

Student Work

---

5-1-1975

## Napoleonic censorship, 1799-1810

Donna Lee Owen Petersen  
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>  
Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

### Recommended Citation

Petersen, Donna Lee Owen, "Napoleonic censorship, 1799-1810" (1975). *Student Work*. 402.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/402>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

NAPOLEONIC CENSORSHIP

1799 - 1810

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of History

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Donna Lee Owen Petersen

May 1975

10937-46

UMI Number: EP73040

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73040

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Graduate Committee Ernst J. Lamm History  
Name Department  
Dale A. Taedert History  
Orville D. Mansard Political Science  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Ernst J. Lamm  
Chairman  
10 April 1975  
Date



FRONTISPIECE

"Si je lâche la bride à la presse, je ne resterai pas trois mois au pouvoir."

Napoléon  
18 Brumaire

## PREFACE

The following work was undertaken as I am sure all such research is with the hopeful thought in mind that some great unknown fact or event would be uncovered in the source of the researcher's work which would shed new light and provide a new interpretation to already conceived ideas. Unfortunately, such a lofty ideal did not come to pass; however, unexpected side effects did transpire which made the effort rewarding.

The Napoleonic Empire emerges, again, as a monolithic giant difficult for some to understand. One man, one nation: the man - Napoleon - the nation - France; they are within the framework of the First Empire indivisible. The magnitude of the governing of France and the Empire by one man, regardless of the many individuals who took orders from him is awe-inspiring. This aspect of the First Empire has been in my opinion strongly reinforced as the research has become more exhaustive. The parallels that can always be drawn in history are more sharply defined than ever if one relates the censorship that occurred during the First Empire and recent events, as of this writing, which have occurred in the United States. The similarities are there and with a modicum of effort something can be learned from them. Power is a subject of fascination for a great many people. The manner in which it can be achieved and put to use in just one facet of the daily life of a people is well worth the study.

The historical endeavor which follows is entirely the result of my effort and research and as such I claim all responsibility for content and interpretation. It is necessary, however, to acknowledge the people who have been of help to me in compiling this work. Dr. Ert J. Gum, my advisor, must be credited with the completion of this portion of my studies. He is the professor who brought history to life for me in his classroom presentations and in his ability to make history viable in today's world. If it were not for Dr. Gum I can say unequivocally I would not have done any advanced work in history. Mrs. Marian Purrier Nelson whose work is cited in the following pages has been invaluable to me. Without her help as a friend and her knowledge of the period I could not have managed a completed page. Last my thanks to the Department of History of the University of Nebraska at Omaha for its faith in me as evinced by its granting to me a position as a teaching assistant while I was engaged in my graduate course work. A special thanks to Dr. A. Stanley Trickett who, as chairman of the Department of History during my tenure as an assistant was ever ready to give of his time and experience to aid a neophyte in the halls of academia.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                | Page |
|--------------------------------|------|
| FRONTISPIECE . . . . .         | iii  |
| PREFACE . . . . .              | iv   |
| CHAPTER                        |      |
| I.    BACKGROUND . . . . .     | 1    |
| II.   IMPLEMENTATION . . . . . | 17   |
| III.  CONCLUSION . . . . .     | 42   |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .         | 50   |

## CHAPTER I

### BACKGROUND

Censorship<sup>1</sup> in France was nothing new when Napoleon Bonaparte came to power in November 1799. In the first half of the eighteenth century censorship covered authors, publishers, and institutions, such as the Church and Parlement.<sup>2</sup> Some form of censorship of the press had existed at least from the early seventeenth century.<sup>3</sup> There were varying degrees of control exercised in different areas but for France censorship was a way of life. Both Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin dictated how news should appear and were careful to make every effort to produce the effect upon the public mind they desired.<sup>4</sup>

Censorship was officially sanctioned in France by the Government as far back as 1515.<sup>5</sup> The police were involved in the regulation of censorship from at least this date also.<sup>6</sup> Under Louis XIII four royal censors

---

<sup>1</sup>The definition of censorship, as used in this paper, is the deletion or suppression of publications or public performance which the government deemed objectionable to the public weal.

<sup>2</sup>Albert Bachman, Censorship in France from 1715 to 1750: Voltaire's Opposition (New York: Publication of the Institute of French Studies, Inc., Columbia University, 1934), 1. Hereafter cited as Bachman, Censorship. Also see Ernest Lavisse, Histoire De France contemporaine depuis les origines jusqu'à la révolution. (9 vols; Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1926), VIII, 8.

<sup>3</sup>James Breck Perkins, France Under Mazarin (2 vols; 3rd ed.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1887), II, 437. Hereafter cited as Perkins, France.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 438.      <sup>5</sup>Bachman, Censorship, 25-6.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 34.

were appointed probably more to break the hold of the Church on manners and morals than for any other reason.<sup>7</sup> These appointments seem to have been one of the first actions by any French monarch to control thought and literature. Prior to the appointment of the four royal censors the Faculty of Theology had handled censorship. The four censors, called Doctors of the Sorbonne, were to receive payments for their service and in case of death they would replace their number by an election conducted by the Doctors of the Sorbonne and two Doctors of Theology from the College of Navarre. The Chancellor was instructed to give the credentials of election to the candidate and since the salaries of the censors were paid by the Crown, the censors were thereby identified with the government and not the university.<sup>8</sup> Chancellor Pierre Séguier, in 1653, further strengthened the hold of the government on censorship. He rescinded the rights of the Faculty of the College of Navarre over censorship, made three or four of them theological book censors only, and held them responsible to him directly.<sup>9</sup> This basis for the practice of censorship remained until the Revolution.<sup>10</sup>

By the late seventeenth century the essential organization of censorship was set. The Chancellor, or the Keeper of the Seals, was the responsible minister. There were two departments under him, the Bureau

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 36. Also see David T. Pottinger, The French Book Trade in the Ancien Regime 1500-1791, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958), 63. Hereafter cited as Pottinger, Book Trade.

<sup>8</sup> Pottinger, Book Trade, 63.      <sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 64

Contentieux de la librairie which handled litigation between printers and publishers, and the bureau gracieux de la librairie which handled censorship administered by a group of readers.<sup>11</sup> As the volume of work grew the Chancellor delegated his authority to the Director of the Book Trade, who worked through the above two departments. Undersecretaries, however, handled the business details of the Director's office and their number varied considerably. There were eight in 1688, sixteen in 1704, but by 1755, when the effectiveness of censorship was dwindling, there was only one undersecretary.<sup>12</sup> In addition to the undersecretaries the Director had several assistants and worked closely with the police who also had a large number of inspectors of their own. However, the university did not give up its old rights of censorship so easily. Parlement and the University both asserted they had rights over censorship even until 1789.<sup>13</sup>

Rigorous censorship existed under Louis XIV, but between 1715 and 1750 its severity began to breakdown as some so-called revolutionary ideas gained credence.<sup>14</sup> The breakdown did not mean government policy had changed. Rather, it meant that people had found a way to circumvent the laws and the government was too cumbersome and indeed, corrupt, to endorse them. By 1750 censorship had lost its teeth. An underground had been perfected by men through which they could avoid the censorship

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 65.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 146-47.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 65.

<sup>14</sup> Bachman, Censorship, x-xi.

laws.<sup>15</sup> As in so many areas laws concerning publications conflicted, for as new legislation appeared the government failed to repeal the old. The structure of the administrative authority was as confused as the laws themselves and amidst such confusion it was not difficult to escape almost any indictment.<sup>16</sup> Usually the King served as the primary officer to whom the censors were responsible. However, as Kings changed and times altered responsibility could fluctuate as did everything else. No general statement regarding policies of the eighteenth century would adequately cover all the facets of censorship. The political group or religious faction in power at the time of publication of any given work governed how that work was treated. The influence upon the King of a mistress or a Minister was a factor as was the financial condition of the government and the ability of an author to pay or his protectors to subsidize his work by exerting monetary influence on those executors of the law who were approachable.<sup>17</sup>

Lamoignon de Malesherbes in 1750 was Director of the Book Trade, or the head of what was called Direction de la Librairie, with a volume of business so great that he used a form of permission to publish called permission tacite. This form of permission covered books that were published but released the Director from responsibility for publishing them. A censor was the official who advised that the permission be issued and it was then registered in the chancellor's office, the headquarters of the guild, and with the Lieutenant of Police.<sup>18</sup> The permission tacite was a function of the Directeur de la Librairie and the

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.      <sup>16</sup> Ibid., 30.      <sup>17</sup> Ibid., 18-19.  
<sup>18</sup> Pottinger, Book Trade, 66-67.

code de la librairie was amended to include this tool. Of course the issuance of the permission tacite brought money into the King's coffers also as a fee was charged. If the book incurred the wrath of any of the factions in the government with which the King had to contend it was a safe way not to have to admit that the book had received a permit to be published and it could be withdrawn from circulation (if there were any copies left).<sup>19</sup> The permission tacite did not carry the stamp of the Great Seal, was not printed in the edition of the book and thus the public did not see the name of the censor. In other instances, a verbal permission clandestine or simple tolérance was issued by a lieutenant of police.<sup>20</sup> The permission clandestine allowed a printer to produce a secret edition of a book with the guarantee that the printer's shop would receive warning in case of a raid or that the police would ignore any violation.<sup>21</sup>

The entire structure of censorship thus was inadequate. The censors had no instructions concerning what they should censor, nor did they have any limit set on their authority. There was no coordination between governmental departments, and a censor had no way of knowing if a book might be revealing state secrets or insulting French allies. Additionally, the Parlement and the Chancellory were very jealous of each other's authority and would not cooperate with one another.

