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For Keith

The Jarman 2014 celebration in memory of the life and work of Derek Jarman (1942–94) has acted as a catalyst for publications, performances, screenings, exhibitions, talks, and conferences that have emphasized the enduring power of Derek Jarman’s art and the centrality within that art of his engagement, through subject matter and form, with the Renaissance.1 As evident from the number of essays in this special issue that focus on Jarman’s 1991 adaptation of Christopher Marlowe’s Edward II (published 1594), this film, more than any other of his books, sets designs, paintings, screenplays, and films, has come to embody the quintessential “Jarmanesque” blend of Renaissance subject matter with queer activism, avant-garde performance, poetry, music, and extraordinarily evocative visuals. The purpose of this essay is to disentangle some of the strands that make up the film. Via a journey through the public Jarman archives at the British Film Institute in London (BFI) and the Bill Douglas Cinema Museum in Exeter (BDC), as well as the privately-held materials in Prospect Cottage, Dungeness (PC), I will trace the development of Jarman’s ideas about Marlowe’s tragedy from his student days at King’s College London, through the film Edward II, to the unpublished screenplay of “Pansy,” the satirical musical that represents Jarman’s final oblique adaptation of the story of Edward II.

My focus will be on the materiality of Jarman’s workbooks, the 12 x 12 inch photograph albums in which Jarman interlaced his scripts with collages of cut-outs, diary entries, and citations, creating a present-day equivalent of sorts to the early modern commonplace book. The many
previously unpublished illustrations in this essay are meant to give the reader a more nuanced understanding of the complexity of Jarman’s scripts; in the online version of the article published in Project MUSE, they can be seen in greater detail and in colour. The workbooks they are selected from represent a collage of recurring ideas and ever-evolving scripts that overlay one another in a palimpsest of Edward II-related materials. They give us access to Jarman’s evolving ideas about how Marlowe’s play could be adapted to the screen as a gay love affair, an account of homophobia in the past, an activist intervention in late 1980s/early 1990s British politics, and, focalized through the figure of Edward II, an autobiographical account of Jarman’s experiences as a queer artist in a homophobic society.

Jarman’s first encounter with Marlowe’s play appears to have taken place in the context of his BA General in English, History, and History of Art at King’s College London between 1960 and 1963. His student edition of Marlowe’s Plays and Poems, edited by M. R. Ridley (PC), is only lightly annotated for Edward II. One of the passages Jarman was fascinated by even then is Gaveston’s evocation of the “lovely boy in Dian’s shape” (1.1.60), which is not only underlined but which also benefits from an arrow pointing to it from the left margin. Jarman was also struck by Marlowe’s tendency towards repetition: Isabella’s “Villain, ’tis thou that rob’st me of my lord,” which is echoed immediately in Gaveston’s reply “Madam, ’tis you that rob me of my lord” (1.4.160–61), is marked-up with lines on either side. In Jarman’s film, the parallel construction of the lines is emphasized by the parallel construction of the image in which Isabella (Tilda Swinton) and Gaveston (Andrew Tiernan) face each other in profile, emphasizing both the similarities and the differences between the two rivals (Fig. 1).

Other passages in Jarman’s student edition have marginal annotations such as “extreme shift” to accompany Queen Isabella’s change of focus in a single speech from young Mortimer to Edward (1.4.296–303). Still others bear comparative comments, such as Spencer’s exclamation “Earth, melt to air” (4.7.103), which Jarman compares to later Shakespeare in an ink annotation “Ant.Cleo let rome in tiber melt” [sic]. Three decades later, the Press Book for the film reveals that Jarman continued to think of Edward II as a story comparable to Antony and Cleopatra, since in the blurb on the film, he is quoted as stating:

Once that relationship [between Edward and Gaveston] is shown what it was, people may just want to see the film as a comment on true love. If
you believe in such a thing [. . .] then everything Edward does, including slaughtering so many people, is completely justified. I mean, if Cleopatra is allowed to get away with whatever she gets away with, or Dido and Aeneas, then surely Edward and Piers Gaveston emerge completely vindicated by history. (Press Book, VIII)

Apart from these few examples, however, there is no indication in the annotations to his student edition that Jarman was particularly taken by Edward II, Doctor Faustus, or The Jew of Malta (the other plays he seems to have read in Ridley’s edition) at that point in his life.

