Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish officer in the French army, was accused of treason in late 1894. His court-martial, conviction, incarceration, retrial, and ultimate rehabilitation in 1906 developed into a political event that divided France and had repercussions throughout England and Western Europe.

The ensuing political scandal known as the Dreyfus Affair resulted from problems rooted in the social and political contortions of nineteenth-century France. A complex and often contradictory cast of characters took part in the series of events that had transformed the first Dreyfus court-martial into “The Affair.” These characters included both those who were actual participants in the mockery called a trial and the subsequent coverup and others whose opinions and rhetoric created the public clamor which ultimately forced a retrial. The positions of the opinion makers vis-à-vis the military, the church, the fallen monarchy, capitalism, and the highly visible Jewish community were polarized into two perhaps too simplistic factions—the Dreyfusards and the anti-Dreyfusards. At both ends of the spectrum of opinion concerning Dreyfus’s guilt or innocence, and the concomitant question of the importance of truth and justice over honor and national security, there were people who made rash and superficial judgments, out of the desire to reduce France’s numerous social and political ailments to no more than a small surface blemish.

The Affair established for the first time in history a new role of social and political activism for writers, artists, and academicians, setting the pace for the involvement of the same groups in the ever more pressing and harrowing dilemmas of the twentieth century. In fact the term intellectual as it is understood today has its roots in the France of the Affair. In 1898, at the height of the Affair, Henri-Gabriel Ibels, the artist who founded the illustrated journal Le Sifflet with the express purpose of aiding the cause for revision, recalled that “intellectual had become the synonym for anti-patriot, informer, spy, traitor, agent of the syndicates as if there had been a syndicate rich enough to buy all these consciences.”

Émile Zola, the distinguished and popular novelist, might be considered the personification of Ibels’s definition. His article “J’Accuse,” a ringing indictment of the military and the government published in Clemenceau’s newspaper L’Aurore (13 January 1898), has become household knowledge even in America. Maurice Barrès, at the time a significant literary voice in France though less celebrated today, played an antagonistic role to Zola who made the search for truth surrounding the improper conviction of Alfred Dreyfus a personal crusade. Barrès was an ardent nationalist and his many articles on the Affair included an inflammatory description of Dreyfus during the Rennes trial. Coming from this respected author, such words helped assuage any questions the public might have raised concerning the possibility that the Jewish officer was innocent. His articles smack...
of prejudice, racism, xenophobia, and blatant anti-Semitism. Zola and Barrès are paradigms of the polarization of the nation's literati, whose bitter arguments served to disseminate information and opinion to the French public.

The effect of the Dreyfus Affair on other French literary Olympians is discussed elsewhere in this volume (see the chapter by Susan Rubin Suleiman) but members of the intelligentsia from all over the globe offered their opinions. Literary luminaries from imperial Russia to the isolationist United States had their say, generally taking up the cause of the accused officer. Anton Chekhov and Mark Twain were two notable examples: they spoke out eloquently on behalf of the captain and denounced the injustice he suffered at the corrupt workings of the military and the legal system.

Every professional discipline was split over the Affair. But none is more fascinating to examine in a museum context than the response of painters, sculptors, illustrators, and the pioneers of the newest visual media—photography and film. It is still unsettling to realize that it was the Dreyfus Affair that caused the break between the two important artists Degas and Pissarro, who had formerly been fast friends. Once again we find two archetypical examples of a much broader phenomenon: Monet, Signac, Cassatt, and Vuillard sided with the Dreyfusards against the anti-Dreyfusards Renoir and Cézanne. And this is only the beginning of a lengthy list. Few artists lived through this era without taking sides. Some refused to take a political stance, as in the case of Rodin, who found that the vagaries of the polarized camps would eventually affect the fate of certain of his sculptures.

The concept for a museum exhibition on the Dreyfus Affair seemed natural, given the proliferation of visual material during the twelve years it took for the Affair—and the struggle for truth and justice it represented—to unfold. Besides the copious polemical material the Affair generated, there was an abundant body of art that was created, affected, or interpreted in connection with the infamous scandal. This examination of the painting, sculpture, drawing, film, and decorative art related to the Dreyfus Affair can be just a beginning in the documentation of what is surely a much larger body of work.

Comprising high art, polemical art, and a great quantity of commercial ephemera, the works included in the exhibition and this volume convey a vivid sense of the texture of fin-de-siècle France. This was an era that thrived on information (the more skewed and sensational, the better) and materialism (which grew ever more commercialized and accessible). And it frequently fused and confused these two.

