

LATEST NEWS OF THE WORLD BY TELEGRAPH AND CABLE.

CONTINUED ON PAGES 5 AND 6

MORE TESTIMONY FOR DREYFUS

Handwriting Experts Shatter the Measurements of M. Bertillon.

ONE CANDID WITNESS

In 1894 He Was Against Dreyfus, but Was Now Convinced of His Innocence - Swears Esterhazy Wrote the Bordereau - Admiration For Major Freysmayer - Facts Opposed to Inferences Furnished the Court by General Mercier.

(By Telegraph to Virginian-Pilot.)

London, Aug. 28.—The balance of the evidence today, for a change, was in favor of Dreyfus. Five witnesses were for him and two against him. The most interesting testimony was that of Chief Handwriting Expert Charavay, who had come to declare he had changed entirely his opinion, which, in 1894, was against and now is in favor of Dreyfus, whom he today affirmed was not the author of the bordereau.

His candid confession of error was received with murmurs of satisfaction in court, which became discreet applause in spite of Col. Jouanin's patient disapproval when he solemnly added: "I declare here, on my soul and conscience, that the bordereau was written by Esterhazy."

A ONE-SIDED ARRANGEMENT.

The important incident, however, was Col. Jouanin's response to Major Carrière's request that a rogatory committee be instructed to take Col. Freysmayer's deposition.

The initial deposition from the Government commissary, Major Lacroix, and Demange having no faith in any measure, because it allows Du Paty de Clam to escape cross-examination, which is the only thing worth having in the present communication. Du Paty de Clam being a witness for the prosecution, Major Carrière was obliged to prepare a list of questions which an examining magistrate will put to Du Paty de Clam at his residence, and no body supposes that the witness will be very much embarrassed by the interrogatories.

THE MANLY FREYSMAYER.

Today the central figure in the courtroom is the modest pilot, for all the leading personages of that day during the last process, was Captain Freysmayer, who was the subject of many flattering remarks upon his manly and soldierly-like bearing. Indeed, the interest in him was so great that some persons walked all night long outside the door of the court in order to obtain standing room in the rear part of the courtroom, in the hope of seeing him at today's sitting, an impression having gone abroad that he might be removed.

His modest and frank manner inspired admiration in all except the Generals and the other military witnesses for the prosecution, who seemed afraid of him and showed in his direction from the other side of the court-yard. Captain Freysmayer will not remain here until the end of the trial, but will leave Rennes in a few days.

BERTILLON'S UNFAIRNESS.

M. Paray-Javal, the draughtsman, called by the defense Saturday to refute the testimony of M. Bertillon, the famous anthropometrist resumed his testimony at the opening of court this morning and with the assistance of a black-board, proceeded to show the fallacy of the calculation of M. Bertillon and the unfairness in not submitting the handwriting of Esterhazy to the same tests as the prisoner. He declared, however, that even if M. Bertillon had done so the results would not have proved anything. The witness, however, insisted that M. Bertillon had adopted a vicious method in old making a partial experiment.

IMAGINARY IRREGULARITIES.

Continuing, M. Paray-Javal proceeded to show that the "geometric" irregularities alleged by M. Bertillon did not in reality exist. He pointed to the number of irregularities in the handwriting of the bordereau and said the same irregularities were practically inimitable in Esterhazy's calligraphy. He also contended that the alleged irregularity of the keyword "infanterie" was only approximate and proceeded to illustrate his arguments on the black-board, showing that all of M. Bertillon's proofs applied as equally to Esterhazy as to Dreyfus. Finally, M. Paray-Javal declared that M. Bertillon's measure to the word "infanterie" which served as the basis of the whole system, was entirely false and therefore M. Bertillon's entire system "falls to the ground and no longer exists" (Great sensation).

WORTHLESS DEDUCTIONS.

This witness, who had awakened the interest of his hearers, said that the bordereau could not have been traced, adding that it was an utter impossibility. He then proceeded to illustrate why this was the case and to prove the fallacy of M. Bertillon's deductions. In connection M. Paray-Javal said, and I thought that he thought M. Bertillon was a very intelligent man, but that his system was false and he, the witness, was convinced that only self-esteem prevented M. Bertillon from admitting his error.

