

**The Adoption of the Citizen-Soldier Model in French and Caribbean
Revolutionary Identities (1789-1848)**

A Dissertation Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Lucas Tyler Sharp

May 2022

Copyright © 2022 by Lucas Tyler Sharp

All rights reserved.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my wife, Maggie, my parents, and my family for supporting me in so many ways throughout my education and the dissertation writing process. I would also like to thank Dr. Alcocer, the director of my research, and my committee members for all of the feedback they provided during the drafting of this dissertation.

Abstract

This study examines the influence of the citizen-soldier model on revolutionaries from the French Revolution, the Guadeloupean Resistance, the Haitian Revolution, and in *Georges*, a literary text written by Alexandre Dumas. The history of the citizen-soldier concept goes at least as far back as ancient Greece and has been implemented in a variety of ways since then. The citizen-soldier model combines the civic and political engagement of citizens with the martial attributes of a soldier. Throughout these different contexts, revolutionaries were inspired by the citizen-soldier model and incorporated it into their identities in different ways. This study reveals the different interpretations of the citizen-soldier model among individual and groups of revolutionaries. These findings expose insights into their beliefs and identities. From French women, to Guadeloupean and Haitian revolutionaries freed from slavery, to French literature, the ideals of the citizen-soldier appeared in the identities of these marginalized voices who advocated for a universal approach to the citizen-soldier model.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: What is the Citizen-Soldier model?	1
Chapter 2: The <i>Amazones</i> , or <i>Citoyennes-soldates</i> : Women Combatants and Activists and their Rights and Identity during the French Revolution.....	15
Chapter 3: Let's Ride! Reine Chapuy, a <i>Citoyenne-soldate</i> of the Revolutionary French Cavalry	50
Chapter 4: The First Amazon of the Revolution?	69
Chapter 5: A Revolutionary Marriage	89
Chapter 6: A Proclamation to the Entire Universe	117
Chapter 7: The Haitian Revolution and the Ideals of the Citizen-Soldier	144
Chapter 8: Alexandre Dumas's <i>Georges</i> and the Citizen-Soldier model	170
Chapter 9: The Ongoing Model of Martial Citizenship.....	189
Bibliography	194
Vita.....	204

Chapter 1: What is the Citizen-Soldier model?

The citizen-soldier model, or martial citizenship, marries the role of a citizen who is engaged in the political and domestic affairs of their community, with that of the soldier, who defends, or is willing to defend, their rights, country, and fellow citizens. Throughout history and literature, from Sparta to France and to the Caribbean, this concept has been implemented in a plethora of different ways. During the French Revolution, women adopted this idea of martial citizenship into their identities. They expressed this concept in their day-to-day lives and strived to gain gender equality. Similarly, Black soldiers and soldiers of mixed-heritage in Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue embraced the virtues of this model.¹ They fought against slavery and sought to expand their rights during the revolutionary period (1789-1804). It is worth noting, however, that the experiences of soldiers of mixed race and Black soldiers varied and relations between these groups were complex and, at times, strained.² Alexandre Dumas, in his 1843 novel *Georges*, also illustrates the themes of the citizen-soldier model. From these contexts, many of these groups were not officially recognized as citizen-soldiers, but they adopted the ideas and perspectives of this construction, nonetheless. Though the definition of a citizen-soldier can vary, I advance the following interpretation as a point of reference for this study: Citizen-soldiers, or martial citizens, are individuals who work toward, or at least do not hinder, the expanding of rights for those left out of full republican citizenship. They are therefore politically engaged,

¹ In this study I will use People of Color to refer to these two groups together. I will also follow Pamela Oliver's recommendations in "Race Names" for capitalization of ethnic groups of people (e.g., White or People of Color). Additionally, Saint-Domingue became Haiti after its revolution against France. I will use both names of this country, depending on the historical context.

² For further details see John Garrigus's book *Before Haiti: Race and Citizenship in French Saint-Domingue* (pp. 85, 208).

respect others' rights, and protect their community in some way militaristically. This martial role can be fulfilled by participation in an official military, a less-organized militia, or solely by being ready to protect the lives and rights of their neighbors or their country from invasion. As scholars in this field may observe, there is ample room for modification of and variation to this definition. However, I have attempted to mirror this explanation of the citizen-soldier model from a principled approach that is inspired by the Enlightenment ideals of natural rights, universal equality, and freedom. The right to bear arms, to vote, and to have equal access to the rights declared by the 1789 *Déclaration des droits de l'homme* were popular liberties for which the individuals in this study advocated for. Though this study's definition is the basis for this research, diverse interpretations of this model appear among the different individuals analyzed. Nevertheless, the martial citizens from this investigation still display, on some level, the practices of my "enlightened" citizen-soldier. Some of these figures may fall short of its definition, but they all, at some point, illustrate the ideals of martial citizenship. One of the goals of this study is to compare the literature of the Enlightenment to that of the individuals of the French, Guadeloupean, and Haitian revolutionary contexts. The conclusions drawn from these comparisons will form a lens that will help shape an understanding of the identities of the individuals reviewed. The different renderings of the citizen-soldier model demonstrate that this idea is always under debate and negotiation and still holds relevance in today's cultural and political discussions.

This study will begin by analyzing the microhistories of revolutionary French women. Reine Chapuy is perhaps the *citoyenne-soldate*, or female citizen-soldier, *par excellence*. In 1793, Chapuy, at the age of sixteen, enlisted in the French cavalry disguised as a man ("Gazette Nationale" 483). After having her gender discovered, she was pushed out of the military, but not

without several honorary commendations by her superiors. In response to her release, Chapuy petitioned the Convention in 1794 to return to the military. This petition demonstrates Chapuy's adoption of the citizen-soldier virtues. Théroigne de Méricourt is another woman who took on the role of martial citizenship. Though not an official soldier, Théroigne was a loud and assertive voice for women's equality through the early years of the Revolution. Through her very dress, which was a masculine horse-back riding outfit termed an *amazone*, Théroigne communicated her belief in women's equality. She carried two pistols and a sword and attended the National Assembly daily. Her activism and rhetoric, in which she advocated for women soldiers, demonstrate her embrace of many of the ideals of the citizen-soldier model. Pauline Léon and her husband Théophile Leclerc are the final individuals who will be considered in the context of the French Revolution. Léon co-founded perhaps the most influential women's society during the Revolution, the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*. She was very outspoken on women's equality and presented a petition to the National Assembly signed by three hundred women for the right to bear arms and defend France. Often epitomizing the citizen-soldier model, she participated in both political and revolutionary events and desired to militantly defend France. Her husband, Leclerc, also displayed this martial citizenship. He volunteered in the National Guard, encouraged Léon's women's society to be politically engaged, and wrote commentaries in his political journal, *L'ami du peuple* (not to be confused with Marat's newspaper of the same title). Leclerc's profile will be explored to provide a masculine French perspective to this study and due to his close relationship with Léon. Though some of these figures' interpretations of martial citizenship are problematic and deviate from its ideals, each of these revolutionaries displayed influences from the citizen-soldier model. Moreover, their stories indicate the prolific nature of the citizen-soldier concept in the imaginary

of the French people during the Revolution. If the French Revolution had acquiesced to women's demands for equality and stayed true to the philosophical language that inspired it, the First French Republic might have enjoyed a greater longevity than it did. The republic could have been strengthened through its diversity by embracing a universal democratization of its citizens and soldiers.

The French women in this study, in many ways, seized the rights that French men enjoyed such as petitioning, bearing arms, protesting, and serving in the military. Dominique Godineau, in "Femmes en citoyenneté: Pratiques et politique," proposes that French women pushed the limits of their rights and the law by exercising certain liberties that were not officially recognized for their sex (207). Furthermore, they justified their actions by affirming their right to do so (207). Furthermore, the idea of "natural" rights plays an important part in many of these women's argumentations. This concept was inspired by Enlightenment philosophers like John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The assertions of revolutionary women illustrate their appreciation for and their adoption of a more universal approach to Enlightenment ideals and to martial citizenship. This brings up Sandrine Bergès's idea, in "Revolution and Republicanism: Women Political Philosophers of late Eighteenth-Century France and Why they Matter," which posits that political writers in revolutionary France were also philosophical writers (354). I will also extend this idea to the orations, actions, and writings of the individuals investigated in this study from the French Revolution, the Caribbean, and from Dumas's novel.

In 1793, the enslaved peoples of Saint-Domingue revolted so forcefully that the colonial government was forced to abolish slavery. Months later, the French government formally ratified this emancipation and expanded it to all its colonies, including Guadeloupe. Throughout the 1790's and the turn of the century, there is substantial evidence that indicates an adoption of the

ideas of martial citizenship among the People of Color of these two colonies. For example, the people on these islands revolted and used republican rhetoric when Napoléon seized power and began his plans to reintroduce slavery. My research reveals many parallels between the rhetoric and experiences of Black soldiers and soldiers of mixed race. However, John Garrigus, in *Before Haiti: Race and Citizenship in French Saint-Domingue*, explores the ways in which the experience of these two groups differed (p. 85, 208). In Guadeloupe, Louis Delgrès emerged as the leader of its Resistance. His orations, actions, and *Proclamation* reveal his espousal of Enlightenment and citizen-soldier virtues. His *Proclamation* declared the rights of the People of Color in Guadeloupe, the innocence of his Resistance, and the rebels' just cause. Delgrès also conducted the Guadeloupean Resistance honorably. During the war, he helped the invading French put out a fire in one of the towns. This duality of martial and civic virtues suggests that Delgrès, and many of the Guadeloupeans, assumed the citizen-soldier ethos into their identities. In Saint-Domingue, the martial citizenship model can also be observed in the writings and speeches of Toussaint Louverture and Jean-Jacques Dessalines. Louverture was the leader of the Haitian Revolution until his arrest in 1802. His 1797 *Lettre au Directoire*, the 1801 Constitution, and his *Mémoires* all employ republican sentiments. Following Louverture's arrest, Dessalines became the leader of Saint-Domingue. After defeating the French, this new leader published two documents which declared the colony's independence. These declarations employed a revolutionary and martial register. Louverture and Dessalines led martial citizens to independence and are key figures in the success of the Haitian Revolution. However, the rights of the people of Haiti were not representative of what one might expect for republican citizens. The People of Color in this colony did enjoy greater rights than what slavery allowed, but the actions of their leaders were, at times, incompatible with the citizen-soldier model.

Alexandre Dumas published his novel *Georges* in 1843. In this story Dumas crafts his eponymous hero with the identity of a citizen-soldier. During his formative years, Georges fosters his intellect and martial abilities. His goal is to triumph over the “préjugés” ‘prejudices’ of his home on the Île de France, or present-day Mauritius (Dumas 32; my trans.).³ Georges, like Dumas, is a man of mixed African and European heritage, and he challenges racism and slavery throughout the plot. Georges works toward social change and equality in the colony, but, when he meets opposition, Georges leads a violent revolt against slavery. Thus, Georges demonstrates the two aspects of the martial citizen model. In this novel, Dumas appropriates the virtues of French republicanism into his hero of Afro-descent. This was likely a strategic move, to show his European audiences that People of Color are entitled to equality and respect. Five years before the 1848 French Revolution and the abolition of slavery, this novel may have also been a call for France to return to a republicanism that recognized the rights of non-Whites. Dumas’s father importantly became the highest ranking Person of Color in the French Army during his time in service. Dumas’s use of the citizen-soldier themes in *Georges* demonstrates that, decades after the 1789 French Revolution, this model continued to be recast and entered dialogues among writers and intellectuals such as himself.

After having outlined the trajectory of this study, I will next examine some integral background information on the citizen-soldier model. In a 1789 *Cahiers de Doléances*, which are documents of grievances, many French people desired access to all military ranks and expressed a preference for a citizen army (Pichichero 196). Thus, according to Christy Pichichero, in *The Military Enlightenment: War and Culture in the French Empire from Louis XIV to Napoleon*, the

³ In this dissertation, I will occasionally provide my own translations when clarity and comprehensibility is important to the idea or discussion at hand. Though this study expects a bilingual audience, I make an attempt to provide translations at key moments to help those readers who do not know French.

French people were “echoing” eighteenth-century discussions in France on the American citizen army and other renderings of citizen armies in French literature, theatre, and philosophy (196). Nonetheless, this idea of martial citizenship does not begin in France. Throughout the Renaissance and Enlightenment, writers took up this idea from ancient Greece. Ancient Greek literature detailing Sparta, Athens, and Rome was highly influential in French culture, literature, and philosophy during the Renaissance, and especially through the Enlightenment (Rosso 52). *Philosophes* like Rousseau, Mably, and Helvétius commended and discussed the Spartan model of government considerably (Le Menthéour 914). Mably even cited Plato, who, in his *Republic*, wanted to create women soldiers (Le Menthéour 931). Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, comte de Mirabeau, a political representative during the early part of the French Revolution, celebrated Athens for its practice of having its citizens earn their citizenship by serving two years in military service (Gresle 112). The influences of Antiquity on the Enlightenment and the French Revolution are undeniable. Likewise, the eighteenth-century discussions of ancient themes and ideas certainly had a cultural impact in French-held Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue.

According to Maxime Rosso, in “Les réminiscences spartiates dans les discours et la politique de Robespierre de 1789 à Thermidor,” the Roman writer Plutarch is the most translated and popular writer from Antiquity in France since the Renaissance (52). In Plutarch’s *La Vie des Hommes Illustres* ‘Lives’ the ancient writer offers an admiring description of Spartan society (Rosso 54). The theme of virtue figures heavily in Plutarch’s account of Sparta. Spartan virtue centers around patriotism and self-sacrifice for the public good and community (Rosso 54). Plutarch explains that the Spartans abstained from luxury in government and in their daily lives (*La Vie* 93-95). Importantly, Plutarch, in “Coriolanus”, explains that in ancient times (before Plutarch), the Latin word for virtue, *virtus*, designated martial valiance or prowess (par. 1). This

is significant because Plutarch emphasizes the Spartans' obsession with this word, *virtue*. This further accentuates Sparta's enthusiasm for martial virtue. Plutarch details the Spartan King Lycurgus's instructions to his people: "Vivre tous ensemble comme Frères . . . qu'ils ne cherchassent point à précéder les uns les autres en autre chose qu'en la seule vertu" (*Les vies* 95). Here, Lycurgus chastises ambition save for creating a competition in virtue. This theme of virtue was also prolific in eighteenth-century dialogues. Notably, the revolutionary leader Robespierre emphasized its importance to the prosperity of France. Plutarch writes that Sparta encouraged self-sacrifice and practice in the martial arts for the purpose of being useful to the state (*La Vie*, 115-116, 120). Parallels can be drawn between this Spartan model and that of the citizen-soldier in Enlightenment philosophy, revolutionary France, Guadeloupe, Haiti, and Dumas's *Georges*. Individuals and ideas in these contexts expressed a desire to carry arms to be able to protect their country and to sacrifice their time, and potentially their lives, for their country.

An important historical development that influenced the citizen-soldier model was the "military enlightenment" (Pichichero 165-168). Pichichero explains that the military enlightenment began taking shape as early as the seventeenth century under Louis XIV (Pichichero 165-168). The ideas of this movement then took form more fully during the eighteenth century. The military enlightenment combined intellectual, domestic, and military aspects into the identities of French people and soldiers (Pichichero 160-162). Louis de Jaucourt, in his 1765 entry for "Héros" in the *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, demonstrates this phenomenon when he writes, "The term hero, in its origin, was consecrated to he who united warrior virtues with the moral and political virtues, he who withstood challenges . . . Such were Hercules, Theseus, Jason, and others" (8:182; trans. by Pichichero 281). This conception is quite similar to Rousseau's outlining of his "guerrier

philosophe,” in his response to the proposed question by the Académie de Corse: “Quelle est la Vertu la plus nécessaire aux Héros; et quels sont les Héros à qui cette Vertu a manqué?” (8). In combining the qualities of intellect, integrity, and valor, Jaucourt and Rousseau illustrate the presence of the military enlightenment in eighteenth-century France. According to Pichichero, three distinct areas of life were impacted by the military enlightenment: “National identity, the armed forces, and the citizenry” (190). Concerning “national identity,” the military enlightenment encouraged the people of France to view themselves as a nation of warriors who loved their country (Pichichero 191). This concept permeated the entire nation, and, consequently, many French women and men sought to participate in this new trend during the Revolution. Likewise, many People of Color in Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue seized upon this idea and participated in the political and military realms of these islands. Regarding the “armed forces,” the military enlightenment encouraged military service as an expression of patriotism in France (Pichichero 190). Finally, the effects of this military and intellectual evolution on the “citizenry” of France are evidenced by an increasing collective desire throughout the eighteenth century to celebrate the common soldier (Pichichero 190; Clarke 238). In 1745, Claude Godard d’Aucour published *L’Académie militaire, ou Les héros subalterns*. In this work, he laments, “Glory is a proud Goddess . . . she caresses all of our leaders . . . but she deigns not turn her eyes onto us; it seems that we are not worthy of her . . . The prideful Goddess is even more unjust knowing that she owes everything that she is to our arms” (19-21; trans. by Pichichero 158). Many of the figures in this study echo these desires for martial glory. In fact, the honoring of common soldiers became an increasingly frequent occurrence in novels, theatre, and in revolutionary France throughout the long eighteenth century (Pichichero 157). Moreover,

the ideas of the military enlightenment likely encouraged the appeal and popularity of the citizen-soldier model to the men and women of this study.

It is necessary to distinguish the citizen-soldier concept from that of the military enlightenment. Both concepts do appear to draw inspiration from Antiquity. The citizen-soldier model, or martial citizenship, in this study's contexts, uses the military enlightenment as its foundation, but it adds a republican, or democratic, ideology. Martial citizenship therefore takes up the military enlightenment idea of a diversified hero, or soldier, who is in some way politically, domestically, and militarily engaged. However, citizen-soldiers are also distinctly citizens, or they at least strive to have the rights of a republican citizen. The duality of these two roles, citizen and soldier, and the rights associated with citizens in a republic are what differentiate the concepts of the military enlightenment and the citizen-soldier model. Many of the rights that that were desired by the disenfranchised individuals of this study were named in the 1789 *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*. This document proclaimed, among other rights, the right to free speech, to administrative and representative positions, and to legal equality (*Les Déclarations* 12-16). In this study, I will examine individuals who were barred from many of these rights and from martial citizenship. Importantly, despite their exclusion, they incorporated the citizen-soldier virtues into their identities, nonetheless. Oftentimes, these figures asserted their rights even though they were not officially recognized by law as citizen-soldiers. The French women, Caribbean People of Color, and Dumas's literary hero provide fascinating insights into the relationships between identity, martial citizenship, and the desire to participate in this model. Furthermore, these contexts reveal a myriad of thought-provoking interpretations and negotiations of the citizen-soldier model itself.

Yet how did this citizen-soldier model come to fruition? The writings of the philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which paint a favorable image of a republican form of government and the citizen-soldier model, were highly influential in revolutionary France. In his “*Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*,” Rousseau endorses the idea of a republic composed of citizens. He proposes that to “former une nation libre, paisible et sage . . . il faut . . . maintenir . . . des mœurs simples, des goûts sains, un esprit martial sans ambition” ‘to form a free, peaceable, and wise nation . . . you must . . . maintain . . . simple virtues, a taste for the wholesome, and a martial spirit without ambition’ (Rousseau, “*Considérations*” 219; my trans.).⁴ Citizens of a republic, endowed with “a martial spirit,” are at the crux of the citizen-soldier model (Rousseau, “*Considérations*” 219; my trans.). Rousseau explains further, “Tout citoyen doit être soldat par devoir, nul ne doit l’être par métier” (“*Considérations*” 230). In these phrases, Rousseau appears to critique the practice of professional armies and soldiers, preferring a citizenry ready to defend itself “without ambition” (Rousseau, “*Considérations*” 219; my trans.). Rousseau thus proposes a more decentralized and localized interpretation of militarism in republics. Edmond Dziembowski, in “Un nouveau patriotisme français, 1750-1770: la France face à la puissance anglaise à l’époque de la guerre de sept ans,” explains Rousseau’s role in the evolution of patriotism in France. Dziembowski outlines the “slow maturation of ideas that radicalize at the end of the [eighteenth] century” going from “‘aristocratic republican’ patriotism (d’Aguesseau), to an ‘English republican’ patriotism (Montesquieu, and Mably to a certain extent), then to a ‘Spartan republican’ patriotism (Rousseau)” (342; trans. by Pichichero 163). Similarly, Pichichero traces the progression from military enlightenment to martial citizenship; however,

⁴ Translation given to provide emphasis and clarity for this important idea. In the discussion that follows, I use Rousseau’s words in translation for the same reason.

she does not appear to create a division between these two concepts. Pichichero asserts, “Enlightened heroism propelled two veins of significant cultural change in the final decades of the *ancien régime*. First, it was a democratizing force in the political imaginary, allowing commoners . . . women, religious, and racial minorities to stake claims to citizenship and to representing the nation” (157). Furthermore, the identities of French people were affected, “they could think of themselves not only as citizens, but as the making of ‘enlightened’ heroes animated by patriotism, social and domestic responsibility, and a strong martial spirit” (Pichichero 191). Many French people began incorporating this conception of citizenship into their identities before and during the French Revolution. During the grain riots of 1787 and 1789, some military officers refused to follow orders to suppress the unrest. One officer from Toulouse explained, “It was not the business of the army to attack citizens” (Bertaud 41-42; trans. by Pichichero 191). According to Julia Osman, in *Citizen Soldiers and the Key to the Bastille*, these types of instances were increasingly frequent (121). Additionally, predecessors to the Revolutionary National Guard, militias made up of citizens began forming at growing rates between 1787 and 1790 (Pichichero 191). Robespierre would even declare in 1791 that “tout citoyen a le droit de participer à la garde nationale” (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 198). In perhaps a now familiar scene, when fears of Austrian invasion rose in May 1792, weapons were handed out to *sans-culottes*, or low-income French, in Paris (Moore 126; my trans.). This historic scenario brings relevance to the citizen-soldier discussion, as it closely resembles the mobilization of citizens in Ukraine in 2022. The French men and women, similarly to Ukrainian citizens, took on the role of both citizen and soldier. In the case of the French, its citizens expressed their martial citizenship by engaging in political protests and dialogues while also participating in military exploits.

These popular citizen-soldier ideas and practices naturally crossed the Atlantic and influenced the diverse peoples of Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue. Laurent Dubois, in *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution & Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787-1804*, employs Fernando Ortiz's term "transculturation" to describe the democratic and Enlightenment influences in the revolts and revolutions of the enslaved people in Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue (7). The concept of transculturation accounts for the influence of different cultures in a group of people. For the Guadeloupean and Saint-Dominguan peoples of Afro-descent, their culture was primarily influenced by African, European, and Native American civilizations (Dubois, *Colony* 7). These influences resulted in the People of Color of these colonies embracing the citizen-soldier model into their identities. Dubois explains,

In France, as in the Antilles, Republican leaders had created a popular army, idealizing soldiers and encouraging them to think of themselves as active citizens and virtuous defenders of the nation. The campaigns in the Caribbean had created a proud and well-trained army made up primarily of men of African descent who had risked their lives fighting the British and spreading emancipation. The French government would find that these Republican veterans of the Antilles were committed to defending their hard-won rights, even if it meant turning against France. (*Colony* 235)

Though oftentimes not able to enjoy the full rights of republican citizenship, many People of Color in Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue were able to join the military and take part in aspects of the citizen-soldier role. Many were inspired by the Enlightenment rhetoric of natural rights and fought against the reintroduction of slavery, and, in the case of the Haitian Revolution, they were successful. Decades later, Alexandre Dumas employed the citizen-soldier model in his

novel *Georges* and continued the fight against prejudice, slavery, and the inequalities that People of Color faced.

Unfortunately, in spite of the egalitarian rhetoric of the Revolution, the societal assumptions and norms regarding gender and race were never fully disassociated from the revolutionary government in France. In France, women did not achieve political and military equality and in Guadeloupe, slavery was successfully reinstituted. Additionally, in emancipated Haiti, political rights for People of Color were far from mirroring those proclaimed in the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme*. Nevertheless, even with these shortcomings, much progress had been made by French women and Caribbean People of Color. These brave individuals adopted the virtues of the citizen-soldier and protested the injustices they faced. They set a precedent for future generations to continue their work and they demonstrated the power of Enlightenment principles when understood as a truly universal concept. Their interpretations of martial citizenship provide examples of negotiation and evolution of this concept which can contribute to modern conversations on identity, citizenship, and soldiering. These stories underline the importance of universal rights and equality and put forward thought-provoking possibilities for the blending of the citizen and soldier roles.

Chapter 2: The *Amazones*, or *Citoyennes-soldates*: Women Combatants and Activists and their Rights and Identity during the French Revolution

During the French Revolution, the conception of citizenship was closely associated with the idea of the armed citizen, or the citizen-soldier (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 1). With the citizen-soldier model in fashion, it should not be surprising that many women activists also sought to incorporate this idea into their identities. Not only did women petition the government to acknowledge their right to bear arms and defend France, but some also took this right into their own hands, practicing the role of bearing arms as citizen-soldiers, even without the blessing of the Revolutionary government. In this study, it will be important to keep in mind Simon Schama’s notion from his work, *Citizens*, which advances that the Revolutionary imaginary had a need and desire for heroes that represented its values and ideals. Lucy Moore adds to this concept, in *Liberty: The Lives and Times of Six Women in Revolutionary France*. Moore advances that the Revolution also created a desire to find heroines. Not surprisingly, the Revolution found heroes of both sexes (Moore xxvii). In keeping with this idea of hero searching, Moore comments that one woman, “burned to distinguish herself in the great drama unfolding in front of her” (xxvii). Not wanting to miss out on a chance to make history, the women discussed in the following chapters were on a quest for citizenship. Though fame might have been an attractive side-effect, women such as Théroigne de Méricourt, Pauline Léon and Reine Chapuy were undoubtedly genuine in their calls for equal rights between the sexes. Furthermore, the legacy of the French Revolutionary women, the literature they created and the actions they accomplished, certainly continue to influence subsequent generations.

The right to engage in martial activities, and thereby exercise a part of citizenship, like their male counterparts, was one of the more important rights for these women. Rudolf Dekker and Lotte Van de Pol, in “Republican Heroines: Cross-Dressing Women in the French Revolution,” assert that as “it became increasingly clear that the Revolution had to be fought and defended with weapons, women more frequently wished to make active contributions” (354). Through political activism and civil disobedience, these activists sought to improve the rights and conditions of women and to open up social and military opportunities for their sex. The virtues associated with the citizen-soldier model and the military enlightenment were adopted by many French women. According to Christy Pichichero, in *The Military Enlightenment: War and Culture in the French Empire from Louis XIV to Napoleon*, the military enlightenment changed the conception of soldiering to include other virtues such as intelligence and political engagement. The citizen-soldier model takes these tenets and adds to it the republican idea of citizenship and rights. For example, Reine Chapuy risked her life while serving France as a cavalry soldier. Furthermore, on September 7, 1789, French women donated jewelry to the Republic, thereby imitating the acts of Roman ladies (Athanassoglou 648). These examples illustrate not only French women’s willingness to sacrifice in many different ways during the Revolution, but also that these women had a knowledge and appreciation of the ancient cultures, such as Rome and Sparta. Consequently, many French women adopted the virtues of Antiquity and the Enlightenment into their identities.

Though true equality between the sexes was never recognized during the French Revolution, Dominique Godineau, in “Femmes en citoyenneté: Pratiques et politiques” provides important insights into the actions of women activists. She argues that while women were officially barred from voting and from the National Guard, which were two essential aspects of

citizenship at the time, they exercised many other rights that citizens enjoyed during the Revolution (199). For example, throughout the Revolution, women presented several petitions to the National Assembly demanding the recognition of rights and for the government to take certain actions. One such petition appeared in October 1789. This petition, which appealed to the important theme of glory, demanded equality between the sexes within the military. This petition also recommended changing the punishment for a soldier's disgrace, which at the time, forced male soldiers to wear women's clothing (Pichichero 208). Importantly, women also enjoyed access to the French Army as soldiers at least until March 1793 (Godineau, "Femmes en citoyenneté" 198).⁵ Additionally, many women led protests, political activism, and several key insurrectional moments of the Revolution. October 1789 was a busy time for women's engagement in the Revolution as this was also the month of the famous Women's March on Versailles. Starting at the Hôtel de Ville, the women demanded weapons and bread, and headed to Versailles to hold the King responsible for a reported slight on the patriotic ribbon, the *cocarde*, a symbol for the new nation (Ball 401). On their way to Versailles, Parisian women gathered guns, swords, and anything else they could find that would serve as weapons. Upon entering the National Assembly, some tried to vote alongside the deputies present, while another woman sat in the President of the legislature's chair (Moore 38). The assertion of the right to participate in the legislative process is a fascinating aspect of this event. Furthermore, this way of thinking was in line with the philosophies of the Revolutionary era. The precedent for this behavior had already been set by the rhetoric of the Enlightenment *philosophes*, the actions and events of the American Revolution, the taking of the Bastille, and the creation of the National

⁵ This is contrasted by the fact that women were excluded from the National Guard from at least as early as 1791 (Godineau, "Femmes en citoyenneté" 198).

Assembly itself. Taking one's rights into one's own hands and asserting them publicly and at times forcibly, was a common act that manifested itself often in revolutionary France, and the women of the Revolution used this tactic often. Interestingly, these rebellious acts, regardless of the actors' sex, were often viewed positively by the French public. Reine Chapuy used this tactic of seizing one's rights when she disguised herself as a man in order to participate in the French Cavalry. Likewise, Théroigne de Méricourt asserted her right to bear arms and dress in masculine garb daily. However, Théroigne was not in disguise, she openly wore what was viewed as masculine, horse-back riding clothing, termed an *amazone*, while not hiding her gender. Similarly, other women, like Pauline Léon and Claire Lacombe, would also enter the public eye maintaining their femininity whilst displaying pistols on their belts and dressing in an *amazone* outfit. Women who so publicly displayed their rebellious nature declared their equality to men with their very appearance. These three women did not stop with appearances, however, as their political engagement was also very important to their identities.

Petitions and addresses, according to Godineau, were other ways in which women demonstrated a desire to be recognized as part of "le souverain" and as citizens ("Femmes en citoyenneté" 199-200). Though not always successful, these formal petitions and addresses did appear to have some impact. For example, Etta Palm d'Aelders made a speech in April 1792 at the Legislative Assembly. She advocated for civic and military roles for women, equal rights and education, the right to divorce, and for the legal age of women to be 21 (Towers 14). According to Alicia Towers, in her thesis *The Society of Revolutionary Women*, Madame d'Aelders's propositions may have had some direct influence on a law passed a few months later which legalized divorce and declared the legal age of women to be 21 (15). A few months after her speech, in another act of public engagement and discourse, women from the Hôtel de Ville

section of Paris went to the Legislative Assembly to request the right to possess and bear arms in defense of Paris. Godineau asserts more precisely that these actions demonstrate that women were indeed exercising rights considered to be that of citizens (“Femmes en citoyenneté” 201-202). Even though constitutionally their rights were limited, these women pushed the boundaries of their situation and, at times, acted outside of the law, justifying their actions by claiming a right to act in such a way, even if it was not recognized officially (Godineau, “Femmes en citoyenneté” 207). It is true that these women exercised, and in a way seized by force the freedom of speech, assembly, petition and even the right to insurrection. By “seizing” I mean that these rights were recognized for men under the *Déclaration des droits de l’homme et du citoyen*, though not for women. Similarly, Théroigne de Méricourt, in wearing her *amazone* outfit which included two pistols and a sword in her belt, exercised and seized on the right to bear arms. Presumably she wore all of these things at her daily attendance at the National Assembly. Though it is unclear if she wore these weapons into the National Assembly, Théroigne’s bearing of arms in public life, and her obsessive presence at the National Assembly, illustrate an exercise of rights, or put differently, a seizing of rights, that was not associated with women at the time.

In a pamphlet entitled “Cahier des Doléances et réclamations des femmes,” written by an anonymous author, Madame B...B... argues, among other things, that men could not represent women in the assembly (Abney 46). Here, Madame B...B... asserts that women should be representatives and calls into question the men’s authority to represent the entire nation by themselves. Time and time again, French women boldly asserted their unrecognized rights through actions and writings during the Revolution. On May 20, 1795, women led another riot chanting the slogan, “Bread and the Constitution of 1793” (Ball 394). Patrick Ball, in “Alternate

Currents in Women's Republicanism During the French Revolution," remarks that the slogans of this march, "express a set of political claims: That the . . . new governmental institutions have responsibilities and duties toward the people" (401). He proposes that these duties include ensuring access to food, respecting the symbols of the people, and the right to insurrection (401). Ball adds that, "Their insurrection might have had economic bases, but it expressed explicit political views about how different sections of society ought to relate to one another, and the rights and responsibilities of each" (Ball 401).

From the beginnings of the Revolution, and particularly during the span of 1792-1793, a "sans-culloterie féminine" movement had taken shape and was present in popular societies and clubs (Godineau, "Femmes en citoyenneté" 199). Many of the discussions these women had revolved around the idea that women made up part of the Sovereign, or the Nation, and should therefore have a say in its management (Godineau, "Femmes en citoyenneté" 200). Undoubtedly part of the allure of women's participation in many clubs was the ability to vote on issues. The president of a Dijon women's club asserted, "il s'ensuit nécessairement que les femmes, qui font partie de la société, doivent contribuer autant qu'elles le peuvent au bien de tous [et] se rendre utiles à la chose publique" ("Les Révolutions de Paris"). The *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* echoed these sentiments.⁶ They believed women could and should be able to contribute to the "utilité commune" (Discours prononcé). Discussions arose around women's rights such as their right to vote, to be armed, and to play a part in the "utilité publique." These arguments certainly harken to the Spartan virtues lauded by the *philosophes*, as well as revolutionary French society and culture. During this time, the French cultural imaginary

⁶ For brevity, this society will sometimes be referred to as Society, with a capital S.

greatly admired the values of the citizen-soldier, the military enlightenment, and Antiquity. These clubs and societies generally adhered to this admiration and played an important role in the lives of the revolutionary women in this dissertation. These organizations gave women like Théroigne de Méricourt and Pauline Léon a place to express their desires and to organize and motivate other women into action like signing petitions, protesting, and even providing security for the Montagnard seizure of power in 1793. Moore proposes that less wealthy women likely resorted to such public displays of activism because of their class, gender, and lack of political connections, as opposed to activists like Manon Roland, who could influence more discretely through her associations (90). Whether or not this was the case, the women of this study are all from lower to middle income levels. However, it is clear that these women were ready to take on the responsibilities of full citizenship, which included the armed defense of their nation as *citoyennes-soldates*.

An important question that will be addressed is how different Revolutionary women interpreted the citizen-soldier model and constructed their identity around it in various ways. Füssel, in “Between Dissimulation and Sensation: Female Soldiers in Eighteenth-Century Warfare,” cites many examples of women soldiers using literature and theatre to tell their stories (535). Füssel, using Stephen Greenblatt’s approach, in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, maintains that French women used written works as a means of self-fashioning an identity (536; Greenblatt 9). The popularity of the writings of women soldiers who detailed their experiences, was also aided by the literary consumer society of the eighteenth-century (Füssel 537). This consumer market was interested in “sensational” stories about hidden identities, particularly those of women in war (Füssel 537). The writings of women soldiers demonstrated “independent negotiations of social roles” which had an effect on the collective

thinking of martial gender identities (Füssel 537). Revolutionary women, themselves, did not shy away from shaping their own new identities through the mediums of speech, writing, and action. One example of identity shaping in literature appeared in 1792. Manette Dupont published “Départ de Neuf Cent (sic) Citoyennes de Paris, Qui se sont enrôlées, déguisées en hommes, pour partir aux Frontières combattre les Tyrans des Nations” (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 8). This document included a song and called for the formation of ten thousand women soldiers. It also referenced the Amazons and detailed how women would take on men’s clothing and military roles (Hopkin 85). This publication was not alone and illustrated French women’s increasing desire to take part in martial citizenship.

Nevertheless, as suggested above, resistance to women’s participation in war, citizenship, or being armed at all, was an obstacle to women activists throughout the French Revolution. This is surely, in part, a result of the inherited traditions of the Old Regime in France. During the reign of the French Kings, or the *Ancien Régime*, the carrying of weapons, and being a warrior, was, with some exceptions, predominantly associated with masculinity and nobility (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 1). One exception occurred during La Fronde, which was an aristocratic rebellion in the seventeenth century. La Lorraine Saint-Belmont defended her lands while her husband was away at war. Oftentimes, the contemporaries of women soldiers like La Lorraine offer an explanation for their actions that is likely disappointing to modern audiences. These reasonings, offered by commentators of the time, provide excuses for women’s heroism, such as their nobility, and that without this quality women had no chance of participating in military arenas (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 1-3). Later, the principles and values of the Revolution, such as liberty and patriotism, and these concepts’ ability to alter courage and actions, would be used to explain away the actions of women in the field of combat. Though many women soldiers

would cite their belief in these republican values, many of their contemporaries believed that it was only through the divine forces of liberty, that these women rose above their natural tendencies to care for the home, and that, otherwise, women were incapable of such martial exploits.

On April 30, 1793, a law was passed that officially removed women from the French Army. Interestingly, this rule was not widely enforced, and many women stayed in the French Army hiding their identities (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 10; Godineau, “La douleureuse”). A month earlier, Rose Barreau, at 20 years old, had already joined as a *grenadier* in her husband’s regiment under a masculine identity using the name Liberté (Dekker and Van de Pol 353). She and her husband fought the Spanish, and in one July 1793 battle he was wounded. She continued to fight until she was out of ammunition at which point she dragged her seriously wounded husband to safety. Here, she then decided to reveal her feminine identity. Surprisingly, she was allowed to stay. This decision was made by Rose’s commanders about three months after the April law that prohibited women in the Army (Dekker and Van de Pol 353). Rose stayed with her military unit until September 29, 1793, almost certainly leaving because she was, amazingly, about eight months pregnant. The leniency of Rose’s commanders demonstrates just how nuanced the sociological viewpoints of French people were during the Revolution. One of her commanding officers called her a “Republican heroine” and recommended her to the Convention. She and her husband also received a military bonus of three hundred pounds (Dekker and Van de Pol 353). These events compose a pattern among French military leaders who acted with permissiveness and acceptance when it came to women soldiers. Rose Barreau’s deeds were also detailed in the *Recueil des actions héroïques et civiques des Républicains français* (Dekker and Van de Pol 353). Note the use of the masculine *Républicain* in the title,

which indicates that Rose was placed among stories of other soldiers who were, presumably, all or mostly men. 150,000 copies of this publication went through the country creating considerable fame for Barreau. According to Dekker and Van de Pol, Barreau represented a republican replacement to Joan of Arc who was associated with the French monarchy (353, 358). As Füssel aptly states, “Extreme conditions demand extreme responses: serving the nation could make cross-dressing now appear as a minor misdemeanor” (531).

However, there was a commonly held, persisting, idea that women, at the most, could be the protectors of the homeland, which relates to the household, but not be present on the frontlines, which corresponds to the idea of conquerors abroad (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 13). Robespierre, an iconic leader of the Revolution, preferred women to stay in their domestic roles. This is despite the fact that many women in Paris already worked outside of the home (Lamar 27). Robespierre and other deputies would claim that the encouragement of women’s liberation was not virtuous. Robespierre also believed that if something caused corruption, or lack of virtue, it was counter-revolutionary (Rosso 58). We can therefore conclude that he saw women leaving their homes to go to battle as contradicting their duties and virtues, and consequently a threat to the Revolution. This would result in a dangerous ideological combination and would help to explain the persecution so many of the women activists experienced during the Revolution.

The values of Spartan motherhood were another important and popular part of the cultural climate in eighteenth-century France. Plutarch’s “Sayings of Spartan Women” was a widely read text and this ancient ideology placed an emphasis on the education of children by their mothers. In the Spartan ideal, mothers would exercise their citizenship and patriotic duties by teaching their children to be virtuous citizens (Pichichero 180; Smart 3). Robespierre would

seize on this idea and encourage this traditional conception of womanhood. This stance is contrasted by the women activists discussed in this work, who adopted the politically active and militant template of Spartan men and Enlightenment thought into their own understanding of civic engagement. The *sans-culottes* men, and many other groups of men around France, had done this as well, and it is a logical consequence that women, too, wanted to participate in this citizen-soldier model. Manon Roland, for example, wrote at the age of 22, “I should have been born a Spartan or Roman woman, or at least a French man” (trans. by Moore 91). Pichichero also adds to this understanding of the cultural climate in the eighteenth century. She asserts that plays encouraged women to imitate the heroines therein (181). For example, Barnabé Farin de Rozoi’s *Décus français* (1765) boldly supported women’s access to military and heroic roles and employed lines reminiscent of Plutarch’s “Sayings of Spartan Women” (Pichichero 181). Women revolutionaries certainly drew inspiration from the stories of women fighters from Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The ancient Amazons are thus a recurring theme among women revolutionaries and David Hopkin, in “Female Soldiers and the Battle of the Sexes in France: the Mobilization of a Folk Motif,” mentions the importance of Bellona, the Roman goddess of war, within the revolutionary French imaginary (83). Bellona also appears throughout eighteenth-century literature both before and during the Revolution.