---

<sup>19</sup> Bachman, Censorship, 146-53.

<sup>20</sup> Pottinger, Book Trade, 67.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

The law carried penalties that were much too severe or obscure and the possibility of enforcing such a law was remote.<sup>22</sup> In essence what existed in the ancien régime was a system of laws, interlocking and overlapping, with an authority profile to match. The impracticality of the system was obvious. For example, two copies of every work were submitted to the censors. One copy was signed by the author and bore his initials on each page. This copy remained in the censor's files while the other copy was returned to the applicant with the censor's signature and initials.<sup>23</sup> Many times if the censor returned an unfavorable report the applicant (printer or author) would resubmit the work to another censor who might be favorable to the book. Also, even if a book was approved by the censors, it might be condemned later if something in it offended a particular group, such as the Jansenists or Jesuits. Then the group would exert influence on the Court, King, or University or Faculty to condemn the book and the permit of the censor was worthless. However, usually by the time the special interest group had gotten the condemnation through, the edition of the book was sold out. All in all the entire process did little to bolster confidence in the legal process. For example, one censor passed on The Koran stating he found ". . . nothing in it contrary to religion and morals".<sup>24</sup> Censorship was supposed to strengthen and support the ancien régime.

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 68.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 70. Also see Fernand Mitton, La Presse Française Des Origines a la Révolution, (Paris: Guy le Prat, 1943), 186.

<sup>24</sup> Pottinger, Book Trade, 73.

The conflicting and complex methods of enforcing censorship plus a fatal division of authority in essence helped instead to undermine it (the ancien régime).<sup>25</sup>

As the eighteenth century progressed and demand for reform in all areas grew censorship underwent some radical changes. Papers, journals,<sup>26</sup> pamphlets and posters appeared in profusion everywhere. They were seen on display in Paris and throughout the provinces. Most of them dealt with the rights of the individual and the sovereignty of the people, while some decried a system which allowed two million aristocrats to dictate to twenty million people.<sup>27</sup> Such public feeling helped to bring about the wording in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen which upheld the right that all citizens could speak, write, and print freely.<sup>28</sup> The phrasing, however, left room for interpretation by whatever group held power as did many of the laws passed under the Revolutionary governments.

The municipality of Paris on the recommendation of the Committee of Police, on 1 September 1789, felt called upon to draw attention to

---

<sup>25</sup>Bachman, Censorship, 153.

<sup>26</sup>For purposes of this paper the word journal and papers will be taken to mean daily publications such as newspapers.

<sup>27</sup>Fernand Mitton, La Presse Française Sous La Révolution, Le Consulat, L'Empire, (Paris: Guy Le Prat, 1945), 12-13. Hereafter cited as Mitton, La Presse Française.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., 31.



the fact that colporters,<sup>29</sup> sellers of printing, and others of the journalistic profession were arousing and misleading the public by certain of their statements. The assembly of the representatives of the Commune of Paris felt that liberty of the press was being abused by some irresponsible people. The colporters were deluding the people and because of such delusions the Committee forbade the colporters from calling out within Paris any writing or brochures which could be considered as detrimental or disturbing to public order and they requested all the districts to join in stopping this abuse.<sup>30</sup> The colporters were accused of advertising only sensational matters and doing so in a way to suggest something different than what the paper reported. They were also accused of calling out items which were not even in the papers to better sell their wares. Indeed, one month later, 3 October 1789, things were still so out of hand that the assembly called for the offenders to be brought to justice. The newspapers protested such accusations, so the Council General of the Commune, with the aid of the Department of Police issued a notice which declared that while it acknowledged that purveyors of false or misleading information were upsetting, it upheld and supported the basic right of the colporters and the papers to advertise the news as they saw it. The notice went to the sixty districts of Paris and the occasion was used by the procurer general to call on all patriots to curb their enthusiasm.

---

<sup>29</sup> Colporters can be equated with the modern-day newsboy, who calls out the headlines from the daily paper.

<sup>30</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française, 53.

He also made special note that the government did not desire to inspire a clandestine press which would be ". . . an arsenal of mischievous malcontents."<sup>31</sup> Notices such as the above appeared quite frequently which should say something about their effectiveness.

The National Assembly had several times turned its attention to the matter of irresponsible reporting by the press. In January 1790, the Committee of the Constitution submitted a decree against the offense of subverting in a propagandistic manner the right granted by law. However, the practices of the colporters continued unabashed.<sup>32</sup> A reverse type of censorship had come into practice - the Royalist journals were proscribed. For example, the Feuille de jour, in operation from December 1790 until August 1792, was condemned as counter revolutionary.<sup>33</sup> However, from 1789 until 1792 the press enjoyed a good deal of freedom when compared to previous years, but it cannot be termed unlimited liberty of the press.<sup>34</sup>

The Council General of the Commune, in 1792, issued a notice whereby it held certain royalist journalists and papers to be poisoning public opinion and gave notice it would take the presses and equipment

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 54. Also see Eugène Louis Hatin, Histoire politique et littéraire de la presse en France (8 vols; Paris: Poulet Malassis Et De Broise Librairie-Éditeurs, 1859), III-IV. Hereafter cited as Hatin, Histoire politique.

<sup>32</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française, 55.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 47. For a more complete list of 1789-1792 papers both Royalist and Revolutionary see Ibid., 31-51.

<sup>34</sup> Hatin, Histoire politique, III-IV, 263.

of these offending journalists and distribute them among patriotic men. The assembly named three commissioners to administer its order. Therefore, by 1792 the revolutionary press dominated the writing of the time and the Royalist press went underground.<sup>35</sup> It would seem that one form of censorship had been substituted for another.

Lines of authority for the actions of the revolutionary governments to administer censorship followed somewhat traditional channels; a fact which becomes apparent when compared with the practices of the monarchy. Though practices conformed to former usages, the confusion of authority which existed earlier tended to disappear. The revolutionary government used their powers where they could to influence the press either directly or by coercion and bribery. Under the second ministry of Jean-Marie Roland de La Platière a bureau d'esprit was established in the portfolio of the Minister of Interior. A decree of 18 August 1792, of the Legislative Assembly consecrated this organism. The Minister of the Interior was to have 1,000 livres at his disposal to use as he judged necessary within the departments and the armies to stop anti-government writings and to foster good public spirit. The funds allotted the Minister of the Interior were to be added to the six million livres previously given to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for his secret dispensation to influence public opinion.<sup>36</sup> The bureau d'esprit thus

---

<sup>35</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 69-70.

<sup>36</sup>The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Charles-François Dumouriez, outlined what format he wanted the Gazette de France to use in order that it would give the public the desired opinion of the executive will. The result of this ploy was that the Gazette became the official Girondin organ and fell from power with the fall of the Girondins. Ibid., 83.

distributed a great quantity of writings to the administrative department with orders that these pages be filtered on down to lesser authorities for the purpose of influencing public thought. Roland also used some of these funds to support papers which he found favorable, e.g., la Sentinelle.<sup>37</sup> Other journalists quite naturally resented this. Jean-Paul Marat, for example, made an issue of this influence peddling and published quite a diatribe against Roland in the Journal de la République français.<sup>38</sup>

Under the Convention the same type of practice continued as had taken place under the earlier revolutionary governments in that they used the papers as organs for propaganda and dictated what they should print. The Executive Council on 22 May 1793, provided 50,000 livres for the Minister of War so that the army would receive those papers best calculated to provide the proper patriotic spirit.<sup>39</sup> The committee of Public Safety in August 1793 announced that citizen Joseph Garat was in charge of editing a journal which would print the correct news. The journal gave a periodic résumé of the general operations of the Convention and was distributed regularly to the armies and the municipalities. The journal was called the Feuille de Salut public and quite obviously its articles were edited to contain what the Convention wanted distributed. Any journalists who offended what the Convention felt was fit to print or to read were called before the Committee of Public Safety and then referred to the Revolutionary

---

<sup>37</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française, 81.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 85.

Tribunal where the penalty was often death.<sup>40</sup> As the terror came to a halt in 1794 the Constitution of the Year III again upheld the liberty of the press but the press did not immediately come out of hiding as it had done previously. When it did surface, that is the royalist, revolutionary and parliamentary press, it resumed its old vitriolic character. However, the press was unanimous in one area, they all attacked the government.<sup>41</sup>

The Directory, in its turn, had to find a way to limit the press and it demanded of the Council of the Ancients and Council of Five Hundred that some type of legislation be enacted. After long deliberation the Council voted on 17 April 1796 the first law that can properly be called a law of the press. The law was indicative of the type that the press would operate under until 1830. All printing would carry the name of the author and the name and place of the printer. Any infraction or falsification was punishable by imprisonment. The editor would be held responsible for all unsigned articles. In the absence of the author the aforesaid would apply to the printer. Distributors and sellers also found themselves guilty under the law if they did not designate the printer. Finally, all provocations in writing or by any other means which advocated overthrow of the Republic or the public will, which had previously been laid down by the Convention, was punishable by

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 87, 105-06.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 175-76. The term "the press" is used here in the generic sense.

death.<sup>42</sup>

The royalist journals were at this time in the majority and well equipped to take advantage of their number.<sup>43</sup> But the Directory was able to spread counter propaganda and exercised strict control over what was printed in official government papers. First, the Rédacteur and then the Journal des défenseurs de la patrie ". . . at the invitation and under the auspices of the government. . . " were official government vessels.<sup>44</sup> These papers were sent to the armies but any diplomatic articles were submitted to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for his perusal.<sup>45</sup> Essentially the Directory bribed or subsidized the papers so that they were favorable to the government. The Minister of Police was the agent most frequently used to distribute money to the papers at the order of the Directory.<sup>46</sup> They had by 1797 grown tired of the continual royalist clamor and requested of the Ancients and the Five Hundred a repressive law against the press. The Five Hundred passed such a measure but the Ancients refused. The Royalists seized on this occasion to renew their attacks on the Directory. The reaction of the Directory was swift and on 4 September

---

<sup>42</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 177.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., 191-92.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 193. Also see Gustave Le Poittevin La Liberté de la presse depuis la révolution 1789-1815, (Paris: Arthur Rousseau, Éditeur, 1901), 47. Hereafter cited as Le Poittevin, La Liberté; Hatin, Histoire politique III-IV, 334.