MORE FALSE CALCULATIONS.

M. Bernard, an inspector of the mines, who took his honors at the Polytechnic School, who followed M. Paray-Javal at the witness bar, said he appeared to refute a portion of M. Bertillon's evidence, which was based on false calculations. Witness said he was greatly surprised that M. Bertillon thought fit to have recourse to psychological arguments to prove:

First, that the bordereau was fabricated.

Second, that the methods which might have been employed in writing certain words were such as to constitute proof against Dreyfus.

BORDEREAU NOT FABRICATED.

M. Bernard also said he was astonished at the fact that M. Bertillon had undertaken to account for the shape of letters and the space between words. There was not 1.25 millimeter as alleged by M. Bertillon, but one dot, 1.56. Moreover, the writing for the bordereau was natural and rhythmic, while its character and size showed it was not written by either a short-sighted or a long-sighted person. The witness then proceeded to illustrate photographically his contention that the bordereau was not a fabricated document. In connection M. Bernard exhibited to the judges a plate representing a page of current handwriting and said:

"If it is examined by M. Bertillon's system it will show certain peculiarities, which would not be of the kind found upon the exhibition of fifty million other documents. M. Bertillon would, therefore, say it was fabricated. But he would be wrong, for I brought the page from a report written by M. Bertillon himself."

BERTILLON SAT UPON.

M. Bertillon demanded permission to reply to the witness, and Col. Jouanin replied: "I cannot grant your request, and I will not grant such permission to any of the 14 experts, except in the case of a personal explanation."

M. Bertillon: "I wish to speak of the manner in which I reconstructed the bordereau."

Col. Jouanin: "Why, you are discussing the case. I cannot allow you to speak except in regard to a personal fact."

ANOTHER WITNESS.

M. Teyssonier followed. He said he referred in all reports to his report dated October 21, 1894, in which he expressed the opinion that the bordereau was the work of the writer of the documents seized at the prisoner's residence, for purposes of comparison, the witness generally indicated the bordereau by letter, pointing out resemblances to the prisoner's handwriting.

In conclusion, M. Teyssonier said he thought it impossible, more than probable, to think that those induced him to believe that he had lost the court would share his sensation.

Referring to the court, witness said he had noticed the prisoner's handwriting was illegible, and he had never seen the document ascribed to Dreyfus.

A PLEA FOR TIME.

The copy of the bordereau made by Dreyfus was then handed to M. Teyssonier, who declared it had never been given to him for purpose of comparison. (Sensation.)

The witness added that he would require three days to give an opinion on it. He could not conclude his examination on the spot. He must have time.

Here a member of the court-martial, giving the results of his examination of the bordereau, remarked:

"The handwriting is always isolated, even at the beginning of words."

To this M. Teyssonier replied that this peculiarity was also found in the prisoner's handwriting.

DREYFUS MAKES A REQUEST.

When he was invited to reply to the witness, Dreyfus said M. Teyssonier's remarks seemed to him quite incorrect, and that in order to reply properly he should be permitted to have the documents under his eyes. As regards the evidence on the subject of paragraphing, Dreyfus added:

"I beg to reply that one does not make a fresh paragraph, except when beginning a new idea. Every time I begin a new idea in anything I will make a paragraph."

The prisoner, in conclusion, asked the President of Court to request the witness to refer to his report of 1894 that he had concluded the writer had attempted to disguise his handwriting, but that towards the end he had resorted to his original handwriting. The witness having begged leave to speak of a personal fact, addressing the judge he said:

"Before you I am only a witness, but turning towards the defense, before this other tribunal I am, perhaps, an accused person."

Colonel Jouanin: "Not at all; you are not accused."

M. Teyssonier: "I am anxious in this respect."

Here the witness picked up a newspaper, which he had brought with him, and began to read, whereupon Colonel Jouanin said:

"You cannot read a newspaper."

"It is a newspaper, it is true," replied M. Teyssonier, "but it is also the report of M. Raoul de Beaulieu."

