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Abstract:

Since its creation in the 16th century and its industrialization in the 19th century, the local and national French press has served as a means to educate, influence, and raise the awareness of the French people. Stories published in Paris and throughout all of France have long served to influence the opinions of the French public with the purpose of strengthening pre-existing values or swaying the public toward a specific manner of thinking or viewing certain issues. In order to do this, newspapers had a specific set of tools that they used to create detailed, vivid accounts of current events and to encourage a specific paradigm of thought among the population: témoignage (the witnessing of events) and reportage (the reporting of these events to the public). After building on the foundation of these techniques, newspapers would use a combination of rhetoric, factual evidence, and sociological and psychological cueing to sway opinions and win the support of the French public. This methodology succeeded in influencing three notable writers of 19th-century France, Stendhal, Émile Zola, and Marcel Proust, who subsequently issued their own versions of témoignage and reportage in response.

Unlike literature, poetry or theater, journalism is intended to keep the public up to date on current events and happenings in their communities, yet as demonstrated here, it was, and continues to be, a medium to tell another kind of story and to influence the reader to lean toward a particular point of view. Some canonical literary works are unapologetically unrealistic, designed to create an entirely new world for the reader, but some of the most impactful, moving and inspiring literature in history is drawn from the writer's reaction to true events. The newspaper articles that tell about these happenings cannot be recounted purely by means of fiction and belief; for a work to generate and sustain a convincing mental picture in the mind of the reader, there must be a basis of factual evidence supported by witness testimony, and the purpose of the work must be rooted in the reportage of that witnessed event. My intention in this essay is to demonstrate a link
between the 19th-century French press and the works Le Rouge et le noir by Stendhal, Germinal by Émile Zola, and Jean Santeuil by Marcel Proust, specifically to show how reportage and witness literature (témoignage) influenced the works of these writers.
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Introduction

Since its creation in the 16th century and its industrialization in the 19th century, the local and national French press has served as a means to educate, influence, and raise the awareness of the French people. Stories published in Paris and throughout all of France have long served to influence the opinions of the French public with the purpose of strengthening pre-existing values or swaying the public toward a specific manner of thinking or viewing certain issues. In order to do this, newspapers had a specific set of tools that they used to create detailed, vivid accounts of current events and to encourage a specific paradigm of thought among the population: témoignage (the witnessing of events) and reportage (the reporting of these events to the public). After building on the foundation of these techniques, newspapers would use a combination of rhetoric, factual evidence, and sociological and psychological cueing to sway opinions and win the support of the French public. This methodology succeeded in influencing three notable writers of 19th-century France, Stendhal, Émile Zola, and Marcel Proust, who subsequently issued their own versions of témoignage and reportage in response. My intention in this essay is to demonstrate a link between the 19th-century French press and the works Le Rouge et le noir by Stendhal, Germinal by Émile Zola, and Jean Santeuil by Marcel Proust, specifically to show how reportage and witness literature (témoignage) influenced the works of these writers.

The basis of my thesis lies in the concept of mental images as codified by the writer and reporter Walter Lippmann, according to whom “the only feeling that anyone can have
about an event he does not experience is the feeling aroused by his mental image of that event" (Lippmann 13). Thus, in order for an individual or a population to develop a certain sentiment about an event, they must first develop a mental picture of that event. These mental images can be created through speeches, headlines, plays, moving pictures, cartoons, novels, statues, or paintings (Lippmann 160), conjuring opinions and emotions that can trigger a response in the reader or viewer. Lippmann goes on to state that "The analyst of public opinion must begin then, by recognizing the triangular relationship between the scene of action, the human picture of that scene, the human response to that picture working itself out upon the scene of action" (Lippmann 17). In the triangular relationship that Lippmann sets forth, I propose that we see a chain reaction that starts from the moment of the event, where reporters, witnesses and correspondents relay information about the event to the public by means of the press, creating a mental image that the public can conceptualize and develop emotions toward, whether positive or negative. Among this public could be found writers and novelists of the 19th century, who read these articles and develop their mental image of the situation; in their case, their specific "human response" to the scene of action is to write their own mental pictures that are designed to create a reinforcing or contradictory mental image that will potentially influence their own readership. They are thus using their platform as writers to make the public aware of issues in their society and to influence them to action in turn.

History has been told by the people who were there, witnessing the events that have shaped our world and telling their stories, a key step toward raising awareness of injustice, hardship, or scandal. The written accounts of individuals throughout the course of history,
not simply in France, have shaped and moved society and government for ages, but how is it done? In his canonical book, Public Opinion Lippmann states, "We cannot be much interested in, or much moved by, the things we do not see. Of public affairs each of us sees very little, and therefore, they remain dull and unappetizing, until somebody, with the makings of an artist, has translated them into a moving picture" (161). This, I suggest, is the goal of both the 19th-century French press and the writers and novelists of the era: to bring to life public affairs that have an impact on their society and to use their platform to create moving images to resonate with their readerships.

The long history of the French press has had sporadic periods of flourishing and censorship since the first newspaper was published in 1615 (Popkin), with the number of newspapers in France expanding from three papers in 1715 to over eighty in 1785 (Fenby 91). Over 3,000 newspapers were founded throughout the 18th century, but after several shifts in government between various forms of republics and monarchies, the manner in which the press was allowed to operate was significantly scrutinized by the government and the Church, limiting what topics they could address and in what manner. Following the establishment of the Third Republic in 1871, circulation exploded from 150,000 in 1860 to 5 million in 1910 (Kurian 341); the press had grown into a lucrative, fine-tuned machine with the development of networking, foreign news correspondent systems, and successful methods of advertising (341). By the late 19th century, a large portion of the French population subscribed to the numerous daily newspapers, several of which leaned toward a specific political, economic, or religious ideology.
With such a large circulation and readership by the end of the 19th century, the French press was a crucial tool for communication with great influence and significance. Before the establishment of prominent papers, the public received updates on the status of politics and economy from fellow citizens or from the government itself. In the latter case, the news was often biased and strongly motivated to put officials in the best possible light. With the Bourbon Restoration and a newly established free press, French newspapers had a lot of liberty to report on matters in the way that they wanted, often doing so in a manner that conformed with the ideologies of their principal readers: *Le Temps* was the foremost paper at the time, with a largely neutral base; *Le Figaro* took a more conservative stance, *La Croix* was the primary Catholic paper, *L’Humanité* was a Socialist newspaper, and *L’Intransigeant* was the Nationalist paper of note (342). Each paper had its own style and approach to not merely reporting the news across France and the world, but also had its own unique voice for expressing thoughts on those matters.

Stendhal, Zola, and Proust were all practiced journalists who worked for papers in France and in the United Kingdom; all three read the newspapers regularly and often contributed to major papers such as *Le Figaro* and *Le Cri du peuple* even after they had published their principal literary works. Drawing inspiration from the stories that they read in the papers, Stendhal, Zola and Proust used similar techniques in their novels to the ones they used in their articles: reportage (reporting) and témoignage (witness testimony) to give weight and detail to their works with the intention of creating a mental picture for their readers that would incite human emotion and would in turn inspire their readership to persuasion or action. In their separate ways, all three authors employed reportage and
témoinage literature in their works to create detailed, impactful stories based on the writers' own observations and experiences.

Michal Giovoni describes witness testimony as being "a speech that brings moral and political subjects into being, sometimes almost in spite of themselves; it is one of the most prevalent devices available today for individuals to come to grips with moral obligations" (148). According to Giovoni, witness testimony served as a means to remind the public of its moral obligation by shining a light on a certain injustice being done to the people. Witness testimony brings the injustice into public awareness and calls for some sort of action to be done to right the wrong. This concept correlates directly with Lippmann's concept of a moral "fact"; the importance of the témoignage is to address the commission of some kind of the wrong against an individual or a group and to relay it to the general public.

The idea of witness testimony is most closely associated with common legal implications, but it holds great swaying power in the arena of political reform, as Giovini describes it as a paradigm that "should be credited for bringing the moral and the political closer together". Witness testimony can be a major factor in influencing a range of actions from apologies to revolutions and work in a similar fashion to that of mental images. The testimony provided offers a visualization to the audience of an event in order to contextualize what is going on in a certain sector and encourages those receiving the testimony to action. Thus, when Giovoni states that witness testimony intends to bring the moral and the political together, he is referring to the desire for a type of political reform designed to guard against future moral wrongs and protect the society as a whole. The
manner in which the witness testimony is conveyed then enters the realm of creating a specific mental image that they want the audience to have.

Witnessing an event in of itself is not sufficient to creating a substantial social and political movement - spreading the word to as large an audience as possible is essential to that kind of change. Thus, ever since its implementation in 1470, the printing press has served a vital role in raising public awareness on sensitive issues and holding the government accountable for any harm or inaction. Before the development of mass production ability of the press in the 1700s, the world of the French public was small and recognized, with any news coming directly from the Church or government officials. With an organized press, citizens were able to get news from third-party sources about a range of different topics from all over the country. The time before and after the French Revolution is a good indicator of this: "in 1700 only three newspapers existed in France, all of them published by the government, by 1785 there were over eighty, including some published" (Price 91). This expanse of access to information caused a "wider audience for new ideas than ever before" (Price 91), therefore an organized, efficient press made the French public both more aware and more enlightened.

Besides informing the general public about domestic and foreign affairs, the press also served a larger purpose: writing the French people under a common language. France is made up of several diverse, regional identities, all with their distinct customs, industries, cultures and their own languages. With members of each region speaking as a language entirely their own, such as Norman in Normandy, Basque in the South, and Breton in Brittany, France was divided by fierce regional identities that superseded any national
recognition. Newspapers across the country, from Paris to Marseilles to Le Havre, all shared a common language that in turn helped foster a feeling of a common French identity, as opposed to individual regional allegiances and boundaries.

With these two functionalities, the advent of an international printing press and the occurrence of witness testimony being used to record moral injustices, France entered a period of great social and political reform. The French language provided a common tongue that ordinary citizens could read, unifying the people and bringing them into the conversation that had once been reserved for the nobles and the bourgeoisie. The press also connected the communities all across the country, educating the people on current events, policies, international affairs and their rights; the French public was more in touch than ever before with the goings-on in their society. Regional, national and Parisian newspapers featured stories of people across the country who had experienced some sort of hardship at the behest of France’s long-standing institutions, giving a voice and an audience to those who had been impacted.

With journalism, it is commonplace for writers to be dispatched to the scene of an event who will witness it first-hand, and then report back what they saw. In other cases, the newspaper may work with a local, partner paper in the region with their own correspondents there on the ground. In any case, it is crucial for there to be an element of witness testimony in order for an adequate mental picture to be established; one cannot describe what one cannot see. While newspapers have reporters and alternative resources available to witness an event and share this with its readers on a daily basis, Stendhal, Zola and Proust had to rely on their own means and their own efforts to witness an event or its
setting firsthand. By travelling, observing, and making notes on what they saw and encountered, these writers were able to gain the knowledge and credibility that they needed in order to create a specific mental picture for their audiences.