This seems to have changed in 1986, the year in which Jarman completed his bleak state-of-the-nation film The Last of England (1987), met and fell in love with Keith Collins, his partner for the rest of his life, and was diagnosed as HIV positive. This is also the year in which Conservative Peer Lord Halsbury first tabled the bill that was to become entrenched in Law in 1988 as Section 28 of the Local Government Act, the Margaret Thatcher-supported legislation prohibiting local authorities from “promoting homosexuality by teaching or by publishing material” (“Section 28”). Marlowe now makes an appearance in Jarman’s private notes: “We must fight the fears that threaten our garden, for make no mistake ours is the garden of the poets of Will Shakespeare’s sonnets, of Marlowe, Catullus, of Plato and Wilde, all those who have worked and suffered to keep it watered” (qtd. in Peake 380). It is at that point that
Jarman returned to *Edward II*, tearing the play apart and reassembling it in fragments in the screenplay “28,” a truncated film treatment that is preserved in the BFI archives.\(^3\) Anticipating Jarman’s retrospective narrative technique in the film of *Edward II*, “28” starts with Edward naked and shivering in the corner of a dungeon. The film treatment integrates Gaveston’s soliloquy from act one scene one of Marlowe’s play in a plot that follows the trajectory of Edward, a homosexual actor suffering persecution in a dystopian near-future Britain presided over by neofascist Prime Minister Margaret Reaper. Blending autobiographical material (including home video footage of Jarman’s childhood), political activism, low-budget super-8 film techniques with a dose of Marlowe, this first treatment projects the early modern past and the political present into a future that looks remarkably like the desolate Britain of *The Last of England*.

With Keith Collins’s help, Jarman soon transformed “28” into the full-length film script for *Sod ’Em*,\(^4\) which sees the plot through to its grim conclusion in Edward’s execution, using the dialogue between Edward and Lightborn from Marlowe’s tragedy (5.5.72–112) for all of Sequence 67 “BERKELEY CASTLE.” Unlike “28,” *Sod ’Em* then resurrects Edward and his lover Johnny, as Margaret Reaper is “mashed in the mouth of hell, horrible mush of masticated blue blood runs down the screen” and Luchino Visconti, Shakespeare, Plato, and God celebrate in “THE GREAT DRAG BALL IN HEAVEN” (224). The script is full of rage and pain, “too angry, too nightmarish, too packed with image and incident” to summarise appropriately (Peake 426)—or, indeed, to allow Jarman to find the financial support necessary to turn it into a film. Yet it is clear that Jarman invested a significant effort in this screenplay, as it survives not only in its posthumous published form as part of *Up in the Air: Collected Film Scripts* (1996), but also in three typescripts: one a sheaf of papers in the Don Boyd archive at the Bill Douglas Cinema Museum,\(^5\) and two near-identical typescripts in Prospect Cottage, which are pasted into photo-album-sized and extensively annotated workbooks bearing the titles “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM” and “SOD ’EM: Novel: Derek Jarman feb. 89.”

Among these, the workbook “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM,” dated “March 1988” on the inside cover, stands out as a literal turning point in Jarman’s thinking about how to pitch his Marlowe-based project to potential funders, as the reverse side of the same workbook represents a different beginning for the project, which is now titled “Edward II.” Famously, in the dedication of the published screenplay *Queer Edward II* to...
“the repeal of all anti-gay laws, particularly Section 28,” Jarman would write: “How to make a film of a gay love affair and get it commissioned. Find a dusty old play and violate it.” The comment acknowledges the difficulties Jarman encountered when trying to find support for Sod ‘Em. This film project was interrupted, it seems, when Jarman received the news that “Working Title had, with the BBC, suddenly come up with the money for him to write a script of Edward II” (Peake 451), prompting Jarman to shift his attention more firmly onto Marlowe’s “dusty old play.” In the “Edward II” script, accordingly, Jarman seeks to find a way of combining a more traditional and textually “faithful” mode of adaptation with his desire to tell the story of a gay love affair and with his passionate investment in fighting the Conservative Government’s homophobia.