Though most of the women discussed in this thesis wanted to engage in military service such as the National Guard or on the frontlines in the French Army, many women found the idea of Spartan womanhood fulfilling and did not want the added right, and certainly not the obligation, to participate in combat roles. That stated, the women’s equality movement is quite nuanced, and it could be said that many women, who sought to participate in martial roles, also desired to emulate the Spartan women of Antiquity. There are several instances of women

activists caveating their desires for military roles with the assertion that they would not neglect their households. Though researchers speculate that these instances were strategic in nature in order to moderate their extremist demands, there is evidence that shows that these assurances were, at least in some cases, sincere. The reality may be a combination of both strategic and genuine rhetoric. We can observe a glimpse into the thoughts of these women in the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*' charter which makes clear that, while the right to bear arms for women was their goal, it was not their goal to make the carrying of weapons mandatory for women (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 246). Importantly, many of the market-women of Paris viewed the idea of women in combat as abhorrent (Moore 235). Nevertheless, it is important to not paint with too broad a brush. Women with modest means like Pauline Léon, a chocolate-maker, vehemently supported the women's martial citizenship movement. Nevertheless, this militant feminist campaign received a lot of resistance as Jacques Brissot, an important Girondin leader, reminded Léon and her friends, "les femmes Spartiates encourageaient leurs maris et leurs enfants à bien servir la patrie dans des combats, mais ne les y suivaient pas: la nature a marqué la place de chaque sexe" (Brissot, no. 941).

Despite the opposition they faced, many women became soldiers, some openly, though usually disguised as men. Pichichero opines that women soldiers "simultaneously operated within and loosened prevalent gender stereotypes" (180). Godineau aptly remarks that these women's stories help scholars understand the institutional forces of exclusion against women within the army ("De la guerrière" 1). Füssel observes that many women became soldiers for social reasons such as a lack of family structure, while others wished to participate out of a sense of patriotism or possibly even adventure (537). Dekker and Van de Pol strongly support the claim that women soldiers were driven by economic instability (360). For some women soldiers,

poverty is a likely impetus for joining the revolutionary French Army. However, Dekker and Van de Pol's conclusions are problematic in that they call into question the important motivating factors of women soldiers. These factors include the citizen-soldier themes of wanting to secure equality and liberty with their own actions and express their patriotism for France. Dekker and Van de Pol rightly point out that the presence of women soldiers was not unique to the Revolutionary period (358). There are, indeed, examples spanning from Antiquity through the Middle Ages. What Dekker and Van de Pol fail to recognize is the uniqueness of the motives of the women, and incidentally the men, of the French Revolution. Many of these French *citoyennes-soldates* desired equal opportunities to that of men. Additionally, they were motivated by Enlightenment principles that similarly drove the male revolutionaries and *citoyens-soldats*. Freedom, equality, and the right to defend one's country are common sentiments among women soldiers and revolutionaries. While economic pressures may have incentivized some women to enlist, Dekker and Van de Pol's assertion that these women were not feminists is incorrect. For example, the words of the revolutionary veteran Madame de Xentrailles, in 1805, provide a counter to Dekker and Van de Pol's claims. She declares, "J'étais femme, quand j'ai repris aux Prussiens . . . , quand j'ai empêché la révolte . . . , quand j'ai sauvé le 11^e bataillon . . . , quand j'ai pansé les blessées . . . Ce n'est point en femme que j'ai fait la guerre, je l'ai faite en brave" (Godineau, "De la guerrière" 13). According to Godineau, these words reveal a desire to leave aside terms of gender and a desire to use a neutral term for bravery and courage ("De la guerrière" 13). It is true that *brave* in French can be a noun in the masculine or the feminine, and there are historical examples of both ("Brave"). Yet, one cannot help but notice that most of the historical examples in the CNRTL dictionary describe masculine individuals ("Brave"). Perhaps

Madame de Xantrailles was hoping to reclaim this term that was undoubtedly copiously gendered toward the masculine. Instead of using the term in a neutral, egalitarian way, as Godineau suggests, Xantrailles's preceding assertions that she was a woman when she accomplished her exploits implies that she is not denying her gender but seeking to establish that women too can act in bravery. To a certain extent, this move does suggest a willingness to establish equal grounds, but possibly in a different way than Godineau indicates. With Madame de Xantrailles's words taken as a whole, it seems that her affirmations convey a desire to celebrate her feats *as a woman* and reclaim this term, *brave*, to show that it can and should be used in both masculine and feminine contexts.

Another aspect which may have affected women's participation in military roles during the French Revolution, was the literature that explored women heroes that appeared throughout the eighteenth-century. Füssel remarks that, "The cultural representations of so-called Amazons and women in uniform resonated with an early modern culture of dissimulation, as well as chiming with an increasing public interest in the discovery of hidden identities . . . [along with] the rise of patriotism, which paved the way for modern nationalism" (530). Here, Füssel acknowledges the role of patriotism and the virtues of the Revolution, as well as the cultural and literary themes leading up to this event, which undoubtedly influenced the women soldiers of the Revolution. In addition to the real-life cases of eighteenth-century women serving in the military disguised as men, there was also a desire in literature to explore this possibility in fiction and other genres. For example, Louis Rustaing de Saint Jory's *Les femmes militaires, relation historique d'une île nouvellement découverte* (1735) is a book about an island in which the equality of sex is very important and the women are mobilized participants in its military (Füssel 530). This example gives credence to Ball's ideas that literature affects reality and inversely, that

reality affects literature (401). It is likely that literature that promoted the equality of the sexes and female soldiers influenced the women of the Revolution. Likewise, the revolutionary *citoyennes-soldates* created their own literature, and likely engendered literature of similar themes during and after their time.

Throughout French history, both before and during the Revolution, women soldiers interestingly received rewards and commendations for their military service, whether disguised or not. The sisters Félicité and Théophile Fernig, aged 16 and 17, for example, received praise and glory from the newspaper, *Le Courrier de Strasbourg* on July 16, 1792. They dressed in men's garb, though it is unclear if they did so for practicality or to blend in. According to the newspaper, the Fernig sisters were honored and respected among the French Army. Though these sisters were able to continue their service once their story was disseminated, unfortunately, once "outed," many women were not typically permitted to stay in the military (Pichichero 210). Füssel points out that in the French context, "The propaganda value of these patriotic women clearly outweighed the threat they posed to the maintenance of traditional gender norms" (533). This is a poignant observation, for though these stories are celebrated, the revolutionary government hardly considered the possibility of recognizing the rights of women nor officially allowing their participation in the military. Additionally, Füssel shows that these "exceptional cases" of women soldiers during the eighteenth-century were used in patriotic propaganda to reinforce the gender boundaries of the time (536). For example, the revolutionary government, upon hearing Léon's petition to create units of women soldiers, seized upon the opportunity, not to acquiesce to the rights she and the other women demanded, but to shame men into military service.

One of the more interesting facets of these events is the “indulgence,” as Füssel describes, that the French military leaders often demonstrated when women were discovered in military roles (533). Füssel adds that military leaders likely responded favorably to women’s participation in martial roles because they could use it as propaganda to encourage patriotism (533). Füssel and Pichichero both remark on the importance of Joan of Arc within French military culture. “The image of the pious virgin fighter still had clout in the military sphere and cultural imaginary” of the eighteenth century (Pichichero 179). These sentiments are not without precedent. Despite Louis XIV’s 1666 decree to punish women soldiers disguised as men, many officers are documented to have justified and rewarded these women’s actions (Pichichero 178). Similarly, in defiance to the April 1793 law that barred women from the French Army, military officers of the Revolution, like the preceding generations of French military officers, were also more accepting and tolerant than the official policies laid forth by the governing body. According to Pichichero, officers frequently sought pensions and rewards for women who had served militarily (208).

Though Füssel claims that the propaganda value of women soldiers’ stories likely caused the proliferation of their tales, we should keep in mind that, with the tradition of Joan of Arc, many officers and French people were predisposed to celebrate such transgressions. To have the opportunity to be a part of a situation or event that harkens to a shared past and culture, such as Joan of Arc, must have encouraged many officers to not only act with leniency regarding women soldiers, but also protect them from punishment and reward them. Furthermore, the Revolutionary press was also keen to point out and celebrate the women soldiers and activists of the Revolution (Godineau, “La douloureuse”). Though the propaganda value that Füssel mentions cannot be ruled out and is likely a contributing factor to the promulgation of the stories

of *citoyennes-soldates*, it should be noted that the leniency and acceptance that many French officers displayed toward them appear to have been done in a sincere, republican manner. The cases of women being allowed to stay in the military after their “outing,” the celebration of their stories, the protection from legal repercussions, and the rewards they received, all suggest the genuine nature of the officers’ approval. Though these sincere, tolerant French officers may still have made up a minority among their peers, the evidence suggests that their ranks included a higher percentage of men more accepting of the conception of the *citoyenne-soldate* than those men of the Revolutionary government.

Clubs and societies also played an important role in French women’s activism, lives, and the *citoyenne-soldate* conception. Societies were a place for men and women to organize and discuss their ideas, their desires for the path of the Revolution, and other philosophical issues. For example, one Madame Elizabeth Bonaventure Lafaurie addressed the Jacobin club at St. Sever-Cap. She began by forgiving the *philosophes* for their prejudices against women, asserting that they were still human and subject to error (Towers 8-9). Madame Lafaurie argued against blindly following tradition and for the rights of women to vote and defend their country if they so pleased (Towers 9). The importance of clubs and societies to the Revolution is quite profound. Interestingly, Olympe de Gouges, Léon and Théroigne were all members of the Fraternal Society of Patriots of Both Sexes which was created in 1790 (Moore 71). Towers characterizes the early women’s activism movement as moderate, but by 1793, it had turned to a more radical nature (23). Perhaps the most influential women’s society during the Revolution appeared at this more extreme period of 1793, the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*. According to Towers, the establishment of the Society was the beginning of the radical feminist movement that represented “the sans-jupon mentality” of lower income women, who demanded equal rights

for their sex, such as the right to bear arms and the right to vote (23). Perhaps this large-scale radicalism that Towers refers to only appeared by 1793. However, it should be noted that before 1793, from the beginnings of the Revolution, women, such as Théroigne de Méricourt and Olympe de Gouges, were already demanding women's rights.

Olympe de Gouges offered perhaps the most formalized outline of rights for women during the Revolution. In September 1791, Gouges published a declaration of the rights of women which mirrored the official 1789 *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*. In her subversive *Déclaration des Droits de la femme et de la Citoyenne*, Gouges proclaimed the natural and political rights of women. Similarly to Godineau's idea of seizing rights, Ball remarks on Gouge's *Déclaration*, that since women were not allowed authorial rights, Gouges was asserting women's rights and citizenship in the very act of writing (396-397). In her *Preamble* to her *Déclaration*, Gouges employs the theme of Nature to justify her arguments. She asks men to examine the natural world, an integral philosophical reference point for the eighteenth century and Enlightenment and points out that men seemingly wish to emulate this world (Jaume 200). However, she asks if there is any example therein which justifies the reality of the "empire tyrannique" of men over women (Jaume 200). She concludes by saying that, in nature, everything works in harmony and cooperation, while also criticizing the false claims of gender equality. In her postface Gouges returns to this idea of nature, notably criticizing slavery and calls it a practice against nature advancing that the enslavers "méconnaissent les droits de la nature" (Jaume 208). In her *Preamble*, Gouges even goes so far as to blame all of the problems facing government on the exclusion of women, "Considérant que l'ignorance, l'oubli ou le mépris des droits de la femme, sont les seules causes des malheurs publics et de la corruption des gouvernements" (Jaume 200). This supports the hypothesis that had the Revolution adopted

more egalitarian measures toward women, it might have been saved from some of its misdeeds and eventual dissolution. Gouges herself advocated for a more moderate approach to the Revolution, and this might have helped its stability. She offered to defend King Louis XVI in court, and she declared, “The blood, even of the guilty, eternally defiles a revolution” (trans. by Moore 166). Though maybe not the most politically savvy move, she also hoped to make an ally out of the queen, Marie-Antoinette. She wished to make her a champion of women’s rights. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Pauline Léon signed a petition for the execution of Louis XVI. These opposed stances reveal fascinating nuances to the constructions of the identity and character of the women activists of the Revolution. Olympe clearly took a more measured approach than revolutionaries like Léon. Ironically, Léon and many members of her radical Society were spared from the guillotine, while Olympe was not.

In her *Déclaration* Olympe employs an Enlightenment register, using terms like “droits naturels” and asserting that the “réclamations des citoyennes” are founded on “des principes simples et incontestables” and that her demands “tournent toujours au maintien de la constitution, des bonnes mœurs, et au bonheur de tous” (Jaume 201). The use of Enlightenment language indicates that Gouges had adopted Enlightenment principles into her identity. Her advocacy for women soldiers and rights makes her a *citoyenne-soldate* who sought to expand martial citizenship to her gender. Gouges’s *Préambule* and enumeration of rights, at times, takes phrases word for word from the official *Déclaration* of 1789. Article I declares, “La femme naît libre et demeure égale à l’homme en droits. Les distinctions sociales ne peuvent être fondées que sur l’utilité commune” (Jaume 201). In Article XIII, Gouges declares equal access to jobs concerning “la force publique,” “l’administration,” and “l’industrie,” and adds, “les contributions de la femme et de l’homme sont égales, elle a part à toutes les corvées, à toutes les tâches

pénibles” (Jaume 202-203). Given her advocacy for regiments of amazon-soldiers, this access to employment would, for Gouges, certainly include military roles such as the National Guard and the French Army.

Not only did Gouges write and publish this declaration, but she was also politically engaged during her revolutionary time. In 1789 she participated in a women’s delegation that went to the National Assembly to petition for equality in jobs and in rights (Towers 17). She also brought petitions to the National Convention concerning getting homes for the elderly, creating public jobs for the unemployed, rights for minorities, and universal education to include women (Lamar 19). Gouges opposed Robespierre and was very outspoken against the Terror. She was arrested on July 20, 1793 and continued to criticize Robespierre while in jail. She was executed on November 3, 1793. Gouges’s *Déclaration* serves as a one of the founding documents for the women’s equality movement during the French Revolution. Her activism and literature demonstrate an adoption of the Enlightenment ideas of nature, rights, and liberty and a desire to expand them in a more universal, and martial, way to her sex.

The influential Society was founded on May 13, 1793, by Pauline Léon and Claire Lacombe, who were both, at times, president of this club, Lacombe being the first (Towers 29). Nevertheless, Léopold Lacour, in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*, suggests that Léon was a more prominent member and leader than Lacombe since her name was on the Society’s *Règlement*, or charter, of July 1793, and Lacombe’s was not (238).⁷ Furthermore, Lacour cites that Léon served as the representative for the Society at Jacobin meetings at least twice in August 1793 (*La Revue*

⁷ Lacour cites the historian Mortimer Ternaux, in *Histoire de la Terreur*, who mentioned “Les lettres, pouvoirs, et adresses de ce club féminin . . . sont signés: Pauline Léon, présidente” (t.VII.p. 331). Lacour remarks that it is uncertain where Ternaux found these documents but that they most likely burned in an archive fire in 1871 (*La Revue* 238).

238). Nevertheless, Lacombe was an important leader, creating “fanatiques” within the Society, devout to their cause (L. Lacour, *La Revue* 240). Interestingly, this Society brought together a diverse group of women, as Léon’s mother and Théroigne de Méricourt were both members. The Society made no distinction of members’ social status and the club was open to women from all walks of life. Members were required to be “*citoyennes* of good habits and who were truly patriots at heart” (Towers 2). The president of the Society had to wear the *bonnet rouge*, a radical statement at the time because it was traditionally worn by *sans-culottes* men (L. Lacour, *La Revue* 245; Moore 191). The Society met in the Jacobin library on rue Saint-Honoré and Léon and Lacombe would also lead the Society toward strong affiliations with the *sans-culottes* and *sans-jupons* movements (Towers 29, 2). Initially, due to increased clashes between the Society and the Jacobin leadership, one might expect that by July 1793, when the Society moved their meetings away from the Jacobin library, the Society’s relationship to the Jacobins was strained. However, on August 15, Léon led a deputation that demanded correspondence and affiliation with the Jacobins who in turn acquiesced to their request (L. Lacour, *La Revue* 246).

The Society’s goals, as explained by Léon, were to create a glorious era and further complete the Revolution (Moore 189). Given the Society’s egalitarian beliefs on gender, it is clear that Léon saw the women’s rights movement as key to completing the Revolution by making the rights it declared more universal. Perhaps she was right. If the Revolution had recognized women’s rights, maybe the Republic would have been stabilized and strengthened, and the Terror and Napoléon’s coup might have been avoided. The Society also sought to be educated on the Constitution and Republican laws, to defend all people against tyranny, and to defend France itself (Moore 191). In May of 1793, the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* was very active in advocating for the formation of military units of women

soldiers. In the Jacobin club, Society members declared “Que des compagnies d’amazones se forment pour combattre les ennemis de l’intérieur . . . Nous sauverons la patrie” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 110).

As alluded to previously, the Society had a charter, or the *Règlement de la société des citoyennes républicaines révolutionnaires de Paris*, dated July 9, 1793 (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 246).⁸ In the preamble, the Society places an importance on virtues declaring that “sans mœurs et sans principes il n’y a pas de liberté, et considérant que pour bien remplir ses devoirs domestiques il faut connaître ses devoirs sociaux” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 246). From the beginning, in the preamble, as well as in Article 1, the Society indirectly proclaims an adherence and aspiration to the concept of the citizen-soldier, or in this case the *citoyenne-soldate*. The above phrase emphasizes an importance on social duties which are, according to the charter, linked with domestic duties. The preamble and Article 1 also place value on the defense of France, a facet of the citizen-soldier ethos. The preamble states that one of the reasons for the establishment of the Society is to “défendre tous les individus qui seraient victimes de quelques acte arbitraire” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 246). Article 1 goes on to complement the defense of country with the declaration of the right to bear arms for women. For the Society, this right to weapons would give them the tools needed to defend the innocent and the rights of all citizens. These opening phrases demonstrate among these women an adoption of the citizen-soldier model. It also illustrates their desire to politically expand this concept to encompass their gender.

Claude Guillon, in *Deux Enragés de la Révolution*, has a different perspective on this preamble. He does not explicitly view this preamble as an assertion of rights and duties but

⁸ Claude Guillon, in *Deux Enragés de la Révolution*, provides a facsimile of the Society’s charter in its entirety.

claims rather that the preamble acts as a defense against the typical accusations men would bring up against the women's equality movement (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 110). That is, women activists were often accused of putting aside the duties of child rearing and housework that were, at the time, heavily associated with women's duties. This is an interesting interpretation that should be taken into consideration. It is quite plausible that the preamble seeks to address these concerns of more traditionally-minded men and women. Yet, at the same time, the preamble also leans into the values of the citizen-soldier model, that is, of having civic and martial aspects incorporated into identity and actions. Tellingly, Article I of the Society's charter declared that the voluntary arming of women in the defense of France was the purpose of the club. It reads, "Le but de la société ayant pour objet de s'armer pour concourir à la défense de la Patrie; sont néanmoins libres les Citoyennes de s'armer ou de ne pas s'armer" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 246). Notice the voluntary caveat added to this provision. Claire Lacombe, for example, was against mothers taking part in the armed defense of their country (Moore 189). Though these concessions indicate that, as Guillon advances, the women of the Society included them in the charter for strategic purposes to placate the traditional conceptions of women, it is also likely that these provisions served another role. This secondary role of Article I served to represent the Society's beliefs. Keep in mind that Claire Lacombe, the first president of the club, believed that mothers should not be in martial roles. This belief may have been common among Society members and likely had an influence on the clause's voluntary nature. Even though the Society is considered an extreme club within the Revolution, there are indications that many of the members still held traditionalist beliefs when it came to women's roles in society and their households. We will see more evidence of this throughout this study.

Returning to Article I, Ball comments, saying that the women of the Society “argued for their inclusion in public citizenship not primarily through the vote, or through representation, but through the right to aid in the defense of the nation” (399). Essentially, Article I demands the right to be a *citoyenne-soldate*. The emphasis on access to martial roles, as opposed to voting rights is somewhat perplexing. Perhaps the women saw the role of the *citoyenne-soldate* as a means to attain the other rights associated with citizenship. The significance of Article I, and its martial provisions, is amplified by its position as the first Article in the charter. Article 1 strongly suggests that these women were influenced by the martial, citizen-soldier philosophy of the ancients, the *philosophes*, and fellow revolutionaries. Its adoption into the Society’s charter indicates that the members wanted to expand the rights of women, while at the same time desiring to maintain some of the gender norms in France. An initial question that comes to mind is how widespread was the adoption of martial citizenship among the women of the Society? Did some believe that women could choose their own paths and refuse a life of domesticity? Probably, but the reality is probably much more nuanced among each individual member. In any case, mandatory military roles or compulsory arming of women seemed to be off the table for most of the Society members.

Moving to Article XII of the Society’s *Règlement*, members were required to be in good social standing or have “bonnes mœurs” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 247). A failure to adhere to this standard would result in expulsion. Per Article XV, members were required to take the oath “I swear to live for the Republic or die for it” (Towers 31). Article XIX declares that an “acte arbitraire” or an attack on one of the members is an attack on the Society. This article specifies that the Society will render its own justice in cases of attack (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 248). This provision alludes to a vigilanteism the Society would, at times, adopt. This article also references

the women's abhorrence of arbitrary acts. This would turn out to be an ironic juxtaposition of policy, as it could be said that several of the Society's acts of vigilanteism turned into arbitrary actions, particularly when it came to attacking those with whom they did not agree. If Article XIX was a more authoritarian provision, Article XXVI demonstrates the Society's democratism. It states that all members had a right to speak at meetings and indicates that eighteen was to be the minimum age for women that wanted to join the Society. This article recognized that many mothers might want to bring their children younger than eighteen years old to meetings, though the children were not allowed to have a "voix délibérative" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 249). This article also seems to portray an aspect of the Society's interpretation of the *citoyenne-soldate* model. At its core, this model was generally perceived as both a martial and civic responsibility of individuals. For the Society, women could come to meetings and participate in political and civic discussions. They could organize and participate in protests and advocate for martial roles for women, while at the same time exposing their children to such ideas, and not leaving them in, potentially, an empty home. In this way, these women could contribute to the propagation of republican ideas in their children. Guillon notes that the charter is signed by the current *Présidente* Roussaud and four other secretaries, including Léon (*Deux Enragés* 12).

Interestingly, Lacombe's name is absent from this charter. Guillon asserts that, contrary to past research, which places Lacombe at the forefront of the Society, Léon played an equally important role in the Society's activities, if not more so than Lacombe (*Deux Enragés* 12). It is certainly true that, if there was ever any doubt to Léon's influence within the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*, the detailing of her actions from this study should prove otherwise. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Society chose new presidents and secretaries quite often. The classic republican fear of having power in the same hands for too

long was expressed by Léon herself as well as in the charter's bylaws which required frequent votes and changes of power. Both Léon and Lacombe were presidents of the Society, and yet they were not at the time of the adoption of this *Règlement*. Therefore, Lacombe's absence should not necessarily negate her importance to the Society's movement and activism.

It appears the Society was quite focused on creating women's military and National Guard units. Though detailed records of the Society's meetings were not kept, or perhaps lost, Pierre-Joseph-Alexis Roussel wrote about an August 1793 meeting he attended (Moore 202). He observed sixty-seven women at one session and Monic, a member, argued for the benefits of a nation made up of armed women defending their country (Towers 32). Roussel opined after the meeting that he was scared of the idea of women getting involved in politics (Towers 32). In Monic's address she also references past and present heroines including Judith, Joan of Arc, the Amazons, Spartan women, and even some of the women of the Society and the Revolution like Claire Lacombe and Reine Audu. Monic declares, "If women are suited for combat, they are no less suited for government" (trans. by Moore 203). Monic also mentions women rulers and influencers of the past as proof of women's capacity to govern and suggested that women could govern nations potentially better than men could (Moore 203; Abray 52). Fascinatingly, Olympe de Gouges was present at this meeting and praised Monic for her speech (Moore 203).

In 1793, the Society was inserted itself into Revolutionary politics. The Society would engage in the politicization of bread prices and the prices of other basic goods (Towers 23). This was due to the increase in food shortages and an increase in prices throughout 1793 (Towers 27). For example, people would begin forming lines at bakeries at two o'clock in the morning and people often went away empty handed. Violence also sometimes erupted in these lines for food (Towers 27). The Society was focused on helping the poorer sections of society and appealed to

the Jacobin faction to “Come to the aid of all unfortunate people. This is the call of nature; this is the vow of true patriots” (trans. by Towers 34). From this quote we can draw two conclusions. The first is that the Society, whether consciously or not, employed Rousseau’s idea of helping others in need, a virtue he considered “natural.” Secondly, the Society here appeals to patriotism and how they envision its manifestation. In all likelihood, many of the women of the Society were well aware of Rousseau’s philosophies as he was a very popular writer. The women of the Revolution were knowledgeable about ancient topics and personas such as the Amazons and Spartans, and it is also quite likely that many of them had read, or were at least familiar with, Rousseau’s writings and ideas. The Society aligned with the Montagnard populist movement in 1793 that would, in mid-1793, supplant the Girondins and place Robespierre in power (Towers 32). According to Abney, in “Feminism in the French Revolution” the Society was, at least in part, responsible for the fall of the Girondins (52). During the coup of May 31 to June 2, 1793, women from the Society took the citizen-soldier role upon themselves by guarding the National Convention, barring any Girondins from entering (Towers 33; Moore 194). Some women praised the Society members for having participated in this movement, recognizing that they pulled double duty in both their households and in public life (Moore 193-194). It would therefore seem that public commentary would acknowledge the dual roles these women took on as *citoyennes-soldates*, even if not in such direct terms. Indeed, the Society members did exercise a function of the citizen-soldier model by participating in this transition of power. Whether or not these actions were justified is another question. In hindsight the Girondins’ fall seemingly led to more unrest, chaos, and the Terror.

Leading up to this change in power, the Society women took to the streets of Paris in May looking for counterrevolutionaries. They were armed with guns and knives in their belts,

and they patrolled the Tuileries garden and the halls of the Convention. They checked entry passes and looked to see if individuals were wearing the tricolor *cocarde*, which, at that point in mid-May of 1793, was not mandated by law. They also stopped individuals whose politics were questionable in the eyes of the Society (Moore 192). Moore points out the irony of the Society's tyrannical actions (192). Though the involvement of citizens in public affairs is in line with the citizen-soldier conception, the Society, in these instances, overstepped their authority within the citizen-soldier ethos. That is, they were harassing, and even attacking those with whom they disagreed, or who were not wearing the patriotic *cocarde*. These actions go against the very ideals of freedom of thought and expression, and freedom from "actes arbitraires" the Society professed to support.

Though the Society did not always use fair and proper judgement, there are several instances of members taking part in public service activities of that suggest an adoption of the citizen-soldier model. On June 30, 1793, the *Assemblée générale* issued a commendation, which also served as an exoneration, of the Society. The statement details their upstanding actions in curtailing the looting of soap: "Elles ont contribué très efficacement à faire cesser le pillage des savons et à détromper leurs concitoyennes séduites par les conseils perfides des aristocrates" (Assemblée générale). Despite this recognition, the Society later admitted that it did expel some of its members for having participated in the looting of soap (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 123). This indicates the presence of integrity within the Society. However, when the Society's actions turned more violent, like with the enforcement of the wearing of the *cocarde* on market-women, their actions could be better described as tyrannical than that of the virtues of a citizen-soldier. Tragically, women from the Society would attack one of their own, Théroigne de Méricourt, on May 15, 1793 (Moore 192). Though a principled approach to republicanism in France would

denounce these actions as arbitrary and unjust, many revolutionaries would have likely lauded these radical acts as being virtuous and in line with the citizen-soldier model. The French Revolution, after all, was a very chaotic and extreme time. All of this suggests that virtue and the qualities that make up an ideal, even one seemingly as clear as that of the citizen-soldier, can depend on who is asked, their perspective, and the cultural climate.

The beginning of the end for the Society came in August of 1793. During this time, when Robespierre held power, the Society shifted away from the Jacobins to the more radical movement of the *Enragés*. They were unhappy with the unfulfilled promises of the leaders of the Jacobins and Montagnards. The Montagnards, in their eyes, were not doing enough for the impoverished people of France. The Society criticized and attempted to destabilize the government. This proved to be the ultimate move that brought an end for all women's societies and clubs across France (Towers 2). The *Enragés* and the Society supported direct democracy, trade regulations and equality. They envisioned a government that created economic equality, and, importantly, the *Enragés* encouraged women to participate in politics (Moore 200-201). The Montagnards' disengagement from supporting women's rights was likely the impetus for this new alliance. Interestingly, in early 1793, the Society had made a surprising shift from the Girondin movement, to the Montagnards. The Girondins had been more receptive to the idea of women's rights and involvement in politics and were therefore perplexed to hear the Society chanting for their heads in the streets. The Society members were heard chanting "Vive la Montagne! À la guillotine les brissotins! Vive Marat! Vive le Père Duchesne" (Moore 193). As demonstrated in the above chants, the Society was prone to advocate for violence and in May and August of 1793, the Society had advocated for the killing of speculators, hoarders, and merchants who drove up the prices of food (Ball 399). Ball remarks, "If we see a deplorable

contradiction, they surely saw a hard-nosed, practical response to concrete circumstances” and he adds, as partial justification to their actions, “to be undominated requires a robust and violent participation in politics” (399). These are interesting comments as Ball alludes to the Revolutionary context and the point of time and culture in which the women of the Society lived. The Revolution was a violent time in France’s history and radical stances like those of the Society’s were not uncommon. Though modern observers would prefer that these women had taken a more measured approach to this situation, it is possible that these women felt they had no other choice but to make such claims. This was perhaps in hopes to be heard and to stand up for themselves during the upheavals of the Revolution. Nevertheless, it should be noted, as Towers points out, that the radical, violent positions, likely contributed to the Society’s alienating nature among French women, and thus prevented a successful unification of the women’s movement. This lack of unification would ultimately make it easier to attack and disband women’s societies in France.

The Society, however, along with the *Enragés* and *sans-culottes* factions, did enjoy some political victories before they were pushed out of politics (Towers 37). In September 1793, the fixing of food prices was established in addition to the passing of economic laws which the Society endorsed. However, these measures also alienated many women who worked in the markets and who were negatively impacted by price fixing (Towers 40). The market-women, sometimes called *Poissardes*, are an important demographic of women who made up the principal instigators of several grain riots throughout the Revolution.⁹ These women sold goods, practiced trades, and were largely from the poorer segments of society. This group of women is

⁹ *Poissardes* was the name sometimes used for market-women because some sold fish in the marketplaces (Moore 30).

an interesting and puzzling segment of the population because many supported and participated in the women's independence and egalitarian movement, while others opposed it. On the egalitarian side, many of these women incorporated into their philosophies and identities the right to sign petitions, attend the National Assembly, and criticize those they found unpatriotic. Moore describes these women as the "barometers of the political environment: if things were really bad, the market women would be restless" (30). Those women that were unaffected by the new economic policies championed by the Society were hesitant to support the club, given its proclivity to use violence and criticize the government (Towers 40). Many women were therefore reluctant to join an organization that could jeopardize their safety (Towers 51). Society members themselves were subject to attacks on their reputations and physical safety from both the government and people on the streets. Abray characterizes the feminist movement of the Revolution as a minority movement, too radical to enjoy enough support (62). That certainly seems to be true for the Society. However, the feminist movement, as a whole, likely enjoyed greater support than the Society itself.

One of the Society's political victories was one which likely also pronounced their doom. In perhaps a skilled strategic move by the government, the Society-supported Terror was adopted on September 5, 1793 (Towers 37). This gave the French government the power to persecute Society and *Enragés* members and eventually shut down women's clubs across France entirely. In fact, Jacques Roux, an *Enragé* leader, was arrested on the same day the Terror was adopted (Towers 47). Then, on September 16, 1793, the Jacobins accused Claire Lacombe and the Society of counterrevolution (Towers 48, 59). Chabot, Basire, Taschereau, and others condemned the Society at this Jacobin meeting. Lacombe was a particular target of these criticisms and was denounced so much so that the newspapers falsely reported that she was

arrested (L. Lacour, *La Revue* 252). The September 1793 mandate of the wearing of the patriotic ribbon, the tricolor *cocarde* was another political success for the Society, but also served as a divisive wedge between many Parisian women. The Society had petitioned the government for the adoption of this measure, yet this law was not in line with the principles of liberty and, like the other deviations from the ideas of freedom and justice, these actions likely undermined the Society's effectiveness in gaining widespread support. Moreover, Towers comments, "Moderate feminism had been tacitly viewed as a natural, yet harmless consequence of Revolutionary fervor" yet the Society itself was viewed as radical by many French men and women who did not like such extreme stances (10-13; 52). For example, though the mandatory wearing of the *cocarde* was not mandatory for women until September 21, 1793, the Society had begun enforcing it on those who were not wearing it, particularly among the market-women (Moore 225; 234). Even when the wearing of the *cocarde* had been mandated, the market-women of Paris stood up to the new regulations and refused to wear it (Towers 54). Moore observes that many of them were against wearing it because they saw it as a mark of citizenship, bearing the responsibility to go to war and be involved in politics. Many of the market-women did not believe women should participate in these types of roles (Moore 235). Taking this into account, we can see how the Society, by violently enforcing the wearing of the *cocarde* even before its legal mandate, alienated a large section of women from supporting them and their fight for women's equality. A police report on September 21, 1793 remarked on the unrest between these two groups of women. It described market-women ripping the *cocarde* off female passerbys, while Society members, in turn, harassed women who were not wearing it (Towers 54). A riot eventually broke out in the market of *Les Halles* when some women tried to enforce the *cocarde* law on the market-women there (Towers 53). Another riot occurred when the women from the

markets interrupted a Society meeting. Though it seems clear now that the market-women started this riot, the government sprung upon this incident and declared the Society responsible for the violence (Towers 55). By the end of October, a group of women from the markets went to the Convention and demanded the dissolution of the Society and asked for the repeal of the *cocarde* law (Towers 61). The National Convention quickly acquiesced to these demands and outlawed all women's groups on October 30, 1793 (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 159). At this time, the government also declared itself "revolutionary until the peace" (trans. by Towers 67). This legislative declaration is relatively significant as it was declaring that the revolutionary government had the power to shut down political opponents, in this case women's clubs, in the name of peace. Furthermore, using the term "revolutionary" implies, particularly at this point of the Terror, that the French government could do whatever it viewed was necessary to maintain the control of power. The Society personally protested this measure at the Convention on November 5, 1793. However, the Convention denied their request to reverse the law (Towers 61).

While women's societies and clubs played a crucial role in the encouragement of thoughtful discussions and the organization of activism, Towers notes that, "Any social or political advancement that had been made by a few feminist activists . . . was quickly destroyed by the tactics and political alliances the group [The Society of Revolutionary Republican Women] had made" (Towers 1). The Society was, in many ways, a source of organization and empowerment, yet, in the end, it likely created the conditions and justifications that would be used to dismantle the progress the women's movements had made. To be certain, mistakes were made on the part of the members of the Society and their activism, but even if the women revolutionaries had avoided these mistakes, it is unlikely that their movement would have

successfully manifested a complete equality between the sexes within the First French Republic. Not only did the violent strategies the Society employed alienate more moderate French women, but we should also keep in mind the influence of the philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau on revolutionary France and French women. Rousseau believed in traditional roles for women rather than their equality or political participation. Rousseau was seen as a kind of founding father to the Revolution, and therefore, his views carried a lot of weight. Even had the Society women avoided the extreme affiliations and measures they endorsed and carried out, it might not have been enough to garner enough feminine support to gain full equality. Nevertheless, it is possible, that without some of the mistakes and enemies the Society created, and had they tempered their more radical views to attract more followers, equality and improvements in women's rights might have been possible. Indeed, women's clubs might not have been outlawed which would have given them and others more chances to affect change. Abrey underlines another important factor which hindered this equality movement: the role social conservatism played during the Revolution (62). This role was particularly accentuated among women who did not work and who were from the middle to higher family-income ranges (62). Abrey advances that these women did not want to change their role, which unlike the less wealthy populations, was a domestic life, free from hard labor (62). Though this may have been true generally, the demographics of the women's movement reveal a more nuanced view of the situation. Théroigne, Gouges, Léon, and Madame d'Aelders all hailed from families having a more middle-income range. However, Towers concludes in her dissertation, "The Society failed miserably in bringing cohesion and structure to a nascent women's movement" (72). Indeed, had the Society been less divisive and been able to recruit the market-women into their movement, it is quite possible they could have strong-armed the Convention into recognizing certain rights for

women. “The government was able to discredit the group [the Society] easily since they did not represent the typical Parisian woman” (Towers 73). Had the government recognized women’s rights and equality, would the path of the French Revolution have been different? A cohesive women’s movement might have changed the direction of the Revolution and safeguarded the rights of French citizens from abuses of power, like the executions of the Terror. The system of Terror discredited the Jacobin and *sans-culottes*’ Enlightenment-inspired ideologies of personal rights and freedoms. The irony is that the revolutionary government did not practice these principles during their governance. It is quite likely that the betrayal these ideas was the ultimate cause of the Revolution’s downfall which consequently led to Napoléon and then the Restoration. A silver lining to this tale of women activists is that in the insurrections of 1848 and 1871, French women took inspiration from the Society, who were viewed as advocates for the middle to lower income groups of French people (Towers 73). In the following chapters we will study the individual French women, or *citoyennes-soldates*, whose stories provide examples of women adopting this concept of martial citizenship into their identity and trying to expand it and its rights for their sex.

Chapter 3: Let's Ride! Reine Chapuy, a *Citoyenne-soldate* of the Revolutionary French Cavalry

Among the citizen-soldiers of the French Revolution, Reine Chapuy is perhaps the *citoyenne-soldate par excellence*. Chapuy served in the French Cavalry and when she was relieved of duty due to her gender, she petitioned the National Assembly to recognize her right to return to military service. This petition expresses the virtues of the citizen-soldier model and yields insights into her beliefs and identity. Chapuy was born on May 12, 1776, at Versailles to Marie-Anne Goujon and Amédée Chapuy (Cottreau, A.N., c II, cote 983). Chapuy began her military service at the young age of sixteen years old, enlisting in the French Cavalry on February 27, 1793 ("Gazette Nationale" 483). After serving for about a year, she was pushed out of military service because of her sex. A military leave document details her portrait and dismissal: "5 pieds, 2 pouces, 6 lignes," or about 5'2", blonde hair and eyelashes, and blue eyes. She had an oval face with smallpox scars and a "nez court, bouche moyenne, et après avoir reconnu son sexe, lui avons permis conformément à la loi de se retirer où bon lui sembleroit. Fait à Beauvais, le 2 nivôse an 2" (Cottreau A.N., c II, cote 983). As shown by this document, Chapuy was dismissed from service after her gender was revealed. Riposting, Chapuy petitioned the National Assembly to return to the military. In her petition, not only did she wish to continue her service as a soldier, but she also advocated for women's access to martial roles. Chapuy's petition demonstrates her adoption and interpretation of the citizen-soldier model and reveals interesting aspects of her identity.

To provide context, I will briefly outline what the citizen-soldier, or martial citizenship, model is. This construction unites the roles of citizen and soldier into one person. The

eighteenth-century citizen-soldier model evolved from the military enlightenment that directly preceded it. The military enlightenment emphasized domestic, political, and martial characteristics in a soldier (Pichichero 160-162). The citizen-soldier mirrors these principles but adds republican values. These virtues include a desire to attain or protect the rights associated with citizens in a republic, such as the right to vote. Furthermore, not only are martial citizens politically engaged in their community, but they are also, in some fashion, militaristically involved in its protection. This can be realized by military service, like in Chapuy's case, or in more non-formal capacities. Citizen-soldiering was an important role for both men and women during the French Revolution. As will be shown, Chapuy participated in martial citizenship by joining the military and demanding the right for women to be a part of the military.