After the scene has been witnessed and the information has been gathered, the second step in this sequence is the actual reporting of the information to the desired audience. Whether it is a newspaper publishing a major breaking news story, a novelist sharing their experiences through their work, or someone writing a private letter to another person, the relay of the information to a second individual constitutes reportage, where the writer reports what they witnessed to the reader. Newspapers in France during the 19th century accomplished this through their daily articles, but the novelists of the time could do so either by publishing articles they submitted to their local papers or via something more autonomous: their literature.

In this essay, the "reportage" that I am referring to is the medium through which the writer relays their information to the reader. By this definition, the articles, essays, and novels cited in this work are all examples of reportage: it is the manner in which the writer reports what they see and experience and transmits their knowledge to the reader. Stendhal, Zola, and Proust were able to use their artistic license as novelists to express their opinions in a more literary way that conform to their unique styles, but all followed similar strategies to the newspaper articles that they are known to have read. In my research, I have found that the writer’s information, and by proxy the mental image that he or she wants to convey, is often transmitted along with elements designed to influence the
reader and public opinion: rhetoric, factual evidence, and sociological or psychological cues.

Rhetoric, or the way that language is utilized for persuading an audience, is a principal tool used in journalism and writing, as it can convey a wide range of attitudes and a certain manner in which to view a particular topic, such as seriousness, sarcasm, urgency, or outrage. Additionally, elements of language, such as punctuation, vocabulary and tone, all create a rhetoric upon which the citizens of the country base their views and stances. But rhetoric alone is not enough to produce an effective article: an important influencing factor in the journalism of the time -and even today- is factual evidence and accuracy. The purpose of newspapers is, as the name suggests, to provide their readers with news in their communities, both locally and nationally. Commentary by the editorial staff and blanket views on issues by the paper as a whole must be supported by methodical, fact-based evidence. This, among other factors, is what gives newspapers the authority and credibility which attract readers. It is, therefore, critical that among personal opinions and the tendency to lean toward one or another political or social ideal, the information in the papers cannot be baseless in fact.

A third means by which 19th-century newspapers exercised influence was through psychological and sociological methods of appealing to readers by evoking particular sets of values and beliefs. At many times throughout the late 19th century, papers used the culture and values of the French public to pique their interest, rally support, or incite outrage. Cornerstones of French culture- the Church, the army, the Republic, liberty- are all employed at varying times to gather the approval (or disapproval) of the public and
encourage it to act. The use of cultural and sociological cues to influence the public can be complex and volatile. In addition to the facts grounded in the St. Étienne and Aubin strikes, for example, newspapers argued for the support of various players in society: the role and protection of the army, the economic contribution of major enterprises, and the humanity of workers. In the case of the Dreyfus Affair, French society was split down the middle into two factions: those who believed that Captain Richard Dreyfus was falsely incriminated, either due to judicial error or corruption, and those who believed in the supremacy of the army and the government’s word.

Throughout his book, Lippmann continues to reiterate the concept of creating an abstraction from a solid fact or chain of events. In one way or another, all of the articles considered here speak to some sort of moral judgement more than a concrete proposal; in one sense, someone can speak to the details, facts, and figures related to the number of people that are not being adequately paid for their work in a certain sector, for example, but in order to make a lasting impact, Lippmann says that we must derive from that a moral judgement to elicit empathy from the reader: "Since position and contact play so big a part in determining what can be seen, heard, read, and experienced, as well as what is permissible to see, hear, read and know, it is no wonder that moral judgement is so much more common than constructive thought" (56). Writers attempt to correlate more complex issues, such as politics, race, economy, and religion with the reader’s private life to make their work more impactful and recognizable.

For example, one can talk politics, republic versus monarchy, Catholic versus Protestant, or capitalism versus communism, but to truly appeal to the sensibility of a
reader and what drives them in their everyday lives and what affects their decisions, it is more influential to approach them from a moral point of view that they can relate to, away from partisan obligations. In each of the following sections, the writers of these newspaper articles and novels attempt to bring the complex issues into the reader's private realm and sway their opinion based on their perceived personal values, or how the reader understands something to be "wrong" or "right". In Le Rouge et le noir, Stendhal points out that defending the Army or the Church can lead one to stray from the moral "fact" of the virtue of honesty and fall into hypocrisy to further oneself for financial or personal gain. In Germinal, Zola posits that defending the Army or a capitalistic company strays too far from moral "fact": working people deserve a living wage to feed themselves and their families. In Jean Santeuil, Proust states that defending the Army or the government strays too far from the moral "fact" that condemning an innocent man to death is wrong. In a way, the writers are whistleblowers, calling on the audience to bring these "blind spots" (Lippmann 111) from the peripheral view and into focus on what really matters.
Stendhal: Love and Hypocrisy

Henri Beyle, under the pen name Stendhal, was a military veteran who served in Napoleon's army. He is known for his sense of irony as well as the historical and psychological elements in his works. Between 1824 and 1827, Stendhal wrote articles for the *Journal de Paris*, the *Paris Monthly Review, New Monthly Magazine* and *London Magazine*, in addition to larger essays such as "Sketches of Parisian Society, Politics, and Literature" and "De l'amour". Stendhal's brand of reportage and témoignage came from his experiences in Italy, where he noted the differences between Italian and French society and culture, which he detailed in his essay "Promenades dans Rome" (Thibaudet 18). The theme of love and passion that he observed in Italy would be developed in his novel, *Le Rouge et le noir*.

Like traditional columnists and journalists, Stendhal was paid to report by numerous newspapers both in and out of France on his observations and experiences in Europe. As a former military man, Stendhal had thorough training and exposure to foreign nations and their laws and customs, having spent his active duty years in Germany and Russia and his later years in journalism travelling to Italy and the United Kingdom (Thibaudet 10). After many years of observing and reporting on different societies and how they functioned, his opinions on the functioning of institutions emerged in his literary works. Although his remarks were directed toward editors and writers in the literary field, in an article Stendhal wrote for the *Courier anglais*, his strong feelings about insincerity and
hypocrisy for personal gain are prominent themes. They would also feature in his novel *Le Rouge et le noir*, published eight years later:

> Toutes les biographies de contemporains publiées en France à ce jour sont remplies soit des plus basses flatteries à l’égard du pouvoir et de l’argent, soit de diffamations mensongères, impudentes et perfides. L’ouvrage que nous avons sous les yeux, quoique fortement teinté de préventions libérales, a été écrit avec un certain respect de la vérité et de la justice. Est-ce la conséquence d’un libéralisme sincère, ou seulement le moyen d’assurer la réussite de l’ouvrage?

*Courrier anglais, 1 novembre 1822*

In this passage, Stendhal indicates that the work of these writers does have merit, but the question of flattery for the sake of money and power throws the intention of the author into question: are these publications the true feelings of the writer, or is it simply what he believes his audience wants to hear? Does it merely serve as a means to further their own social and professional interests? Is it an honest intellectual endeavor, or just a means to success? His contemplation is articulated in the phrase he uses, “L’ouvrage que nous avons sous les yeux”- here, he demonstrates the opposite, something that is tangible and real before our eyes, as opposed to empty words and flattery used for personal gain. This example reflects the great query that prevails throughout his work, the question of belief: can we trust what we have before us? Whether it is politics, literature, or love, are the other person’s attempts sincere, or are their words and actions just a way to further their own interests?

Stendhal begins by creating a juxtaposition between the value of the work and the lack of value in the words by the strength of his vocabulary and his choice of adjectives.
Much as he describes the biographies, Stendhal uses a sentence full of strong words and multiple negative adjectives in a string, one after the other in a tangent of harsh criticism. He uses vocabulary such as “mesongères”, “imprudentes”, and “perfides” to describe the defamations he sees, clearly expressing his displeasure at the behavior of people in his field. Then, in the following sentence, he takes a more level tone as he interprets the work of the writers: he uses expressions with commas to slow down the pace of the sentence and uses the passive voice “a été écrit”, as opposed to an active and direct assertion. His use of the phrase “un certain respect” gives a sense of the measure and thoughtfulness of the words in the work with a pensive, measured effect.

Stendhal then asks the question for both himself and the reader: is this level, admirable literature sincere, or is it simply another, more covert method of promoting oneself for money or power? After establishing this juxtaposition of “diffamations mensongères” versus “un certain respect de la vérité”, Stendhal then invites the reader to consider the issue for themselves. However, he sets up the question with his rhetoric, in effect making it a loaded question: he prepares the first part of the passage with passionate, distrustful language and then fills the second part of the passage with a milder, more trustworthy tone. He is, therefore, asking the reader to choose between lies and the truth, and uses his word choice to make the “correct” answer self-evident.

In December 1827, a little-known incident took place in the town of Grenoble, not far from Stendhal’s hometown. Antoine Berthet, a young man of modest means who had been taken in by a priest and a prominent member of society, walked into a church and shot his lover in the head. The incident was reported on in the local Gazette des tribunaux.
of Grenoble and caught the attention of Stendhal, who found the case fascinating, writing “Jamais cette tête n’avait été aussi poétique qu’au moment où elle allait tomber” (Garcin). The newspaper article detailing the story had a sensationalist, melodramatic style that would later serve as the inspiration for the main character of Stendhal’s novel:

Antoine Berthet, âgé aujourd’hui de vingt-cinq ans, est né d’artisans pauvres mais honnêtes; son père est maréchal-ferrant dans le village de Brangues. Une frêle constitution, peu propre aux fatigues du corps, une intelligence supérieure à sa position, un goût manifesté de bonne heure pour les études élevées, inspirèrent en sa faveur de l’intérêt à quelques personnes; leur charité plus vive qu’éclairée songea à tirer le jeune Berthet du rang modeste où le hasard de la naissance l’avait placé, et à lui faire embrasser l’état ecclésiastique. Le curé de Brangues l’adopta comme un enfant chéri […], il fut reçu par M. Michoud qui lui confia l’éducation d’un de ses enfants; […] avant l’expiration d’une année, M. Michoud dut songer à mettre un terme au séjour du jeune séminariste dans sa maison […].

En 1825, il obtint d’être admis au Grand séminaire de Grenoble; mais après y être demeuré un mois, jugé par ses supérieurs indignes des fonctions qu’il ambitionnait, il fut congédié sans espoir de retour […].

On recueillit des propos sinistres: "Je veux la tuer", disait-il dans un accès de mélancolie farouche […].