As its title suggests, this essay which serves to introduce these various types of images, aims for a visual summary of the Affair. Although there have been more than eight hundred titles published on the subject, many of which presented illustrative material, there has been little systematic review of the imagery. Most of the books that reproduce visual material limit themselves to about a dozen images, that seem to have been tacked on as dutiful addenda. Two books chronicling the visual polemics that arose around the scandal did appear during the Affair. These were John Grand-Carteret's L'Affair Dreyfus et l'Image (published c. 1899) and the Dreyfus-Bilderbuch (published in Germany in 1899). Both are compilations of some of the array of political cartoons about the case, which make some attempt to classify the satirical imagery. Little has been done since these publications first appeared. And certainly no examination of the impact of the Affair on painters and sculptors has been undertaken, save for the occasional mention in scholarly articles or specialized books of the effect of the case on a particular artist or work of art. In this volume, it would be impossible to include more than a sampling of the various types of images created in response to the Affair. A complete compendium of Dreyfus imagery would entail illustrations numbering in the tens of thousands.

Beginning around 1880, the phenomenon of artists serving politics through involvement in journalism coincided with the general increase in the permissiveness and power of the press. The Fourth Estate was frequently irresponsible in its reportage, and this lack of professional accountability is evident in the illustrations as well as in the textual material. Yet journalism was becoming a respectable pursuit for the first time in French history. Figures from politics and letters—fields where there were individuals with opinions on
both sides of the Dreyfus issue who had the influence to shape the course of the scandal—found a meeting ground in journalistic activities. And often there was no clear line of demarcation separating writers from politicians. Many figures wore both hats as they jockeyed positions and careers. Almost every major character in the fight for revision was in some way involved with the press, whether as writer, owner, or backer of the numerous vehicles of opinion. The Dreyfusards Clemenceau, Zola, Scheurer-Kestner, Lazare, Waldeck-Rousseau, Séverine, Fénéon, and the anti-Dreyfusards Drumont, Rochefort, Méline, and Meyer were all engaged in some form or other with the business of journalism. Journalistic activities also saw many artists and writers through difficult economic times, during the periodic lulls in the market for books and fine art.

Besides creating much of the material that went into the journals, artists had a significant role in advertising the publications. The kiosks of Paris and, indeed, all France, were plastered with posters and broadsides promoting commercial or cultural products and political or social ideas. These placards clearly demonstrate the aesthetic and political aims of the publishers, according to the nature of the image or the choice of artist. La Revue blanche was a journal that promoted new artistic ideas, and it was one of the first to publish articles questioning the irregularities surrounding the original Dreyfus court-martial of 1894. The journal employed many leading artists among the Symbolists and Nabis, including Vuillard, Ranson, Denis, Toulouse-Lautrec, Sérusier, and Redon. Vallotton, about whom more shortly, was an artist-in-residence there. Toulouse-Lautrec was an artist who could bring his commercial work to levels of exceptional artistic achievement. His poster (see fig. 1) depicting the wife of the publisher Thadée Natanson in a sinuous art-nouveau style was anything but political. Instead, it served to draw attention to the lofty aestheticism that dominated the intellectual, artistic, and liberally oriented publication.

Clemenceau's L'Aurore, was also liberal, but more distinctly concerned with news and politics than with art and society, to which it also paid some attention. Aurore means "dawn" in French, and Eugène Carrière's poster of 1897 (see fig. 2) shows Dawn arising from the uninformed darkness of the night, an allegorical representation of
the dependability of the information the journal purveyed. This work may indeed be the poster in support of Dreyfus referred to in the literature on Carrière, who was passionately Dreyfusard from the moment he witnessed the degradation of the army captain at the Ecole Militaire on 5 January 1895. He was one of the few artists present, and certainly one of the few whose presence was recorded. That he fervently believed the maligned captain’s protestations of his innocence during that harrowing ceremony is shown in the artist’s correspondence.

Drumont, who can hardly be called a major patron of the arts, nonetheless employed some very competent artists for the illustrated supplement of his scandal sheet, called La Libre Parole. Yet the promotional poster executed for his newspaper can only be characterized as artless (see Mar-rus, fig. 7). What it lacked in aesthetic sensibility, however, it more than compensated for in size and vividness. The monumental poster contains a cartouche with a photographic portrait depicting none other than the egocentric and anti-Semitic owner of the paper himself. Drumont, who often called himself “the chief rabbi of anti-Semitism,” was quite content to use his own fiery likeness as the logo for his paper. Its slogan, “France for the French,” summarizes its anti-Semitic and xenophobic program.