The pages of this “Edward II” screenplay published in Derek Jarman’s Sketchbooks convey Jarman’s early visual conception of the film as set against a Renaissance backdrop of Gothic vaults; they also show the extent to which Jarman at this point had decided that the way forward for his project would be by sticking remarkably close to Marlowe’s words. Not only is the screenplay literally based on pasted-in photocopies of the printed playtext, but on the first page, a marginal annotation in Jarman’s hand specifies that “the whole of this first sequence can be kept largely intact” (Farthing and Webb-Ingall 240–41).

Nevertheless, already on the first page, the script also has a flavor of Sod ‘Em. The annotation accompanying Jarman’s presentation of a naked Gaveston in a bath within “a stony crypt like that of Canterbury” reading Edward’s letter recalls Jarman’s citation in Caravaggio (1986) of Jacques-Louis David’s Death of Marat (1793), in which he depicts the sixteenth-century art critic Baglione in his bathtub in a crypt (see figure 1 in Ellis 379). The marginal annotation specifying that the sequence should be imagined as a “Super 8 image of Edward imposed over [the] London skyline” reveals that this image would be created by using both the technology and the style of Jarman’s low-budget films of that period. As Jarman put it in a handwritten note in the “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM” side of the workbook, “While reading this script it is important to ‘hear’ the soundtrack which like that in The Last of England will tell much of the story” (Fig. 2).

As the script develops, it becomes obvious that Jarman is increasingly dissatisfied with the printed text and starts to make it his own by copying it out in his own hand, editing it down in the process.6 By Sequence 3 of this screenplay (Farthing and Webb-Ingall 242–43), which Jarman sets in a throne room to emphasize the public nature of Gaveston’s return,
Marlowe’s verse has been transcribed into prose that is pasted over the printed text as Jarman makes Marlowe’s text his own and begins to move it out of its Renaissance setting into a multitemporal environment. Accordingly, Sequence 6 (Fig. 3) is set in a garden in which “Gaveston naked gathers flowers with the king.” In the screenplay, the erotic image of the
naked male body literally takes on a greater importance than Marlowe’s text and his homophobic barons, as Jarman pastes a cut-out male body partly over the text.

Tellingly, a few pages later Jarman seeks to ground his emphasis on the beautiful muscular male body in history. That is one of the purposes served by his transcription of the description of Edward II as “fair of body and great of strength” from Ranulph Higden’s mid-fourteenth-century chronicle *Polychronicon* (Fig. 4). Typical of Jarman’s working methods, here, is how he sought to absorb, through copying out, the source texts that would give him a better understanding of the character of the king. In the passage Jarman copies out, the chronicler speaks of Edward’s public displays of exotic extravagance (he keeps a camel and in his progresses a lion follows his train led on a silver chain), his love of music and his understanding of architecture and sculpture. Jarman’s absorption of Higden is obvious in *Queer Edward II*, which notes that “Edward was fond of music” (16) and which twice cites “Ralph Higden” (32, 118). It is also evident in the finished film of *Edward II*, where Higden’s account of Edward’s lion on a silver chain, which the “Edward II” script duly integrates at the beginning of Sequence 10, is translated into the snake-wrestler. Meanwhile, the fiddlers of the chronicle morph into the film’s beautifully incongruous string quartet. But Jarman, in his transcription of Higden, is also attentive to what is not present in the chronicle: an annotation at the bottom of the passage, in black ink, queries the absence of Gaveston from the account: “Gaveston missing.”

Jarman’s visualization of Gaveston as naked in the middle of a flowery garden contrasts with the regimented, sombre, and constrained look of Queen Isabella and her ladies in the outdoor sequence that follows (Fig. 5): “Sequence VII Lawn of Palace Queen and Ladies in waiting in the rain under black umbrellas—dressed in black mourning perhaps a formal garden if possible to contrast more with flowers of sequence with Ed & Gaveston.” Felix Nadar’s 1864 photograph of a young, bare-shouldered Sarah Bernhardt which is pasted in at the bottom of the page possibly suggests a sensual side to Jarman’s imaginary Isabella that is concealed behind the Queen’s black mourning. These outdoor scenes are complemented by two indoor scenes in which tables play a key role (Farthing and Webb-Ingall 244–45). The table around which Mortimer and the barons gather is described as “round,” invoking the male fellowship of King Arthur’s round table. By contrast, the table at which Gaveston sits with Edward is a “high table set up frontally like last supper” within the church-like vaulted space suggested by a pasted-in photograph. This al-
Fig. 3. "Edward II," Sequences 5-6 (reverse of "SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD'EM," PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
Fig. 3. “Edward II,” Sequences 5–6 (reverse of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD 'EM,” PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
Fig. 4. “Edward II,” transcription of Ranulph Higden’s *Polychronicon* and beginning of Sequence 10, with visuals influenced by Higden’s account (reverse of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ‘EM,” PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
Iows Gaveston, in the scene of his arrest by the Duke of Lancaster and Young Mortimer, to be pictured as a Christ-figure.