Chapuy apparently served in the 24th Cavalry Regiment in the Yvendorff company with honor. She received several accolades from her superiors attesting to her bravery. For example, one commendation reads, "Nous commandant dudit régiment, certifions . . . que la citoyenne Reine Chapuis dite Chapuy . . . est entrée au corps . . . et qu'elle s'y est toujours comportée en brave militaire et en vrai républicaine . . . En foi de quoi, fait à Beauvais, le 2 nivôse an II. Signé Gury" (Cottreau, A.N., c II, cote 983). The language in this document is very fascinating, and it is indicative of what other researchers have found concerning French officers' reactions to and treatment of women soldiers. Chapuy's superior, here it would appear to be one Gury, attests to Chapuy's bravery, as well as, importantly, her status as a "citoyenne" and a "vraie républicaine." These accolades make indirect references to the citizen-soldier ideal and the virtues that accompany it. She is also described as a "brave militaire." Not only had Chapuy proven, in the eyes of her commander, that she was a courageous soldier, but that she also had the obligatory devotion to the republic as a "citoyenne." Another military document reports, "La citoyenne

dénommée ci-dessous a servi . . . avec honneur, exactitude et probité. Elle est partie avec différents détachements pour l'armée où elle a remplis ses devoirs militaires avec une bravoure peu commune et a donné des marques non équivoques de son civisme" (Cottreau, A.N., c II, cote 983). Here again, this commentator uses similar language to that of the first French officer, alluding to martial citizenship in citing Chapuy's bravery and "civisme."

In studying these commendations, it is important to keep in mind the philosophical and cultural attitudes of the time. Throughout the eighteenth century, the military enlightenment, and citizen-soldier concepts had heavily influenced the cultural imaginary. In the military enlightenment, civic engagement and public service were added to the military virtues of bravery and physical prowess. The citizen-soldier model, which traces its roots from ancient Greece to Enlightenment discussions, was adopted in France during the Revolution. This concept took the ideas of the military enlightenment and applied the patriotism and loyalty, once given to a monarch, to a republic. What came with this metamorphosis was an appreciation of the rights and liberties which accompanied the new French Republic. In the second document that praises Chapuy, her superior provides an accumulation of vocabulary terms linked with the ideal of the citizen-soldier, or in this case, the *citoyenne-soldate*. This officer, as the one before him, declares Chapuy a citizen, details her honorable service, and explains that she fulfilled her "devoirs militaires" with "une bravoure peu commune." The officer also remarks on Chapuy's "civisme," thereby referring to both sides of the citizen-soldier model. Though Chapuy served in disguise, these complimenting military documents refer to Chapuy as a "citoyenne" and are almost certainly written after her dismissal from service. These praises provide evidence that, at least on a certain level, a more universal approach to citizenship, one that included women, was accepted by many French military officers. Additionally, these documents do not suggest a willingness to

use Chapuy's story as a patriotic propaganda tool, as Marian Füssel, in "Between Dissimulation and Sensation: Female Soldiers in Eighteenth-Century Warfare," proposes was sometimes the case (533). Rather, these military records indicate that these officers sincerely wished to celebrate Chapuy's republican military service. It is possible these officers were influenced by the cultural heritage of Joan of Arc and the tendency to celebrate such instances. However, the officer's republican language, and the title of "citoyenne" they gave to Chapuy, imply the presence of a different perspective on women in the military. No longer driven by traditional outlooks and propagandist intent, the language used in these cases suggests a desire to recognize Chapuy as a *citoyenne-soldate* and to celebrate her actions in service to the Republic. This is contrasted by the National Assembly's continued unwillingness to recognize women's rights and access to military roles. On a grander scale, officers were often keen to take care of the women soldiers they encountered. They were known to shield women from punishment, reward and praise them for their military service, and even keep them in their military units. The military documents which honored Chapuy for her service demonstrate the presence of the "indulgence" that Füssel attributes to many of the French officers throughout the eighteenth-century and French Revolution (533). Interestingly, among men, a more universal understanding of citizenship appears to have been more prevalent in the military than within the "enlightened" political spheres of Paris.

Unfortunately, this sentiment was not omnipresent, nor strong enough to keep Chapuy in the military. Perhaps the officers that wrote those documents wanted to keep Chapuy in service but were overridden by their superiors. There are, after all, cases of women, such as Rose Barreau who were allowed to stay in the army, even after the discovery of their gender. After her dismissal from the military, Chapuy presented a petition to the Convention on January 19, 1794

(Godineau, “La douloureuse”). According to Godineau, Chapuy addressed the Convention wearing her cavalry uniform (“La douloureuse”). However, there is evidence that indicates that Chapuy’s letter was read by a secretary at the Convention, rather than by Chapuy herself (“Gazette Nationale” 483). With only two contradictory accounts found, it remains up to speculation whether Chapuy herself presented her petition. Given her military daring and the very act of writing a petition to return to military service, if given the chance, Chapuy would likely have taken the opportunity to address the Convention herself.

Throughout the petition, Chapuy deploys a style that parallels Enlightenment thought and language. Chapuy’s petition provides evidence for her adoption of the values of the citizen-soldier and a desire to broaden its scope. She begins by providing the reasons that impelled her to join the military, “Enflammée du feu sacrée de la liberté” and filled with the “désir brûlant de venger ma Patrie, de combattre les tyrans et de partager la gloire de les foudroyer” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). In these examples, Chapuy uses words and themes common to eighteenth-century French philosophy and literature. She declares that she is filled with the sacred fire of liberty and wishes to avenge France and gain glory in fighting its tyrants. Far from being disingenuous, Chapuy makes an impassioned case for her actions and virtues and for her return to military service. She uses the popular language of the day, not only to express herself, but also to persuade the Convention to recognize her right to fight in the French military.

Chapuy then affirms her resolve in battle: “le bruit du canon, le sifflement des balles et des obuses, loin de m’intimider n’ont fait que redoubler mon courage” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). She continues, detailing the camaraderie she experienced with the other soldiers, “Je m’y suis présentée avec mes intrépides frères d’armes les cavaliers du 24^e régiment et je l’ai bravé comme eux” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). Here, Chapuy makes parallels to her courage and to that

of her “brothers in arms, the knights of the 24th regiment” (my trans.) In these phrases, it appears that Chapuy is using language to construct and shape her identity. Füssel applies this approach to women soldiers drawing from Stephen Greenblatt’s work, in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Füssel asserts that eighteenth century women soldiers used language as a means of self-fashioning an identity (Füssel 536; Greenblatt 9). In this petition, readers can draw an understanding of how Chapuy saw herself. She viewed herself as a *citoyenne-soldate* who was keenly patriotic, freedom-loving, courageous, martial, and not without camaraderie among her fellow soldiers. The act of writing and speaking can also influence the creator’s identity, creating a circular continuum. In writing her petition, it is likely that Chapuy accessed emotions that stemmed from her identity and translated these emotions into words. These words, in turn, may have led Chapuy to a better understanding of her own identity and personal sentiments concerning her military service to her nation. Chapuy is not only using language, or perhaps exploring language, to shape her identity, but she is also using it to advance women’s rights and persuade her audience, the Convention, to recognize her right to return to military service.

The pursuit of glory is a theme invoked by Chapuy frequently throughout her petition. This subject was also routinely present in women’s and men’s speech and writings in revolutionary France (Godineau, “De le guerrière” 13). Chapuy mentions a desire for glory in fighting and killing France’s tyrants. In doing so, she hoped to obtain the accolades of war and collect “les lauriers républicains” of heroes (“Gazette Nationale” 483). She continues, “Ah! Mes frères, vous qui avez le bonheur de combattre lorsque vous reviendrez couverts de gloire, comment accueillerez vous votre sœur infortunée? De quel œil me regarderiez-vous? C’est donc en vain que j’avais, à votre exemple, fait le serment de mourir pour la République!” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). This is an interesting and puzzling passage in which Chapuy, at this point, has

employed the word “brother” in her petition three times (my trans.). The first time seems to reference her biological brothers whose example of military service encouraged her to do the same. The second instance referenced her fellow soldiers, or “brothers in arms” (my trans.) This third example cited above could be interpreted as referring to either. On the one hand, she could be alluding to her siblings who are in the army, and whom she does not want to lose to in the competition for glory. After all, she does refer to herself as “sister” in this phrase (my trans.). On the other hand, she could also be referring to French soldiers in general, and potentially, future love interests who, “covered in glory” are returning home seeking love (my trans.). In any case, Chapuy does not wish to miss out or feel like she is lacking in glory, whether she is compared to her actual brothers, fellow soldiers, or a potential significant other.

During the military enlightenment a greater push emerged for the recognition and glorification of the common soldier. However, as Joseph Clarke mentions, in “Cenotaphs and Cypress Trees: Commemorating the Citizen-Soldier in the Year II,” the revolutionary government continued the *Ancien Régime*’s tradition of honoring its important figureheads. Famous personalities such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Jean-Paul Marat were celebrated by the First Republic, yet, like the monarchical tradition, it remained relatively silent on the actions of common soldiers (Clarke 224). This led Jacobin clubs and other societies across France to create their own commemorations for ordinary fallen French soldiers (Clarke 224). Begun in May 1793, and finished in August, a pyramid was erected in Reims honoring soldiers from that city who had died in battle (Clarke 225). This yearning for glory and desire to democratize it was a widespread sentiment in France that, in many cases, bridged gender differences as displayed by Chapuy’s petition. It is important to note that it is not just Chapuy’s petition, but Chapuy herself who expressed an aspiration for glory.

Toward the end of the petition, in what could be considered the climax, Chapuy directly calls for her readmission into the cavalry and returns to the theme of glory and equality among the sexes: “Que ma demande soit accordée, je revole à mon poste . . . et je prouverai que le bras d’une femme vaut bien celui d’un homme, lorsque ses coups sont dirigés par l’honneur, la soif de gloire, et la certitude d’exterminer les grands (On applaudit)” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). This final statement is quite powerful and demonstrates Chapuy’s adoption of the virtues of the citizen-soldier model. These virtues include her “soif de gloire” and the desire to serve her republican nation in combat honorably (“Gazette Nationale” 483). Additionally, she boldly proclaims that she will prove that women soldiers are just as good as men. She seeks to establish an equality within the citizen-soldier concept, improve women’s rights, and defend her country. Chapuy’s sentiments and actions in her petition and military career, illustrate her embrace of the *citoyenne-soldate* model.

Nevertheless, Rudolf Dekker and Lotte Van de Pol hypothesize otherwise in *Republican Heroines: Cross-Dressing Women in the French Revolution*. They call into question the patriotism of Chapuy and other women who fought in the French military. They claim, “It is quite possible that poverty was more frequently a (partial) motivating force” (356). They add that fame, pensions, and adventure were also motivating factors for these women citizen-soldiers (356). These researchers even go so far as to suggest that the Fernig sisters, Félicité and Théophile, aged 16 and 17, entered military service for an “adventurous life” and that they were motivated by their sexual liaisons with General Dumouriez (356). However, reports on the Fernig sisters appear to indicate that they desired to defend their village from invasion, a quality that is one of a sincere citizen-soldier. Adventure is indeed a likely contributing factor for the Fernig sisters’ service, as they placed themselves on the frontlines of battles and went on night

patrols. However, the allusions Dekker and Van de Pol make about their desires for adventure and sexual relationships risk undermining the importance of their military service. The newspaper *Le Courrier de Strasbourg* praised and glorified the Fernig sisters' actions. A July 16, 1792 report affirmed that the French Army respected and honored the Fernig sisters and the publication details their service: "Presque tous les jours elles sont sans cesse habillées en homme, afin d'être plutôt prêtes à partir . . . Presque toutes les nuits elles vont en patrouille avec nos soldats; elles les conduisent. La nuit du 10 au 11 [juillet] elles tirèrent au moins chacune plus de vingt coups de fusil. Elles ne redoutent rien; elles affrontent la mort avec un courage vraiment héroïque" ("Le Courrier" 695). It appears evident that they fought with courage. Furthermore, considering the societal and physical risks they took, such as dressing in men's clothing and participating in battles, it is certain that they were driven by a patriotism to the Republic, a desire to defend their village, and, admittedly, likely had a penchant for adventure. However, this adventurism should not be used to undermine the Fernig sisters' service as this is a frequent trait among individuals who voluntarily join the military.

Considering the Fernig sister's combat stories and Chapuy's expressions of patriotism and determination to return to service and glory, it does not seem reasonable to assume or allude to a desire for economic stability or sexual relations, as Dekker and Van de Pol do (356). Chapuy herself, offers a clear rebuttal to economic motivation, "Insensible au vil espoir de la récompense, ce ne sont pas des bienfaits que je réclame; le vrai républicain n'est-il pas assez payé par le plaisir, et dédommagé par la gloire de se battre?" ("Gazette Nationale" 483). Chapuy continues, "Mon unique ambition est de voir mes services accueillis favorablement de la Convention" ("Gazette Nationale" 483). These statements, along with the totality of her petition, seem to exclude Dekker and Van de Pol's hypotheses of economic motivators. Though everyone

needs to eat and make a living, the way Dekker and Van de Pol propose their arguments seems to invalidate the passions and sincerity of the words, actions, and activism of Chapuy and of the other French *citoyennes-soldates*. Moreover, Dekker and Van de Pol directly exclude the motivation of feminism from these women, “Little evidence can be found to support enlistment as an expression of feminism. Although the desire to make women entirely equal can be found among official defense pleas, did those who really entered service think in this way? Sometimes they did, such as Reine Chapuy” and they cite her petition here, “Je prouverai à la République que le bras d’une femme vaut bien celui d’un homme” (357). Yet, in the same breath, they cast doubt on Chapuy’s sincerity, “However, she also stressed that unlike most of her sex, she was not frightened by the violence of war” (Dekker and Van de Pol 357). Here, Dekker and Van de Pol present an elaborate argument. Initially, they claim that, while it is hard to be certain of these women’s truthful commentaries on equality, Chapuy was sincere in her egalitarian feminist language. Yet, in the very next phrase they allude to a section of her petition that, to them, compromises her feminism.

It is unclear which part of Chapuy’s petition these authors are referencing. There are only two phrases of the petition that seem to be the possible citation of Dekker and Van de Pol’s argument. The first: “J’aurais cru déroger au sang généreux de ma famille, si je n’avais pas fait le sacrifice des armes qui sont le partage ordinaire de mon sexe, au désir brûlant de venger ma Patrie, de combattre les tyrans et de partager la gloire de les foudroyer” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). Chapuy, here, only seems to indicate that she “cried, as women are prone to do, in desiring military service and glory” (my trans.) Though an argument could be made that this statement is not politically correct according to today’s standards, it seems clear that Chapuy desired to improve French women’s equality in social and military life and “prouverai à la République que

le bras d'une femme vaut bien celui d'un homme" ("Gazette Nationale" 483). It does not seem reasonable to presume that Chapuy did not actually mean these words. Chapuy was taking on a certain level of risk by advancing this petition to the Convention floor. Furthermore, it does not appear that Chapuy was under the threat of any punishment for her transgressions, rather she was being lauded by her military superiors. This means that Chapuy and her petition were not at the Convention to defend any of her actions, but to demand a return to service, just as the soldier Catherine Pochetat had done.

Pochetat enrolled in the *Bataillon des Enfants-Rouges* on August 2, 1792 with her father and brother. She later became an officer (*sous-lieutenant*) and after being pushed out of the military, she demanded to return to service (Godineau, "La douloureuse"). It is worth looking at Pochetat's petition, as this will add context to that of Chapuy's and of other *citoyenne-soldates*'.

Législateurs, la loi qui enjoint aux femmes de se retirer des armées de la république seroit-elle applicable à celle qui sert sans relâche depuis le commencement de la campagne? Quoi! une honteuse exclusion seroit la récompense du sang que j'ai versé pour la patrie? Je serois chassée des armées françaises, moi qui ai tant de fois poursuivi les Autrichiens fuyant devant elle? Cette main habituée à manier le sabre, n'est plus habile à manier l'aiguille et le fuseau. [. . .] Je vous demande, et j'ai quelques droits à vous demander, une exception honorable en faveur de mes services et de mes blessures. ("Le Mercure" 411)

Interestingly, in addition to demanding the recognition of her right to military service, at the end of her petition, Pochetat alludes to other rights. Though she does not elucidate these rights, her direct declaration for her aversion to household tasks, and her preference for martial exploits,

illustrate striking similarities between Cahpuy's petition and suggest that she too desires the rights French men enjoy under the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*.

Pochetat's statements are quite comparable to those of Chapuy, as Chapuy also expresses her disinclination to a domestic life. Chapuy declares, "Agée de 17 ans et demi; serait-ce à la fleur de mes ans que je me verrai réduite à aller habiter les foyers paternels, tandis que Bellone m'attend dans les siens, et me reprocherait mon inaction" ("Gazette Nationale" 483). Here, Chapuy expresses her aversion to housekeeping as well as her desire to not miss out on military service alongside the Roman goddess of war Bellona. These statements demonstrate that the modern sentiment of "FOMO," or "Fear of Missing Out" is not modern at all. Chapuy, feels a call to serve her nation militarily and feels cheated that she is no longer able to do so based on her gender. Many of the women in this dissertation face similar situations and sentiments. Despite her request being denied, a silver lining to Chapuy's story is that, before her gender was discovered, she was able to serve in the military at a very young age for about a year.

Chapuy's reference to Bellona demonstrates the influence ancient Greece and Rome had on the Enlightenment and French Revolution. Since these ancient cultures were so admired and ubiquitous during the revolutionary years, Chapuy likely included this reference to advance her case and persuade the members of the National Assembly to acquiesce to her demands. After the fall of the Bastille, Bellona began appearing more frequently in pamphlets and literature concerning women soldiers (Hopkin 82). A battalion of "Bellona's Amazons" was the mustering call in one of these early leaflets (trans. by Hopkin 82). Similarly, an August 1790 publication appeared in Paris that called for the mustering of a women's militia commanded by the "archduchess Bellona" (trans. by Hopkin 82). This publication was also accompanied by a song. In response, other songs were created in print which similarly called for women soldiers and

used other ancient themes such as the Amazons (Hopkin 82). Near the end of 1792 and the beginning of 1793, a publication by Manette Dupont appeared entitled “Départ de Neuf Cent Citoyennes de Paris, Qui se sont enrôlées, déguisées en hommes pour partir aux Frontières combattre les Tyrans des Nations” (Godineau, “De la guerrière”). This work included a song and instructions for women to dress in men’s clothing and assume military roles (Hopkin 85). The influence of this text spread to the songs of Parisian street performers like Poirier and Leveau. In an amazing demonstration of influence and propagation, Dupont, Poirier, and Leveau’s songs all borrowed verses and themes from the original 1789-1790 publications which encouraged women’s martial citizenship (Hopkin 82). These examples illustrate how far the transmission of culture, texts, and the arts can go. The “Départ de Neuf Cent . . .” text includes Enlightenment and revolutionary themed mottos like “Femmes libres” and “Vivre libre ou mourir.” These devises, or slogans indicate a growing desire among French women to take on the role of citizen-soldier. At the time of this publication the women’s equality movement had begun to gain momentum. In 1792, women put forward many petitions demanding equal rights, and in May 1793, Pauline Léon’s women’s club, the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*, would be founded. The motto “Femmes libres,” in “Départ de Neuf Cent . . .,” suggests that women saw themselves as free and desired to manifest their equality by advocating for women soldiers and laws that would recognize their rights. One of these rights, as the second devise “Vivre libre ou mourir” alludes to, is the right to bear arms. Several petitions and discussions had been put forward by women concerning this right, and this slogan, along with its call for 10,000 women soldiers, implies a militant interpretation of citizenship for women.

It is likely that this flurry of literature and the arts impacted revolutionary individuals and events. “The significance of a song or an image lies not only with the intentions of the makers

but also in the reception given by the audience” (Hopkin 86). It is possible, and likely, that the propagation of the themes of Bellona and warrior women in literature and song affected figures like Chapuy. After all, she includes Bellona in her petition to return to her Cavalry Regiment. This reference can provide insights into Chapuy’s beliefs, aspirations, and identity. Chapuy’s identity was likely influenced by the cultural imaginary of the French martial citizenry of her time. Having integrated this martial conception of citizenship, along with the ancient literary references to women soldiers like the goddess Bellona and the Amazons, Chapuy believed that she too should have the same rights French men enjoyed. Furthermore, her use of Bellona in her petition is interesting because Chapuy does not appear to have come from a wealthy, highly educated family. Her inclusion of Bellona indicates that this ancient martial figure was quite familiar to a large portion of the people of Revolutionary France. Since Chapuy’s five brothers were all in the army, her identity was likely shaped by her family’s involvement in the military. Evidence for this sentiment is found directly in Chapuy’s petition. By using a popular reference to the Greek and Roman cultures, she hoped to persuade the government to allow her, and women, into the military. Her blatant declaration for her preference of military life over that of a domestic one illustrates a progressiveness radical for her time. Unfortunately, her request to return to military service was unsuccessful as the French people as a whole were not prepared to alter gender norms so radically.

Nevertheless, the literary and cultural influences of Antiquity appear to have made impacts elsewhere. In 1793, in Pérouges (Ain), France, French women formed a National Guard unit named the “Guard of Bellona” (trans. by Hopkin 84-85). Despite being legally barred from the National Guard, women had formed National Guard companies across France as early as August 1790 in Creil, Angers, Villeneuve-la-Guyard, Aunay, Bergerac, and Limoges (Moore

43). These assertions of rights via action are significant because Chapuy, and these French women, defied not only the law, but also the customs, or gender-norms, of the time. These *citoyenne-soldates* wanted to defend their communities and country, thereby displaying the virtues of the military enlightenment and the citizen-soldier ideal. It is worth highlighting that these National Guard units were not formed in Paris and provide evidence that smaller localities, further removed from the politics of Paris, generally acted with more leniency toward women in martial roles, a trait reminiscent of certain French military officers.

It is important to address now the other possible phrase that, for Dekker and Van de Pol, negates Chapuy's feminism in her petition. Chapuy declares: "Bien différente de beaucoup de femmes qu'un fol amour a peut-être entraînés à la fuite des camps, l'amour seul de la Patrie, l'espoir flatteur de cueillir sous mon déguisement les lauriers républicaines . . . voilà mes guides, voilà ce que je t'offre pour mes avocats," and she adds that the accolades she received from the 24th regiment also serve to help plead her case ("Gazette Nationale" 483). These statements demonstrate a love of country and a desire for glory. They also allude to the reality of French women following their loved ones to war. Even if Chapuy, here, seems to be disparaging certain women in and around the army whose motive is love, that does not make her anti-feminist, as Dekker and Van de Pol suggest (357). Similarly, a man would not be considered anti-men if he made a comparable comment calling into question the motives of other men in the army. It seems more likely that Chapuy desired to emphasize the importance of patriotism not only to her own identity but to that of the French soldier's as well.

Dekker and Van de Pol's conclusion that there is "little evidence . . . to support enlistment as an expression of feminism" is rather surprising (357). They claim that patriotism and "revolutionary inspiration" was a much more common factor in women soldiers' enlistment

(357). Dekker and Van de Pol's conclusions are, at times, difficult to follow perhaps due to translation, but it seems as though they underscore the importance of economic motivators for women, reject the possibility of feminism, and assert that patriotism played an important role in women soldiers' motives. Admittedly, economic incentives may have sometimes played a role, and it is true that republicanism and patriotism were highly influential in revolutionary women and men. However, it is also true that statements from soldiers like Catherine Pochetat and Chapuy, as well as activists such as Pauline Léon, Olympe de Gouges, and Théroigne de Méricourt all advocate for egalitarian rights between women and men. Their declarations are therefore feminist in nature. Decker and Van de Pol's argumentation risks diminishing the significant activism that these women undertook. Importantly, Moore points out that many women did not have much to gain and had much to lose by speaking up for their rights (55). Olympe de Gouges paid the price with her life, and Théroigne de Méricourt paid for it with her health and sanity after a street attack. Moore aptly states, "Women who were outsiders and did not have reputations to protect were practically the only ones who dared speak out against the social injustices women faced" (55). She adds, "Any woman who did have a voice in eighteenth-century France, from the queen down, was denounced for immorality" (56). This brings attention to the risks that reputable women like Chapuy and Léon took. Finally, it is also important to recognize the possibility of exclusionary bias in the annals of history. It is fortunate to have the documentation of such women who engaged in the French military, spoke up publicly for women's rights, and advocated for women's ability to enlist in the military. Much more could be missing from this picture that was never recorded, lost, or destroyed. However, the evidence that remains seems clear that French women, like Chapuy, intended to improve the rights of women in revolutionary France.

As for Chapuy, with her reputation and safety on the line, it does not seem plausible that her comments were insincere as Dekker and Van de Pol indicate. These authors double down on their statements: “Although the wish to bear arms was sometimes defended as part of a struggle for equal rights, it would be incorrect to view the female soldiers as feminists” (361). They continue that cross-dressing women soldiers “completely adapted to masculine norms and values” (361). These statements make it clear that Dekker and Van de Pol do not believe in the genuine nature of Chapuy’s statements regarding women’s equality. However, their conclusions seem without sufficient evidence. The sixteen-year-old Chapuy seemed quite sincere when she enlisted in the French Cavalry. The honors she received for her military service and her petition to return to her unit, under seemingly no threat of punishment, reinforce the authentic nature of her words. Furthermore, she declared that she wanted to prove that “le bras d’une femme vaut bien celui d’un homme.” The risks she took in military service, and in the public eye, establish the genuine character of Chapuy who conducted herself as a citizen-soldier. Concerning Dekker and Van de Pol’s claim that women completely adapted to masculine norms, women soldiers, out of necessity and practicality, almost always had to don masculine garb in order to stay disguised within the military. Moreover, the virtues of soldiers, such as those associated with the citizen-soldier model, should not, and were not, viewed as solely masculine virtues. This is evidenced by women soldiers, like Chapuy, who openly called for the chance to cover themselves in glory and to prove that women should have access to the military roles men had. Just because women wanted equal rights to those of men does not mean that they automatically adopted masculine traits. In fact, women like Pauline Léon and Théroigne de Méricourt would distinctly call for troops of *Amazones*, harkening to the all-women warriors of Antiquity. Many women were also keen to advocate for their participation in martial citizenship, while maintaining their roles as

mothers and wives. A new conception of virtues was taking shape in revolutionary France among women and men. Revolutionary women, like Chapuy, crafted an identity around the pursuit of glory, equal rights, martial exploits, and service to France and freedom. These traits should not be seen as strictly masculine, even during the revolutionary years. The words and actions of *citoyennes-soldates* like Pochetat and Chapuy demonstrate a sincere interpretation of martial citizenship and illustrate the continued debate and reworking of the citizen-soldier ideal.

When her petition was finished, the room applauded. Though Chapuy was not allowed to return to military service, not unlike previous generations of women warriors who disguised themselves, she received several other honors (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 4). The Citizens of the Rambouillet Commune strongly applauded her and encouraged her to continue her “Glorieux travaux” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). This contingent of citizens also gave her many gifts reserved for the defenders of the Patrie “dont les blessures attestent leur courage et leur amour pour la liberté” (“Gazette Nationale” 483). Though it is unknown if Chapuy suffered any wounds, this contingent offered these gifts to honor Chapuy and perhaps because they knew that not being allowed to return to the military would incur its own wounds. Nevertheless, Chapuy did earn this honor, even if symbolically, which was reserved for those whose wounds proved their “courage” and “amour pour la liberté.” The Convention also gave her three hundred *livres* to help her and her parents but did not address her desire to return to the military (Gerbaux 56).

Nevertheless, the press reports on Chapuy’s military service, and her petition to the government, clearly left their mark. On January 20, 1794, only one day after the presentation of her petition, a spy for the Interior Ministry reported that many women desired to see and meet Chapuy. Apparently, they lauded her bravery and criticized men who did not have similar courage (Caron 56). These sentiments parallel the Spartan tradition of glorifying those seen to

have virtue, and criticizing those who do not, particularly within the martial domain. Her petition, and other women's commendatory response, indicate that French women, like the French men, were familiar with the ancient and contemporary discussions of Bellona, Sparta, and Spartan virtues. This police report also illustrates that, at least some demographics, were favorable to the application of the citizen-soldier model and Spartan virtues to women soldiers in France.

Through her petition and actions, Chapuy demonstrates an embrace of the citizen-soldier model into her identity. Not only did she serve in the military, but she also advocated for women's equality in the French military. Her language applied the ideas of the Enlightenment and martial citizenship to women and engendered dialogues among women who discussed it favorably. Chapuy's petition, and its reception, is indicative of the expansion and reworking of the cultural and martial imaginary in revolutionary France. French women, and the French in general, were increasingly predisposed to celebrate and encourage stories such as Chapuy's, and the accounts of her actions will surely continue to inspire others.

Chapter 4: The First Amazon of the Revolution?

Perhaps among the most enchanting and fascinating revolutionary figures, Théroigne de Méricourt, or Anne-Josèphe Terwagne from Marcourt, was born in 1762 to a middle-income, literate, Belgian farm family. Anne-Josèphe was therefore twenty-seven years old at the beginning of the Revolution in 1789. Though few literary texts exist from Théroigne, her words communicated messages with depth and were often recorded into the written medium. These orations indicate that Théroigne took up many of the values of the citizen-soldier model and made it her own. She laid claim to this republican concept and asserted that women should have access to it. Though her actions may not have always reflected a diligent interpretation of martial citizenship, many of Théroigne's words and deeds formed a political activism which promoted an inclusive, martial culture in republican France.

In the summer of 1789, Anne-Josèphe took on the name Théroigne de Méricourt (Moore 50). As Théroigne, she “participated in all the major *journées* and special events of the Revolution, which had become the prerequisite for a citizen's civic duty” (Towers 21). She began her feminist activism during the early stages of the French Revolution. Elizabeth Roudinesco, in *Théroigne de Méricourt*, even credits her as the first woman to call for the creation of women's battalions (107). This idea was quite popular throughout the Revolution, and it got plenty of airtime among other *citoyennes-soldates* such as Reine Chapuy and Pauline Léon. One of Théroigne's more memorable habits was that she always dressed in what would become known as an *amazone*. She was always seen wearing “a riding-habit of an austere masculine cut, either in red, black, or white” with the intent to be seen as equal to men (Moore xxv). Additionally, she often wore two pistols and a sword in her belt. Perhaps these clothing

preferences originated from the experiences of Théroigne's youth. At the age of thirteen, after she had run away from home, she worked a cow-herding job (Moore 48). It is unknown if she was the first to wear this *amazone*, but given the fact that, from the beginnings of the Revolution in 1789, Théroigne attended the National Assembly daily in this garb, one can presume it was she who popularized this trend that other influential women like Claire Lacombe would soon follow. Théroigne was not only outspoken visibly in her clothing, but also rhetorically around revolutionary Paris. Her very appearance demanded attention and equality while her actions and words proclaimed women's rights directly.

As evidenced by her running away from home, Théroigne's early family life was not ideal. However, at the age of sixteen, Théroigne met a wealthy Madame Colbert who took her into a warm-hearted home (Moore 48). Here, she was encouraged to read, write, play the pianoforte, and study singing (Moore 48). Eventually, Madame Colbert took Théroigne to London, where she met Lord Spenser. He had promised to marry Théroigne but, when they returned to Paris together, she realized she was one of many mistresses (Lamar 20). She left Spenser, but her reputation was sullied (Moore 48). Apparently, Théroigne was a very talented musician and, for a short time she sang in Italy after her relationship with Spenser had ended (Lamar 20). When the revolutionary years came, Théroigne no longer took up romantic partners, though the newspapers that criticized her were always keen to accuse her of having relationships with Deputies from the Convention (Lamar 20). She reportedly said that she rejected any love interests with "Spartan pride" (trans. by Moore 54). This quote illustrates the expansive influence Antiquity had over revolutionary thought. It also indicates that Théroigne was now on a mission, which for her, took precedence over any love interest that might come her way. In refusing

romance, she was prepared to sacrifice her time, energy, and social life to improve the rights and conditions of women.

During the Revolution, Théroigne aligned mostly with the Girondist political party (Towers 21). Lucy Moore, in *Liberty: The Lives and Times of Six Women in Revolutionary France*, describes the Revolution for Théroigne as “a sacred event, regenerative and transformative both publicly and privately” (69). This description indicates that Théroigne, like many of the French revolutionaries, had adopted an Enlightenment view of the world which placed an importance on the purifying effects of nature and the rights of individuals. Discouraged from the path of the Revolution, Théroigne sought to heal and regenerate her body and soul through nature. After a series of disappointments, Théroigne left Paris in the Summer of 1790 and bought land in the Republic of Liège (Moore 62, 111). Being very outspoken on women’s equality, she was most likely discouraged by the Revolution’s unwillingness to recognize the rights of women. Her presence, and democratic thoughts, apparently alarmed some of the inhabitants and she was reported to the Austrian government and arrested on January 15, 1791 (Moore 112). Interestingly, the Republic of Liège fell to Austrian troops three days before Théroigne’s arrest. This raises the question of whether Théroigne’s presence incentivized the invasion of this small republic. An investigation into the Austrian monarchy’s decision to invade the Republic of Liège could prove insightful. Théroigne was freed in November 1791 and returned to Paris a couple months later in January (Moore 116-117). After another year of intense activism, Théroigne was attacked on May 15, 1793, by a group of women from the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* (Moore 191).¹⁰ Sadly, Théroigne never fully

¹⁰ I will also refer to this group simply as: Society, with a capital s.

recovered from this and after little more than a year, she was placed in an asylum where she spent the rest of her life.

Now that we know the beginning and end of Théroigne's story, we can delve into the details. In her dissertation, *The Society of Revolutionary Republican Women*, Alicia Towers describes Théroigne's philosophy which, incidentally, also describes the citizen-soldier model. Towers elucidates, "She envisioned women as politicians, as well as warriors" (21). Théroigne's ideas hinged on women's equality. In her notebook, Théroigne wrote that women should have equal and natural rights to men and that, "it is supremely unjust that we have not the same rights in society" (trans. by Moore 54). Similarly, during her imprisonment in Austria, she expresses a desire to end "the tyranny which men exercise over my sex" (trans. by Moore 62). Théroigne, like the soldier Reine Chapuy, also revealed a desire for glory in martial exploits. Théroigne explains: "And we would wish to earn a civic crown too, and court the honour of dying for a liberty which is dearer perhaps to us [women] than it is to them [men], since the effects of despotism weigh still more heavily upon our heads than upon theirs" (trans. by Moore 111). With this quote, Théroigne alludes to French women's desires for equality and their adoption of the citizen-soldier role into their identity. This oration also shows that Théroigne was willing to publicly criticize the status quo and advocate for women's martial and political involvement in the new republic.

Théroigne engaged in civic life in the First French Republic by attending the National Assembly daily and was also present at many riots. At the National Assembly and elsewhere, she was almost always seen wearing her Amazon outfit, which included two pistols and a sword (Towers 121). In an adaptation of the citizen-soldier ideal, she exercised her right to attend the legislative body and bear arms in her daily life. Théroigne thus performed the duties of an

engaged citizen concerned with political affairs and the protection of herself and her community. Her *amazone* ensemble also served Théroigne's political views. She states that she had intended "to play the role of a man, because I had always been extremely humiliated by the servitude and prejudices under which the pride of men hold my oppressed sex" (trans. by Moore 49). Théroigne's actions and activism show an appropriation of the masculine dominated idea of the citizen-soldier, and she demonstrates what a *citoyenne-soldate* could do and be. This included attending the National Assembly, bearing arms in daily life, and participating in clubs and societies which were an important aspect of political revolutionary life.

Théroigne's presence at the National Assembly was so regular that a seat was reserved for her (Moore xxv). She even moved to Versailles to more closely monitor the debates of the Rights of Man, or the *Droits de l'homme*, all the while wearing her *amazone*. According to Moore, she was the first to arrive at the National Assembly and the last to leave every day (51). Théroigne stated, "My devotion to the Revolution increased as I grew better informed and became convinced that right and justice were on the people's side" (trans. by Moore 51). This idea that the people are in the right is a typical sentiment found in the philosophy of Rousseau and many revolutionaries. This statement indicates, once more, the influence of the Enlightenment philosophies on Théroigne. Though her presence at the National Assembly, at first glance, could be perceived as passive regarding the legislative voting process, it can also be viewed as illustrating the actions of an engaged citizen. Her very presence, dressed essentially as a cowboy, or more appropriately a cowgirl, declared that women cared about the new Republic and that women's rights, and what the governing body was doing, was important to them. When members of the National Assembly happened to see the omnipresent Théroigne among the crowd, her public vocal declarations that affirmed the need for women's equality were likely

brought to mind. Moore adds to the understanding of Théroigne's vestimentary habits. Moore writes that her clothing illustrated a "free-thinking" in appearance that was popular during the Revolutionary era (58-59). Increasing numbers of French people were defying the aristocratic dress norms and adopting a more casual style such as letting their hair grow longer and styling it more naturally (Moore 58-59). According to Moore, Théroigne believed her masculine clothing would translate to respect for her ideas and actions rather than for her looks (59). Théroigne's practical riding clothes illustrated her advocacy for French women to abstain from luxuries that were unsuitable to freedom. This sentiment demonstrates the influences of Spartan practicality and discipline on Théroigne. Similarly, Théroigne's views on martial citizenship would also follow the Spartan model to an extent, though she would differ, of course, on women's involvement.

Théroigne not only participated in the political realm of the French Republic, but she also was prepared to defend herself and community by going about her daily life armed with the weapons of the day. She therefore performed the duality of a *citoyenne-soldate* which marries in an individual the roles of an engaged citizen and soldier who is concerned with the rights, safety, and well-being of their fellow citizens. In bearing arms, not only was she practicing self-defense and a sort of national guard role, but she was also demonstrating to her fellow citizens, and *citoyennes*, that women too could and should take part in citizenship and the rights that French men enjoyed. She encouraged women to form militias and advocated for Amazon defenders as early as February 1792 (Abray 51; Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 111). It does appear that Théroigne directly gained some ground on advancing the women's movement. In April 1792, she and Queen Audu received commemorative swords from the city of Paris for their heroic actions at the March on Versailles (Moore 119). This 1789 revolutionary event diminished the authority of

King Louis XVI and ushered in a more republican approach to governance. Théroigne's public and official recognition verifies that the Parisian government was willing to recognize women as heroines during the early years of the Revolution. It is evident that Théroigne's influence did not stop there, as she was also friends with Jérôme Pétion, the mayor of Paris. Pétion perhaps referred to Théroigne and the other women's role in the March on Versailles when he declared that women "do not feel any the less that they are *citoyennes*" when their country is in danger (trans. by Moore 119). Théroigne's association with Pétion, as well as her actions and words, may have had an influence on his statements and undertakings. Regardless, it appears as though her activism was great enough to earn herself a sword and recognition as a heroine of the March on Versailles. It also earned her the elected title of "President of her sex" by the National Assembly (trans. by Lamar 20). Nevertheless, because of her outspoken views, she was later accused of encouraging women to go away from their traditional duties and femininity (Lamar 20). This would unfortunately be the low-hanging fruit for those opposed to women's liberation. It was usually one of the first objections, to women's involvement in politics, the National Guard, or the military, and it was perhaps the most frequently employed. The expectation that women should be occupying and taking care of their homes and children for their husbands was used time and again against activists who sought to expand women's rights.

Engagement in societies and clubs in revolutionary France was an important activity for many revolutionaries. Théroigne was no exception and she co-founded and hosted a society in January 1790 called the *Amis de la loi*, in which, interestingly, she was the only woman member. Despite being a minority, she did not shy away from interjecting her ideas on political rights (Towers 21; Moore 52). Nonetheless, this society was rather short-lived and dissolved in the spring of 1790. This proved to be a disappointing blow for Théroigne's notions about the

Revolution (Moore 62). During the months that the *Amis de la loi* was active, this society, in an expression of the citizen-soldier virtues, made it its goal to inform the public on the National Assembly's actions and to educate the public on their rights.¹¹ This society also discussed what should be included in the Constitution and the Rights of Man (Moore 53). Societies in general were integral to the citizen-soldiers of the Revolution, as they enabled them to participate in political discussions and debates. These organizations helped citizen-soldiers fulfill their roles, part of which included being politically active and encouraging others to do the same. As we have seen, the revolutionary societies allowed citizens to discuss political issues and ideas and help them organize political actions like petitions and protests. One of the issues that this society discussed was the discrimination of Jews. They supported true equality and freedom in this case and opposed discrimination. The *Amis de la loi* also advocated to remove the voting tax, as only men who paid taxes could vote. Additionally, they were in favor of a free press, a debated issue at the time (Moore 54). In one society session, Théroigne defended women's equality and challenged the notion of men having natural rights over his family (Moore 53-54). However, she was the only member to do so. Moore remarks, "like Robespierre, most revolutionaries were too busy defending men's rights to concern themselves with women's" (54).