<sup>45</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 193.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 197-98.

1797, it applied the law ( of 28 Germinal Year IV) in a different manner. The Directory ordered that anyone who advocated a return to a Royalist government or the Constitution of the year 1793 be shot. Sometime later that day a notice went out ordering the arrest of a number of authors and printers.<sup>47</sup> The coup d'etat of 18 Fructidor was the St. Bartholomew's Day of the journalists.<sup>48</sup> The Ancients and the Five Hundred approved the Directory's orders and on the next day (19 Fructidor Year V) by article 355 they placed for one year all journals, periodicals and presses under the inspection of the police who would be able to prohibit infractions of the law by virtue of Article 355 of the Constitution of the Year III.<sup>49</sup> It is interesting to note that all through this era the police were usually charged with carrying out the orders of censorship or similar problems with regard to the press. The most frequent ending to any law passed with regard to regulating the press was that "the Minister of Police shall be charged with the implementation of this law." Of course, police are traditionally enforcers of the law; however, in France the leeway allotted to the charges brought by the police was very broad. To legislate journalistic moralities, if you will, is nebulous at best and

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 200. For a complete list of the authors and printers see Ibid., 200-02; Hatin, Histoire politique, III-IV, 357.

<sup>48</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française, 202; Hatin, Histoire politique, III-IV, 264.

<sup>49</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française, 202; Le Poittevin, La Liberté, 67. Also see Maurice Deslandres, Histoire Constitutionnelle De La France De 1789 à 1870 (2 vols; Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1932), I, 399-400. Hereafter cited as Deslandres, Histoire Constitutionnelle.

requires that your enforcer use a good deal of personal judgement. In essence if you are going to have any form of regulatory censorship you have put into the hands of your police a tool which can be used at their discretion and for any number of purposes.<sup>50</sup> There was no new bureau of regulation set up<sup>51</sup> and with this lack of any change it was fairly simple with the advent of Bonaparte and his police chief Joseph Fouché to organize the police and retain and make workable their traditional role.

One of the talents of a good administrator is to make use of the tools of administration he finds around him, particularly if those tools have been ineffectively utilized before but are a familiar part of a government. Bonaparte was such an administrator and the press was such a tool.

While the Directory were having their own problems with the shaping of public opinion, Bonaparte had begun to influence his armies' opinions through judicious use of the printed word. During the Italian campaign he founded in Milan the Courrier de l'Armée d'Italie. Through the paper Bonaparte managed to get his views across to the troops and counter any adverse words they might get from France. Even though the Courrier printed primarily military news it did contain political propaganda. France vue de l'Armée d'Italie printed views on politics,

---

<sup>50</sup>Hatin, Histoire politique, I-II, 462-65, offers some interesting examples of police use of the censorship laws and the peoples use of the police.

<sup>51</sup>Pierre Gaxotte, Le Siècle de Louis XV (Paris: Arthème Fayard et Cie., 1933), 304-95.



administrations, and French and foreign literature. One source suggests that Bonaparte used his two papers to point up by comparison the faults of the Directory and to foster alarm about how France was governed.<sup>52</sup> Bonaparte did the same thing while in Egypt. In Cairo he ordered an official journal printed to report on news of the French colony. Entitled Courrier d'Egypt this paper was supposed to print what was happening in Egypt and to give some idea of what the situation was in France. Its articles primarily reflected the opinions of Bonaparte.<sup>53</sup> Thus upon his return to France and following the days of Brumaire, Bonaparte was no stranger to an artificially manipulated press and was more than likely prepared to take whatever steps he found necessary to get his views across to the public as he wished them made known.

---

<sup>52</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 207; Hatin, Histoire politique, VII-VIII, 381-82, 386.

<sup>53</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 208.

CHAPTER II  
IMPLEMENTATION

When Bonaparte seized the government he ignored initially the strict censorship under which the press had operated. He allowed papers to express their own views, and theatres to produce plays without government clearance. Street criers hawked the newspapers in colorful and not always truthful terms. Pamphlets were distributed freely and posters were put on the walls of the cities without government interference. Even the provincial papers made what editorial statements they wished regarding the coup de Brumaire. This is not to say that the government was unaware of what was being said, but for a brief time freedom of the press was a reality.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the press enjoyed more freedom during the first two months of Bonaparte's coup than it had in any time since 1793.<sup>2</sup>

The political, economic and social situation was dire<sup>3</sup> but there was hope. Paris was in a state of ruin, immorality was open and rampant. Industry was at a standstill; the major items for sale were imported, but the journals poured out the optimism that Bonaparte

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernest Lavisse, Histoire de France contemporaine depuis la révolution jusqu'à la paix de 1919 (10 vols; Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1911), III, 61. Hereafter cited as Lavisse, Histoire de France.

<sup>2</sup>Robert B. Holtman, Napoleonic Propaganda (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), 44. Hereafter cited as Holtman, Propaganda.

<sup>3</sup>Ernest d'Hauterive, La Contre-police Royaliste en 1800 (Paris: Librairie Académique Perrin, 1931), 4-9.

would set everything right again.<sup>4</sup> However, each journal felt that it had the right solutions to the problem, and an excitable, unlettered public found itself being led and torn between conflicting reports and theories. Given such a set of circumstances Napoleon believed it was necessary to have some control over the press and thereby public opinion.<sup>5</sup>

As each faction fought for supremacy, each paper, pamphlet or poster called on Bonaparte to put a stop to any writings which were opposed to its ideas. Since such factionalizing had led to the paralysis of the Year VIII he perforce had to organize and dominate the forces of the Revolution. He had to make the people see the values he could bring to them but not the force he would use to secure those values. They could not be allowed to see the losses they would suffer in mind and in freedom of spirit in order to enjoy the benefits of his rule. Bonaparte had to silence discordant factions, for to allow them freedom in the France which existed in late 1799 and early 1800, was a certain invitation to further coup and anarchy.<sup>6</sup> The Royalist factions found sympathy for their desire to recall Louis XVIII and had to be silenced for Bonaparte had no intention of recalling the Bourbons. The Jacobins, fearing the Royalists and the possibility that Bonaparte

---

<sup>4</sup>Albert Vandal, L'Avènement de Bonaparte (2 vols; 17th ed.; Paris: Plon-Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>., Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1911), II, 71. Hereafter cited as Vandal, L'Avènement.

<sup>5</sup>Napoléon, Correspondence de Napoléon I<sup>er</sup> (32 vols; Paris: Imprimerie-Impériale, 1858-1869), VI, 42-43. Hereafter cited as Napoléon, Correspondence.

<sup>6</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 570-74.

might restore the monarchy, set up a loud opposition to the Consulate so they too had to be silenced. The press, moreover, was irresponsible in its reporting. Editors printed every rumor they heard, including such items as sensitive military operations, and as so much of Paris was illiterate, the street vendors cried out the news, particularly that which was of sensational nature.<sup>7</sup> With the chaotic conditions that existed in France, this type of reporting had to come to a stop if any order was to be established. Some force had to keep the various faction's influence to a minimum and keep every rumor from arousing further an already distraught public. The threat of future uprisings and continuing internal strife were two of the major facets of French life that Bonaparte had to remedy if he were to succeed.

The need for government control rested in the internal condition of France at the time of Brumaire. The French people were exhausted by continuous war and immoral government more distinguished by corruption than for devising viable policies. As a result, the various factions of French political life had been openly opposed to the Directory and for a brief moment all factions had united against one evil. Each political faction, the Royalists, the Jacobins, the Constitutional

---

<sup>7</sup>L. Lanzac de Laborie, Consulat Provisoire et Consulat à Temps (8 vols; Paris: Plon Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>., Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1905), I, 205. Hereafter cited as Laborie, Consulat. Also see Henri Welschinger, La Censure sous le Premier Empire (Paris: Charavez Frères-Éditeurs, 1882), 13. Hereafter cited as Welschinger, La Censure.

Monarchists and the Republicans saw in Bonaparte an answer to their problems.

