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Fat, tyrannical and married six times — this is what immediately comes to mind when you think of Henry VIII. However, this is not the story you will read in this issue of *All About History*. Instead, we explore his early years.

The young Henry was a vibrant and handsome man who excelled at all he attempted, whether it was charming European powers, flirting on the dance floor or beating rivals on both the sports field and the battlefield.

Blowing away the cobwebs of his father’s cautious and miserly final years, Henry sought to restore England to its former glory. He invested in cutting-edge warships like the Mary Rose and was a prolific patron of the arts, commissioning grand palaces and portraits.

Behind closed doors, it’s said he enjoyed many happy years married to Catherine of Aragon and was a devoted father to his daughter Mary.

“So, what went wrong?” you might ask. Was it Henry’s overwhelming need for a male heir to further the Tudor dynasty? The irresistible allure of Anne Boleyn that set him on the road to ruin? Or was it a character flaw in Henry that was always going to taint his reign?

Turn to page 30 to discover a different side of one of England’s most iconic kings.

**Editor’s picks**

14. The story of theatre: Explore an Ancient Greek theatre, find out how a Shakespearean player spent his day, and get tips in method acting in our history of the performing arts.

40. Nobody expects the Spanish Inquisition...: To be the level-headed ones. Find out how a sceptical inquisitor saved lives during the Basque witch trials.

70. "Hitler on the Nile"?: Famous for his part in the Suez Crisis that humiliated Britain and France in the 1950s, was Gamal Abdel Nasser really the villain he was painted as?
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KING OF THE WORLD

The box office giant *King Kong* wowed audiences when it premiered in New York City 80 years ago on 2 March 1933. Director Merian C Cooper was so adamant that he didn’t want to use a man in a gorilla suit when making his seminal movie that he brought in special effects wizard Willis O’Brien, who pioneered numerous techniques to bring the silver screen silverback to life. These included stop-motion animation, matte paintings and even the use of full-scale models.

1933
Winston Churchill puffs on a signature cigar while painting a view of the Sorgue River in southern France. Britain’s WW2 prime minister didn’t take up painting until he was 40 but still managed to produce over 500 pictures before his death. He frequently holidayed in France but was persuaded to take his oils and easel with him by artist Sir William Orpen, who recommended the light in Avignon while painting Churchill’s portrait. 

1948
FROM HUNTERS TO FARMERS
A Khoisan hunter-gatherer in South Africa takes aim with a bow and poison-tipped arrow. Believed to be the first inhabitants of southern Africa, this indigenous people lived a semi-nomadic life for thousands of years before they lost their lands in South Africa, Namibia and Botswana to colonists. Within a few years of this photo being taken, the bushmen were increasingly being forced to adopt farming as new laws curtailed their movements.

1905
HISTORY IN COLOUR

THE NEW CARDINALS

Bishops prostrate themselves during a glittering ceremony at St Peter’s Basilica in which Pope John XXIII appoints them to the College of Cardinals. As well as lying facedown on the floor as a sign of their humility, some of the 23 new appointees pulled their scarlet robes over their heads. As is tradition, the pontiff (who was elected the same year) later gave each of them a gold ring to wear, signifying their new title.

1958
“All the world’s a stage,  
And all the men and  
women merely players”  

William Shakespeare, As You Like It
ALL ABOUT

PERFORMING ARTS

Raising the curtain on acting's evolution from ancient religious ceremony to mass entertainment and how it went from stage to screen

Explores an ancient theatre

Becomes a Shakespearean player

Discovers Italian improv comedy

History's greatest actors

Written by Adam Rees, David Crookes, Jessica Leggett and Jack Parsons
Discover how thousands of years of public performances have shaped today’s most popular plays and movies.

**EGYPTIAN ‘PASSION PLAYS’**
Public performance has its roots in religious ritual. In Ancient Egypt, the so-called ‘Abydos Passion Play’ was held each year, depicting the death and resurrection of the god Osiris.

**ANCIENT GREEK DRAMA**
Dramatic performances were an important part of the festival of Dionysus, with entire days dedicated to plays. Best known for writing tragedies, the Greeks also invented the comedy genre.

**COURTLY MASQUES**
Private performances, known as masques, were all the rage during the reign of the Stuart kings James VI & I and his son, Charles I. They were more extravagant than the plays performed at the public playhouses.

**TOO ENTICING**
While noth was for the upper classes, kabuki was aimed at the Japanese lower classes. It was originated by a woman but females were deemed too erotic and so they were soon banned from performing.

**BRINGING UP THE HOUSE**
Public playhouses were built in England following a ban on performances within London. They either consisted of open-air amphitheatres or indoor halls, and were open to all social classes.

**ELIZABETHAN DRAMA**
The estimated number of people who attended the theatres in London each week between 1560 and 1640, around 3,000 new plays were written to meet popular demand.

**SUPPRESSING THE STAGE**
The Puritan Long Parliament banned public performances and theatre in London altogether, which led to a number of playhouses being torn down – including the Globe Theatre.

**THEATRICAL RENAISSANCE**
Following the restoration of King Charles II, the theatres were reopened after almost two decades of closure. The lavish, bawdy plays signalled the end of austere Puritan rule.

**UNDER CONTROL**
This law allowed the Lord Chamberlain to censor theatre and prevented performances in unlicensed playhouses.

**THE THEATRES ACT REGULATION OF 1843**
This law retained censorship but allowed the building and licensing of new theatres.

**THE THEATRES ACT 1968**
The licence theatres were finally abolished with the introduction of a new licence.
ROMAN THEATRE
While the Greeks kept death off-stage, Roman plays were keen to include blood and gore. This may have been an effort to attract audiences from the chariot racing and gladiatorial battles, which were much more popular pastimes.

THE ROMAN THEATRE OF ORANGE
The theatre could seat up to 9,000 spectators in one go. Length of the theatre: 103 METRES
Height of the theatre: 103 METRES

MYSTERY PLAYS
In Medieval Europe, liturgical dramas were performed by priests as a way of explaining the stories behind religious holidays. Popular plays included the Nativity and the Passion of the Christ.

TRAVELLING PERFORMERS
The commedia dell'arte, a form of professional theatre that originated in Italy, thrived between the 16th and 18th centuries. It was based on improvised performances carried out by troupes travelling throughout Europe.

MORAL OF THE STORY
Morality plays, known as Interludes by contemporaries, developed from religious mystery plays. Interludes were more secular but still centred around the protagonist choosing a good and Godly life.

POETIC PERFORMANCE
Noh theatre was extremely popular in Japan, noted for its emotional intensity. Performances were based on historical or legendary tales and masks were used to convey a character's gender, age, status and emotions.

ENTERTAINMENT FOR THE MASSES
Various new theatres opened during the reign of Queen Victoria because of popular demand for public performances, driven by the Industrial Revolution. Theatre took a more naturalistic approach in this period.

ARRIVAL OF THE CINEMA
The rise of cinema during the 20th century influenced theatre directors and playwrights to incorporate film and images in their productions but also gave rise to concerns that it could eclipse theatre altogether.

BROADWAY IN AMERICA
66 Number of theatres opened on Broadway by 1929
225 Number of new shows produced each year in the 1920s on average
10X Tickets for Broadway shows could cost more than the average movie ticket
Greek drama is the foundation of all Western theatre and it was invented in Athens in 534 BCE. Thespis, a wandering bard, astounded audiences at the Great Dionysia, a springtime festival honouring Dionysus, the god of wine. He added a speech to his chorus line of singers and dancers, reciting poetry as if he was the character whose lines he was reading, thus inventing acting (hence why actors are often called ‘thespians’). Later, Greek tragedian Aeschylus introduced dramatic conflict by adding a second actor, while Sophocles added a third part, making stories more complex.

Tragedy is the best-known genre of Greek theatre. Often based on mythology, tragedies like Oedipus Rex and The Trojan Women would be about a protagonist who experiences disaster or great sorrow due to a moral weakness or the inability to cope with unfavourable circumstances.

However, the Ancient Greeks also developed comedy. Aristophanes mocked powerful Athenians — many of whom were in the audience — for their vanity and foolishness. Much later, Menander wrote comedies about ordinary people similar to modern-day sitcoms. Satyrs were also a form of bawdy entertainment but they were short skits that provided comic relief between the performance of tragedies. They are the origin of the word ‘satire’.

As drama evolved, so did the theatres. The Theatre of Dionysus was built on the grounds of the god’s temple, with an amphitheatre made from wood and later stone. The stage developed from a circular patch on the ground to an elaborate set, with painted scenery and even a crane to lift actors through the air. Preceding the Tony Awards by thousands of years, the Great Dionysia festival included a five-day competition in which three poets each put on one tragedy and one satyr. Judges, chosen by lots, then picked a winner.

**Deus ex machina**
Playwrights grew ever more ambitious with what they could achieve on-stage. In 431 BCE, a wooden crane (the ‘mechane’) was added so that the titular character of Euripides’ Medea could fly away in a magic chariot. He also later used the same device to have Bellerophon make a grand entrance, flying in on winged horse Pegasus. Because of the considerable weight involved, the wooden mechane was likely attached to the skene.

**Enter stage left**
Just as in modern theatre, actors would often enter or exit a scene by walking off-stage. However, the side of the stage the actor chose to come on or off had greater significance in Greek theatre. If you entered from the spectator’s right, it meant the character was coming from the city; if they entered from the left, they were coming from the countryside.

**Monumental remodel**
At first, the Theatre of Dionysus was made of wood. However, the Athenian statesman Lycurges refurbished the whole thing in 330 BCE, replacing the seating, stage and skene with stone. Lycurges also built a new temple to the wine god nearby, but in a sign of the times he erected three bronze statues of the great tragedians Aeschylus, Euripides and Sophocles to the theatre’s main east entrance.

**Bring out the bodies**
While it might seem at odds with modern sensibilities, on-stage death scenes were taboo as Greek plays still had religious significance. Instead when a character died — and they often did in tragedies — the audience would usually hear about it via messenger. However, as stagecraft evolved, the Ancient Greeks developed the ekkyklema, a platform that could be wheeled on stage (often through the skene doors) to present an actor playing dead.
Heavens above
The gods frequently appeared in Greek plays, often appearing in the final act to resolve the plot. To give the impression the gods were appearing in the sky, the actors playing them would deliver their speeches from the rooftop of the skene, which was flat and accessible by a hidden trap door.

Dressing rooms
After a separate stage was built for the actors, it was not long until a backdrop was added. Known as a skene (origin of the word ‘scene’), the front was painted to resemble a palace or temple with a central doorway that characters could use to make a grand entrance. The rear of the skene doubled as a dressing room, where actors could change their masks and costumes.

Open-air seating
The word ‘theatre’ comes from the Greek ‘theatron’, which actually referred to the seating area rather than the stage. Built into the southern slope of the Acropolis, the auditorium was arranged in semicircle so everyone could hear and see the show. It had a capacity of 17000, which was a good thing as attendance for the early, more religious plays was virtually compulsory for all citizens.

Setting the stage
While the chorus could rely on their chanting reaching the audience from the orchestra, the actors performed on a raised stage to ensure they were more visible and audible to the audience. Actors not up to the job may have resented having to perform on a pedestal — it made them an easy target for the critical audience, who would throw food and even stones at performers they didn’t like.

Hallowed ground
The orchestra was the oldest part of the theatre. A circular area with an altar (known as a thymele) in the centre, it had been reserved for religious ceremonies since the 6th century BCE. Rather than being a pit for musicians, the orchestra in Greek theatre was where the chorus performed. Even as Greek theatre increasingly gave way to acting, the chorus continued to play a vital part in productions, often providing commentary on what characters were doing.

Front-row thrones
The front row included 67 thrones made from marble. These seats were reserved for VIPs such as the city magistrate, Athens’ most wealthy (who were legally obliged to fund performances) and the panel of judges during competitions. Regular attendees even had their names inscribed into their chairs. The throne in the middle of the row was more ornately carved than the rest and was reserved for the priest of Dionysus.
PERFORMING ARTS

THE
Anatomy of
COMMEDIA
DELL’ARTE PLAYER
ITALY, 16TH - 18TH CENTURY

HALF FACE MASK
THE NOSE HAVE IT
Almost every commedia character wore a different mask. Though originally a full black mask made of wood or leather, the bottom would soon be removed as Zanni’s role as the comic jester moved from physical mime to also include jokes. While Zanni could be cunning and mischievous, the role was most widely known for playing the fool. A good indicator was the length of the mask’s nose – the longer the appendage, the more dopey the performance. Zanni would often also wear a false beard.

STOOPED POSTURE
SUBMISSIVE ROLE
While the play may include young lovers and parents often from the aristocracy, Zanni would provide comic relief as a servant. Not only was this reinforced through the way they dressed, the actors would also adopt an exaggerated crouched, subservient posture, reflecting their position in society and the backbreaking nature of being a physical labourer. The actor who played Zanni would actually be quite limber as the role often involved physically demanding acrobatics.

SLAP STICK
PIONEERING PROP
This device is where the hyperbolic form of comedy still popular to this day gets its name. It consists of a small wooden paddle with two pieces of wood, which would produce a loud noise when struck to be used in exaggerating Zanni’s onstage antics. Alternatively, Zanni might carry a wooden sword, kitchen utensil or play a musical instrument.

STREET ENTERTAINER
ACTING THE FOOL
These masked actors would travel around Italy (and, in later centuries, all over Europe) performing in market places, country fairs and city carnivals. A form of street theatre, every commedia troupe traded in the same stock characters, like Zanni the comic servant (pictured) and Il Dottore, an old bore. The actors would then improvise comedy around loose stories.

CHARACTERISTIC CLOTHES
SHABBY CHIC
As the character of Zanni was a clownish servant, he dressed in the loose rough linen associated with Bergamasque peasants. His broad cap may also have been directly copied from urban chimney sweeps and his trousers borrowed from Venetian sailors. The commedia would also send up the upper classes: La Signoria would be overdressed, with colourful makeup, excessive ruffles and too many jewels.

KING OF CLOWNS
WHAT’S IN A NAME?
Zanni’s unusual name was short for Giovanni, a common name to Bergamo, Lombardy, where the character originated. While Zanni was a character in its own right, the term ‘zanni’ was eventually used as a collective term for all the comic characters in the show. As result, ‘Del Zanni’ was also another name for the commedia. It is also the origin of the English word ‘zany’.
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ON SALE NOW
The Lord Chamberlain's Men was formed at the end of the 16th century and had taken up residence in the newly built Globe Theatre in the Southwark area of London by 1599. Possibly the most renowned company of actors of their day, the thespians performed in front of Queen Elizabeth I and had exclusive rights to perform the works of one William Shakespeare, who often appeared alongside them in his own plays, supposedly playing the ghost in *Hamlet*. Made up exclusively of men due to women only being allowed to perform under law from 1660, the company's main actors became wealthy by putting on productions almost every day.

**PRACTICE MAKES PERFECT**

In the morning, any spare time would be spent rehearsing. Even though they had started their training as boys, which included singing, dancing and being able to fight with swords, actors had to know several characters and plays were never performed two days in a row. Unless they were the most consummate, confident professionals, rehearsing wouldn't have gone amiss.

**WHOSE LINE IS IT?**

The senior men such as Richard Burbage gained renown for their excellent displays but the company would also enlist boys and other hired hands. Given that each performer only had their own lines and the cue word from their fellow actor, as opposed to the whole script, a bit of practice memorising lines together would have helped.

**SHOW THEIR CREDENTIALS**

Often treated with at best suspicion and at worst disdain, the reputations of acting companies were so low that licences from lords or even the monarch were required in order for them to work. Even a company as well-known as the Lord Chamberlain's Men would have to show they were allowed to perform. The authorities also instructed them on how to censor certain aspects of their performance.
MEET THE BARD
Shakespeare was widely regarded as a celebrity at the time, so it was a boon for the actors of the company to consult with the playwright himself, who even performed with them on occasion. Shakespeare wrote many of his characters with actors from the company in mind and had to get approval on a plot from the company before commencing with the writing.

MATINEE
Despite our image of the Globe Theatre packed at night and lit by flaming torches, performances mainly took place in the afternoon, making the most of the natural light. Before showtime, tiremen would help the actors get ready for the show, including putting on thick white make-up that was poisonous due to containing lead and wigs for whichever male actors were playing the female roles that day.

NO TIME FOR AN INTERVAL
Rules imposed by the government meant that performances were limited to two hours, meaning lines were often delivered at breakneck speed in order to fit in the whole play, or sections were left out. This might not have been fast enough in the winter, though, so candles would have been lit as the sun went down.

CONTEND WITH HECKLERS
The beauty of the Globe was that up to 3,000 people from all sections of society would attend and enjoy whatever comedy, tragedy or drama was being displayed that day. However, certain parts of the audience become more involved than others and as passions and spirits rose, actors also had to contend with fruit and insults thrown from the boisterous crowd before basking in the adulation of the curtain call.

MAINTAIN REPUTATION
Despite the poor repute of actors, the Lord Chamberlain's Men managed to avoid the notoriety of other companies — yet few could begrudge them a celebratory drink after the show in the local tavern. After all, tomorrow would be a new challenge as they’re getting ready to use a cannon during a performance of Henry VIII. What could possibly go wrong?
How to Method Act
Stage the Most Emotional Performance of Your Acting Life
US, 1930s

In the midst of the Golden Age of Hollywood, a new way of portraying characters on screen emerged: method acting. Developed in the 1930s by actor Lee Strasberg, who was inspired by Russian theatre practitioner Konstantin Stanislavski, it encouraged actors to draw upon their past experiences to bring real thoughts and emotion to their performance.

Based on the belief that actors need to know every detail of a character’s life, it took off in the 1940s and came to dominate the silver screen. Since actors had to consider how they would feel in their characters’ situation, method acting was thought to evoke an enhanced sense of realism.

Natural delivery
Be natural. When Marlon Brando mumbled his dialogue in A Streetcar Named Desire, he didn’t sound like he was performing.

Casual demeanour
Method acting allows you to improvise to a much greater degree than classical acting, which has its roots in British theatre.

Move with ease
You need to feel comfortable in your character’s skin, so move around freely. Brando got very close to the camera on occasions.

Be understated
When Brando made his entrance, he constantly touched and scratched his body, portraying a character that felt crude and brutish.

Emotional recall
Draw on your life experience and try to recreate the circumstances around a memory to bring it into the present.

What you’ll need...

Script
BRAIN

Costume
CHAIR

Watch

Understand Your Character
It’s important to get to grips with the role, so work on understanding the character inside and out. Read the script carefully, take note of their age and situation, figure how they relate to other characters and become familiar with their motives. Knowing their overall goal and the potential obstacles to achieving that is useful.

Draw on your experience
You want to create a strong connection with the character you’re playing so compare elements of their life with your own. In a sense, you’re imagining how you’d behave, feel and react in certain circumstances. But it is more crucial that you draw on your life experience to find behaviours or moods that can substitute for those of the character.
How not to... go too far

Method acting has evolved since the 1930s, even though its basics have remained the same. Concerns were soon raised about the extent to which a role and personal experience should blend, and the mental effects that could have on an actor. There has also been criticism that method acting is too internally focused, to the detriment of voice and projection.

As such there have been alternatives to, and departures from, Lee Strasberg’s original methods. American actress Stella Adler, who had studied with Russian theatre practitioner Konstantin Stanislavski, was against drawing on emotional memory and she instead emphasised imagination over past experience. Meanwhile, American actor Sanford Meisner based his approach to method acting on Stanislavski’s system, Strasberg’s teachings and Adler’s stance.

The Meisner technique had actors instinctively behaving to their environment and focusing on others in a scene. Yet some actors still become fully absorbed in a role. Daniel Day-Lewis, Heath Ledger and Christian Bale are among those who have remained in character on- and off-screen.