Steinlen’s poster for his journal, La Feuille, (see fig. 3 and Cate in this volume) is more a demonstration of the artist’s socialist tendencies than it is an expression of his ambiguous stance vis-à-vis the Dreyfus case. The downpour of paper that inundates the proletarian masses in the image serves as a terse critique of this era of journalistic excess.

With Rochefort’s 1899 placard for his own viciously anti-Dreyfusard L’Intransigeant, the newspaper poster became directly involved in the Affair and was actually banned by the police. Reproduced on this public announcement is a representation by the caricaturist J. Belon of a hooked-nosed and thoroughly semiticized Dreyfus stealthily leaving his Rennes prison cell. Prominently affixed to his valise are travel stickers from both Devil’s Island and Berlin, the latter obviously implying that Dreyfus had a furtive connection with the enemy government. The torn document of Dreyfus’s arrest shown in the picture must be a reference to the pardon granted shortly after the
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second judgment at Rennes. Here is a poster that blatantly caters to an anti-Dreyfusard, anti-Semitic market.

Ironically, Rochefort had been the first editor of the republican and anticlerical *La Lanterne*, a paper that would become an ardently Dreyfusard vehicle because of its anticlerical stance. Its 1898 poster possibly coincided with the publication of a petition in support of Colonel Picquart. The poster shows The Church personified as an evil sorcerer emanating from the Basilica Sacre Coeur, a building that had come to symbolize the political dominance of the Church in the Republic (see fig. 5).

On the same side of the media marketplace is a handbill that was central to the heart of the Dreyfusard camp. It announces the reprinting of Zo d’Axa’s weekly journal *En Dehors*, which was no longer in operation. This left-wing publication had been closed down with the antianarchist laws of 1894, but around 1898 it seemed possible to contemplate a reprinting. Louis Anquetin portrays the symbolic elements of the scandal, including the framed army captain himself (see fig. 6). Dreyfus, depicted as a puppet on a child’s hobby horse, sits immobile near the end of a procession. This group is led by a judge, whom Anquetin ironically equips with a set of tipped scales of justice. He is followed by a haughty military officer and a bovine-faced courtier. Dreyfus is trailed by an aloof painter, canvas in hand, who seems unaffected by these personifications of societal ills. It is an unmistakable call to arms for unengaged artists, implying that their individual political commitment is needed against the sinister antimilitaristic, antiroyalist, and antijudicial forces.18

Besides the skill of the graphic artists, the technological advances that allowed inexpensive reproductions were another key factor in the media’s ability to capitalize on the power of the image. The processes attendant to this revolution of photomechanical reproduction had actually carved new niches for artistic endeavor and expanded existing ones.19 Using the potential of these processes enlarged markets for both artist and artwork. As a result, political cartoons proliferated as never before. Photomechanical reproductions form, by far, the most extensive category of the Dreyfus-related images as they spread through newspapers and illustrated journals. It was truly a golden age of visual polemic.

None better illustrates the power of the press during this period in general, and its impact for the Dreyfus Affair in particular, than Félix Vallotton’s arresting cover for the weekly journal *Le Cri de Paris*. Titled “L’Age du papier” (see Cat. 46 and cover of this catalogue) the print appeared ten days after Zola’s inflammatory article “J’Ac-
"J'accuse" was published in the 13 January 1898 issue of L'Aurore. It depicts, with the artist's usual graphic economy, the effect of the more than fifty daily papers on the information-hungry Parisian public. A worm's-eye view of a café scene shows patrons reading the various journals, including Le Temps and Le Journal, while one conspicuously devours Zola's incendiary headline "J'accuse." The faces of all the readers are buried in the all-too-prominent sheets of printed matter. Vallotton's anarchist tendencies load the image with further political implications involving the consumers and their objects of consumption. The publishers and journalists, whose lucrative enterprises are represented by the scads of paper they produce, cater to a top-hatted bourgeois clientele. The poor news vendors depicted hawking their wares at the upper left are certainly victims of the capitalist system. But we might also ask if the bourgeois consumers are not also at the mercy of that system, albeit different aspects of it? The way the print uses the abundance of paper to express the dominance of the press is analogous to the way Steinlen's poster for La Feuille handles the theme.

