



by

Thos. G. Williams, Esq.

Aug; 1986.

39, Delafield Rd,  
Abergafenni,  
Gwent, Cymru.

British History Review

I would like to dedicate this book to the loyal people of Cambria (Wales), who have tenaciously, steadfastly, resisted the tyranny, trickery, and brain washing, by the Normans, and their descendants, through many centuries of time, and finally, have nearly won through from their oppressors.

Thomas G. Williams.

WILLIAM J  
DELAFIELD RD, ABERGAFENNI GWENT. 1978  
BERGAFENNI,  
GWENT. BRITISH HISTORY REVIEW

I feel compelled by the obviously one-sided nature of present British history to try to do something to present a more balanced and, if possible, which I think is, to collect the many clues that exist, to bring about a more truthfull and accurate record of the historical events, for the ordinary man and woman.

The period from the early fifth century to about the seventh is the interval no one seems to be able to clarify. Bede wrote about the events of this time, but it was 300 years before he was born, he says he consulted old records, but some historians cannot accept his account of our history of that time, although he was a "holy" man. David Hume in his "History of England" tells us: The historians "Lapenburg", "Sir Francis Palgrave, and Kemble" regard the whole account of the Anglo-Saxon conquest as of no historical value, and maintain that we have no real history of the A-Saxons till their conversion to Christianity 150 years later.

Their leaders "Hengist" and "Horsa," it is said, are mythical personages, Hengist and Horsa being the neutonic names for stallion and horse.

The fifth and sixth centuries have been called "The Missing centuries" because there is no true knowledge of what happened at that time in Britain.

One historian for this period is a supposedly British monk named "Gildas" unfortunately he tells us very little, and that is very denigratory towards his own people.

It is recorded in Roman history that after the revolt of the "Iceni" under their queen "Boudica", the British were disarmed and not allowed to carry arms.

This action created a difficulty for the Romans because, the British were made incapable of defending their North Sea coast against the attacks by the Danes.

So the Romans were compelled to organise a force for the purpose of defending the eastern coast, under the command of the "Count of the Saxon shore".

This force was in addition to the normal occupation force of two legions, one at Deva (Chester), and the other at Eboracum (York) for a time, but after the abandonment of the campaigns against the Caledonians, it was removed.

Apparently the legionaries of the Roman forces were of various races or nations, from various parts of the Roman Empire. We know this because it is recorded in Roman military records, and from the archaeological evidence, such as funeral monuments or gravestones in memory of the departed, giving all details. We can read in the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, quite a lot about early European history.

In Roman history we read there were several invasions into Italy by the Celtic tribes of Northern Europe, at various times during several centuries B.C.

It may perhaps be necessary to explain that Northern Europe from the Nordic lands of Scandinavia, and the Slav lands of Russia, as across to Spain, were inhabited by various Celtic tribes, also in the west some Iberian. After the Romans had subjected the other tribes of Italy, such as the Etruscans, Sabines, Sabelli, Latins, and united them all under the Roman name, they began to feel more confident and powerful, so they set about trying to remove the threat which was always with them - another invasion by the "Celts" of Northern Europe.

Incidentally the name "Celtic" is of Roman origin. Celtus is the Latin name for a chisel, and the shape of the head of the "Celts" was similar in shape, as it tapered from the temples to the chin. Generally the Romans maintained their frontier on the river Rhine. Not all the German tribes accepted Roman rule, because it meant slavery and exploitation. Those who fought fiercely to maintain their freedom, referred to their countrymen who had submitted to the Romans as - "Welsh". This was used for anyone pro-Roman or Welsh when they brought the term to Britain.

Here is an interesting extract from the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" by Edward Gibbon:- Among the useful conditions of peace imposed by the Emperor Probus on the vanquished nations of Germany, was the obligation of supplying the Roman army with sixteen thousand recruits annually, the bravest and most robust of their youth. The Emperor dispersed them through all the provinces, and distributed this dangerous reinforcement in small bands of 50 or 60 each among the national troops.

Judiciously observing that the aid which the Republic derived from the barbarians should be felt but not seen. Their aid was now become necessary. The feeble elegance of Italy and the internal provinces could no longer support the weight of arms. The hardy frontier of the Rhine and Danube still produced minds and bodies equal to the labours of the camp, but a perpetual series of wars had gradually diminished their numbers. The infrequency of marriage and the ruin of agriculture affected the principles of population, and not only destroyed the strength of the present, but intercepted the hope of future generations. The wisdom of "Probus" embraced a great and beneficial plan of replenishing the exhausted frontiers, by the new colonies of captives or fugitive barbarians, on whom he bestowed lands, cattle, and instruments of husbandry, and every encouragement that might engage them to educate a race of soldiers for the service of the Republic.

Into Britain, and most probably into Cambridgeshire, he transported a considerable body of Vandals. The impossibility of an escape reconciled them to their situation, and in the subsequent troubles of that island, they approved themselves the most faithful servants of the state.

But the expectations of "Probus" were too often disappointed. The impatience and idleness of the barbarians could ill brook the slow labours of agriculture. Their unconquerable love of freedom, arising against despotism, provoked them into hasty rebellion. It is stated that the only historians that are available for the period from the Romano-British to the Norman are "Gildas", "Bede", and "Nennius".

Gildas apparently was a Briton, yet he writes with a denigrating attitude and destructive spirit against his own people. Gibbon in the "Decline and Fall" states; Gildas describes in florid language the improvements of agriculture, the foreign trade which flowed with every tide into the Thames and Severn, the solid and lofty construction of public and private edifices. He accuses the sinful luxury of the British people, a people who according to the same writer, were ignorant of the most simple arts, and incapable without the aid of the Romans, of providing walls of stone, or weapons of iron, for the defence of their native land? ?

Under an index Gibbon states; Mr Whittaker in his "History of Manchester" vol 2 p 503-516 has smartly exposed this glaring absurdity, which has passed unnoticed by the general historians, as they were hastening to more interesting and important events. In the light of the foregoing, the testimony of "Gildas" is suspect. Now the next one is "Bede"; Gibbon writes -; A monk, who, in the profound ignorance of human life, has presumed to exercise the office of an historian, strangely disfigures the state of Britain at the time of its separation from the Western Empire.

Needless to say, the writings of "Bede" are very suspect, as they are so much tainted with hatred of the Britons as to make them untrustworthy. It seems that all the English historians since the Anglo-Saxon period have started off on a false premise, in that they relied and believed in the truth of "Bede's" history. In the "Bookmen Illustrated History of English Literature", by Thos. Seccombe, we find some interesting reviews of English historians. Macaulay, Froude, Buckle, and the most representative of the Oxford school of Stubbs, Freeman, Green, and Gardiner. Thos Seccombe writes;- Like Freeman and Green, Stubbs undoubtedly overstressed the predominance of the Anglo-Saxon or the Germanic element in English history and institutions.

It is obvious that their histories are rendered untrustworthy by their worship of everything of Anglo-Saxon and denigration of everything British, or exclusion of a British view. It is evident that the source of British historical knowledge was misrepresented, possibly forged, interpolated, and otherwise distorted by half-truths, which the British population could not prevent.

We must ask ourselves why was this found necessary? Since we cannot accept the statements of "Bede" let us try to reason out what did happen?

If we look at the statements or histories of the most prominent historians since "Bede", we find some interesting insights into the way they regarded the history as presented by "Bede". Geraldus Cambrensis or Gerald the "Welshman" is regarded by most as too fabulous to be taken seriously.

He seems to be the only historian writing on British history in the Norman period, as the Normans did not seem interested in early British history, apart from the legendary tales of "Arthur" which they romanticised and distorted.

After the destruction of the "Norman" power by a "Welsh" army under Henry Tudor, we find in the Tudor age, Leland and Camden.

Then in the eighteenth century, we have Edward Gibbon who is known and acknowledged as a very learned classical scholar.

In his work "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire", he has some very interesting remarks to give us on British history. Gibbon is plainly sceptical of "Bede" and his history, but as there is no other apparent reference, he was obliged to use it.

Next we have David Hume, who is described by Thos. Seccombe as one of the triumvirate of our historians; Gibbon, Hume, and Robertson.

Hume appears to be the only British historian who attempts to lift the veil on the hidden part of British history, the part played by the old British language in the formation of the new language, and of the British people themselves. When we come to the nineteenth century historians, we notice a great difference in the presentation.

It is over-whelmingly anti-British and pro-Saxon to the point of worship.

The most characteristic representatives of the Oxford school are; Stubbs, Freeman, Green, and Gardiner, forming a most remarkable constellation of interdependent historical talent. Like Freeman and Green, Stubbs undoubtedly over-stressed the predominance of the Anglo-Saxon or Germanic element in so-called English history, and English institutions.

This judgement is by Thos. Seccombe in his review of English literature.

Green is known for his "Short History of the English people".

It is in fact all about the English people, and makes no mention of anything British.

In fact he tells us; in Britain alone, Rome died into a vague tradition of the past.

The whole organisation of the government, and of society disappeared with the

The whole organisation of the government, and of society disappeared with the people who used it.

The villas, the mosaics, the coins which we dig up in our fields, are not relics of our English fathers, but of a Roman world which our fathers' swords swept utterly away.

This tells us that the Romano-British population was exterminated, or that genocide was committed, surely if that were the case someone somewhere would have recorded the genocide. Only one case of genocide is recorded in the "Decline and Fall"; it is that of the Gepidae, whose queen the fair "Rosamonde" was forced to drink out of her father's skull, by the Lombard chief "Alboin".

Her nation of 20,000 lived in the north of Italy, she was taken in marriage by him, and she later avenged her father's death by killing "Alboin".

Bede writes of an invasion of Anglo-Saxons after the Roman power had fallen, and the Romans had left Britain with a British army to go to the defense of Italy against the barbarians.

He paints a lurid picture of this invasion, he says that the Britons fled before the onslaught of the Saxons, who then took over their land.

This picture has been painted from the imagination of "Bede" as is shown up by various sources.

Dr. Leppenberg a noted German historian in his "History of England" says it was rather a peaceful take-over of unoccupied areas of Britain.

Recently we have learned from the "Doomsday Book" many facts which other historians have either ignored or were not aware of, the number of Anglo-Saxons in Britain is shown to have been relatively few in number, and nothing like the hordes that "Bede" has tried to get us to believe.

On the departure of the Romans, although the two legions left, there is no mention of the force under the command of the "Count of the Saxon shore" leaving also.

It is possible that the "Coup d'etat" for the take-over of Britain started initially with this force. It appears that the combatants resolved into two factions or sides, the one side "Pro-Roman" and the other "Anti-Roman". It was probably at this time that the name of "Welsh" was introduced into Britain by the German Celtic tribes-men who had been recruited into the Roman army, and who were trying to overthrow the Roman style government of Britain.

So they called the native British who were loyal to Rome and its system of government, - "Welsh", from their experience in their own country.

They were largely Anglo-Saxons and anti-Roman from their history against Rome in their own country, fighting against their subjection by Rome. The coup-d'etat started by the Anglo-Saxons against the loyal British, became a war of attrition, where the tide of battle or contest was continually ebbing and flowing, where the small forces on each side were equally matched.

The British population must have greatly out-numbered the Anglo-Saxons.

We find a similar situation about 600 years later, in the Norman conquest, where the Anglo-Saxons who had enslaved the British in England, were conquered by the Normans, as they had been previously by the Danes.

The important difference in my opinion between the A.S. conquest and the Norman conquest is in the conquered populations make-up. In the A.S. conquest the native British population were all Britons, and consequently they were all interested in fighting the enemy, because, they knew they would become slaves, also their wives and children, if they did not. Consequently they put up a stubborn resistance that lasted almost for 200 years.

Now some of the "English" historians are at great pains to have us believe that the British population was made to vanish completely. It is reasonable to assume that the British population outnumbered the A.S. by many times, but they were in chaos and not organized to defend their country. Bede writes of great slaughter of the Britons, but there was also great slaughter of the A.S., as at Mount Badon. There is no record of genocide, but the "English" historians of the nineteenth century particularly, are at pains to stress that the British people disappeared.

Some say they vanished, but they do not tell us to where, unless to Wales, which of course is ridiculous, and not now accepted by honest historians.

Why should they be so anxious to be rid of the British population? Because they knew the British outnumbered them, although they were enslaved, they lived on. In the light of the above we can understand how the country was then conquered so easily by the Danes, and later by the Normans. And why the A.S. paid "Dangeld" to the Danes to stop fighting against them.

The descendants of the enslaved British would have very little incentive in helping to defend the country from the Danes, or later on from the Normans, since to them it only meant changing one slave master for another.

Although when Alfred made his successful counter-attack against the Danes it was the Britons of Somerset who rallied to his side under their standard of the "Red Dragon".

Alfred used his own standard of the "Fighting man". Now it is obvious that the population at the time of the Norman Conquest was composed of British, A.S.; and Danes as evidenced in the so-called Domesday Book. It is reasonable to assume that the leaders or aristocracy were composed of A.S. and Danes. It is understandable that the conquered part of the population would not be trusted with arms, therefore all the fighting against the Normans was done by the A.S. and the Danes. One of our greatest historians has recorded what happened to the

A.S. and Danish elements of the population in the battle of Hastings, I refer to the great scholar and historian Edward Gibbon and his work "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire". The "Varangians" of Constantinople. Chap. IV. Contemporary writers have recorded the introduction, name and character of the "Varangians". Each day they rose in confidence and esteem, the whole body was assembled at Constantinople to perform the duty of guards, and their strength was recruited by a numerous band of their country-men from the island of Thule.

On this occasion, the vague appellation of "Thule" is applied to "England" and the new "Varangians" were a colony of English and Danes who had fled from the yoke of the Norman conqueror.