3. TRAIN YOUR MEMORY

To feel ‘on cue’, you will need to develop some triggers. Hone your ‘sense memory’ by relating particular sights, sounds, tastes, smells to certain feelings. Perhaps the smell of bacon cooking makes you joyful or the sound of a dog barking has you shaking with fear. Get to the point where remembering such stimulus provokes an immediate reaction.

4. TRY TO RELAX

Now try to relax — this will help you exert greater control of your body and mind. Sit in a chair for 20 minutes and let your arms and legs hang loose. Move your foot in a circle and shake the tension away, then do this with your other leg before moving to your arms. Now release the muscles in your face and neck and hum.

5. BECOME ALL EMOTIONAL

Fully chilled, you can better work on your emotional recall. You’re looking for a firm connection with your own feelings and emotions, but be warned; it can be draining. Recall a key event, preferably from more than seven years ago (such as the death of a relative — hey, acting ain’t easy) so that the required emotion is played out today.

6. KEEP IT REAL

It’s now time to act the part. Explore the character’s thoughts and feelings during the rehearsal so that you approach the real performance as if you’re playing the scene for the first time. Your aim is to make yourself and the character feel as one, which should make your performance feel more real and hopefully win you that coveted Oscar.

4 FAMOUS METHOD ACTORS

AL PACINO
ACTIVE: 1965–PRESENT
Like many major method actors, he was taught by Lee Strasberg and Charlie Laughton at the Actors Studio in New York City.

MARLON BRANDO
ACTIVE: 1944–2001
Marlon Brando helped popularise method acting but he later distanced himself from Lee Strasberg’s teachings.

DUSTIN HOFFMAN
ACTIVE: 1960–PRESENT
Dustin Hoffman refrained from sleeping for 72 hours in preparation for a scene in the 1976 movie Marathon Man.

ROBERT DE NIRO
ACTIVE: 1963–PRESENT
Taught by Stella Adler, methods differed from Strasberg’s. Robert De Niro prepared for Taxi Driver by driving a cab.
Meet the past and present leading lights who have helped to develop all genres on the stage and the silver screen.

**DHARMENDRA**
**INDIAN 1935-PRESENT**
In Bollywood, the most prolific film industry in the world, Dharam Singh Deol – known as Dharmendra – is one of Indian cinema’s biggest-ever stars. Nicknamed ‘Action King’ for his roles in action film, he was perhaps the world’s single most popular film star, in terms of sheer audience numbers, from 1960 to the late 1990s. He has appeared in almost 100 hit films throughout his career, contributing to the rising popularity of Indian films in other parts of the world from the mid-1970s onwards.

**MARINA ABRAMOVIC**
**SERBIAN 1946-PRESENT**
Born in tumultuous Serbia, then a part of Yugoslavia, Abramović embarked on a mostly solo-performance career from the 1970s onward, in which she subverted the traditions of stage performance by producing a series of provocative, experimental and often self-endangering works that explored the nature of sexuality, pain and even social behaviour. This was often reflected in the actions of her audience members, who would frequently become a part of her nontraditional performances. Her fame was only magnified by the advent of social media, and she is still very active in exploring humanity through performance today.

**HARRISON FORD**
**AMERICAN 1942-PRESENT**
No one’s face has been seen on cinema screens by more people in the Western world than Harrison Ford’s. Getting his first notable role at the age of 31 in 1973’s American Graffiti, few signs pointed to Ford becoming a star. However, after playing Han Solo in the *Star Wars* films and Professor Jones in the *Indiana Jones* franchise, he had become the most popular film actor of all time by 1988. Ford still hasn’t relented that crown and has used his celebrity status to fight for environmental causes and preservation issues.
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE
ENGLISH 1564-1616

Hailed as one of the most influential playwrights of all time and considered to be among the greatest writers of the English language, Shakespeare wrote almost 40 plays, such as Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, Richard III and Macbeth, along with a large collection of poems and sonnets. Equally adept at tragedies, histories and comedies, his work is not only still produced with unerring regularity across the globe, but also an immense influence on a great number of other playwrights, poets, performers and filmmakers to this day.

SOPHOCLES
ANCIENT GREEK C.497 BCE – C.406 BCE

It’s hard to find any one person who has had a greater influence on theatre and playwriting than Ancient Greek pioneer Sophocles. Born into a society that championed philosophy, drama and creativity, he earned fame by beating the then-guarding light of Greek theatre, Aeschylus, in the Dionysia theatre competition in 468 BCE. By altering the rules of playwriting – for example, by adding a third character to the somewhat rigid form of two characters and a chorus – he managed to expand the possibilities of storytelling on stage. He was most famous for his tragedies and while only a few of his plays still survive, those that do are still popular with directors and performers today.

KONSTANTIN STANISLAVSKI
RUSSIAN 1863-1938

Actor-turned-director Stanislavski revolutionised approaches to performance in the late 19th and early 20th century by insisting on the importance for actors to draw on their personal experiences when conveying realistic emotion on stage. This system caught on in Western theatre, which had been dominated by melodrama through much of the 19th century, and later in cinema as well, where it became known as ‘method’ acting, based on the teachings of Stanislavski’s student Lee Strasberg.

SARAH KANE
BRITISH 1971-99

She only published five plays during her lifetime, was never commissioned by royals and her work has not been adapted into major films, but Sarah Kane has had more effect on contemporary theatre than many other 20th-century playwrights. Creating stir when her first play, Blasted, was shown in 1995, she was either hailed as a visionary or attacked for her blunt and explicit writing. She was a big part of the so-called ‘in-yer-face’ theatre, which moved towards a more provocative, socially and politically critical and gritty depiction of the world through drama. Her influence is still felt through Western theatre today, especially among young playwrights.

MOLIÈRE
FRENCH 1622-73

If Shakespeare was the master of the English language and theatre, Molière was undoubtedly the master of the French. Born into an upper-class family, he was involved with theatre from a young age and soon went on to write his own plays. Often receiving royal commissions for work, he gained fame for his comedies, which are still popular material for the world’s stages today. However, despite — or perhaps because of — his background, he began criticising the aristocracy and religion through his subversive use of humour, drawing ire from moralists and condemnation from the prevailing Catholic Church. Some of his plays were considered so insidious that the Church banned them — which only went to further his fame in the long run, of course.

GEORGES MÉLIÈS
FRENCH 1861-1938

Often referred to as the world’s first ‘cinemagician’, Méliès took the nascent film technology recently developed by the Lumière brothers and others and started experimenting with it in creative ways. By trickeries of cinematography, editing and even practical effects, Méliès’ films, of which he made hundreds between 1896 and 1913, introduced an element of narrative, adventure and fantasy to cinema, forming a fascination with the spectacular still felt in motion pictures around the world today.

MOLIÈRE'S most famous plays include Tartuffe, The Misanthrope and The Imaginary Invalid.
PERFORMING ARTS

HISTORY ANSWERS

Was Aphra Behn really a spy?
Diana Khan

Yes! Before Behn became the first professional female playwright in English literature, she was a secret agent. A fervent supporter of the newly restored Charles II, she undertook a mission to Antwerp in 1666, where she contacted a Cromwellian exile called William Scot. Behn offered him a pardon in exchange for information on alleged Dutch plans to invade England. Prior to that, she may have visited the English colony of Suriname in South America to gather intelligence for the crown but the evidence for this is less robust.

What are the roots of kabuki?
Chris Hopkins

Kabuki is a form of traditional Japanese drama with singing and dancing. Though it’s known for its gaudy costumes and coarse humour, it has always been a serious art form that provided a vivid commentary on society. It began in 1603 when a woman named Izumo no Okuni achieved popularity with parodies of Buddhist prayers. She assembled a troupe of all-female players to tour her show but the sensuous character of their dancing and allegations of prostitution led to women being banned from performing in 1629. Kabuki endures to this day but as a male-only art form.

Why is Hollywood the home of the film industry?
Jessica Thompson

While California offers warm weather and varied landscapes that can be used as sets, it didn’t have Thomas Edison. The New Jersey-based inventor ran a consortium of patent holders that monopolised everything needed to create and show movies. He would use the courts to prevent the unauthorised use of everything from cameras to projectors. However, these claims were harder to enforce in California. Not only were the judges less friendly to Edison there, but cross-continental travel was expensive and cumbersome for federal marshals. This time lag was all the new Hollywood studios needed, as the consortium’s patents were expiring and the organisation was losing antitrust cases in the courts.
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When speaking of King Henry VIII, the majority of us probably conjure up the image of a lustful, overweight man prone to fits of fury. His six marriages, the break from Rome and the trigger of the English Reformation as well as his desperate race to have a male heir continue to provoke our interest to this day, largely because of his tyrannical behaviour. However, Henry was an insatiable monarch from the beginning, a man who did whatever it took to get what he wanted. He was, however, a monarch who was never actually meant to rule.

Henry's parents, King Henry VII and Queen Elizabeth of York, had four children who survived infancy: Arthur, Margaret, Henry and Mary. Henry was the second son, the spare to the heir, born at Greenwich Palace on 28 June 1491. Unfortunately, there is little existing information regarding his early life. Having said that, we do know that he spent his childhood in the care of ladies at Eltham Palace, entertained with the tales of chivalric kings, while Arthur was groomed for the throne. Their separation meant that, sadly, little Henry barely got to know his older brother.

Although Prince Henry received an exemplary education, he was never taught the ways of government and administration — he was apparently intended for a life in the Church. Suddenly, everything changed. In 1502, Prince Arthur tragically died a mere five months into his marriage to the red-headed Spanish princess Catherine of Aragon. Just like that, Henry, a ten-year-old boy, was thrust into the spotlight as the heir to the throne, a position that nobody had dreamed he would be destined for.

Henry became the duke of Cornwall in 1502 and the Prince of Wales in 1503. Determined to keep his son away from outside influences, his father hid him away. The next logical step, you may think, was for the king to urgently begin training his son in matters of state but this didn't happen. Instead, little Henry was given no opportunities to learn about ruleship as the king continued to maintain control over all affairs of government. This was in stark contrast to the schooling Arthur had received as heir, when he was sent to Ludlow Castle in Shropshire to assume still more responsibility.

Already isolated, Henry's situation worsened when his beloved mother passed away in February 1503 from childbirth. Elizabeth's death, just a year after the loss of Arthur, left the royal family devastated and stole away the sole source of warmth and love in the young prince's life. Henry was left to enter his teenage years alone with a cold and reserved father, who had become even more withdrawn after losing his treasured wife and queen. The king, keen to maintain his alliance with Spain after the death of his firstborn son, suggested a marriage between Prince Henry and Arthur's 19-year-old widow, Catherine. The new match was agreed and preparations were made for a papal dispensation to sanction the relationship, with Catherine testifying that her union to the late Prince of Wales had never been consummated. Everything seemed to be going according to plan.
However, the situation changed when Catherine's mother, Queen Isabella of Castile, passed away in November 1504. The relationship between her father, King Ferdinand II of Aragon, and King Henry quickly soured and before long, the 14-year-old prince had broken off his engagement to Catherine. He allegedly justified his decision by claiming that he had been forced into the match by his father — whether he was made to break the engagement by the king or through his own free will is debated.

Regardless, the situation left Catherine in limbo in England with little income or resources. Meanwhile, Henry grew into an athletic and handsome man, though he was still denied the opportunity to learn the art of kingship by his father. He became the source of hope for courtiers who wished to see the back of Henry VII and his miserly ways — Prince Henry's reign promised a revival of glory at the English court.

On 21 April 1509, Henry VII succumbed to tuberculosis and the prince succeeded him as Henry VIII. The new king, two months away from his 18th birthday, relished his new-found freedom and immediately rid his court of the remnants of his father's reign. Two of Henry VII's most trusted — and despised — advisors, Edmund Dudley and Richard Empson, were thrown into the Tower of London for high treason and executed.

At the same time, Henry renewed his engagement to Catherine and they married on 11 June, just two months into his reign. Claiming it was his father's dying wish that they wed, it could have been an act of defiance in response to the oppression he had experienced under the late king. Two weeks later, the couple journeyed together to Westminster Abbey for their coronations — Henry and Catherine had officially become the king and queen of England.

Following his coronation, Henry's court was filled with dancing, music, jousts and festivities day and night. His never-ending energy was widely remarked upon and the court was given a new lease of life as Henry lavishly spent the wealth that his father had painstakingly accumulated during his reign. Courtiers marvelled at the new era of luxury and glamour that Henry was ushering in.

Edward Hall, a lawyer and historian, wrote about Henry in his famous work Hall's Chronicle. He stated, "The features of his body, his goodly personage, his amiable visage, princely countenance, with the noble qualities of his royal estate, to every man known, needs no rehearsal, considering that, for lack of cunning, I cannot express the gifts of grace and nature that God has endowed him with all."

Clearly good-looking, charismatic and remarkably talented, Henry embodied all the qualities of a Renaissance king and enchanted all those who beheld him. However, for all of his qualities, he also possessed an impulsive and quick-tempered nature. Indulged as a child without access to the outside world, he had never known anything different. His father had avoided costly foreign wars to focus on consolidating his
Henry’s hobbies
The pastimes of an all-round talented monarch

Music
Henry VIII was a respected composer and musician during his lifetime. There is a common misconception that he composed ‘Greensleeves’ for Anne Boleyn but in fact it was not created until after his death. However, he did pen a number of different pieces of music, which are compiled in his famous collection, the Henry VIII Songbook, created around 1518. Out of the 20 songs and 13 instrumental pieces attributed to Henry, ‘Pastime with Good Company’ is arguably his most famous.

Sports
Known to have been a keen sportsman for the majority of his reign, Henry was noted for his athleticism from a young age. The king enjoyed partaking in archery, jousting, wrestling and dressage, as well as javelin and other sporting activities on a daily basis. In fact, it was claimed that in his early 20s, Henry could supposedly exhaust up to ten horses a day while out on the hunt, a true testament to his good physicality.

Scholarship
Henry is generally considered as one of England’s most intelligent and well-educated kings. He was widely read, with a collection of thousands of books, and was also a learned linguist. He saw himself as a philosopher and author, most notably writing the treatise Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, or The Defence of the Seven Sacraments in 1521 in response to Martin Luther’s 95 Theses, which were nailed to a church door in modern-day Germany. This earned him the title of Defender of the Faith from the pope.

Dance
Among his many other talents, Henry was also a good dancer. During his brother’s wedding to Catherine in 1501, a ten-year-old Henry was said to have grabbed his older sister as a partner and delighted onlookers with his dancing. The king allegedly enjoyed dancing daily, often partnering with his younger sister when Catherine’s numerous pregnancies prevented her from taking part.
A month later, Henry signed the Treaty of Westminster with Ferdinand in which they promised to support each other. In 1512, Henry’s army was finally on its way to France with the intention of meeting Ferdinand’s forces for a joint attack on Aquitaine, which would then fall into English hands after it was conquered. On the surface, it was a perfect plan.

However, Ferdinand, crafty as ever, decided that he would rather pursue his interests in the kingdom of Navarre in northern Spain and completely left Henry’s forces in the lurch. To make the experience even more humiliating, he then sought an alliance with the French, blindsiding the English. Not only had Henry’s ambitions been thwarted, but he had just been taught a lesson on the fickleness of foreign alliances — something that he had not been prepared for.

Despite the setback, Henry was determined to take French territory and reboasted with a new agreement with Maximilian. France had isolated itself from the other European powers in defiance of the pope and Henry’s alliance with the Holy Roman Empire was subsequently seen as a defence of the faith by the papacy. Julius himself offered to bestow the title of Most Christian King, stripping it away from Louis. The pontiff also promised that he would crown Henry as ruler of France, provided he successfully conquered the country. It was a tantalising offer for a sovereign who so desperately wanted the territory.

There was one major issue that Henry needed to face before he could continue his campaign against France. Edmund de la Pole, a nephew of Edward IV and heir to the Yorkist claim to the throne. The situation was difficult thanks to Edmund’s brother Richard, who was living in exile in France as an ally of King Louis. Henry couldn’t allow him to remain alive in England as a blatant beacon for Yorkist supporters, especially with Richard and his allies in France.

He promptly had Edmund executed at the Tower of London in 1513. With the military campaign against France renewed that same year, Henry personally led his troops abroad, arriving in Calais in June. By August, the monarch and his troops had made significant progress together with Maximilian, they seized the town of Thérouanne following the Battle of the Spurs. Shortly afterwards, Henry conquered the town of Tournai in September. These were not the greatest or most crucial of successes but they gave the king a taste of the victory he had hoped for since ascending the English throne.

Although he had dealt with the problem of Edmund and achieved moderate success in France, Henry’s determination to prove himself and his quest for glory drove him to make many questionable decisions. His choice to personally lead his military campaign in France involves an image of a courageous and chivalrous king willing to go with his troops into battle, yet it was an extremely reckless move for a sovereign who had no heir to succeed him or a contingency plan for the throne in the event of his death. Henry had risked plunging his country into chaos for the sake of personal triumph.

Henry’s achievements in France were mild at best in comparison to those of his wife. While the king was away waging war in France, he had left Catherine as regent in England along with a group of councillors to support her. The queen was anxious that King James IV of Scotland would invade England, partly to take advantage of Henry’s absence and also to uphold his country’s accord with France, known as the Auld Alliance. Catherine’s concerns were confirmed when James and his army crossed the border into Northumberland that September, resulting in the Battle of Flodden. Fortunately for Catherine, the conflict was disastrous for Scotland and left many of the
Henry VIII’s beloved flagship

often referred to as ‘Mary the Mystic Rose’ during the time the ship was created.

The Mary Rose took part in Henry’s campaigns against France, most memorably during the England’s time as a member of the Holy League in 1512. Aside from perhaps testing the Channel waters on the way to the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520, it was largely kept out of action during the 1520s and 30s, undergoing a major rebuild. The ship would not grace the water again until 1545, when it was sunk during the Battle of the Solent just outside Portsmouth Harbour.

Scottish nobles dead. King James — incidentally the husband of Henry’s oldest sister, Margaret, a marriage arranged by Henry VII to secure peace with Scotland — was also killed. Catherine sent the bloodstained coat of James to Henry in France as evidence of the historic defeat — in just one battle, she had overseen the bloody glory that her husband so desperately wanted. In comparison, Henry’s success in France was small, insignificant and, above all, expensive.

The king’s costly campaign in France became even more meaningless when, just a year later, he secured peace with Louis. Pope Julius II had succumbed to a fever earlier in the year and the push against France was abandoned under his successor, Leo X. As the new pontiff made peace with Louis, followed by both Maximilian and Ferdinand, the English monarch was left with no option but to do so as well.

Henry reached a truce with the aid of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, who was now the most influential man at court as Lord Chancellor. He supported Henry’s desire for battle with France, effectively replacing the anti-war stances of Foxe and Warham. While Henry enjoyed his frivolities and pursued his obsession with war, he relied on Wolsey like a child. It was often the cardinal who was left to deal with the day-to-day matters of the state, both domestic and financial.

To secure his new peace with France, Henry promised his sister Mary to Louis even though the French king was 34 years older than the princess. It was a dramatic turnaround for Henry, after being so hellbent on defeating Louis. But his efforts turned out to be short-lived as Louis died in January 1515, less than three months into his marriage. He was succeeded by Francis I, a man who proved to be just as vivacious as Henry.
The Field of the Cloth of Gold

A summit where kingly egos were flying high

**01 The king and his men**
Henry is portrayed entering the town of Guines with his entourage, where the English made camp during the summit. Notable figures in the procession include Sir Thomas Wriothesley, Garter King of Arms, and Cardinal Wolsey beside the king. The figure ahead, carrying the sword of state, is Thomas Grey, the marquess of Dorset.

**02 The palace**
Seen here in the forefront, the palace was built specifically for the event and was a temporary structure. It had a solid, brickwork foundation but the walls and roof were made from timber and canvas, reducing the overall cost of the building work. The canvas was subsequently painted to make it look like it was made from bricks.