 […] Le dimanche 22 juillet, de grand matin, Berthet charge ses deux pistolets à doubles balles, les place sous son habit, et part pour Brangues […]. À l’heure de la messe de paroisse, il se rend à l’église et se place à trois pas du banc de Madame Michoud. […] Les assistants épouvantés voient tomber presque en même temps et Berthet et Madame Michoud, dont le premier mouvement, dans la prévoyance d’un nouveau crime, est de couvrir de son corps ses jeunes enfants effrayés. Le sang de l’assassin et celui de la victime jaillissent confondus jusque sur les marches du sanctuaire.
The structure of the *Gazette des tribunaux* article is designed in such a way as to lead the reader in one direction of thinking, then changing this notion entirely through rhetoric and foreshadowing. The language used in the article is full of terms that paint a picture of the gentleman, Antoine Berthet, vocabulary such as “pauvres mais honnêtes”, “une frêle constitution”, and “une intelligence supérieure à sa position” to establish an “underdog” personality- that despite his physical frailty and financial difficulty, he has the intelligence and the ambition to overcome these hardships. The story discusses the graciousness of the priest of Brangues and M. Michoud for taking in this destitute young man and giving him shelter, work, and a purpose. But this pleasant image of an innocent orphan takes a twist at the end of the first passage with the final sentence indicating that, less than a year later, M. Michoud was contemplating removing Berthet from his home. This build-up of the generosity of the townspeople and the foreboding nature of the article allows for the opportunity of dramatic storytelling that invites interest and captivates the reader.

Following the final sentence of the first passage, there is a distinct change in tone: despite the trust and charity of the townspeople, before the end of the year there would be a problem. We also see a contrast in the opinions of Berthet’s superiors at the seminary, where he is now described as ambitious with a melancholy demeanor before he is forced out. Before he leaves the seminary, the article makes note in a short, isolated phrase of Berthet’s “sinistre” words: “Je veux la tuer”. The article has a strong and deliberate sense of mystery about it: why has this “innocent” persona changed so dramatically over so short a time? Why has the tone of the story changed into something more sinister? The article
has been shaped through deliberate choices on the part of the writer, a distinct image of a certain kind of individual, with an unknown trigger that causes a complete reversal of personality.

The beginning of the article establishes the transition from talented, trusted orphan to threatening, melancholy young man ousted from the Grand Seminary, moving quickly through the span of a year. Toward the end of the article, there is a shift from adjectives to verbs - from the words of the people who knew him to his own actions, where Berthet loads the two pistols, hides them under his clothes and enters the church. The specific details in this portion of the article, such as the kinds of pistols, the time of day, and his being three paces behind Madame Michoud, slow down the action to build suspense and add to the imagery. Finally, the article uses the word “assassin,” naming Berthet as a murderer, giving him a strong label in both the final moments of the article and the final moments of his life, a label from which he cannot be redeemed.

The Gazette des tribunaux makes several subtle sociological allusions to the values of the French people, such as the importance of religion, education and kindness by rooting Berthet in this accepted, fostering environment. The expression “pauvres mais honnêtes” is a distinction that directly correlates to the observation that Stendhal makes in the Courier anglais article: the state of being poor, but honest, having more valor than being rich and dishonest. In the following sentence, the article compares the integrity of physical strength versus mental ability, stressing the value of intelligence, thus assigning value to education and the will to learn. When Berthet later exhibits behavior contrary to these values and is rejected by the Church, a pillar of French life, the article then shifts its focus to
the unknown trigger that could cause such a well-placed young man to attempt to commit a murder-suicide. Instead of merely reporting the facts of the event, the Gazette des tribunaux composes a drama full of vivid imagery to create a mental picture that will stand out in the mind of the reader.

Stendhal found inspiration in the story and built upon the same framework: a young man of modest means is taken in by a local, affluent family and teaches their children, then follows his ambition and attempts to climb the social ladder before engaging in a love affair that lead to his downfall. This article is thus an example of how reportage, reporting on the shooting of Madame Michoud, uses a combination of facts and carefully chosen language to both inform and persuade the reader.

The sensationalism of the Gazette des tribunaux article appealed to Stendhal’s Romanticist sensibilities and he later applied the same impassioned writing style and story to his own novel, combining his own experiences by observing and writing on culture. The excitement of the Gazette des tribunaux article is matched by the passion of the characters in Le Rouge et le noir, particularly that of Julien and Madame de Renard and later Julien and Mathilde, as Stendal incorporates the same blind rage that is described in the Gazette des tribunaux. Yet, Stendhal also employs his own journalistic skills by using the style of témoignage and reportage writing that he used for his essays and articles in Italy. The combination of the influence of the Gazette des tribunaux and his own lifelong strong feelings about politics and hypocrisy come together in Stendhal’s cornerstone work, Le Rouge et le noir.
Two years after writing his article in the *Courier anglais* and after the murder-suicide of Antoine Berthet in Grenoble, Stendhal published his masterpiece, *Le Rouge et le noir*. This novel incorporates all the major themes that Stendhal witnessed, wrote on, and experienced personally in his travels around Europe and that he reflected on for his work for the newspapers, specifically the madness that love and passion can entail. In a passage toward the end of the novel, Stendhal combines the two ideas:

Cette philosophie pouvait être vraie, mais elle était de nature à faire désirer la mort. Ainsi se passèrent cinq longues journées. Il était poli et doux envers Mathilde, qu'il voyait exaspérée par la plus vive jalousie. Un soir, Julien songeait sérieusement à se donner la mort. Son âme était énervée par le malheur profond où l'avait jeté le départ de madame de Rénal. Rien ne lui plaisait plus, ni dans la vie réelle, ni dans l'imagination. Le défaut d'exercice commençait à altérer sa santé, et à lui donner le caractère exalté et faible d'un jeune étudiant allemand. Il perdait cette mâle hauteur qui repousse par un énergie jurement certaines idées peu convenables, dont l'âme des malheureux est assaillie.

J'ai aimé la vérité... Où est-elle?... Partout hypocrisie, ou du moins charlatanisme, même chez les plus vertueux, même chez les plus grands; et ses lèvres prirent l'expression du dégoût... Non, l'homme ne peut pas se fier à l'homme.

(Stendhal 649)

The mental image that Stendhal paints in this excerpt begins with the language he uses to describe the emotions Julien feels and what he wants the reader to interpret. Stendhal uses adjectives such as “cinq longues journées” and “Son âme était énervée par le malheur”; Julien is described as having taken expressions “du dégoût” and “le caractère
exalté et faible,” and all of these descriptions aim to create an image of a miserable, despondent individual. Additionally, for the third time, we see the tone and rhetoric from the text flipped: Stendhal opens the passage by depicting the image of a calmer, more empathetic Julien. He is described as being “poli,” “doux,” considerate of Mathilde’s “philosophie” and understanding of her irrationality because of her burning jealousy. Again, we see pleasant adjectives used to describe Julien and his behavior, his patience with Mathilde, for example, and we also see Stendhal toying with the notion of truth.

A major reason behind Julien’s condition is, as Stendhal states, the departure of the woman he loves, Madame de Renal, and the actions of his current lover, Mathilde. But he is also disgusted with life in Parisian society, and states plainly the sentiments that Stendhal expresses in his *Courrier anglais* article: “J’ai aimé la vérité... Où est-elle? Partout hypocrisie, ou du moins charlatanisme, même chez les plus vertueux, même chez les plus grands.” Thus, in this example Stendhal uses a darker rhetoric and psychological cues in his reportage to mirror the mental picture he received from the *Gazette des tribunaux* article. Here, he creates his own image from his having witnessed and reflected on different facets of society through his travels and experiences.

Stendhal also takes this passage a step beyond what he observed in the *Gazette des tribunaux* article by taking us into the mind of the young man and describing not only the physical hardships and demands of depression, but the toll on his soul, his psyche, and the way we view the world. Where the *Gazette des tribunaux* article gave us an individual who changed completely for the worst in a shroud of mystery, Stendhal gives us a look at an emotionally pained young man struggling with the circumstances around him. Both
articles employ the same rhetorical technique of establishing a specific mental image through positive imagery, encouraging adjectives and the suggestion of overcoming obstacles. Afterward, both passages have a distinct turning point where the established mental image is flipped and a darker, more sinister picture replaces it through harsher descriptors or violent intentions.

The articles diverge, however, at the point of the cues that both Stendhal and the writers for the Gazette des tribunaux use to influence the reader’s opinion. The Gazette des tribunaux uses the external sociological values of French society to rattle and shock the reader through the action of a young man turning on his benefactors, teachers and religious leaders, using strong rhetoric to emphasize the change and label Berthet as an “assassin”. The Gazette des tribunaux article shows Berthet’s behavior both before and after the change in his disposition, but it fails to address what happened personally to Berthet in between these times. Meanwhile, Stendhal goes inward and appeals to the empathetic, psychological motivations of the individual, offering the reader a view inside the mind of a man tortured by lost love and invites them to feel his pain. At the end of the Le Rouge et le noir passage, we see Julien contemplating suicide- a much darker image. What we also see here is a shift from an external, sociological point of view, where other people in society give their interpretation of the young man’s behavior, to an internal, psychological assessment of what is going on in Julien’s mind during this time.

In this passage, Stendhal uses a combination of the inspiration he drew from the external factors mentioned in the Gazette des tribunaux article and the observations that he saw and noted in his travels, which he later published in De l’amour in 1837. This passage
reflects the newspaper article that Stendhal read two years prior; the article in the *Gazette des tribunaux* only offered the reader a glimpse of the young man’s outward state: what he did, what he said, and what happened to him, as observed by others. Stendhal takes that case a step further and gives us what he believes is going through the man’s head at the time, and the psychological effects of those thoughts. By writing thoughts such as “thought seriously about killing himself” and being in “the deepest depths of misery”, Stendhal puts the reader into the mind of his character; we see his desperation, his desolation, and the depths to which his mind has descended.

Stendhal’s motivation was a combination of two influencing factors that he experienced in his work and life: patterns of passion among French and Italian people that he observed in his travels and the emergence of hypocrisy and insincerity among other academics and writers in his field. With his *Courier anglais* article, Stendhal is speaking to an audience specific to the literary criticism profession that he works with. This is a fairly limited circle that he is referring to, and his words in the *Courier anglais* are a warning to the insincerity of writers’ intentions and an encouragement to always speak the truth. Later, in *Le Rouge et le noir*, Stendhal has the ability to address a wider readership, the general French population, as opposed to primarily literary critics. With this wider audience, Stendhal expands on his theme of hypocrisy to include his other great moral concern: passion. He combines the two concepts of love and dishonesty in a similar manner, warning of blinding love and the use of lies to further oneself, which he finds prevalent in society, but on the larger platform of his novel.
The techniques that Stendhal uses to craft and relay his mental image is consistent with that of journalism of the era. Stendhal's years of experience throughout France and abroad lend weight to his words- he has been to the locations firsthand and is able to speak to the instances of what he sees. The reportage that he employs consists of the action of reporting his observations to the public, initially in the *Courier anglais* and other newspaper publications and later through *Le Rouge et le noir* and his essays. The rhetoric that he uses involves a combination of darker imagery and strong vocabulary to emphasize the dark place his character goes to and his harsh view on dishonesty. The facts here serve as a way of ensuring authority and legitimacy; the incident at Grenoble was an actual occurrence, giving the story a more realistic air and opening the door to the concept of other, more worrisome possibilities: that major French institutions could be corrupt. Lastly, the psychological cues that Stendhal uses are used in an attempt to get the reader out of the external, judgemental point of view that is demonstrated in the *Gazette des tribunaux* and into the point of view of the man himself, feeling his frustration, uncertainty, and disillusionment with the world around him. By changing the perspective, Stendhal aims to change the conversation.

