

The Assassination of Napoleon

By Ben Weider, C.M., Ph.D

This paper is based on a lecture given at Florida State University in Tallahassee on 18 September 1995 and at the International Military History Festival "Borodino Day," Borodino Russia - September 5-10, 1997

Over 10 years ago I wrote a book which explains the years of research that Sten Forshufvud, my colleague and friend from Sweden, and I did in order to prove without any doubt whatsoever that Napoleon was poisoned during his exile on St. Helena. The book, entitled *The Murder of Napoleon*, was published in 18 languages and has sold over a million copies. That's not bad for a history book. It proves that interest in Napoleon is still very strong.

More books have been written about Napoleon than about any other person in history. The Encyclopedia Britannica states that over 200,000 books have been written about him; the French historians claim that the number is closer to 400,000. It's amazing, isn't it?

People often ask me how I can be so sure that Napoleon was poisoned. After all, he has been dead for 174 years.

The answer is relatively easy. Eight eyewitnesses told me so (through their books, of course), and the information they supplied was confirmed through nuclear science. You don't have to be a genius to understand what you read; you only need to be perceptive, intelligent and know your facts. However, these facts, as reported by the eight eyewitnesses, were ignored, or their meaning has not been understood by historians.

The key that led us to the poisoning was Louis Marchand, Napoleon's first valet. He was attentive, discreet, literate, shrewd, observant and loyal beyond the call of duty. All historians agree with this evaluation of him. He was also a very good artist.

Napoleon treated Marchand like a son, and left him 400,000 francs in his famous will. Napoleon's desire was to honor Marchand with the title of "Count," and his wish was finally carried out when Napoleon III came to power.



Unlike the other companions in exile who wrote books in order to make a profit, Marchand kept a diary while in exile because he wanted his family to know what happened on St. Helena. He instructed his family never to publish these memoirs. However, when his estate finally came up for sale in the early 1950s, it was purchased by Commander Henri Lachouque of the French army, and he arranged to have Marchand's diary published for the first time in 1955.

His book will go down in history as a "time bomb" which helped unravel the mystery of Napoleon's death. Marchand's painstaking accuracy in recording the daily events at Longwood House, just as they occurred, made the equivalent of a doctor's case file of careful notes detailing the progressive decline of a terminally ill patient. His information was vital in "blowing the cover" on what would otherwise have been "the perfect crime."

Marchand took home to France some of the actual hair that was shaved from Napoleon's head on May 6, 1821, and very carefully put the hairs into an envelope on which he wrote:

Louis Joseph Marchand,
First Valet to Napoleon

"Les cheveux de l'Empereur." This lock of hair, in its original envelope, remained faithfully preserved through the years by Marchand's descendants. Neither he, nor any other companions of the exile could have known that one day, long after they were all gone, the contents of this envelope would tell more about the years at Longwood House than the total of all other correspondence, and the numerous books and manuscripts that have been published dealing with the Emperor's exile on St. Helena.

When critics weigh all the evidence presented in this paper and in my new book entitled *The Assassination at St. Helena Revisited*, they too will understand the plot to assassinate Napoleon, therefore preventing him from returning from St. Helena and regaining his throne as he had done when he returned from his first exile on the Elba. I submit that unless someone can produce authentic documents that refute the facts as reported by the eyewitnesses, they must accept their truth.

Napoleon was poisoned during his exile on the island of St. Helena; there is absolutely no doubt about it. He was poisoned in the classical manner of the 19th century. Until this day, no pathologist or toxicologist has seriously opposed the thesis. I call it a thesis for want of a better word, because the poisoning is a fact.

Of the 34 known symptoms of arsenical intoxication, over 30 have been recorded by these eight witnesses. Furthermore, the presence of arsenic in Napoleon's hair has been confirmed by modern forensic medicine and nuclear science.

Over the last 100 years, numerous medical doctors and historians have attributed Napoleon's illness and death to over 30 different causes ranging from gonorrhoea to syphilis, from scurvy to hepatitis to cancer. History records that Napoleon died of cancer, and yet he died fat. How is that possible, when we know that cancer is a wasting disease? Furthermore, Napoleon did not manifest any symptoms of cancer. Ask yourself this question: How can somebody die without manifesting the symptoms of his illness?

Over 30 years ago my colleague Sten Forshufvud of Sweden had tests made on Napoleon's authenticated hair that was shaved on 6 May 1821, the day after his death. Hair grows about one inch every two months. Since the hair was cut at the scalp and was three inches long, this represented six months of Napoleon's life.

By testing the hairs by section, we were able to know almost to the day when he was given high doses of arsenic. The results of the tests on the hair showed extreme highs and lows of the levels of arsenic. The lowest point was 2.8 parts per million and the highest was 51.2 parts per million, and in each section of hair tested, the levels varied in peaks and valleys. This proves that Napoleon ingested more arsenic at specific times and less at others.

Keep in mind that the normal arsenic level in the hair at the time was about 0.08 ppm. Examples of the highs and lows on the Napoleon hairs that were tested are: 51.2; 45.2; 24.5; 18.8; 2.8; 7.1; 20.4; 24.1; etc. These results, which are way above normal, prove without a doubt that Napoleon was being fed arsenic at different times. There is no doubt about this. ([See table](#))

The table shows the results of one such test, in which the hair was tested in eight sections. Note the very high levels of arsenic compared to the normal content of the time, that was established at approximately 0.08 ppm. You will note that the highest content was 51.2 ppm, which is an extraordinarily large amount and shows without a doubt that Napoleon was being fed arsenic at this particular time.

The levels of arsenic in Napoleon's hair, which was tested at the Harwell Nuclear Research Laboratory of London, confirm the facts described by the eight eyewitnesses.

Over the years, people have attributed the arsenic in Napoleon's hair as coming from the wallpaper at Longwood House, the water he drank, medication he took, or from hair cream he used. If these suppositions were indeed factual, then the arsenic levels in the hair would have been constant, as he

would have taken in the same amount of arsenic on a daily basis. The extreme highs and lows show without a doubt that these theories are not based on fact in any manner whatsoever, and should be dismissed.

In 1974, when I met Sten Forshufvud, we decided to work together to prove once and for all that Napoleon was indeed poisoned. For this purpose we constructed two time charts. On the first chart we listed the symptoms as reported by the eyewitnesses on specific dates leading up to his death. The eight eyewitnesses reported independently from each other, in books and diaries, Napoleon's various symptoms. We used these symptoms as the basis of this chart, which covered a period of several months prior to his death.