Moore's observation brings up a very interesting point that engenders several questions. Was the revolutionary government in such danger that, had the National Assembly taken up women's rights, they would have risked losing those of the men's to aristocratic or foreign powers? The decision to recognize women's rights may have been unpopular, but it is unlikely that the Revolution would have failed because of it. In fact, had the recognition of women's

¹¹ Moore provided the details of the society (52-53), but not the interpretation linking the citizen-soldier model.

equality in rights and voting as well as their access to military and National Guard roles been realized, the Republic might have been strengthened and stabilized. This might have saved the Revolution from its eventual fall. A principled approach to governing a republic, in theory, is the fairest if it truly recognizes the universal liberty and equality of its people. This creates an inclusive society where everyone's rights are respected and where everyone has a vote and say in how the country is run.

The *Amis de la loi* was not the only club in which Théroigne participated in. In February 1790, she gave a speech to a men's club, the Cordeliers. After her oration, she was enthusiastically applauded by the group. Théroigne then took the opportunity to ask if women could have a consultative vote in their club, a prospect which they respectfully denied (Towers 22). This moment should be examined more closely, as Théroigne had to know the odds were stacked against her views on women's equality. After having given a speech that received very positive feedback, Théroigne found herself in a favorable moment in which she could advocate for her beliefs. This political and social tact should not be overlooked. Théroigne was aware of the unpopularity of her views and was able to push the envelope whenever possible. She did this passively with her clothing, as well as actively with her words and actions. Her words were oftentimes recorded and reprinted for readers to consume both during the Revolution and to this day. Unfortunately, bad society luck struck again for Théroigne after September 1792. She was accused of murder and of being affiliated with the September Prison Massacres of this year. She was acquitted, but because of these accusations, she had a falling-out with the Cordelier club (Towers 22).

Having been imprisoned in Austria for most of 1791, Théroigne made her first reappearance in Paris at the Jacobin club on January 26, 1792. As a former captive of the

Austrians, she was in a good position to speak as an authority on the debate over war with Austria. She supported this war and was invited to return to the club to tell of her time imprisoned. On her next visit, on February 1, 1792, Théroigne explained that the Netherlands and Belgium regions, under threat from Austria, were full of freedom-loving people (Moore 118). Again, finding herself with an audience that was interested in what she had to say, Théroigne took the opportunity to advocate for military regiments of women soldiers. These situations, in which Théroigne finds the most opportune moment to advocate for women's rights, illustrates her political savvy. On the matter of women's military units, the woman soldier Reine Chapuy would have certainly agreed, yet Théroigne's suggestion differs from other women activists such as Pauline Léon who promoted the creation of home-front women defenders. It is, nevertheless, likely that Léon would have agreed with Théroigne's proposition; however, other women revolutionaries that leaned toward more traditional viewpoints may not have.

The Amazons of Antiquity were used in seventeenth-century France during La Fronde to glorify heroines of that aristocratic civil war (Godineau, "De la guerrière" 3). An increasing French interest in these types of stories during the eighteenth century is evidenced by Abbé Claude-Marie Guyon's *L'histoire des Amazones anciennes et nouvelles* (1740). Similarly, the stories of Amazons and women warrior cultures, as well as actual women soldiers like those of La Fronde, were used by women activists to encourage patriotism in eighteenth-century France (Füssel 533). Interestingly, the popularity of the Amazons in the eighteenth-century French imaginary was present on both sides of the political spectrum. *L'ami du roi*, a royalist newspaper, reported in 1791 on a woman who had advocated for the formation of a club of Amazons to guard the King and France (Moore 44). It appears that Théroigne was also influenced by these cultural tendencies and literature. Additionally, she contributed to this

imaginary of Amazons by dressing and presenting herself as one. She was perhaps the first revolutionary woman to do so. On July 17, 1789, days after the taking of the Bastille and the beginning of the French Revolution, Théroigne wore her white *amazone*, or masculine riding wear, with a round-brimmed hat to the *Hôtel de ville*. There she watched the King pin the tricolor *cocarde* to his hat. Not to be outdone, Théroigne donned the patriotic *cocarde* in her hat as well (Moore 49). According to Moore, Théroigne's presence and appearance on this day built up her fame in the public eye (49). It is uncertain if Théroigne was the first woman to begin wearing this style of outfit, however, at the very least, she is one of the trailblazers of the *amazone* for women of the Revolution.

Moore notes that others began adopting this *amazone*, perhaps most notably from the wealthier and aristocratic sections of French society (59, 73). Moore comments that Théroigne had not meant for her clothing to be a fashion statement, but that it had become one (60). This is possibly a true statement on the surface. However, I will also propose that Théroigne meant to communicate much more through her *amazone*. Théroigne advocated for women's liberation and for martial roles for women. It seems that Théroigne, through her clothing, was indeed trying to make statements and influence others. Though fashion was likely at the bottom of her list, it seems reasonable to advance that she would have welcomed other women donning men's riding clothing. It is likely that this was even among Théroigne's intents in wearing her *amazone*. For Théroigne, the increase in the practice of "cross-dressing" doubtlessly led her to believe her agenda of women's equality was making advances. Concerning influence, Léopold Lacour, in *La Revue Hebdomadaire*, reported that Marc Antoine Baudot, a deputy of the Convention, affirmed that Théroigne enjoyed a good deal of sway in Paris, attracting larger crowds than Claire Lacombe (240). Nonetheless, Lacour also cites René-Pierre Choudieu who claimed that both

women had a considerable influence in revolutionary Paris (240).¹² Though Baudot indicates that Théroigne was Lacombe's understudy, these statements, along with Théroigne's well-known eccentricities from the early stages of the Revolution, suggest the opposite: That Lacombe may have been more greatly influenced by Théroigne. For example, Lacombe, like Théroigne, often wore pants and a pistol (Towers 35). When speaking in front of the National Assembly on July 25, 1792, Lacombe was dressed as an Amazon while offering to fight for the Republic against tyrants (Lamar 23). She also went armed and participated in the attack on the Tuileries Palace when Louis XVI was arrested (Lamar 23). Lacombe differed from Théroigne by wearing the *bonnet rouge* 'the red cap' which was a masculine clothing item of the *sans-culottes* men (Towers 35; my trans.). Though it is difficult to discern who influenced whom, Théroigne's participation in the Revolution, virtually from its inception, suggests that she was highly original and influential. It is also possible that there was a back-and-forth sharing of ideas between revolutionary women such as Lacombe and Théroigne. Ultimately, the theme of the Amazons appears to have had a strong effect on French revolutionary women. This motif influenced women's identities, clothing choices, activism, and how they viewed their roles within martial citizenship.

Though Claude Guillon, in *Deux Enragés de la Révolution: Leclerc de Lyon et Pauline Léon*, recognizes Théroigne's activism and contributions to the Revolution, it appears that he downplays Théroigne's impact. "Théroigne abandonne rapidement le thème de l'armement féminin . . . c'est une femme seule, qui ne parviendra jamais à fonder ou à entraîner un mouvement ou un club" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 113). This assessment does not seem altogether

¹² The publication written by Lacour in 1899 does not detail the source information on Baudot or Choudieu.

fair or true as Théroigne did co-found a short-lived club, the *Amis de la loi*, and advocated for units of Amazons and women's access to martial roles throughout 1792.¹³ Furthermore, her influence on the Revolution seems to be evident given the public rewards she received and her apparent propagation of the *amazone* outfit. Guillon does concede that the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*, of which Théroigne and Lacombe were both members, enjoyed considerable revolutionary impact; however, Guillon does not provide evidence for Théroigne's "abandoning of the theme of women's armament" (*Deux Enragés* 113). Nevertheless, Théroigne's, along with other women's, advocacy for women's rights and the *citoyenne-soldate* model appears to have enjoyed appreciable success through the early years of the Revolution.

Théroigne's time as an activist in the Revolution began quite early in 1789. There are five separate reports that detail Théroigne's presence in the October 1789 women's March on Versailles. Apparently, she was already there at the legislative assembly, as was her custom, when the marchers arrived (Moore 47, 51). After this event, rumors began spreading that Théroigne had stormed the Bastille and beat a brigade of bodyguards at Versailles (Moore 55). Though these stories are likely exaggerated, and oftentimes published to discredit Théroigne, one never knows if there is some truth behind them. Théroigne was almost certainly present at Versailles, and she did fit the description of a revolutionary woman who would engage in violence at the taking of the Bastille. After all, she did carry a sword and two pistols daily and certainly participated in the Attack on the Tuileries in 1792. In 1791, when she was interrogated in the Austrian prison about her role in the 1789 March on Versailles, she declared that the

¹³ Perhaps Guillon, in 1993, did not have access to the information we now have on Théroigne.

people's strong desire for liberty caused this event (Moore 51). A few months after this protest and riot at Versailles, in February 1790, Théroigne was invited to join the deputies of the National Assembly on a march to Notre Dame. She was to participate in a mass that celebrated their oaths of citizenship. While Théroigne was marching alongside the deputies, passersby denounced her presence so much so that she stepped aside from the procession (Moore 62). The onlookers could not understand why a woman would want to participate in the march (Moore 62). This was to be yet another disappointment for Théroigne which likely led to her departure from Paris that summer. Throughout the Revolution, Théroigne was heckled on the streets, in the National Assembly, and in the press (Moore 62). Following the reproach that Théroigne experienced during the procession, she expressed her disappointment with the French men, "The patriots, instead of encouraging me and treating me justly, ridiculed me" (trans. by Moore 62-63). The fact that Théroigne called these men patriots is an interesting lexical move. Pauline Léon would use this same term after she found herself in a similar situation. She too was implored to not participate in an armed revolutionary moment and fascinatingly used the term "patriote" to describe those that disapproved of her presence. With these words, perhaps Théroigne, as well as Léon, attempted to maintain respect for their critics publicly in order to eventually persuade them to agree with their principles. Or maybe these women knew that many of those who criticized them could not be persuaded, yet, in speaking with grace, they may have hoped to convince those undecided men and women to join the women's egalitarian movement.

In addition to physical activism, Théroigne was also quite the orator. On March 25, 1792, Théroigne addressed the *Société Fraternelle des Minimes*, a society of which Pauline Léon was also a member, and declared, "Let us raise ourselves to the height of our destinies; let us break our chains" (Moore 118). She then referenced the example set by the women of Gaul and

Germany who had participated in war and politics (Moore 118). Similar to what Reine Chapuy would do a couple years later, Théroigne rhetorically asked if glory was reserved for men alone. Théroigne believed in equal access to glory, like Chapuy, and that women could and should be able to earn glory on the battlefield. These statements demonstrate a knowledge of historical accounts and literature on women's involvement in war and politics as well as a desire to attain such participation. Recorded for posterity, these allocutions add to the French revolutionary canon concerning martial engagement and republican citizenship.

Théroigne's statements illustrate an engagement with the imaginary of the citizen-soldier ideal. She boldly added her own interpretation to this concept and incorporated it into her identity. In an expression of advancing the *citoyenne-soldate* model, Théroigne addressed the citizens of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine on March 29, 1792, declaring, "Let us arm! We have the right by nature and under the law. Let us arm to show men that we are not inferior to them either in virtue or in courage. Let us show Europe that French women conscious of their rights are worthy of a century of Enlightenment like the eighteenth" (trans. by Dekker and Van de Pol 354). Here, Théroigne, alludes to the literature of the century of Enlightenment that came before the Revolution. She asserts that women have the same rights of nature that writers like Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Locke claimed for men.¹⁴ She believed that women, like men, had the right, as free persons, to go about their lives armed, as she practiced daily, and to enjoy equal rights as citizens in the new Republic. Théroigne's declaration comes just one month after

¹⁴ In his *Second Treatise of Government*, John Locke describes a "state of nature" that is "a perfect state of freedom" and "a state also of equality" (8). However, he does not address the rights of women directly, using the term "man" or "men" often (8). Though these terms could be construed as generalist expressions taken to mean the rights of "mankind," which could include women, it is clear that most eighteenth-century interpretations of his work and of Rousseau's, employ a masculine understanding of these ideas and of the rights of nature. It is worth noting that Locke does use the term "mankind" when considering rights specifically.

Pauline Léon's address to the National Assembly, in which Léon read a petition signed by three hundred women, that advocated for the right to bear arms for women. Apparently, Théroigne's speech was just one of many women's meetings in which she tried to gather women to create *Amazones* (Moore 119). Soon, Théroigne was criticized for her belief that women should have the right to bear arms and to fight for France, and the Jacobin club became concerned and asked her to stop her meetings on April 13, 1792 (Towers 22; Moore 119). Towers comments, "Her politics were not radical but her behavior was" (22). However, both her politics and behavior indeed appear to have been radical to her day's standards, as many were not ready to accept full equality between the sexes. Perhaps she alienated women and men who were not ready to tolerate women in men's clothing who bore pistols and swords. It is plausible that Théroigne might have gained a larger following by not dressing as a man and going armed. Nevertheless, Théroigne's appearance, speeches, and actions seem to be what got the attention of others and was likely the cause of her fame, success, and influence. It seems clear that, to be noticed and to promote change, one must often take certain risks like upsetting others. Had women like Théroigne not done so, in an era of masculine dominance, women's equality might have had an even slower course of progression.

Théroigne was not only active in the women's equality movement, but also in military and political affairs. She organized the Festival of Liberty which took place on April 15, 1792. This celebration commemorated the Châteauneuf soldiers who had mutinied in August of 1790, and who were punished violently. Many French people, however, saw these soldiers as martyrs and true patriots of the Revolution (Moore 120-121). In a separate instance of activism, Théroigne, as well as Pauline Léon, helped organize a protest to the King's unpopular dismissal of his ministers in June 1792 (Moore 127). Théroigne was also present and fought at the Attack

on the Tuileries on August 10, 1792. Here, while wearing her *amazone* she fought alongside soldiers from Marseille. She wore a “black plumed hat and a blue *amazone*, with a pair of pistols tucked into her belt, she was seen standing on a stone holding her sabre aloft” urging Parisians to kill those at the Tuileries (Moore 132-133). She reportedly rallied the revolutionaries who had fled, and she attacked the Tuileries at the head of the Marseille troops (Moore 140). In this battle she attacked François Suleau, a royalist journalist who had criticized Théroigne. She was almost killed but was saved by the crowd who stepped in and killed him (Moore 133). Undaunted by her near-death experience, the following day, Théroigne was ready to continue her involvement in revolutionary events, attending a Jacobin club meeting. The intricacies of this attack, and Théroigne’s participation in it, are not entirely clear or definitive. It is possible that her reported actions here did not follow the citizen-soldier model of respecting others’ rights and lives. Some of the reports from this day suggest Théroigne’s participation in unprovoked violence, where a trial would have been more appropriate. Though she may have at times deviated from a principled approach to martial citizenship, Théroigne very often did express and advocate for this model’s virtues.

Despite her fame, Théroigne was not popular with everyone. Towers claimed Théroigne was attacked by *poissardes* women, who did not like her criticism of the leaders of the Revolution (22). However, Celita Lamar advances, in “Uncovering Heroines: Some Theatrical Perspectives on the French Revolution,” that Théroigne was beaten by *Tricoteuses*, or women that knitted and hurled insults at the guillotine (Lamar 20). Finally, the most recent publication on this matter came in 2006 by Moore who asserts that Théroigne’s attackers had been members of the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* (193). Ironically, Théroigne was a member of this Society; however, throughout 1793, the gap between the politics of the Society

and Théroigne widened. In the early part of 1793, Théroigne had advocated for a measured approach to the Revolution, and she desired to calm the chaos of France by emphasizing the importance of liberty (Moore 192). Théroigne advocated for unification and to do this, she proposed the election of six women from each of the Parisian wards who would encourage the men to cooperate under the goals of liberty and the defense of France. Théroigne believed these women could also chaperone the patriotic schools for girls and participate in national parties wearing long scarves which read “Amitié et Fraternité” (Moore 192). These two words, selected by Théroigne, are telling of a more moderate approach to politics and the Revolution. *Amitié*, meaning friendship and *fraternité* meaning brotherhood both suggest a tone of unity, cohesion, and grace in the face of a chaotic and bloody Revolution (my trans.). Though Théroigne participated in violent events such as the Attack on the Tuileries, perhaps she recognized that that was not the path the Revolution should take. Théroigne also had ties and shared many political views with the more moderate Girondin movement which was in the process of being replaced by the Montagnards. The Montagnards were, in fact, backed by the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*. This could provide more evidence for their role in the attack on Théroigne.

Though it remains uncertain who exactly led the attack on Théroigne, it is clear that a group of women perpetrated the violence. Moore proposes that after searching for Théroigne for weeks, the Society members finally found her on May 15, 1793 (192-193). The women attacked her, yelling “Brissotine,” a pejorative word for the Girondins, and accused her of being a Girondin propagandist. In an attempt to humiliate her, they apparently spanked her, and this was when Jean-Paul Marat stepped in between Théroigne and her attackers to end the violence (Moore 193). It seems Théroigne never quite recovered mentally from this incident. Perhaps, she

had been struck on the head multiple times, or severely. Or maybe this was the final instance of disenchantment she could bear. Conceivably, both possibilities could be contributing factors to the decline of her mental health. Women, who were potentially in the same Society as her, had turned against her, and the Revolution itself was pivoting away from the idea of women's involvement in the political realm. The Girondin administration had been more amenable to women in politics and was now being replaced by the Montagnards. Ironically, the Society itself supported this change of power. Moore aptly states, "The Girondin deputies, who had hitherto been more sympathetic than the Montagnards to the idea of women having political rights, were horrified at the women's attacks on them" (193). The atmosphere in France continued to intensify. Only a few days later, on March 19, Society members along with *Enragés* representatives from the Cordelier's club, visited the Jacobin Club demanding the arrest of anyone suspected of counter-revolution (Moore 193). 1793 would see the rise of the Terror and the executions of many French people. A year after the attack on Théroigne, in the spring of 1794, Théroigne's brother went to French officials to discuss her declining mental state. She was arrested on June 27, 1794, a day before Robespierre's execution (Moore 295). In September of that year, Théroigne was declared insane and spent thirteen years in an asylum (Moore 387). Then, in 1807, she was sent to La Salpêtrière, a sort of hospice home for the sick and mentally ill. Théroigne spent the final ten years of her life there and died in 1817 (Moore 387).

This is a somber ending to the story of an energetic and charismatic revolutionary woman. Théroigne de Méricourt, or Anne-Josèphe Terwagne, was outspoken on women's equality and in her beliefs on the direction of the Revolution. Unfortunately, she paid for it with her well-being and sanity. Théroigne's activism as a *citoyenne-soldate* was quite unique as she was one of the first women to begin wearing the *amazone*, which was both a passive and active

means of advocacy for women's rights. Her daily presence at the National Convention demonstrated for all to see that women cared about the new republic and about the decisions being made in the name of the people. By her garb and presence, Théroigne declared that many French women wanted to be included in the rights of citizenship and desired to be represented in the government. Théroigne's dress and orations demonstrate a harkening to the Amazons of Antiquity as well as to literary and historical accounts of political women. Importantly, her rhetorical addresses demonstrate a desire to participate in the citizen-soldier model. She called for women to arm themselves, and she advocated for women's equality and access to military roles. Though the reported actions of Théroigne during the Attack on the Tuileries signal a deviance from a strict interpretation of a *citoyenne-soldate*, the other instances of her activism demonstrate that she embraced many of the beliefs of the citizen-soldier into her identity and sought to change this model's definition to include women.

Chapter 5: A Revolutionary Marriage

Pauline Léon and her husband Théophile Leclerc met during the course of the French Revolution. However, this couple did most of their revolutionary activities before they met. An enthusiasm for their ideals brought them into the same social circles which eventually led to their marriage. Born in 1768, Léon was twenty-one years old at the beginning of the Revolution in 1789. An outspoken proponent of women's equality, she would become the president of the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* and participate in a number of revolutionary events and protests.¹⁵ A few years her junior, Leclerc was born in 1771 near Montbrison in the region of Lyon and was only seventeen in 1789. Leclerc claimed that he was one of the first citizens to enroll in the National Guard of Clermont-Ferrand when the Revolution began (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 248). In addition to soldiering, Leclerc was also one of the leaders of the extreme *Enragés* party and the author of the journal *L'ami du Peuple*. Léon and Leclerc got married on November 8, 1793, at a time when both were threatened by the government led by Robespierre. They both engaged in and sought to affect the political affairs of their nation and were willing to defend it militantly. These revolutionaries both adopted the citizen-soldier model into their identities. This ideal is a difficult path, however, to stay on, and Leclerc's employment of violent rhetoric generates thought-provoking questions on the appropriateness of violent resistance to invasion and attacks on human rights. In this chapter, I will explore Léon's and Leclerc's interpretation of the citizen-soldier model through their writings, orations, activism, and revolutionary participation.

¹⁵ The name of this club will be shortened and capitalized to Society.

Pauline Léon was born into a chocolate making family. After her father died, she helped her mother run the business and raise her five younger siblings. This service to her family, and consequently to her community, begins to construct a portrait of Léon as a *citoyenne-soldate*. Per the military enlightenment standards, which Christy Pichichero outlines in *The Military Enlightenment: War and Culture in the French Empire from Louis XIV to Napoleon*, the new ideal of heroes involved martial and domestic services (157). The citizen-soldier concept took this idea and added an appreciation of republican virtues like rights, liberty, and equality. In France, the citizen-soldier model also underwent a democratization process which encouraged French people from all walks of life to participate. Raffaella Sarti, in “From Slaves and Servants to Citizens? Regulating Dependency, Race, and Gender in Revolutionary France and the French West Indies,” explains that “The [French] Revolution turned the armed defence of the nation into a crucial feature of citizenship” (19). In an expression of this citizen-soldier concept, or martial citizenship, Léon participated in the taking of the Bastille, a keystone event to the commencement of the Revolution (Guillon, “Pauline Léon” 147). Providing insights into her personal philosophy and identity, Léon declared that her father had raised her without any “préjugé” (Guillon, “Pauline Léon” 148). Like Théroigne de Méricourt, Léon often wore pistols tucked into her belt and frequently participated in the National Assembly. At this governing body, she would heckle and shout down those with whom she disagreed, such as the famous Marquis de Lafayette, and she would encourage figures whom she condoned, such as Robespierre (Moore xxiv-xxvii).¹⁶ Additionally, Léon presented a petition to the National Assembly, signed by members of the Society, which demanded the right for women to bear arms

¹⁶ Nevertheless, Léon would not always agree with Robespierre’s politics or decisions.

and to participate in the National Guard. Léon's actions are demonstrative of a *citoyenne-soldate*, as she was engaged in the martial aspects of citizenship and worked to effect political change.

Léon's conception of her role as a *citoyenne-soldate* involved being armed in the streets of Paris. She claimed that this was necessary to safeguard the Republic from foreign and domestic enemies. She envisioned a National Guard composed of both women and men. She believed women had a "natural" claim to the rights that French men enjoyed. Fulfilling the citizen-soldier ideal, Léon believed that women should not only protect their community by the force of arms but also be involved in the political and public spheres of life. She exemplified this public service by helping her mother run the chocolate business, helping raise her siblings, and boldly speaking out for the rights of women in France through protests and petitions.

The spheres of civic and political engagement often overlap. Léon explains her sentiments on her activism: "J'éprouvais le plus vif enthousiasme et quoique femme je ne demeurai pas oisive; l'on me vit du matin au soir animer les citoyens contre les artisans de la tyrannie" (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 148). Léon's political actions take various forms. In this statement, she describes how she takes to the streets to encourage engaged citizenship among the people of Paris. Claude Guillon, in "Pauline Léon, une républicaine révolutionnaire," comments that Léon tried to "faire reconnaître la place des militantes non seulement dans l'action révolutionnaire mais dans le nouvel ordre social" (148). Guillon here recognizes that Léon wished to insert herself, and women in general, into the "nouvel ordre social" and into revolutionary events. For example, in 1791, Léon joined the Jacobin *Société des Cordeliers* ("Pauline Léon"). Léon attended and spoke at this club several times (Moore 71). Léon was also active in many other clubs and participated in several revolutionary events. One such event occurred on June 21, 1791, when Léon, her mother, and a friend protested near the Palais Royal

following the King's attempt to leave the country. Léon was demonstrating because she viewed the King's actions as treasonous (Moore 99). She claimed that after this event, she was almost killed by Lafayette's National Guardsmen whom she called "monsters" (trans. by Moore 99). Nevertheless, a group of *sans-culottes* stepped in to stop the attack (Moore 99). Guillon also seems to reference this event, if, however, unclearly. Guillon notes that Léon was "sérieusement molestée" by followers of Lafayette though no further details are given, save that it took place in June of 1791 ("Pauline Léon" 151). Assuming that these authors are referencing the same event, Lucy Moore's account, in *Liberty: The Lives and Times of Six Women in Revolutionary France*, which is more recent, appears to give more precise details citing that it was the National Guard who attacked Léon. In July of that same year, on the day of the infamous Massacre of the Champs de Mars, Léon signed the petition that was at the heart of this event ("Pauline Léon"). She was arrested that day and claims again that she was nearly killed by Lafayette's soldiers (Moore 101; Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 104). Guillon also reports that Léon had engaged in a fistfight to defend a friend from the family of a national guardsman ("Pauline Léon" 151). We may never know what happened exactly in these circumstances, however, right or wrong, Léon demonstrated her willingness to stand up in both word and deed to sacrifice for what she believed was right. Léon held a strong distrust of Lafayette who had become the Commandant of the National Guard in the summer of 1789 (Moore 33). She even threw a bust of him out of a window in February 1791 (Guillon "Pauline Léon" 151). Léon viewed him as a counterrevolutionary and believed that his actions at the women's March on Versailles confirmed her skepticism. Considering that Lafayette and his soldiers attacked and killed many citizens in the crowd at the Champ de Mars protest, Léon's accusatorial accounts could be true. Nevertheless, there are reports of rocks being thrown by the crowd at the National Guard, thus

inciting the violence. There were likely inappropriate measures taken on both sides of this conflict and the opposing accounts of this day, which point blame at both the crowd and the National Guard, complicate which side was in the right (Lanza 283-285).

Perhaps the most notable of Léon's contributions to the Revolution was a petition that was signed by over three hundred women including Léon's mother (Dekker and Van de Pol 354; Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 107). Claude Guillon, in *Deux Enragés de la Révolution: Leclerc de Lyon et Pauline Léon*, believes that this petition, *L'Adresse individuelle à l'Assemblée nationale par des citoyennes de la capitale*, is "presque certainement" created by the hand of Léon (107). According to Guillon it was written in February 1792, and on March 6 of that year, Léon presented the petition to the National Assembly (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 152). The petition asked for the National Assembly to recognize women's rights to bear arms and participate in the defense of France. Only a few weeks later, on March 29, Théroigne de Méricourt would similarly make her feminist calling to arms in front of the citizens of Faubourg Saint-Antoine.

The petition begins, "Des femmes patriotes se présentent devant vous, pour réclamer le droit qu'a tout individu de pourvoir à la défense de sa vie et de sa liberté" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 243).¹⁷ This language is assertive in several ways. This phrase declares that women too are patriots and have an inherent right to self-defense that should be recognized. It also mentions the right to the defense of their "liberté." This suggests the right to participate in military roles that safeguard France and its people. The use of the verb "réclamer" also alludes to the fact that these rights are inherent, or natural, and that they should be recognized by the revolutionary government rather than granted. The petition again references the perils that France faces, "Nous

¹⁷ Guillon includes this petition in its entirety in his book *Deux Enragés de la Révolution: Leclerc de Lyon et Pauline Léon* (243-245).

sommes citoyennes; et le sort de la patrie ne saurait nous être indifférent” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 243). These phrases proclaim French women’s citizenship and assert the reality that the decisions of the National Assembly and the plight of France both have repercussions for women. This phrase suggests that women should have a say in how France is run. The following sentence makes it clear that it is also the intention of the women to personally see to the defense of France: “Vos prédécesseurs ont remis le dépôt de la Constitution dans nos mains, aussi bien que les vôtres: eh comment conserver ce dépôt si nous n’avons pas des armes pour le défendre des attaques de ses ennemis?” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 243). Here, the petition continues to underscore women’s equality. Furthermore, according to Léon and the other petitioners, in the above passage, the Constitution belongs to both men and women and that it is only logical and practical to use both sexes to defend it with weapons against its enemies. The petition returns to the idea of natural rights, which was an Enlightenment theory with considerable weight during this era. The petition asserts, “La société ne peut nous ôter ce droit que la nature nous donne” and asks “Croit-on que les tyrans nous épargneraient?” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 243). Not only do the petitioners appeal to natural rights, but also to a realistic and practical approach to life. The women argue that, were France to be successfully invaded, or if an aristocratic coup took place, they, having no weapons, would have no way of defending themselves. They rhetorically ask if the National Assembly believes that women would be spared by the republic’s enemies. These sentiments demonstrate the influence of the citizen-soldier virtues on Léon and revolutionary women. Léon and the petitioners wanted equal rights to those of men. This included having access to roles like defending their communities and nation with the force of arms.

The petition then references the Women’s March on Versailles and that the Republic’s enemies would not forget the role women played in threatening the King and his family. The

allusions to natural rights and the proposals within this petition illustrate Sandrine Bergès's claim, in "Revolution and Republicanism: Women Political Philosophers of late Eighteenth-Century France and Why they Matter," that in revolutionary France, "any political writer was also a philosopher" (354). Bergès maintains that the philosophical sphere had thoroughly saturated French culture and that, in addition to questioning political processes, social and traditional practices were also disputed (354). Accordingly, Léon's petition can be studied as a philosophical text. It employs many of the concepts of the Enlightenment, like asserting what is "natural," and offers a new and different conception to French republican life and citizenship. That is, that women should be involved in France's political, philosophical, and military processes.

The petition continues by declaring the women's wishes to serve and attain glory: "Les hommes sont armés pour vous défendre; d'accord mais aussi, répondrons-nous, pourquoi nous priver du droit de concourir à cette défense et du plaisir de conserver leurs jours aux dépens de nôtres?" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 243). The petition asks why women cannot also enjoy the honor and the right of defending the National Assembly. In these phrases, it appears that this persuasive petition is attempting to flatter the legislators. In mentioning, the "plaisir" it would be to protect the National Assembly, the petition is complimenting the country's representative leaders. The petition adds, "Pourquoi donc n'emploierait-on pas pour terrasser l'aristocratie et le despotisme toutes les ressources du civisme et du zèle le plus pur, de ce zèle que des hommes froids pourront bien qualifier de fanatisme et d'exagération, mais qui n'est que le résultat naturel d'un cœur brûlant de l'amour du bien public?" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 244). In this clause, the petitioners invoke the Enlightenment ideas of "civisme" and "l'amour du bien public." Service to the public good is a recurring theme found throughout eighteenth-century literature and

philosophy, and particularly within the military enlightenment and citizen-soldier model. In referencing these virtues, Léon and the petitioners are declaring that they too have the attributes required for the new republican conception of martial citizenship. The women's association with Enlightenment and republican virtues continues to be expressed in the following passage:

Si par des raisons que nous ne concevons pas, vous vous refusez à nos justes demandes, des femmes que vous avez élevées au rang de citoyennes en rendant ce titre à leurs époux, des femmes qui ont goûté les prémices de la liberté, qui ont conçu l'espoir de mettre au monde des hommes libres, et qui ont juré de vivre libres ou mourir; de telles femmes, dis-je ne consentiront jamais à donner le jour à des esclaves; elles mourront plutôt; elles tiendront leur serment! (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 244)

The women claim that, since their husbands hold the title of *citoyen* they too merit recognition as *citoyennes*. In “tasting” liberty these women have declared to “live free or die” and that their demands are “just” (my trans.).

Comparable to Reine Chapuy's petition, the petitioners cite an aspiration to share in the glory and honor that French men enjoy in defending France: “Aussi nous ne demanderons-nous que l'honneur de partager leurs [les hommes] glorieux travaux, et de faire voir aux tyrans que les femmes aussi ont du sang à répandre pour le service de la patrie en danger” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 244). The parallel statements found in Chapuy and Léon's petitions concerning glory and the defense of the nation are telling of the social changes that were taking place. Not only did a penchant for patriotism, public service, military service, and republican virtues affect the cultural imaginary of French men, but also that of women. Ideas about the role of women in society had begun to change and women like Léon and Reine Chapuy likely helped advance the progression of women's access to martial and political roles in western republics and

democracies. The way these petitions used the Enlightenment language of the day not only demonstrates an adoption of the citizen-soldier model but also illustrates a persuasive tactic that uses popular language as a tool. Was this tactic effective? Though Léon and Chapuy's petitions were not approved by the legislature, Chapuy's was applauded. Additionally, women were seen in the streets hoping to meet Chapuy after hearing the news of her military service and petition. This is evidence for, at the very least, a success in the inspiration of others and an influence on the minds of others. Though not successful in persuading the legislators, this tactic could be a potent tool for those who wish to make changes in society. Using language strategically that appeals to an audience's beliefs can be influential even if it only serves to motivate those who may be sympathetic to a cause.

The petition closes, outlining three demands and appealing to the men's "justice" and "équité." The first begins by requesting weapons: "La permission de nous procurer des piques, des pistolets et des sabres (Même fusils pour celles qui auraient la force de s'en servir), en nous soumettant aux règlements de police" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 244). The second point desired the assembling of women for martial activities on days of festivals and Sundays: "De nous assembler les fêtes et dimanches au Champ de la Fédération, ou autres lieux convenables, pour nous exercer à la manœuvre desdites armes" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés*, 245). The second demand above describes the practicing of martial arts with the weapons listed in the first demand in addition to the performing of military maneuvers. The third clause reads, "De nommer, pour nous commander, des ci-devant gardes françaises, toujours en nous conformant aux règlements que la sagesse de M. Le Maire [Pétion] nous prescrirait pour le bon ordre et la tranquillité publique" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 245). The second and third stipulations allude to women assembling and leading themselves. Although Dominique Godineau, in "De la guerrière à la citoyenne. Porter les

armes pendant l’Ancien Régime et la Révolution française,” interprets this petition to demand access to the National Guard, this is not explicit within the text itself. Nevertheless, the first and third demands do suggest affiliations with the official government, and thus suggest the formation of a women’s National Guard. The National Guard in revolutionary France was often a very fluid organization. It was at times an independent citizen militia and at other times more connected to and regulated by governmental authorities. Though aspirations to the National Guard are likely, perhaps Léon’s petition seeks a sort of hybridization of an independent women’s militia of *citoyennes*, while also allowing for some governmental oversight. The revolutionary government had already begun regulating the men’s National Guard by 1791, so it is certain that Léon and the petitioners, in 1792, felt that it was important to concede these measures of oversight for their petition to succeed. Additionally, Léon and the petitioners may have felt it prudent to leave out the term *Garde Nationale* so to take a more “indirect approach” to their demands.¹⁸ Though *Garde Nationale* is not used in this petition, it does appear that the women intended for the proposed *citoyenne* militia to have some form of government supervision. Perhaps these measures were included to persuade members of the National Assembly. Even more importantly, on a philosophical level, Léon’s petition wished for the revolutionary government to *recognize* women’s rights to bear arms, train, and protect their country. “Recognize” is an important ideological point as the petition illustrates that the women believed these rights to be natural and not given by government. This petition asserts that the French government should *recognize* these rights, rather than grant them.

¹⁸ John Willink, an author and retired Navy SEAL, remarks, in numerous publications, on the benefits of using “the indirect approach” in many aspects of life. Léon’s petition appears to employ this tactic in not using the expression *National Guard*, while also calling for governmental supervision of the proposed women’s military units.

Several scholars have also studied this petition. Dekker and Van de Pol, in “Republican Heroines: Cross-Dressing Women in the French Revolution,” observe that the petition appealed to the *Déclaration des droits de l’homme* and that it asked if these rights do not also apply to women (354). Moore notes that Léon’s petition did not demand civil rights like the vote but did demand the right to defend France (44). Indeed, Léon’s petition does not directly demand other rights; however, the petition does mention women’s status as “citoyennes” and their desire to defend their “lives and liberty” and that the *Déclaration des droits de l’homme* should apply to their sex as well (Guillon *Deux Enragés* 243; my trans.). Though not a direct call for certain rights, apart from the right to bear arms and defend France, the mention of the *Déclaration*, their “liberté,” and their status of citizenship does establish a desire for additional rights. Maybe these petitioners wanted to present their demands to full citizenship slowly, so to progressively gain ground. The fact that the right to bear arms and defend France are the only rights directly mentioned is telling of how important these liberties were to these women. Another motive for this petition may have been due to a belief among Léon and the petitioners that by incorporating women into the National Guard, this, at times, controversial organization would be tempered by a more democratized force. Recall that Léon, by now, has had several negative confrontations with the National Guard and the inclusion of women into this organization may have proved beneficial to the welfare of the nation. Though, as stated, the petition stops short of mentioning the National Guard directly, a positive response by the National Assembly may have resulted in the inclusion of women into this organization.

Guillon examines the following passage from the petition, “Ne croyez pas cependant que notre dessein soit d’abandonner les soins, toujours chers à nos cœurs, de notre famille et de notre maison, pour courir à la rencontre de l’ennemi” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 243). Guillon proposes

that this assertion to not abandon their household and familial duties “confirme l’assujettissement des femmes” (“Pauline Léon” 153). This phrase of the petition does confirm the historical reality that, generally, expectations of women’s roles had not changed very much. However, it may not “confirme l’assujettissement des femmes,” as Guillon suggests. The language in this petition takes up revolutionary themes and tones and it demands certain changes. Pichichero reflects that the above phrase was a strategic move by the Society to ease concerns of their radical demands (208-209). Pichichero adds that “Natural law, the rights of citizenship, and the traditional female role combined in the female citizen-soldier. Léon’s ideal woman warrior was indeed a *patriote sensible* and an ‘enlightened’ perfect hero. She embodied patriotic, militant, emotional, and domestic values at the same time” (209). As Pichichero points out, it is likely that Léon and the Society deemed it prudent, and strategic, to include this phrase in the petition.

However, there is also evidence that many women, including Léon, genuinely did not desire to change their domestic roles, but did seek to gain rights and change their political and martial statuses. The petition’s tempered rhetoric would also likely have been more welcomed among the working women known as *Poissardes*, who were not attracted to the proposed martial lifestyle. Furthermore, a year later, the Society voted internally to not make the carrying of arms, or women’s conscription, obligatory. Initially, in May 1793, the Society *had* called for “compagnies d’amazones” and the conscription of women aged 18-50 years old (Guillon, “Pauline Léon” 154). Yet, this measure was walked back in July of that year by the passing of the charter of the Society. Article 1 of this charter declares that, while the purpose of the Society was to arm women, *citoyennes* were free to abstain (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 246).¹⁹ This

¹⁹ Guillon includes this charter in its entirety in his book, *Deux Enragés de la Révolution* (246-249).

demonstrates the presence of moderation within the Society toward the idea of forced military service for women. To conclude on this matter, it is likely that the language in this passage was calculated to appeal to a wider audience, but it is also undoubtedly representative of the sentiments among many of the women in the Society itself.

Whether or not Léon endorsed this concession to traditional roles remains uncertain. After the revolutionary period, Léon settled down to be with her husband and few records of Léon's life after 1793 have been found (Moore 239). However, there exists a document written by Léon after her arrest which can provide some context to her views on these issues. In July 1794, she wrote that while her husband, Leclerc, was away as a soldier,

Je me livrais tout entière au soin de mon ménage et je donnais l'exemple de l'amour conjugal et des vertus domestiques qui sont à la base de l'amour de la patrie. Au commencement du mois germinal, un sentiment naturel et irrésistible à de jeunes époux, me conduisit à la Fère pour embrasser encore une fois mon mari avant qu'il allât combattre les ennemis de notre patrie . . . nous avons fait à notre patrie tous les genres de sacrifices. (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 125)²⁰

In this letter, Léon connects the care of her household to "l'amour de la patrie." She mentions that she took care of her household, and that when she left to see her husband, her mother took care of the house. Léon wanted to indicate that she had taken care of her domestic and societal services and duties. Léon may have sincerely believed in the petition's provision, that the petitioners did not wish to "abandonner les soins . . . de notre famille et de notre maison" while at the same time advocating for women's right to bear arms and defend their lives, homes, and

²⁰ Léon writes in the postscript the date, July 4, 1794, and the location, the Luxembourg prison.

countries (Guillon *Deux Enragés* 243). According to this document, Léon did not see these two roles as mutually exclusive.