**03 Fountains of alcohol**
In front of the temporary palace there were two fountains, one for beer and one for wine, for the endless consumption of those attending the summit. Look closely at the foreground and you will see revellers who have doubled over and become sick from drinking too much, while others have descended into drunken brawls.

**04 Gold dining tent**
The lavish gold tent depicted in the middle of the painting is the king's golden dining tent, next to which are the ovens and tents where Henry's sumptuous meals were prepared. Enormous quantities of food were consumed at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, where there were thousands of hungry guests in attendance.

**05 Henry meets Francis**
In the centre of the background lies another luxurious gold tent. Upon closer inspection, you will notice that the meeting between Henry VIII and Francis I is taking place inside. The interior is made up of blue velvet, embroidered with French fleur-de-lys, indicating that this tent actually belongs to Francis.

**06 Tournament fields**
At the top right of the painting are the tournament fields where the jousting, sword fights and archery took place. In a bid to outdo one another, the kings spared no expense when it came to sports, games, feasts and music — the tournaments lasted for 11 days, although there were interruptions due to bad weather.
Next to the tournament fields was the Tree of Honour, an artificial tree built for the summit and was covered in gilt. It held shields, which indicated the different competitions of the tournament, and if knights wished to participate then they showed their interest by touching their lances on their desired rival's shields.

In the distance is the town of Ardres, where the French were staying during the Field of the Cloth of Gold. This painting, attributed to the British School, was likely commissioned by King Henry to not only commemorate the summit, but to also highlight the lavishness of the English camp compared to the French.

On the penultimate day of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, the kings, their queens and retinues all attended Mass together. Towards the end of the service, a salamander firework was accidentally set off, which reportedly terrified the people of Guines. It is shown in the top left corner of the painting, flying over the town.

Henry had real glass windows installed for his temporary palace created by Flemish glazers and so the French referred to it as a "crystal palace". Glass was expensive, and it is estimated that around £36,000 was spent in total by the English on the summit, which was more than the total annual costs of the royal household.

The red and white rose, the iconic emblem of the House of Tudor, can be seen as a symbol throughout the painting. Most noticeably, it adorns the front of the temporary palace, as well as being part of the embroidery of the tent on the far right. Henry clearly wanted to make his mark on the spectacular occasion.
In the meantime, Henry’s quest for a legitimate male heir was proving fruitless. Since his son’s death in 1511, Catherine had given birth to two stillborn sons in 1513 and 1515. The royal couple eventually produced a living heir in 1516 but to Henry’s dismay, it was a girl. They named her Mary. The king remained confident that his long-awaited son would soon follow but a miscarriage in 1517 and a stillbirth in 1518 destroyed his hopes.

For the most part, Henry and Catherine’s marriage was relatively happy, despite the king indulging in numerous affairs over the years. Yet the realisation that his wife was nearing her 40s began to eat away at the king, no doubt emphasised when Francis produced two living sons in 1518 and 1519.

In 1519, the balance of power in Europe changed with the death of Maximilian. A new Holy Roman emperor needed to be elected and the main contenders were Maximilian’s grandson Charles I of Spain and Francis. Desperate to not be left out, Henry also threw his hat into the ring, and he now ruled Spain, Austria, the Burgundian Netherlands and the Holy Roman Empire as Charles V. Henry had never had a real shot in the election but that same month, his mistress, Bessie Blount, gave birth to his illegitimate son, Henry FitzRoy—proof that Henry was able to produce a male heir.

Francis became increasingly unsettled as his kingdom was enveloped by Charles’ vast empire and hoping to prevent the latter’s dominance in Europe, he sought an alliance with England. In June 1520, the two monarchs met at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in an event organised by Cardinal Wolsey that was situated between the French town of Ardres and the English territory of the Pale of Calais. Hailed as a momentous occasion, it was supposed to mark the beginning of a new Anglo-French alliance that would keep them both safe in Europe’s new order.

On paper, it seemed like a great idea but from the start it was also an opportunity for Henry and Francis to indulge in their rivalry. No expense was spared as the two kings tried to outdo each other in the arrangements—the summit’s name derived from the fact that the camp tents were made from cloth of gold, a fabric woven with silk and threads of gold. Food and drink flowed freely.
again as Henry signed an alliance with Charles V and Pope Leo X against Francis. For all the money poured into the event, England did not benefit at all — it was all just another example of Henry basking in his own vanity.

The accord with Charles showed that Henry was still clinging on to the idea of conquering French territory — Charles was in the middle of an all-out war with Francis. However, the English king had completely run out of money and Wolsey was forced raise funds through unpopular subsidies and loans to continue Henry’s plans for war. The monarch, focused on his French ambitions, was oblivious to the building discontent in his own kingdom — his attempts to attack France in 1522 and 1523 with little support from Charles gained England absolutely nothing.

When Francis was captured by Charles’ forces at the Battle of Pavia in 1525, Henry once again saw another opportunity to make his dreams come true. Hoping to take advantage of Francis’ absence, he wanted to stage yet another invasion of enemy territory. Wolsey issued the Amicable Grant — another tax that would raise funds for the king’s warmongering — but Henry still hadn’t grasped the anti-war sentiment that was rumbling throughout England. After years of failed military campaigns, the last thing anyone wanted was to cough up more money. Widespread anger against the move forced the cardinal to abandon the grant.

“The realisation that his wife was nearing her 40s began to eat away at the king”

With no money and no domestic support, Henry was all out of options. Angered by the fact that Charles was seemingly refusing to recognise his claim to the French throne, he switches sides. He signed the Treaty of the More with France in 1525, which was then under the regency of Francis’ mother, Louise of Savoy, on account of the French king’s imprisonment. Henry promised to relinquish some of his claims to French territory and to help negotiate Francis’ freedom.

His hope for glory in France reduced to barely a glimmer, Henry’s attention was soon diverted by one of Catherine’s ladies-in-waiting, the young Anne Boleyn. During the first half of his reign, the monarch was not the full-on cruel tyrant he became by the end of his life. Yet, as a spoilt and impetuous young man, whose obsession with chivalric glory and vanity eclipsed the needs of his country, it is clear to see that the seeds had been there right from the beginning.
The Basque Witch Trials

Despite its reputation for intolerance and cruelty, when a witch craze erupted in Spain’s Basque hinterland, the Inquisition became a force of restraint.

Written by Joe Wright
In November 1610, six people were executed for witchcraft in Logroño, a town over 120 kilometres from Pamplona. Another five people, who had died in captivity, were burned in effigy. The local tribunal of the Spanish Inquisition had been sifting evidence and extracting confessions for more than a year and now, before thousands of onlookers, the hapless victims — people who had denied all charges against them — were put to death.

The truth was undeniable — the European witch craze had arrived once again in northern Spain. Mercifully, November 1610 marked the end of the killings but, over the coming years, many more men, women and children would come under intense scrutiny.

At first, this supposed outbreak of witchcraft was thought to be limited to a handful of villages, chiefly Zugarramurdi, but fears of an organised, wide-ranging sect quickly emerged. People would be charged with all too predictable litany of demonic offences. Tales would spread of secretive night-time Sabbaths with their lascivious dances and sexual liaisons with the Devil: “Couplings so horrible,” as one contemporary put it, “that it is a horror to tell.” Murders and mishaps were blamed on the mischief of witches who supposedly scoured the local hillsides to find toads for their poisonous brews. Bizarre, nocturnal aerial jaunts were reported, with the witches sometimes transforming into houseflies or ravens.

From the outset, however, not everyone was convinced of the veracity of these sensational stories. Pedro de Valencia, one of the royal chroniclers, suggested that “some of the things they have admitted are so improbable that many people will refuse to believe them,” so perhaps it was wiser to “consider the whole story to be something the witches dreamed up.”

Even some within the Spanish Inquisition, which was charged with overseeing the trials and executions at Logroño, exhibited scepticism. Alonso de Salazar y Frias had arrived in Logroño in June 1610, appointed as the local tribunal's new and rather junior inquisitor.

Salazar, said to have graduated from the illustrious University of Salamanca and with an impressive career as a lawyer underway, Salazar was not slow to express his doubts. His qualms appear to have been shared by both the crown and the Inquisition's central body in Madrid, the Suprema, and Salazar was charged with conducting a visitation of the Basque region between May 1611 and January 1612.

He conducted interviews with hundreds of people: both those who had confessed to practising witchcraft and those who had levelled accusations. His lodestone was the application of rigorous evidential tests as he exposed animals to supposedly deadly potions. He also organised the physical examinations of women who claimed to have had sexual relations with the Devil and compared accounts of the sites of alleged Sabbaths with the actual locations.
What to expect from the Spanish Inquisition

I. Raising the alarm
The Inquisition tended to deal with witchcraft on an ad hoc basis rather than through regular visits to local areas. Reports of sinister activities would usually first come to the attention of a parish priest through confessions or accusations. If convinced of their credibility, the priest would then conduct interviews and report his initial findings to the local tribunal of the Inquisition.

II. Enter the Inquisition
The officers of the local tribunal would call for the transfer of suspects to the Inquisition's jails. Reports of sinister activities could be curtailed for generations. The Inquisition tended to deal with witchcraft on an ad hoc basis rather than through regular visits to local areas. Reports of sinister activities would usually first come to the attention of a parish priest through confessions or accusations. If convinced of their credibility, the priest would then conduct interviews and report his initial findings to the local tribunal of the Inquisition.

III. Judgement
The rule of thumb was that if a person confessed, the Inquisition was convinced of their guilt, the death penalty was hardly ever imposed in such circumstances. If a person denied being a witch, even though the Inquisition was convinced of their guilt, the possibility of more severe punishments arose. On the rare occasions when executions were ordered, the deaths would take place in large public ceremonies. The consequences for the families of victims were serious — many aspects of involvement in public life, owning property and social interaction could be curtailed for generations.

IV. Spreading the net
In the wake of these initial investigations, a local tribunal might be convinced that an organised and widespread witchcraft sect existed, as was the case with the Basque trials. Under these circumstances, agents of the Inquisition would be sent out with the express purpose of unearthing more guilty parties and assessing the reliability of accusations. The cycle would begin again.

The results were striking. The potions killed no animals, the virginity of many of the women was still intact, and testimonies concerning night-time meetings simply did not tally with physical realities. As Salazar explained in one of a series of reports to the Suprema, far too much was "false, fake and fraudulent," so "the witches are not to be believed." But what could have possessed people to tell such self-incriminatory stories about themselves? Perhaps, he opined, they were delusional. If the Devil was at work, his methods were subtle indeed.

The 80-year-old Maria de Echevarria from Oronoz, for example, had made a confession out of "heartfelt contrition," but "what this good woman was confessing about her witchcraft was, without doubt, nothing but a dream." She claimed to have fallen asleep and then been whisked away to Sabbaths, and yet "nobody ever met or saw her leaving or return, not even her own elderly daughter who slept in the same bed." Another woman insisted that, after surrendering to Satan, three toes had been taken from her left foot. However, it turned out that she had lacked the toes since infancy.

Salazar was blunt: "I have not found a single proof, nor even the slightest indication, from which to infer that an act of witchcraft has actually happened." The accusers, often acting out of malice, could not be trusted and the accused were either caught up in fantasy or had been "weakened by the fierce inducements and sinister methods used to extort their declarations." A climate of fear and paranoia had provided "a reason for everything happened." The accusers, often acting out of malice, could not be trusted and the accused were either caught up in fantasy or had been "weakened by the fierce inducements and sinister methods used to extort their declarations." A climate of fear and paranoia had provided "a reason for everything happened."
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The Suprema heeded his advice and swiftly issued instructions about how future investigations ought to be conducted. Facts were to be checked and re-checked and, at every turn, attention was to be paid to the constant "doubt prevailing in these cases." Most pleasingly of all, those who perished at Logroño in 1610 may have been exonerated. Unsurprisingly, not everyone was delighted by Salazar’s manoeuvres. One of his critics could not “understand how any sensible and intelligent person can bring himself to doubt the truth.”

Everyone surely realised that witchcraft was a real and urgent threat since this “has been absolutely proved and acknowledged by all the scholars in Christendom.” Salazar was acting on “no other basis than his own vocation.”

Others suggested that Salazar himself was in league with the Devil. Such assaults make it
very tempting to position Salazar as a forward-thinking trailblazer of rationalist attitudes towards witchcraft, perhaps even to see him as something of a maverick. A little caution is required, however.

He was neither as progressive, nor as out-of-step with his times, as has sometimes been suggested. Salazar wasn’t questioning the fundamental notion that witchcraft existed, or that it was the result of dangerous alliances with the Devil. He simply concluded that it was not being practised on an epic scale in the specific case of northern Spain in the first and second decades of the 17th century. “The real question,” as he put it, was “are we to believe that witchcraft has occurred... simply because the witches say so?” The evidence told him no, and he acted as he did because of a sharp legal mind rather than a tender heart or some kind of proto-modern sensibility.

It would be erroneous to believe that Salazar was unusual in his sceptical attitude towards charges of sorcery. The Spanish Inquisition’s reputation might lead us to assume that it was endlessly pursuing witches and subjecting them to horrendous punishments but we would be mistaken. It is certainly true that during the decades following the Spanish Inquisition’s foundation in the late 15th century, witchcraft was perceived as a matter of grave concern. Witches could readily be perceived as a target of the tribunal’s mission to eradicate heresy; they were abandoning their baptismal vows by offering fealty to the Devil and they were reputed to abuse holy words and holy objects in their rituals.

The first burnings occurred during the 1490s and some of the local branches of the Inquisition, notably at Zaragoza, adopted a stern approach to any whispers of witchcraft. From quite early on, however, a cautious attitude, not dissimilar to Salazar’s, developed. The default position for many inquisitors was that witches were likely to be deluded rather than genuine acolytes of Satan and detailed rules of enquiry were being enforced by the mid-1520s. The duty, as one edict from the Suprema insisted, was to determine whether the person who confessed to witchcraft had “really and truly committed the crime they have confessed, or whether they are in fact fooled.”

Strikingly, the procedures of the Spanish Inquisition were relatively lenient in cases of witchcraft when compared to the ecclesiastical authorities of Protestant Northern Europe were often a good deal tougher. In Spain, torture was not routinely applied, property was typically not seized from the accused, and the death penalty was rarely pursued.

Local tribunals occasionally adopted more aggressive methods but these were often frowned upon by the Suprema. The last official executions of witches by agents of the Spanish Inquisition took place in Aragon in the mid-1530s, and then in Catalonia in the late 1540s.

“The default position for many inquisitors was that witches were likely to be deluded.”
The Spanish Inquisition

Tribunals in the south of Spain hardly ever seemed to concern themselves with cases of witchcraft. Even the Zaragoza tribunal, after intolerant beginnings, only dealt with a handful of magic and witchcraft accusations between 1550 and 1600, with no death sentences passed down.

In 1568, someone was sentenced to the galleys for teaching spells and a soothsayer was whipped in 1574. Only a single case concerning fully fledged witchcraft came to judgement during these five decades, when a 30-year-old woman, charged with killing animals and people through malevolent magic, was whipped and banished for four years.

Events in the Basque Country between 1609 and 1614 were a rarity. The complicity of the Suprema in the early stages of the persecution was out of character and quickly shifted to a more measured approach — this was precisely why Salazar was dispatched on his visitation.

The region had, admittedly, always sustained a reputation as a mysterious hotbed of witchcraft, and outbreaks of persecution were hardly unknown. Still, when Salazar voiced his concerns, he was reacting to the overzealous strategies of his local superiors and sustaining a long trend of caution and scepticism. But none of this diminishes the significance of Salazar's work and early modern Europe had developed a new way of conceptualising witchcraft. It was now seen as a satanically inspired, highly organised secret sect. Salazar may not have questioned the possibility of the Devil intervening disastrously in human affairs but, when faced with specific suggestions of witchcraft, he was known to behave with an extraordinary rigour and circumspection.

"The vast majority of executions for witchcraft were conducted by the secular authorities"
From the outside looking in

Another supernatural tale that was met with credulity and scepticism concerned the so-called donas de fuera (or 'ladies from outside'). The term applied to a race of fairy-like female creatures, often described as strikingly beautiful and possessing animal hands or feet, and the human beings who associated with them.

The donas' home was Sicily, which, because the island was a Spanish vassal at the time, brought them to the attention of the Spanish Inquisition. Again, the Inquisition appears to have been more interested in investigation than overly harsh punishment—between 1579 and 1651, 65 people, including eight men, were allegedly accused of involvement.

Positive and negative activities were attributed to the accused group. On the one hand, it was suggested that those who offended the donas might have illness inflicted upon them. On the other, those linked to them were renowned for their charismatic healing skills and performed other beneficial duties, such as blessing houses, in their close communities.

The existing legal records suggest that the donas were much discussed, which suggests that those involved were far from bashful about advertising their supposed gifts. Indeed, the associates of the donas—overwhelmingly made up of old, poor women—secured food and payments for their services, and intimacy with the fairy creatures was widely seen as a privilege. Only those with sangre dulce ('sweet blood') could expect to be instructed in the wide range of magical practices.

A number of women brought before the Inquisition admitted that they had concocted their stories and others told of re-enacting supposed encounters with the fairy folk in order to impress potential clients. The notion of night-flying spirits with extraordinary gifts was one of the recurrent themes in the early-modern supernatural world-view and in some places, notably Scotland, a link between fairies and witchcraft was deeply embedded. Fairies at this time were not perceived as the harmless sprites who inhabit the modern popular imagination.
The Spanish Inquisition

His fellow inquisitors had been convinced of a mass witchcraft epidemic because so many confessions shared the same details. But this was what made Salazar suspicious — might it not just as easily signal mass delusion?

Crucially, the reforms and codifications enacted by the Suprema — and inspired by Salazar’s reports — had a transformative effect. It now became necessary to corroborate any accusations of witchcraft, and all testimonies had to be recorded in their entirety rather than simply being summarised. As a result, inconsistencies and contradictions became much easier to spot, along with what Salazar described as ‘claims that go beyond all human reason.’

To his great credit, Salazar also realised that he had played his own part in fanning the flames of paranoia and, for the remainder of his career, he would do much to prevent a repetition of the panic that had engulfed the Basque region. As his reputation blossomed within the Inquisition, he monitored the activities of local tribunals and, on occasion, directly intervened when the secular authorities’ zeal reached fever pitch.

Between 1424 and 1782, as many as 60,000 European people were legally put to death for witchcraft. Historians have, however, talked of a so-called ‘Mediterranean mildness’ in this context. Spain certainly had its share of persecutions but, by comparison with other parts of Europe, it behaved with relative restraint.

The great surprise is that the Spanish Inquisition, for all its infamous notoriety, was one of the key factors in limiting the carnage. One of its agents, Alonso de Salazar y Frías, was a crucial part of this tradition and well deserves his reputation as the ‘witches’ advocate’.

The Spanish Inquisition tried 5,000 people for using magic between 1610 and 1700. None of them were burned.

The title page of the Malleus Maleficarum, the late 15th-century book that set the tone for attitudes towards witchcraft.
Meet the forgotten eleventh president who shaped the United States into a continental giant – but hastened its fall into civil war

**Written by Dominic Green**

The United States of America, the song *America the Beautiful* says, runs “from sea to shining sea”, east to west from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific. The country also runs from the 49th Parallel, much of which marks its northern border with Canada, to the Rio Grande, which forms its southern border with Mexico.

These boundaries were the creation of many ordinary Americans, especially the settlers who established themselves on Mexican land in Texas and British-claimed land in the Oregon Country in the Pacific Northwest. But the formation of the nation as the modern colossus bestriding two great oceans was the diplomatic and military feat of the country's often overlooked eleventh president, James Knox Polk.