These eyewitnesses were all companions of Napoleon, and they are the Marquis Las Cases, who was working with Napoleon on a history of his campaigns; Baron Gourgaud, one of Napoleon's long-serving officers, who followed him into exile; Dr. Barry O'Meara, an English doctor of Irish descent appointed by the English to act as the Emperor's physician; Dr. Francesco Antommarchi, an Italian physician sent by Napoleon's family in Rome to replace O'Meara when he was sent home to England; Grand Marshall Bertrand, who had been with Napoleon for more than 15 years; Louis Marchand, the Emperor's loyal valet of ten years; and two English doctors, Walter Henry and John Stokoe, who attended Napoleon for short periods.



General Gaspard Gourgaud



Emmanuel Augustin Las Cases

These eight people had regular access to Napoleon and observed him on a daily basis, and they all kept independent diaries of their lives on St. Helena.

On the second time chart, we recorded the arsenic levels obtained from the testing on the sectional analysis of Napoleon's hair at Harwell Nuclear Research Laboratory. We used a sample of Napoleon's hair that was shaved at the scalp on 6 May 1821, the day after he died.

The two charts matched. On the days when Napoleon was reported to be suffering from symptoms identical to those of arsenical intoxication, the Harwell reports showed high levels of arsenic in the hair. There is no mistake about this, because Harwell is one of the most sophisticated nuclear laboratories in the world, and was responsible for doing research on the atomic bomb for the British government.

These tests confirm, through modern scientific methods, that the symptoms recorded by the eyewitnesses over 178 years ago were indeed symptoms of arsenical intoxication. No suppositions here, just facts.

Since it has been established that hair grows at approximately one inch every two months, if it is shaved at the scalp and the date is known, then tests for arsenic in the hair can determine almost to

the day when arsenic was ingested. It is important to realize that in 1821, as in the 1990s, it is rare that during an autopsy the doctor would suspect arsenic poisoning unless he was told in advance.

I met Professor Henri Griffon, Chief of Toxicology of the Paris police, who has had a lot of experience with cases of arsenic poisoning, and I asked him if he could explain why so many doctors, then and even now, could overlook arsenical intoxication as a possible cause of Napoleon's death.

Professor Griffon replied that he never found, in any case of murder by arsenic, a doctor who had correctly diagnosed arsenical intoxication as the cause of death. Therefore, it must be conceded that none of Napoleon's doctors can fairly be blamed for not having understood his illness. They were simply not trained to understand the symptoms of arsenical poisoning. Arsenic trioxide is tasteless and odorless --- a first-rate poison.

As recently as September 1967, Mrs. Esther Castellani died in Vancouver, Canada, after having been sick for nine months. Several months after her burial, a lady contacted the Crown Attorney and said she knew how Mrs. Castellani was killed; if she got the protection of the court, she would reveal who did it.

The Crown Attorney did not believe her, because the autopsy report showed that Mrs. Castellani had died from "a viral infection and heart attack."

When the caller persisted, she was granted protection from prosecution, and she then explained that she and René Castellani, the husband of the victim, had poisoned her with arsenic. Apparently René Castellani had promised to marry his accomplice after collecting the insurance money, but when he got the money he changed his mind.

The government authorities exhumed the body and made the same tests on her hair as we did on the hair of Napoleon. The result showed that the arsenic levels in her body were high enough to kill her. Mr. Castellani was arrested, found guilty, and sentenced to 25 years in prison.

During the trial, which took place on 26 September 1967, Dr. Moscovitch, who treated the victim, said he had never considered arsenic poisoning, and neither had several medical experts he called in to examine her at the Vancouver General Hospital. Dr. Moscovitch said: "The possibility of arsenic never occurred to us at all." In the course of Mrs. Castellani's illness, over 125 clinical tests had been performed, all without identifying arsenic.

Dr. Moscovitch said that arsenic poisoning has many guises, and the symptoms are very misleading. That is exactly what led Dr. O'Meara to believe that Napoleon was suffering from dysentery, scurvy, gout, ulcers, and other ailments. If a doctor took two or three of the arsenic symptoms separately, he could be misled as to the identity of the illness. To diagnose arsenic poisoning, a doctor must identify all of the victim's symptoms together, and compare them specifically with those of arsenical intoxication. Unless the doctor is informed in advance, there would be no reason to suspect arsenic, because the symptoms themselves, taken individually, resemble those of many other diseases. It is only when they are all considered together that the fatal pattern is clear.

Let me give you an example of the symptoms described by one of the eyewitnesses: Doctor Francesco Antommarchi was Napoleon's personal physician. In his diary entry dated 26 February 1821 he writes: "The Emperor had a sudden relapse, dry cough, vomiting, sensation of heat in the intestines, generally disturbed, discomfort, burning feeling that is almost unbearable, accompanied by burning thirst." On 27 February he writes: "The Emperor is worse yet than yesterday. The cough has become more violent and the painful nausea did not stop till 7:00 this morning."



Dr. Francesco Antommarchi

This eyewitness report was confirmed by the nuclear analysis of Napoleon's hair which showed another peak of arsenic content at this particular period, thereby proving that he was being poisoned.

It's important that you be aware that Napoleon did not die from arsenic poisoning, but instead was poisoned to death in two phases, by a method used by professional poisoners of the period. The "classical method" of killing somebody without making it appear to be a criminal act consisted of a cosmetic phase followed by a lethal phase.

The cosmetic phase of Napoleon's poisoning started in mid-1816, and this was done through the use of arsenical intoxication. There is, however, evidence that the intoxication by arsenic was used during the Waterloo campaign, several months before Napoleon's exile. Arsenic is an essentially colorless, odorless and tasteless substance which is easily administered in food or wine, and the total quantity needed to carry out a planned assassination would have fitted into a small envelope.

Napoleon was poisoned slowly and chronically with arsenic in order to break down his health and make it appear that he was deteriorating in a normal and natural way from disease. To kill him outright would have meant a revolution in France, because the French army was still loyal to Napoleon, as were the majority of the French people.

To be successful in this phase of the process, the assassin would have to have access to the food or wine that the Emperor was to consume, but at the same time he would have to ensure that he did not poison anyone else. The food eaten at Longwood House was shared by all of those living there, but Napoleon had his own wine supply, which was the vin de Constance, a wine brought in from Capetown especially for him. This wine was drunk only by the Emperor; the others used whatever wine was available at the time.

In their diaries and notes, the eyewitnesses record very carefully more than 30 symptoms that indicate chronic arsenical intoxication. When you list these symptoms and compare them to the arsenical intoxication symptoms described in any modern book on toxicology, you will find that they are identical. To ignore what these eyewitnesses tell us is to ignore history.

If Napoleon was not being fed arsenic during the cosmetic phase of the poisoning, then why did these eight eyewitnesses, independently of each other, record typical arsenical intoxication symptoms?

