room, blood from his cheek falling on his shirt-front, when a Socialist Deputy, 
exclaiming 'Misérable,' threw an inkstand at him, but fortunately missed his 
amaim. Loud altercation went on elsewhere and experiences were related. M. 
Chaulin Servinière states that in trying to part M. de Bernis and M. Gérault-
Richard, he received an unintentional blow on the shoulder and was near 
having his leg broken. The office-bearers of the Chamber eventually met 
and resolved on reporting M. de Bernis and M. Gérault-Richard to the Public 
Prosecutor.

Source: The Times, 24 January 1898.

Appendix 23: World reaction to the verdict at Zola's trial

The Figaro believes that the result of the trial will surprise no one. The jury 
could give no other verdict, especially in view of the pressure exercised upon 
it by public opinion. The journal adds that though M. Zola has been justly 
condemned, no one doubts his disinterestedness and his courage.

The Gaulois says that the jury’s reply was that of good sense and patriotism 
given to professional rhetoricians, and if the polemic still continues it will be 
between those who do not want a revision of the Dreyfus trial and those who 
do – that is ‘between good Frenchmen and the others.’

The Soleil says that the author of the ‘Débâcle’ has shown a malevolent spirit 
from the social point of view, and declares that the verdict was dictated by 
good sense and honourable feeling.

The Aurore says that it is proud ‘to have been struck in company with the 
glorious defender of liberty.’

The Siècle says that M. Zola will pay in prison the penalty for an act of 
courage and revolt nobly accomplished, and that his work will survive...

The Post says that the judgement of the world will be anything but favourable 
when it reviews the incidents of the last few weeks and the convulsions which 
have shaken popular feeling in France. It goes on to say: ‘Details of the life and 
the ways of officers of the general staff have been revealed and the intellectual 
capacity of the leaders of the French army has been exhibited in the worst 
light. The Sandherrs, the Du Paty de Clams, and the Esterhazys will remain 
standing types of French officers of the present epoch and will afford a standard 
for measuring their worth … A Republic in which the army is Sovereign is a 
monstrosity … Although at present we have no reason to view the development 
of the situation in France with anxiety, yet we cannot but reflect that that 
country might enter upon another path, and where it would lead is beyond our 
knowledge. Watchfulness continues to be a dictate of duty for Germany.’

The National Zeitung is convinced that ‘the military reign of terror has carried 
day in France.’

The Voissiche Zeitung says of M. Zola: ‘He is not fallen. Crowned with the 
halo of the noblest heroism and the most genuine humanity his figure towers 
into that immortality which his writings may, perhaps, have failed to achieve. 
What he has done with such courage for the sake of truth, justice, and 
humanity is as surely immortal as the action of Voltaire in the case of Jean 
Calas, performed as it was under far less difficult conditions.’

The Berlin Liberal organ thinks that the French nation will yet acknowledge 
with shame the services of the man ‘who is about to forfeit a precious year of 
a life dedicated to the national glory for his bravery as the champion of truth.’

The Berline Neueste Nachrichten asserts that the elementary principles of 
civilization have been trodden under foot by the people who claim to lead the
vanguard of progress. ‘Anti-Semitism celebrates its worst orgies, and wherever there is the faintest allusion to hated Germany every spark of reason and of honour is extinguished.’

The *Berliner Tageblatt* goes even further. Beginning with the taunt that ‘the French army yesterday won its first victory since its defeat in 1870–71’, it proceeds: ‘For us Germans the trial has a special lesson. Zola receives the blows, but they are meant for Germany. Yesterday we had finally to bury the hope of ever achieving an honourable peace with France. The revision of the Dreyfus verdict has been refused. Will the revision of the peace of Frankfurt be obtained?’

The *North-German Gazette*’s only comment is that Zola appears to have misjudged his countrymen, since in every sensational case in France a verdict and sentence are expected which embody the spirit and temper of the nation, whether it is a question of acquitting a murderess or of withholding clemency from a man who happens to be unpopular. ‘The Court accommodated itself to the temper of the jury and passed the heaviest sentence that the law allowed.’

In the severity of the German comments there is manifestly something more than an ordinary sense of outraged justice. The Anti-Semitic character of the agitation against M. Zola and his friends and the Anti-German attitude of the French military and Chauvinist parties have given a peculiar intensity to the bitterness with which German journals of various shades of opinion have commented upon this unhappy episode in French public life.

The *Neue Freie Presse* says: ‘France will some day bitterly repent of this sentence, the responsibility for which falls upon the whole French people … The French have lost all sense of genuine freedom … Zola, Picquart, and Dreyfus have been sacrificed to reasons of State … That is a return to barbarism, for nowhere is the principle acknowledged that the individual must surrender his life, honour, and freedom because the public welfare prohibits the rectification of a judicial error … A nation whose sense of justice is shaken is always in danger of decay.’