These exiles were entertained in the Byzantine court, and they preserved, till the last age of the Empire, the inheritance of spotless loyalty, and the use of Danish or English tongue. With their broad and doubled-edged battle axes on their shoulders, they attended the Greek Emperor to the temple, the senate, and the hippodrome.

He slept and feasted under their trusty guard, and the keys of the palace, the treasury, and the capital, were held by the firm and faithful hand of the "Varangians".

English authors taking their cue from Bede, have with only minor exceptions, played down or ignored entirely the British element of the population and their language.

It is really amazing the amount of writing about what is called English history, when all the reference we have for it is based on the writings of one man in the so-called A.S. chronicle, and later a collection of various scripts by various authors. I have before me a copy of it, with the translation from Latin of 1823 by the Rev. James Ingram.

He says:—"This title is retained (A.S. chronicle) in compliance with the custom, though it is a collection of chronicles, rather than one uniform work, as the received appellation seems to imply." "This collection of manuscripts are dated from 891 A.D. to 1070 A.D.

In his preface Rev. Ingram makes many interesting observations, as; "Hence it may safely be considered not only as the primeval source from which all subsequent historians of English affairs have principally derived their materials, and consequently the criterion by which they are to be judged, but also as the faithful depository of our national idiom, affording at the same time to the scientific investigator of the human mind, a very interesting and extraordinary example of the changes incident to a language, as well as to a nation, in its progress from rudeness to refinement."

In present times whenever any person makes any statement on any historical event, it is very carefully examined and debated before it is accepted as a true fact, and wins general acceptance. However in past ages this did not generally apply. Persons such as Bede could write down any statement on historical events as they pleased.

There are many examples where so-called historians lacking true knowledge of the particular event, have got over it by supplying what was lacking from their own imagination.

Another thing the searcher after truth must be aware of, and which is never mentioned in A.S. or English accounts, and that is the similarity between the British Celtic tribes and the Deutch or German Celtic tribes. As the Celtic language was used throughout Northern Europe before the conquest by the Romans, and the introduction and adoption of Latin.

It is possible, indeed highly likely the Germans and the Britons could then understand each others language.

This would not prevent them fighting each other, as even the various Celtic tribes of Britain, who spoke the common Celtic language, were continually at war with each other.

This way of life went on in Wales or Cambria long after it had ceased in the part of Britain which later acquired the name of England, and whose people had been subjected and enslaved by A.S., then Danes, and then by the Normans.

It is interesting to recall the treatment of the subjected population by the Normans, as told by Augustin Thierry in his book "The Norman Conquest".

After the conquest the Normans set about the task of sharing out the plunder or spoils of their victory.

During the period of the conquest and after, all people who offered him any resistance were killed, or else fled from Britain, as we have seen in the "Decline and Fall".

It was mainly the enslaved British element of the population who escaped the most of the slaughter, so that the A.S. and Danish part of the population were largely eliminated, or fled from Britain.

We are told that in one revolt in Yorkshire, the people were virtually exterminated.

After all resistance was broken, the Conqueror set about the task of sharing out the spoils, or plunder, among his fellow adventurers.

To this end he ordered that an assessment of all land and property be made throughout England, now under his control.

This register was called the "Winchester" book because it was compiled there, it was also called the "Domes Day" in Latin, this has been corrupted into "Doomsday".

All the previous owners of land in the territory won by the Normans and their fellow adventurers, were dispossessed and possibly killed for some excuse or other.

It is evident that here history is repeating itself.

Just as the A.S. had before dispossessed the British earlier, and the Danes the same to the A.S. they now had to suffer the same treatment. Those A.S. and Danes who did not fly from the country and escaped being killed, mingled with the native British slave population, to escape the fury of the Normans.

The Norman military leaders received grants of large areas of land, with

the people who were living on it, and who became their slaves. This land and its resources were held in fief to their feudal leader or chief, such was the feudal system.

After consolidating their take-over of part of Britain, called England, the Normans tried to take-over or subject the part of Britain which had been given the name of Wallia or Wales by the A.S., who had themselves tried to subject the British people living there, but eventually they gave it up.

One of them "Offa" had built an earth work to mark his boundary, for he could not go any farther, it was ignored after his death. Although in the A.S. chronicles you will notice with a monotonous repetition that the A.S. petty kings all went to Wales, and conquered the Welsh, and sometimes returned home safely.

In the end they gave up, and probably thought that what cannot be altered, must be endured.

Still the Normans thought they would be more successful than the A.S. so they attacked with the help of the enslaved British for several hundred years, they gained some ground, as they moved the frontier from the Severn to the Ave in the south, and parts of Hereford, Worcester, Stafford, and Chester, in the north.

After Henry Tudor conquered the Normans in 1485 these lands were not returned to Wales, because the part of Britain called England became Britain again.

Still the Normans thought they would be more successful than the A.S. so they launched attack after attack for several hundred years with out success.

Eventually, vastly outnumbered, with no reinforcements told, so that the Welsh had to temporarily submit, and the Normans tried to win over the Welsh people with a Norman prince.

The Normans were hoping to reduce Wales to the same condition as they had England, to a condition of slavery, but the spirit and courage of the Welsh people was different to that of the so-called English people.

The terrible treatment of the Welsh people by the Normans, after they had been forced to submit temporarily, brought about the campaign of "Owen Glyndwr", who threw the Normans back to England, when they came to take-over their so-called conquest.

It is an amazing fact that the Normans hired paid mercenaries as soldiers in their attempts at the conquests of Wales and Scotland, also later in Ireland, and that these paid mercenaries or soldiers were mostly Welshmen.

It must be obvious that the lives and conditions of the people who go under the name of English have been one of unending slavery.

From the 1st to the 5th century they were the slaves of the Romans, from the 5th to the 11th, they were the slaves of the A.S. and Danes, and from the 11th to the 15th century they were the slaves of the Normans.

It was in 1485 when Henry Tudor and his Welsh army finally destroyed

the Norman power, and brought about peace from the squabbles of the Norman families. So by attacking Wales the Normans brought about their own end. Now possibly we might consider the language that goes under the name of English. Before the Roman conquest of Britain, all the "Celtic" tribes of Britain spoke the same language, "Celtic", which was spoken over almost all of Europe, this language could not be written.

During the Roman occupation of Britain, Latin was the language of the master race, then with the A.S. element in the Roman army, some A.S. words were introduced to the people of Britain. This mixing of Celtic, Latin, and A.S. words was the start of the present language. After the conquest of the A.S. by the Danes, many Norse or Danish words were mixed into the language. The Norman conquest brought a flood of French words into the language. At the time of the "Renaissance", or the rebirth of learning, during the middle ages, and after the 1000 years of the "Dark Ages" since the fall of the "Roman Empire", it was found necessary with the increasing discoveries in science and astronomy, to coin new words to describe certain things. As usual with other things, they had to go to the people who laid the foundations of European culture and civilisation, - the Greeks. The Greeks had already a word for it. These words were added to the language. During the Roman occupation of Britain, the Celtic scholars must have seen the need for an alphabet for the Celtic language, the same as the Latin language had.

They must have set about to supply this need, now whilst the Latin language had an alphabet of 26 letters or characters, it was found necessary to accommodate all the words or compound sounds of the Celtic language, to have an Alphabet of 28 letters. The first writing of the Celtic language known, is a poem of the battle of "Cetrath" (Catterick) in Yorkshire, in the 6th century. The Celtic language brought here by the A.S. was called Anglo-Saxon, there are not many people who can speak it, for all intents and purposes it is a dead language, used only by academics to understand the few A.S. poems like "Beowulf". This language I am writing is called English, but to be truthful and accurate, there is very little "English" or "English" about it.

An American Professor of English has published a book called "An analysis of the English language". In it he gives a breakdown of the various languages that go to make up English.

Here is his list and amounts of the component parts.

Latin (direct and indirect) .....	50%
Greek .....	25%
A. Saxon .....	20%
Other .....	5%

A more accurate analysis in the light of modern knowledge of Philology would be as shown later on. In the "Decline and Fall" by E. Gibbon we read; - Dr. Johnson affirms that few English words are of British extraction. Mr. Whittaker who understands the British language (Welsh) has discovered more than 3000, and actually produces a long list and a varied catalogue. VOL. II. p235-329. History of Manchester. Mr. Whittaker.

Here is an extract from "Hume's History of England. Mr. Davies also contributed a paper to the "Transactions of the Philological Society" for 1885. He states; - "The stoutest assertion of a pure A.S. or Norman descent is convicted by the language of his daily life, of belonging to a race that partakes largely of Celtic blood. If he calls for his coat (Welsh, cota, German, rock), or tells of the basket of fish he has caught (Welsh, basgawd, German, koch), or the cart he employs on his land (Welsh, cart from car, a drag or sledge, (German, wegen) or of the pranks of his youth, or of the prancing of his horse (Welsh, a trick, prancio, to frolic) or declares that he was happy when a gownsmen at Oxford (W. hap, fortune, chance.) (G. Gluck) (W. gwn, gown) or that his servant is pert (W. pert, spruce, dapper, insolent, or decending to the language of the vulgar, he affirms that such assertions are balderdash, and the claim a sham (W. bald orddus, idle, prating) (W. siom, a deceit, a sham or sham.

He is unconsciously maintaining the truth he would deny. A long list of Celtic words in the English language will be found in Mr. Davies's essay, and also in another valuable paper by the late Dr. Garnet, published in the "Transactions of the Philological Society. Vol. I. p.171.

It appears that a considerable proportion of the English words relating to the ordinary arts of life, such as agriculture, carpentry, and in general indoor and outdoor service, come from the Celtic. The following which might be multiplied almost indefinitely, may

serve as examples; -

English	Welsh or Celtic
basket	basgawd.
bran	bran. (skin of wheat)
Crook, Crockery.	Crochan. (a pot)
Flannel	gwlanen. (from gwlan-wool)
Gown	gwn. (a robe)
Hem	hem. (a border)
Lath	llath. (a rod)
Mattock	katog.
Pail	paol.
Peck	peg.
Pitcher	Piser. (a jug)
Ridge	Rhig.
Solder	sawduriaw. (to join)
Teckle	tecl. (instrument, tool)

Mr. Davies also calls attention to the fact that in the Lancashire dialect (and this holds good for other dialects), many low, burlesque, or obscene words can be traced to a Celtic source, and this circumstance, together with the fact that no words connected with law, or government, or the luxuries of life, belong to this class, is distinct evidence that the Celtic race in England, was held in a state of dependence or inferiority. It is logical to assume that the enslaved Celtic (British) population had adopted many Latin words into their vocabulary during the Roman occupation period.

After their enslavement by the A.S. they must have adopted some of the A.S. words also, and after the Danish conquest later, many from the Norse language.

So by this time, we have a fusion of four languages, we must remember that at this time, 5th to 10th century, discounting Ogam and Runes, there were only two written languages in Europe; - Latin and Greek. Many English writers and historians still today try to maintain and reinforce the assumption of the over-whelming numerical superiority of the so-called English in the British population, there is no proof of this numerical superiority, quite the contrary in fact. There is an almost fanatical zeal to maintain an English superiority, which leads this faction to accept any one or anything as long as they accept they are English.

If we examine personal names, we find that it can be very revealing. It seems that very few of the English names are in fact from an A.S. source, which of course is what English should mean.

Many are of Norman-French origin, also a great number are of British or Celtic origin. Many are from the Gaelic. A large number are of occupational origin, also those based on physical attributes.

It seems there are not many of true A.S. origin, if we have studied the history of our country; - Britain, we can see the reasons for this. We must remember that from the first century to the fifteenth, the majority of the people were slaves, and usually had only one name. It was only the Aristocracy and later on the merchants or industrialists that were able to follow the Roman custom of three or more names, Pro-nomen, Nomen, and Cog-Nomen.

With the powerful influence of the Christian religion on the masses of the enslaved peoples, they believed that if they had a name taken from the Bible, it would then stand them in good stead when the time came for them to leave this vale of tears, and ensure for them a far happier time in the heaven they hoped for. That is why some of the so-called English names, are in reality Jewish names, taken from the Bible. The meaning of most names can usually be obtained from a book on Genealogy.

Many years ago I was interested in trying to find out the meaning of

my name, "Williams".

Of course it is obviously Norman, but it was very hidden, because it came from the original language of the Normans, i.e. Norse. In Norse it was "Vil Jhalm", which when translated into English means "Strong Helmet".

The Norsemen conquered part of France (Gaul) and the channel islands finally in the 10th century, and abandoned their Norse language, and adopted the French language in 1042.

Rollo's followers adopted the French language and customs, but they stayed securely in control as a separate ruling class, as they did in England after the conquest.

The use of occupational names probably developed and became necessary in early times, starting like Tom the Baker, afterwards Tom Baker, or William the smith, afterwards Will Smith, he may have been a blacksmith, or a silversmith etc.

An interesting name is Fletcher, which means a person who makes arrows or fleche, and is a corruption of the French word "Flecheur".

It is very difficult to tell a real English name, because, Celtic, Gaelic, Norse, Norman-French and other nationality names are lumped together under the name of English.

Some English writers in writing about early A.S. times and building up an amplified picture, possibly to boost-up their history, link up the A.S. with the Scandinavian peoples, claiming kinship with the Norsemen, Danes, and the Swedes.

What they do not realise is that the Teutons, Angles, and the other German tribes are Celtic, whereas the Scandinavians are Nordic people, and are ethnologically a different people.

As the Norse were the ancestors of the Northmen or Normans, they were a very formidable force in early times, far more of a danger than the A.S., it appears that some writers think they can enhance the English picture by claiming kinship with them.

There seems to be a general understanding or agreement on the part of most English writers and speakers to ignore, play down, or eliminate any recognition or acceptance of the British part of the population, and that the British language contribution was negligible.