If Napoleon died of cancer, then why did he die fat and not show any symptoms of cancer? It's simply because he didn't die of cancer.

The lethal phase of the assassination started in March of 1821 and, had it not been for modern forensic medicine and our dedicated investigation, it would have been a perfect crime.

This phase was done through the introduction of toxic medications such as tartar emetic, followed by orgeat and calomel.

Dr. Antommarchi writes that on 22 March, Napoleon was given a lemonade drink with an emetic. In the following days, Napoleon was given additional emetic drinks. Tartar emetic is antimony potassium tartrate; it is highly toxic and induces vomiting. Its symptoms resemble those of arsenic, and it is no longer used because of its high toxicity. Given the limitations of medical knowledge at the time, it was quite common for doctors to prescribe a tartar emetic in the hope that, by vomiting, the body would rid itself of the ills for which the doctors had no other treatment.

Antimony potassium tartrate corrodes the mucous lining of the stomach. This eventually inhibits the normal vomiting reflex by which the stomach protects itself, and the patient becomes unable to expel poisons. This is exactly what the poisoner wanted, and what happened, because giving Napoleon the tartar emetic over a period of time ensured that mercury cyanide would not be vomited and would remain in his body in order to complete the poisoning method of the period. The mercury cyanide resulted from the combination of orgeat and calomel, and now I'll explain how it worked to kill the Emperor.

On April 22, a new drink appeared for the first time which was served to Napoleon. It was orgeat. This is an orange-flavored drink which includes the oil of bitter almonds. It was served to Napoleon to help quench his thirst. Thirst, incidentally, is one of the symptoms of chronic arsenical intoxication.

In the Grand Marshall Bertrand's diaries, on page 165, he states very clearly that on 25 April 1821, a case of bitter almonds arrived at Longwood House. Bitter almonds are the ingredient in orgeat that contains hydro-cyanic acid, or Prussic acid.

Before that date, there were no bitter almonds available on the island. Apparently the poisoner was starting to be concerned that bitter almonds would not arrive on time, because the Grand Marshall Bertrand states clearly in his diary on page 166 that someone (although he does not mention his name) asked his four-year-old son, Arthur, to go out and collect some peach stones and leave them in the pantry.



Longwood, Napoleon's home on St. Helena

Peach stones can serve the same purpose as bitter almonds, since they both contain hydro-cyanic acid. You will soon learn how this helped kill Napoleon without any tell-tale signs of criminal activity.

A new book entitled Clinical Toxicology states on page 105: "Oil of Bitter Almonds. The oil is rapidly poisonous when ingested and death occurs promptly when an adult drinks 7.5 cc." Although Napoleon was not given such a large dose, the amount he got is considered a chronic amount.

The Grand Marshall tells us in his book that a few days before Napoleon's death, on the night of 2-3 May 1821, and all the following day, he

was extremely thirsty and drank a lot of orgeat. Remember, thirst is a symptom of arsenical intoxication.

Antommarchi's diary reports that he was concerned about Napoleon being heavily constipated. Constipation is also a symptom of chronic arsenical intoxication. The favorite medication of the day for this purpose was called calomel. In a book entitled "Clinical Toxicology of Commercial products," on page 91, it states that calomel contains mercury chloride.

Now, this is important. Louis Marchand, who was Napoleon's first valet, in his diary on pages 323 and 324 writes that at 5:30 p.m. on 3 May 3 1821, without his knowledge or approval, Napoleon was given 10 grains of calomel, a very heroic dose indeed. This was up to 40 times the normal amount, because the normal dose of calomel for constipation in those days was one quarter of one grain.

The Grand Marshall Bertrand also confirms this in his diary on page 192. This was the irrevocable moment of the final lethal phase which was directly responsible for Napoleon's death.

Calomel contains mercury chloride, and orgeat with bitter almonds contains hydro-cyanic acid, or

prussic acid. Together they combine in the stomach to form mercury cyanide, which would then be expelled from a healthy stomach by vomiting. But Napoleon had been given several drinks containing a large quantity of tartar emetic and this would have inhibited the vomiting reflex. Consequently, the highly toxic mercury cyanide was retained.

Now what happens? The Grand Marshall Bertrand, on page 192, writes: "Shortly afterwards, he fell unconscious. He was completely immobilized by a total paralysis of the voluntary muscles. He could not even swallow." It is well documented that mercury cyanide paralyzes the voluntary motor functions. Forty-eight hours after taking the calomel, and never again regaining consciousness, Napoleon died.

What does mercury cyanide do to the stomach? It corrodes the stomach walls, and creates an annular swelling of the pylorus muscle. The Larousse Medical Illustrated Dictionary explains, on pages 741-742, the very toxic effects of orgeat and calomel, and warns against combining them as a treatment.

The autopsy performed by Antommarchi and observed by many others, including the English doctors, showed that the stomach lining had been heavily corroded and there was a significant annular swelling of the pylorus muscle. However, not suspecting poisoning, the doctors, except for Dr. Antommarchi, who was the only pathologist present, concluded that Napoleon had died of "a condition leading to cancer." In fact, he died of cyanide poisoning, following chronic arsenic intoxication. You and I know that people do not die from a condition leading to cancer - one dies of cancer.

It is interesting to note that Doctor Henry, after the autopsy, noted how effeminate Napoleon appeared, because he had no body hair. He should have realized that a loss of body hair is a symptom of chronic arsenical intoxication.

The Marquis Henri de Montchenu was appointed by Louis XVIII to represent France at St. Helena during the exile. Montchenu reported the day after Napoleon's death, saying--and I quote: "Of the five doctors present at the autopsy, not one knows the exact cause of his death."

In the book *Poisoning Drug Overdose*, on page 744, it states that "Cyanide is one of the most rapidly acting of all poisons, and in the form of hydro-cyanic acid and its sodium and potassium salts, it is one of the most deadly." Oil of bitter almonds in the orgeat contains hydro-cyanic acid.

Was there a poisoner on the island? You bet there was. Here are some of the facts. No suppositions, just facts. On 24 February 24, Cipriani, the majordomo, who was really Napoleon's secret agent, fell ill without warning, though he was always in perfect health. He was seized with violent pains in the stomach and with very cold chills. They placed him in hot baths. Chills and stomach pains are signs of acute arsenical intoxication.

Two days later, at 4:00 p.m., he died. Cipriani was buried immediately, but somebody must have secretly exhumed his body, for it disappeared. Why? Somebody was concerned that an autopsy would show up the poisoning, because it is easy to detect acute arsenical intoxication. His death proves that there was a poisoner on the island living at Longwood House.

William Balcombe, who allowed Napoleon to stay at his tea room called "The Briars" while Longwood House was being repaired and enlarged, became a friend to Napoleon. He always believed that Cipriani was poisoned, because he asked that the tomb be opened and an autopsy be performed, but the body disappeared before this could be done.