The *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* says: ‘Although he has been condemned, our sympathies remain with him of whom Victor Hugo would have said that, as he stood head and shoulders above the crowd, they cut his head off. We take our place beside the man with whom all those must elect to stand who remember the past, who have not forgotten what mankind was before the feeling of humanity got the upper hand, beside the man who seeks to make France once more the land of justice where the fraternization of nations is promoted. If it be a dishonour to follow in his footsteps, then every man of courage will claim a share in this dishonour, and will pray to Providence that he may long participate in that disgrace of which the standard-bearer was yesterday condemned in Paris.’

The *Pester Lloyd* remarks: ‘To what low depths must the nation have sunk which raises Rochefort on to a pinnacle and casts Zola into prison! What has become even of French good taste, now that a Court of justice does not hesitate, according to all appearances, for purposes of revenge to condemn to severe punishment a man whom the world respects as the most prominent and important representative of contemporary French literature, and whose fault, if it can be called one, consists exclusively in believing, as do millions of people outside France, in the innocence of Dreyfus? What has become of the commonsense of the rulers of France, if they imagine that the condemnation of Zola will dispose of the Dreyfus affair?’

*The Times*: ‘M. Zola has been tried as he desired, he has been condemned, as he must have known for a long time that he would be, and he has failed to make the trial, as he hoped, an opportunity for a practical revision of the
Dreyfus judgement by a French Court of Law. But in a far larger sense he has
succeeded, and that with a completeness that may well console him for what
he will have to suffer in person, in pocket and in popularity. He has procured
revision of the Dreyfus case, not indeed in the sense of repairing the wrong
done to an individual, but in the far more important sense of exposing the
perils that assail the foundations of society in France. He has been served by
M. Labori with extraordinary ability, ingenuity, perseverance, and eloquence.
It has been a rare intellectual treat for educated men everywhere to watch
the splendid fight made by M. Zola's counsel against the heaviest odds...
The question of the innocence or guilt of Dreyfus stands very much where it
did. If the great combination against which M. Zola has been struggling are
content with the gratification of vindictive feelings against the prisoner of the
Île du Diable, that satisfaction is theirs. But M. Labori's conduct of the trial
has made it clear beyond the reach of controversy that Dreyfus, innocent or
guilty, was illegally tried and illegally condemned.'

The Standard: 'The very form of the indictment never gave M. Zola free
play, since it covered a corner only of his letter to the Aurore. Witnesses
summoned by him were allowed to absent themselves on the most trivial
excuses, or no excuse at all. The President made little semblance of keeping
order, and permitted the most unseemly interruptions of M. Zola and his
Counsel, Maitre Labori, to pass without so much as a word of rebuke. Worse
than that, he shut the mouths of the Defendant's Witnesses whenever they
came near the Dreyfus case, whereas the Witnesses against him were allowed
to drag in Dreyfus, bordereau and all, at pleasure. Colonel Picquart was
brow-beaten, almost placed on his trial, for breathing suspicion of Major
Esterhazy. When General de Pellieux or General de Boisdeffre condescended
to give evidence, they immediately assumed complete direction of the whole
affair. The Court of Justice became a Court-martial, and a very French Court-
martial too. The speech of the Advocate-General evidently carried far less
weight with the Jury than that abrupt appeal of General de Pellieux to the
sacrosanctity of the Esterhazy tribunal, and the effect of a slur upon the good
fame of the Army in the hour of danger, which might be more imminent than
blameless citizens imagined…'

The Daily News: 'The sentence is brutal, cruel and barbarous. It may be
received with enthusiasm by excited crowds of the most turbulent classes
in Paris. It will not be upheld by the sober sense of the French nation...
But M. Zola has not been altogether unsuccessful. He has made it extremely
difficult for the French Government to persist in refusing Dreyfus a new and
public trial. The question, be it observed, is not whether Dreyfus was guilty
or innocent, but whether he was fairly tried. Upon the first question, no one
who is unacquainted with the evidence laid before the Court Martial can form
an opinion of any value. Upon the second, there is little room for doubt. If a
man can be condemned to a living death on testimony not produced to him
he might as well, and perhaps better, be hanged without trial, or shot on site.
Sooner or later that idea will penetrate to the French mind in spite of all the
furious prejudice against Jews, which the worst part of the French press has
fostered and encouraged.'

The Daily Chronicle: 'The jury have undoubtedly been influenced by the
prevalent opinion in Paris that the army is above the law. When it is safe to
cry “Vive l’Armée!”, but distinctly unsafe to cry “Vive la République!” nothing
but a miracle could have induced twelve French jurymen to acquit M. Zola.
The popular attachment to the army is sincere enough… An unhappy
complication has been made by the anti-Semitic frenzy. Dreyfus is a Jew, and
most Frenchmen believe that he is befriended by an iniquitous “syndicate”,
which somehow comprised the flower of intellectual France, including