Moore reacts differently to Léon's 1794 writing. She remarks, "One of the Revolution's most ardent campaigners for women's rights had finally surrendered to republican segregationist rhetoric – or perhaps, simply, to love" (239). Moore also postulates that Léon may have considered that "a quiet life was worth more than the rights for which she had once fought" (385). Though Léon's above writings laud the domestic role of women, it does not seem likely that Léon would surrender her beliefs on women's equality so easily. Recall Léon's petition, which declares the need for armed women, while also stating that the petitioners do not wish to "abandonner les soins . . . de notre famille et de notre maison." Léon's 1794 letter appears only to reinforce the evidence of Léon's belief in the citizen-soldier and military enlightenment concepts. That is, Léon advocated for women to participate in the defense of the nation and be armed in day-to-day life, while also supporting the importance of domestic duties, or "vertus domestiques." Léon's interpretation of these "vertus domestiques" appears to include the traditional expectations of women and their households. This duality of Léon, however, is very much in line with the citizen-soldier ideals superimposed over the military enlightenment, in which military and domestic virtues were desired in a hero or heroine. Therefore, it is plausible that Léon endorsed the Society's decisions to not support women's conscription and to not advocate for the obligatory arming of women. Nevertheless, Léon also directly sought to progress the rights of French women to voluntarily enter the martial sphere. Though it appears that Léon believed in performing the more traditional domestic roles of women, it seems unlikely, however, that she would have accused another woman, who had left to join in the frontlines of the French army, of neglecting or "abandoning . . . the care of . . . family and home"

(Guillon *Deux Enragés*, 243; my trans.) This accusation was used quite often by some of the men of the Revolution who attempted to shame women who dared to advocate for equal rights and speak up for their sex. Additionally, it should be taken into consideration that Léon's 1794 text was created while she and her husband were in prison and during the time of the Terror. Léon likely did not desire to write anything too extreme as women activists, such as Olympe de Gouges, had already been guillotined. Given Léon's writings and advocacy, she undoubtedly believed in the benefits of domestic duties, self-sacrifice in the name of France, and a martial interpretation of citizenship for both men and women. It does not appear that Léon had given up, as Moore proposes, but rather she was expressing a part of her identity in this writing that also happened to be a socially acceptable principle that would not jeopardize her or her husband's lives. Her radical views on gender equality and martial participation, would therefore be left out of this document.

According to Patrick Ball, in "Alternate Currents in Women's Republicanism During the French Revolution," "The very fact of their petitioning . . . formed a part of their assertion of their right to participate" (398). Ball adds, "Léon and her fellow petitioners saw the right to bear arms as the route along which they could access all the rights and responsibilities of republican citizenship: to be independent, women had to participate in the armed defence and creation of the nation" (398). Ball therefore proposes that their petition can be seen as an exercise of the right to do so. Furthermore, as Ball mentions, it does appear that many women saw the right to bear arms as a pathway to citizenship and equal rights. Léon, Théroigne de Méricourt, and Claire Lacombe publicly sported pistols in their belts, thereby displaying their claims to the republican rights French men enjoyed. As with the petition, these women's bearing of arms declared their right to do so. However, concerning Ball's final claim that "to be independent, women had to participate

in the armed defence and creation of the nation,” some women did not wish to participate in the armed defense of France. This is evidenced by the above discussion on Léon’s convictions as well as Article 1 of the Society’s charter. While Article 1 ardently called for the arming of women and access to military roles, it made it clear that that these measures were voluntary, not mandatory. Therefore, it should not be said, as Ball does, that these petitioners believed that women “*had*” to participate in armed roles to gain access to citizenship. Some may have, but Léon’s writings and the Society’s decision to make the arming of women voluntary, refute Ball’s comprehensive claim.

Only a few weeks after Léon’s presentation of her petition, the *Société Fraternelle des Minimes* resent it to the Legislative Assembly instead of the Constituent Assembly on March 25, 1792.²¹ This time, Léon’s signature was put among the other signatures rather than at the head of the petition (Moore 119). This approach could be telling of Léon’s fame, or perhaps notoriety, in revolutionary Paris. It’s plausible that her name was moved to soften the blow of the petition’s demand for women’s right to self-defense through weapons and to appeal to a wider audience. This is yet another interesting strategic maneuver done by those wishing to advance the issue of women’s rights. The demands for equality had not yet been met, though it seems the movement was growing given that another society decided to bring forward this petition again and to a different legislative body. Though not officially successful, these changes in approach illustrate a strong desire to advance the women’s equality movement and may have helped propagate its message.

²¹ Interestingly, both Léon and Théroigne de Méricourt were members of the *Société Fraternelle des Minimes*.

In August 1792, Léon attempted to participate in the Insurrectionary Commune (Godineau, “De la guerrière” 6; Moore 131). This Commune was supported by Marat, Danton, and less wealthy French people, and it believed that a direct democracy should be implemented in France. On August 10, the King’s Swiss guards were attacked and killed at the Tuileries (Moore 131). In the aftermath of this battle, the National Assembly honored Claire Lacombe, Queen Audu (also known as Reine Audu), and Théroigne de Méricourt for their participation. Théroigne even received a civic crown (Moore 132-133). Léon attempted to join in this attack and brought a pike to the crowd of attackers. Unfortunately for Léon, she had an interaction with the crowd that was comparable to that of Théroigne’s at the procession of deputies. Théroigne was called out of a parade by passerbys who did not think a woman should participate in such a march. Similarly, Léon was also implored to stand down. She details the experience she had: “Le lendemain, armée d’un pique, dans les rangs des citoyens de cette section pour aller combattre le tyran et ses satellites. Ce ne fut qu’à la prière de presque tous les patriotes que je consentis à me défaire de mon arme en faveur d’un sans-culotte; je ne la lui remis cependant qu’en l’incitant à s’en bien servir” (Guillon, “Pauline Léon” 151). The recounting of this story is reminiscent of the Spartan women who interjected their expectations of men’s bravery in battle. These ancient women also scrutinized the men’s actions to ensure conformity to their gallant ideals. Sparta and Antiquity were very popular themes during the Revolution. Manon Roland, a prominent woman revolutionary, is said to have read Plutarch and his *La vie des Hommes Illustres* from an early age (Moore 132). Can we expect Léon, who was taking care of her siblings and working as a chocolatier, to have also read this popular text? It is possible. Léon was a member of at least two active societies and keenly involved in many of the revolutionary Parisian events. This flurry of activity may have led Léon to read such writers as Plutarch and Rousseau. Moore observes that

Léon employed language parallel to that of Rousseau in criticizing the excessive time in office of politicians (230). Here, Moore refers to Léon's reaction to the heightened tensions between the Montagnards, who were in power, and the Society in mid-late 1793. Léon stated, "The prolongation of power was often the tomb of liberty" (trans. by Moore 230). She believed that power in the same hands for too long were detrimental to the French Republic. This statement, which echoes those of Rousseau, may be evidence for Léon's reading of him and others.

At any rate, Léon's bearing in the Insurrectionary Commune, commanding a fellow citizen to employ her pike properly, can be representative of the influence Antiquity had on revolutionary France, even on those who were perhaps not avid readers. Interestingly, in the above quote, Léon mirrored Théroigne's description of the crowd as "patriotes." This respectful tone suggests a desire to avoid enmity between Léon's camp and those that were resistant to gender equality. Women's participation in the martial sphere was clearly contested. It is certain that Léon and Théroigne were both disappointed by the experience of being discouraged from participating in revolutionary events. Yet, they appear sincere in calling those individuals in the crowds "patriotes." Though they disagreed with their opponents, the women activists appear to, at times, take a more moderate, amicable approach. The use of "patriote" that these two influential women used, suggests that they believed that those critics, like the *sans-culottes* who had denounced Léon, should and could be their allies. Leclerc was one of those allies and would soon become Léon's husband. Leclerc even included a petition from the Society entitled *Pétition des Citoyennes républicaines révolutionnaires* in an edition of his journal. This revolutionary couple represents a united front between the Society and Leclerc's *Enragés* party that became critical and demanding of Robespierre and the new Montagnard government. Their criticism will prove most unwelcome.

Théophile Leclerc

Théophile Leclerc was one of the leaders of the *Enragés* party. He was a young and extreme revolutionary who would find himself closely tied to the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*. He encouraged this group of women to incite the French people and disseminate the *Enragés* party's propaganda. These political writings were primarily created by Leclerc and Jacques Roux (Towers 37). Leclerc was born on December 22, 1771, near Montbrison in the region of Lyon. Leclerc claimed that he was one of the first to enroll in the National Guard of Clermont-Ferrand when he was seventeen years old in 1789. By March 1790, Leclerc was eighteen and departed for Guadeloupe. There, he found himself engaged in the civil war raging in Martinique between the aristocrats and republicans (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 248; Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 25). Leclerc likely arrived in Martinique in July 1790 and according to him, he fought with the republicans for six months, from September 1790 to March 1791. On March 12 he was arrested but was able to return to Paris (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 26).

In July 1791, he arrived in Paris in destitution; however, the citizens there came to his aid (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 26). He joined the Jacobin society, *La Société des Amis de la Constitution*, which accepted a diverse array of French people. This included soldiers, mariners, and children (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 26). At this point, once again, Leclerc joins up with a National Guard unit of Morbihan on September 28, 1791, at the age of nineteen (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 27). One Debray even recommended Leclerc for the command of a new battalion of volunteers and his description of the young revolutionary indicates an appreciation he had for his

actions and volunteerism.²² Debray cites Leclerc's, "bonne conduite . . . ses malheurs et son civisme" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 27-28). Debray's praise of Leclerc's "civisme," in addition to these instances of martial volunteerism, demonstrate Leclerc's adoption of many of the citizen-soldier ideals. Leclerc displayed a willingness to sacrifice his time, and potentially his life, for his fellow citizens and country.

In another instance of public service, in March 1792, Leclerc and 24 *grenadiers* 'soldiers' went to the Parisian chapter of the society *Les Amis de la Constitution* to clear the names of these soldiers (my trans.). A minister from Narbonne had denounced their actions in Martinique and the chapter of the club in Laval would not accept them as members (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 29-31). The Jacobins in the Parisian chapter gave Leclerc several compliments after his speech defending these soldiers. One member compared Leclerc to a roman soldier. Monsieur Lasource exclaimed, "Nous sommes . . . dans les beaux jours de Rome et de la Grèce . . . je ne refuse point de brûler mon encens devant les talents et les vertus civiques [de Leclerc]" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 29). After hearing Leclerc's defense, the Jacobins sent a petition in the soldiers' favor to the French military comity (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 31). Leclerc's civic and military engagements do not end there. He was tasked with an espionage mission in Strasbourg. His mission was to gain forces to overtake Brisgau, a German province bordering France (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 32). However, the mayor of Strasbourg betrayed Leclerc, who was chased into France by Austrian soldiers (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 32). It appears the mayor Dietrich had tasked Leclerc with the mission and subsequently alerted Austrian authorities of Leclerc's operation (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 32-33).

²² According to Guillon's research, it is uncertain if Debray, Captain of the National Guard battalion, and Debray, the Commissioner of the Department, are the same person or not. Thus, it is also unclear which Debray said the above quotation.

In February 1793, Leclerc was back in Paris at a meeting of a men and women's club, the *Société fraternelle des patriotes de l'un et l'autre sexe*. This is the first known meeting of Leclerc and Léon (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 34). He then briefly served in the *Armée du Centre*, where he worked in the hospitals of the French Army, and by May 1793, he was officially a deputy in Paris representing the town of Lyon (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 248). Soon after his arrival to the capital, on May 16, *Le Moniteur* reported on Leclerc's address to the Convention. He affirmed his belief in the people's ability to render justice saying "Il faut que le peuple se fasse justice" (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 249). Leclerc added that the people were the bearers of justice and that the people never made a mistake (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 249). These statements are very reminiscent of the philosophy of Rousseau, and other *philosophes*, who place an extreme importance, and a near infallibility, on the will and actions of the people. It is hard not to see the irony in this statement with the Terror swiftly approaching revolutionary France. Perhaps Leclerc would argue that the mistakes made during the Revolution were not really made by the people of France, but by usurpers of the nation's sovereignty.

Radical indeed, Leclerc declared many times that he had instigated insurrection. In his journal, *L'ami du Peuple*, Leclerc takes credit for stirring up unrest in Lyon in May 1793 (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 250).²³ From July to September of this year, Leclerc authored twenty-four editions of this journal. In his opening edition, on July 20, Leclerc provides insights into his political leanings. He offers a message of memorial to Marat who had recently been assassinated. He writes that Marat had served France "sans intérêt et la sauva par son courage" (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 138).²⁴ This idea of "intérêt" alludes to a concept articulated by Rousseau, which places

²³ *L'Ami du Peuple*, no. 21, September 8, 1793.

²⁴ Several editions of Leclerc's journal are reprinted in Guillon's book *Deux Enragés de la Révolution*.

an importance on keeping self-interests out of governments. For this philosopher, governments, particularly in republics and democracies, should serve the “intérêt public” ‘public interest’ instead of personal ones (Rousseau, *Discours sur l’Économie* 59; my trans.). In praising Marat, Leclerc adds, “Que vos enfants apprennent à répéter son nom” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 138). Leclerc includes a comparison of Marat and revolutionary figures with those of the ancient past. Guillon remarks that in comparing Brutus and Marat, Leclerc used an “amalgame typique entre personnages antiques et contemporains” (*Deux Enragés* 139). This juxtaposition of figures illustrates the Revolution’s, and Leclerc’s, willingness to take up ideas from the Greeks and Romans that were, incidentally, so lauded by popular philosophers such as Rousseau.

Throughout his journal, Leclerc emphasizes many of the principles associated with the citizen-soldier model. He stresses the importance of the people’s virtues and service to the nation writing, “L’homme libre doit servir le peuple” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 141). Leclerc also emphasizes the need for a revolutionary army: “La création d’une armée révolutionnaire devient de plus en plus nécessaire” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 179). He goes on to advocate for an equal military, where, regardless of rank, everyone receives the same pay, food, “et que les distinctions militaires ne soient pas un objet de parade, mais seulement pour l’utilité commune” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 180). Like the women in this study, Leclerc appeals to glory in calling on the French men: “Hommes libres . . . la patrie appelle, la victoire vous attend, et la gloire vous prépare des couronnes” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 180). Leclerc also takes the idea of self-sacrifice to a nation a step further by explaining this duty as a debt: “Ce qu’on fait pour la liberté n’est pas un sacrifice, c’est une dette sacrée et celui qui ne l’envisage pas ainsi n’est pas digne d’être français” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 179). Leclerc then implores the wealthy French people not to worry about money for the revolutionary army, explaining, “Les richesses du Français sont dans

sa liberté et son excellent territoire; s'il conserve l'un et l'autre, il sera toujours opulent” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 179). Thereafter, he references a story of the Romans who cared not for the gold that they gave to the invaders to leave Rome. The above statements are reminiscent of Rousseau's writings on Poland. In Rousseau's *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne et sur sa réformation projetée*, Rousseau suggests, “Maintenir, rétablir chez vous des mœurs simples, des goûts sains, un esprit martial sans ambition; former des âmes courageuses et désintéressées; appliquer vos peuples à l'agriculture et aux arts nécessaires à la vie, rendre l'argent méprisable et s'il se peut inutile” (219). Like Rousseau, Leclerc emphasizes liberty, martial virtues, and French soil (agriculture). These sentiments demonstrate an adoption of many of the citizen-soldier attributes.

Nevertheless, Leclerc did not always align with the moral standards of the citizen-soldier model, and his extremes are worth consideration. Leclerc explains in the eighteenth edition of *L'ami de Peuple*, published on September 1, 1793, that many of his fellow patriots in Lyon were hesitant to adopt his extreme proposals of throwing aristocrats into the Rhône. He proceeded to warn them that their moderation may lead to their demise. He recounts this scene and his words: “faire jeter, dans une nuit, six mille aristocrates dans le Rhône. Beaucoup d'excellents patriotes, à qui je parlai de ce projet, pâlirent et frissonnèrent d'horreur. Eh bien! Qu'ils aillent contempler sur les débris fumants de cette cité les funestes effets de leur modération” (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 214). This generalized call for violence against aristocrats goes against the idea of a right to a trial. Leclerc's unnuanced incitements of violence risked unjustly killing those who were innocent or who did not deserve such fates. Leclerc's extreme approach is further evidenced on June 4, 1793, when he spoke in front of the *Conseil général de la Commune* (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 362). *Le Moniteur* reported his words, “L'incarcération des gens, suspects,

dit-il, était un des principaux moyens de salut public. Mais tous les gens suspects sont-ils incarcérés? J'en doute, et les dangers sont toujours les mêmes . . . pourquoi mettez-vous tant de lenteur à vous défaire de vos ennemis? Pourquoi craignez-vous de répandre quelques gouttes de sang?" (L. Lacour, *Les origines* 363). The president of the assembly had to call Leclerc to order and Léopold Lacour, in *Les origines du féminisme contemporain: trois femmes de la Révolution: Olympe de Gouges, Théroigne de Méricourt, Rose Lacombe*, notes that Hébert, an influential revolutionary who founded the popular journal *Le Père Duchesne*, reacted to these extreme ideas naming anyone who called for blood a "mauvais citoyen" (363). These opinions are quite relevant to the discussions of modern republics and democracies. Should peaceful protesting be the only means of dissent? Or are violent means justifiable under certain circumstances? Most current readers would have condoned violent resistance to the actions of oppression and genocide employed by the Nazis. However, current civil rights issues such as liberty, privacy, equality, and police brutality are not as straightforward. Justice is sometimes served in the punishment of police who use excessive force, yet other times justice does not appear to be found. Prudent and engaged citizens of republics must be creative and thoughtful in thinking of solutions and reacting to these problems. Violence should not be used rashly and should be reserved only for when it is necessary to defend one's country and human rights against tyranny. The current defense of Ukraine against Russia, in which many citizens have answered the call to defend their independence, demonstrates the relevance of this subject matter, and the importance of an engaged citizenry.

Théophile Leclerc and Pauline Léon got married on November 18, 1793, nearly a month after the *Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* was forcibly shutdown by armed individuals. This was done after the passing of a law that banned women's clubs and

women from meeting in large numbers (Guillon, “Pauline Léon” 159). Guillon notes that this law was the beginning of the attack on the *sans-culottes* movement (“Pauline Léon” 159). A few months later, after Leclerc had been drafted and sent to war, Léon travelled to the frontlines in La Fère (Aisne) on March 17, 1794, to visit her husband (Guillon, “Pauline Léon” 156; Moore 294). Guillon hypothesizes that Léon was encouraged to leave Paris due to a series of arrests of Cordelier society members with whom she was associated (*Deux Enragés*, 126). Indeed, both Léon and Leclerc had “criticized the hypocrisy and terror of the Jacobin regime” (“Pauline Léon”). Interestingly, Moore speculates that Léon had possibly gone to the frontlines to join in the fighting (294). This postulation is plausible given Léon’s martial ideals and tendencies. Furthermore, the couple had more than two weeks together on the frontlines before they were arrested.²⁵ This gave Léon ample time to engage in soldiering if she chose to do so. No record exists of her combat, though it is possible. Her motives for leaving Paris and going to Leclerc were likely a combination of love, threats of arrest, and, conceivably, to fight for France. Léon and Leclerc were sent to the Luxembourg prison for several months. A few weeks after Robespierre’s execution on August 22, 1794, they were freed. Soon after, Leclerc was called back to his battalion on September 5.

Few records survive of this couple’s activities after the Revolution. However, on July 22, 1804, Léon demanded the release of her brother who had written against Napoléon (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 87). This trace of activity illustrates that, even in the Napoleonic Empire, Léon still believed in actively contributing to her country. In this case, it was advancing a republican agenda. Guillon observes that Léon signs this letter as “femme Leclerc” and not “veuve Leclerc”

²⁵ The couple was arrested on April 3, 1794, and arrived in Paris on the April 6 (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 81).

indicating that Leclerc was still alive. Léon's letter also mentions that they had a son together (Guillon, *Deux Enragés* 87). These are some of the few post-revolutionary details available on Leclerc. We do know that Léon herself became a schoolteacher in Paris and that she was arrested in 1804 and imprisoned for three months after writing a letter that criticized Napoléon (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 157). At some point, Léon moved west to the Bourbon-Vendée region where she took up the printing business with her sister and brother (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 147). A police report in 1817 indicated some suspicion that the printing press had expressed republican ideals during the one hundred days of Napoléon's return (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 157). Again, this evidence suggests that Léon continued her activism well beyond the Revolution of 1789. Though she may not have been as publicly operational as she was during the revolutionary years, it appears that Léon still advocated for republican ideals even whilst under the authority of governments hostile to such notions. These actions demonstrate her continued adoption of the citizen-soldier model. Léon died in Bourbon-Vendée on October 5, 1838, at the age of seventy (Guillon, "Pauline Léon" 159).

Both Léon and Leclerc were politically engaged in the French Revolution. They also both believed in defending it militarily. Situated in the French republican and revolutionary context, these convictions and actions show the influence of the citizen-soldier model on their identities. Recall that the civic and martial roles of citizen-soldiers often overlap, and Léon herself believed that being armed in the streets formed a necessary part of citizenship. She believed that this right was necessary for the protection of the Republic and that both sexes should have the right to defend their nation and participate politically. Léon and her fellow women activists often used a plethora of thoughtful strategies, including tact and moderation, to influence their audiences. In participating in protests and advancing petitions, Léon took part in public and political life in

revolutionary France, thus performing the functions of a *citoyenne-soldate*. Léon presented, and is presumed to be the writer of, the petition *Adresse individuelle à l'Assemblée nationale par des citoyennes de la capitale*. This document was signed by three hundred women and demanded women's right and means to self-defense in addition to access to military roles. With allusions to what is natural, this text should be studied as a philosophical text that constitutes an important work within the Enlightenment and revolutionary era. In claiming that their rights were natural, the petitioners affirmed the Enlightenment belief that their right were inalienable and not permitted by governing bodies. Their petition advances a new understanding of French society within the republican context; one that includes women both politically and martially, as *citoyennes-soldates*. The petition also uses a number of persuasive elements that are worth consideration, as they could prove useful to modern activists. Though unsuccessful in its principal goals, the petition used the dominant language of the time to frame the women's desires. It also shied away from using the term *Garde Nationale* which may have been an attempt to avoid approaching the issue directly. This served to avoid resistance and aide the chances of its success. Importantly, there are indications that many of the revolutionary women activists, such as Léon, did not seek to totally change gender roles. Though many advocated for equal rights and access to military positions, a number of women did not think military service should be obligatory for their sex. Nevertheless, as Patrick Ball claims, some women may have seen the right to bear arms as a necessary gateway to other rights (398). Furthermore, evidence suggests that Léon continued to advocate for republican ideals after the Revolution, and during the regimes of Napoléon and the Restoration.

Similarly to his wife, Leclerc's involvement in the Revolution is one inspired by martial citizenship. The impact of the citizen-soldier model on Leclerc's identity appears evident, as he

fought with the republicans in Martinique and volunteered for the National Guard several times. He also defended a group of soldiers from Martinique who had been denounced by a minister in France. Leclerc also authored many publications in his journal *L'ami du peuple*, in which he criticized the revolutionary government and sought to persuade his audience to see his ideals favorably. Nevertheless, Leclerc was certainly an extremist and often advocated for violence. However, the study of his viewpoints, and the reactions to him, is important for contemporary discussions because the citizens of modern republics and democracies, when faced with tyranny or invasion, must decide between peaceful and violent means of resistance. The importance and practical application in the modern era of the citizen-soldier concept is demonstrated by the citizens in Ukraine, who are taking up arms against a Russian invasion. The importance of citizens protecting their communities in a principled way is just as important today as it was during the French Revolution. The stories of Léon and Leclerc illustrate an embrace, or a partial embrace in Leclerc's case, of the citizen-soldier concept. Léon herself expanded the vision of this ideal, and the rights that came with it, to her sex, proving that the citizen-soldier model is always subject to debate and evolution. This discourse and change are certain to continue well into the twenty-first century.

Chapter 6: A Proclamation to the Entire Universe

The *Proclamation* of Louis Delgrès appeared in 1802, effectively declaring the Guadeloupean Resistance. It served to inspire the people of Guadeloupe to rebel against General Richepance and his French soldiers who were there to re-enslave the population. By 1802, Louis Delgrès, an *homme de couleur*, or a man of mixed heritage, had become a high-ranking leader in the Guadeloupean military. He led the Resistance against slavery and released the *Proclamation* which served many purposes.²⁶ The *Proclamation* was a calling to arms, a defense of the actions of the Resistance, and a declaration of its principles. These principles provide insights into the beliefs and rationale of Delgrès and the rebellion. The *Proclamation* employs French republican and Enlightenment ideals and suggests, like the actions of Delgrès and the Resistance, that the ideal of the citizen-soldier had not been confined to mainland France. Indeed, Delgrès and many Guadeloupeans seized on this model and made it their own. They adopted a more universal approach to this concept and shaped their identities as freedom-fighters via its principles of public and militant service.²⁷ Under the threat of slavery, Delgrès and the members of the Guadeloupean Resistance endeavored to expand the rights declared by the 1789 French Revolution. This expansion of rights, to include the citizen-soldier role, was to encompass the People of Color on the island. Their adoption and modification of martial citizenship illustrates the persevering, attractive, and contentious nature of the citizen-soldier model to Western

²⁶ Not an uncommon practice in this field, I will capitalize the Guadeloupean Resistance to highlight its importance in history.

²⁷ This study does not wish to claim that the citizen-soldier was the only aspect of Guadeloupean identity, but rather, that it made up an important part of Guadeloupean identity during this era.

societies. Today, their rebellion serves as a reminder of the necessity to adopt laws and policies that truly respect and recognize people's rights, freedom, and equality regardless of race.

In 1789, Guadeloupe had 89,823 people enslaved, 13,712 Europeans, and 3,058 “*Hommes libres*” (made up of *hommes de couleur*, or men of mixed heritage, and freed Blacks) (Saint-Ruf 21).²⁸ In September 1789, news of the French Revolution reached Guadeloupe, and revolts of the enslaved peoples began popping up over the following three years. The Contre-Amiral Lacrosse arrived in Guadeloupe on January 5, 1793. During his time there, he secured the rights of the free Peoples of Color and their access to administrative and political roles. He even addressed the “population noire” and said “c’est vous qui représentez le véritable peuple guadeloupéen” (Saint-Ruf 44). Germain Saint-Ruf in *L’Épopée Delgrès* observes that this acknowledgement had a profound and long-lasting influence on the people of Guadeloupe. Saint-Ruf comments,

Pour la première fois, un représentant officiel du pouvoir tutélaire métropolitain déclarait que les colons n’étaient que des immigrants, des exploiters étrangers, que les véritables guadeloupéens étaient ces esclaves qui fouillaient le sol . . . Ces simples mots ouvraient des horizons nouveaux pour ces gens que l’on considéraient comme des bipèdes mais auxquels on avait refusé jusque-là toute qualité d’hommes . . . cette phrase trouve encore,

²⁸ Pamela Oliver in “Race Names” completed research on the preferences of ethnic groups and what they prefer to be called. She found that many individuals desire *Black* to be capitalized, and she likewise capitalizes most names of other groups. This study will follow this practice, unless otherwise noted. Oliver also observes that these preferences change over time, and she seeks to update her blog, which as an active version of her article, with new developments on this subject. She acknowledges that language is always changing, and new developments occur. With a desire to be respectful, I am open to editing this study when necessary. Additionally, in this study, I do not change capitalization in quotes from others, and to reflect historical accuracy, I do not capitalize French terms like *homme de couleur*.

après près de deux siècles, une profonde résonance chez les Guadeloupéens. (Saint-Ruf 44-45)

According to Saint-Ruf, the words of Lacrosse had a lasting impact on the Guadeloupean People of Color. Lacrosse's words may well have helped encourage the sentiments which pushed Guadeloupe into its Resistance and motivated Delgrès to write his *Proclamation* and lead a revolt. Nevertheless, the influence of revolutionary and Enlightenment language is not attributable to Lacrosse alone. Travel between France and the Caribbean, interactions with other Whites of the island, and the abolition of 1794 are just a few examples of sources of Enlightenment inspiration.

On February 4, 1794, France abolished slavery. Unfortunately, after much in-fighting in Guadeloupe, the English invaded in April 1794 and quickly took control. The English placed the French aristocrats back into power, allowing them to rule alongside them and return to enslaving the People of Color in Guadeloupe. France's response, however, was quick and by June 2 of that year, Victor Hugues arrived on Guadeloupe and began taking forts and cities away from British control. Hugues announced the freedom of the enslaved peoples in a declaration that was propagated throughout the island (Saint-Ruf 48). Hugues began this proclamation with the customary eighteenth-century republican address of "Citoyens," and he proclaimed in the first phrases, "Un gouvernement républicain ne supporte ni chaine, ni esclavage, aussi la Convention Nationale vient-elle de décréter solennellement la liberté des nè**** . . . Citoyens vous n'êtes devenus égaux que pour jouir du bonheur et de le faire partager à tous les autres; celui qui est l'opresseur de son concitoyen est un monstre qui doit aussitôt être banni de la terre social" (Saint-Ruf 48-49). Hugues' words created a powerful statement which denounced slavery. Nevertheless, this strong language was not to be the reality on the ground. Formerly enslaved

persons were required to work or be in the military (Dubois, “Amis et Citoyens” 299). To help battle the English, Hugues marshalled a *Bataillon des sans-culottes noirs* made up of individuals freed from slavery.

The name of this military unit, *Bataillon des sans-culottes noirs*, indicates exposure to revolutionary ideas among the freed peoples of Guadeloupe. This is perhaps one of the first instances where the “citizens” of Color, particularly the liberated Black citizens, in Guadeloupe were able to take part in the citizen-soldier model, if however, in a limited capacity. Noël Corbet and Pierre Gédéon were both captains in this military unit and later served an integral role in the 1802 Resistance. Some soldiers are listed in this unit as “black citizens” (Dubois, *Colony* 238). Among these were Hypolite, Gilles François and Pierre. Showing pride in his unit and likely a pride in the freedom associated with the name, Pierre named his newborn child Sans-Culottes (Centre des Archives). Laurent Dubois in his book *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean*, remarks that the establishment of the *Bataillon des sans-culottes noirs* created relationships between the Whites and Blacks of the island (237). For Dubois, this practice illustrated the promise of “social integration embodied in the Republican decree of emancipation” (Dubois, *Colony* 237).

Geneviève Labothière illustrates a distinct example of the adoption of republican and Enlightenment virtues. Labothière was freed during the 1794 abolition and took steps to free her brother from slavery by means of purchase. After doing so, she was called to answer for her crime since it was illegal in Guadeloupe to engage in the commerce of slavery. Dubois explains that for her defense, she “invoked both the legal and natural rights she and her brother had as human beings and as citizens of the French Republic” (Dubois, *Colony* 377). She made clear that since her brother was in Martinique, a French territory taken over by the English, her actions

were justified in freeing him. She declared that she had “purely and simply committed a benevolent and fraternal act, based on the laws of nature, without hurting the laws of the Republic” (Dubois, *Colony* 377). Nevertheless, the Guadeloupean authorities still had her renounce any claim on her brother that the sales documents implied. Dubois observes, “Geneviève . . . claimed that the Republican decree of emancipation – and the natural rights on which it was based – gave all, even those in occupied territory, the right to fight for their freedom in whatever way they found necessary” (*Colony*, 377). In her defense, Labothière used Enlightenment language and argued that the ends, in which her brother was now freed, justified the means of engaging in slavery and having to buy him. These stories demonstrate that even among those populations in Guadeloupe that could not sign their names, like Labothière, Enlightenment thought had seeped into the culture of the freed peoples of Guadeloupe.

After a string of victories for Hugues and the *Bataillon des sans-culottes noirs*, on October 6th, 1794, the English surrendered. Hugues ruled strictly, but he did ensure the liberty of the freed peoples while making Guadeloupe prosperous (Saint-Ruf 57-58).²⁹ Desfourneaux replaced Hugues in 1798. He began putting in measures against the formerly enslaved peoples such as mandatory work and punishment for vagabondage. The Guadeloupeans soon replaced Desfourneaux in October 1799 (Saint-Ruf 61). On December 11th, 1799, Frenchmen Jeannet, Laveaux, and Baco were sent by the Directory to Guadeloupe. Among this group were two *hommes de couleur* from Martinique who would play significant roles in the approaching Guadeloupean conflict: Louis Delgrès and Magloire Pélage, both of the rank of *Chef de brigade*. Soon after, Lacrosse was sent by Napoléon and arrived in May 1801. Lacrosse soon began

²⁹ Saint-Ruf notes that unfortunately, when the political tides turned, Victor Hugues was not above reinstituting slavery in Guyane (French Guiana) when called upon to do so (58).

arresting those he accused of threatening the peace and even deported many of the officers of Afro-descent who had fought for France against the English (Saint-Ruf 64). After a series of political moves, one of the Black officers, Joseph Ignace, tricked Lacrosse and was able to arrest him and his close followers. Lacrosse and his supporters were deported to France and Pélage took command of the island (Saint-Ruf 68-70).

According to Saint-Ruf, for the people of Guadeloupe, France continued to remain the “mère-patrie,” and he references their adherence to the revolutionary principles of liberty and equality (71). “Pour eux il ne suffisait pas que les privilèges des Aristocrates fussent abolis et la République reconnue, il fallait encore que leurs chaînes fussent à jamais brisées. Voilà pourquoi les mots d’ordre et d’égalité lancés par la Révolution trouvaient chez eux une résonance beaucoup plus grande que chez n’importe quel Français” (Saint-Ruf 72). The French Revolution was therefore quite important to the people of Guadeloupe, and they saw in it the means of maintaining their freedom. Now finding himself the leader of Guadeloupe, Pélage declared “Vive la République! Vive le gouvernement consulaire auquel nous sommes constamment fidèles,” thus demonstrating a devotion to France and its republican principles (Saint-Ruf 75). Pélage was not the only one to feel this way. The Council of Guadeloupe adopted the following statement, “Fidélité et attachement à la Métropole . . . ; justice égale pour tous les citoyens . . . ; efforts pour entretenir la population dans un esprit de fidélité et de soumission envers la mère-patrie” (Saint-Ruf 75-76). These words show the complex relationship that the peoples of Guadeloupe had with France. It appears that many wished to retain France as their official country, thereby hoping to retain the rights that the People of Color had attained. However, the French complicated this situation by their own actions, instituting authoritarian laws and eventually reinstituting slavery. Saint-Ruf posits that Pélage and the Council’s statements show a

“naivety” and “lack of clairvoyance” within the Guadeloupean government which would ultimately result in the reestablishment of slavery on the island (76). However, Pélage’s perspective was not universal. The citizen-soldier Delgrès desired to arm the population of Guadeloupe and defend it from any attempts at the people’s liberty. He wanted to create a strong defensive army so that France could not control policy for the island (Saint-Ruf 80). Military leaders Ignace and Massoteau went even further by advocating for complete independence of the island from France. Saint-Ruf characterizes Pélage’s views as naive and this is quite likely the case. Toussaint Louverture, in Saint-Domingue, expressed similar sentiments of loyalty to France. However, there is much to suggest that he was not so naive as to believe that France would honor its initial declaration of abolition and the rights that it had proclaimed for the new citizens of the colonies. Louverture’s approach and rhetoric will be explored in the following chapter.

With the complicity of Pélage, General Richepance arrived on Guadeloupe with secret orders to enslave the population. After Pélage ordered his soldiers to leave the forts and assemble in front of Richepance, the French general disarmed, undressed and held captive all of the Black soldiers who had obeyed Pélage. However, some ignored Pélage’s orders and escaped, but those who had stayed undoubtedly did not expect such treatment at the hands of the French soldiers. In response, Ignace, Mossoteau, Palerme, Codou and 150 soldiers regrouped to establish an insurgency. Noël Corbet, Pierre Gédéon, François Mondésir Gripon and Jean-Baptiste Vulcain are among other notable leaders who played an important role in the 1802 Resistance (Dubois, *Colony* 237, 390-391). Richepance reacted to the Resistance by publishing a declaration which stated that his soldiers were only there to protect the peace, homes, and people of Guadeloupe. Richepance adds that his soldiers exude “des modèles des vertus guerrières, des Français comme

vous” (Saint-Ruf 98). Here, Richepance makes an attempt to use republican language to assuage any doubts that the people of Guadeloupe might have. Richepance used terms like “*vertus guerrières*” and the protection of “*foyers*” to harken to the citizen-soldier ideal. He claimed that the soldiers were French, just like the people of Guadeloupe. He asserted the citizenship of the Guadeloupean populations and hoped to inspire loyalty to a France, that, secretly, and at times openly, no longer respected the Peoples of Color nor their rights. As is laid bare, Richepance was not above lying in order to reestablish slavery.

Louis Delgrès was one of those brave Guadeloupeans who stood up to Richepance’s oppression and recognized the French’s deception. He was a free *homme de couleur*, or a man of mixed African and European heritage. Delgrès was born in 1772 in Martinique, and, at the age of eleven, joined the militia. He soon reached the rank of Sergeant and after the royalists took over in September 1791, he sought refuge in *Dominique*, or the present-day Commonwealth of Dominica. In 1792, he rose through the ranks under the command of Lacrosse and fought against the British to retake Guadeloupe. It is also this year that he participated in the first “racially integrated election in French history held in Dominica” (Dubois, *Colony* 354). Delgrès continued his military career, fighting against the British in several Caribbean campaigns. After having been captured, Delgrès was sent to mainland France where he earned the rank of *Chef de bataillon*. He returned to Guadeloupe in 1800 as an *Aide de camp*. When Ignace imprisoned Lacrosse, Delgrès helped rally the Guadeloupean people and in February 1802, with the help of Captain Massoteau, arrested some of the White officers. When the colonial police tried to arrest Black workers for not working, Black soldiers intervened and stopped the arrests. In a display of the *citoyen-soldat* virtue of *civisme*, Delgrès and his soldiers defied Pélage’s orders to impose authoritarian working laws on the community (Dubois, *Colony* 381).

When the time came to mount an insurrection against the invading Richepance, Delgrès gathered the troops that he could in Basse-Terre and proclaimed in republican terms, “They want to take our liberty, my friends; let us defend it with heart; let us prefer death to slavery” (A. Lacour 251-253; trans. by Dubois, *Colony* 391). Delgrès then addressed the Whites among his soldiers, “Pour vous, je n’exige pas que vous combattiez avec nous contre vos pères, vos frères qui, peut-être, se trouvent dans la division française; déposez vos armes, je vous permets de vous retirer ensuite où bon vous semblera” (A. Lacour 251-253). This statement illustrates in Delgrès the duality of the citizen-soldier. Not only was he a military leader, fighting for the freedoms of Guadeloupe, but he was also a sensible citizen with compassion and understanding for his neighbors. Furthermore, the respect exhibited by Delgrès’s units toward public property is yet another example of this *sensibilité* of the Guadeloupean citizen-soldiers. Certain commentators offer conflicting narratives and have accused Delgrès of being ambitious and reckless.³⁰ Nevertheless, Saint-Ruf defends Delgrès, asserting that his *Proclamation*, which declared the Enlightenment principles of the Resistance, in addition to his deeds during the revolt, are proof of his just cause (111).

In the Guadeloupean Resistance, women, men, and children joined the cause, armed with anything they could find (Saint-Ruf 105). In a key battle, the freedom-fighters were defending Basse-Terre from Richepance. Women brought ammunition to the Resistance soldiers singing *La Marseillaise*. They also joined in the combat (Dubois, *Colony* 394). The actions taken by these *citoyennes-soldates* of Guadeloupe are reminiscent of those carried out by French women on the day of the taking of the Bastille during the French Revolution. There, women brought food and

³⁰ Saint-Ruf cites the *Mémoire pour le Chef de brigade Magloire Pélage . . . and Pardon (Jean Marie), La Guadeloupe, depuis sa découverte jusqu’à nos jours*. Paris, 1881, 1 vol. in-8.

drinks to their husbands and sons who had participated in the riot. On May 9, 1802, Delgrès declared, “Mes chers amis, on en veut à notre liberté, sachons la défendre en gens de cœur et préférons la mort à l’esclavage” (Saint-Ruf 106). This rhetoric, coupled with the determination of the Resistance, which included children and the elderly, shows how important freedom was to the Guadeloupean people.

On May 10, 1802, Delgrès’s *Proclamation* was published and put up in public areas in the city of Basse-Terre. The full title was: *Proclamation à l’univers entier le dernier cri de l’innocence et du désespoir*. White Frenchman Monnereau helped as a secretary for Delgrès in writing the *Proclamation* “to the entire universe” (my trans.). Educated secretaries were often employed in the writing of important documents. Use of secretaries spanned from Saint-Dominguan leaders Toussaint Louverture and Jean-Jacques Dessalines to the French Emperor Napoléon Bonaparte. The influence of secretaries should be considered when studying documents from this era; however, their presence should not be used to utterly dismiss attributing these documents to the commissioning authors. John Patrick Walsh addresses this subject in his book *Free and French in the Caribbean: Toussaint Louverture, Aimé Césaire and Narratives of Loyal Opposition*. Walsh observes, “To question Louverture’s authorship would be to place a modern view of writing and authorship onto a historical period when dictation and redaction were the norm” (91). Likewise, Delgrès should be considered the author of the *Proclamation*. This perspective on the *Proclamation* is supported by Delgrès’s employment of an Enlightenment register in other speeches and oral declarations.