Now, you must be asking the key question - since Napoleon was poisoned, then who did it? We must consider these facts in order to come to a conclusion: whoever poisoned Napoleon had to be on the island and living in Longwood House, the prison home of Napoleon, during the entire exile of over five years, because Napoleon was suffering intermittently from the same symptoms during the entire period.

The most important factor to consider is that whoever was administering the arsenic was doing so

from the beginning of the exile, and continued until the second, or "lethal" phase in 1821. This immediately eliminates all the people who left St. Helena before Napoleon died, and also eliminates those who arrived during the exile. Therefore it leaves just Louis Marchand, the valet, the Grand Marshall Bertrand, and the Comte de Montholon. The person responsible for the poisoning would have to be in regular contact with Napoleon, and therefore had to live in Longwood House. This immediately eliminates the Grand Marshall Bertrand, who lived some distance away, since his English wife wanted more privacy and did not like to be in close proximity to the other companions of the exile. Bertrand attended the Emperor as and when required by him.

There were only two people who had this very close contact with Napoleon daily, and who were able to enter his room whenever it was necessary, and who had meals with him on a regular basis.

These were the Comte de Montholon and Louis Marchand. Louis Marchand is recognized by all historians, and the companions of the time, as a loyal, devoted valet who served Napoleon like a son. He had absolutely no possible motive to harm Napoleon.

The Comte de Montholon, on the other hand, had no reason to admire nor wish to serve the Emperor on St. Helena, yet he volunteered his services to do so. Consider that Napoleon was only 46 years of age at the time and in good health, and he could have lived at least another 20 years. This could have meant that Montholon would have had to spend a good part of his life serving him. Unless he was an agent of the Bourbons, and knew in advance that he would need to spend only a few years on the island because of his assignment to poison Napoleon, there would be no logical reason for him to do this.

One of the reasons that Montholon was upset with Napoleon is that he had ordered Montholon's discharge from his post as the French envoy to Wurzburg, after he married the twice-divorced Albine Roger against Napoleon's wishes.

The Comte de Montholon was a very strong royalist. Consider the following facts:

1. His stepfather, the Comte de Sémonville, was a close friend of Louis XVIII and the Comte d'Artois.
2. Comte Charles-Louis de Sémonville was known as a very crafty individual who continued to serve successive French regimes from Louis XIV to Louis-Philippe. This was indeed a great accomplishment in those days. The Comte de Sémonville was known to be an agent of the Arch-Bourbon, the Comte d'Artois, brother to King Louis XVIII.
3. For services rendered to the House of Bourbon, the King made Sémonville a peer in the new French House of Lords. Therefore he occupied one of the highest offices of state.

Comte de Montholon was raised bearing the name Montholon-Sémonville. However, when he left to go to St. Helena, he very cleverly dropped the Sémonville part of his name and went as simply Comte de Montholon.



Montholon was also known as a playboy, he was always in debt, and enjoyed the fast life. Why would a man with that background want to spend at least 20 years of his life serving Napoleon on St. Helena unless he had specific orders to prevent Napoleon from returning to France by poisoning him?

Consider that the Comte de Montholon was the sommelier, and had exclusive access to Napoleon's wine. It was through the wine that Napoleon was poisoned. Arsenic powder is neutral - it has no taste - and could be put into wine whenever Montholon wanted to.

In fact, Baron Gourgaud, in his memoirs, records that he warned Napoleon that he might be poisoned through the wine. However,

Comte de Montholon

Napoleon did not take this warning seriously.

It is interesting to note that the Grand Marshal Bertrand, in a letter to Cardinal Fesch, stated that a few days after Cipriani's death, a maid in Montholon's employment, and a young child died with the same symptoms. Did they eat or drink by accident something that Montholon had prepared for Cipriani? We'll never know, but it is a strange coincidence indeed.

Consider also that Montholon was a major beneficiary of Napoleon's will, and was appointed one of the three executors. Montholon was alone with Napoleon when he prepared his last will and added codicils.

Montholon actually was left over 2,200,000 francs, a huge amount of money in those days, and yet he was bankrupt and had to flee to Belgium to escape his creditors in 1829.

During his stay at the defense establishment in 1814, while Napoleon was at the Elba in exile, Montholon had appropriated to himself some military funds amounting to 6,000 francs. Yet he was never punished for this crime, thanks to the intervention of the Comte d'Artois who later became Charles X, King of France.

Consider that it was Louis XVIII who appointed the Comte de Montholon a General in the French army during the period of Napoleon's exile on the Elba.

All historians, even those who don't agree that Napoleon was poisoned, agree that Montholon was a very scheming and unscrupulous man who lied on a regular basis. My colleague Sten Forshufvud and I believe that he was an agent of the Bourbons, and the facts point to this. As such he would have pursued the King's wishes against the man who was categorized at the time as an outlaw and an enemy of peace in Europe.

Consider this: Each of the companions who shared the exile with Napoleon wrote a book or kept memoirs. They all reported more or less the same symptoms that Napoleon suffered from, except the Comte de Montholon.

One example is that Montholon reported that Napoleon was emaciated when he died, yet all the others, including the British doctors who were present at the postmortem, said that Napoleon was excessively fat. In order to confirm the cancer report, he had to claim that Napoleon died in an emaciated condition. Gaining weight is a symptom of chronic arsenical intoxication.

Louis Marchand was the only companion of the exile still alive when Montholon's book was published in 1848. He said that Montholon was either a liar or his memory had failed him. Substantial parts of Montholon's memoirs were totally different from those of his companions.

It is our view, Sten and I, that the Comte de Montholon was sent to St. Helena by the Comte d'Artois to ensure that Napoleon would never return to France as he did following his first exile to the Elba.

We have found the method used in the assassination of Napoleon, and by looking at the opportunity and motive, we have found the murderer. The case is very clear. Napoleon was murdered by the Comte de Montholon, using chronic arsenical intoxication combined with acute cyanide poisoning. As an agent of the Bourbons, he succeeded with his mission. Montholon had the opportunity, competence and credible motive to achieve secretly the removal of any likelihood that Napoleon might return to claim the throne from Louis XVIII.

I ask you - were the eight eyewitnesses hallucinating when they recorded independently of each other more than 30 symptoms of arsenical intoxication? Not to recognize the symptoms they described is to ignore history and suggests a terrible blind spot.

Was the Harwell Nuclear Research Laboratory, one of the most respected laboratories of its kind in the world, which actually helped produce the atomic bomb for England, wrong in their analysis of Napoleon's hair which showed high dosages of arsenic up to 51.2 ppm? Impossible.