"We have no need to consider the reports of the judge. The incident is closed."

M. CHARAVAY AGAIN.

After a brief suspension of the session, the court resumed hearing testimony, and M. Charavay, the archivist and expert in ancient manuscripts, was called to the witness bar. His deposition was so lengthy that he had to be requested to speak up.

"In 1894," said M. Charavay, "I, with two colleagues, though acting upon separate instructions, were commissioned to examine the bordereau and a number of documents for comparison, assigned, and in different handwriting, I examined first the latter documents and by the process of eliminating, fixed upon one resembling the bordereau. I was then furnished with specimens of the handwriting in question, but was not told the name of writer. I asked if the documents could be regarded as genuine and was told the place from which it emanated, which could not be mentioned by me, and which could leave no doubt in regard to its value."

FORMER DEPOSITION FAULTY.

"Now, I must inform the court, that in the view of the fact that handwriting which was not produced in 1894, and which is evidently akin to the handwriting of the bordereau and the other documents, was based on false calculations. Witness said he was greatly surprised that M. Bertillon thought fit to have recourse to psychological arguments to prove:

First, that the bordereau was fabricated.

Second, that the methods which might have been employed in writing certain words were such as to constitute proof against Dreyfus.

BORDEREAU NOT FABRICATED.

M. Bernard also said he was astonished at the fact that M. Bertillon had undertaken to account for the shape of letters and the space between words. There was not 1.25 millimeter as alleged by M. Bertillon, but one dot, 1.56. Moreover, the writing for the bordereau was natural and rhythmic, while its character and size showed it was not written by either a short-sighted or a long-sighted person. The witness then proceeded to illustrate photographically his contention that the bordereau was not a fabricated document. In connection M. Bernard exhibited to the judges a plate representing a page of current handwriting and said:

"If it is examined by M. Bertillon's system it will show certain peculiarities, which would not be of the kind found upon the exhibition of fifty million other documents. M. Bertillon would, therefore, say it was fabricated. But he would be wrong, for I brought the page from a report written by M. Bertillon himself."

BERTILLON SAT UPON.

M. Bertillon demanded permission to reply to the witness, and Col. Jouanin replied: "I cannot grant your request, and I will not grant such permission to any of the 14 experts, except in the case of a personal explanation."

M. Bertillon: "I wish to speak of the manner in which I reconstructed the bordereau."

Col. Jouanin: "Why, you are discussing the case. I cannot allow you to speak except in regard to a personal fact."

ANOTHER WITNESS.

M. Teyssonier followed. He said he referred in all reports to his report dated October 21, 1894, in which he expressed the opinion that the bordereau was the work of the writer of the documents seized at the prisoner's residence, for purposes of comparison, the witness generally indicated the bordereau by letter, pointing out resemblances to the prisoner's handwriting.

In conclusion, M. Teyssonier said he thought it impossible, more than probable, to think that those induced him to believe that he had lost the court would share his sensation.

Referring to the court, witness said he had noticed the prisoner's handwriting was illegible, and he had never seen the document ascribed to Dreyfus.

A PLEA FOR TIME.

The copy of the bordereau made by Dreyfus was then handed to M. Teyssonier, who declared it had never been given to him for purpose of comparison. (Sensation.)

The witness added that he would require three days to give an opinion on it. He could not conclude his examination on the spot. He must have time.

Here a member of the court-martial, giving the results of his examination of the bordereau, remarked:

"The handwriting is always isolated, even at the beginning of words."

To this M. Teyssonier replied that this peculiarity was also found in the prisoner's handwriting.

DREYFUS MAKES A REQUEST.

When he was invited to reply to the witness, Dreyfus said M. Teyssonier's remarks seemed to him quite incorrect, and that in order to reply properly he should be permitted to have the documents under his eyes. As regards the evidence on the subject of paragraphing, Dreyfus added:

"I beg to reply that one does not make a fresh paragraph, except when beginning a new idea. Every time I begin a new idea in anything I will make a paragraph."