It is very difficult to understand this attitude, for most want to know the truth about their ancestors, and do not desire to be fobbed off with a distorted, unreal, and glamorised version, however attractive it is made.

Prof. E. Washley in his contribution to the book "English Language and Literature", states; - "about the invasion of the A.S., that the A. Britons accustomed so long to live in safety under the stern but just Roman rule, were helpless against these fierce invaders. It is a mistake to suppose that they were exterminated or driven into the wilds of Cornwall, Wales, and the Scottish highlands and islands; the Britons were not exterminated, but absorbed by their Saxon conquerors. Their civilisation and language vanished, but the race remained."



This is a big change to what was previously stated about the British, who were told that they had all vanished.

This is wishful thinking on somebody's part.

After what happened during the Norman conquest, when the A.S. had to do the fighting against the Normans, and were destroyed and militarily wiped out, or fled from Britain, whereas the descendants of the enslaved population could not contest the issue, the Normans, and consequently were allowed to live and work for the Norman conquerors as their slaves.

Because of the propaganda that has been supplied to the history books over a long period of time, a large section of the British people have been persuaded or brain-washed into believing that they are different from the Welsh, Scots, or Irish, that they are English, and therefore not to be confused with the others, whom they refer to as "The Celtic Fringe".

Regarding this belief it is interesting to read a report in the "Sun" newspaper for Nov. 10, 1971.

Jon Akass writes an article entitled "Its all Double Deutch".

Accèlèbrated German archaeologist, Dr. Rolf Hachmann, who deserves to be even more celebrated, has discovered that Germans are not all Germans by any means.

The Teutons, he says, are more Celtic than Germanic.

This means they have a lot in common with the Welsh, Scots, and Irish.

The authentic Germanic tribes, he says, come from much farther east, like Czecho-Slovakia.

He has published a book on his findings, which is selling briskly in Germany.

After this, what price the "Celtic Fringe?"

I have asked several German students if there is any record of any emigration from Germany to Britain in the 5th century, the answer is no.

The Danish conquest which was caused by the massacre of the Danes who had settled in Britain after the fall of Rome, taking advantage of the chaos in the 5th and 6th centuries, when there was no one guarding the east coast against such people.

As the A.S. were unable to prevent the Danes entering Britain, they offered them gold, to stop them fighting against them, of course they kept asking for more, finally this led to the massacre, which led to the invasion by Sweyn, king of Denmark, and his army; the A.S. were not in numbers to prevent the Danes sweeping through the country with fire and sword, and of course they submitted and paid the Danes off with "Danelord". Here is a quote from the history of England by David Hume; Chap. III p64-65. Shortly after this marriage, Ethelred formed a design of murdering the Danes throughout his dominions.

But though ancient historians speak of this massacre as universal, such a representation of the matter is absolutely impossible, as the Danes formed a large part of the population of Northumbria and East Anglia, and were very numerous in Mercia.

The animosity between the inhabitants of A.S. and Danish race, had,

from repeated injuries, risen to a great height, especially through the conduct of the Danish troops, which the A.S. Kings had long been accustomed to keep in their pay, for their excellence as soldiers. These mercenaries who were quartered about the country, committed many acts of violence. They had attained to such a height of luxury, according to later English writers that they combed their hair once a day, bathed themselves once a week, and frequently changed their clothes.

Secret orders were given to commence the massacre on the festival of St. Brice, s day Nov. 13th 1002. A.D.

The rage of the populace, excited by so many injuries, sanctioned by authority, and stimulated by example, spared neither sex or age, and was not satiated without the torture as well as death of the unhappy victims.

Even Gunhilda, sister to the King of Denmark, who had married Earl Paling, and had embraced Christianity, was seized and condemned to death, after she had seen her husband and her children butchered before her face.

In the agonies of despair, this unhappy princess foretold that her murder would soon be avenged by the total ruin of the English nation. Never was prophecy more strictly fulfilled, and never did barbarous policy prove more fatal to its authors.

Sweyn and his Danes appeared the next year off the eastern coast, and took full revenge for the slaughter of their people. Twice was Ethelred reduced to the infamy of purchasing a precarious peace.

At length towards the close of 1013. A.D., Sweyn being virtually sovereign of England, and the A.S. leaders everywhere swearing allegiance to him, Ethelred, equally afraid of the violence of the enemy and of the treachery of his own subjects, fled into Normandy, whither he had sent his queen Emma and her two sons, Alfred and Edward.

This Danish conquest and the settlement of numbers of Danish people in Britain made a noticeable difference to the language of the ordinary people.

Bearing this in mind our analysis of the language should be thus;

Latin .....	50%
Greek .....	25%
Celtic)	
Anglos).....	25%
Norse )	1
	100%

I would like to point out to readers that the inability of the A.S. to defend themselves against the Danes, shows that they were rather thin on the ground, and that the enslaved British took no part in the defence of the country, this is evident from the action of the A.S. 1000 181.

in progress, was the work of Sir Francis Palgrave, the "Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth".

But if it be the object of an historic work to promote a critical knowledge of history, and to aid the solitary student in his researches, mere literary or bibliographic notices will be found wholly inadequate; and, as a basis for such researches an accurate review of the several authorities, of their peculiarities and deviations from each other, must be set forth.

Among no historic writers are we more to seek for such information, than among those of England, with the exception, perhaps, of Lingard and Palgrave, and even these seem to have been guided rather by accident, though not always followed, tact, than by a scientifically founded view.

Hence by English historians, chroniclers are not infrequently adduced as authorities, who in the present work are either not cited at all, or in those rare cases only when their original sources cannot be traced, such as :- Mathew of Westminster, Roger of Hoveden, John Bromton, William Anygton and others.

With correct and critical editions of the several authorities, which might serve as a compass whereby to steer on the dark ocean of history, England is but ill provided for.

The study of English history would have been exceedingly facilitated, had the edition of the English historians to the year 1500 A.D. commenced under the authority of the late Parliamentary Commission, appointed for the preservation and publication of British historical and legal monuments, been carried on to completion; there being not only many excellent manuscripts still unused of the chronicles already; - though for the most part very indifferently edited, but also a considerable number of important historic sources that have never yet appeared in print.

Had this design been carried out in a way commensurate with the means possessed by the commission, England might, at no distant period, have exulted in a collection of historical and legal monuments excelling those of other countries in as great a degree as her present printed chronicles are inferior to the historical collections of Italy, France, Germany and Denmark.

The wish for a complete collection of the English historians of the Middle Ages was first publicly expressed by Gibbon; - that his wish was not carried out into effect is a matter of deep regret. The hope once fostered by the historic inquirer, of deriving considerable information respecting the earliest history of Britain from our Welsh sources has not been realised.

The history of Wales and Cornwall has undoubtedly received some illustration; highly interesting is it also to have determined the very great antiquity of the poems of the bards Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarch Hen and Merddyn, some of which may probably be assigned to the 6th century.

This slight review may serve to call the attention of everyone familiar with such studies, who are desirous to use the A.S. chronicles, on the several copies of which, the oldest Latin chronicles of England are based, in any original or derived form, to the difficulties

any welcome and a stimulating phenomenon, therefore, while my volume was demanded time, which should rather have been devoted to the work these

Even the simple work of procuring the most important original authorities and preparing them for use, all authorities and preliminary

to feel that the establishment of such a work, even in cases where the countrymen and professors, in which the lovers of that study are not

to do English history, no the paths opened to him by some honours of the country, and in knowledge of general history, while to the

Of modern writers, the greater number, though industrious were want only a very little more to the

And the collection of the MSS. of the MSS. in its present condition, and the objects of the MSS. are not in the MSS. in the MSS.

presented themselves, more particularly with reference to the early

understanding arrived, greater difficulties than had been anticipated

and however, the wished for leisure for forming the plan of the new

disclosures, the hope of being useful, even to the scholar, through some new

ly in intimate connection with the English court, which tend to the

ion of England in the latter years of Queen Elizabeth, was frequent

preserved at Hamburg, which city, previously to the great level

of the Middle Ages, the use of valuable records, of which some are

while various occupations connected with the history of the commerce

whether he should ordain not devote himself to the undertaking,

such were the points urged against the doubts of the authorities to

In common life offer themselves even to this day, to the lower Saxon;

and personal observation; the illustration of the A.S. tongue, which

proximity to that country, like favourable to literary intercourse

the industry and other circumstances of the present England; the

community of possession there, in knowledge relative to the commerce

far kingdom, are richer than most others of Germany, the valuable

of the MSS. the MSS. in works relative to the MSS. in the MSS.

tending an exact critical examination of that estimable relic. From the time of Bede to that of William of Malmesbury, a space near 400yrs, England possessed no chronicler who recorded independently of the A.S. chronicle, the history of the whole country, an inquiry into the sources and authors of that work is the more desirable.

earnest endeavors to know and make known those sources of old English history, which are at present accessible, would have been far from successful, had not the chiefs of the libraries at Göttingen, Göttinger, Kiel and Wolfenbutel most kindly favoured me with the long and uninterrupted use of many rare works and manuscripts necessary for such investigations.

able feeling it my duty to express to these estimable friends, my sincerest gratitude for the confidence and benevolence shown me, I feel myself called on again to mention my valued friend Mr Cooper, whose influential mediation I am indebted, not only for many high interesting and important works for the Norman and later portions of English history, but also for the communication, before the completion of the present work, of several valuable materials, prepared under the Record Commission, for A.S. history, which he granted to the personally unknown foreigner, for his particular use, previously to their publication.

ly that which is here given appear not wholly unworthy of such honorable confidence. Hamburg 16th Sept. 1833. J. M. Lappenburg.

the public affairs had, in consequence of the departure of the Romans and the inroads of enemies, fallen into the utmost disorder. That which had formerly been public or private property of the Romans became, either by purchase or usurpation a new unsettled possession in the hands of a people who had long forgotten how to govern. The inhabitants of the island were at that time, as their language now, scarcely to be called Romanised, on the contrary the posterity of the Romans among them had rather assimilated themselves to the original Britons.

In this state of dissolution it must have been an easier task to the conquerors of Britain than that which their warlike brethren found it the better organised states of Europe, to obtain possession of the object of their efforts, without causing the rights of the stranger to be felt in the most oppressive manner.

Indeed the very gradual progress made in the occupation of many parts of Britain by detached hordes, independent of each other, and of various recesses, almost induces us to regard it less as a conquest than as a progressive usurpation of the British territory.

From the circumstance that the A.S. had to pass over in ships to the country destined for their future home, it follows that they brought with them but few women and children, and as "Vor-Rigern" had no repugnance to a union with the daughter of "Hengist" it is probable that the German warriors, with the exception perhaps, of a few of noble race, would not disdain to unite themselves with the British women.

The chronicle of Caradoc, a monk of Llanerwan, has been estimated too highly with regard to English history. This work which reaches to the year 1156, has been translated and edited, first by H. Lloyd and Dr. Fowell in 1584, and secondly in 1697 by H. Wynne.

Its chief basis is the A.S. chronicle, and a Welsh chronicle, into which the author has interwoven many British traditions, though very uncritically and unchronologically. It is believed to have been composed in the monastery of Strata Florida. Some manuscripts are as early as 1410. A similar work by John Brechfa is likewise much esteemed by inquirers into Welsh history, an edition of which, as well as of other British monuments, hitherto little known, or possibly wholly unknown to us, would, without doubt, shed considerable light on the history of the remnant of a great people, which has with remarkable tenacity, preserved its nationality throughout a period of 2000 years.

The Welsh chronicle used by Caradoc is probably the "Chronicon Wallie" from the year 444 to 954, together with the beginning of the continuation of the same, or the "Chronicon Cambrie" to the year 1286.

An edition of both is given in the "Corpus Historicum" under the title of "Annales Cambriae".

The chronology followed in these Annales is not reckoned from the birth of Christ, but begins with a year which may possibly be intended for that of the coming of the Saxons, but which would indicate an adherence to the A.S. chronology, while among the Welsh we might rather expect to find a continuation of the Roman Annals. The uncertainty arising from this mode of calculating is the more to be regretted, as these few pages, notwithstanding their brevity of detail, contain valuable notices of the rulers, and of the military history of the British tribes, and the general history of the Britons, as it has hitherto been known to us from Caradoc, acquires from them numerous as well as important additions and rectifications. The Chronicle of the Princes of Wales, written in Welsh, entitled "Brut Y Tywysogion" begins with the abdication of "Cadwalader", in the year 681, in which Tysilio and Geoffrey of Monmouth terminate, and is continued to the conquest of Wales by Edward 1st.

The oldest Irish chronicles, written partly in Irish and partly in Latin, contain but little useful matter for A.S. history, though they report some circumstances illustrative of the battles of the inhabitants of Scotland and Wales with A.S., with a few other-wise unknown particulars, and some variations, which cannot, however, shake our faith in Bede and the A.S. chroniclers, but deserve attention as originating from other records of history.

It was not until the fall of the Stuarts and the rise of the commons of England, that the country first gained a tolerable history of the A.S. in the mother tongue, by the hand of him, who, above all others, successfully employed the Germanic element of his language;— the exalted John Milton.

One class of the population at the period of the Norman conquest consisted of the unfree or servile, whose numbers, as registered in the "Doomsday Book", was little above 25,000. Of these the majority were in a state of slavery by birth, where their fore-fathers had been either Roman slaves, British prisoners of war, or other enemies.

The difference of the number of servile in the several provinces is particularly remarkable. They appear most numerous in the territories where the British population maintained itself the longest, viz; in the old land of the "Hwiccas", more especially in Gloucester, where the proportion existed of one slave to every third freeman, and in Cornwall, Devon and Stafford, where there were one to five freemen. The further we remove from the Welsh border, the smaller is the proportion of the slave to the freeman.