Delgrès’s *Proclamation* itself employed terms strongly associated with Enlightenment philosophy and the French Revolution. The document begins, “C’est dans les plus beaux jours d’un siècle à jamais célèbre par le triomphe des lumières et de la philosophie qu’une classe

d'infortunés qu'on veut anéantir se voit obligé d'élever sa voix vers la postérité, pour lui faire connaître, lorsqu'elle aura disparu, son innocence et ses malheurs" ("Proclamation de Louis").

The language in this opening phrase clarifies to the Guadeloupean listeners and readers that the Resistance fighters were forced into insurrection by the oppressors, the French. Delgrès goes on to explain that the oppressed people of the island were "obliged to speak up to the ears of posterity" ("Proclamation de Louis"; my trans.). In using a shared lexicon with revolutionary France, this passage suggests that a philosophical reading, or understanding of this text, should be applied in understanding it. This is the approach that Sandrine Bergès applies in "Revolution and Republicanism: Women Political Philosophers of Late Eighteenth-Century France and Why They Matter." Bergès claims that, during the Revolution, "any political writer was also a philosopher" (354). Likewise, Delgrès's political *Proclamation* was not devoid of philosophical themes. The *Proclamation* praises the glorious "triumph" of the Enlightenment and of the revolutionary events of the eighteenth-century. I will also argue that Delgrès's *Proclamation* can be read as an autobiographical text. For Marc Fumaroli in *La Diplomatie de l'esprit: de Montaigne à la Fontaine*, memoirs in France often served to challenge the official narrative. Fumaroli adds, "History is a trial for which posterity alone will be able to give a definitive conclusion" (188; trans. by Walsh, *Free and French* 84). In his *Proclamation*, Delgrès seeks to vindicate the Resistance's actions against France's agent, General Richepance. Delgrès offers history a different perspective so that the "official" French version can be contested.

The *Proclamation* continues, "Victime de quelque individus altérés de sang qui ont osé tromper le Gouvernement Français, une foule de citoyens, toujours fidèles à la Patrie, se voit enveloppée dans une proscription méditée par l'auteur de tous ses maux" ("Proclamation de Louis"). Here, Delgrès declares the citizenship and loyalty of those in his camp to *revolutionary*

France, but he protests the fact that they now find themselves declared its enemies. This rhetoric parallels that of the fidelity expressed by Louverture and Pélage. Even Delgrès, who is fighting a war against France's General Richepance, affirms his allegiance to France; however, unlike Pélage, he sees France's betrayal. This rhetorical move, not uncommon among colonial rebels, is a rich field for analysis. Perhaps Delgrès believes that the French Republic has been commandeered and that the Guadeloupeans are the only patriots left to fight France's usurpers. In declaring the Resistance's loyalty to France, Delgrès suggests that the invaders are the defective citizens. The following lines of the *Proclamation* support this interpretation of Delgrès's intent. They ask, "Quels sont les coups d'autorité dont on nous menace? Veut-on diriger contre nous les baïonnettes de ces braves militaires dont nous aimions à calculer le moment de l'arrivée et qui naguère ne les dirigeaient que contre les ennemis de la République?" ("Proclamation de Louis"). Delgrès questions the "autorité" of Richepance's mission and hostilities. Delgrès harkens to a shared past between France and Guadeloupe and reminds France that, in 1802, France is still a republic. Similarly to the writings of his contemporary, Louverture, Delgrès references the republican ideals lauded by the Revolution of 1789. These principles, according to Delgrès, are, or should be, cherished and respected both in Guadeloupe and in France. Delgrès points out the irony and injustice of the situation in which the freedom-loving peoples of Guadeloupe find themselves being considered the "ennemis de la République" ("Proclamation de Louis"). Delgrès denounces this fratricide and underlines the disgrace of the treason against the ideals of the Republic.

Throughout these passages, Delgrès's *Proclamation* continues to use a philosophical vocabulary parallel to that of the Enlightenment and French Revolution. These conventions could be a stylistic flare from the Secretary Monnereau, however, Delgrès's name is signed at the

bottom of this document, and he was quite accustomed to such rhetorical norms. For example, just one day before the publishing of the *Proclamation*, Delgrès had been quoted saying to his troops, “Mes chers amis, on en veut à notre liberté, sachons la défendre en gens de cœur et préférons la mort à l’esclavage” (Saint-Ruf 106). Delgrès holds his “liberté” in high regard and would “prefer death over slavery” (Saint-Ruf 106; my trans.). Furthermore, the rallying cry for the Resistance was “Vivre libre ou mourir” (Saint-Ruf 112). Like the revolutionaries of the French Revolution, these ideas embodied a new identity. One in which “everyone” had rights that were once reserved for the elites.³¹ For Delgrès and the Resistants, those rights must be defended at all costs. These sentiments are of die-hard republicans and of staunch citizen-soldiers and demonstrate the adoption in Guadeloupe of Enlightenment principles, and of the citizen-soldier concept. Delgrès’s Resistance was fighting for its rights and liberty. These facts, and Delgrès’s statements illustrate Delgrès’s republican and revolutionary nature, and they support the establishment of an intimate connection between him and his *Proclamation* despite the use of Secretary Monnereau.

In the following passages, Delgrès declares the resolve of the Resistance to “tyrannie” in this “siècle de la philosophie”:

Eh bien! nous choisissons de mourir plus promptement. Osons le dire, les maximes de la tyrannie la plus atroce sont surpassées aujourd’hui. Nos anciens tyrans permettaient à un maître d’affranchir son esclave, et tous nous annonce que, dans le siècle de la philosophie, il existe des hommes, malheureusement trop puissants par leur éloignement

³¹ In an ideal world, the Enlightenment ideas encompass *literally* everyone, but as shown in the first part of this study, women were not wholly included in revolutionary France. Likewise, the rights of People of Color were also often contested throughout the Caribbean, even after emancipation. Additionally, in my research of this era, I did not come across the acknowledgement or discussion of women’s rights in the Caribbean sphere, though more research on this topic is necessary.

de l'autorité dont ils émanent, qui ne veulent voir d'hommes noirs ou tirant leur origine de cette couleur, que dans les fers de l'esclavage. ("Proclamation de Louis")

Here again, Delgrès highlights the hypocritical conduct of the French culture and government by employing the oppressors' terms against them. In referencing the "siècle de la philosophie," Delgrès alludes to the Enlightenment and to all the ideals of liberty, equality and reason that come with it. Delgrès flips the script, accusing the French of acting in "tyrannie" ("Proclamation de Louis"). "Tyrannie" is another popular and weighted term of the French Revolution, and Delgrès's use of it here demonstrates not only an understanding of these concepts, but also an adoption of them into his identity. Furthermore, in this selection of phrases, Delgrès employs an accumulation of expressions which serves to highlight his intent. Delgrès remarks, "les maximes de la tyrannie la plus atroce," which is already a strong start to his accusation, "sont surpassées aujourd'hui" ("Proclamation de Louis"). This buildup of powerful Enlightenment expressions illustrates the persuasive intent of the *Proclamation*. In employing these loaded phrases, Delgrès may have hoped to show the French their error in oppressing the Guadeloupeans. Moreover, it is certain, based on the opening lines,³² though I advance here too, that Delgrès wished to convince future generations of his just cause. The justificatory nature of this *Proclamation* suggests that Delgrès viewed his forces as the forces of the French Republic. This indicates that Delgrès saw Napoléon's army as rogue agents, traitorous to the French Republic and its ideals.

The principles of the citizen-soldier model can be found throughout the words and deeds of the Guadeloupean Resistance. Though, in my research on Guadeloupe, I have found no specific mention among primary resources of the "citizen-soldier," Delgrès's *Proclamation*

³² "qu'une classe d'infortunés qu'on veut anéantir se voit obligé d'élever sa voix vers la postérité, pour lui faire connaître, lorsqu'elle aura disparu, son innocence et ses malheurs" ("Proclamation de Louis").

appears to refer to it, using a synonym. Delgrès asks, “Et vous, Premier Consul de la République [Napoléon], vous guerrier philosophe de qui nous attendions la justice qui nous était due, pourquoi faut-il que nous ayions à déplorer notre éloignement du foyer d’où partent les conceptions sublimes que vous nous avez si souvent fait admirer?” (“Proclamation de Louis”). The implementation of the term “guerrier philosophe” ‘warrior philosopher’ is an interesting lexical and strategic choice (my trans.). This verbiage seems to make a direct reference to the martial citizen-soldier ideology. In the above passage, Delgrès asks why this “guerrier philosophe” has made the freed People of Color admire such lofty principles as natural rights, freedom, and justice, while at the same time, is not willing to recognize or defend these principles for the people of Guadeloupe. This expression, “guerrier philosophe,” suggests a reference to a collective France that has encouraged its revolutionary principles, yet has defaulted on its promises. France adopted the citizen-soldier ideals throughout its Revolution. Citizens were inspired by the philosophy of writers like Locke, Voltaire, and Rousseau. This philosophy permeated the militant Revolution and, consequently, the citizen-soldier role and identity became established in republican France. With Delgrès wondering why these “conceptions sublimes” are being disregarded, which France has “que vous nous avez si souvent fait admirer,” it appears clear that the citizen-soldier model, and its ethos, did not stop in France but traveled across the Atlantic and inspired the freed peoples of the colonies.

Concerning this “guerrier philosophe,” Rousseau writes about this figure in his response to the proposed question by the Académie de Corse: “Quelle est la Vertu la plus nécessaire aux Héros; et quels sont les Héros à qui cette Vertu a manqué?” In this article, Rousseau mentions this personnage directly and asserts, “Le brave ne fait ses preuves qu’aux jours de bataille; le vrai Héros fait la sienne tous les jours” (“Quelle est la Vertu” 7). This phrase highlights the

importance Rousseau placed on the public service of citizens in a republic. Rousseau similarly celebrates Cato the Younger, a Roman who was able to take a corps of soldiers and create, according to Rousseau, “une société d’hommes sages, équitables et modestes” (“Quelle est la Vertu” 8). Rousseau describes his “warrior philosopher” hero who is both valiant and cultured: “ce guerrier Philosophe et bienfaisant qui d’une main accoutumée à manier les armes, écarte de votre sein les calamités d’une longue et funeste guerre, et fait briller au milieu de vous avec une magnificence Royale les sciences et les beaux-arts” (“Quelle est la Vertu” 8; my trans.). In this description, Rousseau reflects the effects of the military enlightenment on the expectations of military soldiers, their ideals, and their conduct. Not only were soldiers looked to for the defense of their country, but they were also expected to cultivate civic virtues such as public service and their education. The citizen-soldier concept, which came into fruition during the French Revolution, superimposed on this previously aristocratic concept, a Rousseauian, democratized mutation of this model which valued the rights of citizens. In the above passage, Rousseau effectively describes the duality of the citizen-soldier concept. For Rousseau, this *guerrier philosophe* is proficient in “arms, . . . sciences, and fine arts” (“Quelle est la Vertu” 8; my trans.). Rousseau explains that bravery is not enough and that heroes should be diversified in their virtues. He writes, “L’âme la plus pure peut s’égarer dans la route même du bien, si l’esprit & la raison ne la guident, & toutes les vertus s’altèrent sans le concours de la sagesse” (“Quelle est la Vertu” 9). For Rousseau, pure intentions are not enough and should be guided by “reason,” “esprit,” “wisdom,” and love of country (“Quelle est la Vertu 9; my trans.).³³ This understanding of the citizen-soldier, or *guerrier philosophe*, does not appear to be lost on Delgrès. He employs

³³ This word, “esprit” is infamous for its various meanings. Here it could mean spirituality or intellect.

this term and calls on France to reflect on the ideals that made this construction, and the French Revolution, possible. Delgrès hopes to remind the French people that these “conceptions sublimes” should apply to all peoples regardless of skin color.

Natural rights are the next subject which Delgrès must defend. The *Proclamation* asserts, “La résistance à l’oppression est un droit naturel,” effectively echoing the *Déclaration des droits de l’homme et du citoyen* of 1789 as well as Olympe de Gouges’s *Déclaration des droits de la femme et de la citoyenne*. Each of these three documents catalog this right as a “droit naturel” ‘natural right’ (my trans.) Delgrès adds, “La divinité même ne peut être offensée que nous défendions notre cause: Elle est celle de la justice, de l’humanité. Nous ne la souillerons pas par l’ombre même du crime. Oui, nous sommes résolus à nous tenir sur une juste défensive, mais nous ne deviendrons jamais des agresseurs. Pour vous, restez dans vos foyers; ne craignez rien de notre part” (“Proclamation de Louis”). Here, Delgrès emphasizes his refusal to use violence arbitrarily and the nonaggressive nature of the Resistance.

The use of the term “divinité” is worth further investigation. This term suggests a belief in a Creator much in line with the Enlightenment religion of Deism. To call Deism a religion may suggest an organized, universal belief, though, in the eighteenth century, this was not really the case. Then, Deism was most often practiced by observing the natural world and drawing conclusions and beliefs from it. For Deists, the natural world was evidence enough for a Creator; however, this word, and Delgrès’s term “divinité,” leave room for interpretation. That is, the audience can interpret these terms howsoever they choose, whether that be the Christian God, the Deist Creator, or any other Divine being or beings that the readers and listeners might believe in. Not only is this language Deist in nature, but it is also, incidentally, rather inclusive. This was perhaps important for Delgrès because many of his followers likely held diverse religious beliefs.

The *Proclamation* closes with, “Et toi, postérité, accorde une larme à nos malheurs, et nous mourrons satisfaits! Le Commandant de la Basse-Terre Louis Delgrès” (“Proclamation de Louis”). These passages signal to “postérité” that Delgrès and his companions are innocent and just in their “cause.” Delgrès declares that “divinity cannot be offended by our cause: Which is of justice and humanity” (my trans.). Delgrès describes their strategy which will be a “just defensive” and that they will not be the ones to fire the first shots (my trans.). This part of the document is relevant for contemporary discussions on the nature and methods of protests and resistance. In this situation, Delgrès and the Resistants are drawing a line in the sand. Delgrès announces that their Resistance is not an offensive, but one of defense. He and his army wish to be left alone in peace and to live in freedom; however, if General Richepance follows through with his aggressive strategies, they will defend their liberty to the death.

It is difficult to disassociate the ending of the *Proclamation* with that of earlier passages in the document. Delgrès begins and ends the *Proclamation* by addressing “posterité” directly. In the beginning, he takes on a narrative style, that describes the present, as if it were a past event. The *Proclamation* begins, “C’est dans les plus beaux jours d’un siècle à jamais célèbre par le triomphe des lumières et de la philosophie qu’une classe d’infortunés qu’on veut anéantir se voit obligée d’élever sa voix vers la postérité, pour lui faire connaître, lorsqu’elle aura disparu, son innocence et ses malheurs” (“Proclamation de Louis”). This allusion to successive generations provides an interesting perspective on the thought-processes of Delgrès. It expresses a desire that is present throughout the *Proclamation* to explain the Resistance and its motives to the future and to defend its actions. Like an autobiography, it serves to tell the story of the Resistance and offers the future a different perspective of the Guadeloupean conflict. However, this frame of mind is not entirely novel. It appears evident that American and French rhetorical, philosophical,

and political conventions found their way to emancipated Guadeloupeans who fought to retain their freedom. For example, the writers of the American *Declaration of Independence* express a similar preoccupation with how the world will view their document and rebellion. It begins,

WHEN in the Course of human Events it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation. (Cato 13)

Furthermore, the concern with posterity is so strong for the Americans that even the United States' Constitution mentions it specifically. The U.S. *Declaration of Independence* was a very influential text for the French Revolution. Likewise, it is possible that both Delgrès and his secretary Monnereau were familiar with this rebellious text. In comparing this opening passage of the U.S. *Declaration* to Delgrès's *Proclamation*, several similarities can be identified. They both reference Deism, or a more loosely defined belief in a Creator. Similarly, to the American *Declaration*, Delgrès's *Proclamation* offers a defense of the rebels' actions. Moreover, the Americans used "Nature's God" while Delgrès used "divinité." Both allude to and refer to natural rights, what is natural, and nature itself. Finally, these documents employ their adversaries' language ironically. The *Declaration of Independence* drew from the English philosopher John Locke and his *Two Treatises of Government* (Wendorf 313). Delgrès's *Proclamation* makes use of the French *Déclaration des droits de l'homme*, affirming the people's natural right to resist oppression.

These Guadeloupean and American texts reveal a fascinating concern for the legacy of their movements. Each document includes several points which demonstrate a willingness to be

conscientious of how the future might view their actions. It is certain that the writers of both the American *Declaration* and the Guadeloupean *Proclamation* were aware of the risks they were taking in beginning a rebellion for independence. If they were to fail, they would be killed, and the victors would likely write the history condemning the rebellions. These authors wanted to present a reasoned defense of their insurrections, whether they won or lost. Delgrès claims innocence in the Guadeloupean conflict and that he and his supporters are “victime” of their blood, or heritage and race. He asserts that they are loyal to France, yet he believes General Richepance’s promises are disguised and misleading. He argues that formerly the French would only attack the enemies of the Republic, but now they appear to be attacking the supporters of that Republic. Delgrès makes plain his alignment with republican values and implores posterity to see these injustices: “Ah! Sans doute un jour, vous connaîtrez notre innocence, mais il ne sera plus temps” (“Proclamation de Louis”). Delgrès makes direct reference to the Resistance’s innocence and declares their just cause. Much like the Americans, Delgrès weaponizes the French’s language against them, invokes the right to self-defense and declares his refusal to begin the hostilities. With his defense to future observers complete, Delgrès implores “postérité” to shed a tear and some compassion for their plight and to recognize the mistreatment that they have endured.

Parallels can also be made between Delgrès’s *Proclamation* and Toussaint Louverture’s 1797 *Lettre au Directoire* (Saint-Ruf 109). In this letter, Louverture makes similar references to France’s former principles of Liberty and the hypocrisy that has now manifested. Louverture advances,

Mais non, la main qui a rompu nos chaînes ne nous asservira pas à nouveau. La France ne reniera pas ses principes, elles ne nous enlèvera pas le plus grand de ses bienfaits, elle

nous protégera contre nos ennemis; elle ne permettra pas que sa morale sublime soit pervertie, que ces principes qui sont son plus grand honneur soient détruits, que ces plus belles acquisitions soient avilies, et que son décret du 16 pluviôse qui est un honneur pour l'humanité, soit révoqué. (Saint-Ruf 109-110)

Like Louverture, Delgrès is still “attached” to the French Republic and France (Saint-Ruf 111; my trans.). Saint-Ruf elucidates, “C’est la lutte pour la Liberté et non une lutte contre la République,” and he cites the *Proclamation*: “une foule de citoyens toujours fidèles à la Patrie se voit enveloppé dans une proscription méditée” (111). This loyalty, to a country that had turned its back on the rights of these People of Color, indicates that Delgrès and Louverture sought to reestablish what they saw as the true republican France. They were French republicans fighting against an imperial counter-revolution. Their struggle as citizen-soldiers highlights the importance of a citizenry motivated by a universal understanding of equality and freedom, ready to defend itself from attacks on its rights and lives.

According to Saint-Ruf, the *Proclamation* made an impression on the population of Guadeloupe, and many of the free Black Guadeloupeans took the vow to fight against the reestablishment of slavery (112). “Vivre Libre ou Mourir” became the rallying call from the day of the *Proclamation* (May 10, 1802) and on into the Resistance (Saint-Ruf 112). According to an 1870 edition of Larousse, “On le voyait [Delgrès] s’asseoir dans une embrasure de canon, un violon à la main, y braver les boulets du général Richepance . . . pour animer ses soldats” (Césaire 69). This picture of Delgrès is an interesting, romantic vision of the Resistance leader. Following the publishing of the *Proclamation*, Richepance and Pélage tried to trick Delgrès. Pélage sent a letter and began with “Citoyen Commandant” and used other republican phrases. However, Delgrès was not persuaded by this manipulative language (Saint-Ruf 112-113). In the

first attacks by Richepance and Pélage, Delgrès's forces were pushed back. This was mostly due to a lack of sufficient arms and experience among the Resistants (Saint-Ruf 114). On May 12, at the battle on the Belost habitation, women sung the Marseillaise while bringing ammunition and encouragements to the Resistants. These women also joined in combat, loading weapons and caring for the wounded (Saint-Ruf 115). This bloody battle was won by the Resistance and after the fighting ceased, Delgrès withdrew to fort Saint-Charles (Saint-Ruf 116). Richepance then sent a letter to Delgrès, promising liberty if his forces laid down their arms. Delgrès began his response with a republican timbre. He addresses Richepance as "Citoyen" and explains, "je vais vous parler par l'organe d'un vrai républicain qui préfère mille fois la mort à l'esclavage – et c'est aussi les vœux de tous les compatriotes" (Saint-Ruf 118). This language, once again, reinforces Delgrès and his "compatriotes'" adoption of Enlightenment, revolutionary, and citizen-soldier ideals. Delgrès goes on to implore Richepance to cease hostilities so that the "guerre civile" can end, and "prospérité" can recommence (Saint-Ruf 118).

With the aid of English forces, Richepance begins the siege of the fort on May 17th. That night, at three in the morning, Delgrès attempted an escape but was unsuccessful. However, Richepance's losses were great and Pélage came up with the idea to use the Guadeloupean soldiers taken captive at Point-à-Pitre against the Resistance (Saint-Ruf 119). On the 21st, it was clear to Delgrès that the rebellion needed to head into the countryside to survive. He freed the French prisoners in his possession and with four hundred soldiers, and a large number of free Blacks, snuck past the siege and into the wilderness (Saint-Ruf 121). Saint-Ruf defends Delgrès and the Resistants against some commentators who claim that an explosion of the fort was thwarted by the released French prisoners. Saint-Ruf cites that Delgrès had benevolently released

those prisoners,³⁴ and he brings attention to the respect that he and his soldiers had toward private and public property. Later, Delgrès even sent his own soldiers to help those of Richepance put out a fire in town (121). For Saint-Ruf, Delgrès's Resistance avoided destructive tactics because, "il voulut placer sa résistance sur un plan social et moral, sur le plan de l'abnégation" (129).³⁵ Abnegation, or self-sacrifice, is an appropriate way of describing Delgrès and his freedom-fighters. The care for their own community, an attribute of an army of citizen-soldiers, led them to resist the colonial forces of Richepance and refuse the amnesty offered by him. Given Richepance's treatment of the people of Guadeloupe before, during, and after the Resistance, it is unlikely this amnesty would have been honored. Delgrès's aid against the fire and his previous conduct with the White settlers, in which he permitted them to lay down their arms so that they would not have to potentially fight their families, reinforces Saint-Ruf's assertion that Delgrès fought an uncorrupted rebellion. Therefore, Delgrès appears to have conducted the Resistance as a *gentleman*. This *sensibilité* illustrates his dual nature as a citizen-soldier that possesses the inherited traits of the *guerrier philosophe*.

After successfully vacating the fort and reaching safety, Delgrès and the *Chef de bataillon* Ignace divided their forces. Delgrès took to the mountains while Ignace went to Point-à-Pitre (Saint-Ruf 121).³⁶ Like Delgrès, Ignace was an important leader of the Resistance. He was a Black carpenter and had freed himself before the liberation of 1794. While free, he lived in

³⁴ This stands in contrast to the executions of prisoners and other inhabitants of Guadeloupe carried out by General Richepance which is detailed throughout Saint-Ruf's book, *L'Épopée Delgrès*.

³⁵ Whilst Delgrès did not employ destructive tactics, others in the Guadeloupean Resistance sometimes did (Dubois, "Amis et Citoyens" 301).

³⁶ Conventionally, historians believed Delgrès's final stand was on the mountain of Matouba. However, Jean-Marie Nol in *La vérité sur l'histoire du sacrifice de Louis Delgrès en Guadeloupe* (2021) has recently claimed that it was not at Matouba, but on the heights of the summit Houëlmont. Nol cites the strategic practicality of this location, as well as remnants of a fort, tombs, and residue from a powdered explosion. Nol advances that no such evidence is present at Matouba.

the woods with those who had run away from enslavement (Saint-Ruf 122). During the Resistance, after he and Delgrès had split their forces, he gathered freed Blacks from the surrounding population and he and his coalition occupied an abandoned fort (Saint-Ruf 124). Soon after, Pélage successfully attacked the fort on May 25th. All the Resistants there were either killed in combat or later executed as prisoners (Saint-Ruf 124). According to Saint-Ruf, the defeat of Ignace was a mortal blow to the Resistance (127). Meanwhile, Delgrès, with the aid of his subordinate officers Kirwan, Dauphin, Jacquier, and others, set up a defensive in one of the mountainous regions on Guadeloupe. May 28th was to be the final day of fighting. It became clear that the Resistance would lose and Delgrès gave his followers the option to leave or stay and die with him. Delgrès and 300 Resistants screamed “Vive la liberté” before dying in an explosion of their own creation (Saint-Ruf 129). After the Resistance was over, there was no one left to protect the Guadeloupean’s from the tyranny of Richepance. About ten percent of the island’s population were either executed or deported (Dubois, *Colony* 404). According to Dubois, the Black soldiers and *hommes de couleur* who had fought for their freedom and the French Republic, represented a physical and ideological danger to Imperial French Guadeloupe (*Colony* 406). This ideological danger was a result of the Guadeloupeans’ citizen-soldier identity which encouraged them to protect their liberty, community, and their rights by the force of arms. Furthermore, the Resistance fighters had indeed fought for the French Republic, both in the past, and arguably during the Resistance in fighting against Imperial France. Nonetheless, it was a bygone France. Napoléon had taken charge, and the law to reinstitute slavery had already been passed. If it was still called a republic, it was one in name alone. Importantly, the legacy of the freed people of Guadeloupe is that they fought for a truer and more universal understanding of

freedom and liberty than Napoleonic France ever did, and their Resistance may have had an influence on France's abolition of slavery some forty years later.

After his victory, Richepance continued his orders from Napoléon. That is, to reintroduce slavery. Delgrès's wife, Marie-Rose Toto, who had participated in the combats of the Resistance, was executed (Saint-Ruf 132). In her final words, she declared, "Des hommes après avoir tué leur roi, ont quitté leur pays pour venir dans le nôtre porter le trouble et la confusion. Dieu les jugera!" (Saint-Ruf 132). This exclamation demonstrates a penetrating knowledge that Marie-Rose Toto possessed of France's recent history and shows a desire to point out France's savage conduct. On July 17th, 1802, Richepance reinstituted slavery and the *hommes de couleurs* no longer retained citizenship.

The fight and sacrifice for freedom by Louis Delgrès and the Guadeloupean Resistance are not forgotten today. Saint-Ruf celebrates Delgrès's Resistance, "Son combat fut un combat pour donner sa vraie grandeur et son universalité à la *Déclaration des droits de l'homme*, un combat pour montrer . . . que la population guadeloupéenne . . . avait toutes les qualités pour faire un peuple majeur, digne et fier, capable de mourir pour sa liberté" (145-146). In 1989, the fort in Basse-Terre that Delgrès fought in was renamed in his honor, "Fort Delgrès," by local administrators. Within the fort, visitors can read Delgrès's *Proclamation* that is printed on a plaque, and they can look at a chronology of events of the fort's history. Even Parisian streets have been named after Delgrès and in 1998, a dedication to him and Louverture was added to the Panthéon. Delgrès's reads, "Héros de la lutte contre le rétablissement de l'esclavage à la Guadeloupe, mort sans capituler avec trois cent combattants au Matouba en 1802. Pour que vive la liberté." Dubois, in "Haunting Delgrès" points out the symbolism of the placement of these commemorations (174). They were placed in the hallway which leads to Victor Schœlcher's

tomb. Schœlcher was the leading abolitionist who helped finally end slavery in 1848. He used the historical revolutions and revolts of the Caribbean as tools of persuasion, arguing that if the newly won Second Republic of France did not abolish slavery, the Caribbean would rebel once again. Dubois points out that this aspect of Schœlcher's argumentation is often overlooked. Consequently, Dubois argues that the Caribbean revolutionaries of the 1790's and early 1800's should be recognized for their contribution to not only liberating Haiti, but also to the abolishment of slavery in 1848 ("Haunting Delgrès" 174-175).³⁷ Therefore, Delgrès and his Resistance can be viewed as having lasting impacts on the fight to abolish slavery and on the restoration of rights to People of Color.

The presence of revolt from the early 1790's in Guadeloupe, in addition to the creation of the *Bataillon des sans-culottes noirs* after abolition, established the practice of citizen-soldiering in Guadeloupe that continued through the decade and into the Resistance of 1802. Many of these *citoyens-soldats* had been enslaved, and the construction of the citizen-soldier was taken up by the Guadeloupean populations. They helped the French fight against the English and later fought against the French and the reinstitution of slavery. When republican France no longer recognized the rights of the People of Color in Guadeloupe, these citizen-soldiers sought to defend a more universal interpretation of the rights that the French Revolution had proclaimed. Delgrès's *Proclamation*, which defends the principles of freedom and the natural rights of People of Color, illustrates an adoption of Enlightenment ideas among Guadeloupeans. It shows a desire to fight loyally for what they saw as the true France which guarantees the rights of all its citizens,

³⁷ Dubois notes that many Guadeloupean and Caribbean scholars similarly advocate for this interpretation of history.

including the People of Color in Guadeloupe.³⁸ Despite the use of a secretary in the drafting of the *Proclamation*, Delgrès's rhetorical statements, which employ a similar register, promote the claim that he was heavily influential in the creation of this text. Furthermore, Delgrès demonstrated numerous times the civic side of the citizen-soldier role. By defying Pélage's orders to enforce authoritarian working laws and helping to put out a fire during war with Richepance, Delgrès and his soldiers provided public services for the well-being and rights of the Guadeloupean people. This duality of civic and militant actions and sentiments among the Resistance demonstrates an adoption of the citizen-soldier model and a desire to expand it in a more universal way. Their fight and defeat illustrate the importance of valuing human rights and life and the gravity for societies to be vigilant and proactive against threats to these principles.

³⁸ I did not find information concerning sentiments on the rights of women in Guadeloupe, though more research is required. We know that France did not grant full rights to women, and, in my research, women were absent in the Caribbean political discussions.

Chapter 7: The Haitian Revolution and the Ideals of the Citizen-Soldier

From about 1794 to 1802, Toussaint Louverture was a key figure and revolutionary leader in Saint-Domingue, or present-day Haiti. In this chapter I will propose that he, and his successor Jean-Jacques Dessalines, adopted many of the sentiments of the citizen-soldier model. I will explore three documents attributed to Louverture which demonstrate his championing of citizen-soldier and Enlightenment ideals and his desire to keep slavery out of Saint-Domingue. In addition to Louverture's writings, the rhetoric, events, and actions of the freed peoples of Saint-Domingue also illustrate the influence of Enlightenment thought and an espousal to the citizen-soldier principles. However, even when freed, the Black populations, at most times, were not officially recognized as citizen-soldiers by law and did not enjoy the rights one would expect in a republic. Nevertheless, many inhabitants of Afro-descent believed they were citizen-soldiers in their hearts and incorporated it into their identity. Their actions demonstrate this identification and through this lens they can be considered citizen-soldiers. After Louverture's arrest and deportation, Jean-Jacques Dessalines would take his place as leader of the colony. When Dessalines and the Haitian people defeated France in 1803, Dessalines published two declarations of independence which further reveal the influence of republican ideals on the island.³⁹ Louverture and Dessalines, much like the Guadeloupean Resistance leader Louis Delgrès, used republican language with the intent to persuade France to come back to its former principles which helped bring about abolition in 1794. Since the 1794 abolition, People of Color in Saint-Domingue had increasingly greater access to military roles and enjoyed limited rights.

³⁹ Saint-Domingue became Haiti after victory against France. I will use both terms, depending on the historical context.

Though at times deviating from the citizen-soldier model, Louverture and Dessalines are important figures in the fight against slavery and in the Haitian Revolution. Their actions and words reflect an embrace of enlightened martial citizenship which provide insights into not only their identities but also those of their people's.

It is important to begin by defining the citizen soldier, or martial citizenship, model. Though the citizen-soldier has seen a multitude of interpretations, this study advances the following republican definition: A citizen-soldier is a person who is politically engaged seeking to advance the rights and freedoms of the people of their country or community. These rights include, but aren't limited to, political equality, freedom from slavery, freedom from arbitrary acts, the right to vote, and the right to bear arms. This citizen-soldier also engages in some level of martial activity. This can include participation in an organized military, a militia, or simply being prepared and willing to protect their community and nation from invasion or tyranny. Notice that this definition does not require that individuals be recognized by law as citizens or soldiers, but it is their actions, sentiments, and identities which qualify them as citizen-soldiers.

The citizen-soldier model has a long history. During the Enlightenment, French philosophers, particularly Jean-Jacques Rousseau were inspired by the literature and models handed down from ancient Greece and Rome. Rousseau wrote favorably on Antiquity's practice of combining the role of citizen and soldier. In his "Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne," he recommends for Poland to institute a republic of citizens. He proposes to "former une nation libre, paisible et sage . . . il faut . . . maintenir . . . des mœurs simples, des goûts sains, un esprit martial sans ambition" (Rousseau, "Considérations" 219).⁴⁰ Rousseau adds, "Tout

⁴⁰ My translation: "to form a free, peaceable, and wise nation . . . you must . . . maintain . . . simple virtues, a taste for the wholesome, and a martial spirit without ambition."

citoyen doit être soldat par devoir, nul ne doit l'être par métier" ("Considérations" 230). During the French Revolution, French men and women took up this idea into their identities and acted as both citizens and soldiers. They expressed their citizenship by engaging in political discussions and protests, and they demonstrated their soldierly qualities by joining the French Army, National Guard, and by simply being citizens ready to defend their community or nation if the need were to arise. This was similarly the case in Saint-Domingue where Enlightenment and revolutionary sentiments had crossed the ocean and influenced the enslaved peoples.

Revolts of the African populations grew throughout the early 1790's. They demanded freedom and the rights of citizens. In 1791 the French government recognized citizenship for individuals of mixed race who were among some of the first non-Whites able to take part in voting, political positions, the militias, and thereby the citizen-soldier model. When abolition was realized on the island in 1793, Raffaella Sarti remarks, in "From Slaves and Servants to Citizens? Regulating Dependency, Race, and Gender in Revolutionary France and the French West Indies," "The [French] Revolution turned the armed defence of the nation into a crucial feature of citizenship. This was even more so for slaves: fighting for the revolutionary republic proved an avenue to freedom, for males, to enfranchisement" (19). Laurent Dubois, in his article "Citoyens et amis!": Esclavage, citoyenneté et République dans les Antilles françaises à l'époque révolutionnaire," refers to the emergence of a "républicanisme militant" among the freed peoples of Saint-Domingue (297). According to Dubois the people of Saint-Domingue used this practice to protect their freedom ("Citoyens et amis" 297). Dubois explains, "des insurgés commencèrent à utiliser leur participation militaire comme moyen de pression pour revendiquer leur liberté. Ce fut le cas à . . . Saint-Domingue, où la transformation des esclaves insurgés en soldats de la République suscita l'abolition de l'esclavage tout d'abord dans cette

colonie, puis dans l'ensemble de l'empire français" (Dubois, "Citoyens et amis" 293). As stated by Dubois, the People of Color in Saint-Domingue forced abolition via insurrection before the official decree of emancipation in 1794.

Demonstrating the activism and sentiments of citizen-soldiers, a group of armed rebels visited the Commission of Saint-Domingue in June of 1793 proclaiming, "We are negroes, and French . . . We will fight for France, but in return we want our freedom . . . [and] our *Droits de l'Homme*" (Dubois, *Colony* 160). This action and rhetoric illustrate an adoption of the citizen-soldier concept. These men, and the concurrent rebellions against slavery, effected political change (freedom from slavery) by employing the ideology of the Enlightenment from a position of force and power. A month later, the colonial government under Léger-Félicité Sonthonax was forced to end slavery. However, complete citizenship was not fully realized for those freed from bondage. Many of the former slaves, while paid, were required to work if they were not in the military. Nevertheless, formerly enslaved persons, in many cases, could join Saint-Domingue's military, and some earned positions of political power (Dubois, "Citoyens et amis" 298). Though Louverture's and Dessalines's regimes did not allow for a principled implementation of the citizen-soldier model, the adoption of many of this concept's ideas is evident among these leaders and among the Saint-Dominguan people and soldiers. The examples in this chapter will show that though many of the people of Afro-descent in Saint-Domingue were excluded from full rights, citizenship, and soldiering, many, yearning for its fruition, adopted the citizen-soldier ideology into their identities anyway. Louverture, Dessalines, and the formerly enslaved populations used the French's egalitarian language to assert the need for their rights and freedom to be respected. Saint-Domingue's martial interpretation of republicanism, whilst the execution

was at times flawed, demonstrates a desire among its people and leaders to engage in and establish the citizen-soldier model.

Before examining Louverture's texts, a brief historical overview of the revolutionary events of Saint-Domingue will provide some context. In 1790, Vincent Ogé, inspired by his time in revolutionary France, led an unsuccessful rebellion. After this, Dubois explains, in *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution & Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787-1804*, that Saint-Domingue experienced a series of revolts, and in 1793, Léger-Félicité Sonthonax was sent by France to establish peace (170). Facing threats from foreign nations and the insurrections against slavery, he was inescapably obliged to emancipate and promise citizenship for those enslaved persons that would fight against Britain and Spanish threats (Dubois, *Colony* 170). Still unsatisfied with incomplete abolition, the revolting people of Saint-Domingue forced Sonthonax to declare complete abolition. By 1794, this abolition was echoed in France for all its colonies, and Louverture had become the central unifying general for the People of Color in Saint-Domingue. From then, until 1798, Saint-Domingue found a stable peace (Kaisary 396). In 1797, Louverture sent his *Lettre au Directoire* which pledged allegiance to France but asserted the freedom of the people of Afro-descent on the island. In 1798, Louverture accused Sonthonax of trying to reinstitute slavery and deported him. A few years later, in 1801, Louverture gained much power with the newly declared Constitution which is considered by many to have created a dictatorship for him. Ronan Chalmin, in "Éthique et rhétorique de la Révolution chez Gracchus Babeuf et Toussaint Louverture," observes, "En France, comme en Haïti, les généraux prennent le pouvoir et mettent en place des régimes autoritaires et réactionnaires" (851). General Leclerc was sent by Napoléon at the end of 1801 to reestablish slavery in Saint-Domingue. In May of 1802, Louverture agreed to a ceasefire with French forces but was soon deceived, captured, and

sent to France as a prisoner. With Louverture gone, the struggle against Leclerc faltered. However, news of Delgrès's and Guadeloupe's defeat helped galvanize the revolutionary forces and complete independence efforts in Saint-Domingue (Dubois, *Colony* 401). Dubois, in "Haunting Delgrès," advances:

Delgrès's defeat, and the brutality of the repression exercised by the French, made clear to the people of St. Domingue that their survival and freedom depended on defeating the French, so that while the officers' death signaled the end of hopes for a free Guadeloupe, it ultimately contributed to the birth of the second Republic in the Americas, and the first founded on the ashes of slavery. (172)

Therefore, Delgrès's, Louverture's, Dessalines's, and their followers' sacrifices and efforts helped protect the people of Haiti from the reintroduction of slavery. Additionally, their rebellions were ultimately used by Schœlcher in his successful arguments for the abolition of slavery in 1848 (Dubois, *Colony* 421-422).

In his works, Toussaint Louverture's uses a writing style that mixes a loyal republican rhetoric with the hardline approach that a return to slavery is unacceptable. Louverture's audiences included both the free People of Color in Saint-Domingue as well as political administrators in France (Girard, "Un-Silencing the Past" 665). Louverture's martial stylistic tendencies, coupled with a republican register, suggest an adoption of many of the ideals of the citizen-soldier into his identity. Philippe Girard, in "Un-Silencing the Past: The Writings of Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian War," observes that Louverture's *Mémoires* emphasized "soldierly values" and included the terms "Honor," "Duty," and "Rank" with high frequency (667). While in prison, Louverture wrote his *Mémoires* in a phonetic French; however, in most of his writings he utilized a secretary to help in writing statements in standard French (Girard, "Un-

Silencing the Past” 664). John Patrick Walsh, in *Free and French in the Caribbean: Toussaint Louverture, Aimé Césaire and Narratives of Loyal opposition*, asserts that the use of secretaries was standard during Louverture’s era, and that he should be viewed as the author of these texts (91). When compared to Louverture’s *Mémoires*, which was written in his own hand, Louverture’s 1797 *Lettre au Directoire* demonstrates considerable rhetorical similarity despite the probable aid of a secretary.