It was he who successfully asserted American claims against Britain in the Oregon Country, securing the northwestern corner of the nation without firing a shot. He also sent an army to Mexico City and forced the Mexican Republic to surrender all of its territory north of the Rio Grande.

But Polk's presidency was only a brief triumph. His inability to understand that slavery was a danger to the Union accelerated America's path to the catastrophic Civil War in 1861.

**Frontier Origins**

In Pineville, North Carolina, Polk was born in a simple log cabin in 1795, the first child of Samuel and Jane Polk, who could trace their family origins to Presbyterian emigrants from Ireland. At the baptismal font, it apparently emerged that Samuel had doubts about Presbyterian theology so his firstborn son went unbaptised. Nevertheless, his mother, a strict Calvinist, imbued him with staunch religious principles of hard work, self-discipline and an unquestioning faith in predestination, the belief that God has already decided what will come to pass.

But it was Polk's grandfather Ezekiel who ordained the future of the family's lives. In 1803, when Polk was eight years old, Ezekiel, like a Biblical patriarch, led some of his family on a pilgrimage into the wilderness. They settled in the frontier country at Maury County, Tennessee, and three years later, Samuel and his family joined them. Polk was a sickly child and life was hard. In 1812, he underwent an operation for urinary stones — the anaesthetic was brandy — which may have left him sterile.

The Polk family soon dominated the political life of this new society in the woods. As Samuel's business interests grew, he became a county judge. He also befriended another influential judge, Andrew Jackson, the future hero of the War of 1812.
By and president of the United States. After studying at the University of North Carolina, Samuel’s son began practicing law at Nashville, Tennessee, in 1820. Polk’s first brief was to defend his father against a charge of public brawling. Samuel allegedly paid a token $1 fine.

In 1822, Polk stood for the Tennessee House of Representatives as a Democrat and won by a huge margin. Jackson supported his political career, causing the two to spark an alliance that would endure for the rest of Jackson’s life. Polk played the ‘Young Hickory’ to Jackson’s gnarled ‘Old Hickory’. Months later, Polk also made another strategic alliance (possibly with Jackson’s encouragement) by marrying Sarah Childress, the accomplished but strictly religious daughter of one of Tennessee’s leading families.

A year later at the 1824 elections, Jackson won the popular vote but failed to get a clear majority from the Electoral College. The House of Representatives instead chose John Quincy Adams as president but he had come second in both the popular vote and the Electoral College. Jackson and his supporters alleged underhand dealings by Adams and his supporters. When Polk came to Washington, DC, as a Tennessee Congressman in 1825, he took up Jackson’s cause, calling for the abolition of the Electoral College and echoing Jackson’s agrarian populist policies. These depicted the small farmer as the true American pioneer, and the urban, eastern establishment as a corrupt elite.

When Jackson won the 1828 election, Polk became one of his closest advisors. As Jackson’s voice in the House of Representatives, he rose quickly, learning how to manipulate the legislative machinery of committees and procedures as he went. In 1838, with a presidency in mind, he returned to Tennessee and won the governorship. But he was unable to master the Tennessee House.

Mexican Stand-off

The economy was still weak after the Panic of 1837—a recession caused in large part by Jackson’s policies—and in 1840, Jackson’s presidential successor, Martin van Buren, lost the White House to the rival Whig party. The Tennessee legislature voted against Polk’s requests for expensive programmes of education and infrastructure, and his Jacksonian proposal to strengthen state banks against financial panics instead of giving additional powers to a national bank. In 1841, Polk lost the governorship. He stood once more in 1843, only to face failure once again.

Still, Polk had positioned himself to inherit the nomination as van Buren’s running mate in the 1844 elections. Polk was a diplomat in a Washington where political differences still led to duels, and where the issue of slavery was threatening to split the North and South. In a Jacksonian style, he also aligned himself with the issue that would force slavery to the top of the agenda by the end of the 1840s—the territorial expansion of the United States.

The Creed of Expansion

In 1845, as President Polk steered the United States towards a stand-off with Great Britain in the Oregon Country and a war against the Republic of Mexico, the journalist John O’Sullivan wrote that it was “our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allowed by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions”.

Since then, the words ‘manifest destiny’ have served as shorthand for the ideas that drove the expansion of the United States. This process ensured the rise of the nation as a global power in the last decades of the 19th century, but it also accelerated the slide towards the Civil War and the decimation of the Native Americans.

Polk’s party, the Democrats, was the party of expansion and slavery. The opposition, the Whigs, were looking for abolition as they feared that expansion would tip the political balance of the United States away from the cities of the northeast, and instead towards a society of slave-holding farmers in the west.

For the Whigs, talk of manifest destiny was a corruption of the noble principles on which the American republic had been founded, and a reflection of the dangerous populism of Andrew Jackson and his protégé, James Polk. Yet the United States had been founded by Puritans who, like Polk’s mother, believed in the religious predestination of their society. The idea of manifest destiny, like the later belief in American exceptionalism, was a reflection, ugly or not, of the country’s origins.

“The Polk family soon dominated the political life of this new society in the woods”
In 1836, the white settlers of Mexican-ruled Texas declared their independence. Jackson, then the president, had recognized the rebels but Mexican threats of war had prevented him from annexing the self-proclaimed Republic of Texas. Meanwhile, Britain, which had defeated the United States little over two decades earlier in the War of 1812, was courting Texas.

The Texans were slaveholders while the British, having recently eradicated slavery, used their navy to become patrons of abolition. If the United States allowed Texas to fall into British or Mexican hands, it would become an obstacle to expanding west. But if America absorbed Texas as a pro-slavery state, it would exacerbate tensions between the South and the North’s abolitionist majority. Tensions would also rise if Texas was absorbed without slavery, as it would become a haven for escaped slaves.

Polk, too, was a slave owner — he had inherited 20 slaves and a cotton plantation on his father’s death in 1827. The right to hold slaves was protected in the American Constitution but he underestimated slavery’s potential as an issue capable of dividing the Union. He believed that expanding the country was a more pressing affair than the South and the North’s abolitionist majority. Tensions would also rise if Texas was absorbed without slavery, as it would become a haven for escaped slaves.

The Whigs and Democrats were both divided over Texas. When the Whig nominee, Kentucky’s Henry Clay, declared that he was against annexing it, so did Van Buren. Jackson, who favoured the plan, now pushed for Polk, presenting him as the only nominee capable of uniting the party and winning the presidency. Polk deployed his experience as a party politician, skilfully manoeuvring through nine ballots at the party convention of 1844, and took his chance.

“Who is James Polk?” became the Whigs’ election cry. He was the first ‘dark horse’ candidate but he only appeared to emerge from nowhere.

In reality, he was actually an experienced administrator, materialising from within a party in crisis, as Abraham Lincoln would as the Civil War loomed. Yet while Lincoln would become the candidate of a party on the edge of civil war, Polk won the 1844 election as a unifier.

**AMERICAN SOIL**

The American population was doubling in every generation and now equalled that of Great Britain. This baby boom created a rapid momentum of industrial growth in the established states in the east and a constant flow of settlers to the west. The country now possessed the means and numbers to fulfil the dream of the Founding Fathers — a United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific. To Americans of the era it seemed History and God had predestined that the nation would become a global power.

"THE AMERICAN POPULATION WAS DOUBLING IN EVERY GENERATION"

Polk's inauguration featured in the Illustrated London News

**ASK THE EXPERT**

Rather than a ‘dark horse’ candidate, biography writer Walter Borneman argues that Polk was actually a tenacious workhorse.

What was Polk like as a man? Polk was scholarly, reserved, and bookish — what some might today characterise as a ‘nerd’. Growing up on what was still the rough and tumble American frontier, he spent time lifting law books, not splitting rails. With his personality, however, there burned considerable political ambition from a very early age.

As a career politician, was it really unexpected that he would run for president? The idea of Polk as a ‘dark horse’ is a political myth. Polk was one of the most seasoned and accomplished politicians of his day, someone who had designs to follow in Andrew Jackson’s footsteps of the White House from the very beginning of his political career. In the Tennessee legislature, seven terms in Congress, including two as Speaker of the House, and as governor of Tennessee, Polk always had his eyes on the bigger prize. He was the only nominee capable of uniting the party in 1840 and was positioning himself for the same in 1844. The letters that go back and forth between Polk and his campaign managers show how much he manoeuvred and sought the nomination.

Was he really a workaholic? Polk was a hard worker and his work ethic has not been exaggerated. As a three-time candidate for Tennessee governor, he drove himself relentlessly on the campaign trail, riding horseback back and forth across the state. He might well have employed surrogates. As president, Polk was very much a hands-on manager with regular cabinet meetings, a constant stream of visitors, and numerous meetings with political friends and foes alike.

Was Polk blind to the rising tensions over slavery? Polk was definitely not blind to the rising tensions between the North and South over slavery — he was himself a slave owner — but he generally chose to ignore or at least downplay these ties. For example, he was very careful as president to keep his ownership of slaves and a Mississippi plantation quiet. Many historians have claimed that Polk’s expansionist policies were tied to his promotion of the expansion of slavery but I don’t believe this is true. Polk was motivated largely by the example of Jacksonian America and manifest destiny to expand across the continent. He pushed this agenda for reasons of trade with the Pacific and to counter British and Spanish interests in North America far more than any idea of expanding slavery.

Why is Polk not better remembered? The major reason is that Polk was a slave-owning Southerner whose legacy got pushed aside in the wake of the Civil War. I have always thought it interesting to speculate which side Polk would have come down on had he lived to see the war. Many assume that he naturally would have supported the Southern cause as a result of his inherited plantation but his strong Unionist tendencies — clearly in the mould of Andrew Jackson — may well have kept him on the side of the North. Perhaps he might even have kept Tennessee in the Union.

Walter Borneman is the author of *Polk: The Man Who Transformed America and the Presidency*. His latest book is *MacArthur at War*. 
James K Polk: American Conqueror

The Treaty of Paris, 1783
The Treaty of Paris, in which Great Britain recognized the independence of its former American colonies, established the United States of America as 13 states, with an eastern border on the Atlantic Ocean and a northern border with British-nursed Canada. Its western border was the eastern bank of the Mississippi River.

The Florida Cession, 1819
In 1819, when West Florida declared its independence from Spain, President James Madison sent in the troops. Spain did not accept this conquest until 1819, when the Adams-Onis Treaty finally settled all American and Spanish claims in North America. Six months later, Spain annulled part of the treaty by recognizing the independence of Mexico, creating new boundaries.

The Louisiana Purchase, 1803
In 1803, the French leader Napoleon Bonaparte tried to re-establish the French Empire in the Louisiana Territory. Three years later, the administration of President Thomas Jefferson bought the 1.3 million-square-kilometre territory from the French government for 50 million Francs ($15.25 million) and the cancellation of debts worth 18 million Francs ($3.75 million).

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, 1848
Imposed on a defeated Mexico by the administration of President James Polk in the aftermath of the Mexican-American War, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo massively expanded the borders of the United States towards the Rio Grande, with the acquisition of Texas, and the Pacific Ocean, with the acquisition of California.

The Alaska Purchase, 1867
In 1867, Secretary of State William Seward signed the Alaska Purchase, in which the United States bought more than 865,000 square kilometres of territory in Alaska from the Russian Empire. The Russians, realizing that Alaska was militarily indefensible, sold it for $7.2 million – about two cents an acre.

The Gadsden Purchase, 1853
In 1853, the United States paid $10 million to the Republic of Mexico for just over 48,000 square kilometres of territory in what is now southern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico. The US wanted land for a transcontinental railroad and the Mexican government needed money. The purchase was named for James Gadsden, the American ambassador to Mexico.
The outgoing president, Andrew Tyler, tried to push a resolution for the annexation of Texas through the Senate with Polk’s help. Taking office as the eleventh president, and the youngest up to that point at the age of 49, Polk pledged to complete the annexation of Texas, to defend slavery as a constitutional right and to protect the claims of American settlers in the Oregon Country, which extended from the northernmost border of Mexico at the 42nd Parallel to the 54th.

Britain and the United States both claimed the territory – Britain through the expeditions of Captain Cook and George Vancouver, and America through the land explorations of Lewis and Clark as well as the voyages of Robert Gray. Neither country wanted a conflict. In 1818, they agreed to administer the land together but the influx of settlers in the 1840s tipped the demographic balance towards an American majority and patriotism rose accordingly.

When Polk spoke of annexing the Oregon Country, the British threatened war. Polk, calculating that they were more interested in good trade relations, proposed dividing it, extending the Canadian-American border eastwards to the Pacific. Britain would get Vancouver Island but would concede the future state of Oregon.

Polk had called Britain’s bluff and he now called it again in Texas – but he didn’t read his adversaries’ intentions correctly. In December 1845, he signed a resolution annexing the land, then sent an envoy to Mexican president José de Herrera with an offer to buy New Mexico and California for $30 million. Polk expected de Herrera to sell but he refused.

While exploring the idea of sponsoring a coup in Mexico, Polk sent General Zachary Taylor and 3,500 troops to the Nueces Strip – an area on
the northern bank of the Rio Grande claimed by Texas and Mexico – in early 1846. He instructed his general to provoke the Mexican Army and by May, word had reached him that American soldiers had been killed and captured on the Strip. Polk accused the Mexicans of having “shed American blood on American soil”, even though Taylor had seized California.

Los Angeles, which allowed him to declare the empt possible interference, Polk sent his troops to during his circumnavigation of the globe. To pre-forward meant pushing back Great Britain’s ambitions — the British claim to Califomia dated to Sir Francis Drake’s landing at ‘New Albion’ in 1579, but it was only in 1846 that Texas and Mexico — in early 1846. He instructed his general to provoke the Mexican Army and by May, word had reached him that American soldiers had been killed and captured on the Strip. Polk accused the Mexicans of having “shed American blood on American soil”, even though Taylor had provoked the conflict. Congress voted for war.

Naturally, pushing the United States’ frontier forward meant pushing back Great Britain’s ambitions – the British claim to California dated to Sir Francis Drake’s landing at ‘New Albion’ during his circumnavigation of the globe. To pre-empt possible interference, Polk sent his troops to occupy Santa Fe, the capital of New Mexico, and Los Angeles, which allowed him to declare the seizure of California.

WESTWARD HO

In September 1847, Mexico City fell to the United States and Polk imposed the terms of Mexico’s defeat via the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Texas was to become the 28th member of the Union and the Rio Grande its southern border.

Mexico also ceded a vast tract of land – known as California – in the west and its northern border touched the southern border of the American half of the Oregon Country. It included almost all of the future states of Arizona, Nevada and Utah, large parts of Wyoming and Colorado, and half of New Mexico. In return, America paid Mexico $15 million – less than half the amount that Polk had offered before the war – and agreed to settle claims amounting to $3.25 million by American citizens against the government of Mexico.

Texas entered the Union in 1845 as a slave-holding state. Soon after, Iowa entered as a “free” (non-slavery) state in 1846. California, its population suddenly increased by the Gold Rush that began just a week before the annexation in 1848, entered the Union in 1850 as another “free” state. Nevada became a free state just before the elections of 1864, its admission potentially hurried through because Lincoln wanted to ensure a Republican majority in Congress.

The expansion of the United States south and west exacerbated tensions over slavery – its already divided political parties disagreed over whether the “peculiar institution” should be extended to the new territories. Polk, once the master of political compromise, didn’t stay in office and attempt to reconcile the pro- and anti-slavery factions. He had secured the Democratic nomination in 1844 as a compromise candidate – but the compromise was that he wouldn’t run for a second term.

Yet there could be no lasting agreement on slavery. With Polk retiring from the presidency, the Democratic Party would soon split over its expansion into the newly won states. When the Democratic convention chose Lewis Cass, a strong supporter of spreading slavery, as its presidential nominee, Democrats from the northern states, who opposed expanding it, broke away.

Calling themselves the Free Soil Party, they nominated van Buren as their candidate – but this split the Democratic vote and allowed the Whigs’ nominee to move into the White House. The new president, sworn into office in March 1849, was none other than Zachary Taylor, the star of the Mexican-American War.

TROUBLED WATERS

Despite his relative youth, Polk was exhausted after four years in the top job. He and his wife decided to leave Washington, DC, in 1849 to begin a planned tour of the south of the country that was meant to end at their new home in Nashville. Instead of a triumphal return, the tour would eventually turn into a funeral march.

The Polks kept to a busy schedule of festivities as they travelled down the East Coast. Never physically strong, Polk picked up a heavy cold as their tour turned west towards Alabama. Taking a riverboat destined for New Orleans, he ignored rumours of a cholera outbreak, despite several passengers dying of the infectious disease on their journey down the Mississippi River.

When the Polks arrived in New Orleans, Polk continued to ignore swirling rumours of cholera cases in the city and insisted on honouring his invitations and his public. He and Sarah then took another ship bound for Tennessee. At one point on the journey, he fell so ill that he had to disembark and spend several days in bed on dry land. While a doctor assured him that he definitely did not have cholera, Polk kept drinking water, even during the epidemics. As Sam Houston, his fellow Tennessee Democrat, joked, Polk was “a victim of the use of water as a beverage”.

The Polks quickly returned to Nashville and settled into their new home after a visit to Polk’s ageing mother. Polk’s health rallied and it seemed he was in the clear – but he suddenly declined again. He finally died at home on 15 June 1849, probably from cholera.
Spanish Flu Centenary

COULD SPANISH FLU STRIKE AGAIN?

Leading expert Dr John Oxford says that we cannot 'forget and relax' about the great plague of 1918.

What caused this particular influenza outbreak to be so deadly?

These pandemic influenza viruses are basically bird viruses. Birds are their natural hosts, particularly migrating birds like ducks, swans and geese. They are inadvertently infected with all kinds of influenza strains and they come into contact with local birds, particularly chickens. The viruses then move from the migratory to the local bird populations that are under more stress — they're usually battery fed, squashed together in farms when they start to become infected.

The birds' keepers are at risk of picking up the influenza from their livestock, and the viruses can move from the keeper to the family and then to their friends. That's the route we think, and we think that's what happened in 1918, as well as with the later outbreaks in 1957, 1968, 1976 and 2009. You can't stop migrating birds, so humans have a problem.

In the period of 18 months, it was global — maybe as many as 50 to 100 million people died. That puts the Spanish flu into a category of its own. You might think of the bubonic plague, as everyone does when they think of history's great infections, but this excelled that. While the bubonic plague is recognised as an important infection, it had nowhere near the impact of the Spanish flu.

To what extent was World War I responsible for the outbreak?

The pandemic is tangle up in the war — without the war, I don't think we would have had the pandemic. Whoever was responsible for the conflict, in a way they also have to take ownership for the extraordinary amount of people who died from the influenza.

We can conclude that if you're a politician and you start indulging yourself in warmongering, you have to be pretty careful and take responsibility for it — which they usually don't.
The Spanish flu is the biggest outbreak of any infection either then or now and we still have to take it very seriously all these years later. We're obliged to look at it and ask why did that virus do what it did, how did it do it, did it have some special virulence factor and could we possibly have a return of it. By understanding the Spanish flu, we can somehow protect ourselves against an influenza that could do the same again. I don't think we can forget and relax. We must still take it seriously and we have to plan for these recurring pandemics or else we could be caught nattily. We're still getting pandemics and we'll continue to get them.

**SPANISH FLU**

**GLOBAL PANDEMIC**

How a deadly influenza virus infected a world still recovering from the Great War

Written by Charlotte Evans

On a crisp morning in spring 1918, dawn breaks over the small French town of Étaples. War wages on the Western Front. A young soldier lies in sweat-drenched linen, gasping for air between coughing fits as foaming bodily fluids stream from his nose and mouth. His face is ashen grey, mottled with deep red, and his body convulses in a futile attempt to clear his lungs. Unwittingly, he sprays half a million viruses into the cramped military hospital. His body is under biological siege and after a short, excruciating battle, he draws his last breaths, succumbing to a mystery disease that will soon claim the lives of up to 100 million people worldwide.