The image the two works convey is indeed close to reality. For the Dreyfus Affair was certainly one of the first political issues in history that was so intensely managed by the media. The press continuously manipulated the scandal, if only to augment its fortunes. La Libre Parole, Edouard Drumont's anti-Semitic scandal sheet, revitalized its lagging readership by leaking news of the arrest. Similarly, the newspaper shown in Vallotton's print, Clemenceau's L'Aurore, founded only a year earlier, sold over 300,000 copies on the day Zola's famous indictment was printed. A document that corroborates the avidity with which the journalistic output was consumed is the photograph of the Mme. Bizet Straus circle (see fig. 7), an ardently pro-Dreyfusard group, here shown absorbed in reading the sensational headlines of the various newspapers. Here, Madeleine Bizet, daughter-in-law of the composer, Paul Hervieu, playwright, and Mme. Straus, widow of Georges Bizet are shown reading both pro- and anti-Dreyfusard journals to ascertain every nuance of fact and factual distortion.

Vallotton's involvement did not stop at this prelude to the next two years of journalistic hype that reached its peak during Dreyfus's retrial in Rennes of September 1899. The artist created numerous works, including a contribution to the album of twelve prints honoring the officer who
risked his career in announcing that the real culprit was Colonel Walsin-Estherhazy. His lithograph for Hommage des artistes à Picquart, perhaps one of the strongest and most original of the suite, depicts the anti-Dreyfusard Prime Minister Mélène wakening from a dream with the startled realization that Dreyfus is innocent (pl. 124). This revelation was a factice mockery of that official’s stated misconception “There is no Dreyfus Affair,” words he uttered just moments before the scandal escalated.

Among Vallotton’s other illustrations for the Natanson-owned paper Le Cri de Paris is the moving cover of 1 October 1899 issue, published shortly after Alfred Dreyfus was pardoned. His graphic reinterpretation of a much-reproduced photograph of the returned prisoner reunited with his children is made even more poignant by the children’s close interaction with their father. Its ironic title “Père, Une histoire” (“Papa, a story!”) heightens the poignancy still further. Surely the public already understood the convoluted tale of Alfred Dreyfus to be an epic whose complexity Hannah Arendt would later compare with that of a Balzac novel. The artist Henri-Gabriel Ibels also drew an image of the pardoned captive with his children, this one titled “To the Glory of Scheurer-Kestner” (see pl. 164). This sentimental image has none of the bite of Vallotton’s. On the contrary, it evokes the sad irony of the untimely death of the vice-president of the Senate. Scheurer-Kestner, an Alsatian and one of the first of the revision bandwagon, died the morning Dreyfus’s pardon was announced. Many other illustrators took part in the campaign to disseminate information and opinions from both sides of the Affair. Most noteworthy are the anti-Dreyfusards Forain and Caran d’Ache and their arch enemy Ibels. They established two opposed illustrated journals, Psst . . . ! and Le Sifflet, against and for Dreyfus respectively. These two weeklies demonstrate the trend toward papers generated in rival pairs, which often benefited more from their mutual opposition than from their specific points of view. Dennis Cate discusses these artists and their made-for-the-Affair journals, as well as the participation of the Montmartre school. It is, nevertheless, important to remember that these were by no means the only artists whose works appeared in the pages of the copiously illustrated journals.

A host of illustrators, both pro- and con-Dreyfus, dispatched their drawings to the various papers. Some even jumped sides as their own or their employers’ political convictions and views of the case changed. One example of such a change of heart is the illustrator known as Pépin, who worked for the right-wing (though also republican) newspaper Le Grelot. His reappraisal of his anti-Dreyfusard stance forced him to sever a twenty-year-long association with that paper. The prodigious illustrators Alfred Le Petit and Moloch actually met at the offices of their employer L’Etoile (see pl. 38). Other new draftsmen soon appeared on the scene, adopting such au court pseudonyms as Cyrano (for Edmond Rostand’s recently published play). Le Figaro, a conservative journal which had originally taken a moderate position on the scandal and then turned revisionist, was one of the few dailies that published caricatures several times a week. It engaged the talents of Forain, Léandre, Caran d’Ache, and Henriot among others. Forain’s career there would end around the time Le Figaro began printing drawings relating to the Dreyfus Affair. The artist refused to compromise his views in line with the paper’s newly liberalized ones. Caran d’Ache stayed with Le Figaro, probably making some ideological concessions as he continued to illustrate Psst . . . ! (pl. 49). Drumont’s La Libre Parole illustre included among its contributors Chanticlear, Gravelle, and Maillotin, and they created a barrage of scathing images (see pl. 6).