Bonaparte's triumph at St. Cloud seemed to be the dawn of a new era. All of France felt that conditions would improve immediately. Paris was released from the influence of the mob; clerics came to life again, and there was optimism with regard to the hope that the Church might again function. The study of the sciences was revived and reborn.<sup>8</sup> All factions thought that now they would at last have their way. Each paper published spoke of how conditions would become better, assuming the new government would accept its advice with regard to its own political feelings. The Jacobin papers, in the light of Bonaparte's political past, felt that now the Revolution, and they, were safe. The Royalist papers expressed the hope that Bonaparte would call the Bourbons back to the throne. The moderate Republicans hoped that the excesses of the Revolution would end. The Constitutional Monarchists repeated their call for a constitutional monarchy. The new freedom, however, contained the seeds of still more discontent. The more moderate papers such as le Diplome and Gazette de France called on Bonaparte to stop the Jacobins, claiming that they had ravaged France for ten years.<sup>9</sup> The Parisians were alarmed at the prospect of a civil

---

<sup>8</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, I, 446-50. Also see André Castelot, Josephine: A Biography, trans. by Denise Folliot (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1967); \_\_\_\_\_, Napoleon, trans. from the French by Guy Daniels (First ed.; New York: Harper & Row, 1971); and Vincent Cronin, Napoleon Bonaparte, An Intimate Biography (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1973).

<sup>9</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 32-33.

war between the Royalist and Jacobin factions.<sup>10</sup> The Republican journals called Bonaparte too conservative and the Royalists called him too radical.<sup>11</sup> Thus to a demand for liberty of the press he could reply ". . . in a moment I should have thirty Royalist journals and as many Jacobin ones and I should have to govern with a minority."<sup>12</sup> The division that these various opinions and expectations fostered made it necessary that Bonaparte take some decisive action.

The Constitution of the Year VIII promulgated on 25 December 1799, contained no mention of the press, and the Consular government tended to arrogate to itself those responsibilities which the Constitution did not specifically state.<sup>13</sup> Thus, Bonaparte, on 27 December 1799, declared that the Moniteur was the only official journal. It would consist of four pages of three columns each and contain notices, proclamations, and Consular decisions. It was charged with keeping hearts loyal to the Republic.<sup>14</sup> Bonaparte took this action to discredit other journals which were, at this time, printing news which they purported to be a forecast of the actions the government would take. By designating the

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., II, 38.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., II, 35-40.

<sup>12</sup> William Milligan Sloane, The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte (4 vols; New York: the Century Company, 1916) II, 254.

<sup>13</sup> Jacques Godechot, Les Institutions de la France sous La Révolution et l'Empire (Paris: Imprimerie des Universitaires de France, 1951), 654. Hereafter cited as Godechot, Les Institutions. Also see Laborie, Consulat, I, 206.

<sup>14</sup> Vandal, L'Avènement, I. 552-53; Moniteur, Septidi, 7 Nivôse, An 8, #97, 1.

Moniteur the only official journal Bonaparte, in effect, indicated that the news printed by any other journal was only that journal's opinion and was not of an official nature. The above action, according to one authority, was the first move in a planned series of moves to suppress the liberty of the press.<sup>15</sup>

The new legislative bodies met on 1 January 1800. In the first session there evolved an incident which, when reported by the papers, apparently helped to solidify Bonaparte's feelings about the press. The Tribunal had only so much time within which it could consider or examine a piece of proposed legislation.<sup>16</sup> Benjamin Constant, a member of the Tribunal, spoke against the limit and against the fact that while the Tribunal could discuss it could not propose nor vote on proposed legislation. The Corps Législatif had the prerogative of passing or rejecting legislation but it could not discuss. Constant called this a ". . . regime of servitude and silence."<sup>17</sup> The majority of the Tribunal, however, men whom Bonaparte hand-picked, supported the Constitution, and called for termination of Constant's speech and for the meeting to get on with a discussion of the law under

---

<sup>15</sup> Laborie, Consulat, I, 206.

<sup>16</sup> When a proposed law was sent to the Tribunal for discussion the government fixed the date on which the law was to be voted upon by the Corps Législatif, thus effectively limiting debate in the Tribunal. Godechot, Les Institutions, 488-89.

<sup>17</sup> Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 49-50; Deslandres, Histoire Constitutionnelle, I, 477-79.

consideration.<sup>18</sup>

The press reported the meeting in various fashions slanted to fit individual editors particular political bent. Certain journals spoke out against the membership of the Tribune. They said that such dissension was only what could be expected when a group of men who were worn out, discredited, and used to a life of discord acted as public servants. These journals stated that the men of the Tribune would be at fault if the pacific act of Brumaire should come to failure.<sup>19</sup> The Journal des Hommes-Libres, written under the direction of Joseph Fouché, stated that since Constant was one of the dissenting leaders his speech was not worthy of note for Constant was involved in a lewd affair with Madame de Staël. On the other hand, the Gazette de France insinuated that Constant was really in the pay of the Abbé Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès and behind Sieyès was the Orleanist faction.<sup>20</sup> The journals of the far right, the Royalists, denounced the Tribune, for dissension presented them with an opportunity to discredit the men of the Revolution, many of whom sat in the Tribune.<sup>21</sup> The dissenters in the Tribune found only

---

<sup>18</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 51.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., II, 53. Due to the combined facts that Vandal does not list all of the dissenting journals and that journals other than the Moniteur are not available for examination, most of the dissenting ones cannot be identified.

<sup>20</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 54. For a slightly different interpretation of this event see Louis Adolphe Thiers, History of the Consulate and the Empire of France under Napoleon (12 vols; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1893), I, 81. Hereafter cited as Thiers, History of the Consulate.

<sup>21</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 54.



one defender. The moderate Republican l'Ami des lois stated that while it did not equate Bonaparte with Cromwell, if Bonaparte should abuse the military powers, break his pact with the French people, and by violence dispel the various factions which were in evidence in the Tribune, the French must find a Washington of their own to lead them to republicanism such as was found in America.<sup>22</sup>

The outcry of the press, the various interpretations that were put upon the actions that took place in the Tribune, were of a nature that could not be allowed to continue. France was already torn apart by conflict. The journal's in reporting the meeting as they saw fit, in accordance with their own political wishes, were inciting the people to lose confidence in a government which had barely begun to function. If allowed to continue unchecked, the press would succeed only in aiding the overthrow of the Brumairists. The people's minds were indoctrinated with the idea that a legislative uprising such as had just taken place usually preceded a coup or an uprising in the government.<sup>23</sup> Such beliefs, of course, Bonaparte and the Brumairists could not allow at this time. The next step was now clear, the press had to be controlled somehow.

In answer to the journal's reports on the stormy first meeting of the Tribune, Bonaparte had the Moniteur print on 8 January 1800,

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., II, 55.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., II, 53.

that in the Tribune there was no real opposition to the government.<sup>24</sup> The people who had spoken against the government were merely people who wished to draw attention to themselves and to have their names brought to the public's attention. However, the journals still did not stop printing the news as they saw fit.<sup>25</sup> More stringent measures were necessary.

In a meeting on 16 January 1800, Bonaparte pondered what action to take with regard to the press. Pierre-Louis Roederer, who was present at this meeting, along with Charles François Lebrun, Jean-Jacques Cambacérès and others, agreed with one of Bonaparte's suggestions that each province be allowed only one journal and Paris be allowed a total of six.<sup>26</sup> Another suggestion was that papers be submitted to the Senate for approval. Cambacérès feared the danger that might result from leaving such approval to the Senate. Lebrun proposed that a tax be placed on journals and control be exercised in that manner. They finally agreed to limit publications and the terms appeared in the

---

<sup>24</sup>Moniteur, Octidi, 18 Nivôse, An 8, #108, 1.

<sup>25</sup>Thiers, History of the Consulate, I, 83.

<sup>26</sup>Even though France had been divided administratively into departments and arrondissements, the old divisions were still referred to as provinces.

consular decree of 17 January 1800.<sup>27</sup> This decree, known as the Law of 27 Nivôse, stated that the Minister of Police allow, during the duration of the war, the publication of only thirteen newspapers within the Department of the Seine.<sup>28</sup> The decree also stated that all journals concerned exclusively with the sciences, arts, literature, commerce, announcements, and notices were not suppressed. The Minister of the Police was to report on all journals printed in other departments and make certain that no new papers were printed within the Department of the Seine or any other departments of the Republic. The owners and editors of the journals affected by the decree were to present themselves to the Minister of Police to swear fidelity to the Constitution, to their quality as Frenchmen, and to give their place of residence and their signature. Also suppressed were all journals which showed a lack of respect for the social pact, the sovereignty of the people, the glory of the armies, or that published anything derogatory against the government or friends of the governments allied with the Republic.

---

<sup>27</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 71; Laborie Consulat, I, 207. For a different interpretation of this event see Welschinger, La Censure, 87, and Louis Madelin, Fouché 1759-1820 (2 vols; 5th ed., Paris: Plon-Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>, Imprimeurs Éditeurs, 1923), I, 295, note 2. Hereafter cited as Madelin, Fouché.

<sup>28</sup>Le Moniteur Universal, Le Journal des Débats et des Décrets, Le Journal de Paris; Le Bien-Informé, Le Publiciste, L'Ami des Lois, La Clef du Cabinet, Le Citoyen-Française, La Gazette de France, Le Journal des Homes-Libres, Le Journal du Soir, par les frères Chaigneau; Le Journal des Défenseurs de la Patrie, La Décade Philosophique. For text of decree see Moniteur, Nonidi, 29 Nivôse, An, 8, #119, 472.

or extracted from foreign journals any such articles.<sup>29</sup> Thus the papers in Paris were reduced from seventy-three to thirteen. The public accepted the decree calmly and peacefully and some people even expressed pleasure that now the detestable writings would finally cease.<sup>30</sup> Thus the door was opened wide to arbitrary censorship by the head of state in concert with the police.<sup>31</sup>

In any discussion of censorship one must contend not only with Napoleon Bonaparte, but also with another less well-known figure, the Minister of Police - Joseph Fouché. When Napoleon seized power in November 1799, he appointed Fouché as Minister of Police, a man who had earned a reputation for excellence while Minister of Police under the Directory.<sup>32</sup> He was a known Jacobin, regicide, terrorist --- an all around man of the Revolution. For these reasons Bonaparte felt that Fouché would help control the revolutionary factions within France.<sup>33</sup> By the decree of 17 Nivôse the power to stop journals from operating, to screen editors, to report on what papers said, and though it was not

---

<sup>29</sup> Bulletin de Lois de la République Française, B.N. 345, #3535, 17 January 1800, Series 2, IX, 910.