The prisoner, in conclusion, asked the President of Court to request the witness to refer to his report of 1894 that he had concluded the writer had attempted to disguise his handwriting, but that towards the end he had resorted to his original handwriting. The witness having begged leave to speak of a personal fact, addressing the judge he said:

"Before you I am only a witness, but turning towards the defense, before this other tribunal I am, perhaps, an accused person."

Colonel Jouanin: "Not at all; you are not accused."

M. Teyssonier: "I am anxious in this respect."

Here the witness picked up a newspaper, which he had brought with him, and began to read, whereupon Colonel Jouanin said:

"You cannot read a newspaper."

"It is a newspaper, it is true," replied M. Teyssonier, "but it is also the report of M. Raoul de Beaulieu."

"We have no need to consider the reports of the judge. The incident is closed."

M. CHARAVAY AGAIN.

After a brief suspension of the session, the court resumed hearing testimony, and M. Charavay, the archivist and expert in ancient manuscripts, was called to the witness bar. His deposition was so lengthy that he had to be requested to speak up.

"In 1894," said M. Charavay, "I, with two colleagues, though acting upon separate instructions, were commissioned to examine the bordereau and a number of documents for comparison, assigned, and in different handwriting, I examined first the latter documents and by the process of eliminating, fixed upon one resembling the bordereau. I was then furnished with specimens of the handwriting in question, but was not told the name of writer. I asked if the documents could be regarded as genuine and was told the place from which it emanated, which could not be mentioned by me, and which could leave no doubt in regard to its value."

FORMER DEPOSITION FAULTY.

"Now, I must inform the court, that in the view of the fact that handwriting which was not produced in 1894, and which is evidently akin to the handwriting of the bordereau and the other documents, was based on false calculations. Witness said he was greatly surprised that M. Bertillon thought fit to have recourse to psychological arguments to prove:

First, that the bordereau was fabricated.

Second, that the methods which might have been employed in writing certain words were such as to constitute proof against Dreyfus.

BORDEREAU NOT FABRICATED.

M. Bernard also said he was astonished at the fact that M. Bertillon had undertaken to account for the shape of letters and the space between words. There was not 1.25 millimeter as alleged by M. Bertillon, but one dot, 1.56. Moreover, the writing for the bordereau was natural and rhythmic, while its character and size showed it was not written by either a short-sighted or a long-sighted person. The witness then proceeded to illustrate photographically his contention that the bordereau was not a fabricated document. In connection M. Bernard exhibited to the judges a plate representing a page of current handwriting and said:

"If it is examined by M. Bertillon's system it will show certain peculiarities, which would not be of the kind found upon the exhibition of fifty million other documents. M. Bertillon would, therefore, say it was fabricated. But he would be wrong, for I brought the page from a report written by M. Bertillon himself."

BERTILLON SAT UPON.

M. Bertillon demanded permission to reply to the witness, and Col. Jouanin replied: "I cannot grant your request, and I will not grant such permission to any of the 14 experts, except in the case of a personal explanation."

M. Bertillon: "I wish to speak of the manner in which I reconstructed the bordereau."

Col. Jouanin: "Why, you are discussing the case. I cannot allow you to speak except in regard to a personal fact."

ANOTHER WITNESS.

M. Teyssonier followed. He said he referred in all reports to his report dated October 21, 1894, in which he expressed the opinion that the bordereau was the work of the writer of the documents seized at the prisoner's residence, for purposes of comparison, the witness generally indicated the bordereau by letter, pointing out resemblances to the prisoner's handwriting.

In conclusion, M. Teyssonier said he thought it impossible, more than probable, to think that those induced him to believe that he had lost the court would share his sensation.

Referring to the court, witness said he had noticed the prisoner's handwriting was illegible, and he had never seen the document ascribed to Dreyfus.

A PLEA FOR TIME.

The copy of the bordereau made by Dreyfus was then handed to M. Teyssonier, who declared it had never been given to him for purpose of comparison. (Sensation.)

The witness added that he would require three days to give an opinion on it. He could not conclude his examination on the spot. He must have time.

Here a member of the court-martial, giving the results of his examination of the bordereau, remarked:

"The handwriting is always isolated, even at the beginning of words."