As readers will notice I have quoted extracts from the History of England by Dr. Leppenburg.

It will be obvious to most people that as Dr. Leppenburg has pointed out, there is a serious deficiency in the early historical records of Britain, and also a lack of an investigative zeal to corroborate the presently accepted ideas of our history, or to disprove them as worthless, unless they can be unequivocally established beyond all doubt. All the lack of investigative motive and the abandonment of several moves designed to remedy this sorry state of our early historical records, over a considerable space of time, leads one to think that certain interests are deliberately pursuing this policy, because they do not want the truth to be revealed.

I recall the difficulties experienced by the Rev. A. Wade-Evens when he had his book on our early British history, "The Emergence of England & Wales", ready for the press.

Apparently he could not get the book published in England, so his friend Mr. Gros Jean of Belgium, had the first edition printed in Belgium.

Notes on Rev. Whittakers book "History of Manchester".

There are four books in two volumes.

I was able to see these two books in Newport Library.

quote;- Mr. Hume appears in his history to be frequently seduced from the truth, by pursuing a splendour of sentiment, and led away by an affectation of singularity into wildness, and extravagance. And he sometimes appears adapting his sentiments to his situation, and throwing out such observations as will best serve the present purpose.

Appendix No II. I have here subjoined what I have frequently referred to in the work, the itinerary of Ricardus Corinensis. Such a curiosity ought no longer to be locked up in the few copies of Dr. Stuxley's comment, or the fewer of Mr. Bertrams original, to this end I have added the the parallel parts of Antonines, that the one may reflect a light on the other.

And I have annexed to the whole, the modern places corresponding to the each ancient name, as they are assigned by Gale, Horseley and Stuxley. Preface;- if we compare the endeavors of our country-men for the illus-

tration of our antiquities with those of other nations, we shall find the preference both in numbers and matter, due to us. The Italians and French are our only competitors. The latter have acquired, the former are born with, a passion for antiquities.

Both will teach us a style, when we have ascertained our knowledge, and we may borrow from the one a portion of scepticism, to contrast with the assiduity of the other.

The French carrying those engaging talents they possess in the general elixir of literary pursuits, into their antiquarian researches, have handled those obscure subjects with the same ease as romances, without going so deep as graver nations, even their superficial knowledge appears to greater advantage by an animated style, and pertinent reflections, while our language is capable of concise judicious remarks, is drawn out into tedious unanimated narrative in such compositions.

Those who have hitherto treated our topographical antiquities seem to have trodden only in mazes overgrown with thorns, neglecting the flowery paths with which the wilderness of obscurity is diversified. Incorrect pedigrees, futile etymologies, verbose disquisitions, and crowds of epitaphs, lists of landholders, and such farrago, thrown together without method, unanimated by reflections, and delivered in the most uncouth and horrid style, make the bulk of our county histories.

Such works bring the study of antiquities into disgrace with the generality, and disgust the most candid curiosity.

The History of Manchester is attempted upon a different plan, upon that which has long appeared to the author the only judicious and manly one for a work of antiquities.

Had he foreseen the full extent of his scheme at first, he should not have had the hardiness to form it.

And had he known, in any part of the execution, the time and labour which the rest would have cost him, he had certainly shrunk back from the attempt, and closed the whole work immediately.

He once designed to have deduced the history only to the conquest.

The whole is divided into four books, containing as many periods; the British and Romano-British, the Saxon, the Danish and Norman, and the modern.

The reader must not expect in this work, merely, the private and uninteresting history of a single town.

He may hope to meet with all the curious particulars that can with any propriety be connected with it.

Our national history before the Roman conquest is the most important and remarkable in our annals.

It most forcibly lays hold on the passions, by the quick succession and active variety of its incidents, and the decisive greatness of its revolutions, and, what is more, it is that portion of our annals which gives the body and the form to all the succeeding centuries of them. It contains the commencement of every part of our public and private economy.

And yet this period has been more wretchedly described than any other,

and continues to this day, loaded with difficulties, and embarrassed with obscurities, on every side. But the present writer hopes to unfold many a dark and entangled clue to this history, and to settle at last upon decisive principles, the origin and transactions of the Picts, the Scots, the Saxons, and the Danes, the conduct of the provincials on the departure of the Romans, and the genuine annals of "Arthur" and of "Alfred".

We have seen some extracts from the History of England written by Dr. Lappenburg, who tells us that he had the use of the libraries of most of the north German towns, such as Gottingen, Hanover, Kiel, and Wolfenbutel.

He said, they favoured me with the long and un-interrupted use of many rare works and manuscripts, necessary for such investigations. Yet, with all this free facility, he is unable to give us any evidence of an emigration of Germans to Britain in the fifth century.

From the statements of Bede, who quotes vast numbers of Germans coming to Britain in the fifth century, (without any proof) and the tales about the British leader "Vor-tigern" inviting the Germans over to Britain, surely if these statements were true, they would have been recorded in the historical records of Germany.

The name "Vor-tigern" is not a mans name as it is given in most histories, but it is a rank or title.

Correctly it is "Vor-teyrn" translated it is Vor-Over, Teyrn-Konarch. So loosely it means Over-all Konarch or King.

If there had been any evidence of an organised force leaving Germany at that time surely Dr. Lappenburg would most certainly have told us all about it.

Reading between the lines, it is evident to me that Dr. Lappenburg was disappointed in not finding any confirmatory evidence of the evidence of the so-called A.S. invasion of Britain in the fifth century, amongst the ancient records of the N. German towns.

And that he was hopeful that the ancient records in Britain would supply the necessary corroboration and proof required to establish the assertions as true facts.

After an examination of the available sources in Britain, which is only Bede's writings, he soundly criticises the lack of any real evidence to substantiate the assumptions and assertions that had been made.

So it would appear that the way in which the A.S. came to Britain, was, as members of the Roman legions.

It is evident that the forces of the A.S. could not have been a great number, because the subjection of the Romano-British took a long time, almost 200 years, if the A.S. had been strong in numbers, they might have accomplished the conquest in a short space of time. After they had subjected part of the British population, they started to call that part of Britain by the name of the part of Germany from which they came.

The unconquered part of the British population fought a successful rear-guard action, but were confined to the western side of Britain,

where they maintained their freedom, and independent way of life, and sustained the ancient British way of life, and the ancient Celtic language.

Dr. Lappenburg pays tribute to the amazing fact of this part of the British nation having sustained their language and individuality over 2,000 years of history.

The only part of Europe where the ancient Celtic tongue of Europe is still used, and alive, and where some of its people still play an active part in the government of Britain.

It will be obvious to any person of average intelligence, after reading the fore-going remarks and extracts from independent authors, none of whom could be accused of any bias towards the British, that the British side of our history has been deliberately destroyed and ignored or misrepresented, by many so-called historians.

This belief becomes increasingly obvious when we read the accounts of our history as presented by the 19th century English historians, especially when you have read the Welsh accounts of our history.

Readers will have read about the remarks made on our British history by various authors, on the curious lack of any true, authentic, and corroborated evidence of our early history.

And when steps were taken to rectify these sad omissions of the true accounts of our history, they were all thwarted by some means or other.

It is apparent that many of the British people realise that there is something very suspicious about our written history, without being able to say definitely what it is.

It seems that a powerful minority have collaborated to glorify every thing English and to eliminate every aspect of British.

This seems to have come into prominence particularly during the 19th century, and it may have some connection with the rise of the British Empire.

To quote an example of this;- the channel of water between Britain and France was known as the British channel ever since Roman times, but about the middle of the 19th century it became known as the English channel.

Also the Severn estuary has come to be called the Bristol channel. The sailing ships had to wait in the Severn until the tide was full, so that they could go up the Bristol channel or River Avon to the port of Bristol.

Also these people tried their best to claim that the county of Monmouth was part of England, and for many years they used South Wales and Monmouthshire. Yet in the Act of Union 1536 Henry Tudor states;- "I formed the county of Monmouth out of the lands of the Principality of Wales." The same way in which the Romans gradually over-powered their neighbors, by hook or by crook, by fair means or foul, until they became the most powerful and most hated people in Europe.

This hidden minority in England have taken advantage of every little circumstance that has helped them to make English dominant.

It goes under the name of English, but if we trace it through history, it is probably the Norman character.

The Normans realised they had to conquer Wales and Scotland to be secure.

So they started the conquest of all their neighbors, as did the Normans.

They conquered England in four years, then for 200 years they tried to conquer Wales, but after a partial success, after which they staged a farce of crowning a Norman Prince of Wales.

When they went into Wales to collect the rewards of their so-called conquest, they were sent packing back to England by Owen Glyndwr who had consolidated Welsh resistance to the Normans.

Later Henry Tudor and his Welsh army destroyed them and their power.

They tried to conquer Scotland, failed, but succeeded in their conquest of Ireland, which was continued by the "Tudors" after the Norman power had been destroyed, but the same spirit of dominating their neighbors was present with the "Tudors".

This was shown when the 'Union of England & Wales' was brought about, and through marriage the union with Scotland.

The union of England & Wales was done by Henry Tudor without the consent of the people of Wales or England.

The same as the union of England & Wales to Scotland was brought about without the consent of the Scottish people.

The eventual union was brought about by the bribery of the Scottish nobles to agree to it. 1704.

Ireland was forcibly taken by the Normans in the conquest of the Irish people.

After several hundred years the Irish people obtained their freedom from the invaders of their country.

When the Romans brought about the union of all the people of Italy, it meant the extinction of the other peoples, names such as the Etruscans, Sabines, Latins, Sabelli, etc, many of whom were far more civilized and cultured than the Romans, as were the Greeks.

So it is working out in Britain, if England could have maintained its empire and consequently its economic power, gradually Wales would lose its identity, and become so-called English, the same would have happened to Scotland.

Now fortunes wheel has changed the process, Ireland first of all Ireland herself from process of destruction.

With England having lost the source of its economic power, and having to join with other European nations to preserve itself, it will save Scotland and Wales from losing their identities, and being absorbed into England.

Of course if the establishment had been really serious about what it pays so much lip service to i.e. Freedom, Justice, and Democracy, it would have set up a real union of federal nations in the British Isles, respecting each other, and dealing fairly with each other.

As it is we have one dominating the others, and not dealing fairly with the others, but seeking to efface the individuality and different cultures of the others.

In reviewing the circumstances and implications of the Norman conquest, it can give us a valuable guide to the conditions and numerical proportions of the peoples who lived in the part of Britain which had come to be called England.

Since we cannot give credence to the historical writings of Bede, we must try to fathom out the truth by a method of comparison and logical deduction.

The Norman army was composed of 20,000 Normans, 20,000 Bretons, and 20,000 French, in all 60,000 men, in the battle of Hastings they lost 15,000 men killed, this left them with 45,000 men.

We do not know the number of men in the English army, or the number killed.

The Norman scouts reported the position of any pockets of armed resistance by the A.S. to the conqueror, who then eliminated them.

In four years with this force they conquered the A.S., who it seems would not use the help of the British population, in case of a revolt against them.

From these established facts we can see that the numbers of the A.S. must have been very small indeed as they could not defend the country they had taken over, against such a small army of invaders.

Another pointer is, that on the invasion of the Danes the A.S. were so thin on the ground, they were unable to stop them, and resorted to paying them gold to stop fighting them. (Dangeld)

The British were impotent witness's.

It must be obvious from this that the numbers of the A.S. must have been very small indeed, and we can now understand why it took them from about 450 A.D. to 700 A.D., to overcome the resistance of the unarmed British population.

The small numbers and long time taken, point to a coup'd etat rather than an invasion, such as Bede would have us believe.

The so-called English historians, particularly the 19th century ones, realised the danger that their distortion and fabrication of the history would have to withstand was from the existence of the British population, which accordingly they tried to make disappear, or to be assumed as English.

Now some among the historians have adapted their stories, and admit that the British did not disappear or was driven into Wales.

They now say they were absorbed by the English.

When we examine the numbers of the A.S. and Danes, it is logical to believe that it was the British who absorbed the Danes and Normans.

After studying our country's history for the past 15 years, since I retired from industry, I feel I am in a position to give a reasonable and balanced summary of some of the historical events of our country's history, I do not mean the names of Kings and Queens, but the fundamental changes such as the Norman conquest.

Many people accept unquestionably the histories as written by educated persons, who it seems can be trusted to record the truth, this unfortunately is not always to be relied on.

When I began to

When I began to investigate to try to find out if the sometimes controversial stories that have been put in the history books for the education of the children in schools throughout the country, are logical and truthful, I found it was evident from a study of the various histories of what is called England, that there has been a determined effort to brain-wash every one into believing the propaganda that has been propagated.

The early history of Britain is greatly misunderstood by most people, this is because it has been deliberately made so, by certain people who do not want people to know the truth of their historical origins. We all know today what an important part is played by psychological propaganda in warfare, when one people seeks to take-over other peoples land, and subject them.

If we are interested to try to find out the truth of our country's history we must bear in mind the conditions appertaining to each particular period in our country's history.

We must also bear in mind that it is only just over 100 years since the Education Act of 1870 made it compulsory for every person to be able to read and write in the common language.

Previous to 1870 the mass of the people were largely illiterate, although they might have been intelligent. Under these circumstances with an uneducated population, where knowledge of items of popular news, or facts of history, were circulated by word of mouth, it is easy to see how people can be taken advantage of by unscrupulous persons who are in a position of power, for their own ends.

An outstanding example of the way in which this propaganda warfare has been used in Britain, is that a number of supposedly ancient records which have been put together and called "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle", and written by an A.S. called Bede.

Many things written in these records have been found to be wrong, and some stretch the bounds of credibility so much so, that many historians refuse to accept any of it.