Louverture begins his 1797 *Lettre au Directoire* by praising the revolutionary French Republic’s victories and ideals. However, he quickly turns to address the possible threat of a return to slavery on the island, “Lorsque le peuple de Saint-Domingue a d’abord goûté au fruit de la liberté qu’ils tiennent de l’équité de la France . . . quelle fatalité peut avoir conduit le plus grand ennemi de sa prospérité et de notre bonheur à oser encore nous menacer du retour de l’esclavage?” (Chalmin 860).⁴¹ Using powerful language, he tries to persuade the Directory against the reinstitution of slavery. He accuses some of wanting to bring back “les scènes d’horreur d’autre fois” with “les mains liberticides” (Chalmin 860). Yet, Louverture assures the Directory that this task will not be successful, “Mais ils ne réussiront pas, je le jure par tout ce que la liberté a de plus sacré. Mon attachement à la France, ma connaissance des noirs me font un devoir de ne pas vous laisser dans l’ignorance ni des crimes qu’ils méditent, ni du serment que nous renouvelons d’être enserrés sous les ruines d’un pays que la liberté a ressuscité plutôt que de souffrir le retour de l’esclavage” (Chalmin 860). Similarly to statements from Delgrès, Louverture declares his “attachement à la France” but that he, and the people of Saint-Domingue, would rather die than see a return of slavery to the island. Louverture then addresses his children,

⁴¹ Ronan Chalmin includes Louverture’s letter in his article, “Éthique et rhétorique de la Révolution chez Gracchus Babeuf et Toussaint Louverture.”

whom he sent to live in France. He expresses concern for their safety, and he declares that if they are indeed punished, “faites-leur savoir qu’en les punissant de la fidélité de leur père ils ne feraient qu’ajouter à leur barbarie, sans aucun espoir de me faire jamais manquer à mon devoir” (Chalmin 861). In these passages, Louverture highlights the fact that if his children are harmed while in France, it would only “ajouter” to the French’s “barbarie” emphasizing the injustices of French actions. He also highlights his proper alliance with the Republic that, in 1794, successfully abolished slavery. In short succession, he alludes twice to his “devoir” to defend the republican ideals of freedom in Saint-Domingue. In his later *Mémoires*, Louverture would continue this style using “devoir” and other soldierly terms to express his sentiments.

Next, Louverture offers an impassioned assertion of the freedoms of the People of Color in Saint-Domingue. He calls on France to maintain its republican ideals, and warns that his people will not allow slavery and will die fighting for their freedom:

Mais non, la main qui nous a rompu nos chaînes ne nous asservira pas à nouveau. La France ne reniera pas ses principes, elle ne nous enlèvera pas le plus grand de ses bienfaits, elle nous protégera contre tous nos ennemis, elle ne permettra pas que sa morale sublime soit pervertie, que ses principes qui sont son plus grand honneur soient détruits, que ses plus belles acquisitions soient avilies, et que son décret du 16 pluviôse qui est un honneur pour toute l’humanité, soit révoqué. Mais si, pour rétablir l’esclavage à Saint-Domingue, on faisait cela, alors je vous le déclare, ce serait tenter l’impossible; nous avons su affronter les dangers pour obtenir notre liberté, nous saurons affronter la mort pour la maintenir. (Chalmin 861)

To emphasize the adoption of republican values in Saint-Domingue, Louverture adds, “Voilà citoyens Directeurs, la morale de la population de Saint-Domingue, voilà les principes” (Chalmin

861). In these closing remarks, Louverture explains that Saint-Domingue is now a country whose population is inspired by the ideals of the citizen-soldier. He explains that they will fight for their freedom from slavery and warns the French government that any attacks on the People of Color's liberty would fail, due to the armed population ready to defend itself against such attacks. Nevertheless, at the same time, Louverture is espousing France's own ideals and affirming Saint-Domingue's loyalty to France. This suggests, similarly to Delgrès's rhetoric, that Louverture views his interpretation of French republican principles as purer than that of the Directory's. His letter indicates that reinstituting slavery would be a hypocritical and even traitorous decision on the part of France. Chalmin observes that Louverture is speaking for the people of Saint-Domingue and that he takes the position of peace and that only France could be responsible for beginning hostilities (847, 850). Again, one cannot help but make the connection with this non-aggression to that of Delgrès's *Proclamation*, which asserts the Guadeloupean Resistance's "juste défensive" and that he and his followers would not become the "agresseurs" ("Proclamation de Louis").⁴² Nonetheless, Louverture applies less weight to this idea of peacefulness. Louverture warns that a betrayal of republican values, and consequently of the liberty of the people of Saint-Domingue, would incur war. Louverture, as opposed to Delgrès, was speaking from a position of greater strategic and political power. This likely gave him confidence to be more forceful in writing his *Lettre* to France. Cyril L. R. James, in *Les Jacobins noirs*, similarly remarks, "Toussaint pouvait défendre la liberté des noirs sans réserve, et ce qui donnait à sa déclaration une force et une unité de vue qu'on trouve rarement dans les grands documents de cette époque" (182). Delgrès, on the other hand, was leading a Resistance that was

⁴² Germain Saint-Ruf, in *L'Épopée Delgrès*, calls attention to the similitudes between Delgrès's *Proclamation* and Louverture's *Lettre* (109). Saint-Ruf, however, does not go into comparative detail.

unlikely to succeed, and he felt the need to leave behind proof of his and his troops' innocence and a defense of their actions to "postérité" ("Proclamation de Louis").

Louverture ends his *Lettre au Directoire* with a conclusion reminiscent of the citizen-soldier ideals. He declares that he would rather die instead of "de cesser d'être fidèle à la France et à mon devoir, plutôt que de voir les liberticides profaner et souiller le dieu de la liberté, avant qu'ils ne puissent me ravir l'épée, les armes que la France m'a confiées pour la défense de ses droits et ceux de l'humanité, pour le triomphe de la liberté et de l'égalité" (Chalmin 861-862). Louverture doubles down on the righteousness of his cause, which, in his words, supports the true France. Louverture alludes to a hijacking of republican France, and that, in accordance with his "devoir," he will fight with his "épée" for the true ideals of the Republic. For Louverture, these ideals most importantly translate to the maintaining of the abolition of slavery. Chalmin comments that Louverture demands that the "vérité de la Déclaration des droits de l'homme soit répétée et respectée" (840). Chalmin refers to a "déception de la Révolution" and that Louverture wishes to "révolutionner la Révolution" and continue the Revolution to its logical ends (840-842). Louverture's *Lettre* suggests a desire to return to a sacred and shared past between France and Saint-Domingue. Louverture sought to hold France to its initial claims and remind the French of their true republican principles. The Revolution abolished slavery in 1794, and Louverture desired to return France to the ideas of liberty and equality which spurned such a momentous event. The irony of this situation is of course that Louverture supported and enforced required paid labor for the formerly enslaved peoples. Dubois notes that Louverture "gave emancipated citizens little more than the right to work" (*Colony* 339). More aptly stated, this "right" was more of a duty, which, if defied, resulted in severe penalties and even death sentences. Though Louverture espouses many of the virtues of the citizen-soldier and does many

positive things for his country, he strays from the martial citizenship model when he fails to implement his republican rhetoric of rights.

Nevertheless, the ideals of the revolution are at the heart of Louverture's *Lettre au Directoire*. According to Chalmin, Louverture is in a struggle for the definition of the very principles of the Revolution (840). Similarly, Florence Gauthier, in *Triomphe et mort de la révolution des droits de l'homme et du citoyen (1789-1795-1802)*, observes that Louverture "ne s'adresse pas à n'importe quelle France, mais à celle des droits de l'homme. Parfaitement conscient des progrès réalisés par les liberticides en France, il présente Saint-Domingue comme le rempart des droits de l'homme . . . défendre les droits de l'homme à Saint-Domingue, c'est défendre les droits de l'homme en France encore, et dans le monde" (343-344). Gauthier's characterization places Louverture and Saint-Domingue as the defenders of the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme* and names France as its subverters.

In Louverture's writings, Chalmin refers to a return to the "vérité" of the words of "liberté" and the "droits de l'homme" which the French government had abandoned (853). However, given the fact that Louverture leads Saint-Domingue in a dictatorship legalized by the 1801 Constitution, can we be certain that he, like the rhetoric of the Directory, did not write in manipulative code? The Directory and First Consul (Napoléon) publicly spoke of liberty for the French colonies in the Caribbean, all the while plotting to bring back slavery. Did Louverture play a similar game? Behind his republican language, was there an ambition for power? These questions may not have definitive answers, or the responses may be lost to time; however, it is certain that Louverture was sincere in his fight against slavery for the people of Saint-Domingue. It is also likely that he was genuinely animated by the *Droits de l'homme* of 1789, and it is possible that he would have eventually brought about these rights if he had not been arrested.

Concerning these questions, we find a defense of Louverture in Chalmin's work. He posits, "[il a] lutté contre les principaux phénomènes d'inégalité qui faisaient de la révolution un événement réservé à une minorité privilégiée, du point de vue social et racial. [Il a] sacrifié [sa] vie au succès de l'universalisme proclamé par la Déclaration des droits de l'homme de 1789" (856). Indeed, Louverture fought and sacrificed his life to maintain abolition, but it is hard to argue for his complete support of the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme*. Louverture held nearly all the power in Saint-Domingue, and yet the freed people of his colony did not enjoy the rights they had fought so hard to obtain. Louverture insisted on repressive working laws, believing this was the key to keeping slavery out of Saint-Domingue. Louverture's 1797 *Lettre* remains a complex document to understand in the context of the Haitian Revolution. However, Louverture's use of citizen-soldier language in this work demonstrates the presence of this idea in Saint-Domingue and Louverture's willingness to employ it.

It may have been the case, that in 1797, Louverture was more devoted to a literal interpretation of the *Droits de l'homme* than later in his life. The Constitution of 1801 in Saint-Domingue suggests a change in ideology or perhaps a revelation of his beliefs. The 1801 Constitution named Louverture governor of Saint-Domingue for life and this document is characterized by a practical and Spartan interpretation of a republic. It is important to note that Louverture did not write this constitution. However, he was essentially given dictatorial power by it, and he voluntarily enforced its forced labor provisions. Dubois, in "Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution," observes, "Louverture had consistently enforced limits on the freedom of ex-slaves, arguing that such limits were necessary to consolidate and protect emancipation" (238). According to Philip Kaisary, in "Hercules, the Hydra, and the 1801 Constitution of Toussaint Louverture," Louverture instituted mandatory, albeit paid, labor in a

desire to keep the profits of Saint-Domingue high (397). Louverture justified this measure because he believed that Saint-Domingue needed the money generated by the plantations to support the import of necessary food goods that would in turn sustain the island's independence (Kaisary 398). C. L. R. James, in *The Black Jacobins*, describes the Constitution as despotic and that it was unpopular among the "mulatto" and Black populations (265-266). It should be noted that the Constitution itself was ironically drafted by the elites of the island, including former enslavers who desired to maintain the plantation economy (Kaisary 395). Kaisary, however, advances, "While it may be tempting to regard the 1801 Constitution as a barbarous despotism, by contextualizing it within the debates on the rights and duties throughout the Atlantic World at the time, we can come to understand the 1801 Constitution's limits on freedom as measures that were consistent with an ideology of freedom that included reciprocal rights and duties" (402). This debate on what duties citizens have toward the state, reaches into questions concerning what citizen-soldiers should be and do.

Should citizens be required to defend their nation? Or in Saint-Domingue's case, should citizens be required to work for the success and survival of the nation? This question was at the center of debates in France. Some did not believe military conscription was necessary or justified, while others did. Conscription did finally win out in France with the *Levée en masse*; however, the issue of conscription and civic obligations is still valid today. If the state guarantees its citizens rights, what reciprocal duties are owed to the state? Taxes offer a means of financial support, but what if the state is under the threat of invasion or starvation? These questions help frame Louverture's actions in mandating work but also provide ample topics for debate on martial citizenship. French women, for example, encouraged the *citoyenne-soldate* model. However, they generally did not want to make the carrying of arms, or soldiering for that matter,

mandatory for their sex. The argument could also be made that conscription, or forced, paid labor, goes against the principle of individual liberty. However, if that liberty is threatened by exterior or interior forces, one could argue that forcing citizens to save liberty, is ironically justified. This debate will likely continue as conscription in France was used into the second half of the twentieth-century. Though practicality is a strong justification for Louverture's actions, I posit that a principled approach to the rights of people should win out, and that the citizen-soldier should be a voluntary role.

The populations of Saint-Domingue apparently felt the same way. Carolyn Fick in "Emancipation in Haiti: From Plantation Labour to Peasant Proprietorship," advances that for the formerly enslaved workers, "Work and labour for the profit of another or for the production of export crops on which the colony's existence depended was profoundly antithetical to their own vision of things" (15). Among freed populations, another vision of freedom was that of wandering, sometimes termed "vagrancy" (Kaisary 403). Leon Litwack, in *Been in the Storm so Long*, compares this phenomenon, which occurred after emancipation in the Caribbean and in the southern United States, to birds being freed after being in a cage for too long (223). Louverture condemned this practice of wandering and the 1801 Constitution prohibited it. Kaisary characterizes "Louverture's Constitution" as being "preoccupied" with safeguarding the island against slavery, which is why it adopted these authoritarian measures (404). Consequently, parallels can be drawn between the French and Haitian Revolutions. During the French Revolution, true freedom and equality were not realized for French women who were left out of the *Droits de l'homme*. Additionally, the Terror, in the name of state survival, trampled the rights of the French with thousands of executions. Similarly, the 1801 Constitution and Louverture instituted authoritarian laws in the name of defending emancipation in Saint-Domingue. It cannot

be stressed enough that the Constitution was largely drafted by former enslavers, and that the incentive for them to keep the lucrative plantation system was undoubtedly present. However, Louverture was appointed the leader and he enforced mandatory working laws harshly both before and after the Constitution. Furthermore, while he did work to improve labor conditions, the rights and freedom that he proclaimed in his 1797 *Lettre au Directoire* did not come to full fruition under his leadership.

The 1801 Constitution of Saint-Domingue begins by declaring that this colony, “fait partie de l’Empire français, mais qui est soumis à des lois particulières” (“Constitution”). This complex rhetoric, which expresses loyalty to France while asserting a strong sense of autonomy is present throughout the Constitution and echoes Louverture’s 1797 *Lettre*. Article 3 quickly addresses the issue of slavery: “Il ne peut exister d’esclaves sur ce territoire, la servitude y est à jamais abolie. Tous les hommes y naissent, vivent, et meurent libres et Français” (“Constitution”). Not only does this Article prohibit slavery, but it also asserts the people of Saint-Domingue’s French citizenship. The writers of the Constitution, as well as Louverture himself, apparently still wished to stay attached to France. Louverture wanted to remain linked to France, perhaps because of its professed ideals, yet continued to be skeptical of the French’s convictions on slavery. Thus, he maintained a certain amount of independence from France in case the “mère patrie” decided to reestablish bondage. The Constitution asserts racial equality in Article 4: “Tout homme, quelle que soit sa couleur, y est admissible à tous les emplois” (“Constitution”). Interestingly, a division is created within the military by Article 52. It establishes one corps that is a paid “garde coloniale” and another that is an unpaid, “garde coloniale” (“Constitution”). This unpaid “garde coloniale” appears to draw from the concepts of the citizen-soldier model and creates militias for each local community. Both paid and unpaid

militaries are created for the “maintien de l’ordre public, la protection due à tous les citoyens et la défense de la colonie” (“Constitution”). However, Article 56 specifies that the recruitment of these forces will be according to laws proposed by the governor, Louverture, and ratified by the Assemblée Centrale (“Constitution”). This particular interpretation of the citizen-soldier model restricts access to it at Louverture’s discretion. Thus, it is not an institution with universal access. Therefore, though this construction shares some traits with the citizen-soldier model defined by this study, it is not entirely faithful to the principles of rights and equality. Though Louverture and the Constitution lean heavily on republican ideals, the Constitution of 1801 also gravitates toward what Louverture thinks is best. In this case, the composition of the militias and military is to be subject to Louverture’s approval.

Though Kaisary advances that the 1801 Constitution “does not contain anything resembling a ‘Bill of Rights,’” (400), the section entitled “Dispositions générales,” I argue, does share certain qualities with that American document. Article 63 outlines, “La maison de toute personne est un asile inviolable,” and Article 64 provides specific instructions on the arrest of persons so that it cannot be done arbitrarily. In Article 66, the right to petition the government and governor is protected. Though not many rights are outlined, these articles do safeguard certain liberties.

In a Spartanesque move to protect the morals of the island, the establishment of schools required governmental approval and surveillance per Article 68. Article 69 doubles down on this practical, authoritarian, and moral-driven principle, which is a characteristic emphasized throughout the Constitution. Article 69 reads, “La loi surveille particulièrement les professions qui intéressent les mœurs publiques, la sûreté, la santé et la fortune des citoyens” (“Constitution”). Similarly to Sparta, the Constitution places importance on the military service

of Saint-Dominguan soldiers. Article 72 declares, “Il sera, par le gouverneur, décerné au nom de la colonie, des récompenses aux guerriers qui auront rendu des services éclatants en combattant pour la défense commune” (“Constitution”). Finally, the Constitution provides a legalization of conscription and mandatory labor in Article 76. It reads, “tout citoyen doit ses services au sol qui le nourrit ou qui l’a vu naître, au maintien de la liberté, de l’égalité, de la propriété, toutes les fois que la loi l’appelle à les défendre” (“Constitution”). Louverture, and the Constitution saw the practical benefits of having a population that would be compelled to provide labor and be armed and ready to defend the colony. Russell Crandall, in “The Black Bonaparte,” comments, “The complexities of Louverture’s story remind us that even the greatest among us will reflect the constraints and moral blind spots of the times” (190). Ironically, Louverture forced the people of Saint-Domingue into labor, a practice that many of the island’s people had fought to eradicate. Louverture’s construction of his version of the citizen-soldier shows that this concept appears to always be under negotiation and change. His interpretation begs the question: What freedoms come with being a citizen-soldier, and who gets to be one? From Sparta to France to the Caribbean, these questions have received varying answers. The study of these divergences can help shape a better understanding of rights and citizenship in the modern era.

By October 1802, Louverture had been arrested and was in a French prison writing his *Mémoires*. As Girard notes, Louverture defends his actions as leader of Saint-Domingue, and he relies heavily on military values like “duty,” “honor,” and his “rank” as general (trans. in “Un-Silencing the Past” 667). Comparable to his other writings and speech, Louverture places faith in the good will of the French government. Walsh, in “Toussaint Louverture at a Crossroads: The *Mémoire* of the ‘First Soldier of the Republic of Saint-Domingue,’” argues for the importance of Louverture’s *Mémoires*, “for its summary of key moments of Louverture’s leadership including

his prioritization of the *Constitution*. Concluding with an appeal to justice . . .” (89). Walsh asserts that Louverture’s *Mémoires* “continues to reconfigure republicanism and colonialism” (“Louverture at a Crossroads” 91). I will also propose that his *Mémoires* serve as an ideological display of his beliefs. He seeks to reconcile France and Saint-Domingue into a strong republic that refuses slavery. Furthermore, Louverture seeks to illustrate, with his language, that the people of Saint-Domingue are inspired by the citizen-soldier model and will refuse any challenge to their freedom which France, at one time, acknowledged.

In his *Mémoires*, Louverture includes many justifications to his actions. Part of his defense includes describing General Leclerc’s expedition and hostilities on Saint-Domingue. He comments that, “Si ses intention étoient pure comme celle du gouvernement qui lenvoit . . . il auroit pris la peine de mecrire” (Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint* 78).⁴³ This statement gives the benefit of the doubt to France and Napoléon. Later Louverture adds that Leclerc had begun the “first hostilities” in battle, and he criticizes Leclerc’s conduct while justifying his own. Apparently, Leclerc had attempted to turn the people against him by accusing Louverture of treating them like enslaved people. Louverture responds, beginning with a critique of Leclerc:

Doit on employer de telle moyen dant un pays ou regnait la tranquillité, et qui etoit au pouvoir de la republique, si jai fais travaille me samblable, cetoit pour leur faire goute le pris de la liberté sans lixence, cetoit pour en pe che la corruptions des meurces; cetoit pour le bonheur general de lisle, et pour lintéret de la republique, et javois effectivement

⁴³ Some of Louverture’s memoirs are written with the aid of a secretary. This particular volume is by his own hand and suggests that he was not educated in standard written French. This chapter will mostly use Louverture’s original writings and will thus reflect grammatical divergences from standard French. Translations will be provided for this reason when necessary.

resire pus que l on ne voiiot pas dant toute cette colonie au cun homme Deseuvré. . . .

(Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint* 96)⁴⁴

In this passage, Louverture offers a direct defense of his enforcement of the forced labor provisions of the 1801 Constitution. Louverture argues that he only enforced mandatory labor “pour leur faire goute le pris de la liberté sans lixence” (Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint* 96). This argument is rather interesting as well as enigmatic. By applying forced paid labor, Louverture maintains that it was to give the people an opportunity to “taste the price of freedom without limits” (my trans.) However, if the people of Saint-Domingue truly had liberty without “license,” or “limits,” then forced labor would not be present. Nevertheless, given Saint-Domingue’s history of enslavement and its precarious position between liberty and slavery, one can understand why Louverture might sincerely believe the population is living in “liberty without limits” despite the presence of mandatory labor. Thus, he presumably believes, and may have been correct, that the only other option to this forced paid labor was slavery. Perhaps Louverture had plans to become less authoritarian once Saint-Domingue’s freedom was more solidified. In any case, these passages provide further insights as to how Louverture justified such measures. He advances that forced labor was implemented to safeguard the republic and the virtues of the island. He also contends that it was for the “bonheur general,” another buzzword of the Enlightenment, and thus demonstrating his adoption, or at the very least an insincere expression, of such ideas.

⁴⁴ “Should one use such means in a country where tranquility reigned, and that was in the power of the republic? If I made my fellows work, it was to make them appreciate the price of liberty without license, it was to prevent the corruption of morals; it was for the general happiness of the island, and in the interest of the republic, and I had indeed succeeded because you could not see in the entire colony a single man without occupation. . . .” (trans. by Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint* 97).

Now in prison, it must have been clear to Louverture that Leclerc, Bonaparte, and the French government were not of the same mind of 1789 that declared the *Rights of Man* and later the abolition of slavery. However, it appears that, in condemning Leclerc's rogue actions, Louverture is attempting to provide Napoléon with the means to evade responsibility for attacking the freedom and peace of Saint-Domingue. Louverture recounts his arrest and the poor treatment he and his family received. He presumes the reasons were for his race, "sans doute je dois cette meprise a ma couleur, mais ma couleur ma tele enpêché des servis ma patrie avec zelee et fidélité, la couleur de mon corp nuit elle a mon honneur et a mon courage" (*Memoir of Toussaint* 136). In terms seemingly inspired by the citizen-soldier ideal, Louverture explains that his skin color did not affect his duties to "serve his country" (my trans.) Similarly, in a separate letter, Louverture writes to Napoléon, "je sui un de votre soldat, et premier soldat de la république à St. Domingue" (Walsh, "Louverture at a Crossroads" 91). Louverture describes himself, here, as one of Napoléon's soldiers as well as the "first soldier of the republic of St. Domingue" who is devoting his service to maintaining emancipation (my trans.). This language illustrates Louverture's expression of martial citizenship and emphasizes the values he fights for. Louverture maintains rhetorical allegiance to France and Napoléon in hopes that the two will return to the foundations of 1789 and a rejection of slavery.

In his *Mémoires*, Louverture also expresses the citizen-soldier identities of his soldiers. He writes about his response to hearing that General Rochambeau had killed some of them, and he explains that he wrote to the general, expressing his anger over the situation. He asked why his soldiers were being killed who had, "si bien concourus au bonheur de la colonie et au triomphe de la republique . . . je combatroit jusqu'a la mort pour venger la mort de ces brave soldatx et ma liberté et rétablire le calme et lordre dans la colonie" (Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint*

70). In this passage, Louverture brings attention to the soldiers' service to Saint-Domingue's prosperity and its "boheur" as well as to the French Republic. Later, he asserts that all his actions were to the benefit of the "bien publique" (Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint* 146). He adds, "Je me faisoit un devoir et un plaisir de contribuer a la prosperite decett belle colonie, zèle activite, courage . . ." (Girard, *Memoir of Toussaint* 148). Louverture paints his own actions as well as that of his soldiers, as citizen-soldiers, fulfilling their duties to their people and country. Louverture's writings seem to prove that the citizen-soldier model was present in the imaginary and identities of the people of Saint-Domingue. Though he may not have always demonstrated a principled approach to the ideals of the citizen-soldier, his expressions in these works demonstrate an espousal of its morals.

After Louverture's arrest, the Haitian Revolution faltered. However, in July 1802, news reached Saint-Domingue of Guadeloupe's failed Resistance and the reinstitution of slavery there (Saint-Ruf 138). This news was a calling to arms for the people of Saint-Domingue (Saint-Ruf 138-139). Delgrès's Resistance and sacrifice now inspired the people of an entirely different island to stay in the fight against slavery. Dessalines and the people of Saint-Domingue were victorious against the French. Jean-Jacques Dessalines became the new leader of Saint-Domingue and issued a couple of documents which declared independence for Haiti, the new name of the island. Deborah Jenson, in "Dessalines's American Proclamations of the Haitian Independence," notes that Dessalines's texts were created with the aid of "educated advisors and secretaries who had a mastery of the technology of writing and were familiar with a stock of distinguished political tropes" (81). Nevertheless, Jenson points out that, although his proclamations utilize western revolutionary conventions, they also demonstrate a will to supplant those customs with his own and with those of his people ("Dessalines's American" 81). Despite

alluding to the secretaries' influence on these documents, Jenson notes that the various texts attributed to Dessalines contain a striking number of similarities which strongly suggest, "Dessalines as the primary authorial voice in his proclamations" ("Dessalines's American" 82).

After the French's defeat, Dessalines issued a *Proclamation of Independence* on November 29, 1803.⁴⁵ This document, signed by the Haitian leaders Dessalines, Henri Christophe and Clerveaux, declares, "Rendus à notre première dignité, nous avons recouvré nos droits et nous jurons de ne les jamais céder à aucune puissance, quelle qu'elle soit sur la terre; le voile effroyable du préjugé est déchiré en pièces, et il l'est à jamais. Malheur à quiconque oseroit tenter d'en rajuster les sanglans lambeaux" (Jenson, "Dessalines's American" 78). Jenson interprets this pronouncement:

This long metaphor infuses a strange corporeality into the abstract idea of prejudice: either the veil of prejudice has concealed wounded bodies, becoming bloodied in the process, or has its own fantastical body, so that when it is torn apart by those who have suffered under it, it bleeds. Whether its sanguinary appearance owes to its aggressive nature or to vengeance through which it has been dismantled is not clear. In either case, prejudice, an abstract psychological construct, is inseparable for Dessalines from the visceral evidence of violence. To use this violence in a new rhetoric that would serve the crafting of new laws is the clear goal of this former slave as political speaker.

("Dessalines's American" 78-79)

⁴⁵ I will use Deborah Jenson's phrase "proclamation of independence" but will use capitalization and italics ("Dessalines's American" 78). She uses this term to differentiate this document from that of the official January 1, 1804, *Declaration of Independence of Haiti*.

Prejudice was obviously an issue that preoccupied the thoughts of the People of Color in Haiti. Dessalines's employment of it, here, seems to suggest that the "veil of prejudice" has hidden something from the oppressed people of the island (trans. by Jesnson, "Dessalines's American" 78-79). Dessalines precedes this phrase with, "brought back to our dignity, we have recovered our rights" (my trans.) It appears that the "veil of prejudice" hid and kept away the "rights" and "dignity" of the People of Color in Haiti (my trans.) The *Proclamation of Independence* indicates that these rights include freedom from enslavement, and that the Haitian people have fought a costly revolution which has rendered the torn pieces of this veil bloody.

This word *préjugé* is referenced again by Dessalines a few months later in a speech entitled "I have Avenged America." In a classic tactic, Dessalines weaponizes the French's themes and language against them. He compliments the Haitian people and, instead of referring to a common metaphor of his time, the "tree of liberty," he declares, "vos mains, saintement armées, ont porté la hache sur l'arbre antique de l'esclavage et des préjugés. En vain le temps, et surtout la politique infernale des Européens . . ." (Jenson, "Dessalines's American" 78). Fighting prejudice with hands "saintement armées" alludes to a glorification of soldierly values by Dessalines. In a similar rhetorical fashion, Dessalines praises Delgrès's sacrifice in Saint-Domingue, "le brave et immortel Delgrès emporté dans les airs avec les débris de son fort plutôt d'accepter les fers. Guerrier magnanime!" (Césaire, "Mémorial" 69). These valorizations of the warrior signal the importance of an armed population to Dessalines, which was able to beat back the incursions of slavery. Additionally, the documents of independence he released applauded the principles of liberty and equality to his warrior nation. Nevertheless, as leader of the newly christened Haiti, Dessalines did stray from the path of the citizen-soldier. He enforced mandatory labor laws like Louverture and inflexibly killed the Whites of the island. The racial cleansings

that occurred in Haiti under his leadership, which also saw violence between people of mixed-heritage and of the Black population, illustrate the need for a principled approach to the citizen-soldier model that venerates an impartial and universal understanding of rights, justice, and equality.

The *Declaration of Independence of Haiti* appeared on January 1, 1804. Again, Jenson maintains that Dessalines was the primary contributor to the content of this declaration (“Dessalines’s American” 76). She argues that the writing of the declaration had for its goal to “create a Haitian political identity and agency that would resonate on the world stage” (“Dessalines’s American” 76). Dessalines certainly employed Enlightenment rhetoric in this document. The *Declaration of Independence of Haiti* begins with “Liberté ou la mort” as if it were the title. Near the beginning, it declares its separation from France and that each general must “prononçât le serment de renoncer à jamais à la France, de mourir plutôt que de vivre sous sa domination, et de combattre jusqu’au dernier soupir pour l’indépendance. Les Généraux, pénétrés de ces principes sacrés . . . ont tous juré à la postérité, à l’univers entier, de renoncer à jamais à la France. . . .” (“Acte d’indépendance”). No longer pledging loyalty to France, Dessalines declares a rupture, one that can never be mended. He claims that the generals are endowed with “these sacred principles” of a free people, independent from France (my trans.). In the following passage, Dessalines might have been paying homage to Delgrès. Dessalines, like Delgrès, appeals to “posterity, and the entire universe” (Acte d’indépendance; my trans.). In a separate speech, Dessalines mentions Delgrès directly, so it was likely that he was familiar with Delgrès’s *Proclamation*, and it is possible that it had an influence on his declaration. From Delgrès, to Louverture, and now Dessalines, the Caribbean revolutionaries all seemed to be concerned with their legacy, and how their actions would be viewed by their contemporaries and

the future. Dessalines wanted to emphasize that this separation from France was irreversible, and that independence and liberty would be defended passionately.

The writings and rhetoric of Louverture and Dessalines show an exposure to and an expression of the citizen-soldier ideology. Furthermore, their words and actions, which led Saint-Domingue to freedom and independence, demonstrate an adoption of this model. Nonetheless, their actions, at times, do not follow the principles of martial citizenship. Louverture and Dessalines were in positions of near absolute power, and yet Louverture failed to expand the rights he professed to defend, while Dessalines led racial cleansings. The successes and failures of Haitian independence provide important lessons. The Haitian Revolution shows that not only can the citizen-soldier model be beneficial in protecting a citizenry from tyranny and slavery, but that it is also not an infallible practice. The texts and rhetoric of Louverture and Dessalines emphasize the resolve of the Haitian people, who will fight to the death rather than become enslaved once more. These citizen-soldiers revolted, demanding their rights and an end to slavery, forcing abolition before its ratification in 1794. Louverture's *Lettre au Directoire*, *Mémoires*, and 1801 Constitution highlight the influence of the citizen-soldier model and Enlightenment principles in Saint-Domingue. With these documents, Louverture sought to maintain loyalty to France and reconcile the estrangement of Saint-Domingue. He hoped to improve France's interpretation of citizenship to include People of Color. Louverture expresses concern for the "bien publique" as well as the physical protection of the island from invasion and slavery. He also believed citizens should contribute to their country, and he implemented mandatory labor laws that he severely enforced. However, he defended this controversial action in his *Mémoires*, claiming that it was for the "bonheur general" and to defend his people's "liberté." Like Louverture, Dessalines praised the principles of Enlightenment and the martial

citizens of Haiti who, “saintly armed,” defeated prejudice (my trans.). In his speech and in his documents of independence, Dessalines also references a “préjugé” which has denied the rights of the People of Color in Haiti but has now been defeated. He goes on to declare that the liberty and independence of the island will be defended to the death. Like their revolutionary European and American counterparts, Dessalines’s and Louverture’s actions did not always demonstrate a perfect approach to the enlightened citizen-soldier ethos of respecting the rights, liberty, and equality of others. Nevertheless, not only did their actions liberate Saint-Domingue from slavery, but they also likely had an influence on the French’s 1848 abolition of slavery. Their different interpretations of the citizen-soldier concept, and their shortcomings, can provide insights and points of discussion on the concepts of citizenship and rights in the revolutionary era and beyond.

Chapter 8: Alexandre Dumas's *Georges* and the Citizen-Soldier model

In 1843, Alexandre Dumas published a fascinating tale of a young man of mixed African and European descent named Georges Munier. The novel, *Georges*, is named after its eponymous protagonist and takes place on the Île de France, or present-day Mauritius. Dumas constructs a tale of love and revenge, and he creates a story that is critical of “préjugé” ‘prejudice’ and of the inequalities that the People of Color in French culture face (my trans.).⁴⁶ In this chapter, I will advance that Dumas’s hero is representative of the citizen-soldier model. Dumas combines in Georges the two important qualities of the citizen-soldier: a martial disposition and civic engagement, which are led by intellectual prowess. Like a martial citizen, Georges is engaged in his community and fights against the prejudice of his home island to bring about true equality. When he meets resistance, he eventually takes a more drastic approach by leading a rebellion of the enslaved population. In *Georges*, Dumas offers a new take on the citizen-soldier model which promotes its adoption among People of Color. This novel demonstrates to European audiences that People of Color want and deserve the rights and respect which the White French enjoy. This strategy may have also been an allusion to the rebellions against slavery which took place in Haiti and Guadeloupe. Dumas’s illustration of martial citizenship in *Georges* highlights that even after the Revolution of 1789, the citizen-soldier model was still being reworked and discussed by intellectuals and writers such as himself. Furthermore, I will argue that Dumas wished to portray the wrongs of prejudice that People of

⁴⁶ In this chapter, I will follow Pamela Oliver’s recommendations in “Race Names” for capitalization of ethnic groups of people (e.g., White or People of Color). I use People of Color to refer to non-White people in a given context. I am open to modifications to this terminology. In *Georges*, Dumas employs the terms “homme de couleur” and “noir,” to denote ethnic differences.

Color across the Francophone world had to endure. In doing this, he hoped to persuade the Western world to end slavery and racism. With abolition and revolution in France following the publication of *Georges* by only five years, Dumas may indeed have influenced political attitudes. These insights illustrate the importance and influence of the citizen-soldier model in literature when coupled with Enlightenment ideals. The powerful themes of liberty, equality, and justice in this novel are just as relevant today as they were in 1843.

In the beginning of this story, Georges's father, Pierre Munier, is an "homme de couleur" and leads his "corps de noirs" against a British attack, saving the endangered White French soldiers whose leader refused his request to join them in battle (Dumas 16). After his victory, Pierre takes a British flag as a trophy, and Georges asks to hold it. While his father is away, there is a confrontation between Georges and M. de Malmédie's son, Henri. The Malmédies are White aristocrats and Henri demands the British flag from Georges, who refuses. Henri then hits Georges across the forehead with his sword, and Georges's brother, Jacques, punches Henri. M. de Malmédie intervenes and eventually demands the flag, and Pierre acquiesces, thus beginning the tale of Georges's revenge. Soon after this conflict, Pierre sends his two sons to France to earn an education; however, the omniscient narrator informs us that the real reason is due to the hatred that M. de Malmédie holds toward their family after the flag fiasco. Inserting a critique of racial prejudice Dumas explains ironically that Henri has no need for an education: "Qu'avait-il donc besoin de savoir? Si ce n'est que tout homme de couleur était né pour le respecter et lui obéir" (20).

Georges studies in France for 14 years, all the while with the intention to obtain revenge. The narrator explains, "Le jeune Georges . . . jura guerre à mort à un préjugé" (32). This line epitomizes the moral character of Georges and is the driving factor behind his actions in the

novel. While in France, Georges works toward the success of his revenge and for a victory over racism via his education. He implements a varied and balanced education and fosters not only, “la supériorité morale,” but also a “supériorité physique,” and the narrator explains that Georges, “comprit . . . que la réunion de ces deux qualités faisait un homme complet” (32). This “réunion” recalls the duality of the citizen-soldier model and the influence of the military enlightenment on it. The citizen-soldier combines martial skills in an individual who is also politically engaged. Enlightened citizen-soldiers, or martial citizens, work to advocate for the principles of equality in natural rights and is willing to protect themselves and their community in some way martially. With the ascendancy of the military enlightenment beginning in the seventeenth century, intellect and creativity became added expectations of soldiers (Pichichero 160-162). This, consequently, transferred over to the citizen-soldier model. Martial citizenship is very similar to the military enlightenment; however, it builds on this movement’s principles of domestic and martial characteristics by adding a republican interpretation. What is novel about the citizen-soldier model is that at the end of the eighteenth century, as its name implies, individuals are not exclusively soldiers or citizens. They act as both. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the French Revolution, and Dumas’s renderings of martial citizenship all reflect these ideological influences. Consequently, Georges takes control over his education during his time in France, embracing the citizen-soldier model. The narrator explains that Georges,

Fixa l’emploi de sa journée des règles dont il résolut de ne pas se départir: le matin, à six heures, il montait à cheval; à huit heures, il allait au tir au pistolet; de deux heures à midi, il faisait des armes; de midi à deux heures, il suivait les cours de la Sorbonne; de trois à cinq heures, il dessinait . . . enfin, le soir il allait ou au spectacle ou dans le monde, dont

son élégante courtoisie, bien plus encore que sa fortune, lui ouvrait toutes les portes.

(Dumas 33)

It could even be said that Dumas creates Georges with the qualities of the *guerrier philosophe* ‘warrior philosopher’ (my trans.). This figure is referenced by Louis Delgrès in his 1802 *Proclamation*, which declared the Resistance in Guadeloupe against slavery. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his 1768 answer to the Académie de Corse’s question: “Quelle est la Vertu la plus nécessaire aux Héros; et quels sont les Héros à qui cette Vertu a manqué?,” mentions this character as well, describing this hero as possessing the strength and prowess of a soldier and the intellect and reasoning of a scientist, philosopher, and artist (“Quelle est la Vertu” 7). Marlene Daut, in “Haiti and the Black Romantics: Enlightenment and Color Prejudice After the Haitian Revolution in Alexandre Dumas’s Georges (1843),” refers to this education as Georges’s “mental, physical and intellectual ‘enlightenment’” (1). The education Georges implements is certainly in line with an Enlightenment approach to pedagogy, but it specifically adds the militant and physical aspect. This diverse education in the Occident was certainly not unheard of. It traces its lineage through the Enlightenment, Renaissance, and at least as far back as ancient Greece. This curriculum takes a varied approach to education which combines physical and mental exercises. However, as cited above, Georges understands the advantages of obtaining a physical and intellectual “supériorité” to his contemporaries, and principally the Whites in France and on his home island. The narrator explains, “Tout ce qu’il avait fait depuis dix ans, c’était pour dépasser ses compatriotes mulâtres et blancs” (Dumas 38). This “supériorité” is essential to Georges because he feels that he needs those skills that he has worked toward to triumph over the “préjugé” of the Western world. Thanks to his hard work, Georges becomes proficient not only in education but also in the physical activities prized in his time such as

horse-back riding, swimming, shooting guns, and sword skills. Thus, Dumas creates in Georges the portrait of a young citizen-soldier. In Paris, he is quickly, “cité comme un des esprits les plus intelligents, comme un des penseurs les plus logiques, et comme un des cavaliers les plus distingués de la capitale” (Dumas 33). In this “penseur”-“cavalier,” Dumas paints an ideal within Georges that is highly reminiscent of the citizen-soldier and *guerrier philosophe* constructions. Capable in social and military domains, Dumas’s Georges is a respected figure in Parisian society.