Finally, overall, Stendhal's intention is to demonstrate the prominence of hypocrisy in France's most treasured institutions, the Church, the Army, and upper-class society, in addition to the maddening effect of love and passion within these settings, creating a mental image of the noble cornerstones of French culture as being influenced by money, powerful names, status and lovers. This serves as both a warning and a source of disillusionment for those who consider these institutions infallible; Stendhal asks the
reader to consider the humanity of the men involved rather than engage in a kind of idol worship. These men are leading the country on several fronts - government, religion, military - and Stendhal's intention here is to encourage his readership to be more skeptical of those in positions of leadership in France and to be aware of what, according to Stendhal, is going on behind the scenes. His use of rhetoric, facts, and cues through his reportage and temoignage is an effort to construct the same concern and skepticism that he feels within the mind of the reader, and in turn inspire them to discourse and action on this matter.
Zola: Humanity and Fraternity

In 1869, two separate strikes began in the French mining towns of Saint-Étienne and Aubin. The first, in St. Étienne, began as a result of poor working conditions; the workers demanded higher salaries, an eight-hour workday, and the establishment of better safety measures within the mine. On June 16, 1869, a group of miners were met by companies of the 4th and 17th regiment of the French Army (Mazars) and were arrested and taken to prison, while a group of friends and family of the miners confronted the soldiers and blocked their passage. The Army responded by firing into the crowd and attacking with bayonets, which resulted in 14 deaths (Mazars). Later that same year, workers in the town of Aubin felt they were being exploited by the mining company due to the low quality of the coal they produced and competition with Great Britain. The miners went on strike for three days, and on October 8, 1869 a riot broke out, resulting in 14 deaths and 22 injuries.

Daily newspapers such as Le Figaro and Le Temps relied on correspondence from regional and local newspapers, such as Le Petit Nord and L’Echo du Nord, to provide a more detailed and sometimes more passionate account from reporters who were close to the situation, but the overall tone and attitude toward the clashes at the strikes changed according to the affiliation of each newspaper. The more right-leaning Le Figaro took a more conservative approach and defended the mining company’s efforts to end the strike and their contribution to the economy; the more liberal La Presse conveyed feelings of humanity and empathy toward the people who suffered in the harsh conditions and lost their lives; and the religious paper La Croix defended the army and their actions in the
situation. All of these papers used rhetoric, factual evidence, and sociological cueing to create and sustain a mental image of the situation that supported the particular viewpoint of their followers.

One of the most prominent and influential newspapers in French history is *Le Figaro*, a conservative paper that has offered daily news and commentary on French current events from its launch in 1826 to the present. *Le Figaro* was one of the most widely read papers in Paris during the 19th century and offered a unique voice in its examination of the daily events of the country. The writers of *Le Figaro* often took strong stances for the side of a story that supported the ideologies of their readers and vehemently contested those claims that went against their views.

In the case of the strikes in Saint-Étienne and Aubin, *Le Figaro* was an outspoken supporter of the French Army:

La malheureuse affaire de Saint-Etienne fournit aux journaux agréables une mise en scène assez ridicule.

Après avoir publié la liste des soldats blessés et contusionnés, ce qui n’est que tout naturel, ils publient la liste des hommes qui ont eu leurs fourniments et leurs habits détériorés.

Notre armée et assez riche de hauts faits d’armes et de combats glorieux pour qu’on lui épargne de semblables pavés. Si les journaux agréables veulent prouver que les soldats n’ont tiré qu’après avoir essuyé le premier feu, ils s’y prennent fort mal, car ils auraient dû alors raconter comment et à quelle heure chaque fondement ou chaque habit a été abîmé.

*(Le Figaro, June 21, 1896)*
*Le Figaro* immediately begins constructing a mental picture with the use of adjectives that build up the status and esteem of the soldiers, referring to the incident as “la malheureuse affaire”: a term that implies bad fortune or unluckiness, diminishing the severity of what occurred at Saint-Étienne, an incident which resulted in 14 deaths, including the death of a child (Mazars). The French army is “assez riche de hauts faits d’armes” and has seen “de combats glorieux”, wording that is intended to place the soldiers upon a righteous platform by expressing both their noble work and the dangers that they face while doing that work. The opening line of the article sets the tone with its language and establishes a judgement on the scene and its players without providing any facts for the reader- it is assumed that they are familiar with the situation.

In contrast to the honor given to the Army, the failure to mention the miners and their role in the story strips away their identity and the purpose of their dispute. The miners and victims of the incident are not mentioned by role or profession and are simply referred to as “the men”, and there is no mention of the event at all, except for the first sentence where it is described as an “unfortunate affair”. Is this a way of diverting attention, or refusing to cater to those who would characterize it another way? The article continues this trend with its statement, “Si les journaux agréables veulent prouver que…”, which is used in a “prove it” context, expressing disbelief at the notion of wrongdoing by “notre” Army. Thus, the language of the article seeks to diminish any kind of empathy or connection to the miners- in this case, the adversary to the newspaper’s cause.

In addition to the language that the article employs, there are also broader commentaries that speak to the assumed cultural values of the reader. The second line in
the article adds the thought “ce qui n’est que tout naturel”, a statement that affirms the importance and prominence of the Army: they come first. The matter-of-fact attitude associated with this statement suggests that the opinion is universal and that there is a degree of understanding with the audience that this fact is obvious. They continue on to state “la liste des hommes qui ont eu leurs fourrains et leurs habits détériorés”; the setup of this phrase is done in such a manner as to convey the absurdity that the two thoughts are, indeed, in the same sentence. Here, the statement creates a paradigm where those who share the ideologies of the article and its readership are those in the right and those who would believe otherwise are not only absurd and simply incorrect, but they also hold beliefs that are directly contrary the proper French thinking and values.

Similarly to how the adjectives are used to paint a positive image of the Army and diminish the miners, the language used here puts a positive light on Le Figaro itself and its support for “notre armée”, while demeaning the intentions of the other newspapers. The article reinforces this idea as it describes the “agréables” newspapers that do not sing the praises of the Army in this situation. By using first-person pronouns such as “nous” and “notre” contrary to “ils” and “les journaux agréables veulent”, Le Figaro draws a clear line between those who support the Army and its values and those who do not and between itself and newspapers that do not understand the serious mission of the army and dwell instead on torn uniforms. Furthermore, the use of “notre” and “nous” can be construed as the newspaper speaking for itself, but this phrasing also opens the door for the reader to identify with Le Figaro as well, further distancing itself and solidifying the gap between those who are with “us” and those against “us”. Altogether, the Le Figaro article uses this
combination of rhetoric, language, and sociological coding to create a mental picture that reflects its values and those of its base: that the Army was right and the miners were wrong.

Since its launch in 1836, La Presse was one of the most popular and widely read newspapers in France. While the paper’s stance tended to lean slightly conservative, La Presse made an effort to ensure that the paper was not too limited in its values. As such, the editors felt free enough to use their platform to speak of the injustice of the Saint-Étienne incident and to encourage sentiments of empathy and humanity from its readers:

Mais la question a un autre côté plus grave: toute une population ouvrière souffre, par sa faute ou non, qu’importe; elle souffre. On dit qu'elle a été détournée par des meneurs; si cette population ne souffrait pas, elle n'eût pas écouté les meneurs; les grèves ne se produisent pas seulement à Saint-Étienne; il y en a à Lyon et ailleurs; il y a partout de grandes souffrances. Le rapport d’un général annonçait que le calme matériel est revenu, c’est bien; mais quelque chose préparant le calme moral, une amélioration dans le sort de ces pauvres gens, ce serait mieux. Tant que le problème a été posé dans les cabinets des économistes, on a pu l’ajourner sans danger; il se pose aujourd’hui dans les rues, dans les campagnes, dans les galeries souterraines des mines; il se pose pressant, impérieux, il faut le regarder en face. Parmi les tâches nombreuses de la nouvelle législature, la plus grave peut-être sera de préparer, nous n’osons dire d’achever, la solution de cette grosse question du labeur et du salaire.

(Le Presse, June 21, 1869)

The language used in the passage from La Presse attempts to gain the backing and sympathy of the people by using language such as “souffrance”, “grave”, and “ces pauvres gens” multiple times in order to stress the gravity of the situation in Saint-Étienne. The
article attempts to avoid taking a negative stance and pointing out the faults of one side or the other, instead attempting to offer a remedy or awareness with a more hopeful message, such as with the expression “par sa faute ou non, qu’importe”, which addresses the question of blame: who is at fault in this situation? The answer of La Presse is that it does not matter, and that the greater question of humanity is the true concern.

The article employs the same rhetorical tactics multiple times in order to stress the importance of the issue and how it relates to the other political and social concerns of the time. The expression “tant que” places a value on the attention that the topic is receiving, and that despite how much that the issue is being discussed in government, it is being debated even more still in the homes and communities of the French people. The tone shifts midway through the passage to one of positivity: the report from the general “c’est bien”, the improvement of the people “ce serait mieux”, and the writers of La Presse hope that a peaceful solution to the problem is underway if not completely in place, which reflects the direction La Presse believes public officials need to take.

Among the careful language used and the psychological prompts scattered throughout this article, there are also brief pieces of information, the factual data, to support the claim of the writers and to create a deliberate mental picture designed to encourage empathy while offering updates to the public, appealing to the reader’s intelligence and presenting a string of logic for them to follow. What La Presse is trying to achieve is to make the public see what it perceives as the truth. By using factual evidence and vocabulary such as “partout” to express multiple locations and naming particular cities to show that this was not an isolated incident, La Presse points to a deeper, more
far-reaching problem. After the strong opening sentences concerning the suffering working-class population, the passage begins to introduce supporting information, such as the General’s announcement of calm being restored, the legislation that is pending with the cabinet at the time, and the how the question of labor and salary will be addressed. With this sentence, La Presse attempts to keep the public informed of the actual sequence of events that are happening in the government and Saint-Étienne with a minimal amount of emotion or sensationalism: providing their readership with the facts surrounding the situation. One could argue that this also serves to encourage trust in the newspaper by maintaining its role as a source of factual news developments.

From a sociological perspective, La Presse appears to circumvent the “us and them” mentality and attempts to talk to the reader with a message of unity and compassion. The passage in the article opens with “toute une population souffre”, speaking bluntly with little wordplay, even shortening the statement to its basis: “elle souffre”, emphasizing the fact that people are suffering. The sentence seeks to negate the need to differentiate between Army and civilian, union and workers, and cuts straight to the humanity of the situation.