<sup>30</sup> Thiers, History of the Consulate, I, 20. Also see Ernest d' Hauterive, Napoléon et Sa police (France: Collection "L'Histoire", Flammarion, 1943), 159. Hereafter cited as Hauterive, Napoléon police.

<sup>31</sup> Welschinger, La Censure, 13.

<sup>32</sup> Marian Purrier Nelson, "The Napoleonic Police under the Administration of Joseph Fouché, 1799-1810" (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Omaha, 1967), 16-18. Hereafter cited as Nelson, "Napoleonic Police."

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 19.

spelled out in so many words, the power to decide what was considered anti-government rested with the Minister of Police. Any task which was under the Ministry of Police was also under Fouché. He was not a man to delegate positions without being certain he would know exactly what was going on throughout those areas for which he was responsible. Fouché was not a man to subordinate himself to any master but he and Napoleon worked well together, with a few exceptions, for some nine years.<sup>34</sup> What was the real function of Fouché in the role of censorship? The role, like the man himself, is difficult to trace, ambiguous and twisting; however, there is little doubt that Fouché was the ultimate authority behind most steps taken with regard to censorship in France from 1800 to 1810.

Fouché soon proved his competence to the Provisional Consulate. With regard to censorship he did nothing in the first few days after Brumaire. The people were happy; let them savor this new sensation for a while. The brutal treatment to which the press had been subjected under the Directory ceased. During the six weeks of the Provisional Consulate only one journal was persecuted. Both the editor and the printer of the notoriously Royalist journal, l'Aristarque, were arrested. However, the two men were released shortly after their

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 19-44.

arrest and suffered only a reprimand from the Central Bureau.<sup>35</sup>

Fouché, regardless of this time of relative inactivity, was the master of the press.<sup>36</sup> He controlled directly some of the comments repeated in the Journal des Hommes-Libres in a rather devious manner and one that should serve to illustrate just how this man's mind functioned. The Journal des Hommes-Libres, also known at various times as Ennemi des oppresseurs de tous les temps, Journal des hommes, and Journal des républicains, was known as a Jacobin journal. Shortly after Brumaire, Fouché, rather than suppressing the journal, endeavoured to control it. He managed to gain control of the journal by appointing as its principal editor one Méhée de la Touche.<sup>37</sup> The journal then, while it enjoyed a reputation of being a free agent and a Jacobin journal, was in reality under the control of Fouché. If this journal spoke against any adverse reaction to Brumaire it immediately seemed that the Jacobins supported Bonaparte. On the contrary, if it spoke

---

<sup>35</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, I. 463.

Bonaparte, while reorganizing internal administration, replaced the Central Bureau with the Prefecture of Paris in 1800. Under the Directory, the Central Bureau functioned much as a police headquarters to the city of Paris. For a complete breakdown on how the police functioned under Fouché see Nelson, "Napoleonic Police."

<sup>36</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, I, 463; Godechot, Les Institutions, 658.

<sup>37</sup>Madelin, Fouché, I, 277.

Méhée was a regicide and responsible for signing the order for the September massacres in 1792.

against something that the Royalists had done it would appear that it was only running down its opposition since anything the Royalists favored the Jacobins automatically suspected. By being the man behind the scene Fouché, through judicious insertion of editorials or slanted news items, controlled the feelings ascribed to the Jacobins and at the same time conveyed to the rest of Paris the impression that this was the Jacobin view. The control also would have benefited Fouché in the event the Brumairists were overthrown. Fouché would then have had a well-oiled instrument for expressing whatever views he thought expedient.<sup>38</sup> Even though the government took no immediate action against the press, within twelve days after Brumaire Fouché had shown the journals and papers what to expect from him. He wrote that in the future there would be no communications to journalists, no billeting, nor notes issued without police approval.<sup>39</sup> Now this man, by a decree of 17 January, held what amounted to dictatorial powers over the press of Paris and France.

Immediately following the Law of 17 Nivôse some of the suppressed journals continued to print news. However, these journals were quickly seized and their plants closed. By these examples other such acts were discouraged. The Paris journals now numbered thirteen. One of the reasons for the retention of the thirteen journals was that they possessed an established clientele and substantial fame.<sup>40</sup> In effect,

---

<sup>38</sup> Vandal, L'Avènement, I, 463-64.

<sup>39</sup> Godechot, Les Institutions, 655; Welschinger, La Censure, 82.

<sup>40</sup> Laborie, Consulat, I, 209.

the Consuls had perpetrated a type of miniature Fructidor except that instead of proscribing journalists they suppressed journals. The journals of the extreme right were, in effect, executed "en masse."<sup>41</sup> The thirteen remaining journals felt themselves forced to heap praise upon the Consuls. However, they attempted by delicate slanting to put forth their political opinions. The Journal des Hommes-Libres remained the voice of the Jacobins. The Journal de Paris and Le Publiciste approved the decrees of 27 Nivôse and maintained that during the reconstruction of the government and the duration of the war some discipline was necessary. The Gazette de France desired that the Consulate resemble as much as possible the ancien régime and its editorial tone reflected this desire.<sup>42</sup> In effect the Law of 27 Nivôse had not stopped the press from attempting to influence public opinion in one way or another and that influence the First Consul did not desire.

The Directory, attempting to explain the suppression of the press, had found it necessary to report periodically the discovery of plots against itself. These propagandistic reports were not believed by the public. Now, it was just the opposite. The journals reported plots against the government, some true, some not, and the people believed them. However, the government did not desire such items printed. To stop this type of reporting the Consuls took urgent action. Since the Jacobins were particularly amenable to violent overthrow of authority,

---

<sup>41</sup>Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 72.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., II, 296.



the Journal des Hommes-Libres was suppressed in April 1800. The freedom to put up posters, cry out the news, or print a journal or pamphlet which did not have the approval of the police was forbidden. The presentation of any play which had not been cleared by the Minister of the Interior was also forbidden.<sup>43</sup> The orders did not meet with Fouché's approval. Bonaparte had moved overtly against the Jacobins and Fouché did not feel that this was advisable. In a meeting with Bonaparte and Lucien, Fouché expressed his opinion and he and Lucien argued violently over the advisability of suppressing the Jacobins. The police reports for the next day or two, which were submitted to Bonaparte, were slanted in such a manner that it appeared that only the Royalists were responsible for the agitation which existed. Within three days of its suppression the Journal des Hommes-Libres was in operation again.<sup>44</sup>

In the operation of censorship there was not under the Consulate a clear division of duties. Fouché and his subordinates<sup>45</sup> were charged with carrying out the actual suppressions of papers and policing the theatres. The Ministry of Police had no clear cut order to be responsible for the content of the papers, or what the theatre presented. The Ministry did not hold within itself the power to order changes

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., II, 339; Napoléon, Correspondence, VI, 266.

<sup>44</sup> Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 339-40.

<sup>45</sup> For a study of who these subordinates were and how they functioned within the department see Nelson, "Napoleonic Police," Chapter III.

in the written or spoken word. There was no law sanctioned by a legally constituted body which provided for censorship,<sup>46</sup> but it was practiced in varying degrees of severity.<sup>47</sup> Who held ultimate control over what was inserted in the papers? Bonaparte gave this question consideration and heard varying opinions on the matter. Joseph Fiévée, former editor of the Chronique de Paris and an advisor to Bonaparte,<sup>48</sup> agreed that the Police should have the power to suppress the papers but did not feel that they should have the power to dictate what the papers said. Fiévée and Fouché were enemies of long standing and this may have had some bearing on Fiévée's opinions. However, he put forth the idea that the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Justice should dictate what the press printed and the ultimate decision should rest with the First Consul. The greater part of these deliberations took place from February 1800 until the end of the year. The result was that Bonaparte did not follow Fiévée's suggestion and while he did not issue a decree to the effect that the police would dictate what was printed, he did allow Fouché a fairly free hand with regard to what the papers printed or did not print.<sup>49</sup> By the end of 1800 the police dictated to the

---

<sup>46</sup>Godechot, Les Institutions, 658; Laborie, Consulat, I, 216. Censorship was not legally established until 5 February 1810.

<sup>47</sup>Hauterive, Napoléon police, 198.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., 159. Also see J. Fiévée Correspondence et Relations de J. Fiévée avec Bonaparte Premier Consul et Empereur. Pendant onze années (1802-1815), (3 vols; Paris: Collection Universelle, 1837). Hereafter cited as Fiévée, Correspondence.

<sup>49</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 16; Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 71.

existing journals what to print and they gave explicit instructions at times not to mention a certain name or event.<sup>50</sup>

The First Consul on 5 April 1800, directed Fouché to determine that the editors of journals were of good faith and patriotic nature, were not corrupt, and that in the future every journal printed would be required to carry the signature of an approved editor.<sup>51</sup> Under this directive Fouché installed a bureau of the press within the Ministry of Police to survey journals and books. A chief of this division and examining officials under him had charge of the work. The Prefect of the Police in Paris received orders that he should allow no postings on the walls of the city without his approval.

