendar, with the exception they must be in by 5.30 in the evening. Of course there are very few capable of getting out unless attended by an orderly so that we seldom have regulations broken.”

The medical staff, however, wanted a significantly stricter regime, arguing that it should not be a “home to go as you please and do what you like. It is from a medical point of view must run. If it is a hospital, you cannot cure people if you are going to allow men to come home at night. ‘Blimey, it is not going to do any good to the men.” In the end it was the medical view that prevailed. Visiting was restricted, meals were served at set times, male orderlies were employed, and a curfew imposed. Persistent ‘troublemakers’ were expelled.

From the beginning the home also served a broader patient audience. If space allowed, those suffering from spinal injury, particularly the local mining community, were admitted on the understanding that if a serviceman required a bed then they in turn would have to leave. This was partly altruistic, but it also helped as an addition to the Home’s income. As the numbers of servicemen needing treatment and attention fell, the number of non-servicemen increased. By 1938 only five of the original war patients were still in the Home, but generally its function had changed. This was reflected in its income streams, so that it received some £800 in respect of maintenance still in the Home, but generally its function had changed. This was reflected in its income streams, so that it received some £800 in respect of maintenance streams, so that it received some £800 in respect of maintenance

The new Wendy Goddall Award for Quality Research

The award honours the former Chair of East Midlands Museums Service and was won by the Galleries of Justice in Nottingham for ‘WWI: Heroes and Villains’. Using archive material from the museum’s collections, family history resources, material held at the Nottinghamshire Law Society and the Society of Friends, this special exhibition explored the local and national impact of the Great War on crime, policing and the imprisonment of conscientious objectors, enemy aliens and prisoners of war.

The ‘Heart of the Community’ Award

The award was won jointly by Allford & District Civic Trust in Lincolnshire, the Swannington Heritage Trust from Leicestershire, the Welford Remembers 1914–1918 project connects the community (and particularly the school children) of Allford and its surrounding area with the events and sacrifice of the First World War in five-year programme that reflects the changes and impact brought about by the conflict.

Meanwhile the ‘Swannington – Surrounded by Heritage’ project engaged community groups to research the village’s history and to develop innovative interpretation – including paintings, models, costumes and books for children – that helped to make heritage interesting for museum visitors.

The ‘Judges’ Special Award

The Award was shared by Swannington Heritage Trust (for their overall achievements) and the Leicester Arts and Museums Service. ‘German Expressionism Leicester’. The Total Artwork’ established the true significance of a collection that began with a ground-breaking 1934 exhibition held in conjunction with German Jewish and political refugees; the project then helped transform the way that way multiple audiences could understand and be inspired by the paintings.
De Montfort University Heritage Centre

BY ELIZABETH WHEELBAND

Built around the only remaining ruins of the medieval Church of Annunciation, De Montfort University’s Heritage Centre immerses visitors into the story of The Newarke. Originally developed as a Roman settlement, the site grew into a significant religious precinct during the 1300s and was also where King Richard III’s body was presented following his death at the Battle of Bosworth as proof of his defeat. The Heritage Centre is designed to offer public access to the previously isolated arches, develop links with the community and provide an insight into the developments and achievements of the institution, including works by students and staff.

Two temporary gallery spaces, which will change every six months, highlight a variety of these works as well as our wide-ranging Special Collections – consisting of archives, artworks and objects dating back to our foundation in 1870. Our current temporary exhibitions are on display until April 1, 2016.

Our current temporary exhibitions are on display until April 1, 2016.

The Road to Reform

This year the country is celebrating two major anniversaries in the evolution of Parliamentary democracy – 750 years since the first Parliament and 800 years since the sealing of the Magna Carta.

Timed to complement these anniversaries, The Road to Reform highlights some of the most radical events in British political history, exploring the growth of democracy and the struggle many have endured in pursuit of representation and the right to vote. These moments have ignited passion and change, shaping the contemporary rights we have today.

Road to Reform also explores how Leicester has always been something of a radical city, its citizens eager to campaign for reform. The exhibition considers the careers of some local figures prominent in reform, abolition, temperance and suffrage.

Contemporary Protest

Organised in partnership with De Montfort University’s Media Discourse Group, this exhibition examines the resurgence of social movements in Europe and beyond, with special reference to events in the UK and protest on the Spanish mainland.

Contemporary Protest explores the themes of austerity, national identity and political discontent to understand the experiences of those who have decided to resist.

Recent initiatives include work on the Spanish Civil War and memory, studies of the media and disability, local newspaper coverage of the First World War, journalism and democracy in Iraq, ethnographic studies of club and music cultures, feminist history, contemporary protest, film and pedagogy in Nigeria, and social media use in the Brazilian favelas.

Recent initiatives include work on the Spanish Civil War and memory, studies of the media and disability, local newspaper coverage of the First World War, journalism and democracy in Iraq, ethnographic studies of club and music cultures, feminist history, contemporary protest, film and pedagogy in Nigeria, and social media use in the Brazilian favelas.

Our current temporary exhibitions are on display until April 1, 2016.

To learn about more about the Heritage Centre including opening hours please visit www.dmu.ac.uk/heritagecentre or contact us on 0116 207 8729.

Elizabeth Wheelband
De Montfort University Heritage Centre

The University of Northampton is running an exciting project celebrating the history of Northampton and the wider county, and we would like you get involved!

Follow Northampton is a collaborative project run by staff and students of the University. Now in its third year, Follow Northampton is dedicated to exploring the architectural heritage of the town through pictures, oral histories, videos and a free dedicated history trail app. The free app allows users to get a fresh perspective on the history of Northampton town centre. Users can open dedicated windows telling the story of individual buildings such as All Saints' Church, the Drapery and the Old Black Lion pub. The app can be used with Apple iOS devices (iPhone and iPad) and is available via the AppStore. Just search ‘Follow Northampton’. The app was designed by iMedia in Milton Keynes and Rob Farmer from our learning technology team here at the university.

Following on from the success of the app, the Follow Northampton team are now looking for people willing to share their stories of Northampton’s disused or lost buildings. This is part of the ‘Hidden Voices: Students, Place and Community’ project. It will run until June 2016.

If you would like to suggest a building, share your memories or simply would like more information, please:

Email Dr Drew Gray
drew.gray@northampton.ac.uk

Email Sabine Coady Shaebitz
sabine.coadyshaebitz@northampton.ac.uk

Visit the website www.follownorthampton.co.uk to download the app.

FOLLOW NORTHAMPTON

APP SCREENSHOT

ARCHES FROM THE CHURCH OF THE ANNUNCIATION

(© DE MONTFORT UNIVERSITY)

In the next issue – Hidden Voices: write about those who were marginalised or excluded, newcomers whose voice is/was seldom heard, those who wanted to remain below the radar (for whatever reason) or whose voice has been overlooked or forgotten.