To this M. Teyssonier replied that this peculiarity was also found in the prisoner's handwriting.

DREYFUS MAKES A REQUEST.

When he was invited to reply to the witness, Dreyfus said M. Teyssonier's remarks seemed to him quite incorrect, and that in order to reply properly he should be permitted to have the documents under his eyes. As regards the evidence on the subject of paragraphing, Dreyfus added:

"I beg to reply that one does not make a fresh paragraph, except when beginning a new idea. Every time I begin a new idea in anything I will make a paragraph."

The prisoner, in conclusion, asked the President of Court to request the witness to refer to his report of 1894 that he had concluded the writer had attempted to disguise his handwriting, but that towards the end he had resorted to his original handwriting. The witness having begged leave to speak of a personal fact, addressing the judge he said:

"Before you I am only a witness, but turning towards the defense, before this other tribunal I am, perhaps, an accused person."

Colonel Jouanin: "Not at all; you are not accused."

M. Teyssonier: "I am anxious in this respect."

Here the witness picked up a newspaper, which he had brought with him, and began to read, whereupon Colonel Jouanin said:

"You cannot read a newspaper."

"It is a newspaper, it is true," replied M. Teyssonier, "but it is also the report of M. Raoul de Beaulieu."

"We have no need to consider the reports of the judge. The incident is closed."

M. CHARAVAY AGAIN.

After a brief suspension of the session, the court resumed hearing testimony, and M. Charavay, the archivist and expert in ancient manuscripts, was called to the witness bar. His deposition was so lengthy that he had to be requested to speak up.

"In 1894," said M. Charavay, "I, with two colleagues, though acting upon separate instructions, were commissioned to examine the bordereau and a number of documents for comparison, assigned, and in different handwriting, I examined first the latter documents and by the process of eliminating, fixed upon one resembling the bordereau. I was then furnished with specimens of the handwriting in question, but was not told the name of writer. I asked if the documents could be regarded as genuine and was told the place from which it emanated, which could not be mentioned by me, and which could leave no doubt in regard to its value."

FORMER DEPOSITION FAULTY.

"Now, I must inform the court, that in the view of the fact that handwriting which was not produced in 1894, and which is evidently akin to the handwriting of the bordereau and the other documents, was based on false calculations. Witness said he was greatly surprised that M. Bertillon thought fit to have recourse to psychological arguments to prove:

First, that the bordereau was fabricated.

Second, that the methods which might have been employed in writing certain words were such as to constitute proof against Dreyfus.

BORDEREAU NOT FABRICATED.

M. Bernard also said he was astonished at the fact that M. Bertillon had undertaken to account for the shape of letters and the space between words. There was not 1.25 millimeter as alleged by M. Bertillon, but one dot, 1.56. Moreover, the writing for the bordereau was natural and rhythmic, while its character and size showed it was not written by either a short-sighted or a long-sighted person. The witness then proceeded to illustrate photographically his contention that the bordereau was not a fabricated document. In connection M. Bernard exhibited to the judges a plate representing a page of current handwriting and said:

"If it is examined by M. Bertillon's system it will show certain peculiarities, which would not be of the kind found upon the exhibition of fifty million other documents. M. Bertillon would, therefore, say it was fabricated. But he would be wrong, for I brought the page from a report written by M. Bertillon himself."

BERTILLON SAT UPON.

M. Bertillon demanded permission to reply to the witness, and Col. Jouanin replied: "I cannot grant your request, and I will not grant such permission to any of the 14 experts, except in the case of a personal explanation."

M. Bertillon: "I wish to speak of the manner in which I reconstructed the bordereau."

Col. Jouanin: "Why, you are discussing the case. I cannot allow you to speak except in regard to a personal fact."

ANOTHER WITNESS.

M. Teyssonier followed. He said he referred in all reports to his report dated October 21, 1894, in which he expressed the opinion that the bordereau was the work of the writer of the documents seized at the prisoner's residence, for purposes of comparison, the witness generally indicated the bordereau by letter, pointing out resemblances to the prisoner's handwriting.