La Presse makes use of the sociological cue of an appeal to the reader’s safety and security, introducing the notion of “le calme moral” and “le calme matériel”, a significant argument in the course of this passage and a major factor in forming the mental images of the public. The paper begins with the introduction of a supporting fact, the general’s report and the “material calm” that this announcement of nonviolence brings; here, La Presse is describing something that is calm on the surface, an external, superficial calm. The article goes on to describe the lack of a “moral calm”, which is the inner peace beneath the surface:
the kind of calm that comes from within and allows an individual to lay their head down at
night. The argument is that concerns about food, housing, and supporting one’s family still
exist and disrupt the moral calm. Such concerns dwell at the heart of the French public and
cannot be assuaged with the words of a distant general.

The newspaper also combines its use of rhetoric and social cues with its expression
“on a pu l’ajourner sans danger”, implying that officials can discuss and debate the issue
without concern from the safety of a government office, but the average and lower-income
citizens do not have this luxury. This kind of statement includes a psychological trigger
that is unsaid: they can safely address the problem from the cabinet office, as opposed to
the unsafe environment of the rest of France. _La Presse_ finally addresses specifically what
the concern is in the final words of the article- “la grosse question du labeur et du salaire”-
but until this is actually named, the article speaks solely of an unnamed concern in all areas
and homes of the country.

_La Presse_ continues to say that this instance of suffering is not limited solely to the
strikes of Saint-Étienne or Lyon, but is all across France, a notion it supports with the
example of the issue being posed “dans les cabinets des économistes”, “dans les rues, dans
les campagnes, dans les galeries souterraines des mines”. The mental picture that the
newspaper creates is one of both pain and brotherhood, of a long-known suffering that has
afflicted French society for decades. In addition to appealing to the humanity and
fraternity of its readers, the article tries to appeal to their sense of justice and
responsibility by saying that it is necessary to “le regarder en face”; this is not a situation
that will go away if ignored and looking away will not stop the pain that afflicts their
society. Thus, the La Presse article creates a mental picture of fellow countrymen that suffer from under an economic system that takes advantage of them and drives them to ruin. The article thus implores the public to recognize the people’s struggle and acknowledge that there is a problem with working conditions in the mine.

Where Stendhal’s columnist approach to Le Rouge et le noir grew from years of experiences and observations through his travels, Émile Zola took the approach of investigative journalism in writing Germinal. Zola is known to have read Le Figaro, La Presse, and several other newspapers daily. He often cited specific articles in the notes in his dossier (Becker). After reading about the plight of miners in the daily papers and after conducting research on his own for many years (Zola 5), Zola headed to the mining area to experience the conditions himself on February 23, 1884. A similar strike to those of St. Étienne and Aubin began in the northern mining town of Anzin; there, Zola took extensive notes and recorded as much detail as he could about the lives and work of the miners. He drew maps of the mine and of the homes, interviewed miners, noted the living conditions, calculated the prices of food versus wages, descended into the mines, recorded the range of sensations and emotions of being in the mine, and noticed the effects on his health. All of these notes would be compiled in his dossier and would be the basis for his creation of the world in Germinal.

Where Le Figaro disregards the workers and La Presse touches on some of the more broad facts ("elle souffre" and "la question du labeur et du salaire"), Zola made use of years of extensive study and research to show why and how this is happening in order to create a detailed image for the reader. His level of reportage and témoignage in investigating and
recounting his experiences to the public was diligent and thorough, with years of research into all manner of themes surrounding the working crisis in the French mining towns. For several years, Zola gathered material from numerous sources including magazine articles, medical journals, pamphlets, newspaper articles, and his own observations from his stay in the mining town of Anzin. There, he recorded in his dossier every detail he could fathom: kinds of food, price of food, types of clothing, ceremonies and rituals, the description and maps of the mining pits, the different kinds of rocks and coal, schematics of the equipment that the miners used, maps of homes and descriptions of family life, basing his novel on as many facts as possible to strengthen his portrayal of a flawed system that results in the suffering of the working class. *Le Figaro* later stated "Voici le livre du jour: *Germinal!* Un livre puissant, un livre superbe!" and "Il en a même cité un fragment qui a permis de dire que M. Émile Zola, en écrivant ce roman de damné où il peint avec un relief terrible les misères, et les souffrances des mineurs, avait ajouté un cercle à l'Enfer du Dante." (*Le Figaro*, 14 mars 1885). The detailed account found in *Germinal* of what the miners and their families actually experienced on a daily basis was designed to give his story as much legitimacy as possible and to make his argument indisputable.

In his dossier, Zola notes a quotation from Larousse’s *Le Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIX siècle*, the article under the citation "grève": "L'Angleterre est le berceau des grèves; mais pas de lutte possible entre la caisse du capitaliste et l'estomac de l'ouvrier", and Zola's personal notation follows: "Mon drame est là." This statement indicates that for Zola, an entire novel lived within a single word and the concept surrounding it. This gives us a clue as to Zola's deliberate actions: each word has a
meaning, so that as one takes a critical look at *Germinal*, we can assume that Zola has chosen his words carefully. Specifically, Zola is interested in the economic relationship between employee and employer, and how the vast difference between them impacts the lives of the worker and their families. One such passage demonstrates his meticulous word choice, while also incorporating the many resources and avenues of his research. It involves the contemplation and illustration of the effects of the strike across the countryside:

C’était en effet, dans le pays entier, un long retentissement de ruines. La nuit, lorsqu’il errait par la campagne noire, ainsi qu’un loup hors de son bois, il croyait entendre les effondrements des faillites, d’un bout de la plaine à l’autre. Il ne longeait plus, au bord des chemins, que des usines fermées, mortes, dont les bâtiments pourrissaient sous le ciel blafard. Les sucreries surtout avaient souffert; la sucrerie Hoton, la sucrerie Fauvelle, après avoir réduit le nombre de leurs ouvriers, venaient de crouler tour à tour. À la minoterie Dutilleul, la dernière meule s’était arrêtée le deuxième samedi du mois, et la corderie Bleuze pour les câbles de mine se trouvait définitivement tuée par le chômage. Du côté de Marchiennes, la situation s’aggravait chaque jour: tous les feux éteints à la verrerie Gagebois, des renvois continuels aux ateliers de construction Sonneville, un seul des trois hauts fourneaux des Forges allumé, pas une batterie des fours à coke ne brûlant à l’horizon. La grève des charbonniers de Montsou, née de la crise industrielle qui empirait depuis deux ans, l’avait accrue, en précipitant la débâcle. Aux causes de souffrance, l’arrêt des commandes de l’Amérique, l’engorgement des capitaux immobilisés dans un excès de production, se joignait maintenant le manque imprévu de la houille, pour les quelques chaudières qui chauffaient encore; et, là, était l’agonie suprême, ce pain des machines que les puits ne fournissaient plus. Effrayée devant le
malaise général, la Compagnie, en diminuant son extraction et en affamant ses mineurs, s’était fatalement trouvée, dès la fin de décembre, sans un morceau de charbon sur le carreau de ses fosses. Tout se tenait, le fléau soufflait de loin, une chute en entraînait une autre, les industries se culbutaient en s’écrasant, dans une série si rapide de catastrophes, que les contrecoups retentissaient jusqu’au fond des cités voisines, Lille, Douai, Valenciennes, où des banquiers en fuite ruinaient des familles. (Zola 371)

Zola creates a detailed, in-depth mental picture charged by his reportage and produced by his témoignage of conditions at the Anzin mine in 1884. He uses a single passage to elaborate on the suffering of the people of rural France and uses a combination of facts, rhetoric, and metaphor to heighten the understanding of the devastation. This passage begins with a description of the labor situation, “C’était en effet, dans le pays entier, un long retentissement de ruines” (371), while some claims made by newspapers focus on the idea that an attack on the Army is solely the fault of the workers on strike. Opening the passage in this manner, “en effet” (371), serves as a refutation of the idea that the situation is merely worker strife, but is in fact a matter of a portion of French society struggling in a state of ruin. Building on this premise, Zola emphasizes the intensity and desperation by using terms such as “souffrance” and “en affamant” (371) to instill a somber, dire atmosphere. Newspapers and editorials of the age usually employed the blanket term “souffrance” to describe the pain in the mining towns, but Zola expands on this concept. As the reader may not identify with the vague, far-reaching “souffrance”, Zola employs more universal terms, such as “le malaise”, “effrayée”, and “crouler” (371), that the majority of people can understand in some capacity. Thus, Zola uses a varied rhetoric with
both abstract, acute vocabulary to stress the direness of the situation, and yet uses more grounded, relatable language to help the reader personally understand.

Zola opens the passage with the interjection "c'était, en fait", establishing from the beginning the events of the situation and and insisting that what he describes is, in fact, reality. Before actually describing what exactly the situation is, he takes a break in his statement to reiterate the claim made by La Presse, that what is going on afflicts "le pays entier": this problem affects all of France, not merely a small population of people in certain rural areas. Zola continues to describe what the affliction is, but instead of saying it outright like La Presse, "la question du labeur et du salaire", Zola employs strong vocabulary to impress upon us the direness of the situation: "un long retentissement de ruines". The beginning of the following sentence further sets the atmosphere, with the expressions "la nuit" and "la campagne noire" giving the passage a dark and foreboding tone. With this first sentence, Zola uses imagery and frightening rhetoric to begin the mental picture that he wants the reader to have: the image of total destruction and desolation that leaves the countryside, according to Zola, in ruins.

As Zola is very deliberate in his word choice, we can assume that each description has a specifically designed purpose; in this passage, practically every part of speech has a negative connotation. Zola uses nouns with dark associations to describe what is going on and the sentiments that surround it: "la chute" and "la crise" are all frightful, perhaps harmful circumstances, followed by feelings of "effrayée" and "le malaise". Nearly all of the adverbs and adjectives are in some sense diminutive; closed-off terms such as "arrêtée", "immobilisés", and "fermées" which all denote a sense of immobility and lack of progress, a
mentality that mirrors the economic situation. Many of the verbs in the passage also convey a similar sense of decline, such as "réduit", "empirait", "ruinaient" and "s’aggravait". In this manner, Zola’s language and the description he offers mirror the state of the French mining towns. Furthermore, he chooses slowed or stopped verbs that reflect the reduced production, adjectives that convey the uneasiness of the people living in these conditions, and frightful vocabulary to describe the dire circumstances. Not only does he use negative language to bring the situation to life in the mind of the reader, but he also includes several superlatives to indicate that it is nearly as terrible as it could be, with terms such as "l’agonie suprême" and "définivement tuée", emphasizing both the seriousness and the finality of the issue.

