

## Lettre de Madeleine Mugliston à Émile Zola du 6 septembre 1898

Auteur(s) : **Mugliston, Madeleine**

### Les folios

En passant la souris sur une vignette, le titre de l'image apparaît.

5 Fichier(s)

### Les mots clés

[affaire Dreyfus](#), [Australie](#), [Journalisme](#), [Le Rêve](#)

### Relations

Ce document n'a pas de relation indiquée avec un autre document du projet.□

### Citer cette page

Mugliston, Madeleine, Lettre de Madeleine Mugliston à Émile Zola du 6 septembre 1898, 1898-09-06

Centre d'Étude sur Zola et le Naturalisme & Institut des textes et manuscrits modernes, CNRS-ENS ; projet EMAN (CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne Nouvelle).

Consulté le 18/01/2026 sur la plate-forme EMAN :

<https://eman-archives.org/CorrespondanceZola/items/show/1277>

Copier

### Présentation

Genre

- Correspondance
- Presse (numéro de revue)

Date d'envoi [1898-09-06](#)

Adresse Spring wood, New South Wales, Australie

# Description & Analyse

Description Lettre d'une écolière à Émile Zola, en français. Elle lui dit toute son admiration. Sa mère a lu La Débâcle et lui permettra de lire bientôt Le Rêve.

## Information générales

Langue

- [Anglais](#)
- [Français](#)

Cote AUS Mugliston 1898\_09\_06

Éléments codicologiques Un bifeuillet original et deux coupures de presse du Sydney Morning Herald.

Source Centre d'étude sur Zola et le naturalisme

## Informations éditoriales

Éditeur de la fiche Centre d'Étude sur Zola et le Naturalisme & Institut des textes et manuscrits modernes, CNRS-ENS ; projet EMAN (CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne Nouvelle).  
Mentions légales

- Fiche : Centre d'Études sur Zola et le Naturalisme & Institut des textes et manuscrits modernes, CNRS-ENS ; projet EMAN (CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne Nouvelle). Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Partage à l'Identique 3.0 (CC BY-SA 3.0 FR).
- Image : Document reproduit avec l'aimable autorisation des ayants droit d'Émile Zola. Toute reproduction du document est interdite sans autorisation des ayants droit. Les demandes peuvent se faire à l'aide du formulaire de contact.

Contributeur(s) Macke, Jean-Sébastien (édition scientifique)

Notice créée par [Jean-Sébastien Macke](#) Notice créée le 19/12/2017 Dernière modification le 21/08/2020

---

"Edmonclville"  
Springwood  
New South Wales  
September 6<sup>th</sup> 1898

M. Schubel

Monsieur,

Permettez à une écolière, tout en  
vous offrant son respect, de vous  
féliciter sur vos nobles efforts pour  
procurer un beau jugement pour  
ex-capitaine Dreyfus. J'ai propor-  
-tement sympathisé depuis le  
commencement de la lutte, et  
j'espère que la guine que vous  
vous êtes dénué soit courrouée  
de succès.

J'envoie deux extraits d'un des principaux journaux Australiens.

(Sydney Morning Herald) pour vous montrer comment la partie que vous avez pris est regardé ici.

Ma mère, qui connaît et aime la France depuis qu'elle demeurait là, a versé des larmes en lisant votre beau livre "Le débâcle".

Ma mère m'a promis que bientôt je pourrai lire, ce qu'elle appelle votre poème en prose, "Le Rêve" et comme j'aime la lecture au-delà de tout, ce sera une vraie joie.

Veuillez, Monsieur, agréer l'expression de mes bons voeux et de mon admiration respectueuse,

Madeleine MacListon

THE SYD

SPECIAL CABLES.

FROM THE "HERALD'S" LONDON CORRESPONDENTS.

THE DREYFUS CASE.

A NEW YORK DRAMA.

SCENES IN A THEATRE.

LONDON, Sept. 2.

A drama founded on the Dreyfus case has been produced in a New York Theatre.

Among the audience there were most emotional scenes. Many people were affected to tears, and there were loud cries of "Give him a new trial."

at colony.

The Dreyfus case, even more humiliating for France and more fruitful in surprises than the Panama case, has just undergone a fresh development of the most exciting kind. On July 8 last, a new French Ministry having come into office, the Minister for War, M. Cavaignac, felt impelled to make a statement to the Chamber of Deputies and to the nation upon the national question, the case of Dreyfus. M. Cavaignac assured the Chamber of the guilt of this ex-officer, and rested his assertion upon certain documents which he read. They consisted of correspondence between unknown persons relating in a way to the case of Dreyfus, and of a confession made up of fragments of the prisoner's conversation on the day of his military degradation. The importance of this event lay not so much in the character of the evidence submitted as in the fact that the French Ministry had chosen to abandon its attitude in regard to the case. Hitherto the Ministry had always rested upon the "chose jugée," that is, they had declared that it was impossible to go behind the decision of the tribunal which condemned Dreyfus. Last July it seemed good to the Minister for War to defend the tribunal itself by supplementary evidence. One of these documents—the most relied upon—was a letter unsigned, but understood to be from the foreign agent with whom Dreyfus was held to have been in traitorous communication. It was in these terms:—"I have read that a deputy is going to make an interpellation on Dreyfus. If"—here is a portion of a phrase which M. Cavaignac was unable to read—"I shall say that never have I had any relations with this Jew. That is understood. If you are asked, say the same, for nobody must ever know what has occurred with him." That letter was relied upon as proof positive, and the Chamber by 470 votes to 2 ordered the Minister's speech to be placarded throughout France. Now we have Colonel Henry, one of the head-quarters staff of the army, and a prominent officer of the anti-Dreyfus cause, confessing that he forged this letter. Henry has committed suicide, and the Government of France is brought face to face with a reconsideration of the entire scandal, though M. Cavaignac has resigned rather than consent to a revision of the case.