Hermann-Paul and Couturier contributed designs to Le Sifflet, as did its founder Ibels. Couturier also assiduously recorded the Rennes trial for many other journals and magazines. Numerous examples of the original drawings for these still exist. They appear, for the most part, accurate if dull visual reportage (see pls. 142–148). His art was given freer rein in more complex pro-Dreyfus imagery of his own imagination. En voulez-vous des aveux (see pl. 41) is one such example. In this print, he hangs the lot of corrupt army officials in effigy for their many and varied crimes. These victims of the hangings are depicted as puppets of the corrupt military system. His Apothèse Orphéonique is an image of great iconographical complexity. The anti-Dreyfusards, Déroulède, Coppée and d’Esparrès, dressed in antique robes, appear to present Estherhazy with a sword to fall upon after a battle which ends in a Pyrrhic victory.
Many of his designs were so enormously successful that they were made into a series of popular postcards and other ephemera.

One cannot discuss the courtroom imagery generated by the Dreyfus Affair without mentioning Paul Renouard. Renouard produced a large body of graphic work that depicted scenes of the Zola trial, the Court of Appeal, and Rennes. He has been described as “master of the ‘snap-shot’ sketch” and, indeed, his several views of the gesticulations of the lawyer Labori at the Zola trial are a case in point (see pls. 30a, b). A fervent Dreyfusard, he executed numerous sketches of the various proceedings and the individuals involved, using both lithographic and wood-engraving techniques. The several extant sets of these graphics recall the immediacy of his deft hand and reveal his ability to capture the emotion of events and people. A noteworthy example is the depiction of Dreyfus’s lawyer immediately after the second conviction at Rennes (see pl. 141). Demange holds his heavy head in his hands as he sits in despair after the long and emotional proceedings of the second court-martial (as if the first trial and conviction had not been enough!). The sardonic note struck by the emphasis on the crucifix, a device used to similar effect by Daumier earlier in the century, adds currency to the repeated injustice of the second conviction in a society that purported to be democratic and Christian. Another view of the Rennes court-martial in process indicates the artist’s ability to politicize his observations (see pl. 132). Renouard captures the pale figure of the defendant, physically immobile and mentally dazed. Pushed to an insignificant corner of the background, Dreyfus is rendered as a transparent, ghostly presence. The defendant seems to present his testimony, not to the judges, whose faces are obscured, but to the arrogant, cross-legged, military elite whose complicity in the returned prisoner’s frame-up seems quite evident. The artist’s depiction of the traditional guard of dishonor—that is, the soldiers, their backs turned on the “degraded” captain—renders it as civilized barbarism (see pl. 135).

Although far less artistic and seemingly un-opinionated, several drawings for reproductions by an illustrator who must be known simply by his monogram (O.I.) are enlightening. They show the members of the working press engaged in getting the Dreyfus story. They also show the curious
means used to relay information from reporter to consumer. He depicted the many photographers awaiting their subjects during the retrial of 1899, and the use of homing pigeons to speed images to Paris in the rush to beat the competition. These offer privileged glimpses of journalistic life behind the scenes (see pls. 150 and 152).

The camera, one of the most revolutionary inventions for art in the nineteenth century, was bound to play a major role in the propagandistic flurry. The perfection of the halftone and the new technologies of improved photosensitive plates expanded the role for the political uses of photography. Photographic images could now be reproduced in magazines, newspapers, leaflets, and posters easily and cheaply. Noteworthy among the photographers who provided illustrative material for newspapers is Gerschel. His two hundred photographs of the Rennes trial appeared in numerous publications, and the prints were compiled in albums and sold as souvenirs. Some examples of Gerschel’s subjects include Madame Dreyfus arriving for her daily visit with Alfred, and candid shots of the military officers and attorneys who swarmed through Rennes during August and September of 1899 (see pls. 153–163).