The Anglo-Saxons chronicle upon which what is called English history is based, is very confusing and by being ambiguous and biased, it makes it very difficult for us to try to find out the truth.

To give an example of the way in which Bede's propaganda works; it states that the British population was conquered and driven into Wales (Cambria) and Cornwall, or else exterminated.

We now know that this is ridiculous, but for hundreds of years people believed this to be true, it is only this last few years or so that it has been proved to be completely wrong.

This is not history, but propaganda, suppose the Germans had conquered and invaded Britain in the last war, that they controlled our country, and later on one of them wrote the history of that time of Britain. Would he write the truth?

Yet this is how so-called English history was written. All the later English historians merely repeat his untruths and ignore the proper investigation of the British side of our history.

They mostly all wrote their biased histories in the 19th century. The period of the Roman occupation of Britain is well recorded by Roman historians, but after they left is where the difficulty in finding out the truth of what happened, starts.

We know that S. Britain was governed by a military governor, and his army of two legions, until about the year A.D. 410.

The term "Welsh" was first used in Britain after the fall of the Roman power, although it had originated in what is now called Germany, several hundred years before.

We read in the "Decline and Fall" that Rome was invaded several times during B.C. by the Celtic tribes of Northern Europe. Under Julius Caesar they decided to take steps to stop them invading.

We can read about how Caesar waged his campaign against the Celtic tribes of Gaul, in his book called "War Commentaries". He went on to conquer most of the Celtic tribes of Germany, where the Romans sustained their greatest defeat, in losing a legion. After having been so successful they continued to conquer nation after nation, and they remained the most powerful state for a thousand years. It started about 800 B.C. and fell about 500 A.D., when it was overrun by the Goths and Vandals, Scandinavian peoples.

In their German campaign they achieved a partial conquest, and the tribes who maintained their independence from Roman rule, referred to their compatriots who had embraced Roman rule and the "Pax Romana" as ..... Welsh? This means Roman patriot.

As we have read under "Probus" and later emperors, the Romans recruited the German or Deutsch Celtic tribesmen into their legions. Many of these came to Britain, took British wives and after completing their service, settled here.

Both people spoke a Celtic language, and which still survives in Britain.

After the Romans left, a struggle ensued between "Pro-Roman" government supporters and "anti-Roman", who were making a "Coup d'etat". After 400 years of Roman rule, many of the British population had become effete and demoralised.

The anti-Roman government faction referred to the loyal British Pro-Roman faction as ..... Welsh".

After about 200 years of squabbling, the contending parties settled in separate parts of Britain, the eastern side acquired the name of Anglia or Angle-land, and the western side the name of Wallia or Wales, instead of the British name of Cambria.

Wales means the land of the Pro-Roman British. Angle-land or England means the land of the German tribe called Angles. During the 200 years after the departure of the Romans, the part of Britain where the A.S. had settled, or been settled by the Romans, was in chaos.

In the parts where the British were predominant, things remained unchanged.

It seems as Dr. Lappenburg has written, that the A.S. where they could

settled down peacefully among the British, there was plenty of room for them, and they were a Celtic people like the Britons. However it seems that friction did develop for one reason or another, which led to fighting, as had been the custom among the British tribes before their conquest by the Romans.

There is no recorded information regarding the number of A.S. in Britain or of those who came to Britain. As their numbers became preponderant in any area, they asserted their will over their British hosts, and took what they wanted. Their leaders or chiefs became to be called kings of their particular areas.

We can read quite a lot about these petty kings in the A.S. chronicle, if it is to be believed. The boundary between the British dominated areas and the A.S. dominated areas, seems to have been fluid.

As evidence seems to show that where the A.S. became dominant they enslaved the British population, and contrary to the propaganda, the British people remained in situ.

We read that the midlands which was called Mercia by Offa, was largely British in population, and as soon as Offa died, after holding for 40 years it was too difficult for the A.S. to control, and collapsed into anarchy.

These petty A.S. regions tried to combine, but as with the British previously they resorted to fighting each other. Some of the English historians state that they became unified in what was called the Heptarchy, but Sir Henry Palgrave tells us there is no evidence of one ruler and one kingdom until after the Norman conquest.

In the free and easy situation after the departure of the Romans, with no organised government to protect the people and keep out foreigners, many Danish people had come into the country.

Eventually the A.S. got exasperated with the Danes who were living among them for various reasons, and they decided to exterminate them.

Secretly the A.S. plotted to this end, and all over the part of Britain which had come to be called Angle land they agreed to rise up in arms and exterminate the Danes on St. Brice's day in the year 1002 A.D. Even Gunhilda, sister to the King of Denmark, who had married Earl Paling and had embraced Christianity, was seized and condemned to death, after she had seen her husband and her children butchered before her face.

In the agonies of despair, this unhappy princess foretold that her murder would soon be avenged by the total ruin of the English nation. This massacre was carried out, and retribution came in the Norman conquest when the A.S. or English were exterminated. This led firstly to an invasion by the Danish King Sweyn and his army, who came to avenge the massacre of his people. The result was that the Danes conquered the A.S. and made them pay tribute or "Dangeld".

This result shows that the A.S. in Britain were only an armed minority over some of the British people whom they had enslaved. It appears that after the Danish conquest of the part of Britain which had come to be called England, the A.S. were relegated to a minor role,

until the death of Edward the Confessor, when an A.S. named Harold Godwin was placed on the throne, instead of Duke William of Normandy, who had been promised the throne by Edward the Confessor. Duke William had visited England and must have known the disposition and social pattern of the country under the control of the Danes and A.S.

It is evident that the A.S. played a minor role and that there was bad feeling between them, as was made plain in the massacre of the Danes on St. Brice's Day in the year 1002 A.D.

Duke William realised he would have to make a fight against the A.S. and the Danes in England, it is possible that he made an arrangement with the Danes in England, as they were of the same race (Nordic) as the Normans.

When he started to organise his army, he raised 20,000 Norman soldiers from the Channel Islands and Normandy, he realised they were not enough for the task he had in mind, so he contacted the Duke of Bretagne, who agreed to join him with 20,000 Breton soldiers, also the King of France who supplied 20,000 French soldiers. This was his total army of 60,000 men.

Duke William must have known the fighting strength of the A.S. and Danes, especially after the retaliation invasion of King Sweyn's army from Denmark, following the massacre of the Danes in England, and the defeat of the A.S.

With his knowledge of the free British or Welsh in his mind Duke William must have realised he had to be very careful how he used his small army, even after the A.S. or English army had fled from Britain.

It is recorded that he ordered his scouts to search out and report to him the position of any armed resistance, he then marched his forces to them and annihilated them.

We do not know what happened to the Danes who had been living in England, possibly they were given the chance to change sides.

Something like this must have happened because there was little resistance, and with this small force England was conquered in four years.

The British population continued to be enslaved under the Normans, instead of the Danes and A.S.

The Normans then turned their attention to the Britons who remained free, and who had been called "Welsh", this proved a much more difficult task and they tried for several hundred years to bring about a conquest.

It seems that the Normans knew about the Roman precept of "divide and conquer", so the enslaved British population were brain-washed to believe and think of themselves as English, although the Normans knew what had happened in the conquest, and how they had disposed of the A.S. or English.

This was because the Normans did not wish the enslaved British to revive their British loyalty, for fear they would join with the free British or "Welsh".

If this had happened, the Normans knew they could not maintain their hold over Britain, so this is why they fostered antagonism between the so-called English and the free British or "Welsh".



Evidently the free British did not realise the full potentiality of the Norman conquest, after several hundred years of separation from the enslaved part of the British population. The division between the so-called English and the free British or Welsh, has been encouraged and exaggerated for hundreds of years, right up to the present day. Yet it is remarkable that after all these hundreds of years of indoctrination, many of the so-called English people think of themselves as British, and are proud of their British ancestry.

The propaganda has been such as to encourage them to look down on all Welsh people, as inferior and of low intellect, backward, and only capable of performing menial tasks. Of course we can see the purpose of this attitude on the part of a small but powerful minority in Britain.

This Norman inheritance is no doubt the driving force that made the British invade other peoples lands, and exploit them under the pretence of making an empire.

In the book by J. Lindsay called "The Normans and their World", we find the following:- "We may note in passing that the A.S. chronicles, the Irish Annals, and the Russian Chronicle under the name of Nestor, were the only histories in the vernacular in Europe before 1200 A.D. It is extraordinary that a writer of British ancestry should be so oblivious of the early British historical writings of the Annales Cambriae, which pre-dated the A.S. Chronicle of Bede and others by several hundred years, written in Latin, not vernacular, and yet a German Professor Dr. Lappenburg was fully informed about them.

Annalistic compilations in the monasteries derived from the custom of entering short historical notices on the pages of Easter tables. An interesting item in this book states:-

The A.S. chronicle says of the micel here (Danish army) that invaded England in 892 A.D.

By the grace of God the "Here" (Danes) had not on the whole afflicted the A.S. (English) people greatly, but they were much more seriously afflicted in those three years by the mortality of cattle and men, and most of all in that many of the best royal thegns who were in the land, died in those three years. The writer does not link the deaths with the invasion, but perhaps the trouble was indirectly related to the war situation. Indeed, in another passage we find that it is the A.S. (English) army which most afflicted the people, i.e. the British. Under 1000 A.D. we read:- In spite of it all, the British army went about as it pleased, and the A.S. (English) caused the people of the country (British) every sort of harm, so that they profited neither from the native A.S. army nor from the foreign (Danish) army. Their term "Here" is used for both armies, though normally it was kept for the enemy.

Notes taken from the History of England by Sir Francis Palgrave. Preface:- As I proceeded, however, I became more and more inclined to complete the annals of our country.

One chasm after another was filled up, and the narrative having been composed and recomposed, assumed the shape in which it is now offered to you.

Let me hope, then, that occasionally whilst the younger branches find some amusement in the tales and adventures here brought together, some of the older folks may be willing to take this little summary in hand, as a temporary substitute for the unmanageable folios produced by the unweary industry of Savile, Twysden, and Wharton, also Wilkins, and which have so often descended to the floor from the desks, on which they surround me.

Upon the original sources whence the volume is derived, I will not at present enlarge; it being my intention, on a future occasion, to discuss the origins, character, and merits of our ancient chronicles.?

Note. The laws which Edgar enacted at the request or with the assent of the Witan of Wessex were to be implicitly observed by his own immediate subjects including the Britons who inhabited the A.S. shires. The A.S. history in every part and branch of it, is extremely obscure, and though I have done my best to discover the truth, still I am convinced that others working with the same intent, may probably come to very different conclusions.?

Amongst the many causes which have contributed to render our A.S. history unpopular, is the extreme difficulty of forming any definite idea of the obscure and shadowy personages who figure in its pages.?

Note. The King of Gumbria, and the Kings or under kings of the Welsh, sit high unto the King of the Scots. The two latter, Blethyn and Rhivalon have just now sworn oaths to King Edward and given hostages, that they will be faithful to him in all things, and every where ready to serve him by sea and land, and that they will perform all such obligations, in respect of the country, as ever their predecessors had done to his predecessors. But the Welsh are an unfaithful nation, untrue even to themselves. Griffith, the brother of the Welsh King, to whom they succeed, was slain by his own men, and his bloody head was sent by Earl Harold to King Edward, at London. The Welsh are constantly rebelling against us; but we keep a firm hold upon them, and compel them, upon every needful occasion, to acknowledge our supremacy. To do them justice, though they rebel, they are truth tellers and never deny the fact of their legal subjection. ?? In their triads, as well as in their laws, they commemorate the sum paid by Wales, when their kings receive the seizing or possession of their country from the King at London. ??

Note. Chapter 11. After the migration of the A.S. to Britain, the name of old Saxons was given to the parent stock. It would be interesting to know the authority for this statement. ? It is probably another invention by Bede. After relating the way in which the A.S. obtained power in Britain by slaying the British chieftains at a banquet, Palgrave adds:- these

details have been told so often, that they acquire a kind of prescriptive right to credit; but I do believe that they bear no real relation to the real history of A.S. England than the story of Aeneas, as related by Virgil, does to the real history of the foundation of Rome.

Nothing can be more unlikely than that Vor-tigern should have invited over these implacable enemies of Britain, the Dragons of Germany as they are called by the bards, for the purpose of warring against the Picts, with whom the British or their kinsmen had been so recently allied.

It seems this story has been supplied by the imagination of Bede, and about 500 years after it was supposed to have happened. The fact of this so-called history by Bede, destroys ones credibility to the history as supplied by him, and on which English history is based.

Note:-

No portion of our island has continued more truly A.S. than Cantwara or Kent.

The fair haired Kentish yeoman bears in his countenance the stamp of his remote ancestry, and the existence of the gavel-kind tenure in Kent, or the custom whereby the land becomes devisible among all the children, instead of descending to the eldest, is a singular proof of the steadiness or good fortune which enabled the Kentish men to assert their franchises, when all England yielded to the Norman sway or Primogeniture.

Author comment.

This reveals not A.S. but British custom among the ordinary people, the same as in Wales, until Henry Tudor destroyed the Normans and joined England and Wales together, abolished gavel-kind and instituted Primogeniture.

Note.

London was after wards wrested by the Mercians from the West Saxons, and the geographical extent of the state perhaps exceeded any other of the A.S. Kingdoms.

But Mercia never became compact.

The population was greatly mixed; the Britons approached nearly to the number of the A.S. (English) and the chieftains or ealdormen who ruled the minor states of which it was composed, possessed great power, so that the kingdom contained within it the seeds of disunion and decay. In this manner were formed the states of the so-called Heptarchy, an erroneous term, but which has become so familiar by usage, that there is some difficulty in discarding it from history.

It must, however, be rejected because an idea is conveyed thereby, which is substantially wrong.