Zola supports his idea several times throughout the passage, not simply with the general idea of suffering, but with numbers and names- tangible factors to help the readers understand the scale of the problem. Here again, the large-scale nature of his explanations are probably meant to demonstrate his intellectual mastery and thus give himself authority (Barthes). In a single paragraph, Zola lists eight factories that have been slowed or shut down entirely, six different kinds of troubled industries including sugar, flour, glass, and coal, and three additional cities that have been affected besides the mining towns themselves. He also provides three reasons for the troubles of the industry: the stoppage of orders from America, the overabundance of invested capital in excessive production, and the unforeseen lack of coal, all of which contribute heavily to the economic crisis. He goes further to include more specific factors that affect the work, such as the lack of active furnaces and the “banquiers en fuite” (371) who slow productivity and take advantage of
the workers’ families, respectively. Concrete examples and numbers are used here to dispel any illusion or benefit of doubt and reflect Zola’s research and his solid understanding of the situation at hand.

Finally, Zola does not use phrases that appeal to his readers’ sociological and cultural values, but instead uses the more literary forms of metaphor and imagery to illustrate the effects of the strike and convey a very specific mental picture. The opening sentences of the passage depict the unemployed miner, Étienne, as he “errait par la campagne noire, ainsi qu’un loup hors de son bois” (371) The haunting, ravenous imagery in this single sentence puts Étienne, a man looking for work, in a hungry and predatory state, except that the wilderness where he wanders involves the danger of failing human advancements: bankruptcy, unemployment, and famine.

One of the most prominent sociological cues that Zola employs in this passage is the final sentence, "où des banquiers en fuite ruinait des familles". In the beginning of this expression, Zola describes the bankers as being "en fuite", fleeing the financial devastation and reflects on their cowardice in fleeing the area. He also accuses them of ruining families, but he does not, however, elaborate on the concept of the ruined families, and it is in this manner that a psychological cue is triggered in the reader, by opening the door to a large number of possible ways a family could be ruined. There is the element of physical harm, in this case the kind of harm that can result from an accident or injury in the mines. With the mention of bankers, it is possible that Zola was also referring to the more abstract notion of financial ruin, and the inability to pay a mortgage, buy food, or support one’s family. And finally, there is the third possibility of separation and the breakdown of the
family unit as a result of the strain brought on by the working conditions. By bringing up
the notion of family, Zola invites the reader to reflect on the ramifications of such a crisis
and reflect on possible connections to their own family, thus relating to the plight of the
characters and solidifying the mental image Zola conveys.

In addition to evoking familial harm with the fleeing bankers and childhood fears of
the wolf in the woods, Zola taps into France's strong religious belief system. By using the
term "fléau", Zola invokes images of the plagues of Egypt. With comparisons to Biblical
punishment, Zola brings the specter of God's wrath over the French countryside, an image
intended to strike fear into the minds of a predominantly devout audience. A crucial factor
in effectively influencing public opinion, according to Lippmann, is the ability to encourage
the reader to action by creating a clear mental image that will inspire emotion. Fear and
uneasiness in the face of pious allusion is more likely to trigger an emotional response and
motivate the reader to take additional action, in this case to perhaps help themselves or
others.

With the line "il croyait entendre les effondrements des faillites, d’un bout de la
plaine à l’autre" (371), Zola appeals to the psychology of the reader, as opposed to the
reader’s politics and social class (as newspapers tended to), and attempts to instill a
different kind of fear: not primal, but civilized. While the first element of the imagery is
more concrete and conveys a more universal fear recognized in all ages, from children to
the elderly - the image of a hungry wolf - the concept of “faillite” is abstract, not an actual
object, and yet its meaning is known in a frightening context to a large population, albeit in
a different way. Adults will recognize this particular word as referring to a situation of
complete ruin: the loss of money, home, reputation, social standing, and perhaps even the inability to feed yourself or your family. Zola continues to build on this kind of fear via his choice of the word “effondrements”, which reinforces the frightful connotation, as “effondrement” is rarely used in a positive context, often associated with accidents and deadly circumstances.

Zola speaks to the entirety of the French public in general to address the true trouble of the miners; the incidents at St. Étienne and Aubin put the workers at a disadvantage, as they are not as well-known and respected as the soldiers in the Army. Thus, Zola conducts very thorough research and witnesses the operation of a mining town in person, reporting back to the people of Paris in great detail through his novel. Using carefully chosen rhetoric, psychological cues related to food and family, and the foundation of facts that he acquires from his personal observations at the mine, Zola brings the world of the miners to life in the mind of the reader. While avoiding a direct accusation against the Army or the mining companies, Zola focuses instead on depicting the real-world fears and hardships that the workers suffer and leaves the question up to the reader: is this just?

Ultimately, Zola’s intention with this passage is to create an ominous, eye-opening image as to what exactly the miners are facing for the people who sit miles away and read about the strikes from the comfort of their middle-class homes. By applying what he observed and witnessed from his stay at Anzin during the strike, his on-site research talking and working with the miners themselves, Zola creates a mental picture of anxiety and destitution that will resonate with the people who cannot see it themselves. As he was inspired by the coverage of the articles in Parisian newspapers that reported the situation
in St. Étienne and Aubin, Zola’s passage here serves as an effort to continue to inspire a response within his own readership regarding the plight of the miners.
Marcel Proust: Innocence and Integrity

Marcel Proust was one of the most notable French writers of the 19th and 20th century, most famous for his masterpiece *À la recherche du temps perdu*. Proust’s signature style explores the concept of memory, specifically involuntary memory and the reflection on one’s life and past. As with Stendhal and Zola, Proust has a background of journalism that extends back to his early days at university, where he wrote columns in *Le Gaulois* and *Littérature et critique*. Later he wrote columns in *Le Figaro littérature* and *La Presse* on a variety of topics, including literature, poetry, politics, and romance. As Proust began to focus on his novels, he no longer contributed but did continue to follow Parisian newspapers closely, often commenting on certain articles in correspondence to friends and acquaintances or mentioning certain articles in his notes, among them articles from *Le Figaro* and *Le Temps* (Proust 120).

Chronicling the life of a young, intellectual man in Paris, *Jean Santeuil* is regarded as Proust’s most autobiographical work, as it more closely correlates to the events of his own life than do the characters in *À la recherche du temps perdu*. In part, *Jean Santeuil* was derived from Proust’s own experience of witnessing the Dreyfus Affair from the heart of Paris. Thus, while it is not his cornerstone work, *Jean Santeuil* conforms to Proust’s unique writing style and serves as another example of témoignage in French literature. Although *Jean Santeuil* was published in 1952, thirty years after Proust’s death, the novel is unique as it offers the opposite side of reportage: a glimpse at an individual member of the Paris community observing the Dreyfus Affair in real time.
In the final years of the 19th century, France was swept up in a political scandal that split public opinion into two vastly different camps. In Lippmann’s terms, they stridently promoted mental images that directly contradicted each other. In December 1894, Captain Alfred Dreyfus was accused of espionage, convicted and sentenced to exile in a rushed, closed-door trial. Two years after his sentencing, a witness came forth with documents claiming to prove Dreyfus’s innocence and accusations of a possible Army cover-up. Over the course of twelve years, the whole of French society was engulfed in a fierce debate that lasted over a decade as to the innocence of Captain Dreyfus (Bredin). Nearly all of the Paris newspapers during this period covered the Dreyfus Affair on a relatively daily basis; and despite the journalistic canon of impartiality, many papers betrayed their alliances through their approaches and rhetoric.

*Le Temps* was a leading newspaper during the 19th century. It was established in 1861 and later rebranded as *Le Monde* after 83 years of circulation. Having a reputation for being neutral in current events and focused as much as possible on the facts, practically to "the point of boredom" (Bellanger), *Le Temps* had a more subdued rhetoric in the manner in which it speaks to its readers, sticking mostly to the factual evidence of any given situation. However, occasionally, *Le Temps* utilized language to emphasize certain points, as in an article published after the exoneration of Captain Dreyfus in 1906:

Disons tout de suite que la sentence du conseil de guerre de Rennes est annulée sans renvoi.

L’arrêt rappelle, d’abord, dans quelles conditions s’est engagée cette seconde révision.
Il admet - «sans qu'il soit besoin d'examiner d'autres faits» - comme faits nouveaux suffisants pour motiver l'annulation, la falsification de la pièce 26, dite de l'organisation des chemins de fer, celle ensuite où l'initiale D a été substituée à l'initiale P., et enfin la découverte de la minute du commandant Bayle, dont la disparition avait été affirmée et imputée à Dreyfus.

Passant ensuite en revue les diverses charges relevées contre Dreyfus, successivement, dans les divers systèmes de l'accusation, la Cour de cassation démontre qu'aucune d'elles ne subsiste.

Il est incontestable, affirme l'arrêt que le bordereau est non de Dreyfus, mais d'Esterhazy.

(Le Temps July 13, 1906)

The rhetoric employed by Le Temps with this article focuses on the details by which the judgement was laid out, opening the article with the statement “disons tout de suite.” This statement establishes immediacy and stresses the fact that the final decision has been made and that the affair is definitively over. The opening statement in the article directly reinforces the importance of the trial being cancelled “sans renvoi” - in other words, the case is closed, leaving no room for dispute. In the second passage, the statement opens with “il admet”; this phrasing has a slightly heavier tone associated with defeat or acquiescence, in this case implying a resignation to the facts and the admission that something is indeed true. Afterward, Le Temps states plainly that “c'est incontestable” that the guilty party was not Dreyfus. The use of short, curt sentences avoids any kind of extra wording or implication that there is more to the matter. In short, the result lies as it is.

Le Temps was known for strict impartiality and made great efforts to stick to the factual evidence and reduce commentary, speculation and interpretation in its reporting.
However, in this instance, *Le Temps* opens the article with “Disons tout de suite”, immediately creating a presence and identity in the story. The choice is notable, as the passage could have omitted the phrase completely with the same effect, with perhaps a more newsworthy element: simply “La sentence du conseil de guerre de Rennes est annulée sans renvoi”. In the second sentence, *Le Temps* begins its reportage with the word “d’abord”, indicating the first matter at hand. This differs from the initial “tout de suite”, which speaks to a certain kind of immediacy, stressing the importance of the information as opposed to the chronological order of business. To include the following “d’abord” in the following sentence and later “ensuite”, *Le Temps* establishes a level of redundancy that suggests that the addition of this particular statement is intended for a supplemental meaning.

*Le Temps* follows its statement beginning with “il admet” with facts, including the latest evidence that was sufficient to end the trial and confirm the innocence of Dreyfus, transitioning to factual evidence from the final hearing to support its mental picture of Dreyfus’s innocence that its rhetoric establishes in the opening passage. Here, *Le Temps* sets forth items in the report that were deemed false or otherwise inadmissible, specifically “la piece 26”, “l’initiale D”, “l’initiale P”, and “la découverte de la minute du commandant Bayle”. The facts provided here by *Le Temps* show what was addressed in the hearing and exactly why certain items of evidence were thrown out of the case. The way that the facts are mentioned here offers little to no embellishment or commentary; they are presented in such a manner as to definitively demonstrate the extent to which the evidence was insufficient to reconvict Captain Dreyfus. *Le Temps* also uses the phrase “divers systèmes”
to indicate a thorough check of the legal system, as if assuring the reader that it was a comprehensive investigation and no stone was left unturned. After all of these checks and investigations, none of them provided concrete evidence against Dreyfus, leading *Le Temps* back to its closed-ended, final rhetoric: the verdict is incontestable.