In conclusion, M. Teyssonier said he thought it impossible, more than probable, to think that those induced him to believe that he had lost the court would share his sensation.

Referring to the court, witness said he had noticed the prisoner's handwriting was illegible, and he had never seen the document ascribed to Dreyfus.

A PLEA FOR TIME.

The copy of the bordereau made by Dreyfus was then handed to M. Teyssonier, who declared it had never been given to him for purpose of comparison. (Sensation.)

The witness added that he would require three days to give an opinion on it. He could not conclude his examination on the spot. He must have time.

Here a member of the court-martial, giving the results of his examination of the bordereau, remarked:

"The handwriting is always isolated, even at the beginning of words."

To this M. Teyssonier replied that this peculiarity was also found in the prisoner's handwriting.

DREYFUS MAKES A REQUEST.

When he was invited to reply to the witness, Dreyfus said M. Teyssonier's remarks seemed to him quite incorrect, and that in order to reply properly he should be permitted to have the documents under his eyes. As regards the evidence on the subject of paragraphing, Dreyfus added:

"I beg to reply that one does not make a fresh paragraph, except when beginning a new idea. Every time I begin a new idea in anything I will make a paragraph."

The prisoner, in conclusion, asked the President of Court to request the witness to refer to his report of 1894 that he had concluded the writer had attempted to disguise his handwriting, but that towards the end he had resorted to his original handwriting. The witness having begged leave to speak of a personal fact, addressing the judge he said:

"Before you I am only a witness, but turning towards the defense, before this other tribunal I am, perhaps, an accused person."

Colonel Jouanin: "Not at all; you are not accused."

M. Teyssonier: "I am anxious in this respect."

Here the witness picked up a newspaper, which he had brought with him, and began to read, whereupon Colonel Jouanin said:

"You cannot read a newspaper."

"It is a newspaper, it is true," replied M. Teyssonier, "but it is also the report of M. Raoul de Beaulieu."

"We have no need to consider the reports of the judge. The incident is closed."

M. CHARAVAY AGAIN.

After a brief suspension of the session, the court resumed hearing testimony, and M. Charavay, the archivist and expert in ancient manuscripts, was called to the witness bar. His deposition was so lengthy that he had to be requested to speak up.

"In 1894," said M. Charavay, "I, with two colleagues, though acting upon separate instructions, were commissioned to examine the bordereau and a number of documents for comparison, assigned, and in different handwriting, I examined first the latter documents and by the process of eliminating, fixed upon one resembling the bordereau. I was then furnished with specimens of the handwriting in question, but was not told the name of writer. I asked if the documents could be regarded as genuine and was told the place from which it emanated, which could not be mentioned by me, and which could leave no doubt in regard to its value."

FORMER DEPOSITION FAULTY.

"Now, I must inform the court, that in the view of the fact that handwriting which was not produced in 1894, and which is evidently akin to the handwriting of the bordereau and the other documents, was based on false calculations. Witness said he was greatly surprised that M. Bertillon thought fit to have recourse to psychological arguments to prove:

First, that the bordereau was fabricated.

Second, that the methods which might have been employed in writing certain words were such as to constitute proof against Dreyfus.

BORDEREAU NOT FABRICATED.

M. Bernard also said he was astonished at the fact that M. Bertillon had undertaken to account for the shape of letters and the space between words. There was not 1.25 millimeter as alleged by M. Bertillon, but one dot, 1.56. Moreover, the writing for the bordereau was natural and rhythmic, while its character and size showed it was not written by either a short-sighted or a long-sighted person. The witness then proceeded to illustrate photographically his contention that the bordereau was not a fabricated document. In connection M. Bernard exhibited to the judges a plate representing a page of current handwriting and said:

"If it is examined by M. Bertillon's system it will show certain peculiarities, which would not be of the kind found upon the exhibition of fifty million other documents. M. Bertillon would, therefore, say it was fabricated. But he would be wrong, for I brought the page from a report written by M. Bertillon himself."

BERTILLON SAT UPON.

M. Bertillon demanded permission to reply