Scenes reminiscent of the Black Death would play out across Europe and the United States before spreading across the globe. The soldiers on the frontline of World War I were unaware of the invisible invader thriving deep in the rat-infested trenches that would cause the most devastating epidemic in modern history.

The first wave of Spanish flu broke out in France in 1918, sweeping across Europe while a simultaneous outbreak cropped up in North America. It spread fast, thriving in the poor sanitation of the battlefront, travelling with the battalions. When the guns fell silent after Armistice Day, soldiers returned home to their loved ones, unwittingly carrying the deadly microbe even further afield.

A second wave of the pandemic spread across China, India, Japan and the rest of Asia before making a return appearance in the United States. There was still more to mourn as the final wave of this great plague hit from January to June 1919, focusing its strengths on the areas that had been hit by the first wave and rarely touching the places afflicted by the aggressive second wave.

The 1918 influenza strain was unlike any other. It attacked the healthiest and strongest through a fatal chain reaction that triggered an unfathomable immune response. This flu subverted the immune system and used its strength to destroy the healthy tissue of vital organs. Individuals with poorer immune systems were spared by this overreaction of the body, while everyone else was bombarded with an attack from the virus and immune response instead.

Influenza can leave sufferers bedridden for weeks as the fever, joint pain and lethargy foreshadow the nastier symptoms yet to come. The virus’ incredible success to plague our species comes from its remarkable ability to reshuffle its genes into new patterns, so it can invade unrecognised by the human body, making it virtually unstoppable.

The flu becomes more dangerous when it infects animals, where it can mutate to include more deadly genes, and it is this survival mechanism that has caused large-scale pandemics throughout history, including the Asian flu of 1957 and the Hong Kong flu of 1986. These pandemics have mostly arisen from disease hot spots where animals and humans live in close proximity, and scientists have little doubt the Spanish flu began in the same way.

At the time of the outbreak, there was hysteria as people blamed mustard gas and the squalor of the trenches, while burgeoning suspicions were fostered against the German U-boats — had they deployed biological warfare? But as Spanish flu penetrated further into Europe, it became clear that it was a devastating disease, although there were few reports about it.

While the British Empire and Allied nations had been placed under wartime censorship, Spain's neutrality allowed relatively free reporting, leading to the false understanding that it was hit first. This led to the disease’s nickname, Spanish flu. Though there is some contention surrounding the outbreak’s origins, there is a consensus that it didn’t start in Spain. Instead, there are two likely sources – France and the United States.
The site of the first confirmed outbreak was at Camp Funston in Fort Riley, Kansas, a US Army camp that was preparing American troops for battle across the ocean in Europe. The first victim was Private Albert Gitchell, who was diagnosed on 11 March 1918, and within days, over 500 men at the camp had reported sick. This was considered the source of the outbreak for decades and it had been expected that when the US became involved in the war, they brought the killer virus back home from Europe. But this hypothesis changed when Dr John Oxford, a British expert on influenza, identified the French military base in Etaples as the pandemic’s source.

This overcrowded major troop staging and hospital camp on the Western Front provided the perfect breeding ground for a killer virus. The soldiers alternated every few weeks between the festering trenches before retreating to the military camps to rest in close contact with chickens and ducks. In late 1917, military pathologists reported the onset of a new disease with high mortality – which would later be recognised as Spanish flu – among the 100,000 soldiers that were frequently passing through the encampment.

Additionally, Dr Oxford’s team revealed a part of the story that had been lost in the historical narrative of the Great War – even before America’s involvement, doctors and nurses from the US were enlisted and were free to visit home. It is this movement he attributes to the almost simultaneous outbreaks at Fort Riley and Etaples.

The conflict had seen soldiers drafted from every corner of the British Empire and as war waged in the trenches of the Western Front, they needed yet more manpower. Soldiers answered the call for arms from Australia, the Caribbean, Pakistan and beyond. The disease then swept through the world in a second deadly wave, facilitated by the jubilant servicemen returning home. It destroyed families and bought entire civilisations to their knees. Funeral homes were overwhelmed and bodies were piling up outside. Mass graves were being dug and some corpses were thrown into the ocean. In Punjab, streets were littered with uncollected bodies and trains were stopped to be cleared of the dead and dying.

In desperation, some Arctic communities allegedly had no other option than to line the tops of the roofs of their houses with the bodies of loved ones as they were unable to dig into the frozen ground and didn’t want wild animals to drag the carcasses into the wilderness. The Moravian Mission reported that in Okak, Labrador, where only about 50 people survived from a population of roughly 266, huskies feasting on the bodies of the dead attacked an orphan child, who had been left to fend for herself.

Many who managed to survive the virus perished from starvation or hypothermia instead, when they were too weak to get water or stoke their fires. The workforce became weak and businesses, including postal and garbage disposal services, shut down. Almost every nation had makeshift morgues with hundreds of corpses. Some cities marked their doorways to show that someone had died. In Toronto, they used a white sash for children, grey for the middle-aged and purple for senior citizens.

Hearses carrying bodies through the streets became familiar sights, and anxious citizens stuffed cotton with moth ball necklaces. Others sipped violet-leaf tea or warm milk and ginger, or would furmigate their houses with hot coals and sulphur. The desperate attempts to ward off the virus were futile. By November 1918, the outbreak had reached the remote town of Brevig Mission, Alaska, killing every adult. It only spared a few children and teenagers.
With no established cause for the disease that was killing people overnight, and with medical professionals contending with only rudimentary scientific knowledge on the pathogen they were confronting, countries frantically fought back against the virus in any way they could. New Zealand purportedly began exterminating rodents, while towns in England poured disinfectant into the street gutters. The United States began fumigating areas with potent concoctions of coal, tar and formaldehyde, and newspapers printed warnings about breathing in fresh air and to avoid close contact with other people.

People began to communicate more by phone and post but even letters may have been baked in a hot oven before they were opened to kill the bacteria. Telephone installers took to dipping cheesecloth in formaldehyde to cover their nose and mouth. The Australian and American governments mandated masks to prevent the spread but they did nothing against the virus. There was little the world could do other than to wait for it to run its course.

The deadly strain of influenza disappeared as fast as it had started but survivors were not left without scars. Many of those who recovered also suffered physically crippling involuntary jerks, spasms and catatonia caused by brain inflammation. Scientists believe that the so-called 'Spanish Lady' had become a victim of her own success, leaving only the immune or dead in the wake of her destructive path.

With few new hosts to infect, the virus evolved again into a much less deadly strain — an ancestor of the flu we battle today. Many details of the greatest medical tragedy will be forever lost to history, misplaced in the shadow of the Great War, but we can only hope to prepare ourselves for the day pandemic influenza strikes again.

**CHARTING THE OUTBREAK**

Despite what its name suggests, the plague didn’t begin in Spain and it spread far beyond Europe.

**KEY**

- **First wave**
- **Second wave**
- **Third wave**

1. **March 1918: Riley, Kansas, US**
The first confirmed case of Spanish flu was reported when chef Private Albert Mitchell was absent from work due to illness. A local doctor reported the incident to the Public Health Service but it seemingly wasn’t investigated. Over 500 soldiers were hospitalised within a week and a month later, the virus had run its course.

2. **April 1918: Etaples, France**
Unknown to the public at the time, the virus had been circulating the military base of Etaples for several months before breaking out. Pathologists from Aldershot, UK, eventually published studies in the medical journal The Lancet that marked Etaples as the source of the outbreak but the paper was still subject to wartime censorship.

3. **Winter 1917: Shaanxi Province, China**
Some historians believe that when approximately 96,000 Chinese labourers were brought to Europe to work behind British and French lines, many carried a virus with them. Chinese health officials have since identified this virus as identical to Spanish flu.

4. **August 1918: Brest, France**
Brest was one of the largest ports of disembarkation for American troops, where 700,000 US soldiers arrived in Europe — providing the virus with the perfect opportunity to cross the Atlantic.

5. **August 1918: Freetown, Sierra Leone**
Arriving on the British warship HMS Manta, the virus quickly hit about two-thirds of the city's population, who contracted influenza over the following months. The disease would quickly spread through Africa.

6. **August 1918: Boston, Massachusetts**
Boston almost immediately shut schools and theatres after sick civilians overwhelmed the local hospitals. Public gatherings were discouraged in an attempt to stem the contagion.

7. **September 1918: Bombay, India**
When influenza arrived in modern day Mumbai with the returning soldiers, it swept north and east across the nation. India was the most affected country with the virus killing up to 22.5 million people in just a matter of months.

8. **November 1918: Spain**
Spanish flu plagued Spain with the same ruthlessness as elsewhere. Many Spaniards believed it returned with a vengeance thanks to migrant workers from Portugal transmitting the disease.

9. **February 1919: Paris, France**
Over 2,700 people died of influenza and pneumonia in Paris following the Versailles peace conference, opened in the city on January 1919 in order to sign a treaty to end World War I.

10. **Early 1920: Serbia**
The Spanish flu continued into early 1920, but this was the tail end of the disease. A total of eight people died in Kraljic, Budisava and Gospodinci, which appear to be the last cases in Serbia.

11. **Winter 1920: Mexico City, Mexico**
The last handful of Spanish flu cases in Mexico City were reported towards the end of 1920 and the disease seems to have disappeared shortly afterwards.

**Global Pandemic**
The Rothschild family served as bankers to European governments for centuries — so why are so many people afraid of them?

Written by Jason Colavito

When the French anti-Semitic La Vieille France folded in 1923, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency offered no words of mourning for its ending, dryly noting that its publisher said it had closed shop "because of lack of support or interest". It left little international impression in life but achieved astonishing influence after its death.

While the magazine that had once published the anti-Semitic tract known as the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion might have found too few subscribers wanting to read about a Jewish conspiracy to control the world, articles from La Vieille France found favour among some American anti-Semites who had developed an unhealthy fixation with the House of Rothschild, one of the wealthiest banking families in the world — and the object of obsessive fear and loathing.

Writing in a book published in America in 1926, the expatriate Russian count and outspoken anti-Semite Arthur Cherep-Spiridovich, then resident in the United States, cited an article by Conrad Siem in La Vieille France as evidence that the Rothschild family were the masterminds of a global Jewish conspiracy to destroy the United States. Siem had alleged that in 1876, when he was just a teenager, German chancellor Otto von Bismarck had told him personally that Jewish bankers had purposely planned the American Civil War and had favoured the Southern states. Siem claimed to recall Bismarck’s words perfectly: "These bankers," he allegedly said, "were afraid that the United States, if they remained in one block and as one nation, would attain economical and financial independence, which would upset their financial domination over the world. The voice of the Rothschilds predominated. They foresaw tremendous booty if they could substitute two feeble democracies, indebted to the Jewish financiers, to the vigorous republic, confident and self-providing." To this, Cheerep-Spiridovich added that the Rothschilds had ordered the murder of Abraham Lincoln for spoiling their plans.

In 1921, the anti-Semitic automobile magnate Henry Ford's Dearborn Independent, which had recently published the Protocols in English, also translated Siem's article. Nearly a century later, the central claim of Siem's La Vieille
The Rothschild Conspiracy Debunked

An anti-Semitic cartoon depicting the Rothschilds as the world's financial controllers

France article remains a staple of fringe literature, appearing in print and online in a bewildering array of books and articles revolving around an iron triangle of anti-Semitism, economic nationalism and political discontent.

Indeed, just a few years ago, the late American conspiracy theorist Jim Marrs cited Siem's Bismarck quotation to argue that the Rothschilds and evil space aliens were working together to suppress American greatness. "The War Between the States was fought more over economics than slavery, despite how modern political correctness aims to convince otherwise," he wrote in 2014. For him, "economics" was a codeword for Nathan Rothschild, the founder of the British branch of the banking dynasty.

Almost from the beginning, anti-Semitism, economic nationalism and extremist politics attached themselves to the Rothschild family, creating an elastic but nefarious myth whose core the early modern practice among royalty and the nobility to hire a so-called 'court Jew' to handle their finances and lend money when needed. But Mayer introduced several innovations that transformed his banking interests and allowed his family to accumulate wealth on a scale no court Jew had hitherto achieved.

Mayer had five sons and he initiated each into the ways of finance before sending them to the capitals of Europe. The eldest, Amschel, took over from his father in Frankfurt. The second, Salomon, went to Vienna. Nathan ventured to Manchester and then London, while Calmann headed to Naples during the Austrian occupation. The youngest, Jakob, established himself in Paris in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars. By sending his sons across Europe, Mayer was establishing an international organisation that would operate independently of the fortunes of Europe's rulers and their upper-class subjects.

Rothschild messengers helped spread news of Britain's victory at Waterloo

MYTHS BUSTED

Some bizarre claims that have stalked the Rothschild family

MORE POWERFUL THAN THE CROWN

Conspiracy theorists say that Nathan Rothschild claimed to control Britain through its finances: "The man who controls Britain's money supply controls the British Empire, and I control the British money supply." Of course, Nathan Rothschild never said this. A similar line, "Give me control of a Nation's money supply, and I care not who makes its laws," is often attributed to his father Mayer. First cited in 1939, the quotation has never been verified but may represent Mayer's point of view during his lifetime.

SECRET AGENTS OF THE ILLUMINATI

Conspiracy theorists claim that the Rothschilds are part of the Illuminati, the supposed secret society controlling the world. (The real Illuminati, who controlled nothing of importance, disbanded in the late 1700s.) They paint a lurid image of a 1972 party thrown by Marie-Hélène de Rothschild in which celebrity guests including Salvador Dali dressed in outlandish costumes in celebration of surrealism.

While the costumes and décor mirrored great works of art, conspiracy theorists imagined that the costumes were secret Illuminati symbols, which the top-secret group photographed for all to see. "They're just that secret.

LIZARDS FROM OUTER SPACE

Conspiracy theorists like David Icke claim that the Rothschilds are reptilian creatures masquerading as human beings, along with most of the world's political, economic and social leaders. Believers hold that these cold-blooded monsters act inhumanely because they feed off the blood and misery of humankind. Do we really need to say that no one has ever found proof of a reptilian Rothschild?

THE RUSSIAN OR ROTHCHILD REVOLUTION?

Conspiracy theorists claim that the Rothschilds tried to enhance the value of their oil holdings by funding the Russian Revolution to gain access to Russian oil fields. However, the British branch of the family bank, headed by the Provisional Government in Russia, a considerable sum of money after the February Revolution in order to keep Russia in World War I. But the family was openly hostile to the Bolsheviks and refused to accept any deposits from the Soviet state for decades after the October Revolution. A compromise, not the deaths of three millionaires, created the Federal Reserve the next year.

SUNK ON PURPOSE?

Conspiracy theorists say the Rothschilds ordered the sinking of the Titanic in 1912 to eliminate other millionaires who opposed the creation of central bank in the United States, specifically Benjamin Guggenheim, Iosif Strauss and John Jacob Astor IV. However, while the US Federal Reserve was established in 1913, many others that weren't on board the Titanic, particularly Democratic politicians, opposed the central bank. In fact, a much stronger central bank bill had been considered from 1910 to 1912 but failed even after the Titanic sank because of Democratic opposition in Congress. A compromise, not the deaths of three millionaires, created the Federal Reserve the next year.
In a revolutionary era where the stability of a monarchy could no longer be assumed, Mayer's innovative approach gave the family insurance against the fickle fates of Europe's crowns. Should war or disaster strike one branch of the family, four others stood ready to mitigate any losses. Similarly, the family favoured financial diversification to ensure that changes in markets would have a minimal impact on their prosperity. So successful were these efforts that everyone from Victor Hugo to Kaiser Wilhelm II used 'Rothschild' as a synonym for unimaginable wealth.

Of equal importance, Mayer's choice to entrust the branches of the family firm to his sons rather than to associates or business partners meant that even after his death in 1812, the five sections of the family remained in close cooperation. Thus, when three of the brothers died in 1855, Amschel's interests passed to his nephews and the family business continued in Rothschild hands. Mayer considered this unity so important that he treated his sons' love lives like royal dynastic marriages, promoting unions with first or second cousins to avoid diluting control of the fortune.

But the family's efforts to keep their banking interests for themselves also laid the foundation for conspiracy theories. Their notorious secrecy, meant to protect their business interests from outsiders, gave extraordinary room for rumour to replace fact and for prejudice to colour conversations.

The late 1700s saw an age of paranoia about secret societies, a flame of fear that burned across aristocratic Europe because of the unprecedented events occurring in Revolutionary France. Secret societies of every kind became enemies of the monarchical state and groups like the Illuminati and the Freemasons were seen as not just anti-governmental, but also anti-Christian.

The fact that the Rothschilds were Jewish and secretive caused suspicion as well — no more so than during the Napoleonic Wars when Nathan marshalled both the resources of the family bank and a network of couriers and agents to move gold to help Britain fight Napoleon. It is no exaggeration to say that he all but funded the British war effort. As a reward, the Austrian emperor granted four of the Rothschild brothers noble titles in 1816, and all five became barons in 1822, with a coat of arms bearing the motto Concordia, Integritas, Industria — concord, integrity, industry.

The extended Rothschild family counts many fascinating figures among its members:

**Nathan Mayer Rothschild** (1777–1836)
Perhaps the world's richest man in his day, Nathan established the British branch of the family bank and helped fund Britain's successful war effort to defeat Napoleon. He also financially backed Britain's efforts to end slavery. His business success established his family as the greatest of Europe's investment bankers.

**Lord Walter Rothschild** (1868–1937)
Lacking the talent for finance, Walter Rothschild left the family business to go into zoology, often hooking zebras up to a carriage and driving them through London. He also helped create the Balfour Declaration, establishing support for Palestine as a Jewish homeland in 1917.

**Dame Miriam Rothschild** (1908–2005)
Inheriting a love of flies from her entomologist father, Miriam became the world's leading expert on them. She also worked as part of the Enigma code-breaking team at Bletchley Park during World War II, campaigning to legalise homosexuality and better conditions for lab animals.

**Victor Rothschild** (1910–90)
Victor served in top financial positions and as a Labour peer, advising Edward Heath and Margaret Thatcher's governments. During World War II, MI5 recruited him as a spy. After his death, several former KGB agents accused him of being a Russian mole linked with Kim Philby's Cambridge Five.

**Pannonica de Koenigsberger** (1896–1977)
Sister of Miriam, Pannonica was named after a species of moth discovered by their father. She fought for the Free French Army in 1935, before moving to New York City in the 1950s and befriended musicians including Art Blakey, Sonny Rollins, Bud Powell and Charlie Parker, earning her the nickname 'the Jazz Baroness.'
The debt that the anti-Napoleonic alliance owed to the Rothschilds inspired some nervousness and it was then that conspiracies began to emerge particularly as the Rothschild sons and grandsons began to expand their banking interests in ways that no previous bank had achieved. Rothschild money helped the Brazilian government raise millions of pounds to pay for its independence, funded Cecil Rhodes in the founding of Rhodesia and De Beers, and raised the capital needed for Japan to fight the Russo-Japanese War. They provided support to Louis Phillippe of France, his usurper Napoleon III, and his replacement, the Paris Communards. But unease festered as Rothschild wealth accumulated. Their list of noble titles grew and their palaces and art collections multiplied. During an outbreak of anti-Semitism in France in 1895, a Rothschild bank was bombed. As early as 1836, one newspaper focused its concern on the family’s Judaism, asking, half in jest, if Baron Rothschild was indeed “the Messiah so long looked for by this extraordinary people” before chiding that this Messiah cared only for money and power. By 1846, the criticism was becoming more explicit. A pamphlet signed ‘Satan’ but written by anti-Semitic writer Georges Dairnvaell caused a sensation when it accused Nathan of using his family’s network to profit from a day’s advantage over the British government in learning of Napoleon’s defeat. “In a single coup,” Satan said, “he gained 20 million francs” by playing the stock market. Later versions of the story accused him of causing a market collapse for the same purpose. The whole story was false — Nathan was not the first with the news and his market gains were relatively modest compared to those who had had faith in a British victory before Waterloo. But the anti-Semitic smear playing off centuries-old stereotypes of Jews as ruthless, money-hungry villains endured in ways large and small. The story wound its way into a wide variety of media, such as outlets as diverse as the Encyclopedia Britannica and Nazi propaganda films. A few years ago, conspiracy theorist Jim Marts drew on this story and decided that Nathan Rothschild was an evil agent of gold-hungry extraterrestrials who were, essentially, space Jews — stereotypes mythologised.
Banking Dynasties

The interesting thing about the early conspiracy theories is how closely they mirrored seemingly fair-minded accounts in the popular press. John Reeves published *The Rothschilds: Financial Rulers of Nations* in 1887 and, in service of praising his subject, devoted the first chapter to extolling the way the “thrifty and industrious” family rose from a “downtrodden race” in the face of the “intense hatred” Christians held for Jews.