The combination of rhetoric and facts in this article is used to build confidence and to assure the readers of two things: that the case is closed and that Dreyfus is innocent. At the time this article was published, this case had been the subject of an ongoing debate for twelve years, with many people involved and much evidence presented as to the guilt or the innocence of Captain Dreyfus. Therefore, the mental picture that *Le Temps* strives to create here is one of indisputable certainty as to the innocence of this man. The manner in which they do this is not by his appearance or actions, but by focusing on the possible argument that he may in some way be guilty. *Le Temps* appears to anticipate the questions and doubts of the reader and provides a thorough, successive dump of information intended to eradicate any other form of interpretation besides that of Dreyfus’s innocence.

*Le Figaro* was a part of a different faction of the Dreyfus Affair and thus had a different message. As a strong supporter of the Right and the French Army, *Le Figaro* took aim at Dreyfus and his supporters, labelling them as troublemakers and disturbers of the peace. On the same day of Dreyfus’s exoneration, *Le Figaro* published their version of the announcement in a contrary manner:

```
Sans renvoi! Le procès de Rennes est cassé sans renvoi. Des solutions proposées est-ce là la meilleure? Oui, puisqu'elle est la définitive et que sur trente six millions de Français trente-cinq millions vivent dans le culte de la paix publique et savent que la justice humaine n'a point pour objet de contenter tout le monde mais seulement...
```
d'imposer, dans un effort de vérité, par une fin respectable donnée
au procès, la fin de la discorde.

Fini quel mot émouvant quand on songe à ce qui se termine! On a lu
jusqu'au dénouement l’épouvantable histoire aux chapitres sans
nombre. La dernière page du livre, dont tant d’autres n’ont point
assez vécu pour connaître le dernier tome, on l’a tournée. Fini
L’Affaire est achevée. Il n’y a plus d’affaire Dreyfus!

(Le Figaro, July 13, 1906)

*Le Figaro* uses a similar tactic to *Le Temps* by its use of the exclamatory statement
“Sans renvoi!” in the opening sentence of its article, but with an exclamation point that
connotes strong emotion that was never explicit in *Le Temps*. The news of the result of the
trial could have been relayed without this expression entirely, beginning with simply the
“le procès de Rennes” sentence. Thus, these two words were added with the intention of
serving a particular purpose. The first sentence of the article opens with more energy than
its counterpart in *Le Temps*, and sums up the entirety of the *Le Temps* opening statement
with the two words “sans renvoi”.; this set-up evokes a tone that is both pleased and
relieved with the news that the affair is *finally* over. The second sentence supports the first
exclamation and adds context by elaborating that the Rennes trial has ended without
rebuttal. The passage continues to say that “la justice humaine n’a point pour objet de
contenter tout le monde”, and that in this case the goal of “justice” was simply to “end the
discord”. This gives the article a resigned and consolatory tone, as if it understands that
justice was not entirely fulfilled in this situation, except in such a way as to quiet the
minority and bring peace back to the community.
In the second sentence, *Le Figaro* describes the Rennes verdict as “cassé sans renvoi”, as opposed to “annullé”, as described by *Le Temps*. This particular word choice is more than a simple synonym, as it carries a much different connotation. Whereas “annullé” insinuates a straightforward, clerical result, “cassé” implies that something is wrong, or literally broken. The article does not expressly explain what is broken, but it serves as a tool to help direct the impressions of the audience. The term “cassé” has a visual reference, a damaged object, and provides an image that can be called to the minds of the reader, as opposed to the more abstract concept of “annullé.

Due to *Le Figaro*’s desire to stay away from the concept of losing the trial, the attention is focused on relief over the affair being over, and thus the theme of completion is prominently instilled in the rhetoric throughout the passage. The words "fin" and "fini" are used two times each, repeated throughout the piece to reiterate the article’s main message, that the affair is finally over. The expressions "la dernière page" and "le dernier tome" put an artistic embellishment on the idea, furthering the assertion that the lingering debate is over. Finally, the phrase "dant tant d’autres n’ont point assez vécu pour connaître le dernier tome" verges on offering a moment of in memoriam, a pause to reflect on the members of the community that have passed away over the past twelve years and did not get to see the resolution. All of these elements come together to create a somber, cathartic tone that is full of relief at the "true" victory: the Dreyfus Affair is over.

There is a distinct lack of factual evidence in the *Le Figaro* article, merely the announcement of the trial verdict, which is mentioned at the beginning and the end of the piece. Overall, rather than a receptacle for facts, the article is a means of offering
consolation to its supporters in their defeat after the twelve-year debate. With the scarcity of facts, one can suppose that, in this case, the facts are not essential or necessary. The principal motive here is to use sociological and psychological cues to re-code readers’ thoughts from defeat to acceptance with dignity.

The article is designed to support the pre-established mental picture in the first sentence: the “understanding” that the majority of French citizens, presumably their readership, are respectable people in search of public peace. In the first passage, *Le Figaro* claims that “sur trente six millions de Français trente-cinq millions vivent dans le culte de la paix publique”; this statement insinuates that of the great majority of the French population, it was only a handful who have pushed for the retrial in order to cause discord and disturb the peace. The difference of one million people in the population, as noted by *Le Figaro*, illustrates how a small, bothersome portion of the population perpetuated the Dreyfus Affair for twelve years. However, even though *Le Figaro* provides these numbers, they are extremely disproportionate and are in no way accurate. Thus, in this context the use of figures is hyperbole, exaggerating the size of the anti-Dreyfusards to emphasize their righteousness and the absurdity of the Dreyfusards’ behavior.

Whereas the *Le Temps* article appears to be targeting the French public as a whole, *Le Figaro* seems to be speaking solely to its fellow right-wing supporters. Consider what really happened: the beliefs of the anti-Dreyfusards were declared wrong in a court of law and Dreyfus’s innocence emerged. As a strident promoter for the conviction of Dreyfus, *Le Figaro* has a difficult task of addressing his exoneration and attempts to remedy this feeling in a manner of different ways, primarily by profiling its audience and crafting a different
mental picture to console its readers: a picture of relief and memorialization. The opening passage announces the end of the debate, focusing more on the fact that it is over and not necessarily on how it ended, with Dreyfus’s exoneration. Le Figaro seeks to raise the esteem of its readers by placing them on the moral high ground, before taking a moment to reflect on the time and events that have happened since the beginning of the affair.

By using fraternal language to express a level of commiseration, the newspaper draws a distinction between what it considers its loyal readership with noble French values and those that would say otherwise in the media and around the country. After presenting its exaggerated numbers with anti-Dreyfusards representing 97% of the population, the article continues to ask if the proposed solution to the trial is correct and then answers its own question: “oui”. This question-and-answer dynamic is designed to suggest further interaction with the public and create a common link between the paper and its readers: they are thinking the same thing. Finally, the paper pauses for a moment of lamentation, addressing the readers as “vous” and remembering the people that the community has lost in the twelve years since the Dreyfus Affair began, fostering elements of fraternity and comradeship.

Whereas Germinal places the main characters in the heart of the action and embodies the core of the issue - the miners’ suffering- Proust creates a spectator, a neutral party uninvolved with the conflict itself, and yet very much involved in the effects that resulted from the debate and the social and ethical questions therein. Proust often uses Jean Santeuil to ponder ideas and concepts that demonstrate the humanity of Dreyfus:

À vrai dire, la seule chose qui était en question dans cette enquête,
c’étaient des choses comme celle-ci: Dreyfus restera-t-il à l’île du
Diable, sera-t-il recondamné à être fusillé? Le général de Boisdeffre sera-t-il obligé de se faire sauter la cervelle, le colonel du Paty de Clam sera-t-il obligé de fuir à l’étranger sans plus voir une seule des personnes dont le commerce et la considération lui avaient fait jusque-là ce qu’on appelle une existence enviable? Le colonel Picquart depuis déjà un an en prison allait-il ou non passer devant un conseil de guerre qui le condamnerait à vingt ans de travaux forcés, c’est-à-dire que jusqu’à l’âge de soixante-cinq ans il ne pourrait plus jouir de l’existence et de la liberté? (Proust 160)

Proust’s rhetoric in this passage is designed to both shock and ground the reader. He begins the passage with "À vrai dire", as if to imply that contrary to what is believed or debated, either in the press or among the population at large, the truth behind the matter is simply the situation he describes. His tone is somewhat neutral and he does not appear to be accusatory or inflammatory, but questioning and sympathetic. The question that Proust poses in his first sentence is designed to be straightforward but full of abrupt impact: should Dreyfus be exiled or sentenced to death? Additionally, the way that Proust frames the opening statement as a question, he asks the reader and, consequently, allows room for the reader to ask themselves: should this happen?

The vocabulary used to describe the scenario in this passage is chosen in such a way as to demonstrate the distinct lack of choice that the men on trial have. On two occasions, Proust uses the term “obligé” to describe an action that is compulsory, in this case something that is required by the actual French court as well as the court of public opinion. In his opening question, Proust uses the term “recondamné” to indicate Captain Dreyfus’s condition and in this case, “recondamné” refers to the sentence placed upon him by the
court and the jury, another circumstance of which he has no control. Finally, Proust includes the possible fate of Colonel Picquart, the prospect of “travaux forcés”. The inclusion of this particular example not only programs the reader with a conceivable image and a frame of reference, but also reinforces the structure Proust has been building in this passage: manual labor, something Picquart may be forced to do. This recurring theme of choice and lack of control that Proust creates shifts as he takes these issues to the reader. The questions that he poses place the emphasis on the consequences that the trial could determine and, in his opening statement, Proust plainly asks the reader if the evidence is there to support the sentences.

Where Le Figaro does not even mention Captain Dreyfus, the individual, Proust goes into detail as to the facts and the consequences of the case in order to convey a clear picture of what is at stake for this man. The articles in the papers had focused on both the crimes of which Dreyfus is accused and the evidence provided to support or oppose the accusations. But here, Proust focuses on the facts of the sentence itself and what it would mean for those involved: Dreyfus could be exiled again to Devil’s Island or sentenced to death, Colonel Paty de Clam could face exile, General Boisdeffre could be driven to suicide, and Colonel Picquart could face a prison sentence or manual labor for the rest of his life.