After these sequences, the screenplay peters out as the photocopies of Marlowe’s text are no longer extensively marked-up or transcribed. The blank pages next to them are now filled with a long text that Jarman first conceived as a “Prologue for the script.” After an opening that imagines the curtain call for a performance of an opera, however, this Prologue becomes ever more a personal meditation until, at act two scene two, it butts against the upside-down last page of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM,” with its “GREAT DRAG BALL IN HEAVEN,” coming from the other end of the workbook. From that point onwards, the script of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM” literally takes precedence over that of “Edward II,” as the pages of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM” are pasted over the pages of “Edward II,” which are now barely annotated. The exception is the page of “Edward II” that reproduces Edward’s execution: here, the photocopied text is marked-up in a way that suggests Jarman’s particular interest in this moment (Fig. 6).

The thread is picked up again in a 1914 edition of Edward II (ed. Briggs), which Jarman, according to the date on the flyleaf, acquired in September 1988. This is the edition that Jarman evidently used to construct the sequences for his film, as he moved away from the close adherence to Marlowe’s tragedy in his first “Edward II” screenplay and began to edit and reorganize the text. The resulting more episodic order defies the rigid chronology of his first draft, moving much closer to the disjunctive techniques he had used in “28” and Sod ’Em and to the queer temporality Jim Ellis finds characteristic of Jarman’s Caravaggio (1986) (see also Huttner). Jarman’s method of crossing out the very lines he wishes to integrate into his screenplay is symptomatic of his attitude towards the Marlovian text at this point: Marlowe is cited at the same time as he is subject to an erasure that superimposes Jarman’s political and artistic aims over his early modern pre-text (Fig. 7).

The thread is also picked up in the complete shooting script for Edward II (also preserved in Prospect Cottage), which cuts the play up into the sequences that are first delineated in Jarman’s copy of the Briggs edition. This is the workbook that was photographed in Jarman’s hands on the set of Edward II (Queer 75, 93) and whose front cover bears an “It’s cool to be queer” sticker from the OutRage! activist campaign aimed at outing closeted public figures. The term “queer” is of crucial importance to understanding Jarman’s attitude to the material in the book: Jarman intensely disliked the either/or binary of heterosexual vs. homosexual and
SEQUENCE VII

Larry of Palace Green and had not his
narrowing in the saw in their
underlay - dogs in black mummies
perhaps a formal garden of roses
for modest men who’s frame of thought
with Edi Ganevna.

EXT...
Fig. 5. “Edward II,” Sequence 7 (reverse of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM,” PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
Fig. 6. On the left, the upside-down annotations to “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ‘EM”; on the right, the marked-up murder scene in “Edward II,” on the far right the pasted-in screenplay of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ‘EM” bent back to reveal the “Edward II” script underneath (PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.

Fig. 7. Jarman’s sequencing, mark-ups, and annotations in Briggs’s edition of Edward II (PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
repeatedly insisted on his preference for the term “queer, which includes all of us” (*Smiling* 161). The workbook reveals that it is on-set, at a very late stage of the production process, that Jarman rewrote Marlowe’s “is it not strange that he is thus bewitched?” as “is it not queer that he is thus bewitched?”—the most significant of his textual interventions in the film. There, Tilda Swinton gives the word a striking emphasis which replicates aurally the arrows pointing to the emendation in the script (Fig. 8).