The poster Dreyfus est un traître (see pl. 105) was one of the first to use the new halftone process to serve mass production. Employing photographic images of five former ministers of war, this visual and verbal diatribe might be categorized as an updated illustrated broadside. An anti-Dreyfus polemic appears beneath each image. The distribution of more than 136,000 copies of this mass-market propaganda compelled the Dreyfusards to retort. Using a nearly identical format and the very same commercial printer, their rejoinder showed a gallery of eleven Dreyfusard activists, including notable intellectuals and journalists (see pl. 106). The history of these two posters supports the argument that the Dreyfusards attached less importance to the imagery contained in their publications than did the anti-Dreyfusards. Accordingly, they were often content to play a defensive role, merely duplicating the latest efforts of the enemy camp.

The appearance of what was obviously a bogus photograph of Baron von Reinach in L’Antijuif caused quite a sensation. The baron, infamous for his connection with the Panama Scandal of 1892 and a relative of the esteemed Dreyfusard Joseph Reinach, had died mysteriously at the height of that earlier scandal. The photograph’s caption read “Von Reinach assassinated by Clemenceau.” It was intended to discredit the two prominent Dreyfusards—Joseph Reinach and his uncle’s purported assassin. Such apocryphal images were not new to the scene of political intrigue. The neo-Impressionist painter Signac had, ten years earlier, in 1889, created an illustrated pamphlet depicting the premature and fictitious death of General Boulanger, in order to mock the power-hungry general.

Yves Guyot, director of the Dreyfusard daily Le Siècle, devised a clever method to show the public the virtually limitless possibilities for manipulating photographs. It also served to refute the veracity of the posthumous photo of von Reinach. His supplement Les Mensonges de la photographie (see pl. 107) showed several unlikely juxtapositions—mostly of anti-Dreyfusard figures—within the same photo. These images were created by the superimposition of several negatives into one print. The most ironic of them shows Colonel Henry awaiting a shave from his newfound barber, the former minister of war, Godefroy Cahaignac. This image sarcastically refers to the forger Henry’s own suicide by razor (see fig. 9).

Outside the realm of photographic images, but continuing the theme of propagandistic placards, is one of the most amazing efforts at large-scale visual character assassination: the series of more than fifty posters titled Musée des horreurs (see pls. 169–177). This suite of hand-colored lithographic posters, exceptional in their artistic quality, appeared around the time of the Rennes trial and continued for nearly a year thereafter. They appeared weekly and were also offered by subscription. These images were, no doubt intended to disgrace the victorious Dreyfusards who, following the compromise whereby the army captain was pardoned, had become more prominent in the leadership of the Third Republic. Signed with the pseudonym “V. Lenepveu,” they portray the faces of various Dreyfusards and Jews (including Zola, Dreyfus, Clemenceau, Jaurès, Waldeck-Rousseau, Baron Rothschild, Joseph Reinach) with near-photographic accuracy. Their bodies, represented more fancifully in the form of mammals, serpents, and fish, serve the artist as metaphor for his own tawdry practice of social and political Darwinism.
Given the rash of varied types of mass-produced images discussed thus far, it is not too difficult to conclude that the Dreyfus Affair had offered lucrative commercial, professional, and ideological rewards to those who manipulated it. Perhaps it is possible to believe that most of the aforementioned material was created out of genuine political conviction. Nevertheless, it is difficult to ascertain whether the ephemera that emanated from this media-hyped event served anything but material ends.

The market for materials created in this political cauldron seemed endless, and the range of manufactured paraphernalia showed that politics could propel cottage industries into big businesses (and not just in the area of journalism). Children were targeted as a market for materials that relayed the contorted tale of Captain Dreyfus. Comic strips appeared, both pro and con, naturally, to wit the sheets titled *Histoire d'un innocent* and *Histoire d'un traître* (see pls. 73–74). Colorful and charmingly illustrated, they were certainly one way to teach children recent history. Even Pierre Dreyfus, we are told, eventually learned his father’s sad story through such a device.

Novelties relating to the scandal pose some mysteries: For what audience were they intended? Why do mostly anti-Dreyfusard images remain? For example, one could play with the elongated, phallic, and Semiticized nose of Dreyfus’s brother in the toy called “Le Pif du Frère Mathieu”; or be assured that Zola’s heart was in the right place as we lift the flap at the rear of the realist author’s pants to discover the tattoo: “Mon coeur à Dreyfus” (My heart belongs to Dreyfus) (see pl. 66). Another card permits us to pull the figure of Truth from the bottom of her proverbial well through a tug-of-war of various Dreyfusard and anti-Dreyfusard figures (see pl. 67).