All historians agree that Napoleon died fat, and was not in the wasted condition that cancer would produce, especially after five years without treatment. Getting fat is another symptom of arsenical intoxication. Why? Because chronic arsenic poisoning causes obesity.

The epilogue to this is that after 19 years, when Napoleon's body was exhumed to be returned to France, it was in an excellent state of preservation. Why? Because it is consistent with arsenic poisoning, because although arsenic could kill, it also preserves tissues.

Finally, I'd like to refer you to the last sentence of a two-column book review published by *Newsweek magazine* in its book section when my first book was published:

"The effect is history at its most electrifying. It will surely draw the wrath of Napoleonic scholars. I cannot be sure that Forshufvud and Weider are right, but to prove them wrong, their opponents will have to produce an impressive hat and hope there is a rabbit in it."

Napoleon and Death

By David Chandler (1934-2004)

"Death is nothing," wrote Napoleon to General Lauriston in 1804, "but to live defeated is to die every day." [1] Like any many -- especially an active soldier -- the Emperor was aware of the possibility of violent death. Many soldiers are killed in the hot, desperate confusion of fighting. Relatively few die from coldly planned murder - but such was the fate of Napoleon Bonaparte in May 1821 after six years at St. Helena, barren rock in the midst of the distant Southern Atlantic.

Napoleon was fatalist, "All that is to happen is written down. Our hour is marked, and we cannot prolong it a minute longer than fate has predestined." [2] He was, therefore, aware of his destiny -- but he was determined to "use" his future to the full. It is incredible that the Emperor still remains so popular and fascinating to us today in the mid-1990s. He must at least have been very skillful at using propaganda. This fascination continues from 1821 to the present.

As an author, it was never my ambition to attempt to prove that Napoleon was murdered. That was left to Dr. Ben Weider, who in this regard has made great advances over the last five years -- far more than we would have expected. Careful skepticism may be better than enthusiastic belief - but this compulsive interest over Napoleon's fate at St. Helena has yielded results, Forshufvud (and now Weider) are challenging the skeptics - many of whom are French. Many eminent individuals, including the historian André Castelot, Dr. Paul Ganière, Dr. Guy Godlewski (former president of this important journal), Baron Gourgaud and Comte de Las Cases (descendants of the companions at St. Helena) and Professor Jean Tulard (president of *l'Institut Napoléon*) [3] have argued why Napoleon could not have been murdered. They may well need to revise their arguments. The "conceivable" theory of Napoleon's murder has already passed through to the "possible" and Dr. Weider now clearly believes he has discovered the truth.

There is no doubt that the Emperor, whose fate it was to live out the last six years of his life as a captive on an isolated South Atlantic island, had his fair share of near brushes with the "grim reaper" on the battlefield. Indeed, his great military career might well have been stifled at a very early stage, for at the siege of Toulon in late 1793, he suffered all of three wounds -- having his forehead gashed by a bayonet on 15 November, his chest slightly injured when a horse was killed under him, one month later (16 December), and then, that very same day, receiving quite a serious injury to his left inner thigh -- again from a British bayonet - during the fierce fighting on Pointe L'Egulletter overlooking the inner harbor of the naval arsenal. [4]

Over the following 22 years of his active military career, he had a further 18 horses killed beneath him in battle. At the battle of Marengo in June 1800, he sustained a glancing blow from a spent ball on his left riding boot which tore away the leather and removed some of the skin beneath. Nine years later, at the storming of Ratisbon, he received a painful but very serious injury to the Achilles tendon just below his left heel, and later that same campaign on the second day of the Battle of Wagram (6 July), his left leg was again grazed by a cannon ball.

Over the years, he also survived two shell bursts. A shell fell beneath him in the siege-lines before Acre, but he was saved on that occasion by the prompt action of two soldiers standing close to him who unceremoniously flung their general to the ground and covered him with their bodies. All three escaped, save for being covered with sand, and Napoleon promoted his human shields to officer rank on the spot. He was probably never closer to death in action than at Arcis-sur-Aube on 20 March 1814. A howitzer shell, its fuse smoldering, plunged into the earth a few feet from the Emperor, who calmly rode his mount straight over the smoking missile. "The shell exploded, the horse, disemboweled went plunging down, taking his rider with it. The Emperor disappeared in the dust and smoke, but he got up without a scratch..." [5]

Some might consider that Napoleon bore a charmed life on the battlefield but, from first to last, his own attitude to death was that of a fatalist as has already been mentioned.

In addition to the perils of the active service, he also survived several assassination attempts. At the *coup d'état of Brumaire* in November 1799, an infuriated member of the *Conseil de Cinq-Cent* drew a dagger upon him, but was restrained by a grenadier before he could strike his blow. In September 1800, a second attempt on his life was narrowly foiled on the steps of the Paris *Opéra*, and Christmas Eve the same year saw the explosion of the "infernally machine" on his way to (again) the *Opéra*. But, fortunately, his vehicle had passed the critical spot before the detonation occurred, causing havoc behind him. [6]

According to his valet Constant - whose recollections are not invariably accurate - the year 1800 also saw an attempt to eliminate the First Consul by the placing of poison in his favorite snuffbox. What is absolutely certain is that he narrowly escaped a plot to kidnap and possibly murder him in late 1803 - the notorious George Cadoudal affair in which General Charles Pichegru (strangled in prison on 5 April 1794) and the famous General Jean Moreau (1763-1813, killed at Dresden) were implicated; and in 1809, in Austria, he was almost stabbed by the 18 year old student fanatic, Stapps, whose knife was narrowly deflected by the watchful General Rapp when the would-be assassin was merely an arm's length from his intended victim.

Clearly, Napoleon had his bitter enemies, amongst them a number of members of the exiled House of Bourbon. For a number of years, Louis XVIII apparently hoped that Napoleon might restore him to the throne of his ancestors, but this illusion was shattered after Napoleon's coronation on 2 December 1804. It may well be that the Emperor was in greater peril than he knew over the next decade - not so much from the known perils of the battlefield or from the pistol or dagger of the straightforward assassin - but from the concealed hand of the poisoner.

Napoleon's personal health was generally sturdy and sound. His energy was both immense and sustained. To cite only two examples from the mass of evidence recorded by his contemporaries, this bursting energy was both physical and mental. On 1 March 1805, he reputedly covered over 50 kilometers on horseback during a whirlwind tour of the battlefield and environs of Marengo, exhausting horses in the process, not to mention his accompanying staff and friends. [7]

Napoleon could be equally demanding - of himself and others - in the council chambers. On September 18 and 19, 1806, he is known to have dictated 102 letters to successive teams of *perspiring* secretaries almost without pause, as he prepared the final details for the launching of his devastating campaign against Prussia. [8]

"Work is my element," Napoleon once asserted. "I was born and made for work. I have recognized the limit of my eyesight and of my legs, but never the limits of my working power," [9] As a result, therefore, the Emperor felt severely trapped on St. Helena, its being so small.