At no one period of our history were there ever seven kingdoms independent of each other.

The Romanised Britons of Lloegria (later England) appear to have united more readily to their invaders.

I apprehend that they possessed less nationality, and sometimes even national prejudices are the safeguards of independence.

A large proportion of the population consisted of either slaves, or of churls or villeins, who were compelled to till the ground for the benefit of their masters.

Note.

All the powers of the British kings were assumed by the Saxon victors. The conqueror entered into the palace, encircled his shaggy locks with the diadem, threw the Dalmatica over his shoulder, and became entitled to the riches and ample domains of the British sovereigns. The "Cynge" or king as exclusively appropriated to the sovereign, seems to have been derived from a Celtic term... Cen or Ceon, signifying head or chief.

Note.

The prosperity of Mercia was however of very short duration. The welfare of the country was not founded upon right government and justice, it was a tower built upon sand, and after the death of "Offa," upon whose personal character, the vigour of the government during his long reign of 40 years, had principally depended, the splendour of Mercia declined, and the fortunes of Wessex prevailed.

Note.

Egbert, the first nine years of his reign are nearly a void in all the authentic chronicles, but in these narratives which are less trustworthy, the vacant space is partly filled up by the account of a parliament held at Winchester in which Egbert decreed that South Britain should take the name of England.

It is tolerably clear, that in consequence of the greater preponderance of Angles, the nations whom we usually term A.S. were often called English, but our country was not called England till a much later period, and the parliament of Egbert is a pure fable.

Note.

Seven weeks afterwards, having been joined by the men of Somerset, Alfred sallied forth and took his position at Egbert's stone on the verge of the forest of Selwood; which by the Welsh, or British inhabitants of Somerset, who perhaps constituted the majority of the population, was called by the name of the great forest, or Coed Mawr.

Here he unfurled his standard.

Note.

Of this time at present, the names of fields and towns, hills and rivers, in Cornwall, are the only memorials of the British language, whose extinction cannot be contemplated without sentiments approaching to regret.

The most useful political virtues arise from an honest feeling of nationality; and no badge of nationality is more innocent and efficient than the cherished possession of an ancient, and at the same time, peculiar language.

Note.

It was not until after the Norman conquest that England really became one kingdom, governed by one king, and possessing one supreme legislature, and the false consequences deduced from the mistaken supposition of their earlier union, perplex the whole course of our history.

Note.

A British population still lingered in the surrounding countryside,

the inmates had repaired to the abbey from the remotest parts of the west, and Wintonbury was the central point, which commanded the ven-eration of the Scots, the Cymru, and the A.S., the three great nations of the isle of Britain.

Note:-

So much abhorrence did the deed excite, that William the Conqueror afterwards employed the murders of St. Brices's day as an incentive (battle cry) to his Norman nobles in urging them to avenge the blood of their kinsmen.

Note.

The Normans had by this time adopted the use of the French language, A.D. 1042, or as it was called "Romance".

Edward had acquired a partiality for this dialect which had become familiar to him during his stay in Normandy, and by his example it was becoming fashionable amongst the higher classes, at least among the favourites of Edward; and we cannot doubt but that this circumstance tended to raise up a further cause of discontent.

A nation which loses its own speech is half conquered.

If we talk like another set of people, we are very apt to begin to think and act like them.

Note;

Edward let the reins of government drop out of his hands, allowing matters to take their own course, he now appeared almost as a simpleton, and the defence and protection of the country depended entirely upon the great Barls, amongst whom the territory of England was divided.

Note;

Harold crossed to Ireland, and he was so pleased and favoured to be allowed to remain in that country under the kings protection.

This fact should be remarked, because it seems to show that he was not considered as being out of the Kings dominions, or in other words, that the opposite coast of Ireland was part of Edwards realm?

Harold Godwin as the last A.S. (English) ruler, has often been viewed with peculiar partiality, but it is perhaps difficult to justify these feelings.

He had no clear title to the crown in any way whatever, Harold was certainly not the heir.

Edwards bequest in his favour was very dubious, and he failed to obtain that degree of universal consent to his accession, which, upon the ordinary principles of political expediency, can alone legitimize a change of dynasty.

The A.S. power had been fast verging to decay.

As against their common sovereign, the Barls were rising into petty kings.

Note;

William did not confine himself to his own subjects, all the adventurers and adventurous spirits of the neighbouring states, were invited to join his standard, Armorica now called Brittany, had become a fief of Normandy, and though the Duke could not compel the baronage of that country to serve in his army, still they willingly yield to his influence. Alan Fergant, and Bryan, the two sons of Eude, Count of Brittany, came with a numerous train of Breton knights, all ready for the conflict -- perhaps eager to avenge the wrongs of Arthur, upon the Saxons, who had

usurped the lands of their ancestors.

Others poured in from Poitou, Maine, from Flanders and Anjou, and to all all such promises were made as should best incite them to the enterprise -- lands -- liveries -- money, according to their rank and degree, and the port of St. Pierre sur Dive was appointed as the place where all the forces should assemble.

At the end of the first volume; Palgrave gives an interesting observation, in that he states;-- "The Norman Conquest was the grave of England".

To make such a statement, Palgrave must have realised what the result of the Norman, and the virtual extermination of the A.S. (English) really meant.

Conquest This tells us that this was the finish of England, nevertheless it was carried on under the name of English, instead of Norman.

It is well known that the Norman army had pursued the A.S. - Danish army, or English army as some call it, with relentless fury, which led to that army, or what was left of it, having to flee from Britain.

It is recorded by Gibbon in the "Decline & Fall", that on leaving Britain they found refuge in the service of the Roman Emperor in Constantinople, where they ended their days.

It is probable that the Normans were not as ruthless with the Danish minority, because they were Nordic people like the Normans were. The odd remnants of the A.S. were absorbed in with the native British, who greatly outnumbered them, and all were the slaves of the Normans. After the Conquest under the tyranny of the Normans with conditions of slavery, it is not surprising that little or no history was written in England, but it was in Wales in the British Celtic language. These records do not seem to have been researched to give us the valuable information that is so necessary to understand this time in our countries history.

The Norman tyranny lasted for over 400 years, and was brought to an end by a British army under Henry Tudor, in 1485.

With the greater freedom under the Tudors and the Stuarts, people began to take an interest in their history again.

It seems that for hundreds of years no real true history of Britain was recorded in the vernacular, until we come to the 18 century, with Gibbon, Hume, and Robertson, and even then very few people were literate and able to read and understand it.

It seems that by general agreement among some historians they effaced every thing British and represented it as English.

This must have been a continuation of the Norman policy. This took place mainly in the 19th century, in the 20th century came a desire to know the truth of our history, instead of propaganda disguised as history.

The Normans came to be called English, just as the enslaved part of the British people had, in furtherance of this aim, the whole country was called England, rather than Britain, and in affairs with other countries it was called England.

Wales and Scotland were ignored or treated with silent contempt. All the time a minority were working to denigrate and efface every thing British, and amplify and exalt the name of English. During the Norman period 1066 - 1485 it was mainly only the Norman aristocracy who could read and write. (Latin and French) After the Tudor conquest of the Normans and the decay of feudal slavery, gradually there arose a middle or trading class of people, and an increase in learning generally, as well as in history. But the enslaved people had lost contact with their fore-fathers and some possibly did not care; nationality they were.

Here are some clues taken from "The Normans and their World", J. LINDSAY. Page 202; against Duke William's army were Harold's shire levies, a close phalanx, a shield or wall of up to ten or twelve ranks deep, with house-curles making up the front line. The latter would have dismounted, as horses were used for attack, not defence.

Each side had its standard, the Normans the papal banner charged with cross and roundels, Harold, the Dragon of Wessex, (now called Wyvern) and his own sign of the fighting man. The tapestry (Bayeux) shows a model dragon on a pole over him as he dies. Heraldry had not yet been born, though emblems of various kinds had long been used.

Asser's "Alfred" tells of a dragon woven by the daughters of Ragnar Lothbrok on a banner called Reaven (Raven), which was captured from his sons in 879 A.D.

Some knights on the tapestry have shields painted with dragons.

Page 154; Still the English kingdoms had marked differences from the barbarian kingdoms on the continent, as well as affinities with them. There was an organic element in the society, a strong binding element, which was not to be found elsewhere. I suggest; - This element was the native Romanised enslaved British people.

Probably influences from Merovingian Gaul furthered the process, which came to a head in the short period of Mercian supremacy in the eighth century, when Aethelbald called himself "Rex Brittanice". This was a premature development, though none the less significant.

Here are some interesting clues printed in the "Countryman" 1977.

In 1937 a young Cambridge lecturer planned to do a "Doomsday" book study of the geography of England, to fill two volumes. Now forty years on, he has completed the work with the seventh fat volume.

Five have looked at the various regions, the sixth was a gazetteer, and in the seventh, H.C. Lerby, who retired last year as Professor of Geography at Cambridge, surveys the whole scene.

He has had many contributors working under his editorship along the way, this is his own work.

What emerges is a comprehensive survey of England as it was in 1086 A.D. it would be hard to produce a comparable book for the present day.

Even the maps, for the casual observer, have their excitement. The vineyards then for instance match the pattern of the modern revival. Stretching from west Dorset to Ely and east of that line. There are maps to show where hawks nested, the hunting activity on the Welsh border, and the effect of raiding there.

The population of England then was 268,984, of whom 10% were slaves. A man sold at Lewes fetched 4d.

Norfolk had most people, followed by Lincolnshire and Suffolk. Doomsday England (C.U.P.) 228 unfolds astonishing detail in its broad sweep.

This survey taken in 1086 A.D. would present a different picture to that before the conquest, because of the virtual extermination of the Anglo-Saxons and their replacement by Normans, Bretons and French.

One A.S. thing that remained after the Norman conquest was the A.S. words that had been absorbed into the common vernacular. That 400 yrs after the coup d'etat take-over of part of Britain by the A.S. and their subsequent conquest by the Danes, who were included in the census taken by the Normans, we can see that the original numbers of the Britons, A.S. and the Danes were very small indeed.

It is fairly obvious that the slave element would be the British natives who had allowed part of their country to be stolen from them, but it is possible that many of them had secured their freedom in some way. As we now know the true population of England after the Norman conquest was 268,984.

There were three races or nations contained in this figure, first the native British, who must have been far more numerous than the invaders of their country, I would assume the British to be at least half of this population or 134,492, the other half could have been roughly divided by Danes and Normans, or in round figures 67,248 each. So we can see that Duke William's Norman army was sufficient for the purpose, particularly as he knew the Saxons would not use the British in their army, and could trust the Danes after the massacre of St. Brice's day 1002 A.D.

In the Preface to the "20 Century" Dictionary published in the U.S. in 1890, we find some very interesting observations relative to what is called English.

Until about the time of the reformation, the language existed chiefly in the form of dialects, and while the common literary tongue was establishing itself, and after it became established, its relations with dialectal and provincial forms were most intimate. The sources of the English vocabulary thus presented are extremely various.

These dialects arose from the different peoples settled in different parts of England, who lived among the native British, whom they had enslaved.

Firstly the Anglo-Saxons became dominant over the British, then the Danes dominated them both. After the Norman conquest the Normans became the dominant power in England, then they tried to assert their power over Wales and Scotland.

The Norman power was eventually destroyed by Wales, in 1435. All these peoples made a language contribution to what the Normans had called English, and that name has remained. Even after Wales had conquered England, the history was so misrepresented as to make believe that the so-called English had conquered Wales, this is the lie that was taught in the schools, and consequently what most people believe.

We must remember that with some people the end justifies the means, all is fair in love and war. Since the Act of Union, Wales has been shackled and hamstrung by being joined to England, and by being gradually weakened, until it has become virtually impotent, which is what some people want, whereas if she had remained independent, she would have progressed the same as England. In the U.S. we see the descendants of the British people who emigrated to there from Britain, trying to maintain their identity against other races.

Apparently they identify themselves as W.A.S.P. or White Anglo Saxon Protestants, which of course they are not.

They are fundamentally the descendants of the British (Celtic) stock, with an admixture of Danish-Norman (NORWIC) stock. It has been noticed and remarked on, that a certain number of people who call themselves English, always refer to our country as England, whereas all British people should refer to it as Britain or U.K. I am an ordinary person of average intelligence and I have never had the benefit of Grammar school or University education, yet I have been able to unravel the twisted presentation of our history.

This begs the question - why has this not been elucidated by the Professors and other experts of our history. As will be seen from what I have gleaned from the writings of prominent historians, all efforts in that direction have been frustrated, the people must remain ignorant of the true history.

Even after the battle of Bosworth and the defeat of the Normans, who had to hide behind the name "Plantagenet" in order to pass themselves off as English, so that they could call on the support of the mass of the population to their side, and who had come to believe themselves to be English.

The fact that the Royal Family of the Tudors were Welsh brought about a better treatment for Wales from both the King and Parliament, after the terrible treatment under the Normans. Parliament had little power, which was given by the King or Queen, who were absolute monarchs, with the power of life or death.

The "Tudors" had to contend with the other nations of Europe, who had consolidated their countries into strong aggressive forces. After the defeat of the Normans who had controlled England & Wales and the so-called English population, who were in reality the descendants of the enslaved British, no one was able to tell the people the truth of their history, the Normans with their terrible cruelty had obliterated

the records and brain-washed the population, who were mostly slaves, as the Saxons had done previously. The historical records of what had happened by Welsh historians was probably destroyed or else ignored by those in control. The ordinary people after the defeat of the Normans, with the improvement in their way of life under the Tudors, did not give any thanks or credit to Wales for having freed them from their slavery.

