

Re: OT: Historical Amnesia

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-11/0224.html>

From: Patrick Powers (*frisbieinstein_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 11/01/04

Date: 31 Oct 2004 19:58:23 -0800

timo@physics.uq.edu.au (Timo A. Nieminen) wrote in message news:<53fa7cee.0410300043.33961bad@posting.google.com>...

>

> *But, fundamentally, 10:1 is just plain wrong. 10,000 men-at-arms + 15,000 mostly useless infantry versus 1000 men-at-arms + 5,000 very effective longbowmen (who also fought very well in close combat) is not 10:1 odds, despite mediaeval tendencies to only count the bigshots.*

>

Quite true. The reason I did that is because it is common for a small, trained, determined force to defeat a much larger rabble. I don't know how well-trained the respective men-at-arms were. Still, 25,000-to-6,000 odds are quite long enough.

> *Think "mudpit". 250 knights and 250 horses flailing about in mud.*

>

> *Well, there were about 10,000 French men-at-arms, but they couldn't all charge at once. Add to that disorganisation and incompetence, and the numbers in the first attack were smaller than one would have expected success from.*

Everything had to go right (or wrong, if you are French) for the English to win. It was like the nine planets arranging themselves in a line. A freak occurrence.