The theatre came now under the control of the Minister of the Interior who had the duty to approve all theatricals produced. The Minister approved all plays presented in Paris; in the provinces the prefects examined new plays and sent reports to the Minister of the Interior. As for old plays, the directors of the plays must submit a résumé for ministerial approval. Such were the preliminaries of theatrical censorship.<sup>52</sup>

The First Consul was kept current on all publications. Louis-Madeleine Ripault, reader to the First Consul, had charge of analyzing

---

<sup>50</sup>Laborie, Consulat, I, 211.

<sup>51</sup>Godechot, Les Institutions, 655.

<sup>52</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 13-14.

all the journals printed on religion, philosophy, and politics.<sup>53</sup> He was also to analyze books, plays, wall posters, placards, and announcements and to submit a report each day to the First Consul.<sup>54</sup>

As the Consular regime progressed the government censored or suppressed journals for a variety of reasons.<sup>55</sup> A provincial journal, the Républicain démocrate (d'Auch) was suppressed for speaking of a rise in the price of grain; a fact brought to Lucien's attention as Minister of the Interior by the prefect of Gers and the suppression was ordered by Lucien.<sup>56</sup> On 28 May 1800, the Consuls issued an order to suppress l'Ami des lois for having dared to ridicule the Institute of Paris.<sup>57</sup> The Correspondence des Councils nationale was seized in the month of August 1801, for ultramontaine opinions. On 10 August the Moniteur announced the suppression of l'Antidote which was ". . . full of horrible maxims which will produce all kinds of trouble." It is

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 14; Napoléon Correspondence, VI, 533.

<sup>54</sup> Welschinger, La Censure, 15; Godechot, Les Institutions, 656; Napoléon Correspondence, VII, 254-55; Hauterive, Napoléon police, 160.

<sup>55</sup> All succeeding material in this paragraph, unless otherwise noted, is taken from Welschinger, La Censure, 82-86.

<sup>56</sup> Godechot, Les Institutions, 656; Holtman, Propaganda, 46; Welschinger, La Censure, 82.

<sup>57</sup> Vandal, L'Avènement, II, 393; Holtman, Propaganda, 45.

It is interesting to note the action by the Consuls was taken when Bonaparte was in Italy. When he heard of it he wrote a lengthy diatribe to the Consuls, to the effect that they should not have issued such an order and that liberty of the press must be allowed at all costs. Napoléon Correspondence, VI, 432. For further enlightenment regarding the dichotomy of Napoleon's views on censorship see A. du Casse, (ed.) Mémoires et Correspondence politique et militaire de Prince Eugène (10 vols; Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1859), I, 124, 145, 158. Napoléon Correspondence, X, 634, 651.

interesting to note that this order was countersigned by the infamous M<sup>h</sup>ée.<sup>58</sup> On 25 September the Prefect of Police of Paris, Louis Nicolas Pierre Joseph Dubois, issued a notice to stop for the moment the circulation and sale of the Journal des Débats and Gazette de France for reproducing a story on the Pope and nineteen Bishops who were exiled in London.<sup>59</sup> Dubois also served notice at this time, by order of Fouché, from Bonaparte, that any other journals which mentioned religion or ministers were to be subject to the same fate.<sup>60</sup>

The various censors used their authority in curious ways.<sup>61</sup> The issue of 2 October 1801 Gazette de France was censored because it had made a joke about doormen. Why this should so offend the censors is not clear. The censor, Beaulieu, spoke in 1802 of making a ". . . small correction . . ." in a story that a paper had printed. The small correction consisted of suppressing the journal and imprisoning the editor. The seizures, suppressions, and arbitrary measures multiplied. The owners of the Publiciste, were forced to submit to Fouché's desire that Marigniez be editor of their journal. Provincial journals also were censored, and the government took action to protect Frenchmen from French language papers published abroad. Mengaud, Commissioner-General of the ports of Manche and Pas-de-Calais demanded on 29 August 1802,

---

<sup>58</sup> Moniteur, Duodi, 22 Thermidor, An 9, #322, 1.

<sup>59</sup> Godechot, Les Institutions, 656.

<sup>60</sup> Napoléon, Correspondence, VII, 272.

<sup>61</sup> All succeeding material in this paragraph, unless otherwise noted, is taken from Welschinger, La Censure, 82-86.

that the Minister of Police take action against English journals that attacked Bonaparte. The Gazette de Leyde was seized on 2 September 1802, at the frontier and its circulation forbidden in France. The same treatment was accorded the Spectateur de Nord.

Censorship did not apply only to papers, journals, and theatres. It also applied to books but in a slightly different manner. There was no definite commission for reviewing books until 27 September 1803. At that time by Consular decree, a revisionary commission was established and was to receive from the Prefect of the Police a copy of all books printed.<sup>62</sup> They were to pass judgment upon the contents and report to the Grand Judge who would in turn report to Napoleon. In 1803, then, the censorship of books was placed under the Minister of Justice. From 1800 to 1804, however, the Fifth Division of the Police had the job of surveying all printing and book shops.<sup>63</sup> Contents of the books were not changed or passages deleted, but the entire book was suppressed.<sup>64</sup>

The police in 1800 brought forth a grave question in the affair of

---

<sup>62</sup>From available sources it would appear that the prefect was the Prefect of Paris.

<sup>63</sup>There is an overlap of a few months here in which it has been impossible to ascertain if both the commission and the police division functioned or if one or the other was supreme.

<sup>64</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 16-18.

a brochure<sup>65</sup> entitled Parallèle entre César, Cromwell, Monk, et Bonaparte. This brochure was supposedly written by Fontanes, a writer of the reactionary partisans, but it has been fairly well-established that Lucien was really behind it and probably at the express order of the First Consul.<sup>66</sup> When the brochure appeared it caused a most unfavorable feeling against Bonaparte. A man who could never admit that he had made an error,<sup>67</sup> Bonaparte was furious at the reaction the publication of the brochure had produced and especially singled out Fouché for having allowed it to get into print. Fouché ordered the brochure seized and issued a statement that the book was part of a treasonous plot against the government.<sup>68</sup> The affair, so far as the public was concerned, quieted down but there were repercussions in the relationship of Fouché, Bonaparte, and Lucien. Bonaparte had to find someone to take the blame for his own miscalculation and Lucien fitted the requirements. He relieved his brother of the Ministry of the Interior and sent him to Spain. But where did the guilt lie for having allowed the brochure to get into print? True, Bonaparte approved it

---

<sup>65</sup>Welschinger in his chapter entitled Des Livres uses the terms livres, brochure, and pamphlet when speaking of the various publications.

<sup>66</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 133; Madelin, Fouché, I, 332.

<sup>67</sup>M. Fauvelet de Bourrienne, Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte, tran. from the French by John S. Memes (3 vols; New York: P. F. Collier, 1892) I, 244.

<sup>68</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 134; Madelin, Fouché, I, 333.

but only after having received advice from someone that it was the thing to do at the time. The person behind the advice was Joseph Fouché.<sup>69</sup> The affair was one of the reasons for the ultimate dismissal of Fouché in 1802 from the Ministry of Police. Bonaparte never forgave Fouché for having discovered the entire plot and the role Bonaparte played.<sup>70</sup> Other books or brochures and pamphlets were censored also. The police seized on 5 December 1801 a brochure entitled l'Émigration which had fomented trouble among people holding land previously owned by émigrés.<sup>71</sup> There was anxiety among the people holding former nobles' land as to whether or not the government planned to return the land to the émigrés. The Cri de l'Humanité pour les victimes engorgées sous Robespierre was suppressed on 13 December for it had stirred up bad memories. The Lettre d'un Française was suppressed on 26 December for writing about the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. Another book vigorously proscribed by the Minister of Police was one which had already been suppressed under the Directory. Considérations sur la France by Comte Joseph de Maistre, was most severe in its judgments against the men of the Revolution and called on the French to

---

<sup>69</sup> Pierre-Louis Roederer, Mémoires sur La Révolution Le Consulat et L'Empire (Textes choisis et présentés par Octave Aubry; Paris: Les Petite-Fils de Plon et Nourrit, Imprimeurs Éditeurs, 1942) 153-54.

<sup>70</sup> Welschinger, La Censure, 135.

<sup>71</sup> All succeeding material in this paragraph, unless otherwise noted, is taken from Welschinger, La Censure, 136-57.



think again of their King. In 1802, a member of the old Five Hundred, Camille Jordan, incurred Bonaparte's wrath by the publication of a book entitled Le vrai sens du vote national sur le Consulat à vie. Jordan supported the motion of a Consulate for life but he advocated having certain guarantees such as the end of arbitrary arrest, ministerial responsibility, and liberty for the press. The book was seized and Jordan held under arrest for a time. Certain books, however, escaped the notice of the censors because they were worded in such a way that their meaning was not immediately clear. Abbé Delille's Poèmes de la Pitié,<sup>72</sup> was one such book. Fiévée finally brought this work to the First Consul's attention and Bonaparte, as a result wrote to his Minister of Justice, Claude Aubroise Régnier, on 7 July 1803, telling him to allow seven days for the study of a book before it was authorized for publication.<sup>73</sup> Pamphlets against the First Consul were printed in profusion in London, Berlin, and Fauche-Borel by Royalist agents. The dramatist Geoffrey on 3 June 1803, was ordered to delete from his work Commentaire des oeuvres de Racine a passage dealing with the excesses of anarchy and tyranny. All books which dealt with military matters were prohibited unless cleared by the Ministry of War.<sup>74</sup> The censors did perform one service for France, in the opinion of some

---

<sup>72</sup>Abbé Jacques Delille was a French poet noted for his translation of Milton and ". . . famous for his ingenious method of paraphrasing." Dictionnaire Encyclopédique Pour Tous Petit Larousse (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1964, 19<sup>e</sup> Tirage), 1309.