In the time of the Tudors, we first read about "Merrie England". Even today we see and read of anti-Welsh treatment, not openly but hidden, so that some Welsh people change their allegiance and their name to English, so that they will not be unfairly treated, or get more favours, or not denigrated. Many so-called English people know all this and try to ignore it, since they cannot alter it personally. The power of the U.K. centred in England has been used against Wales, Scotland and Ireland, in order for England to have total supreme power.

The logical action to remedy this state of affairs, is for Wales, Scotland and England to form a real United Kingdom, by each having its own state parliament, and each running their own affairs, a federal government, as in the U.S. of America and other modern countries. After giving much study and thought to the question of the old British or Celtic language and its relevance to the British people in this modern 20th century, it is such an emotive subject to some people that they are unable to think clearly and subjectively on the matter.

I think it is necessary to review the whole history and development of the language, if we are to make any decisions on the future of the language. The Celtic language was used by the Celtic tribes of Northern Europe from time immemorial, without being able to write it down or record it.

After the Celtic tribes of Europe had been conquered by the Romans, they were introduced to the Latin language, which had an alphabet and could be written down as well as spoken. Celtic scholars in Britain and Germany developed an alphabet for their own language based on the Latin language, during the Roman occupation of Britain and Germany. The vernacular of the Britons adopted many Latin words, this vernacular has continually modified and adopted foreign words to suit its requirements.

At the time of the Renaissance in the Middle Ages it had to adopt many Greek words. Now the Celtic language as spoken by the free British or Welsh was only slightly affected by Latin, and as far as I understand remains essentially the same as when it was first developed and issued about 1500 yrs ago.

The Celtic language of the Romanised Britons in England has continually been improved and amended to suit the needs of the people by adopting Latin words from the Romans, then after the gradual take-over by the

Anglo-Saxons, some A.S. words, later after the Danish conquest they adopted some Norse or Danish words. After the Norman conquest they adopted a lot of Norman French words. Although the A.S. dominated the British in England for a long time they did not adopt their German names. This polyglot of languages was probably first called "English" by the Normans to distinguish it from their language (e.g.) Norman-French. In view of the fact that this ancient language of Europe is so unique, it should be encouraged to continue as long as some people will continue to use it.

In my experience, with my limited knowledge of it, I find it is imprecise and sometimes ambiguous, and it seems to me that it cannot hope to compete with so-called English, which is really Welsh or Celtic that has been stream-lined and continually improved through the centuries.

The loyal British or Welsh who kept the invaders away from their part of Britain, did not adopt any A.S., Danish or Norman-French words into their vernacular, like their enslaved compatriots had in the other part of Britain.

This is why the language remained the same for about 1200 yrs, and did not improve and modernise like that in the part which had been taken over and called later England. Although the population is called English they do not have real German names like Hans, Heinz, Seigfried or Gunter for men and Hanna, Bertha, Lotti et cetera, as modern Germans do.

If there had been an Anglo-Saxon invasion and conquest with the probable extermination of the British in England then the present population would have Anglo-Saxon names like Heinz, Hans, Sigurd etc., as modern Germans do.

Even after Wales had conquered England, the history was so misrepresented as to make believe that England had conquered Wales. This is the lie that was taught in the schools, and consequently what most people believe to be true.

We must remember that with some people the end justifies the means, all is fair in love and war. Since the Act of Union, Wales has been shackled and hem-strung by being joined with England, and by being gradually weakened, until it has become virtually impotent, which is what some people want, whereas if she had remained independent, she would have progressed the same as England.

In the U.S. we see the descendants of the British people who emigrated there from Britain, trying to maintain their identity against other races.

They identify themselves as W.A.S.P. i.e. White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, which of course they are not. They are fundamentally the descendants of the British (Celtic) stock, with an admixture of Danish-Norman (Nordic) stock. It has been noticed and remarked on that a certain class of people who call themselves English, always refer to our country as England, whereas all British people should refer to it as Britain or U.K.

I am an ordinary person of average intelligence and I have never had

the benefit of a Grammar school or University education, yet I have been able to unravel the twisted presentation of our history. This begs the question; why has this not been elucidated by the professors and other experts of our history. As will be seen from what I have gleaned from the writings of prominent historians, all efforts in that direction have been frustrated, the people must remain ignorant of the true history. Even after the battle of Bosworth and the defeat of the Normans, who had to hide behind the name "Plantagenet" in order to pass themselves off as English, so that they could call on the support of the mass of the population to their side, and who had come to believe themselves to be English.

The fact that the Royal Family of the Tudors were "Welsh" brought about a better treatment for Wales, from both the King and Parliament, after the terrible treatment under the Normans.

Parliament had little power which was given by the King or Queen, who were absolute monarchs with the power of life or death. The Tudors had to contend with the other nations of Europe, who had consolidated their countries into strong, aggressive forces. After the defeat of the Normans who had controlled England and the mixed population, who were mainly the descendants of the enslaved British, with Norman and Danish minorities, no one was able to tell the people the truth of their history, the Normans with their terrible cruelty had obliterated the records and brainwashed the population who were mostly slaves, as the Saxons had done previously.

The historical records of what had happened by Welsh historians was destroyed or else ignored by those in control.

The ordinary people after the defeat of the Normans, with the improvement in their way of life under the Tudors, did not give any thanks or credit to Wales for having freed them from their slavery. In the time of the Tudors we first read about "Merrie England". Even today we see and read of anti-Welsh treatment, not openly but hidden, so that some Welsh people change their allegiance to England so that they will not be unfairly treated, or get more favours, or not denigrated.

Many so-called English people know all this and try to ignore it, since they cannot alter it personally.

The power of the Union centred in England has been used against Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, in order for England to have total supreme power.

The logical action to remedy this state of affairs is for Wales, Scotland, and England to form a real United Kingdom, by each having its own state parliament, and each running their own affairs, a federal government, as in the U.S. of America and other modern countries. After the conquest of England by Wales the border became an anachronism, and its main purpose is to preserve the ancient area of Wales or the "Principality" from being over-run and being called a part of England. If there had been a conquest by the A.S. of the British as they related, then the population of England would have mainly German names,

apart from the genuine British or Celtic names, they have largely Jewish names taken from the bible. The present flag of England has no connection with the A.S. or English, you can read about its origin in the "Decline & Fall of the Roman Empire".

This came about when the Normans joined the other Christian European nations in going to the Crusades to stop the infidels (Moslems) overrunning the holy Land and desecrating Jerusalem.

In order that the different Christian nations could recognise each other and avoid killing each other, they wore a surcoat of white cloth with their national emblem or flag on it, over their armour. The French had the Fleur-de-Lis, the Germans the three ostrich feathers, the so-called English Normans had a red cross.

This became the flag of England in about the thirteenth century.

If the A.S. or English had survived the Norman Conquest like the enslaved British, then it is most likely that a lot of them would have Anglo-Saxon names like their brother A.S. in Germany, names like --Heinz, Hans, Sigurd etc, for the men and similar German names for their women. D

From Decline and Fall by Ed. Gibbon.

The origin of the adoption of St. George as patron saint of England. George, from his parents or his education, surnamed the Cappadocian, was born at Epiphania in Cilicia, in a fullers shop. From this obscure and servile origin he raised himself by the talents of a parasite; and the patrons whom he assiduously flattered procured for their dependant, a lucrative commission or contract, to supply the Roman army with bacon.

His employment was mean--he rendered it infamous. He accumulated wealth by the basest arts of fraud and corruption; but his malversations were so notorious, that George was compelled to escape from the pursuits of justice.

After this disgrace, in which he appears to have saved his fortune, at the expense of his honour, he embraced, with real or affected zeal, the profession of Arianism.

George, with two of his obsequious ministers, counts Diodorus and Dracontius, master of the mint, were ignominiously dragged in chains to the public prison.

George-- the Primate of Egypt assumed the pomp and insolence of his lofty station, but he still betrayed the vices of his base and servile extraction.

The remains of these guilty wretches were thrown into the sea at Alexandria, afterwards the body must have been recovered and made a martyr.

The Normans from England on going to the Crusades in the Holy Land, with the French, Germans and other Christian soldiers, who all had their patron saint and a battle cry also, soon found out that they were

at a loss in urging their soldiers against the enemy. Having found the tomb of St. George, they decided to adopt him as their patron saint of England, although he was the patron saint of several countries already.

Now they had a battle cry-- for God and St. George. They would not adopt St. David who belonged to the British, whom they had partly conquered, and as slaves whom they despised. Having given the origin of the flag of England, it is in order to give the origin of the flag of Wales, which was originally the flag of Britain, and which has since been given different names in different parts of Britain.

Here is a copy of a letter which I had printed in the "Western Mail".

Having read the report about the origin of the flag of Wales (Feb 6, 85) I would like to comment that, like the flag of England, there is a lot of nonsense written around it.

When the Romans were embarked on making their empire, and after they had conquered the Celtic tribes of Northern Europe, under Augustus they had conquered a people called Deicians, who lived on the Black Sea coast and which is now called Romania.

These people threw off the Roman yoke, and the Romans were unable to reconquer them.

Later, Claudius came to Britain in the second century and raised a British army, he marched them to Deicia and let the British engage the Deicians while the Romans looked on.

The British defeated the Deicians, and Claudius was so pleased he took the standard of the defeated Deicians and awarded it to the British commander as a battle honour.

This British battle honour is called by different names in Britain, in Wales where the British tradition and culture is zealously guarded it is called *Ydraig Coch* (Red Dragon), in the other parts of Britain it is called *Wyeerne* (West Country) *Griffon* (Midlands) and *Griffin* in the South.

After reading the *Doomsday Book*, which is a modern edited presentation of the original "*Domesday*" book, which was an inventory of the plunder which the Normans, Bretons and French had won in the Norman conquest of the part of Britain called England.

In the Preface the editor states, I should like to mention my fellow writers, Andrew Ghitty, Neil Fairbairn, Clive Unger Hamilton, R.H. Healy, Michael Keil, and David Neave, as well as the researchers and editors who worked tirelessly on the strange words and unusual names of our Anglo-Saxon and Norman ancestors ???

Readers will note there is no mention of our native British ancestors, although in almost every entry there is some reference to British and Celtic things.

A prominent item that I noticed, was the frequent statements that large areas of the country are devastated and laid waste, particularly in the North and West, after the conquest.

We can imagine what happened to the people who lived in those areas that were devastated, but they are careful not to state it. We can believe that this kind of thing-- genocide, was against the Anglo Saxons or English, because the British in England were enslaved, and could not contest with the Normans, neither did the Danes, who were kindred of the Normans.

The fury of the Normans was against the English part of the population for three reasons,- Because they had tried to exterminate the Danes in 1002 A.D., and they had reneged on their promise to make William King after the death of Edward the confessor, also, to steal their wealth and land.

The population after 1086 A.D. was severely diminished, and the Normans, Bretons, and French no doubt tried to make up the numbers by encouraging their peoples to come over to Britain and share their good fortune. It seems there were not many who came, there is no record of any emigration from France, Normandy, or Brittany. The Normans soon came up against the loyal British or Welsh, who tried to repel the invading Normans, just as they had done against the Saxons.

The Normans were short of men, they tried to recruit paid mercenaries to help them to control and dominate what was left of the original population in England. They took steps to destroy all signs of British patriotic feelings and brainwashed the surviving enslaved British that they were English in order to get them to fight their own people, --the Welsh.

As the ordinary were illiterate and simple minded peasants, they gradually succumbed to this brainwashing, after many generations, until the Norman power was finally broken by Henry Tudor and his Welsh army in 1485 A.D.

Henry Tudor could not eliminate all the damage that had been done to the peoples loyalty to ~~Britain~~ especially the landed gentry who retained the economic power over the ordinary people, and who were largely anti-British because of Norman deceit and pretending to be English to be able to claim the support of the brainwashed population.

No doubt during the period 1066- 1485 the Normans did all they could to destroy any vestige of the peoples true origins, the Anglo-Saxons and Danes had no doubt followed the same principles, in order to get the common people to become loyal to the invaders, and not their true loyalty to Britain and the British.

It is nevertheless remarkable that the British people living in what is called England and which name is copied from a part of Germany called Angle-land, still retain their sense of loyalty to Britain, and being British.

It shows plainly that this sense of being known as English has been imposed on them by a powerful dominant force. If they really were English they would have the same names as the Angles in Germany, names like Fritz

names like "Fritz or Hans for the men, and Helga or Irma like the women. Also with their nationality, if they were English they would be Germans, not British. Our history was neglected and distorted by the invaders of our country for hundreds of years.

After searching everywhere for bits of information that will help to establish the truth of what has happened in our history, and to counter-act the lies and distortions that have been written into our recorded history, mainly by foreign invaders, it is very gratifying to have some confirmatory statements that some other persons have the same purpose in view. In the "Sunday Times" of April 3 1983, an article headed "The Strange Death of Literary History", practically admits that our history has been written like a novel.

It is now recognised that our history as written for hundreds of years is a travesty of the truth. This fact is recognised and propagated in a book called "The History Men" by John Kenyon. In a review by John Vincent, he states that :- It is the emergence of professionalism, albeit belatedly, albeit unexpectedly, that provides backbone to John Kenyons book.

There is a bow to the 17 century scholars on the way, for they invented the Public Record Office hack. There is a bow to the 18 century for giving us David Hume, who saw things steadily and saw them whole, or in other words, provided a Tory interpretation of 17 century England which has stood up well. There is something less than a bow to the great Victorian Prophets and moralists. They used history for ulterior purposes, candidly, avowedly, and also shamelessly.

They wrote for the general literary public, the ultimate sin. They did not consider history distinct from literature. In all this they were enormously successful. The strange death of literary history takes some explaining.

Like the Dinosaur, it died suddenly and at the height of its powers. It was killed by people in universities, who to maintain status in a scientific environment, needed to make history difficult. But these people were few and classics long remained the dominant subject.