Yet another gimmick was the ten-part series of cigarette papers that offered the simplified tale of an honorable, but maligned captain (see pls. 68–70). It viewed the Affair from a Dreyfusard vantage point. Its trademark, “Le Papier du Bordereau,” refers to the paper document whose misattributed authorship wrongly convicted Dreyfus. The series thereby equate, not at all subtly, the relative value of that piece of spurious evidence with the vaporous end-product of cigarettes—smoke! Adult board games, both pro and con, also appeared (see pl. 71). Dreyfusards could follow...
the spiral trail titled "The Game of the Dreyfus Affair and the Truth" making visits to various pro- and anti-Dreyfusard characters in pursuit of the central and winning point of Truth. And the "Game of Thirty-Six Heads" published by L'Anti-juif might be considered a panacea for anti-Dreyfusards seeking a break from Parisian nightlife (see pl. 72).

Political imagery was not new to the folding fan, that important accessory of the well-dressed woman. Examples from the period of the French Revolution were emblazoned with allegorical scenes commemorating the American Revolution of 1776, the treaty between America and France, and the French involvement in the wars of Spain. In an updating of the imagery on these coquettish yet practical appurtenances, visual references on fans of the late nineteenth century were made to the latest hot political topic. Several examples are preserved at the Musée Carnavalet in Paris. Their images, mostly culled from newspaper illustrations, relate both to Dreyfus and Zola (see figs. 10–11).

Another bountiful category of material was the recently invented postcard. The scandal created a flurry of examples of this popular new form of correspondence. The drawings of many illustrators mentioned previously were reproduced on these new vehicles for quickly jotted missives. Among the artists whose works found their way to the mailbox were Moloch, Couturier, and Orens. So desirable were Couturier's illustrated cards, that they were quickly out of print, soon to become cherished collectibles (see pls. 94–103). Various photographs of the trials, especially at Rennes, and composite photographs of the important characters in both the Dreyfusard and anti-Dreyfusard camps were also widely used as illustrations for postcards (pls. 82–83).

The vast commercialization of the Affair, a phenomenon reflecting the late nineteenth-century's societal degeneration and seeming lack of propriety, appears amply evident from the preceding discussion. The bounty of images (and words) that were quickly, cheaply, and widely dispersed powerfully affected the transmission and formation of opinion. The commercial material, if only through its sheer quantity, gives a strong sense of popular preoccupation with the Dreyfus Affair. Needless to say, many artists continued to work in the non-commercial realm and some of them produced art that was shaped by the hotly debated issues. To think that art of this kind was capable of exerting even a small fraction of the impact of the abundant commercial imagery is unrealistic. Some readers might even ask why the serious art that showed the impact of the Affair should be discussed at all: Its messages were often so personal, and its interpretation often so complex. Yet others might call into question the scrutiny already afforded the photomechanically reproduced images and the ephemera—both seemingly insignificant by-products of modern culture. Nevertheless, the fact that so-called high art and its makers on occasion fell prey, sometimes unwittingly, to political entanglement is in itself certainly worthy of examination in this context. Given the limitations of space and the scope of this book, the following must suffice as a cursory exploration for what may well be fertile territory for future investigation. Of particular note here is the different ratios of pro- and anti-Dreyfusard material that seems to obtain between the corpus of polemical images and ephemera and that of the fine art generated by the Affair. As previously mentioned, in the commercial category, the anti-Dreyfus output was seemingly greater than that of the Dreyfusards; whereas the work of the serious artists seems almost exclusively Dreyfusard. It would, nevertheless, be wrong to draw any conclusions from these empirical observations without a quantifiable study.

The intersection of politics and art was certainly not a new phenomenon sparked by the Dreyfus Affair. In fact, nineteenth-century France witnessed numerous examples of politics reflected in art, interacting with it, and sometimes even interrupting its production. Commissions for art by the various monarchies and republics resulted in the creation of works with specific programmatic goals; whether the portrayal of the power or heroism of the monarch (e.g., the portraits of Napoleon by Ingres and David) or as conciliatory offerings to the various factions of the French public (e.g., François Rude's Marseilles of 1836); Other artists commented either reportorially or allegorically on contemporary political issues and events (e.g., Delacroix's Massacre at Chios, or his Liberty Leading the People). Around mid-century and thereafter, many of the works of Courbet, Miller,