For four years France has been struggling with this scandal. In 1894 an artillery officer, detached for special service at the Ministry of War, an Alsatian by birth, a Jew, with a German name, Captain Dreyfus, was arrested on a charge of treason in selling the military secrets of the nation to foreign agents. He was tried in secret by court-martial, and condemned to degradation and perpetual exile. He was degraded at a military function in Paris, and at once despatched to one of the most dreary and hopeless prisons, the Ile du Diable, in the Gulf of Cayenne, where the only news of him that at infrequent intervals reaches the world is intelligence of breakdown in health and attempts at self-destruction. The family of Dreyfus believed in his innocence, and they have ever since maintained an agitation for his release. But this agitation led to a revival of militarism and anti-Semitism. Every attempt to revise the sentence of the

this agitation led to a revival of militarism and anti-Semitism. Every attempt to revise the sentence of the secret military tribunal which condemned Dreyfus has been made to appear as an attack upon the French army and its general staff, as well as an attempt to overrule the law by a Jewish ring, exercising press, financial, and political influence. The French Government has steadfastly maintained that Dreyfus is guilty, and that his sentence was not to be reviewed in any way. Public opinion in Paris has been peculiarly inflamed by the case. Last year a new influence was cast into the affair. M. Zola, who in his laborious way had been examining the Dreyfus case, came to the conclusion that that officer had been condemned upon insufficient evidence. He addressed through a Parisian journal, "l'Aurore," three letters to the Government and the nation accusing the military staff of injustice towards Dreyfus, and demanding reparation. The then Premier (M. Méline) ordered Zola to be brought to trial. The first trial took place in February, amid scenes of wild popular and military clamour. The court was the theatre of scenes almost as grotesque and unbecoming as those in the streets. Generals wept and threatened the Court by turns; young military officers and barristers fought; students howled down the name of Zola; mobs paraded the streets and sacked the shops of Jews. It was a deplorable exhibition for the City of Light, which to its inhabitants is the cynosure of civilisation. Finally, Zola and his publisher were condemned; but the decision was reversed by the Court of Appeal. A second trial was ordered, again Zola was condemned, again he appealed. Meanwhile all sorts of incidents accumulated. Esterhazy, who has just been cashiered, Picquart, Paty du Clam, Rochefort, Henry, and many other well-known figures have shared in the odium of this amazing case. Duels have been fought, the most serious sections of the French press, even the "Revue des Deux Mondes," have been convulsed; all public opinion in France has been one long ferment. The press of other countries, even that of Russia, has condemned the management of this famous, or infamous, scandal, and France bids fair to remember with horror and ignominy the names of Dreyfus and his accusers.

If it were only the fate of the miserable man condemned to a living death on the Devil's Island, off Cayenne, the case would have its human interest. But it is now laden with issues far more momentous than any man's rehabilitation. It involves the integrity of the army and the Cabinet; it implies that civil liberty in France exists at the will only of the headquarters staff in Paris. Whom a court-martial condemns is for ever lost, and to question the sufficiency of his trial is to asperse the Army and to undermine the Republic, and the history of this case shows that both these tremendous powers will crush any criticism. Surely that is a dangerous symptom for the Third Republic, and presages the Third Empire or else a military autocracy under the forms of a republic. Mr. Bodley's severe reflections upon the governing men and ideas of modern France are supported by a case like this. The present state of the case is obviously one of transition. M. Zola is morally rehabilitated. Though he may be a fugitive from his country, condemned to fine and imprisonment, and to

at the will only of the headquarters staff in Paris. Whom a court-martial condemns is for ever lost, and to question the sufficiency of his trial is to asperse the Army and to undermine the Republic, and the history of this case shows that both these tremendous powers will crush any criticism. Surely that is a dangerous symptom for the Third Republic, and presages the Third Empire or else a military autocracy under the forms of a republic. Mr. Bodley's severe reflections upon the governing men and ideas of modern France are supported by a case like this. The present state of the case is obviously one of transition. M. Zola is morally rehabilitated. Though he may be a fugitive from his country, condemned to fine and imprisonment, and to suspension from the Legion of Honour, he stands in the estimation of foreign observers higher for his magnanimous championship of the miserable Dreyfus. France cannot let the results of Zola's trial rest unchallenged, any more than the results of Dreyfus's trial. It may not be expedient to probe to the depths this military scandal as the Panama robbery was probed, but either the pains and penalties of Zola, Picquart, Dreyfus, and all on that side must now be reviewed, or

France must stand committed to militarism—the regime of the Army instead of the Republic.

---

Omdurman is in the hands of the