In fact professionalism is a myth. However dull the under-lings, the star performers of this century do not by any means represent the English professional classes, nor do they represent normality, or freedom from ulterior motives. In fact they are like most all previous historians, they write books in order to persuade you to agree with the axe they grind. There is no great divide between literary and professional historians, except, that the latter are better at disguising what they are up to.



This review of "The History Men", tacitly admits that our (British) history as presented by the mainly Victorian historians is mainly a literary exercise with ulterior motives, and is by no means the accurate record of the historical events of our country's history. Some British will realise what the purpose of this distortion of the truth of our history is for. Wales has been the greatest sufferer from this distortion of the history.

Although we have this admission that our history has been merely a literary exercise with ulterior, it will be hopeless to expect the so-called English historians to re-write our British history. So it must be done by our own loyal Welsh historians. Most of the people who go under the name of English, would I believe, be pleased to know the truth of their history, although it is not very flattering to them.

The important points I would like to mention are:- In the Norman conquest, the Anglo-Saxons or English were exterminated, but in the history books they imply it was the British who were exterminated, the Norman army after the battle of Hastings numbered 45,000, the English army fled from Britain. The Normans were afraid of the free British or Welsh; so they brain washed the enslaved British in England, that they were English and they must destroy the Welsh.

If the enslaved British in England had united with the free British or Welsh, the Normans knew they would be driven out. A Cambridge lecturer did a study of the Doomsday book in 1937, now over 40 years later, it has been published. The population of England in 1086 A.D. is given as 269,000. About half this number would be the native enslaved British, the other half would be roughly the combined numbers of the Saxons and Danes.

The places of the exterminated Saxons were taken by the Norman conquerors. The Norman power was later destroyed by Henry Tudor and his British army in 1485.

T.G. WILLIAMS

39, DELA FIELD

ABERGAFENNI,

GWENT,

CYMRU,

U.K

Letter to the Western Mail on Doomsday Programme on B.B.C I

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to comment through your paper, on the programme by the B.B.C.I on Sunday Nov. 22nd called "Doomsday." I have studied British History for the past fourteen years, reading all sources of information, which I could, including the "Decline & Fall", and David Humes History of England, et cetera.

My opinion of the programme is, it was piffle, and English brain-washing from the Normans at its best.

Only one worth-while fact I heard, and that was, that the part of Britain called England was owned and possessed by 200 of the chief Norman soldiers, who became the land owning aristocracy of England. Nothing was said of the large areas of the country that were devastated, together with their Anglo-Saxon or English enemies.

The Normans twisted the history to make it appear that it was the British slave population who were exterminated, so that they could hide behind the name of English and claim the support of the brain-washed native British population, who were told they were English.

I would like to include in this book an extract from a book by a friend of mine, Mr A.H. Evans, who died in 1983. The book is called "English Historians and Welsh History".

Trevelyan and the Tudors; English historians of the Trevelyan stamp are always eager to give the impression that the Anglo-Saxon English after the conquest of their leaders by the Normans, still remained a martial race, and this in the face of the cannot be denied evidence, that the great majority of the ordinary people were villeins and slaves of the privileged few. We quote from another English historian, to prove that Trevelyan was not alone in his glorification of all things English.

G. Warren Hollister, on page 117 of his work;- The Military Organization of Norman England, has this to say;- In 1073 A.D. William is reported to have led a large force of English and Frenchmen into Maine to quell a major rebellion. How was this possible in view of the fact that Anglo-Saxon England was composed of a mass of unarmed and untrained villeins and slaves ruled by a martial aristocracy whom Williams had already almost wiped out, the job to be completed two years later, in 1075 A.D. And William, in putting down the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy laid waste entire districts, murdering men, women and children, nothing was spared.

Are we to suppose that under such circumstances England could have furnished William with soldiery. No, not for almost three hundred years were ordinary Englishmen in any numbers to be found in the army of the Norman Plantagenet nobility. Their infantry, up to the last of Edward I Scottish wars, were composed in the main of Welsh mercenaries, with a heavy sprinkling from time to time, of Gascons and Bretons.

According to most English historians, the well-known battles of Jcrey and Poitiers were won by English long bowmen, but the historian for the wars of this period, Prof. Oman, proves that over half the army were mercenaries, of whom the great majority were Welsh archers and knifemen, more probably a combination of both.

A word on these "knifemen".

English historians have besmirched the name of Welsh soldiers after the time of Edward I, by stating that they lost their fame as archers and were used on the battle-field as knifemen to finish off the wounded.

A more easily exposed lie has never been printed, for if the Welsh soldiery had become battle-field scavengers . . . who rallied around Glynwr? . . . who won the battle of Bosworth field?

Froissert tells us that at the battle of Jcrey, "There were some Cornish and Welshmen on foot, who had armed themselves with large knives; these advancing through the ranks of the men at arms and archers, who made way for them, came upon the French when they were in this danger (from plunging horses wounded by arrows) and, falling upon earls, barons, knights and squires, slew many, at which the king of England was afterwards much exasperated." p 166 vol I Chronicles Johnes edition.

The King was exasperated because, not content with killing off the nobility, the Cornish and Welsh despoiled their bodies of anything of value, also denying to the King the right of ransom money. The Welsh, Bretons, and Cornishmen and other mercenaries had long since found out that they got nothing of the ransom money, so increasingly over the years, they had taken to killing and despoiling the unfortunate nobility. This was probably the prime reason why over the centuries there is found a sharpening increase in the number of nobility killed in action, compared to the earlier years.

It should be noted that few Welsh historians have exposed this English historical lie of "Welsh battle-field scavengers". Far too many of them are tied in with the English establishment, and if I stress this fact once again, what true Welshman will blame me, or what ordinary Englishman whose lot down the ages, has been one of repeated attempts to gain a measure of freedom from the aristocratic brutes who hounded him and his kind? Feudalism was brought to its grave, not only by the rise of a powerful merchant class, but by a number of inter-relating causes, such as the above undermining of Chivalric practice on the battle-field, as well as the insatiable greed of the nobility itself for wealth at any cost.

20-7-84

Dear Sir-

39, Delafield Rd,  
Abergafenni,  
Gwent.

It is now recognised that our history as written for hundreds of years is a travesty of the truth. This fact is recognised and propagated in a book called "The History Men", by John Kenyon.

In a review by John Vincent, he states that - it is the emergence of professionalism, albeit belatedly, albeit unexpectedly, that provides backbone to John Kenyon's book.

There is a bow to the 17 century scholars on the way, for they invent the Public Record Office hack.

There is a bow to the 18 century for giving us David Hume, who saw things steadily and saw whole or, in other words, provided a Tory interpretation of 17 century England which has stood up well. There is something less than a bow to the great Victorian Prophets and moralists.

They used history for ulterior purposes, candidly, avowedly, and shamelessly.

They wrote for the general literary public, the ultimate sin. They did not consider history distinct from literature.

In all this they were enormously successful.

The strange death of literary history takes some explaining.

Like the Dinosaur, it died suddenly and at the height of its powers. It was killed by people in universities who, to maintain status in a scientific environment, needed to make history difficult.

But these were few and classics long remained the dominant subject.

In fact professionalisation is a myth.

However dull the underlings, the star performers of this century do not by any means represent the English professional classes, nor do they represent normality or freedom from ulterior motives.

In fact they are like most all previous historians, they write books in order to persuade you to agree with the axe they grind.

There is no great divide between literary and professional historians except that the latter are better at disguising what they are up to. The above review of the "History Men" tacitly admits that our history as presented by the mainly Victorian historians is mainly a literary exercise with ulterior motives and is by no means the accurate record of the historical events of our country's history.

Some British will realise what the purpose of this distortion of the truth of our history is for.

Wales has been the greatest sufferer from this distortion of the history.

Although we have this admission that our history has been merely a literary exercise with ulterior motives, it will be hopeless to expect the so-called English historians to re-write our British history. It must be done by our own loyal Welsh historians.

Most of the people who go under the name of English would I believe be pleased to know the truth, although it is not very flattering to them.

Thomas G. Williams

March 6; 1987.

39, Delsfield Rd,  
Abergefenni Gwent,  
Cymru.  
Tel. No. 4032

Dear Sir, Madam/

As a student of history, I was reading a book by Thomas Carlyle entitled, "O liver Cromwells Letters and Speeches", Published in 1846. It may be of interest that what was contained therein, among many other matters appertaining to the Lord Protector, was, his family matters. It appears that these facts are not generally known to the British public. Oliver Cromwell's mother... Elizabeth Steward, married William Lynne of Bessingbourne in Cambridge, the marriage lasted only a year, it ended with the death of her husband and her first born child.

As a widow she met a Welsh gentleman from Glamorgan, named Morgan Williams, who was prevailed upon to change his name on marriage to Mrs Lynne ...to Cromwell, and was made heir to the Cromwell family wealth. They had ten children in all, of whom seven came to maturity, and Oliver was their only son. The exact date of the young widows marriage to Morgan Williams alies Robert Cromwell is nowhere given, but seems to have been in 1591. Robert Cromwell and his son Oliver, also grandsons, all signed their name Cromwell alies Williams.

Morgan Williams was born in the parish of Llandriff, somewhere between the mouth of the Rhymney river and Cefn-On, six miles from the Rhymney river mouth, at Caerdydd. I hope we can locate his birthplace from the parish records, and give it the same veneration and care as the people of Huntingdon have given to his sons birthplace, by making it a national shrine, and place of homage to the man who led us on the road to Democracy.

I am prepared to do what I can to that end. The name Williams is derived from the Norse language... Vil Jhelm, and translates as "Strong Helmet".

23-9-81.

39, Delsfield Rd  
Abergefenni,  
Gwent.

Dear Sir

After having experienced a life-time of historical propoganda which is pro-English, and having retired in 1970, I resolved to study our history to find out the truth.

The results of years of study and research I have written into a book which I have called "British History Review". In the "SundayTimes" of April 3 1983, an article headed "The Strange Death of Literary History", practically admits that our history has been written like a novel.

The important points I would like to mention are; in the Norman Conquest, the Anglo-Saxons or English were exterminated, the Norman army after the battle of Hastings numbered 45,000, the English army fled from Britain. The Normans were afraid of the free British or Welsh; so they brain-washed the enslaved British in England that they were English and they must destroy the Welsh.

If the enslaved British in England had united with the free British or Welsh the Normans knew they would be driven out.

A Cambridge lecturer did a study of the "Dooms day Book" in 1937, now over 40 years later, it has been published.

The population of England in 1086 A.D. is given as 269,000. Half this number would be the native British slaves, the other half would be roughly the combined numbers of the Saxons and Danes. The places of the exterminated Saxons were taken by the Norman conquerors. The Norman power was later destroyed by Henry Tudor and his British army in 1485.

Many people are interested in the origin of the term "Welsh"; here it is the term "Welsh" was first used in Britain after the fall of the Romans, although it had originated in what is now called Germany, several hundred years before. After the Romans embarked on the conquest of the Celtic tribes of northern Europe, they conquered the Celtic tribes of Gaul (France) and then most of the Celtic tribes of Germany.

They achieved partial conquest and the tribes who maintained their independence from Roman rule referred to their compatriots who had embraced Roman rule and the "Pax Romana" as "Welsh".

Under Probus and later emperors, the Romans recruited the German or Deutch Celtic tribesmen into their legions. Many of these came to Britain, took British wives and after completing their service, settled here.

Both peoples spoke a Celtic language, and which still survives in Britain. After the Romans left, a struggle ensued between pro-Roman government supporters and anti-Roman who were making a coup d'etat.

After 400 years of Roman rule, many of the British population had become effeminate and demoralized.

The anti-Roman government faction referred to the loyal British Pro-Roman faction as "Welsh".

After about 200 years of squabbling, the contending parties settled in separate parts of Britain, the east side acquired the name of Anglia or Angle-land, and the west side, the name of Wallia or Wales, instead of the British name of Embria.

Thomas G. Williams

March 1 1987

159, Delafield Rd,  
Abergafenni,  
Gwent, Cymru.  
NP 7 7AW

Dear Mr. Flint/I was agreeably surprised and pleased to find another British person with the same aspirations and motives as myself. I was very pleased to receive the booklet "Moongold", why Moongold? I believe that the historical knowledge in Moongold should be made known to our people, it is useless waiting for the experts of our history to rewrite it, they are in fear of the establishment, and their pensions.

I have just stated this in a letter to Dafydd Wigley M.P. I have written also to the Cleglen Publishing Co in Cardiff, asking if they can publish my book. I had contacted a local man, who said he would publish it for me, but no news so far.

I am writing to an American of Welsh descent, in North Carolina, and who is very interested in British history, I would like him to have a copy of "Moongold".

I have already sent him a copy of my book.

As you know our history has been hidden, obscured, and destroyed by the invaders of our country, so that it is difficult to give a concise consecutive account. A lot of time to search for fragments of the truth from here and there, wherever we can find it, this makes it difficult for some people to follow.

Now at last we are beginning to know what has happened in our history. Sooner or later there will have to be a challenge to the accepted account of our history.

The publicity given to the revelations from the "Doomsday" book have at last provided the necessary initiative to the lingering need for such a revisal of our known facts about our early history.

I have just recently managed to get some copies of my book done, by a loyal Cymro, so I am able to send you a copy.

I think you will find it very interesting, as you are aware, you have to search out the clues of the truth first of all before you can write it down, and that takes time.

I am hoping that this Cardiff publisher will be able to deliver the goods.

Perhaps you can help in the distribution and selling in the North.

When you have read the book and digested it, people tell me they have to read it several times before their minds finally accept it.

I know you will let me know what you think of it, and if we can improve it in any way.

With my best wishes,  
Yours fraternally,

Thos P. Williams