It is also in this workbook that it becomes clear that, as Lee Benjamin Huttner also explains, Jarman hesitated between various choices for his film’s final moments. The split within the film between Edward’s (Stephen Waddington) murder by Lightborn (Kevin Collins, as Keith Collins is credited in the film), which is followed by a replay of the scene in which Lightborn throws the poker into the pool and kisses Edward, is the result of Jarman’s hesitation, even as he was filming these scenes, about how to end the film. In this workbook, the threat of death that hangs over the unexpected redemptive kiss is visualised starkly: on the page facing the dialogue, Jarman has pasted a large, crumpled-up black metal foil used, as Collins notes, by “Lighting cameramen […] to mask and reshape lights” (qtd. in Farthing and Webb-Ingall 234–35). This is the only such page that I have seen in any of Jarman’s workbooks, and one that, in its substitution of vacant blackness for the habitual on-set scrawls, somberly bears witness to the fact that Jarman was bedridden at the time of filming Edward’s execution and had to leave the filming of that scene to Ken Butler (*Queer* 160).

The film concludes with a shot that tracks over the immobile figures of the OutRage! protesters while a final voiceover by Edward hauntingly speaks:

> But what are Kings, when regiment is gone,  
> But perfect shadows in a sunshine day?  
> I know not, but of this I am assured,  
> That death ends all, and I can die but once.  
> Come death, and with thy fingers close my eyes,  
> Or if I live let me forget myself.

The voice comes from beyond the grave and puts a final mournful spin on the tragedy, denying it, at the very end, the promise of redemption held by Lightborn’s kiss and the victory of queerness symbolized by young Edward III’s (Jody Graber) dance on the cage containing Isabella (Tilda Swinton) and Mortimer (Nigel Terry). In the screenplay, however, it is young Edward III who is imagined as speaking these lines, “with a book,
Fig. 8. Sequence 19 in *Edward II* shooting script workbook (PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
as if he has been reading the story” (Fig. 9). Additional handwritten notes show uncertainty about further elements of the *mise-en-scène* and the positioning of the scene: “mothers dress,” reads a note in black ink; “poker after this” is added in blue biro, while at the bottom of the page, Jarman wrote in red: “add this scene as original as well monks robe crucifix and skull [sic].” As imagined and reimagined in Jarman’s screenplay, *Edward II* is a tragedy of the past read by the queer young ruler of the country, with a visual of a monk with crucifix and skull that incorporates Jarman’s recreation of Caravaggio’s *Saint Jerome Writing* in the final moments of the film.

The hesitation over the ending of the film and the evident desire to make it a moment that belongs to Prince Edward, the survivor, rather than his murdered father, is evident in the final screenplay that engages with the material of Marlowe’s *Edward II*. Once he had finished filming *Edward II*, Jarman returned once more to the material of *Sod ’Em*, which he had provisionally shelved in 1989, in the form of the workbook “SOD ’EM: Novel: Derek Jarman feb. 89.” In that workbook, on the first page, the title “Outline for a new film **** by Derek Jarman: SOD ’EM Let’s put the GREAT back into BRITAIN” has a handwritten insertion that makes it read “PANSY IN SOD ’EM.” In its fullest incarnation, dated August 1991 (several months, then, after the final wrap of *Edward II*), “Pansy,” a musical, is a spin-off from the “Bliss” project for which Jarman had received some Channel 4 development funding. The script combines elements of “Bliss” with the tragic material of “28” and *Sod ’Em* recycled in the mode of an intensely abrasive satirical comedy. When pitched to Channel 4 in its new form as “Pansy,” the project received a “blanket rejection” (Peake 477; Mackay).