<sup>73</sup>Napoléon, Correspondence, VIII, 491.

<sup>74</sup>Holtman, Propaganda, 79.

perhaps. They suppressed the writings of the erotic-maniac, the Marquis de Sade. He had the audacity to offer his Justine and Juliette to the First Consul. Bonaparte promptly threw the work into the fire; the censors seized all copies and de Sade was arrested.

Thus, though Bonaparte insisted censorship did not exist in France, it is clear that controls did exist. Perhaps the country was a bit more quiet, but it was a bit less free, and without warning France drifted closer to tyranny.

## CHAPTER III

### CONCLUSION

When Napoleon became Emperor on 18 May 1804 and although his feelings on the press were well known he had inserted in section VIII of the senatus consultum establishing the imperial government articles LXIV through LXVII a senatorial commission called the liberty of the press. The commission was composed of seven members chosen from the Senate elected by ballot by the Senators. Any authors, printers, or bookmakers could take their grievances directly to the commission. However, upon close examination of these articles in the senatus consultum, one discovers that these works had to be printed and distributed by subscription and within a certain time or they did not come under the jurisdiction of the commission.<sup>1</sup> In reality the periodic press had no guarantee.<sup>2</sup> A decree of 9 July 1804 reestablished to the Minister of Police, with the scope or jurisdiction of the high police, the surveillance of journals and books. The independence of journals was nonexistent. It rested solely on the arbitrary power of of the police.<sup>3</sup> Napoleon spoke of the press in general as ". . . my

---

<sup>1</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française 226; Hauterive, Napoléon police, 157. Additional comments on the essential futility and cumbersomeness of these articles are also made by Deslandres, Histoire Constitutionnelle, I, 568.

<sup>2</sup> Mitton, La Presse Française, 227; Hauterive, Napoléon police, 157; Welschinger, La Censure, 18-19.

<sup>3</sup> Hauterive, Napoléon police, 157.

journals."<sup>4</sup>

After 1804 with the return of that redoubtable Minister, Joseph Fouché, Napoleon continued his vigilance of the printed word but he had a more reliable censorship organ than previously - Fouché and the police.<sup>5</sup> It is one of the interesting facts of the First Empire that one man (Napoleon) held absolute control over so many varied facets of life in France.<sup>6</sup> Napoleon had reports coming directly to him from all parts of the Empire and by and large these were accurate reports considering the size, complexity, and divergences of the people and areas controlled. As previously mentioned Fiévée was invaluable to Napoleon as his personal reporter but he relied upon a number of people to report to him on the events in his Empire.<sup>7</sup> There is little doubt in this writer's mind, however, that one of the main supports of Napoleon's surveillance system, if not the main support, was Fouché.

Napoleon, by a series of decrees issued on 10 July 1804 recalled Fouché to the post of Minister of the Police, and established that the surveillance of journals was exclusively the province of the Minister of the general police.<sup>8</sup> The men Fouché gathered to work under him, such as Pierre-Marie Desmarest, head of the secret police, concerned themselves

---

<sup>4</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 227.

<sup>5</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 59.

<sup>6</sup>Hauterive, Napoléon police, 32.

<sup>7</sup>Nelson, "Napoleonic police", 97; Welschinger, La Censure, 67-68.

<sup>8</sup>Godechot, Les Institutions, 658.

with all the services of the press. Fouché and the police now had the power to slant the news. Previously this had not been true. Napoleon in his correspondence to Fouché had shown a marked preference for detailed planning of articles and slanting of events to produce the effect he desired.<sup>9</sup> Fouché later received only broad orders to produce a particular effect on the public's mind; the details were left to the Minister.<sup>10</sup> A decree of 10 July 1804 divided all France into four arrondissements and put at the head of each a Concillor of State. These four men were Pierre-François Réal, Pélet de la Lozère, Miot and Dubois. Such an administrative move thus relieved Fouché of much of the routine of surveillance but allowed him to have complete reports on every facet of the French press.<sup>11</sup>

There is ample evidence that while Fouché did an excellent job of keeping the press under control on his own, Napoleon was ever aware of what was happening. Napoleon's correspondence contains many examples of this awareness.<sup>12</sup> Letters were constantly being written by Napoleon from wherever he might be instructing Fouché to take specific steps to

---

<sup>9</sup>Napoléon, Correspondence, X, 532, 557-78, 688-98.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., XIV, 157, XVI, 165.

<sup>11</sup>Godechot, Les Institutions, 530; Le Poittevin, La Liberté, 116-17. For a more detailed knowledge of how the concillors worked and in what areas, see Nelson, "Napoleonic police," 48-49.

For a complete list of type and number of journals printed and/or circulated in each department see Welschinger, La Censure, 290-93.

<sup>12</sup>Napoléon, Correspondence, VI-X.

stop a rumor or to plant a story.<sup>13</sup> According to one authority the content of any printed matter could be traced to one or another governmental source by the headings affixed to the document. For example, articles headed "politique" came direct from the Emperor's cabinet; if printed in foreign journals they came by way of the appropriate minister, usually the minister of foreign relations. Everything appearing under the heading of "intérieur" was edited by the Minister of the Interior. "Paris" was comprised of articles coming by way of the cabinet from the Emperor and included résumés of assembly debates and publications of decrees. The heading "mélanges" was composed of propaganda fabricated within the ministries. Other headings included "institut," "Poésie," "Litterature," and "spectacles," all consisting of officially contrived or fabricated news.<sup>14</sup> As Napoleon traveled about Europe he read his journals closely and if something displeased or irritated him he quickly notified Fouché, often using terms that were harsh to say the least.<sup>15</sup>

Censorship under the control of the police seemed to work rather smoothly, as smoothly as control of the mind and spirit of a people can, until sometime around 1808. This time limit seems to correspond with

---

<sup>13</sup>Le Poittevin, La Liberté, 118-19; Hauterive, Napoléon police, 161. For a more complete picture as to how Napoleon managed this personal surveillance of written works see Hauterive, Napoléon police, 32; Napoléon, Correspondence, X-XIV.

<sup>14</sup>Godechot, Les Institutions, 657.

<sup>15</sup>Mitton, La Presse Française, 229; Napoléon, Correspondence, X, 536.

the beginning of Fouché's disillusionment with his Emperor.<sup>16</sup> A conclusion drawn from this would seem to be that so long as Fouché and Napoleon were in agreement the police function of censorship managed to repress the public spirit to Napoleon's satisfaction. Napoleon insisted throughout his reign, but especially until 1810, that he did not advocate any type of censorship. Between 1799 and 1810 Napoleon was most vehement in this idea - Censorship did not exist in France.<sup>17</sup> However, as Fouché became disillusioned and began to allow the police to loosen their hold on the public mind<sup>18</sup> Napoleon began to change his tactics. He still did not advocate censorship openly but he began to solicit advice from many quarters on how he might best control the opinion of the French people.<sup>19</sup> The end result of this search was a

---

<sup>16</sup> Nelson, "Napoleonic police", 119-22; Hatin, Histoire politique VII - VIII, 526; Fiévée, Correspondence, II, 262. It would appear that the disillusionment worked both ways and had from Napoleon's side for some time.

<sup>17</sup> Welschinger, La Censure, 22.

<sup>18</sup> From 1808 on Fouché became increasingly involved in trying to curb Napoleon's war policy and preserve the Empire according to his (Fouché's) own lights. It could be therefore that there was no deliberate thought in Fouché's mind to loosen police control but rather his interests in other areas caused his attention to the police to be less watchful. Nelson, "Napoleonic police," 119.

<sup>19</sup> Hauterive, Napoléon police, 203-05.

decree of 5 February 1810.<sup>20</sup> Such a measure had been in Napoleon's mind for some time<sup>21</sup> but he did not bring it to fruition until he and Fouché began to be at cross purposes. Official censorship, which had existed in one form or another ever since Napoleon came to power,<sup>22</sup> was legally recognized by the decree. Official censors were created for printing and books<sup>23</sup> and by a decree of 14 December 1810, the title Imperial Censors was put into use.<sup>24</sup>

From 1810 on the pressure Napoleon put upon his administration to control the press increased in direct proportion it seems to the lack of success of his ministers to accomplish his wishes. Fouché was no longer in control of the ministry of police. René Savary, Duc de

<sup>20</sup> For the complete text of the Decree see Moniteur, Mercredi, 7 Février 1810, #38, 156-57; Welschinger, La Censure, 279-86. Also see Frank Maloy Anderson, The Constitutions and other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France (Minneapolis: H. W. Wilson Co., 1904), 433.

The Decree of 5 February 1810 synthesized many of the previous measures taken against the press. The measures had been used since 1804, but not enacted into law until 1810.

<sup>21</sup> Welschinger, La Censure, 28.

<sup>22</sup> Hauterive, Napoléon police, 198.

<sup>23</sup> Previously censors did not bear the title "Official Censors". For names of official censors see Welschinger, La Censure, 32.