The depiction of suicide is particularly jarring- General Boisdeffre could accept his sentence of exile or execution, but instead Proust introduces the concept of suicide, alluding to the tragic need for an escape from the situation. But taking it a step further, he describes the suicide with explosive, gratuitously violent imagery designed to get the attention of the readers and break through barriers in the mind of the reader. The Dreyfus
Affair had been going on for several years at this point, and the facts were well-known by most of Parisian society; thus, Proust may have sensed fatigue and apathy on the part of the public. The purpose of these facts is to create a precise mental picture of what exactly is at risk; these names and these men are not anonymous, faceless entities that will simply fade away with a closed case and a guilty verdict, but are human beings, fellow Frenchmen, whose lives will virtually end. I propose that, by connecting the facts behind the sentencing, Proust attempts to foster the public’s empathy for these men and their situation by making them real with a concrete image.

In this passage, Proust uses facts in the form of names, times, and sentences to support his argument: that these are not inventions, illusions or acts of fiction, but are the real men facing real consequences for actions that may or may not have taken place. His use of time in the final sentence of the passage, "Le colonel Picquart depuis déjà un an en prison" (160) and “jusqu’à l’âge de soixante-cinq ans il ne pourrait plus jouir de l’existence et de la liberté?” (160), gives a relatable reference to the reader, a relatable time frame that they can conceptualize. In the papers, the weight of the sentence is seldom mentioned or glossed over. Proust puts the reality of what the men face into perspective: twenty years of hard labor, exile on Devil’s Island, or possibly death. In addition to his stern rhetoric, Proust’s facts and numbers put the weight of the sentencing into perspective: instead of an abstract, unseeable notion, the reader can clearly imagine the stakes.

The premise of Proust’s references to the Dreyfus Affair in Jean Santeuil is to record his own experiences witnessing the trial first-hand in Paris and to address his concerns surrounding the treatment and condemnation of Captain Dreyfus. Proust studied the
Dreyfus Affair extensively, reading multiple newspapers daily and believed that the grounds of the Affair were completely dubious to begin with— the hasty, closed-door trial, the handwriting, witness evidence, and the availability of another, more probable suspect were enough to cast a reasonable doubt. But outright calling out the French government on a mistake and suggesting the army was doing something nefarious is too concrete and severe of an insinuation and is likely to be dismissed by those who do not already hold the Dreyfusard point of view. So instead, Proust takes a more subtle approach and presents an abstract argument about the fallibility of the facts: is the evidence presented sufficient enough to prove Dreyfus's guilt and condemn the man to a lifetime of exile or death? With this in mind, Proust turns to the consequences of a guilty verdict and appeals to the reader's own sense of integrity and self-preservation by addressing what will happen if the sentence is carried out, asking the audience to consider if justice is truly being served.

As with Stendhal and Zola, Proust's novel is speaking to an individual person who may be reading the book, so he employs the use of psychological cueing. Through difficult and, in this case, deliberately violent imagery, Proust attempts to make the reader understand by putting them in the place of the accused. The mental picture created here uses images of abandonment and desolation, of an individual with no hope for choice or redemption. He stresses the notion of being exiled and alone, with no friendship, loved ones, or the kindness of strangers to help him through difficult times, citing the loss of "l'amitié et "la considération" (Proust 160) in an effort to appeal to the humanity of the reader. Thus, by speaking to the primal fear of isolation and the human need for
companionship, Proust generates a mental image of the end of one's life, a psychological technique designed to create emotions of fear, sadness, and empathy.
Conclusion

French newspapers of the 19th century used the specific techniques of reportage and témoignage to create vivid mental pictures to generate and influence public opinion. Per Walter Lippmann, a successful mental picture results in human emotion and response (Lippmann); by this criteria, the mental pictures conjured up by the articles I have analyzed here are successful in their mission, as they have subsequently inspired the human reaction in three of the most prominent writers of the age: Stendhal, Émile Zola, and Marcel Proust. Each of these men found inspiration in the current events, scandals, and crises that were recounted in the daily French press, employed the same set of tools in reportage and témoignage, and used their own skills and experiences to create their own mental pictures that would be conveyed in their works. By using the same tools of reportage and témoignage found in the modern press, Stendhal, Zola, and Proust used their platform and prominence to share their opinions and views on each case in an effort to inspire their readership to share human emotion, adopt particular perspectives on social problems, and carry on the line with the succeeding generation in a hope of a better society.

Toward the end of his book, Lippmann describes the press as being an entity separate from everything else that we are familiar with in society and stresses its importance:

The press is no substitute for institutions. It is like the beam of a searchlight that moves restlessly about, bringing one episode and then another out of darkness into vision. Men cannot do the work of the world by this light alone. They cannot govern society by episodes, incidents, and eruptions. It is only when they work by a
steady light of their own, that the press, when it is turned upon them, reveals a situation intelligible enough for a popular decision. The trouble lies deeper than the press, and so does the remedy. (364)

Using Lippmann’s characterization, I contend that the articles published in the French press shine the searchlight on several social issues throughout 19th-century France: the prominence of hypocrisy and affectation in the Church and among officials, the working conditions of miners and other rural laborers, and the question of the innocence of a single individual against the judgment and actions of the government and the Army. My argument is that these writers see this spotlight and use their literature to open a wider inquiry into these matters, using their skills, as Lippmann puts it, as "gifted men to help visualize it for us" (161).

With hundreds of news stories per day, in order to have a lasting impact, an article must resonate with the reader on a personal level. The story must have some kind of relation to their own lives, values and beliefs, affecting the individual's moral compass and compel them to denounce the wrong: "But it is also true, that no visual idea is significant to us until it has enveloped some stress of our own personality. Until it releases or resists, depresses or enhances, some craving of our own, it remains one of the objects which do not matter" (Lippmann 162). When a large enough audience holds these mental pictures and are urged to action or discourse, this is when significant social and cultural changes occur. Thus, shaping the opinion of the public can in turn affect government policies, civil rights, economic progress and personal liberties for generations.
The effect of events and the shaping of public opinion unfolds in a particular way. Initially, a questionable event occurs with witnesses there to report and share the stories with others. These details are then reported by the press, which constructs a mental image according to the demographics of their audience and the expectations of their readership: they tailor the facts and the questions around the event to conform to what they perceive as the public's values and beliefs, and steer public opinion toward what they want the people to think about the event. The readers in turn are influenced by the articles and the way that the facts are presented, and if the mental picture is employed effectively, they are compelled to create their own discourse and create a mental image that will carry over to further individuals.

Building and amplifying on this process, Stendhal, Zola, and Proust all used their platform as novelists and their greater literary freedom relative to that of the press, to construct their own mental images and attempt to better illustrate their respective causes. In publishing novels, writers construct a different, stronger mental image for the public, and those who are truly affected by the material will be driven to their own action, furthering the process and reaching more people. This action is particular to the individual's means, profession, and influence; effective mental images raises awareness among the public, which continues to pay it forward until meaningful change takes place.

The rhetoric used in both newspaper articles and novels is an often overlooked but very critical tool used in crafting a mental image for the reader. Lippmann characterizes the particular use of rhetoric in newspapers by saying, "Every newspaper when it reaches the reader is the result of a whole series of selections as to what items shall be printed, in
what position they shall be printed, how much space each shall occupy, what emphasis each shall have" (354). In order to appease readers, advertisers and investors, newspapers are very deliberate in their choices to be sure to gain and keep the support of their constituency. For this reason, nothing is left to chance; an exclamation point can relay feelings of exasperation or excitement, a strong descriptor can label one party in a story as a hero and another as a villain, and the simple use of "us" and "them" can draw lines between people of different belief systems. This level of attention to detail in the choice of language, vocabulary, and tone is all done with the intention of sending a specific message and conveying certain emotions that they desire the reader to sense.

Besides bolstering the authority of newspapers and authors, facts in a news story or in literature provide a solid base upon which the individual can develop the social question behind the issue. Lippmann clarifies this concept by saying, "For while two men are willing to admit that there are two sides to a 'question', they do not believe that there are two sides to what they regard as a 'fact'." By creating a foundation of facts that are indisputable, both the reader and the writer both move on what is considered disputable, and therein lays the debate. In the case of the Le Temps article, the facts are listed as the evidence in the trial and the sentence Dreyfus faces, while the social question that the public debate faces is the question of innocence and integrity of an individual. Zola's detailed account of the struggles of the mining towns, naming specific names, industries, cities, and businesses in Germinal demonstrates his deep knowledge of the situation in the mining towns, and from there he can discuss the question of what these facts mean. But a news story without facts to support it is merely conjecture, and literature without a factual basis is simple fiction.
The facts serve as the basis for any argument, which then builds around the question surrounding those facts. From there, the way that the facts are presented can influence the reader's attitudes toward the inquiry, or as Lippmann puts it, "A public opinion is primarily a moralized and codified version of the facts" (125). Much like the way statistics can be tailored to support a specific point of view, so too can facts be provided in support of a particular perspective in a news story. A writer can use a variety of social and psychological uses to appeal to the reader's personal values and to influence their opinion based on those values. Articles such as that of Le Figaro during the strikes in St. Étienne and Aubin appeal to the patriotic moral code of the French public, by praising the French Army and condemning those who would doubt the word of the government, in the case of the Dreyfus Affair.

Zola as well uses several of these codes: family, personal responsibility, economic and professional circumstances. He emphasizes the importance of the safety, security and the ability to support one's family through his depiction of a countryside in financial ruin with no food, money, or work prospects. He addresses the economic aspect of the situation by stressing the importance of having the economic and financial means to look after one's self and their loved ones, breaking it down to both the individual economic need of buying bread and shelter and the national need of having the capital resources to support the trade needs and labor force of citizens. Dealing with the strike in its professional aspect, Zola stresses the importance of the care and attention of the miners and their work; that is to say, they are not unemployed people looking for government handouts but are hard-working, dedicated individuals seeking fair pay and benefits for their work. And
finally, Zola ties all of it together by tailoring his mental image to appeal to the personal moral code of the reader by making references to what he believes are the personal codes that would most impact the audience: the importance of food, family, and financial security and the injustice of denying these necessities to workers.

I believe that this relationship between literature and journalism discussed in this paper are not exclusive to 19th-century French literature, but that they can also be found in 20th- and 21st-century literature and journalism in a variety of modern informational mediums, such as magazines, columns, blogs, and online-only news and political websites from all over the world. Unlike literature, poetry or theater, journalism is intended to keep the public up to date on current events and happenings in their communities, yet as demonstrated here, it was, and continues to be, a medium to tell another kind of story and to influence the reader to lean toward a particular point of view. Some canonical literary works are unapologetically unrealistic, designed to create an entirely new world for the reader, but some of the most impactful, moving and inspiring literature in history is drawn from the writer's reaction to true events. The newspaper articles that tell about these happenings cannot be recounted purely by means of fiction and belief; for a work to generate and sustain a convincing mental picture in the mind of the reader, there must be a basis of factual evidence supported by witness testimony, and the purpose of the work must be rooted in the reportage of that witnessed event. Works such as *Le Rouge et le noir*, *Germinal*, and *Jean Santeuil* demonstrate the power of effective journalism, and how rhetoric and social cueing combined with a foundation of facts and evidence can push the
targeted audience toward a particular manner of thought and inspire the next generation of influential, socially engaged literature.
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