We know again from the recollections of his closest associates, that he was very moderate in his eating and drinking habits, and rarely would accept any form of medicine. And yet, at a number of very critical moments during his military career, he was abruptly afflicted by incapacitating and transitory illness. At Austerlitz, he was suffering from a severe attack of conjunctivitis - but on 10 December 1805, he could write to Josephine "...my eye trouble is cured." In May 1809, after the close of the unsuccessful battle of Aspern-Essling, he reached quarters at Kaiser-Ebersdorf, at 3:00 a.m. on 23 May, and sank into a deep depressed and totally lethargic daze for the space of fully 36 hours, during which time his staff could obtain no orders from him.

This was very untypical of him, but worse was to follow three years later. Before the battle of Borodino, he was afflicted by an attack of acute dysuria and swelling of the legs, which he attributed to the dampness of his bivouac area. Next day, (6 September 1812), he developed a persistent dry cough, hoarseness, difficult and irregular breathing, and an irregular pulse rate. Most accounts attribute this to a severe cold, but there may have been more to it than that. James Kemble is of the opinion that he was suffering from coinciding attacks of acute cystitis and pyelitis. [10]

Next year, after the battle of Dresden, fought amidst pouring rain, he was afflicted by severe vomiting and diarrhea, which was at the time put down to some garlic in a mutton stew or some off-color *pâté-de-foie-gras* that he had eaten, but once again the timing and nature of the indisposition gives one cause to wonder, as toxicologists will declare the odor of garlic under certain conditions is barely distinguishable from that of arsenic.

Throughout the following month, Napoleon was plunged into despondency and relative inactivity, finding it hard to make firm decisions. Then at Leipzig, on the night of 17-18 October, he was again attacked by severe stomach pains and lay doubled-up on his camp bed. "I feel bad. My mind resists but my body gives in." Was this, as Kemble asserts, duodenitis arising from a prolonged anxiety state ... or due to something much more sinister?

The most frequently discussed indisposition occurred within the period of the climactic series of engagements that ended Napoleon active career. It was an illness that struck on the night of 16-17 June, 1815, immediately after the battle of Ligny, when it required the ministrations of Prince Jérôme, Baron Larrey and Marchand to get their imperial master over the crisis. This may have been linked to prolapsed piles associated with complete exhaustion, as some have speculated, although important evidence exist that Napoleon did not, in fact , suffer from this complaint, as his faithful valet attested. [11] Whatever the cause of his illness that night, its effect on his power to reach decisions on the morning of the 17th proved critical. Instead of issuing effective orders for the proper pursuit of the defeated Prussians and the coordination of efforts with Marshal Ney required to trap Wellington at or near Quatre Bras, the Emperor spent the whole morning viewing the battlefield of Ligny, the scene of his considerable victory that previous day. This period of hesitation or at least inactivity proved of the utmost importance in determining the outcome at Waterloo and Wavre on the 18th.

On a number of very important occasions, therefore, Napoleon was very much off-form. It would be a bold man who would assert that one of these highly inconvenient lapses in the Emperor's state of well-being was due to other than natural cause. The strains of high command in any war are immense, and many in general has succumbed to one form of trouble or another on the eve of, actually during, or immediately, after a major engagement. [12] It was that Napoleon seems to have had rather more than his share of such misfortunes, giving his normally excellent state of health, which persisted through his middle as well as his earlier years.

One way and another, therefore, Napoleon was no stranger to the thorough and near-reality of death. The actual circumstances of his demise on St. Helena have been shrouded by doubt and surmise ever since that fateful day, 5 May 1821. Today the most generally-held belief is that he succumbed to carcinoma of the stomach [13] the supposed cause death of his father in 1785. But the evidence of the post-mortem reports- there were three independent accounts of the autopsy findings - is in some ways conflicting and not all medical authorities are in agreement with this finding. Some,



including the French historian, Dr. Godlewski (as already mentioned above), postulates a death due to hepatitis and a gastric lesion rather than a cancer. It is hard for the inexpert layman to judge the purely medical evidence and the inclination for the modern scholar to accept the most generally held view is extremely strong, until some positive evidence to the contrary is produced and carefully tested. In the current context, the recent research of the FBI have greatly strengthened Dr. Weider's case. [14] Academic caution is at once traditional and very necessary, but is equally important to hold an open mind.

Of course the hypothesis that Napoleon did not die a natural death, strong rumor circulated particularly but exclusively in Bonapartist circles, that Emperor was being subjected to the attention of a poisoner - as indeed Napoleon so believe in his

will. Some accused Sir Hudson Lowe of his villainy, but however unpopular and possibly misunderstood that person was, relatively few contemporaries gave such accusations much credence. It is now clear that the British government, far from trying to cause or hasten Napoleon's demise, took positive steps to guard against any such occurrence. The posting of sentries around Longwood which Napoleon so bitterly resented - and the insistence that he should be accompanied by a British officer whenever he went riding - were measures dictated at length as much by a genuine concern for the safety of his person as by a wish to ensure that he did not attempt to escape from the island.

Those who argued that the need for such security precautions was baseless, given the presence of a Royal Naval flotilla of the island, ready to intercept any such attempt, are not on very strong ground; even at the present time, despite the resources of electronic surveillance and other scientific measures, it is very hard to devise a fool-proof system as the deaths of the Baader-Mainhoff terrorists in the custom-built German prison in October 1977, serves to illustrate. To shield Napoleon from a possible assassination attempt, the authorities attempted to keep a tight control over all individuals arriving at and departing from the island, although they realized that only a Draconian policy of protection and supervision had much chance of shielding their distinguished prisoner from an assassin's bullet, or knife-blow. This the author of the book freely accepts as truth.

However, how could they hope to guard Napoleon from an enemy place, hidden, within his personal entourage? Forshufvud's thesis is that Napoleon was administered arsenic, in calculated dose, over a number of years and finally succumbed to poisoning by the hand of one of two closest associates, Charles Tristan, Count of Montholon - the *coup de grâce* being in the form of poisoning with mercuric cyanide in a lethal dose, just prior to his death.

The evidence of the hair samples from Napoleon's head is of central importance to these allegations which the late - Sten Forshufvud and Ben Weider have now long set out to prove - and to my mind the latter has now almost proved his statement.