Hungarian-Italian Ignazio Balla, later a fascist, published *The Romance of the Rothschilds* in 1913 and filled it with praise for the banking family. However, he left the reader with no doubt that the Rothschilds were “ghetto” Jews whose Hebraic affinity for money drove them to success and “unlimited control” over European finance.

The 1934 movie *House of Rothschild* dramatised the family’s rise but also focused on the hatred they faced, condemning European anti-Semitism. Those who loved and hated Rothschilds both emphasised their Jewishness, regardless of whether they accepted or rejected the stereotypes that fell under that description.

As the family’s 20th-century descendants swelled into the hundreds, so too did the theories about Jewish influence on finance, politics and war. Anti-Semitic writers blamed them for every major conflict, the assassinations of presidents and kings, and even of masterminding the Holocaust to provide a pretext for the foundation of Israel. They remain a touchstone for Neo-Nazis and white nationalists, as well as far right activists.

The current French president, Emmanuel Macron, once worked for Rothschild & Co, and the leader of the National Front, Marine Le Pen, implied a few years ago that such a connection surely made him an enemy of the people. Russian state television’s popular news show *Vremya* reflected the accusation last spring and also accused the Rothschild family of controlling the world’s media and financial resources, as well as terrorist organisations and both the American and Israeli governments.

The lunatic fringe took things to their logical extreme. For example, David Icke, a broadcaster turned conspiracy theorist, alleged that Jewish bankers were actually reptilian space aliens that were plotting World War III in the name of “Rothschild Zionism.” “I add the ‘Rothschild’ to...”

---

**Foreign Office, November 2nd, 1917.**

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty’s Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish national aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet.

“The Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.”

---

The Balfour Declaration, which enshrined the British government’s support for a Jewish homeland in 1917, was written as a letter to Lord Walter Rothschild.
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“He imagined that the family spread its genes around the world to gain genetic global control”

Family fortunes

Conspiracy theorists claim that the Rothschilds control one-half of the world’s wealth. However, this vastly overestimates the family’s holdings. Investopedia estimates that the Rothschild family collectively controls $250 billion to $1.4 trillion ($350 billion to $2 trillion) in assets but Credit Suisse reported that total global wealth exceeded $207 trillion ($280 trillion) in 2017. Though the wealthiest one per cent of all humans do control more than 50 per cent of global wealth, the Rothschild share is divided among dozens of family members and is no longer one fortune.

The House of Saud
The al-Saud family has ruled Saudi Arabia with absolute authority since the 18th century, through the modern government has been in place since 1932. Most of the al-Saud wealth comes from its control over the country’s vast oil reserves.

The Walton Family
Sam Walton built his family’s retail shopping empire in relatively short time, opening the first Walmart store in 1962. Today he six heirs control 54 per cent of Wal-Mart Stores Inc stock, while the company employs 2.1 million people worldwide.

The Mars Family
Owners of the world’s largest private confectionery company, Mars Inc, this family business has been putting sweets on shelves since 1911. Founded by Frank Mars, his son Forrest is credited with adding the Mars Bar and M&Ms to their line-up.

The Koch Family
Brothers Bill and Frederick are lightning rods for both left- and right-wing conspiracy theories, having transformed their father Fred C Koch’s oil refinery into a multinational conglomerate with interests in real estate, commodity trading, chemicals and more.

An early bill of exchange issued by Nathan Rothschild

constantly emphasise the true creators of Zionism and its controllers to this day,” he wrote in 2013. He imagined that the family spread its genes around the world to gain genetic global control. “So when these people come to power, they carry the Rothschild genetics and answer to their control system, but they are not officially called ‘Rothschild’, and in this way the scale of the Rothschild infiltration of government, finance and so on remains hidden behind an army of offspring known by different names.” Jim Marrs added that this “extended network of relations also has been created through concubines, mistresses, slaves, hired help, and even rape.”

Even in 2017, David Wilcock, a believer in aliens and conspiracies and a presenter on the History Channel’s Ancient Aliens, claimed to have deduced that the Rothschilds threatened to assassinate him for revealing UFO secrets. No matter the form that tales of the Rothschilds’ imagined power take, the claims ultimately trace back to 19th-century anti-Semitic tracts, refashioned to reflect the dark impulses and anxieties of each new age.
Today, we take colour photography for granted. We can snap a dozen gaudy selfies in seconds and often delete them just as quickly but it wasn’t always that way. Prior to the 1970s, colour film was prohibitively expensive to be so casually wasted, meaning that most images we have of the past are monochrome, showing nothing of the vibrancy of life in the eras they were taken.

A growing movement seeks to change that, using digital techniques to accurately colourise black and white photos. *Retrographic* is a new book, produced in association with the Victoria & Albert Museum and the Royal Photographic Society, that has collected together some of history’s most iconic shots that have been colourised by artists. We can now see the deep khaki of army uniforms, the gold jewellery of the wealthy and even fully appreciate the ethereal, haunting eyes of the ‘Mad Monk’ Rasputin for the first time. In addition to the photos we know and love, the project has transformed some everyday scenes from the 19th and 20th centuries into full colour. Here are just ten of the images featured in *Retrographic* and the fascinating stories that accompany them.

**WE CAN DO IT!**

Brought to life by Patty Allison, this photograph embodies the strong, powerful women of World War II. From left, Frances Green Kari, Margaret Kirchner, Ann Waldner and Blanche Osborn Broiss — four members of the Women’s Airforce Service Pilots (WASPs) — finish a flight on a B-17 Flying Fortress Bomber in the US, 1944.
AN ACT OF WAR
On 11 December 1941, Adolf Hitler declared war on the US at Berlin’s lavish Kroll Opera House. Colourised by Mads Madsen, the Führer stands under the Imperial Eagle, raging to the crowd against President Roosevelt’s supposed antagonism.

GOING DOWN
6 May 1937 saw the end of passenger travel by airship. Photographed by Murray Becker and colourised by Matt Loughney, the Hindenburg caught fire when it attempted to dock in New Jersey, US, after flying from Frankfurt, Germany. In total, 36 people were killed.
On 18 February 1964, Cassius Clay (better known as Muhammad Ali) met The Beatles. Colourised by Matt Loughrey, this image shows the men just before they all rocketed to fame as the new stars of the music and boxing worlds. Clay won his first heavyweight title just seven days later.
THE WILD WEST

Taken by John CH Grabill in 1888, this image (colourised by Mads Madsen) came to represent the American Frontier. It has formed the basis for reimaginings of cowboys and the Wild West in books, television and films ever since.

THE MAD MONK

This photograph of Grigori Rasputin was taken circa 1910 and colourised by Olga Shimina. The Mad Monk was known as a mystic and confidante to the Romanov family. He was blamed for much of Russia’s misfortune before his violent death on 30 December 1916.

PRISONER OF WAR

Colourist Tom Marshall brings to life this touching scene of a British soldier helping an injured German prisoner to walk a few days before the end of the Battle of the Somme — one of the bloodiest conflicts of World War I.
LONG MAY IT WAVE

Taken by Joe Rosenthal in 1945 and colourised by Matt Loughrey, the raising of the American flag on Iwo Jima, Japan, has become synonymous with American victory and is the basis of the Marine Corps War Memorial in Virginia, US. Three of the soldiers in this image were killed just three days later in the bloody Battle of Iwo Jima.

THE BURNING MONK

On 11 June 1963, Buddhist monk Thích Quảng Đức burned himself to death at a busy Saigon intersection as a protest against the way the South Vietnamese government was persecuting Buddhists. This powerful image won American photographer Malcolm Browne a Pulitzer Prize. It has been colourised by Matt Loughrey.
THE ORIGINAL FEMME FATALE

Dutch exotic dancer Margaretha 'Gretha' MacLeod — universally known as Mata Hari — was the toast of Paris when this picture was taken in 1906. However, MacLeod met a bloody end in 1917 when she was executed by firing squad in France after being convicted as "the greatest woman spy of the century" for allegedly selling secrets to the Germans in World War I.

WIN!

A copy of Retrographic

If you've enjoyed seeing these iconic shots in living colour, enter our competition to win one of five copies of Retrographic. This coffee table collection features 192 pages of striking, colourised images. Offering a unique visual tour of recent history, the book features Victorian adventurers, scenes from the Great Depression and the World Wars, the social revolution of the 1960s and much more. Normally retailing for £19.95, it includes informative gems about each picture and a foreword from Royal Photographic Society Ambassador Jeff Vickers.

For your chance to win, visit historyanswers.co.uk and answer the following question:

In what year did the Hindenburg crash?

A. 1937  
B. 1967  
C. 1917
Gamal Abdel Nasser

The British establishment saw him as ‘Hitler on the Nile’ but Nasser’s vision for Egypt had a long-lasting impact

Written by Anne Alexander

I
t was a hot summer’s evening in July 1956 and Alexandria’s Mansheya Square was packed with thousands of people listening to Egypt’s president, Gamal Abdel Nasser. It was a long speech filled with the leader’s typical shifts in register and tone, switching between the rhetoric of classical Arabic and chatty colloquialisms.

The joking tone of Nasser’s speech jarred with the recent news that US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had abruptly withdrawn an offer of funding for the Aswan High Dam project, humiliating the Egyptian leader. The punchline of the speech set the crowd roaring, however: “Everything which was stolen from us by that imperialist company, that state within a state, when we were dying of hunger, we are going to take back [...] The government has decided on the following law: a presidential decree nationalising the International Suez Canal Company.”

The drama in Mansheya Square was only the prelude to a much greater performance — in November 1956, Nasser held his nerve in the face of an attack by Britain, France and Israel. Known today as the Suez Crisis, British troops seized Port Said and Israeli forces entered Sinai. But diplomatic intervention from the US and the USSR turned what looked like military defeat into a diplomatic and moral victory for Nasser, making him a hero of the anti-colonial struggle.

Besides these moments of triumph, there was also defeat and tragedy. Alongside the Nasser who won the respect of millions around the Arab world and beyond for standing up to the bullying tactics of the old colonial powers, there was also the Nasser who oversaw the ruthless repression of his political opponents. Alongside the Nasser whose lack of interest in personally profiting from his political success endeared him to many ordinary Egyptians, there was the Nasser who was prepared to sacrifice one of his oldest friends, Field Marshal Abdel-Hakim Amer, who was reported to have killed himself in mysterious circumstances after Egypt’s catastrophic defeat during the Six-Day War in 1967.

Nasser was born to a sub-postmaster and a coal merchant’s daughter on 15 January 1918. During his early childhood, the relationship between Britain and Egypt would be reshaped through the creation of an Egyptian monarchy and with it the trappings of independent nationhood.

Defining moment

The overthrow of King Farouk

The bloodless military operation that saw the head of Egypt’s old regime brought down in a matter of hours was fronted by General Mohamed Naguib. Meanwhile, Nasser was working behind the scenes with the small group of junior officers whose underground network had only taken shape a few years beforehand.

23 July 1952
As Nasser spoke at an open-air rally in Alexandria, shots were fired at him from the crowd by a member of the Muslim Brotherhood’s paramilitary wing. Nasser managed to escape unharmed but the sweeping repression that followed the assassination attempt radicalised many Brotherhood activists with long-term consequences.

26 October 1954

Expert biography
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The contradiction between the formalities of statehood and the reality of continued colonial power was nowhere more painfully evident than in the Egyptian Army, which Nasser entered in 1937 as one of the first generation of native Egyptians to join and train for a career as an officer.

After World War II, Egyptian politics took a tumultuous turn with the emergence of a mass protest movement calling for the withdrawal of British troops. Among the small group of like-minded officers who were inching towards the first steps of rebellion, Nasser argued against formal affiliation with existing political parties so the loose network gave itself a name — the Free Officers. Its leaflets addressed to the officer corps began to appear in 1949 or 1950, echoing the rising frustrations felt by many in Egyptian society with the monarchy, which they saw as corrupt, ineffective and in thrall to the British.

The catastrophic outcome of the 1948 war in Palestine was a turning point for Nasser and his comrades — their first experience of combat was a disaster. Poorly led and ill-equipped, they were unable to turn the military tide against the forces of the new Israeli state. Nasser later recalled an exchange of words with an Egyptian soldier who was fleeing the battlefield: “I said to him, ‘Why are you running away?’ He said, ‘In Egypt I don’t even have an inch of ground to my name.’”

Nasser’s discussions with the peasant conscripts showed him that the problems with the monarchy ran deeper than the incompetence of the army’s general staff. The regime’s reliance on the support of large landowners was a block on progress in general, he would later conclude. Without land reform to give small farmers a real stake in Egypt’s economy, the agrarian economy would stagnate and the millions trapped in poverty could neither produce or consume enough to kick-start the next phase in economic development. It was no accident that the first significant reform enacted by the Free Officers following their seizure of power in July 1952 was to break up some of the big landed estates.

The coup that brought the Free Officers to power on 23 July 1952 was bloodless. The young men who had plotted its course in secret chose an older colleague, General Mohammed Naguib, to be the public face of their junta but Nasser was quickly emerging as the real leader behind the scenes. After a year and half in power, the group split as differences between Naguib and Nasser over whether to restore parliamentary life boiled over into open conflict.

Nasser won the battle and settled scores with the Muslim Brotherhood in the aftermath, arresting thousands of the movement’s members following a failed attempt to assassinate him in October 1954. This wave of repression would have a long-lasting impact. One of those arrested was Sayyid Qutb, whose experiences of jail and torture led him to formulate a set of justifications for armed struggle against the ‘barbarism’ of the state, which inspired later generations of radical Islamists.

The Suez Crisis gave Nasser the opportunity to build a popular base for himself in a country where the memories of the crackdown that followed the Nationalisation of the Suez Canal

26 July 1956

Nasser meets with Libyan leader Colonel Gaddafi in 1970. Both men came to power on a wave of Arab nationalism.
1954 attempt on his life were still fresh. It set Nasser, and Egypt, down the route of attempting to play Great Power politics as a way to solve the problems of economic underdevelopment.

Overnight, Nasser was transformed into a hero of Arab nationalism, the nebulous ideology that inspired movements similar to the Free Officers in a host of Arab countries. In Syria, the major Arab nationalist organisation was the Ba’th Party, a mass movement then locked in bitter competition with the Communists. The leaders of the Syrian Ba’th initially saw Nasser as a kindred spirit, whose sudden popularity after Suez would allow them to isolate their left-wing rivals. The leadership of the Syrian Army also feared the growing influence of the communists and flew to Cairo to propose a union between Egypt and Syria, the United Arab Republic (UAR), in 1958. This collapsed only three years later, reflecting Nasser's inability to impose the agenda for political and social change he was advancing in Egypt on Syria.

The final major drama in Nasser's life ended in bitter defeat with the catastrophe of the 1967 war with Israel. The use of Great Power politics did nothing to help. Israeli forces obliterated the Egyptian Air Force in the first hours of a disastrous war, prompting Nasser to offer his resignation in a televised speech. Within hours, protests had brought thousands into the streets demanding his return to office and spelling out a message of warning to figures in the regime who wanted to see a rapprochement with the US.

9 June 1967

Nasser celebrates the seizure of the Suez Canal

Defining moment
Resignation and reinstatement

Israel forces had obliterated the Egyptian Air Force in the first hours of a disastrous war, prompting Nasser to offer his resignation in a televised speech. Within hours, protests had brought thousands into the streets demanding his return to office and spelling out a message of warning to figures in the regime who wanted to see a rapprochement with the US.

9 June 1967

Nasser celebrates the seizure of the Suez Canal

Hero or Villain?
GAMAL ABDEL NASSER

As a poster boy for post-colonialism, Nasser's popularity with the Egyptian people endured. His affinity for other Arab states meant he was well-loved abroad, too.

Dubbing him the 'Hitler on the Nile' was certainly an exaggeration but Nasser's repression and torture of his political opponents proved he had a dark side.

Nasser's place in history is secured thanks to the Suez Crisis. Though his vision for a united Arab world didn't stick, his impact on modern-day Egypt is visible.

Was Nasser a hero or a villain? Get in touch and let us know what you think.
What if...

South America had joined World War I?

If Britain had convinced Chile and Argentina to side with the Allies, the Great War could have been a truly global conflict

Written by Jonathan O'Callaghan

What was Latin America's mentality as a whole towards Europe during World War I? That would depend on where you were. Mexico was tilted into the conflict as a result of its proximity to the US, and because of things like the Zimmermann telegram (an intercepted communication from Germany proposing an alliance with Mexico). Some people in Latin America were really stirred by the conflict. Certain ethnic communities, and the British and the Germans, immediately jumped on boats and came back to Europe to join the forces.

People were really freaked out by the war when it started but in August and September of 1914, the Latin American general public was really intrigued by the news of what was going on because so many of them were immigrants - particularly Italians and a fair number of British people. There were lots of people who still identified with Europe in cities like Buenos Aires. So many of those living there were immigrants or their children. It really was an immediate thing, even though they were thousands of miles away.

The Antarctic explorer Ernest Shackleton was sent as a British envoy to persuade Argentina and Chile to join the Allies in 1917. Why was he was unsuccessful? There were desires of the British to get the Argentines involved and there were some ways that they could induce them. They would have been allowed to more or less take control of German ships in their harbours and they could have done things like take control of German businesses.

But the Allied cause wasn't popular enough - especially the British cause. It wasn't particularly favoured among the general public in Argentina and definitely not among the political leaders during the war. Being anti-British was pretty popular. I believe they wouldn't join the war because the inducements were not enough. Shackleton's visit was big news when it happened and there were later efforts too, like the high-level British diplomatic De Bunsen Mission in 1918.

The Argentine leaders, like President [Hipólito] Yrigoyen, didn't see enough benefit in joining. Remaining neutral was a great way for Latin American politicians to prove to their public that they were truly looking out for them - they were putting Argentina before British businesses and imperial governments. They could have taken control of German business and there were potential benefits but it would have been a political problem to come down on the side of the Allies. Yrigoyen was seen as being in the pocket of the Americans and he was trying to change that.

Was there anything that could have convinced them?

Well, I imagine that there were all sorts of rumours going around that members of his government could be bought and then the story the British often told where some members of his administration were probably being bought off by the Germans in order to push this neutralist stance. So I don't know that there would have been a possibility of bribing their way through the policy.

Maybe they could have been more open, there could have been some sort of loan given to the Argentines, although they didn't really need any sort of loan at the time. They could have been given inducements like large amounts of coal - they certainly needed that for their railways. But the thing is that the Allies basically got what they wanted out of Argentina during the war anyway. They were still getting as much food as they wanted.

"There were lots of people who identified with Europe in cities"
What if... South America had joined World War I?
What if... SOUTH AMERICA HAD JOINED WORLD WAR?