While “Pansy” ostensibly excises the Marlovian material that was at the centre of the earlier drafts, *Edward II* remains spectrally present. To “poker your arse” is part of the homophobic repertoire of a gang of bullies and Marlowe continues to feature in a list of banned books. Tellingly, “Pansy” seems to continue the story of the queer young prince triumphing over his heterosexual establishment mother, which Jarman had also worked into the end of *Edward II*: as Tony Peake puts it, “In *Edward II*, [Jarman] had touched on the way the young prince observed his elders and then reacted to them. He wanted to take this process one step further, moving it from the margins of the film to the centre of the screen” (476). Accordingly, the musical tells the story of young Pansy, through whose biography Jarman wished to “[chart] the progress of law reform from 1953 to the present” and show how “the Queer Nation are still second
Fig. 9. Sequence 81 in *Edward II* shooting script workbook (PC). Image courtesy of Keith Collins.
class citizens in our society” (Fig. 10, “Pansy”). Once more, we are in a dystopian near-future England ruled by Prime Minister Margaret Reaper and her sidekicks chief of Police Cesspit Charlie and Archbishop Deeply Caring. Unlike his counterpart Edward in Sod’Em, however, who ends up murdered by his jailer in Berkeley Castle, Pansy is rescued by his abseiling fairy godmother, the black bus conductor Stormin’ Norma. Together, they crucify Reaper, who is responsible for the execution of Pansy’s lover, and Norma crowns Pansy king of a realm now dedicated to “sexual freedom.” In his last stab at writing the ending of Edward II in “Pansy,” Jarman thus imagined a conclusion in which the political order is changed for good and in which the hero survives without needing God to resurrect him. The last, hopeful, words of the screenplay are the young king’s: “To the
future.” The Marlovian journey Jarman embarked on during his student days in the sixties thus ended more optimistically than his film of Edward II would lead us to believe, with hope that what lay ahead would be better than the reality of 1991.

Notes

1For an account of some of the commemorative events that were part of Jarman2014, see Silverstone; see also www.jarman2014.org.

2Many thanks to Keith Collins for providing high-resolution images of the documents in his possession and for kindly allowing me to reproduce these images in this essay.

3Thanks to Nathalie Morris at the BFI for her help with this script.

4In a brief preface to the published script, Jarman states that he “wrote this fast and furiously using a copy of Marlowe I found in a shop” (185). He also implies that the contribution to the script by Keith Collins (“HB” in Jarman’s published works) was confined to “spend[ing] hours typing it up” (185), a claim that is contradicted by the double attribution of authorship on the script of “28” (“by Derek Jarman and KC”) and the copyright note in Up in the Air, which attributes copyright to “Derek Jarman and Keith Collins 1986.” Gianmarco Del Re gives a date for Sod ‘Em of 1988 (82), as does Wymer (144); neither provides supporting evidence but both seem to assume that the script was written in response to Section 28 rather than in anticipation of the legislation, as I suggest he might well have done, with the title added in 1988, when the bill was given its title and passed.

5Don Boyd was one of Jarman’s producers and happened to be the first person Jarman told of his HIV diagnosis. The presence of the script in his papers suggests that Don Boyd owned the rights for the project.

6Striking, in view of Tony Peake’s account of Stephen McBridge moving to Dungeness to help Jarman write the screenplay (456; Peake also notes the involvement of Simon Watney), is the fact that no hand other than Jarman’s is visible in this screenplay. This, then, appears to be a workbook in which Jarman on his own tried out his first ideas for a film of Edward II.

7The workbook of “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM/Edward II” is organized in such a way that it is impossible to know for certain which side of the book Jarman started to fill in first. The movement from “SEX N VIOLENCE: SOD ’EM” to “Edward II” I am stipulating here is based on the overall sequence of events that led from “28” through variations of Sod ’Em to the film Edward II. It is however possible that Jarman started working on the script of “Edward II” before reverting to the material of Sod ’Em, pasting that over the abandoned “Edward II” script—either direction is compatible with his working methods.

8On Jarman’s engagement with queer theory, both directly through reading and discussing Foucault and indirectly, through working with Ken Butler and Tilda Swinton, see Pascale Aebischer (48–50).
“TO THE FUTURE”: DEREK JARMAN’S EDWARD II IN THE ARCHIVE

On the figure of the “queer child” in Edward II, see also Alexandra Parson’s essay in this issue.

1953 is the date of two landmark trials: John Gielgud was convicted for cottaging in the same year that also saw the much-publicized first trial of Edward Douglas-Scott-Montagu, 3rd Baron Montagu of Beaulieu, for allegedly taking sexual advantage of a fourteen year-old boy. This is the trial that precipitated the landmark trial of Lord Montagu alongside his cousin Michael Pitt-Rivers and friend Peter Wildeblood in 1954, which set in motion the law reforms that culminated in the decriminalization of homosexuality in 1967. For an account of the trials, see Bengry.

Works Cited


Mackay, James (producer). Personal correspondence with the author. 10 Mar. 2014. Email.