The arsenical content of hair samples which had been preserved by Napoleon's valets, Marchand and Noverraz, was demonstrated to be abnormally high by tests conducted in the early 1950's. When Sten Forshufvud first produced this thesis [15] it was received with strong resistance in French academic circles. The evidence was dismissed on hypothetical grounds that there were many ways other than poisoning, whether accidental or deliberate, which could account for the presence of the high content of arsenic. Doubt was also cast on the authenticity of the hair samples. But that they contained an abnormal arsenical content could not be denied following the publication of the findings of Dr. Hamilton Smith, head of the Department of Forensic Medicine at Glasgow University. He had subjected individual hairs to an irradiation examination at the Harwell Atomic Research Centre situated near London (England) but the evidence reached was not to be conclusive as to numbers or dates of poisonings - only that arsenic had been received into the system of the subject.

For many years, the author shared the common view, doubting the validity of the evidence produced. A meeting with Ben Weider, whom I know and respect as a serious Napoleonic historian, in the course of a shared pilgrimage to the battlefields of Waterloo in 1975 - during which he revealed his total conviction that Napoleon had been intoxicated by arsenic and had finally succumbed to mercuric poisoning - caused me to reconsider all the available evidence. This by that year included an important development - the discovery of a technique by Dr. Smith, whereby the arsenical content of a single hair could be accurately measured in a series of small segments. By this method, it had proved possible to date with considerable accuracy the timing of the various dosages of arsenic that had been introduced into Napoleon's system, and this closely fitted a pattern with the more circumstantial evidence that will here be found treated at length. Calculations of the time involved in the growth of a hair could be made and compared with the arsenic-altered characteristics of the sample under analysis. Thus a sharp picture of some accuracy could be built up for the period 1820 - 1821, when the hair was shaven from Napoleon's head.

For the evidence of the state of the hair at the time of death, reliance had to be placed on, amongst others, the sample that had come down from the Emperors valet, Abram Noverraz. The evidence of the intake of cumulatively a large amount of arsenic at different times is impressive. The indication would seem strong that Napoleon's malady at St. Helena was caused by poison deliberately administered. It is well worth noticing that many of the symptoms that Napoleon evidenced on the island belong to the syndrome of arsenical poisoning.

The attribution of the deed to Count Montholon is of prominent consideration. Inevitably, if one accepted that Napoleon died from poison, the finder of suspicion and indeed of accusation, must point in the direction of this somewhat enigmatic figure. The progressive changes in the composition of the Longwood entourage - and the deliberately provoked quarrels and in-fighting amongst members of Napoleon's staff that led to them - would fit well with such a belief.

The sudden death of the majordomo Franceschi Cipriani, on 26 February 1818, closely followed by those of a woman and a child (both members of the Montholon household) also merits close examination as some historians have accepted it as fact that these deaths were caused by acute arsenical poisoning.

Certainly Montholon had opportunity to administer poison on numerous occasions. Equally, as a major beneficiary by Napoleon's will [16] (as he was no doubt fully aware, having been present at the drafting and as one of the three executors appointed by its terms), Montholon did indeed stand to benefit personally by his master's death; this regardless of whether or not he was an agent of the Bourbon government, as Dr. Weider is convinced was the case.



General Charles Tristan
Comte de Montholon

This aspect of the Forshufvud thesis, [17] as it was first propounded in 1961, has been particularly hard for scholars, especially French ones, to accept. Many historians, indeed, declare themselves to be wholly unconvinced, amongst them Napoleon's biographer, who wrote as follows:

"De quoi est mort Napoléon? Sten Forshufvud a imaginé un véritable roman policier fondé sur l'empoisonnement à l'arsenic et désigné le coupable: Montholon"[18]

Tristan de Montholon is, indeed, an enigmatic and sinister figure. Many historians have tended to accept at face value the bland autobiographical sketch that Montholon included in the introduction to his *Récits de la captivité de Napoléon à Sainte-Hélène*. [19] According to this, he was a soldier of some experience (correctly). He claims to have received five wounds during the Austrian campaigns of 1809, subsequently promoted to "Général-de-Brigade" in 1811, and ultimately, after escorting Napoleon from near Fontainebleau to Paris in march 1815, and thereafter serving as an Imperial aide-de-camp with "*l'Armée du Nord*," attaining the rank of "Général-de-division" on 15

June of that year.

Few of these particular claims are supported by the records. Although Montholon did serve as an aide to Joubert, Championnet, Augereau, MacDonald and Berthier in turn between 1800 and 1809 - thanks in large measure to his step-father's (the Count de Sémonville's) influence with Maret, the confidant of Napoleon - there is no record of either his wounds or his claimed promotions in the dossiers held by the Ministry of War. [20] It would indeed seem that he never advanced beyond the rank of full colonel during the Napoleonic Wars. He earns no entry in Six's famous " Dictionnaire Bibliographique..." (Paris, 1934) as no generals are listed from 1792 - 1814 and he was not included in the further additional volume covering 1815. However we discover Montholon was promoted to a " *Maréchal de Camp*" (the equivalent to junior general) on 23 August 1814 by King Louis XVIII -

having joined the Bourbons. [21]

Montholon, made Member of the Legion of Honor on 14 March 1806, was also made a *Chevalier de Saint-Louis* on 8 July 1814 (a Royal promotion). He was given the title of Count of the Empire in 1809 when Napoleon also gave him a gift of 4,000 francs - but there is no clear mention of Montholon's wounds. It is true that Montholon switched back to Napoleon in early 1815 - and of course stayed with the Emperor, joining H.M.S. *Bellerophon* on 16 July and Later H.M.S. *Northumberland* from 7 August to 17 October 1815 when the French party disembarked at St. Helena. Nevertheless, it is certain that Montholon joined the Bourbons from April 1814 until early in February 1815. Except for Dr. Weider's, there is no other clear explanation for Montholon's movements.

There are some earlier periods of Montholon during his years in the Empire. He was, as he claimed, sent as Minister-Plenipotentiary to the Grand Duke of Wurzburg in early 1812, but the Emperor removed him of his secret and unacceptable marriage to Albine de Vassal. Similarly, Montholon had held a junior court post from December 1809 under the Empress Josephine - thanks to his step-father's influence, but he did not carry out many duties.

Following his disgrace in 1812, he spent a long spendthrift period, dissipating his step-father's money, before briefly holding a National Guard command on the Loire for one month from March 1814.