So did Argentina kind of support the Allies anyway?
Yes, just by its willingness to sell. Of course, it had to sell to someone but it was willing to sell food to the Allies in 1917 and 1918. Half of the meat consumed by Allied soldiers came from Argentina, along with huge amounts of wheat and other grains. Some historians argue that these were really deals that benefited the Allies more than Argentina but I disagree — I think these deals really served Argentina, too.

It would have been sort of intriguing if they had joined the war. Maybe there would have been more domestic crackdown because of the Germans in Argentina. It's easy to imagine them crushing the German community more definitively.

Was Germany trying to get Argentina and Chile on board with its own war effort?
Germany's main goal in South America was to keep the nations there neutral — there was no attempt like the Zimmermann telegram. They were very keen on keeping their connections with South America, and Germany had had a really significant role in the Chilean military and a variety of other armies in South America before the war, so they had long-term diplomatic and commercial ties for quite a while. The Germans certainly hoped to keep those open post-war and they were quite successful.

If Argentina and Chile had entered the war, what would have been different?
I guess the long-term changes would have been to the German communities and Germany's connection with Latin America. The latter probably would have been the biggest change if Chile and Argentina had declared their allegiance to the Allies. The way the war was fought, there probably wouldn't have been Chilean or Argentinian soldiers or navies floating on the seas. Brazil did join the war [in 1917] and there weren't really any significant military benefits from them joining.

Would it have changed Argentina's global standing?
It would have indicated a much closer relationship with the US than they ended up having — their ties were kind of touchy throughout the post-war years. Argentina actually had a really interesting position in post-war global politics. Because it stood up and refused to join the war, it was considered unique and led the group of neutrals, which could be seen in its work in the League of Nations. Had they joined the war, it would have been possible that Argentina and Great Britain would have had a very different relationship throughout much of the 20th century. The Falklands War in the 1980s was a bit of an apotheosis of the problems between the countries. If they became closer, there was the possibility for some sort of transatlantic relationship for Britain, beyond the one with the US.

What about Chile's standing after World War I?
Chile made a lot of money in the nitrates trade during the war, which was very important for explosives, but that collapsed with peace and the creation of technological innovations that put nitrates out of business. In many ways, Chile had a similar wariness of European imperialism to the Argentines.

How would it be different?

Real timeline

Alternate timeline

A new alliance
Promising them British coal as well as the right to seize German ships and businesses, Shackleton convinces Chile and Argentina to fight
The short-term benefits of Chile joining the war would have been the same as Argentina — they could have commandeered German ships in their harbours and taken over German businesses in their country if they had wanted to. Then they could have created a longer-term transatlantic relationship with the British or the US. But there were no strategic benefits to either of them for entering the war — there was no German land they could grab.

If Chile had entered the war, would things have been different there?
I guess one of the more apocalyptic scenarios was that if the Chilean government had joined the war, the half a million Germans living there would have risen up out of anger. On the other hand, a lot of the Germans were there because they didn't really want to live in their homeland any more. Some of them were just happy to be immigrants.

How would Chile's relationship with the US have been different after the war if they had entered?
I guess it would have been similar to what could have happened with Argentina. The US swooped in pretty quickly after the Germans were pushed out by the blockade and the British were focusing on other markets. America was already moving in during the war, so historians think Chile was more worried by the American incursions into their markets than the Argentines were. Chile seemed so far away for the US. You would have been hard pressed to find anyone in the US who cared if Chile joined the war or not.

Did Brazil entering the war in 1917 — the only Latin American country to do so — play a part in Argentina not joining?
What Brazil got out of joining the war was a bit of status. They wanted to show they would support the US, that it was a hemisphere solidarity. The Brazilians and Argentines really didn't get along with one another at all, so it's not at all surprising that Brazil joined the war and then Argentina refused to. What the Brazilians got out of the war was proof for themselves and for other countries that they were an important government.

After the war, the Brazilians were invited to the Paris Peace Conference, so they brought a delegation. They didn't play a significant role but they were trying to talk of themselves as being a real world power. At the conference, for instance, there was talk about giving Brazil a permanent seat on the council of the League of Nations, which was being created.

The Brazilian-Argentine dynamic was always a rocky one but the Brazilians felt that they got more or less what they wanted from the war. They did get some prestige from it, and they were welcome at the big table when it came to creating the post-war world.

What effect did World War I have on Latin America?
World War I played a gigantic role in the development of these nations. As a result of the conflict, they became increasingly against globalisation and more nationalistic in their economic and political outlooks. In that way it was a turning point in the history of Latin America in general.

Whether or not these countries entered the war, the war entered their lives — it really impacted them tremendously. Latin America was not alone in the 1920s and 1930s of striving against economic globalisation and I think that, in some ways, their wariness of the rest of the world has been a defining characteristic of Latin American relations with the rest of the world ever since.

"Because it stood up and refused to join the war, it was considered unique and led the group of neutrals"
Through History

PISTOLS

From explosive bamboo attached to spears to mass-produced plastic guns used the world over, the pistol's history is nothing short of fiery.

**HAND CANNON 13TH CENTURY**

Regarded as the first true gun, the hand cannon was a heavy, cumbersome beast consisting of a barrel, a handle and more than enough space for gunpowder and flesh-searing projectiles. The weapon could be held in two hands but two people were often called upon to operate it — one lighting the gunpowder using red-hot iron rods, matches, coal or wood, and the other being careful to aim it in the right direction. This was important because the firearm's aim was rather poor due to typical imperfections in the gun and the volatile nature of gunpowder. It caused rocks, arrows and metal bearings to scatter wildly, accompanied by an ear-busting bang.

"Two people were often called upon to operate it"

**FIRE LANCE 950**

Gunpowder was invented in China around the 10th century and was quickly weaponised to make bombs, mines and rockets. The first primitive firearm was a spear tied with a bamboo tube that could shoot arrows. It was known as the huo qiang (fire lance) because the projectiles would be followed by a gout of flame. It only had a range of three metres, so it's thought soldiers mostly fought hand-to-hand with spears while the gunpowder shot gave them an edge in close-quarter combat. Fire lances were carried by both regular troops and the cavalry at the siege of Yangzhou in 1276.

**COLT M1917 1917**

Despite President Woodrow Wilson's determination to keep the United States out of World War I, America entered the conflict in 1917. As a consequence, the US Army became concerned that its soldiers lacked the vital firepower needed to overcome the enemy and it requested both Colt and Smith & Wesson produce six-shot, .45 caliber revolvers to supplement the standard M1911. In doing so, they used moon clips, which had only recently been invented. These not only allowed multiple rimmed and rimless cartridges to be held together, but boosted the speed and reliability of reloading the revolvers.

**WALTHER P38 1938**

When German emperor Wilhelm II authorised use of the P08 Luger in 1913, it became the world's first successful semi-automatic pistol and an ever-present sight during World War I. But the pistol was expensive to make and it frequently clogged, so when the German arms manufacturer Carl Walther produced the Walther P38 — noted for being the first locked-breech pistol to use a double-action trigger — the Wehrmacht snapped it up. The pistols were produced en masse from the mid-1940s yet demand was so high that rival weapons manufacturers Spreewerk and Mauser were drafted in to help. A staggering 1.2 million were made.
**Through History**

**BLUNDERBUSS** 17TH CENTURY

The blunderbuss took two forms: a muzzle-loading firearm that is often considered to be an early form of shotgun, and a handgun version known as a dragon. Both were particularly lethal when being shot at close range and they became especially popular among those fighting at sea. But the dragons were more widely used by troops on the ground due to their portability and startling blasts, so much so that the cavalrymen who carried these lightweight weapons became known as dragoons.

**MATCHLOCK PISTOL** 15TH CENTURY

Having to light the priming powder of a gun by hand proved rather distracting for soldiers. By inventing a mechanism that automatically handled the firing process with the pull of a lever, soldiers could focus their concentration on the intended target instead. The first of these mechanisms was known as the matchlock and it made use of a curved metal lever called the serpentine. It held a slow burning match that would lower into the priming powder held within the flash pan of the gun and ignite it. This would light the main charge in the gun and cause it to fire. The pistol could then be reloaded.

**SMITH & WESSON MODEL 1** 1857

Percussion firearms used a weather-resistant lock and ignition system, doing away with the need for a flint and frizzen in favour of a cap containing highly explosive mercuric fulminate. The cap would be struck by the hammer and ignite the gunpowder in the barrel. But the system was soon fazed out thanks to developments such as Smith & Wesson's first revolver, the Seven Shooter. Later named the Model 1, this pistol used rimfire metallic cartridges, so-called since the firing pin would strike the rim. It could hold seven .22 shortfire rounds and soldiers on both sides of the American Civil War clamoured to use it.

**GLOCK 17** 1982

There were problems with many of the guns produced until the closing stages of the 20th century. It's just they weren't all that apparent until Gaston Glock amassed a host of European handgun experts and ended up with his semi-automatic Glock 17. Designed for the Austrian military, which wanted to replace its old Walther P38 handguns, this new pistol adopted a polymer frame rather than metal and the result was a lighter, higher-capacity gun. Indeed, with a standard magazine capacity of 17 rounds, a trigger pull of five pounds and an efficient manufacturing process that allowed the company to undercut its rivals on price, it proved to be hugely revolutionary.

**FLINTLOCK PISTOL** 1610

French inventor, gunsmithe, artist Marin le Bourgeoys is credited with having developed the true flintlock and it was so effective, it became a firing mechanism on muskets, rifles and pistols for two centuries. It worked by placing flint in the jaws of the gun's hammer before cocking it and having it strike a piece of steel called the frizzen when the trigger was pulled. Since the frizzen doubled as the cover for the priming pan, it would not only cause sparks but expose the powder, duly igniting it. The main powder would then light and a ball would be fired. Flintlocks even saw action in the American Civil War.

**COLT PATTERSON** 1836

Having been designed by Samuel Colt and produced by his newly founded Patent Arms Company in Paterson, New Jersey, it's easy to see where this ground-breaking gun gets its name from. But the same can't be said for Colt's inspiration. Early literature suggested he noted the way ship steering wheels worked; others claim he caught view of Elisha Collier's 1814 flintlock revolver. Either way, the Colt Patterson was not only accurate thanks to its single rifled barrel, but also efficient since it had a revolving cylinder with five chambers. Still, users had to take it apart to load and it cost $50. Around 2,800 were built.
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A sail-powered warship settles to the bottom of the sea as the battle progresses. The technology of steam revolutionised naval warfare and modern ships took part in the Battle of Hakodate. The presence of the sinking vessel serves as a prominent acknowledgment of the changing conduct of battle.

French foray
Wearing uniforms with white trousers, French soldiers took part in the battle in support of the Tokugawa loyalists who had established the northern Ezo Republic. French advisors assisted forces loyal to the deposed shogun and shared command of the troops with the Japanese.

Cavalry charge
In this c.1880 image of the battle, the leaders of the rebellion against the Meiji government advance at the forefront of a cavalry charge against imperial troops. Shown left to right on horseback are Enomoto Takeaki, Otori Keisuke, and Matsudaira Tarō.

Hero forward
Wearing a yellow tunic and brandishing a bloody sword, rebel subordinate commander Hijikata Toshizō lunges forward against the imperial line. Hijikata, among the most experienced rebel soldiers, is killed during the battle. The exact location of his death is unknown but he is remembered with a monument on the field.

When the US Navy Commodore Matthew C Perry opened up Japan, it set off a chain of events that would revolutionise the country within a decade. Until this time, the Tokugawa shogunate, a hereditary military dictatorship, had largely ruled Japan for over 250 years, leaving the emperors to fill a secondary and more ceremonial role. Tokugawa Japan was largely a period of peace and stability but the country was entirely dependent on agriculture and extremely socially conservative. The four feudal classes—warriors, farmers, artisans and merchants—were rigid, with no mobility between them. Intense isolationism also banned foreign travel, trade or cultural exchange.

However, the Americans’ superior firepower convinced a group of Japanese leaders that the shogunate’s reign had left their country weak.
On 3 January 1868, an alliance of samurai—the warrior class—from Chōshū, Satsuma and Tosa staged a coup d'état. They deposed the shōgun, Tokugawa Yoshinobu, and handed direct power to the 14-year-old Emperor Mutsuhito.

Unsurprisingly, the transition of power wasn’t as simple as that. A 17-month civil war erupted between Tokugawa loyalists and those that supported the emperor. While the shogunate had more numbers, the imperial forces embraced modern weapons, including Armstrong howitzers, Miné rifles and Gatling guns. A core elite of the shogunate forces had recently received training from a French military mission to Japan but the so-called Boshin War rapidly went in the Emperor’s favour.

But even after Tokugawa personally surrendered, not every loyalist was prepared to do the same. The war entered its final phase, known as the Battle of Hakodate. Better understood as a campaign, it included land and sea actions that would run from autumn 1868 to 27 June 1869.

Refusing to accept defeat, Admiral Enomoto Takeaki and his small fleet of steam-powered warships, carrying several thousand troops and their French military advisors, sailed north. They captured the island of Ezo, now called Hokkaido, in October 1868. It was declared a republic with Enomoto elected as its president.

Naturally, the imperial forces were not going to accept this. On 9 April 1869, the imperial warships landed 7,000 troops near Esashi and Otobe. During the weeks that followed, the emperor’s forces, commanded by Kuroda Kiyotaka, assaulted several rebel strongholds while marching on Hakodate. A naval battle also resulted in the sinking or capture of rebel ships and the loss of one imperial vessel.

Major fighting ended with the surrender of the Goryokaku fortress on 27 June 1869.

The Battle of Hakodate is significant not only as the last prominent engagement of the Boshin War, but also for the employment of modern weapons. This reflected the sweeping change that was coming to Japan. The emperor declared the new period to be ‘Meiji’ meaning ‘enlightened rule’. Since his death in 1912, he has been known as Emperor Meiji.

Under his authority, Japan transitioned from a feudal to a modern state and the structure of government was updated. A rapid industrial revolution saw railways and telegraphs built while a capitalist economy was established, a national army formed and universal education introduced. When Japan next faced a military stand-off with a foreign nation it would prove itself a Great Power, defeating Russia in 1905.
Greatest Battles

### Imperial Forces

**Retreat to Ezo**

While other shogunate forces surrender, Enomoto Takeaki refuses to turn his fleet over to imperial authorities. Instead, he sails to the island of Ezo, arriving in late October 1868.

**March to Hakodate**

Shogunate troops march towards Hakodate under the command of Hijikata Toshizo and Otori Keisuke, capturing the town's primary fortification, the star-shaped, western-style Goryōkaku fortress, which was perhaps undefended, at the end of October 1868. Goryōkaku becomes the stronghold of the shogunate forces in the defense of the short-lived Republic of Ezo.

**Matsumae Domain subdued**

The shogunate offensive to take control of all of southern Ezo, the island known today as Hokkaido, begins with a march on Matsumae Castle at the southern tip of the island, where the leaders of the Matsumae Domain have reportedly declared allegiance to the imperial court. Hijikata, one of the most experienced field commanders in the shogunate rebel army, leads his troops to capture Matsumae Castle in November 1868.

**Pincer attack on Esashi**

Hijikata and Matsudaira Sadaaki, at the head of forces from the Kuwana Domain, lead strong columns in converging marches against the village of Esashi, a bustling centre of fisheries and commerce on the southwest coast of Ezo. They assault the town but lose the valuable rebel warship Kaiyō Maru in the process.

**Republic of Ezo**

Their positions on the northern island temporarily secure, Viscount Enomoto and other leaders of the shogunate forces proclaim the Republic of Ezo in January 1869. Enomoto, who has inspired the rebels to continue fighting, is elected president and the republic is established on a democratic basis, resembling that of the United States. Britain and France offer conditional recognition to the new state; however, the imperial government is determined to maintain Japanese unity.

---

**Kuroda Kiyotaka**

Victor of the campaign against shogunate rebels on Ezo. Kuroda later became the prime minister of Japan.

**Strengths:** He was a strategic thinker and was willing to spare an enemy commander.

**Weaknesses:** He supposedly had a hot temper, especially when drunk.

**Chōshū Kiheitai**

The Chōshū Kiheitai was an armed militia made up of volunteers from at least five domains in Japan that supported the Meiji restoration.

**Strengths:** They were well-disciplined and had the most up-to-date weapons.

**Weaknesses:** The volunteers relied on donations from their wealthy supporters.

**Gatling Gun**

Named for its inventor, Richard Gatling, this hand-cranked weapon increased firepower with devastating results against massed enemy troops.

**Strengths:** It produced a heavy volume of rapid fire.

**Weaknesses:** It was difficult to transport overland and had the potential to overheat.
The imperial landing
Under the command of Kuroda Kiyotaka, the imperial Army, 7,000 strong, lands at points near Esashi and Otobe on the east coast of Ezo on 9 April 1869. A powerful flotilla of the Imperial Japanese Navy, including modern steam warships and the French-built ironclad Kōtetsu, accompanies the troops to provide offshore logistical support and firepower capable of bombarding land targets with its heavy guns while also potentially countering Enomoto’s shogunate warships.

Kuroda leads his troops on an overland campaign towards Hakodate, attacking rebel strongpoints along the southern and eastern routes of their march. Within the month, Matsumae Castle has fallen and defences at Kikonai are captured. Hijikata makes a stand at Futamataguchi but is apparently forced to make a hasty retreat.

The naval Battle of Hakodate begins on 4 May and concludes six days later with a great victory for the imperial Japanese Navy. The shogunate’s navy has already lost a couple of ships off Esashi. Two more are sunk and three captured by imperial vessels. The imperial Navy suffers a little damage.

In May 1869, the decisive battle for Hakodate erupts as imperial troops assault fortifications around the town. Rapid gains are made in the north as the rebels slowly capitulate, while imperial soldiers allegedly climbed Mount Hakodate and fire artillery at targets below. Hijikata is killed as he hurries to the support of the Benten Battery. As imperial forces surround Goryōkaku’s fortress, Enomoto is persuaded to surrender on 17 May.

Kuroda spares the life of Enomoto, now his prisoner. Along with numerous other former rebels, Enomoto is granted a pardon in 1872 and renders valuable service to the Meiji emperor.

Refusing to surrender, Enomoto proclaimed the northern Republic of Ezo, lost the Boshin War and survived to serve the emperor. strengths: He was shrewd and diplomatic but a resolute opponent of Meiji. weaknesses: He refused to acknowledge defeat until Hakodate.

Originally a shogunate police force, the Shinsengumi were elite fighters. Hijikata Toshizo was supposedly a commander of the unit. strengths: Well-trained and tenacious, they used modern and traditional Samurai weapons. weaknesses: They were a relatively small force and the leaders were quickly lost in war.

Used by both sides, the Minie rifle fired a large bullet and was supplied by the French and British. strengths: It was accurate and had rapid muzzle loading. weaknesses: It was later eclipsed by more efficient breech-loading rifles.
The Ottoman Empire, once a dominant force in the East, is in decline. Sensing an opportunity for expansion, the ambitious tsar of Russia, Nicholas I, has set his gaze on the jewel of Constantinople and eastern expansion. With the city, Russia would have unparalleled access to foreign trade routes and a strong port for its budding navy.

A diplomatic incident in Jerusalem gave Russia an excuse to declare war on the Ottomans. Concerned with how the tsar’s growing power would impact them, Britain and France issued an ultimatum once it became clear the Ottomans could not successfully fend off the attack. The European powers’ threats were ignored and a hastily thrown together expeditionary force was mobilised to take the fight to the Russians, targeting their navy base at Sevastopol in the Crimean peninsula.