<sup>24</sup> Moniteur, Jeudi, 20 Décembre 1810, #354, 1409-10; Godechot, Les Institutions, 658; Le Poittevin, La Liberté, 61; Welschinger, La Censure, 33.



Rovigo, replaced Fouché in title but hardly in ability.<sup>25</sup> By this time the official papers printed were organized into such a system of lies that only the severest examination could gain any type of correct impression. This included those who were responsible for the papers content as well as the general public.<sup>26</sup> Savary reduced the number of papers still further than before and by a decree of 4 February 1811 the number of papers in Paris was reduced to four; the Moniteur, Journal de l'Empire, Gazette de France, and Journal de Paris. All other journals were suppressed and all their assets were confiscated.<sup>27</sup>

The most important time period in the First Empire with regard to the Administration of censorship was undoubtedly from Brumaire through 1804. Within that time period the actual manner in which censorship was to function was tried, refined and set. The relationship of the French people with their Emperor was a good one in light of their previous leaders' relationships. The timing was well planned for censorship to work if it was ever going to work. Research indicates that effective censorship was a reality as long as the administrators were effective competent men with faith in their leader. When their faith began to break down and the ablest of men were no longer

---

<sup>25</sup>Welschinger, La Censure, 77.

<sup>26</sup>Holtman, Propaganda, 59.

<sup>27</sup>Moniteur, Jeudi, 7 Février 1811, #58, 146; Godechot, Les Institutions, 658.

committed to an idea and a leader the administration of censorship became a sometime thing. In certain cases such glaring errors were made as to lead one to think Napoleon's subordinates were deliberately allowing inaccuracies so as to bring to the reading public's attention the fact that it was being duped.<sup>28</sup>

There is much room for speculation on what happened after the machinery began to break down. Was it deliberate on the part of certain men in the government of the First Empire or did it give way because of the ponderous weight of its own bureaucracy? Did Napoleon lose interest or see that censorship, no matter what he did, was a non-viable entity? If other matters had not intervened could the man who so greatly influenced late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Europe have added one more achievement to the long list history has attached to him whether in admiration or disdain? The questions go on to be answered perhaps at another time and in another framework. Censorship was a living thing, it was administered by a coterie of dedicated individuals and it did affect the Napoleonic government as well as the people and countries connected with or who came in contact with that government.

---

<sup>28</sup>Holtman, Propaganda, 202.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### SOURCES

#### A. Public Documents

Anderson, Frank Maloy (ed.) The Constitutions and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France, 1789 - 1901. Minneapolis: H. W. Wilson Co., 1904.

Brotonne, Leonce de. Dernières Lettres Inédites de Napoléon I<sup>er</sup>. 2 vols. Paris: Honore Champion, Libraire, 1903.

France. Bulletin des Lois de la République Française. (Series 2). (Brumaire 1799 - 1804).

Lecestre, Léon. Lettres Inédites de Napoléon I<sup>er</sup> (An VIII - 1815). 2 vols. 2nd ed. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1897.

Napoléon. Correspondence de Napoléon I<sup>er</sup>. 32 vols. (Vols. I - XX). Paris: Imprimerie Imperiale, 1858 - 1869.

#### B. Memoirs

Abrantes, Laure Saint-Martin Junot, duchess d'. Memoirs of the Emperor Napoleon, from Ajaccio to Waterloo, as a Soldier, Emperor, Husband. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: M. W. Dunne, 1901.

Bourrienne, M. Fauvelet de. Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte. 3 vols. Translated from the French by John S. Memes. New York: P. F. Collier, 1892.

Casse, A. du (ed.) Mémoires et Correspondence politique et militaire du Prince Eugène. 10 vols. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1859.

Constant, Mémoires de Constant, Premier Valet de Chambre de L'Empereur sur la vie Privée de Napoleon sa famille et sa cour. 4 vols. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1910 - 1919.

Fiévée, J. Correspondence et Relations de J. Fiévée avec Bonaparte Premier Consul et Empereur. Pendant onze années (1802 - 1815). 3 vols. Paris: Collection Universelle, 1837.

Miot. Memoires of Count Miot de Melito, minister, ambassador, councillor of State, and member of the Institute of France, between 1788 and 1815. Edited by General Fleischmann from the French by Mrs. Cashel Hoey and Mr. John Lillie. London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1881.

## BOOKS

- Abbott, John S. C. The History of Napoleon Bonaparte. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1855.
- Aulard, Alphonse. Paris sous le Consulat. 4 vols. Paris: Librairie Leopold Cerf, 1903.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paris sous le premier empire: recueil de documents pour l'histoire de l'esprit public a Paris. 3 vols. Paris: L. Cerf, 1912 - 1923.
- Bachman, Albert. Censorship in France from 1715 to 1750: Voltaires Opposition. (Publication of the Institute of French Studies, Inc.) New York: Columbia University, 1934.
- Beyle, Marie Henri. A Life of Napoleon by Stendahl. Translated by The Rodale Press. London: The Rodale Press, 1956.
- Bourdan, John. Napoléon au Conseil d'etat. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1963.
- Castelot, André. Josephine: A Biography. Translated by Denise Folliot. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Napoleon. Translated from the French by Guy Daniels. 1st ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Cronin, Vincent. Napoleon Bonaparte An Intimate Biography. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1973.
- Deslandres, Maurice. Histoire Constitutionnelle De La France De 1789 à 1870. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1932.
- Dictionnaire Encyclopédique Pour Tous Petit Larousse. 19<sup>e</sup> Tirage. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1964.
- Droz, Joseph. Histoire Du Regne du Louis XVI. 3 vols. Nouvelle Edition. Paris: V<sup>e</sup> Jules Renouard, Éditeur, 1860.
- Forssell, Nils. Fouche: The Man Napoleon Feared. Translated by Anna Barwell. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1928.

- Fournier, August. Napoleon I. Translated by Annie Elizabeth Adams. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912.
- Gaxotte, Pierre. Le Siècle de Louis XV. Paris: Arthème Fayard et C<sup>ie</sup>, Éditeurs, 1933.
- Godechot, Jacques. Les Institutions la France sous la Revolution et l'Empire. Paris: Imprimerie des Universitaires de France, 1951.
- Hatin, Eugene Louis. Histoire politique et litteraire de la presse en France. 8 vols. Paris: Poulet-Mallassis Et De Broise, Librairies-Éditeurs, 1859.
- Hauterive, Ernest d'. La Contre-police Royaliste en 1800. 2nd ed. Paris: Librairie Academique Perrin, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. La Police Secrète du Premier Empire 1804 - 1810. 4 vols. Paris: Librairie Perrin et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1908 - 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Napoléon et sa police. Paris: Flammarion et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1943.
- Holtman, Robert B. Napoleonic Propaganda. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950.
- Howard, John Eldred. Letters and Documents of Napoleon. Selected and translated by J. E. Howard. 1 vol. published to date. London: The Cresset Press, 1961.
- Kircheisen, F. M. Napoleon. Translated by Henry St. Lawrence. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1864.
- Laborie, L. de Lanzac de. Consulat Provisoire et Consulate À Temps. 8 vols. Paris: Plon Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1905.
- Lavisse, Ernest. Histoire de France contemporaine depuis la revolution jusqu'à la paix de 1919. 10 vols. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1911.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la revolution. 9 vols. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1926.
- Madelin, Louis. Fouché 1759 - 1820. 2 vols. 5th ed. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1923.
- Mitton, Fernand. La Presse Française Des Origines a la Révolution. Paris: Guy Le Prat, 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. La Presse Française Sous La Révolution, Le Consulat, L'Empire. Paris: Guy Le Prat, 1945.

- Perkins, James Breck. France under Mazarin. 2 vols. 3rd ed. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons; The Knickerbocker Press, 1887.
- \_\_\_\_\_. France Under The Regency. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin and Company; The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1901.
- Poittevin, Gustave Le. Le Liberté de la presse depuis la révolution 1789 - 1815. Paris: Arthur Rousseau, Éditeur, 1901.
- Pottinger, David T. The French Book Trade in the Ancien Regime 1500 - 1791. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Pratt, Fletcher. The Empire and the Glory: Napoleon Bonaparte 1800 - 1806. New York: William Sloan Associates, Inc., 1949.
- Razi, G. M. Le Droit sur les Nouvelles. Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1952.
- Real, Pierre F. Indiscretions of a Prefect of Police. London: Cassell, 1929.
- Roederer, Pierre-Louis. Mémoires sur La Révolution Le Consulate et L'Empire. (Textes choisis et présentes par Octave Aubry.) Paris: Les Petite-Fils de Plon et Nourrit, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, 1942.
- Sloane, William Milligan. The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte. 4 vols. New York: The Century Company, 1916.
- Thiers, Louis Adolphe. History of the Consulate and the Empire of France Under Napoleon. 12 vols. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1893.
- Thompson, James M. Napoleon Bonaparte. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Vandal, Albert. L'Avènement de Bonaparte. 2 vols. 17th ed. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>., 1911.
- Welschinger, Henri. La Censure Sous le Premier Empire. Paris: Charavaz Freres-Editeurs, 1882.

#### PERIODICALS

- Coffin, Victor. "Censorship and literature under Napoleon I, "  
American Historical Review. XXII (January, 1917), 288-308.

## NEWSPAPERS

Le Moniteur Universal, Year VIII - 1810.

## UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Nelson, Marian Purrier. "The Napoleonic Police under the Administration of Joseph Fouché, 1800 - 1810." Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Omaha, 1967.