It is beyond the realms of reason that such a suave but unscrupulous and unprincipled man could also have been an agent of the sinister count d'Artois, who was brother to King Louis XVIII. The Bourbons, more than any other party, had reason to fear the possibility of a Napoleonic restoration as their popularity waned in France and Europe. A desire to remove, once and for all, the exile of St. Helena and the perils he represented much have been tempting. [22]



Montholon later in life

This is not to deny that Montholon's subsequent career and activities deserve to earn him a further measure of suspicion. His sale of many of St. Helena documents, in direct contravention of Napoleon's known wishes, indicates his desperate desire for ready cash in the years that preceded his eventual receipt of 2,200,000 francs - or more - from the emperor's bequest. Indeed, he was declared bankrupt in 1829 and had to flee to Belgium to escape his creditors.[23] Moreover, his attitude towards Sir Hudson Lowe [24] and to the reasons for Napoleon's death were ambivalent - he shifted his ground inexplicable on these matters over the years. If he had been liked by Dr. Henry, Montchenu and Sturmer (and to a lesser degree by Marchand) [25] he was very much disliked by Bertrand, Gourgaud, Balmain and Dr. O'Meara and by the valet Ali (born Saint Denis) whose forthright criticisms of both Montholon and his supposed recollections form an important part of the case against him. [26] The *Récits* are in large part - at least for the period 1815 - 1818 lifted from the writings of O'Meara and Las Cases. Only a quarter of the book - the least

convincing part - is devoted to the three lost years of Napoleon's life, being based on Montholon's own writings. [27] By any standards Montholon appears to have been a scheming and unscrupulous man. His accusers though they are, Ben Weider (and the late Sten Forshufvud) are at some pains to examine the self-justification by which Montholon or any other agent of royalty could have pursued the King's wish against a man categorized as an outlaw and the enemy of peace in Europe. [28]

Dr. Weider has "...produced and reproduced a fascinating and deeply researched book. it could well lead to considerable changes being written into the history of Napoleon's last years on St. Helena", as I wrote in 1978. [29] Certainly the matter of Napoleon's illnesses and death have never been

more exhaustively scrutinized. The story unfolds and the scientific evidence they furnish at the end of the volume are more than enough to provide justification for careful thought and reconsideration. There was a great fuss for several years before the Emperor's death at St. Helena as was recounted in *The Observer* (London) on Sunday 30 June 1816:

It is truly ridiculous to read the contradictory accounts with which the newspapers are crammed respecting Napoleon many of which contain gross falsehoods; and one would suppose at first they had never been written by persons in the island. Such are the stories of his recounting to two young ladies the history of his campaigns, with all the loquacious vanity of a schoolboy describing the hair-breadth escapes he had encountered in his first fox chase: when the fact is that it is a subject which he scarcely ever touched on, and never without having been asked some question concerning them, It is a piece with the Munchausen accounts of his breakfast, which modestly states that he drinks a pot of porter and two bottles of claret at that meal, when the fact is that there are few men more temperate than he in the use of wine. [30]

Although Napoleon in fact only drank white Chambertin, the writer prophetically mentions in the same paragraph both the instrument of Napoleon's poisoning and the means of its discovery. Little did the writer, so many years ago guess that Napoleon's fate and destiny might be linked with a "... hair-breadth" ... bottles of wine". But then, of course, Montholon was already devastatingly at work.

It is now almost certain that Napoleon died by foul means, and that Count Montholon was guilty of murder.

Notes

1. Correspondance Napoléon 1er, (Paris, 1870), Vol. X, p.69
2. W.H. Hudson, The Man Napoleon, (London, 1915), p.201
3. Souvenir Napoléon, (Paris, 1982), p.25
4. See D.G. Chandler, The Campaigns of Napoleon (13th Printing, New York and London, 1993, pp. 20-24.
5. Gen. H. Camon, La Guerre Napoléonienne, (Paris, 1925, Vol.2, p.152 (f.n.)
6. The Cadoudal plot, see painting, P.R. Jones, Napoleon, 1800-1814, (San Francisco, 1992), p.85.
7. See D.G. Chandler, On the Napoleonic Wars, (NY & London, 1993), p.193.
8. Ibid., Jena, 1806, (London, 1993)
9. E. Las Cases, Memorials of the Emperor Napoleon..., (London, 1836), p.359.
10. James Kemble, Napoleon Immortal, (London, 1964), p.193.
11. Ibid., on illness before Waterloo, see R. Richardson, MD, Napoleon's Death: An Inquiry, (London, 1974), passim.
12. N. Dixon, On the Psychology of Military Incompetence, (London, 1967)
13. See Kemble, p.278, and P.Garnière, Sainte Hélène, Terre d'Exil, (Paris, 1971).
14. For the latest FBI information see B. Weider, Assassination at St. Helena Revisited, (et seq), Part Four, p.471-474 and p.476.
15. See Sten Forshufvud , Napoléon a-t-il été empoisonné? (Paris, 1961) and Ibid., Who killed Napoleon? (London, 1962).
16. A. de Jonge, Napoleon's Last and Testament, (NY and London 1969).
17. Sten Forshufvud and B. Weider, Assassination at St. Helena-the poisoning of Napoleon Bonaparte (Canada, 1978).
18. Jean Tulard, Napoléon, ou le Mythe du Sauveur (Paris, 1977), p.453.
19. See Count Montholon, Récits de la captivité de Napoléon à Sainte Hélène, 4 Vols., (Paris, 1847).
20. See Secrétaire d'Etat, Ministère de la Guerre, Relevé de Service (Paris, 12 August 1833); and Le Conseiller d'Etat, Directeur., (Paris, 22 march 1855, - seen by D.G. Chandler at Vincennes (Paris, 20 September 1982), when he examined with 65 document, Note: No. 63 documents gave been withdrawn from the carriers at Vincennes. There were no reasons offered by the officials.
21. See Archives Ministère de la Guerre (23 August 1814)
22. D. Hamilton-Williams, The Fall of Napoleon, (London 1994), p.288.
23. Ibid., p. 17.
24. Ibid., p. 22.
25. See D.G. Chandler, A Dictionary of Napoleonic Wars (NY, 1979) p.255.
26. For see Constant Wairy see by Proctor Patterson Jones, Napoleon - an Intimate Account... 1800 - 1814 (New York: Random House, 1992).
27. B. Weider, Assassination at St. Helena Revisited (NY, 1995), passim; also see Ibid., (Canada, 1978), and with B. Weider and D. Hapgood, The Murder of Napoleon (NY, 1982P and many issues for the popular edition with Reader's Digest, (1983 etc.).
28. See Dr. Godlewski, Les Compagnons de la Captivité (Ch. 6) in Marcel Dunan's Sainte Hélène, Terre d'Exit (Paris, 1971), pages 128 - 138 for an examination of Montholon's character and record, Godlewski, however, does not mention the poisoning of Napoleon.
29. See a considered statement by Dr. P. Griffith on D. Hamilton- Williams, The fall of Napoleon (see p.(23) above) upon "Book Reviews" (p.33-35) on The Age of Napoleon No. 19 Magazine (February, London, 1996).
30. Quote "150 Years Ago" (The Observer, London, 1966).