WHERE TO STAY

Although Florence Nightingale and her army of nurses are working tirelessly at the Scutari Barracks, your best bet for survival is to be sent to the Renkioi Hospital, about 500 kilometres away from Crimea. A prefabricated building designed by the brilliant Isambard Kingdom Brunel, the facility is located outside of the malaria zone, making it much safer for patients already suffering from war wounds or disease. With a logical design and proper sanitation methods, the hospital, although never reaching capacity, will see over 1,000 patients but only 50 deaths – a staggering achievement when compared to installations on the peninsula.

Dos & don’ts

- Try to keep your camp clean. Disease caused from unsanitary conditions will kill many more people than the fighting.
- Report on what you see. The shocking images of camp and hospital conditions sent back to Britain will help orchestrate real change in how the army operates.
- Eat your five a day. Although the Royal Navy is taking steps to avoid scurvy by providing crews with concentrated fruit juices, the army has no such policy.
- Make sure you fight bravely. Many of the most celebrated actions in British military history will be played out in the Crimean War, including the doomed Charge of the Light Brigade and the Thin Red Line.
- Act on vague orders. Always be clear what your superiors want you to do, otherwise you could end up charging towards certain doom.
- Get swept up in the patriotism and propaganda. The British government will fan the flames of jingoism to gain popular support but will fail to mention the horrific human cost of the war.
- Underestimate modern technological advances. The Crimean War will see many military innovations and the first heavy use of railways and telegraphs in war.
- Snub the peace talks. Before the European allies joined the war, there were attempts to resolve the conflict without further bloodshed. The terms were rejected by Russia.
WHO TO BEFRIEND
Florence Nightingale
Known as 'the lady with the lamp' and a 'ministering angel', Florence Nightingale is a pioneering nurse who might well save your life in Crimea. Hearing about the deplorable condition and supply shortage of the armies medical core, Nightingale and a force of volunteer nurses sailed to the peninsula to lend their aid. She's improved sanitation, men's diet and exercise to dramatically cut down the number of deaths in army hospitals. If you find yourself suffering from typhus, cholera, typhoid or a war wound, then being treated by Nightingale will significantly increase your chances of pulling through.

Extra tip: Nightingale's meticulous record-keeping will be used as her evidence to push for real change to army medical practices when she returns to Britain. Befriending her could not only save lives during the war, but will enact a lasting positive change on the British Armed Forces.

WHO TO AVOID
Lord Lucan
Commander of the British cavalry division under Lord Raglan, Lord Lucan is an experienced officer but a tyrant to serve under. A harsh and uncaring disciplinarian who rigorously follows the chain of command, he is despised by his men. This reputation is not helped by the nickname of 'the exterminator', which he gained for his actions during the Irish potato famine. Along with this, he will be one of the three men held responsible for the catastrophic Charge of the Light Brigade when he follows his suicidal orders without question. Consider a transfer if you find yourself serving under him.

Helpful skills
What you need to get ahead and stay alive in the Crimean conflict

Medical knowledge
With disease running rampant through military camps, medical expertise could help you and others survive the horrors of war.

Military training
With war engulfing the peninsula, knowing how to use a musket, ride a horse and swing a sword could be the difference between life and death.

Journalism
The Crimean War was the first modern conflict to be extensively covered in news outlets. Your candid photos and detailed reports of the conflict will help sway public opinion at home.
Night of the Long Knives

The owner of Ernst Rohm’s favourite sausage restaurant in Munich was arrested on 30 June 1934 and hours later murdered in Dachau.

20 APRIL 1934
Adolf Hitler orders the SA to become subordinate to the Reichsheer. SA leader Ernst Rohm agrees but privately vows to defy the command.

20 APRIL 1934
Hermann Göring transfers control of the Gestapo to SS chief Himmler, while the latter quietly restructures his organisation into a force independent of the SA.

17 JUNE 1934
Vice Chancellor von Papen speaks at Marburg University against SA terror. His subsequent threat of resignation risks the end of the Nazi government.

30 JUNE 1934
Hitler arrives at the Hotel Hanselbauer in Bad Wiessee, Rohm is arrested along with the SA leadership and taken to Stadelheim Prison in Munich.

Did you know?
The owner of Ernst Rohm’s favourite sausage restaurant in Munich was arrested on 30 June 1934 and hours later murdered in Dachau.
Bluffer’s Guide
NIGHT OF THE LONG KNIVES

What was it?
After more than a year in power, the Nazi regime closed ranks. It undertook a ‘blood purge’ of the party’s paramilitary wing, the Sturmabteilung (SA), commonly known as the Brownshirts. The SA’s leader Ernst Röhm was personally arrested by Adolf Hitler in the early hours of 30 June in a hotel outside Munich. Members of his entourage — found suggestively sharing beds — were also rounded up and executed. This was immediately followed by similar action in Berlin with Hermann Göring dispatching elite Schutzstaffel (SS) execution squads to take out ‘undisciplined and disobedient characters and asocial or diseased elements’.

At least 85 people are known to have died, with the Nazis taking the opportunity to also settle scores with old political rivals. Former chancellor Kurt von Schleicher was gunned down in his home with his wife. Members of the key Catholic Centre Party, a Bavarian politician essential to the failure of Hitler’s 1923 Beer Hall Putsch and even a music critic (in a case of mistaken identity) were also killed.

Why did it happen?
As the violent vanguard of the National Socialist movement, the Brownshirts were essential to the party’s ascent to power. By 1934, the ranks of the fighting organisation had swelled to around 4 million, dwarfing the muzzled Reichswehr, Germany’s military.

Röhm’s frequent talk of absorbing the army alarmed the conservative generals and President Hindenburg, and his calls for a ‘second revolution’, emphasising the socialist aspect of National Socialism, made him few political allies. The unruly peacetime behaviour of SA members persisted as a threat to the stability that the Nazis had promised to usher in with their leadership. Rumours of a Röhm-led coup against Hitler were stoked with evidence of French involvement that had been manufactured by the SS. The old guard had outlived their usefulness.

Acting against Röhm enabled Hitler to demonstrate his power while demanding allegiance, consolidating his control of the party and presenting himself as the solution to the chaos the Nazis had done so much to ferment.

Who was involved?

Adolf Hitler
20 April 1889 – 30 April 1945
Hitler personally led the putsch, intent on confronting the SA threat and securing himself as the arbiter of Germany’s destiny.

Ernst Röhm
28 November 1887 – 1 July 1934
Once Hitler’s trusted accomplice, Röhm’s fall from grace took him to an ignominious end in a cold prison cell.

Heinrich Himmler
7 October 1900 – 23 May 1945
Proving his allegiance and strengthening his position within the Nazi hierarchy, Himmler directed the SS intervention against Röhm.
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On the Menu

LUCANIAN SAUSAGES

A CENTURION’S FAVOURITE SNACK ANcient ROME, 4th CENTURY BCE

This Ancient Roman delicacy originates from Lucania, a region in the heel of southern Italy. The Lucanians were on-and-off again allies with the Roman Republic, usually pledging fealty when a rival tribe threatened them. It’s believed legionaries returning from deployment in the region brought the recipe for this spicy smoked sausage back with them to the capital around 200 BCE. The first recorded mention of the sausages in Rome was in a 1st-century poem, with more frequent references, including recipes, dating from the 300s BCE.

Sausages — Lucanian or otherwise — were a cornerstone of a Roman centurion’s diet and their success on campaign has been partly attributed to the food as it was nutritious, portable and kept even on the longest marches into enemy territory. Lucanian sausages were regularly eaten with spelt flour bread.

Ingredients

Makes about 25 sausages

Spices:
- 1 tbsp ground black pepper
- 1 tbsp ground cumin
- 1 tbsp ground bay leaves
- 1/2 tsp dried savoury herbs

Herbs:
- 30g parsley
- 1 tbsp rue (ruta graveolens)

500g lean pork
6m sausage casings
550g lard
150g pine nuts
1 tsp whole black peppercorns
3 tbsp garum (if you can’t find this, you can use fish sauce)
2 tsp salt
curing salt

Did you know?

Variations on this Roman sausage can be found around the world today from the Brazilian linguiça to the Bulgarian lukanka.

METHOD

01 Before you start, cut up 200 grams of the lard into small cubes and put them in the freezer for an hour. While they’re freezing, soak the sausage casings — preferably ones made from pig intestines — in lukewarm water for no more than 30 minutes.

02 Using a meat grinder or a food processor, mince together the lean pork and the last 350 grams of lard.

03 Grind the spices using a pestle and mortar. Then mix them in a bowl with the meat, garum, salt and curing salt before putting it all through the grinder or food processor for a second time.

04 Dry roast the pine nuts in a pan. Then, using the pestle and mortar again, crush them with the black peppercorns and combine this and the lard from the freezer with the meat mixture.

05 To ensure your sausage meat is spiced to your liking, you may want to fry a small ball of it in a frying pan and give it a taste before continuing.

06 Using a sausage stuffer, stuff your sausage meat into the casings. Put a sausage casing over the utensil's tube leaving at least 15 centimetres off the end. Add meat into the machine and once you have one long, thin coil of sausage, take the casing off and tie it at one end.

07 Divide the coil into individual sections by pinching and twisting the casing to create a string of sausages. When you get to the end of the coil, tie off the other end. Prick the sausages with a sterilised needle to make sure that you get rid of any air bubbles.

08 If you are able to get hold of a cold smoke generator, you can smoke authentic Lucanian sausages — this may take up to a day or more. If not, use a barbecue. Place wood chippings on top of the coals and hang the sausages about 30 centimetres above the barbecue to smoke for about an hour.

09 Enjoy your Lucanian sausages! They can be kept unwrapped in the fridge for up to four weeks.

Did you make it? Let us know!
REVIEWS
The books, TV shows and films causing a stir in the history world this month

DARKEST HOUR
Gary Oldman gives blood, toil, tears and sweat to show another side to the WWII PM

Certificate PG Director Joe Wright Cast Gary Oldman, Kristin Scott Thomas, Lily James, Stephen Dillane Released Out now

At the time of writing, Dunkirk and Darkest Hour are both competing for the Best Picture Oscar. Both films are set in 1940, with German forces poised to invade England — but Darkest Hour is the polar opposite of Christopher Nolan's return to form. The latter was packed with jaw-dropping panoramas and spectacular action sequences but little dialogue. Joe Wright's latest is a political thriller, set in the shadowy halls of power, where the drama is limited to a war of words. The enemies here are not so much Hitler and Mussolini as they are ousted leader Neville Chamberlain and his ally Viscount Halifax, who both believe making peace with the Nazis is the best thing for Britain and scheme to undermine Churchill's premiership.

Wearing heavy make-up, Gary Oldman physically resembles neither himself nor Winston Churchill but the Dracula star is no stranger to prosthetics. He goes beyond mimicking the prime minister's characteristically odd cadence, theatrical grandstanding and cigar sucking to get to the heart of the man buried beneath the fat suit. However, his Churchill is perhaps not the swaggering patriarch we've come to expect: he's an alcoholic, prone to self-doubt and depression, haunted by the spectre of Gallipoli. While he boldly demands "victory at all costs", in private he questions if it's really the right thing.

The pedant in us wishes that the film's most important scene — in which Churchill steels himself after a dark night of the "[Oldman] gets to the heart of the man buried beneath the fat suit" — wasn't a complete fabrication. In it, Churchill leaves the Westminster Bubble and takes a trip on the London Underground, where he encounters a carriage full of defiant Brits that refuse to surrender to Hitler. Never have Tube passengers been so chatty, and nor has a single stop on the District line ever taken so long. We would have preferred to know how the British Bulldog actually found the inner fortitude to lead the nation to this melodramatic mush, but it's at least refreshing for a biopic to abandon the antiquated 'great man' theory of history. Instead, Darkest Hour acknowledges that the war was a collective effort won through more than the decisions of a titled, white, male elite.

It's a shame, then, that the other characters are so one-dimensional. Stephen Dillane's Halifax makes for a suitably villainous aristocratic foil, but his motives — for refusing the premiership and appeasement — are never probed. Kristin Scott Thomas' Clementine Churchill is regal and witty but only serves to provide her husband with a shoulder to cry on. Lily James' young typist offers little more than a sounding board for Churchill's monologues.

Whether it's Oldman's scene stealing or a shortcoming of the writing, the rest of the cast are not given enough limelight to round-out their performances. The exception is Ben Mendelsohn's George VI, who sparks off Oldman wonderfully as the calm and considered king who develops a grudging respect for the boorish PM. An electrifying performance from Oldman steals the show, pulling focus from both his co-stars and a surprisingly subversive World War II story.
**THE COBURG CONSPIRACY**

The truth behind one of royal history’s most famous marriages

**Author** Richard Sotnick **Publisher** Ephesus Publishing  **Price** £9  **Released** Out now

When author Richard Sotnick met the late Earl Mountbatten 40 years ago, the resulting conversation led him to investigate two so-called conspiracies that may have shaped the face of the British monarchy. One is widely known, the other perhaps a little more obscure, but both make for compelling reading.

Sotnick’s *The Coburg Conspiracy: Victoria and Albert—Royal Plots and Manoeuvres* delves initially into the question of how Leopold I of Belgium rose from the relative obscurity of ruling an impoverished German fiefdom to becoming the husband of Charlotte, the ill-fated heir to the British throne. Ably handling the sometimes intricately intertwined branches of European nobility, Sotnick navigates the often-confusing world of royal genealogy with aplomb. For his second conspiracy, Sotnick attempts to untangle the murky rumours surrounding the supposedly questionable paternity of Leopold’s nephew, Albert. Could the father of Queen Victoria’s husband have been a domestic servant or maybe even the ambitious Leopold himself? All of this is certainly scandalous but whether or not it’s very convincing must be left to the reader to decide.

What comes through on every page is the author’s fascination with his subjects and the obvious dedication with which he has approached this book. *The Coburg Conspiracy* is an easy and fairly quick read, and contains some useful supporting material including a very handy chronology to keep readers on track. Though it will hold little new material for dedicated enthusiasts of Victoria and Albert or Leopold and Charlotte, there’s much to enjoy here for the casual reader and keen royal watchers alike.

---

**ELEGANT ETIQUETTE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY**

Avoid social embarrassment with this handy guide

**Author** Mallory James **Publisher** Pen and Sword Books  **Price** £13  **Released** Out now

The world of 19th-century society was ruled by etiquette, from the drawing room to the ballroom and beyond. This slim but informative volume by Mallory James attempts to present an all-inclusive guide to avoiding social embarrassment in the Regency and Victorian eras.

Drawing on contemporary 19th-century etiquette guides, James guides the reader through every social situation imaginable and offers step-by-step instructions for those who might be researching, writing about or just interested in the good manners essential to those who moved in an often stifling world. In doing so, she also attempts to establish what these rigidly observed customs meant for society at large and how everyday life might have looked for those who lived under such rules.

This enjoyable book is packed full of revealing facts and unexpected information. Despite its relatively low page count, it is a comprehensive volume that leaves few — if any — stones unturned when it comes to social occasions. Perhaps aware of the occasionally obscure customs that she is dealing with, James ensures that each chapter goes into the social mores of the matter in question, explaining important topics ranging from precedence and rank to marriage and employing households servants, among others.

All of this adds up to a very entertaining read and one that casual researchers and those looking for a quick guide to etiquette will find invaluable. Authors of 19th-century fiction in particular will certainly find it a useful addition to their bookshelves.
AELFRED’S BRITAIN

The slaughter and statecraft that shaped Viking Britain

Author Max Adams Publisher Head of Zeus Price £25 Released Out now

Foreign invaders from across the ocean. Treasures stolen, never to be seen again. Apocalyptic prophesies and bloody battles that altered the course of a nation. The history of the Viking Age in Britain has it all, and it seems as though Max Adams has researched every aspect of this chaotic, bloodstained period of upheaval, producing a beautiful and curious book befitting a very curious time.

Within a few pages, it becomes clear that one is in good hands with Adams: he doesn’t assume that the reader possesses much knowledge of the period; he has researched this work in astonishing detail; and his love of a subject he has dedicated 457 pages to leaps up from every page. Yet perhaps what is most pleasing of all is the fact that, despite the title, this book doesn’t just focus on the trials and tribulations of the only Briton to ever have been afforded the epitaph of ‘great’.

While plenty of ink is rightly dedicated to the man who guided a fragmented country through one of its darkest hours, other figures are also examined, including Aelfred’s — or Alfred, as he’s more commonly known today — ambitious and ruthlessly successful children, namely his son Eadward, who by the time of his death in 924 had almost completed his father’s mission of bringing the Vikings to heel.

By framing Britain within the wider context of a Europe regularly witness to violent clashes between the supposed ‘heathens’ of Scandinavia and the apparently more noble forces of Charlemagne (about whom an anecdote is included that refers to an elephant called Abul-Abbas that the Frankish king kept as a pet), the author sets the wider scene of a lethal game in which Britain has it all, and it seems as though Max Adams researched this work in astonishing detail; and his love of a subject he has dedicated 457 pages to leaps up from every page. Yet perhaps what is most pleasing of all is the fact that, despite the title, this book doesn’t just focus on the trials and tribulations of the only Briton to ever have been afforded the epitaph of ‘great’.

While plenty of ink is rightly dedicated to the man who guided a fragmented country through one of its darkest hours, other figures are also examined, including Aelfred’s — or Alfred, as he’s more commonly known today — ambitious and ruthlessly successful children, namely his son Eadward, who by the time of his death in 924 had almost completed his father’s mission of bringing the Vikings to heel.

By breaking the book up into sections, Adams helps the reader to properly map the many years he covers. The inclusion of timelines before each section provides further support with mentally placing a series of famous and lesser-known events in chronological order. Another appreciated touch is his use of the old English word for preface, ‘forespec’, as the title of each introductory section, which makes this ancient tale feel all the more authentic. However, this work is not without a Burrow Mump-sized disappointment, which most frustratingly concerns arguably the single most pivotal event in the entire book: the Battle of Edington in May 878.

With only Wessex standing between the Great Heathen Army under the command of Guthrum and total control of the island, Alfred’s forces made a final stand on the edge of Salisbury Plain, fully aware of the ramifications of defeat. Fortunately for the king, his men routed their formidable opponents, but the details of their triumph are contained within an irritatingly brief sentence from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

While the paucity of information concerning the battle is, of course, not Adams’ fault, framing the battle as the moment that Alfred “tamed the tiger in the smoke” does lend a sense of drama to an event that then fails to live up to the hype. It is an anticlimax that hits like a Viking raid: fast, brutal and over before the realisation of what has happened has begun to sink in.

Even so, despite this unexpected disappointment, this is a beautifully crafted and impeccably compiled book, and one that is certainly a must-read for anyone with even a passing interest in the events and figures that moulded Britain during the reign of the Vikings.

While a superbly researched and informative, the shadow of an anticlimax often looms over sections of this book.
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This Hollywood epic won a record 11 Academy Awards — but does it make the cut for historical accuracy?

01 The film is based on the 19th-century historical fiction novel *Ben-Hur: A Tale of Christ* by Lew Wallace. The main character, Judah Ben-Hur, is a fictional Jewish prince but his life runs parallel to Jesus Christ, who he encounters.

02 Towards the beginning, the Roman tribune, Messala, asks Ben-Hur, at this point his friend, to provide him with information on anti-Roman Jews. Ben-Hur refuses to betray his own people and the film correctly portrays the tensions between the Romans and the Jews.

03 In the movie, Ben-Hur is depicted as one of the galley slaves, the enslaved men who powered the Roman ships. However, this is inaccurate because slaves were not used in this capacity at this time — the ships were actually powered by free men.

04 Alongside the inaccuracy regarding galley slaves, the battle against the Macedonian pirates is also completely false. The film is set during the lifetime of Jesus, between 4 BCE to roughly 30 CE, at which point there were no pirates with large warships.

05 The iconic chariot race towards the end of the movie portrays just how dangerous the sport was, if a bit toned down. As well as this, it correctly shows how successful chariot racers could gain a life of fame, glory and wealth through the sport.
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