Other researchers have considered the character of Georges in alternative lights. Daut brings attention to a trope that appeared in colonial-themed literature throughout the nineteenth century. Similarly to Georges, this recurring character, the “inspired mulatto,” is a Person of Color, has had a European education, and upon returning to their home colony, is frustrated by the prejudices they encounter due to their skin color. This figure seeks to rebel in some way, sometimes with a revolt of the enslaved population (Daut 2). Incidentally, Georges fits all of these characteristics. According to Daut, the term, “inspired mulatto” was coined by Alfred Allinson in his 1903 English translation of Dumas’s novel, *Georges or the Isle of France* (2). Allinson posits in his preface that Georges represents Dumas himself who had to confront the insults thrown at him by his contemporaries due to his race (iv). Léon-François Hoffman, in “Dumas et les Noirs,” also supports the theory that the character of Georges is an allegory for Dumas and demonstrative of the attitudes of nineteenth-century People of Color (xx-xxi). Alternatively, Molly Krueger Enz, in “The Mulatto as Island and the Island as Mulatto in Alexandre Dumas’s ‘Georges,’” proposes that the protagonist, “struggling with his mixed racial and insular identities, represents the hybrid nature of the Francophone Indian Ocean islands as an isolated figure in search of an identity within a larger collectivity” (383). Enz continues that

Georges represents an island insomuch as he is always in isolation and in search of an identity. However, I contend that Georges is only in isolation during his education in France where he, incidentally, crafts his identity with a disciplined physical and mental education. This identity was of the citizen-soldier and the closely associated *guerrier philosophe*. He honed his physical and mental abilities with the purpose of fighting against the prejudices of his time. After leaving France, he quickly ends his isolation, forming relationships. During his voyage home he and Lord Murrey become friends, and upon arriving on the island, he is reunited with his father and brother. He also finds a love interest in Sara and forms a bond with Laïza, a man that he freed from slavery. Far from being isolated without an identity, Georges has a charisma and bearing which draw people to him. He uses this personability, and his identity as a citizen-soldier, to further his aim, which is to defeat prejudice and slavery.

As Allinson and Hoffman point out, the parallels between the character of Georges and the author Dumas appear evident (iv, xx-xxi). However, I will advance that Georges importantly represents the Enlightenment and republican ideal of the citizen-soldier. The novel *Georges* suggests that Dumas sought to celebrate this model as representative of the Enlightenment ideals of freedom, equality, and martial lifestyle. Dumas glamorizes this martial citizenship, or what Rousseau calls an “esprit martial” (“Considérations” 219), within the character of Georges and appears to advance such a figure as an ideal that People of Color, and all people, can follow. In making Georges fashionable, charismatic, and desirable, Dumas paints the citizen-soldier idea as a respectable and attractive practice. Furthermore, the author expands this model to incorporate People of Color, a practice and idea that was still in dispute during his time. Dumas’s appropriation of martial citizenship for people of Afro-descent is emphasized by Georges’s adoption of its virtues and his battle against prejudice. With tensions rising under King Louis-

Philippe's monarchical rule, and the revolution of 1848 looming, Dumas may indeed have intended his 1843 novel *Georges* to rejuvenate martial republican sentiments in French culture. Consequently, Dumas hoped to steer France in the direction of a more universal understanding of rights and equality. Whether or not *Georges* had any influence on the events of 1848, the author's literary depiction of a citizen-soldier of Afro-descent demonstrates that one can pursue political and social change by printed means. Nonetheless, not only did Dumas attempt to influence the minds of French people with his criticism of prejudice in *Georges*, but he also participated in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. Therefore, Dumas himself appears to have embraced the citizen-soldier model.

After Georges's time in Paris, he, not surprisingly, joins the French Army and receives two honors during his service. After having obtained both social and military recognition, Georges felt that he had done all he could in "civilisation." The narrator explains: "Sa lutte avec la civilisation était finie, sa lutte avec la barbarie allait commencer" (Dumas 38). Georges had conquered all of the vices and virtues of "civilisation" in mainland France. In the above passage, the narrator makes no attempt to hide an attack on the colonial system and prejudice. In calling Georges's colonial home of L'Île de France barbaric, he consequently alludes to French society both there and in "civilized" France (my trans.). This attack criticizes the treatment of People of Color within the whole system. Georges will face this "barbarie" by avenging the past insult of Henri and by attacking the scourge of prejudice and slavery.

Upon his journey back to l'Île de France, Georges befriends Lord Williams Murrey, who he later finds out is to be the new governor of the island. Jean-Michel Racault, in "Mimétisme et métissage sur *Georges* d'Alexandre Dumas," describes Lord Murrey as a father figure to the young Georges (148-149). Racault advances that Murrey represents the social recognition that

Georges desires (148-149). According to Racault, Murrey constitutes for Georges a means of forcing the Malmédies hand in Georges's marriage to Sara (148-149). Sara is a young White lady betrothed to Henri Malmédie, but who falls in love with Georges. According to Enz, Murrey represents the "white" part of Georges, while his real father, Pierre, represents his "black" ancestry (390). Enz advances, "Georges refuses to emulate his father" who does not fight against prejudice and adds, "by doing so he rejects his African ancestry" (390). However, it does not appear that Georges wishes to reject his African heritage, rather his goal throughout the novel is to end, or at the very least fight, prejudice and slavery. If he can be successful in this, then he will have scored a major blow against the inequalities that he and others of Afro-descent face.

While Georges is riding through town for the first time in years, he meets Sara, who is having trouble communicating with a Chinese merchant (Dumas 28). Romance is sparked from their first interactions when Georges interjects himself to provide translation services. Like the writers of the Enlightenment, and like his Romantic contemporaries, the author places an importance on the themes of love and nature. Deism and the appreciation of nature are also recurring themes employed throughout the novel. For example, in a later scene, Sara is swimming by herself in the wilds of the island. The narrator devotes a long paragraph to Sara and her communion with her natural environment, emphasizing her positive qualities, and her adoration of nature (54). We learn that the two things that she loves the most in the world are "la campagne et le bal" (Dumas 54). Suddenly, Sara is chased by a shark. She escapes with the aid of Laïza, an enslaved man who attacks the shark, and of Georges, who shoots it. The narrator describes Georges as "l'ange libérateur," and he earns this name again in the following scene (Dumas 60).

After Sara's rescue, Laïza and Nazim had been caught by a group of enslavers led by M. de Malmédie and Henri. Laïza had been helping prepare Nazim for his escape, and was, coincidentally, present to help rescue Sara. While the Malmédies are trying to figure out a punishment for Laïza and Nazim, Georges appears. When they became aware that Georges had shot the shark, M. de Malmédie wondered what he could offer as a reward to him. Georges asked for Laïza and Nazim as his prize. M. de Malmédie obliges him, and after he leaves, Georges frees the two from enslavement. This scene stands in contrast to Daut's claim that Georges wished to "profit from the labor of slaves" (2). Daut advances,

Caught between his desire to profit from the labor of slaves as a plantation owner and his desire to lead a colonial rebellion in order to avenge the rights of citizenship denied to him under the colonial system, Dumas's eponymous Georges emerges as a symbol of the failure of Enlightenment thought and its outgrowth in the transatlantic abolitionist movement to deal adequately with either the economics of slavery or the theories of racial inferiority that supported it. (Daut 2)

Yet, this assessment does not appear altogether accurate. Georges is considered a "master" by the narrator due to his inheritance; however, Georges does not prioritize this potential source of wealth (my trans.). This is evidenced by the liberation scene above and when he later frees the three hundred people whom his father had enslaved. Georges can be criticized for the delayed emancipation of these enslaved persons; however, Georges did genuinely wish to combat prejudice and slavery. One of Georges's primary aspirations is to avenge the slight Henri de Malmédie gave him when they were boys. Georges reasons that the rationale of this slight was based on a "préjugé," which, as we know, Georges has sworn "guerre à mort à un préjugé" (Dumas 32). Though the story calls attention to the failures of Enlightenment and abolitionist

movements, Georges, far from embodying the failure of these ideas, stands as a pioneer of its universal interpretation and represents Dumas's hope for these movements.

Although Georges is resolute in fighting intensely against “préjugé” initially, it does not appear to be his goal to lead a revolt of the enslaved people of the island. Racault observes that Georges wished to gain recognition by the aristocratic circle of L'Île de France (147). This is, in part, true. However, Georges's character is much more nuanced. Georges appears to be pulled in two directions. On one hand, Georges wishes to avenge Henri's insults against him and establish himself as an equal, and even a superior, among the Whites of the island. On the other hand, he is pulled by his hatred for prejudice and his desire to manifest a war on it to its fullest extent. Early in the novel he suggests that his dad should lead such a rebellion. Later, Georges does it himself and the narrator informs the reader that it was his intention of doing so all along. However, Daut proposes that Georges's vendetta against “color prejudice,” rather than “the economic system of slavery” is why his rebellion fails (4). However, Daut's argument is not convincing. Georges is indeed focused on the racial aspect of slavery, and he verily fights against it. His rebellion does not appear to have been defeated due to his lack of attention to the economics of slavery, but rather he was thwarted by a series of events that weakened his rebellion. Firstly, Georges's trait of “orgueil” ‘vanity or excess pride’ pressures him to attend a meeting in which he is arrested by Lord Murrey (my trans.). Later, a large number of revolutionaries are distracted by free alcohol, distributed by the governor. It is for these reasons that his revolt fails.

During his initial return to l'Île de France, Georges had remained an anonymous foreigner to most of the island, including the Malmédies. It is at Lord Murrey's ball that he makes his grand entrance. There is a shock throughout the party when his name is announced,

and Georges had arrived late in order to make a more noticeable arrival. The narrator explains, “Ce n’était pas sans intention qu’il s’était fait attendre: sur le point d’entrer en lutte avec le préjugé qu’il était résolu à combattre, il avait voulu, du premier coup, voir face à face son ennemi: . . . l’annonce de son nom et son entrée avaient produit tout l’effet qu’il pouvait attendre” (66). “Préjugé” is an omnipresent antagonist in this novel. Soon after Georges sits down between two English women at the table, it reappears: “Sara respirait: elle savait que le préjugé qui poursuivait Georges n’avait pas d’influence sur l’esprit des étrangers” (Dumas 66). Here, Sara is relieved that Georges is not placed next to any of the prejudiced French of the island. Enz comments that Georges must beat prejudice against his race to “reintegrate into society” (389). Contrary to this claim, Georges has already integrated into aristocratic society despite the prejudices against him, and he delights in taking part in the functions of the elites. He was popular in Paris, befriended Lord Murrey, the governor of the island, and fashioned a love interest with the sophisticated Sara. Far from wishing, to “reintegrate into society” as Enz proposes, Georges already has, but he wishes to change it entirely by combatting prejudice even further. With the adoption of the citizen-soldier into his identity, he wishes to defeat prejudice for the betterment of the island and so that he and the People of Color there are considered true equals in a newly formed society.

The plot continues when Georges and Lord Murrey visit the Malmédie house and Georges has the audacity to ask M. de Malmédie for Sara’s hand in marriage. Georges and Sara had already confessed their love for each other at this point, so he already knew that she was willing to marry him. After his request, turmoil ensues, and it is revealed that Sara loves Georges. Enz posits that Georges believes he can end prejudice by marrying Sara (389). However, this characterization falls short of Georges’s intentions. Expressing his martial

citizenship, Georges indicates later that he was always planning on mounting a revolt on the island. Georges does however admit that he was willing to let Henri's first insult go, had the Malmédies acquiesced respectfully to Georges's marriage proposal. Yet, since Henri had delivered yet another offense in this scene by raising his cane aggressively toward Georges, our young hero demanded an explanation for Henri's conduct. Henri refused to fight Georges based on his race, and thus, Georges's need for revenge was solidified.

Later in the novel, Lord Murrey holds a festival with several different competitions. The main event is a horse race in which Henri and Georges are competing. The two young men are nearing the finish line when Georges smacks Henri with his whip, thereby publicly insulting him as payback for his past transgressions. The narrator explains the weight of Georges's actions: "C'était non seulement une provocation à un rival, mais une déclaration de guerre à tous les blancs. Georges se trouvait donc, par la marche irrésistible des choses, en face de ce préjugé qu'il était venu chercher de si loin, et ils allaient lutter corps à corps, comme deux ennemis mortels" (Dumas 105). When Georges returns to his father's land, Laïza visits and proposes a revolt of the enslaved people on the island. Laïza declares, "Nous sommes décidés à nous débarrasser des blancs. Nous avons, Dieu merci! Assez souffert pour avoir le droit de nous venger" (Dumas 106). Laïza hopes for "un avenir de vengeance et de liberté" (Dumas 106). When Georges learns that Henri will not dual a "mulâtre," and that Henri and his friends plan to attack him, he agrees to be the leader of the revolt (Dumas 109-110).

Laïza gathers the willing enslaved population and references Haiti's triumph over slavery. Then, Georges arrives and claims leadership of the rebellion, giving everyone present money to buy weapons (Dumas 115-116). Enz comments again on Georges's motives to lead this rebellion, "Throughout the novel Georges seeks approval and recognition from whites: first

in Europe and then on the Ile de France . . . even when he agrees to lead them [the enslaved population] in revolt against the whites, it is only for personal gain. He wants to possess what the whites have: a sense of superiority. That is why he proposes to Sara” (389). On the contrary, Georges already believes he is superior to everyone, and that is not why he proposes to Sara, as Enz suggests. His marriage with Sara is an expression of their love. Georges explains his intentions in reflecting on what he might say to Sara after his revolutionary victory, “J’ai voulu faire disparaître dans une tempête hommes, lois, préjugés . . . et j’ai réussi” (Dumas 116). It is not through Sara, that Georges believes he can defeat prejudice, but through social and political change. These changes are in line with his adoption of the citizen-soldier model. Georges wanted to end slavery and would use militant means if necessary. He also desired to expand the rights of People of Color and end racism on his home island. It is true that his marriage to Sara would have likely had an effect on the social dynamics of the island, perhaps for the better. Yet, the narrator makes it clear that the two young people love each other, and it appears only incidental that their love insults Henri. Even after he is assured of Sara’s love, Georges still feels the need to avenge Henri’s insults. For Georges, the revolt is not just for revenge and even less about social recognition, as Enz indicates. Georges explains to Lord Murrey, “je suis revenu ici pour accomplir une destinée. Il faut que j’aille jusqu’au bout. J’ai un préjugé à combattre. Il faut qu’il m’écrase ou que je le tue” (Dumas 97). These sentiments are repeated after the rebellion has failed and when Georges defends himself in court. The narrator describes Georges’s ambitions, “Ce que Georges dit ne fut point une défense, ce fut l’histoire de toute sa vie: il ne cacha point qu’il était revenu à l’Île de France dans l’intention de combattre, par tous les moyens possibles, le préjugé qui pesait sur les hommes de couleur; seulement il n’a dit pas un seul mot des causes qui avaient hâté l’exécution de son projet” (Dumas 149). Georges’s goal is to fight prejudice.

Along this quest, the narrator explains that events caused his plan to come earlier than expected. These passages from the novel strongly suggest that Georges had planned all along to fight prejudice, as a citizen-soldier, by benefiting and freeing the enslaved inhabitants of the island.

After organizing the revolt, Georges receives two invitations to visit Lord Murrey's from Sara and Murrey himself. Because of his "orgueil," Georges feels that he cannot refuse (Dumas 18). When he arrives, M. de Malmédie is also there, and he and Lord Murrey offer peace and acceptance of his marriage with Sara. Georges tells Sara, "Je sais que vous viendrez à moi, Sara, malgré . . . tous les obstacles, tous les empêchements, tous les préjugés" (Dumas 121). Here, Georges emphasizes the love between him and Sara despite "all of the prejudices" (my trans.). Nevertheless, Georges refuses the peace, and Lord Murrey informs Georges that he knows of the revolt. Georges persists in his refusal asserting that with Henri's refusal to apologize or duel, he was decided in his campaign to end slavery and prejudice. Lord Murrey consequently places Georges under arrest. However, he is later able to escape and rejoin Laïza. He finds his soldiers partying with alcohol given to them freely by the governor in hopes of quashing the rebellion. "Georges et Laïza se regardèrent avec ce sourire qui signifie: 'il ne s'agit plus ici de vaincre, mais de mourir et de bien mourir'" (Dumas 127). In these phrases, the narrator paints the sentiment of soldierly honor in Georges and Laïza, thus alluding to the citizen-soldier model. Not within an organized military, Georges and Laïza are both free men, adopting the virtues of citizen-soldiers and fulfilling a public service in fighting the oppression of the island. He and Laïza lead about three hundred revolutionaries, a historic and significant number that alludes to the Spartan King Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans as well as the three hundred Guadeloupeans and their leader, Louis Delgrès, fighting against slavery. In using this number, the narrator romanticizes Georges's and Laïza's struggle and constructs in them the values of

martial citizenship. They were fighting so that the oppressed people of the island could have rights and access to the citizen-soldier model, and the freedoms that the White French enjoyed.

Georges and the revolutionaries do, however, win their first battle, but at its end, Georges is shot in the side. Meanwhile, two hundred “noirs” assemble at Pierre’s house, and Pierre leads them into the forest, while Georges, Laïza, and their troops set up a fortification in a cave. Eventually, though, Georges and his soldiers must retreat. Georges is badly wounded, so Laïza carries Georges, chased by the English. After being shot twice, Laïza is finally exhausted and can no longer carry him. As the English approach, Laïza commits suicide and Georges is taken captive. After the trial, he is sentenced to death.

While Georges is in prison, the author appears to return to the themes of Deism and naturalism, painting a positive picture of these motifs. These themes go alongside those of military enlightenment and martial citizenship. The narrator explains that Georges didn’t practice any religion on the surface but was profoundly spiritual. A preacher visits Georges in his cell and they have several discussions. The narrator describes the preacher as “un de ces hommes qui, élevées au milieu des grandes scènes de la nature, ont cherché et trouvé le Seigneur dans ses œuvres” (151). In these passages, the narrator suggests a positive view of Deism within Georges and in the preacher’s Deist, or naturalist, approach to Christianity. Though the preacher may hold certain Christian convictions, he uses nature to understand God. The narrator adds another description of the preacher, “C’était enfin un de ces cœurs sereins qui attirent à eux les cœurs souffrants pour les consoler, en prenant pour eux-mêmes une part de leurs douleurs” (151). This Deism and appreciation of nature is amplified when the preacher returns and finds Georges reading *Paul et Virginie* by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. The narrator, in turn, provides several Saint-Pierre styled descriptions of nature within close proximity to these allusions to Deism. For

example, when Pierre enters the woods with his troops, the narrator explains, “Selon son habitude, la nature, toujours jeune, insoucieuse, toujours féconde, semblait, par sa sereine tranquillité et son calme bonheur, une éternelle ironie de l’agitation et des douleurs de l’homme” (133). The importance that Dumas places on nature and Deism in *Georges* highlights the novel’s connection to Enlightenment ideas. These connections are made throughout the book, and the author crafts a martial, politically engaged, and Enlightenment-inspired citizen-soldier within his hero, Georges. This depiction of enlightened martial citizenship indicates a willingness in Dumas to adopt this model in himself. It also suggests a desire to inspire others to do so as well, particularly those People of Color that had been denied martial citizenship. Furthermore, with France still under monarchical control in 1843, Dumas may have hoped to inspire the French to reclaim the citizen-soldier model so to retake their rights and reestablish a republic. The author’s use of citizen-soldier themes in *Georges* shows that this model is a persistent idea in Western Republics that appears to be continually negotiated and debated.

The narrator also uses Georges’s time in prison as an opportunity to accentuate the protagonist’s status as a tragic hero, drawing parallels to those of Antiquity. The narrator brings attention to Georges’s “orgueil” and makes reference to the hero’s connection with the ancient Greeks. While in prison, Georges’s vanity reappears when he asks the doctor to take his pulse. The doctor is surprised with how low it is and, “Georges sourit orgueilleusement” and exclaims, “Ah! Messieurs les blancs, dit-il, vous aviez hâte de me voir mourir? Je le conçois, ajouta-t-il; peut-être aviez-vous besoin d’une leçon de courage. Je vous la donnerai” (Dumas 153). Here, we observe his sense of superiority and pride. These qualities are compounded when Georges gets out of his bath and fixes his hair and beard with “plus de soin qu’il n’eût fait pour aller dans un ball” (Dumas 153). While taking his bath, Georges exhibits his appreciation for the practices of

the Greeks. He addresses the doctor, “Vous le voyez, docteur, dit-il je me règle sur l’antiquité: les Athéniens prenaient un bain au moment de marcher au combat” (Dumas 153). Not only does Georges reference and admire the Athenians directly, but he also tends to his hair, as the Spartans did, before battle. When the preacher sees Georges and the care he has put into his appearance he exclaims, “Oh! Mon fils, mon fils . . . gardez-vous de l’orgueil: l’orgueil a perdu votre corps, prenez garde qu’il ne perde encore votre âme” (Dumas 153). Earlier Georges had confessed to the preacher that the only sin he felt guilty of was his “orgueil” which was, according to him, the cause of his downfall. However, the narrator explains more deeply, “C’était son orgueil qui le soutenait, c’était son orgueil qui le faisait fort, c’était cet orgueil qui le faisait grand” (151). Like a tragic hero of Antiquity, Georges’s vanity is both a boon and a burden.

During the procession toward his execution, Georges stops at a church and Sara is there waiting to marry him. The narrator offers a description which links Georges once again with Antiquity, “Si jamais triomphateur fut fier de son triomphe, ce fut Georges . . . Ce n’était plus un pauvre insensé, impuissant à atteindre un but impossible, et mourant avant de l’avoir atteint; c’était un vainqueur frappé au moment de sa victoire; c’était Épaminondas arrachant le javelot mortel de sa poitrine, mais de son dernier regard, voyant fuir l’ennemi” (Dumas 155). Georges now feels a sense of contentment. Now that he is able to marry Sara, “Georges pouvait mourir, Georges était récompensé de son long combat, il avait lutté corps à corps avec le préjugé, et tout en frappant Georges mortellement, le préjugé avait été tué dans la lutte . . . Ce n’était plus le condamné prêt à monter sur l’échafaud, c’était le martyr s’élançant au ciel” (Dumas 155). Though unsuccessful in defeating slavery and prejudice entirely, the narrator claims this small victory for Georges against prejudice. As mentioned earlier, I assert he did not marry Sara to

fight prejudice. He married her for love. Nevertheless, their marriage was an attack on the racial hierarchy of the island and this small consolation was enough of a victory for Georges to die satisfied. However, true to Dumas's characteristic writing style, Georges's father, Pierre, leads a daring rescue to save his son and Sara after their wedding. They make their way to Georges's brother's ship and escape the island, but Lord Murrey, being an excellent captain, gives chase. Georges fights Murrey, and the governor later dies of his wounds. Georges laments to Sara, "Si je ne devais pas vivre avec toi, Sara, dit Georges en se retournant, sur mon honneur, je voudrais mourir comme lui" (Dumas 171). In this line, Georges expresses the respect he has for the admirable Lord Murrey who, for most of the novel, had been Georges's friend and ally. This sentiment indicates an adoption by Georges of the military virtues of respect and honor. Dumas, in having his hero fight against prejudice and for the freedom of the island, advances in *Georges* a unique version of the citizen-soldier model to nineteenth-century audiences. This hero is educated in and inspired by France's own morals from the Enlightenment era; yet, he is of Afro-descent and wishes to expand the rights that Whites have to People of Color. Dumas likely created this appropriation to call attention to the need for true equality to finally be recognized. This adoption of ideals in an atypical hero might have been an attempt by Dumas to reference the Enlightenment beliefs and actions of the Guadeloupean and Haitian insurrections against slavery.

Alexandre Dumas crafts within Georges an identity which includes the citizen-soldier model. The author wished to establish that Georges was educated and inspired according to the principles of Enlightenment and ancient Greece, and he uses themes of Deism, the appreciation of nature, and Antiquity to reinforce these ideals in his protagonist. Inspired by these principles, Georges imposes on himself a militaristic and intellectual education. As a citizen-soldier, Georges intended to serve his community by ending prejudice and slavery. Moreover, his actions

to free enslaved persons and lead a revolt against slavery reflect an interpretation of citizenship characterized by political and martial participation. In the story, Georges endeavors to prove the color prejudices held against him wrong, and he fights to end these biases on his home island. He began by putting forward the persona of an elegant gentleman, and freeing people from slavery. His ultimate battle against “prejudice” came with a revolt, which, the narrator tells us, was his plan all along (my trans.). When it ends in failure, the narrator revisits Georges’s association with Antiquity and paints the portrait of a tragic hero whose pride was both a source of his strength and weakness. In the story of *Georges*, Dumas offers a new take on the citizen-soldier concept. In having his hero be of African descent and adopt revolutionary French morals, Dumas perhaps mirrors the sentiments of the Haitian and Guadeloupean revolts and emphasizes the need for the concretization of universal equality. The representation of the citizen-soldier model in *Georges* demonstrates that even decades after the French Revolution, this persistent concept was still sparking dialogue in the Western world about who had access to citizenship and what roles and rights it should entail. This dialogue continues to this day. In *Georges*, Dumas, criticizes color prejudice and slavery, and he and his hero, advocate for a more universal interpretation of martial citizenship. This story suggests that Dumas sought to inspire his contemporaries to value the Enlightenment ideals and to include People of Color in its interpretation. Interestingly, revolution and abolition came only five years after the publishing of *Georges*. Perhaps Dumas’s republican and abolitionist novel had an influence on these events. The insights of this study demonstrate the significance and potential impact of the citizen-soldier construction in literature when coupled with an inclusive understanding of Enlightenment ideology. *Georges*’s compelling themes of egalitarianism, freedom, and justice before the law are just as important to today’s audiences as they were to Georges Munier.

Chapter 9: The Ongoing Model of Martial Citizenship

In this study, I investigated the influences of the citizen-soldier model in several Francophone revolutionary contexts. I hope to have shown that an embrace of many of the virtues of martial citizenship took place among French women, People of Color in Guadeloupe and Haiti, and in Alexandre Dumas's *Georges*. The sentiments associated with the citizen-soldier model, which include advocating and, at times, fighting for rights, appear to have helped shape the identities of the individuals—both fictional and actual—discussed in this research. The figures therein, regardless of their legal status of citizenship, seized on the ideas comprising the citizen-soldier model and incorporated many of them into their beliefs. They used its themes and principles to lay claim to the rights that the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme* declared. Not only did these disenfranchised groups advocate politically for their rights and equality, but they also participated, in some way, militarily in their respective areas of influence. Importantly, these individuals often used the language of the enlightened citizen-soldier in their argumentations. However, it is necessary to remember that their activism came at a cost. Many freedom-fighters sacrificed and risked their reputations, freedom, and lives for a more equal world. Their stories support the idea that a widespread transmission of the values of the citizen-soldier model occurred in France, Guadeloupe, and Haiti. Moreover, the understanding of these individuals' identities as citizen-soldiers is an aspect of history, culture, and literature that has been neglected. The insights from this survey help paint a more complete picture of the cultural imaginary in these contexts and will hopefully engender further discourse on the citizen-soldier model. The accounts featured in this research also attest to the continuous dialogue and discussion around martial citizenship. This negotiation and debate on citizenship is sure to continue into the twenty-

first century. The microhistories within this study provide historical interpretations and understandings of the citizen-soldier model for contemporary conversations concerning history, literature, and citizenship.

Further research can always be undertaken, and there are many areas of the citizen-soldier model that require additional scholarship. Christy Pichichero, for example, mentions the influence of the stories of the American citizen army on revolutionary France (196). Since the American context is one of the early forerunners of the citizen-soldier model in the eighteenth-century, this subject could prove most illuminating to the study of martial citizenship in revolutionary America, France, and beyond. Perhaps further stories remain to be examined that detail the transmission of the cultural idea of martial citizenship between American, French, and Caribbean settings. Additionally, beyond Reine Chapuy, there are many more *citoyennes-soldates* who engaged in the military and in activism during the French Revolution. These women, like those of this study, could be studied within the context of the citizen-soldier model. In a similar vein, the women of the Caribbean and any discussions concerning women's rights in revolutionary Guadeloupe and Saint-Domingue could also be examined. For example, Adbaraya Toya was an African woman who was a fierce warrior of the Dahomey Kingdom. She was brought to Saint-Domingue enslaved, and she took over the care of Jean-Jacques Dessalines, the first leader of independent Haiti. She taught him martial arts and military tactics, which would prove instrumental to him during the Haitian Revolution. Dessalines would later make her leader of his army (Knight). Toya's story, and the presence of the themes of the citizen-soldier in Haiti, promise to be a thought-provoking and fruitful investigation.

The 1801 constitution, in which Toussaint Louverture was named governor for life, shows an interpretation of citizenship which asserts that citizens have certain obligations to the

state. For Louverture, the people of Saint-Domingue were rightfully required to enter into the plantation labor force. Louverture reasoned that this was necessary to secure the nation's prosperity and emancipation. This perspective may have been, at least pragmatically, correct. It is true that Saint-Domingue faced a hostile world that coveted the colony's agricultural and human (in the form of slavery) resources. Though forced paid labor is not the most attractive practice, neither is military conscription. Conscription itself was deployed by Western republics throughout the twentieth century. Louverture's complex dilemma adds to the eighteenth-century conversation on rights and duties of citizens. Further analysis of these topics could help shape a better understanding of Louverture's intent and help frame modern questions on citizenship, rights, and obligations.

The employment, endorsement, or refusal of violence in revolutionary French and Caribbean settings are important areas of study that require deeper exploration. It is not only important to further understand the culture and literature of this era, but doing so is also pertinent to today's audiences. Modern citizens must determine the appropriate response in holding their government, or other governments, accountable for wrongs. This idea can also be applied to government officials and employees who must decide on the appropriate reaction to controversial actions committed by others. An investigation into the violent and peaceful revolutionary events could result in valuable findings and conclusions. For example, additional information is needed on the French Army officers who refused to quell the 1787 and 1789 grain riots. One officer asserted that "It was not the business of the army to attack its citizens" (Bertaud 41-42; trans. by Pichichero 191). Pauline Léon also engaged in peaceful dissent with her printing press during the Napoléon and Restoration regimes. However, in situations like Guadeloupe and Haiti, the people there faced an imminent return to slavery and violently

resisted. A careful scrutiny would be required in the analysis of the complex nature of violent and peaceful approaches to resisting despotism within the citizen-soldier context.

Dumas's *Georges* illustrates that the idea of the citizen-soldier was continuing to be negotiated and discussed years after the 1789 Revolution. In having Georges, a man of mixed heritage, adopt the Enlightenment and citizen-soldier values, Dumas proposes a new rendition of martial citizenship to European audiences. Dumas's employment of these themes demonstrates the persistent nature of debate over the citizen-soldier model in republican and democratic nations. The question of who gets to be a citizen, and who gets to be a soldier, and what the overlap, if any, is between these two roles, continues to this day throughout the Western world ("Faut-il un retour du permis de porte d'armes en France?"). The war in Ukraine offers thought-provoking insights into the citizen-soldier concept in the twenty-first century. Ukraine has been arming its citizens to defend its independence. This is a situation similar to the one in which France found itself in during the Revolution. When faced with fears of an Austrian invasion, the government began handing out weapons to *sans-culottes* (less wealthy French people). The Ukrainian conflict brings relevance and conversations back to the citizen-soldier concept and what it should entail in republics and democracies. The study and understanding of the citizen-soldier model in the French revolutionary republican context can speak to questions and concerns on this topic that arise in modern times. This relevance emphasizes the importance of academic literary studies which so often address contemporary concerns.

The struggle for equal citizenship and soldiering in this study demonstrates the importance of laws and policies which truly recognize people's freedom and equality in rights. Today, women face pushback when it comes to access to duties in the military. For example, in a recent press release, the U.S. Navy confirmed that the first woman had passed the rigorous elite

training of the Navy SEALs on July 15, 2021 (Starr and Kaufman). Though this is a fantastic accomplishment, this report brings attention to military standards which are masculine focused. Perhaps it is time to reevaluate this situation in order to progress inclusiveness while maintaining the high standards of these elite military units. More research is required on this subject, particularly with regard to the contexts of France and the Caribbean. Matters such as this bring up important questions to be studied in the future: How do modern-day France, Guadeloupe, and Haiti view the citizen-soldier model, a philosophical and literary idea that was implemented and forged in the eighteenth-century? How does the modern national guard function in these countries? How does soldiering work in present-day Haiti? What rights do citizens have in these countries and what types of access to soldiering do they have? These types of questions, and the answers to them, will help bring greater context to the topics of this study.

The citizen-soldier model is a construction that marries the martial aspects of the soldier, and the civic engagement of a citizen into a single person. In this study, I hope to have shown that women of the French Revolution and People of Color fighting slavery in the Caribbean, embraced this dual concept of the citizen-soldier into their identities, despite it being forbidden to them. These individuals fought to expand their rights and access to this model. Examples of these activists' adoption and advocacy of martial citizenship abound in their actions, as well as the philosophical petitions, political documents, and literature that they produced. The different interpretations of the citizen-soldier concept within this study provide a framework for a better understanding of the literature and cultural imaginary of the revolutionary period. The diverse renditions of martial citizenship can be instructive for modern dialogues concerning what it means to be a citizen and a soldier in the twenty-first century.

Bibliography

- Abray, Jane. "Feminism in the French Revolution." *American Historical Review*, 80, 1975, pp. 43-62.
- "Acte d'indépendance." *Digitèque des matériaux juridiques et politiques*, Université de Perpignan via Domitia, edited by Jean-Paul Maury, mjp.univperp.fr/constit/ht1804.htm. Accessed April 18, 2022.
- Allinson, Alfred. trans., *Georges or the Isle of France*. London, Methuen & Co., 1903, p. iv.
- Assemblée générale du 30 juin 1793. Extrait du P.-V. Dans les papiers de Claire Lacombe, Archives Nationales: T 1001.
- Ball, Patrick. "Alternate Currents in Women's Republicanism During the French Revolution." *Australasian Philosophical Review*. 3:4. , 2019, pp. 392-402.
- Bergès, Sandrine. "Revolution and Republicanism: Women Political Philosophers of Late Eighteenth-Century France and Why They Matter." *Australasian Philosophical Review* 3/4, 2021, pp. 351–70.
- Bertaud, Jean-Paul. *La Révolution armée: Les soldats-citoyens et la Révolution française*. Paris, 1979, pp. 41-42.
- Blanc, Olivier. *Olympe de Gouges*. Paris, Syros, 1981, p. 136.
- "Brave." *Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales*. www.cnrtl.fr/definition/brave. Accessed Dec. 13, 2020.
- Brissot, Jacques Pierre. *Le Patriote français: Journal libre, impartial et national par une société de citoyens*. Keip Verlag. no. 941.
- EC, Basse-Terre, 6, no. 42; 9, no. 136; 10, nos. 40, 69, 107.

- Capdevila, Luc. "Identité de genre et événement guerrier: Des expériences féminines du combat." *Femmes en guerres*, Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 2011, pp. 11-25.
- - - . "La mobilisation des femmes dans la France combattante (1940-1945)." *Clio*. *Femmes, Genre, Histoire*. no. 12, Berlin, 2000, pp. 57-80. doi: 10.4000/clio.187.
- Caron, Pierre. "Report of Charmont, Jan. 20, 1794." *Paris Pendant la Terreur: Rapports des agents secrets du ministre de l'intérieur*, Paris, 1910-64, pp. 3-56.
- Centre des Archives d'outre-mer, Aix-en-Provence. EC, Basse-Terre, 7, no. 146; 6, nos. 36, 45.
- Césaire, Aimé. "Mémorial de Louis Delgrès." *Présence Africaine*. no. 23, 1958, pp. 69-72.
- - - . *Toussaint Louverture; La Révolution française et le problème colonial*, Paris, Club français du livre, 1960, p. 228.
- Chalmin, Ronan Y. "Éthique et rhétorique de la Révolution chez Gracchus Babeuf et Toussaint Louverture." *MLN*, vol. 130, no. 4, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015, pp. 836-62.
- Clarke, Joseph. "Cenotaphs and Cypress Trees: Commemorating the Citizen-Soldier in the Year II." *French History*, vol. 22, no. 2, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 217-40. doi: 10.1093/fh/crn010.
- "Constitution du 8 juillet 1801." *Digithèque des matériaux juridiques et politiques*, edited by Jean-Pierre Maury, Université de Perpignan via Domitia, mjp.univ-perp.fr/constit/ht1801.htm. Accessed April 18, 2022.
- Cottreau, *L'intermédiaire des chercheurs et curieux*. Paris, Archives nationales, 1885, c II, cote 983, 18e année.
- Crandall, Russell. "The Black Bonaparte." *Survival*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2017, pp. 183-190.
- Daut, Marlene. "Haiti and the Black Romantics: Enlightenment and Color Prejudice After the

- Haitian Revolution in Alexandre Dumas's *Georges* (1843)." *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2017, p. 12
- Dayan, Joan. "Haiti, History, and the Gods." *University of California Press*, 1995, p. 5.
- "Déclaration de l'Indépendance d'Haïti." *Uhem Mesut*, www.uhem-mesut.com/public/decl-indep-haiti-1804.pdf. Accessed Jan. 6, 2022.
- Dekker, Rudolph and Lotte Van de Pol. "Republican Heroines: Cross-Dressing Women in the French Revolution." Translated by Judy Marcure, *History of European Ideas*, 1989, pp. 353-363.
- Discours prononcé à la Société des Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires par les citoyennes de la section des droits de l'homme. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1793, Lb (40) 24111.
- Dubois, Laurent. *A Colony of Citizens : Revolution & Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787-1804* . Williamsburg, VA, University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- - - . *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2004, pp. 205-208.
- - - . "'Citoyens et Amis!': Esclavage, citoyenneté et République dans les Antilles françaises à l'époque révolutionnaire." *Annales: histoire, sciences sociales (French ed.)*, vol. 58e année, no. 2, 2003, pp. 281-303.
- - - . "Haunting Delgrès." *Radical History Review*, vol. 78, 2000, pp. 166-177.
- Dumas, Alexandre. *Georges*. 1843, Lexington, KY, 2019.
- Dziembowski, Edmond. "Un nouveau patriotisme français, 1750-1770: la France face à la puis

- sance anglaise à l'époque de la guerre de sept ans." *Oxford Voltaire Foundation*, 1998, p. 342.
- Enz, Molly Krueger. "The Mulatto as Island and the Island as Mulatto in Alexandre Dumas's 'Georges.'" *The French Review*, vol. 80, no. 2, 2006, pp. 383–94.
- "Faut-il un retour du permis de porte d'armes en France?" *Le Figaro*, March 28, 2018, video.lefigaro.fr/figaro/video/faut-il-un-retour-du-permis-de-port-d-armes-en-france/5757485175001/. Accessed March 8, 2021.
- Feyereisen, Justine. "Les Identités de genre en guerre." *Femmes en guerres*, 2011, pp. 109-115.
- Fick, Carolyn. "Emancipation in Haiti: From Plantation Labour to Peasant Proprietorship." *Slavery and Abolition*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2000, pp. 11-40.
- Fumaroli, Marc. *La Diplomatie de l'esprit: de Montaigne à La Fontaine*. Paris, Gallimard, 1998, pp.190-191.
- Füssel, Marian. "Between Dissimulation and Sensation: Female Soldiers in Eighteenth-Century Warfare." *Journal for EighteenthCentury Studies*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2018, pp. 527-542. doi: 10.1111/175409298.12567.
- Garrigus, John. *Before Haiti: Race and Citizenship in French Saint-Domingue*. Springer, 2006, pp. 85, 208.
- Gauthier, Florence. *Triomphe et mort de la révolution des droits de l'homme et du citoyen (1789-1795-1802.)* Syllepse Eds, 2014, pp. 343-344.
- "Gazette Nationale ou le Moniteur universel." Retro News: Le site de presse de la BnF, no. 121, Jan. 20, 1794, p. 483, www.retronews.fr. Accessed Feb. 14, 2022.
- Gerbaux, Françoise. "Les Femmes soldats pendant la Révolution." *La Révolution Française*. no. 47, 1904, p. 61.

- Girard, Philippe R., *Memoir of Toussaint Louverture*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
- - - . *The Slaves who Defeated Napoleon: Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian War*. The University of Alabama Press, 2011. p. 19.
- - - . “Un-Silencing the Past: The Writings of Toussaint Louverture.” *Slavery and Abolition*, vol. 34. no. 4, 2013, pp. 663-672.
- Godard, Claude, d’Aucour. *L’Académie militaire, ou les Héros subalterns*. 1745, pp. 19-21.
- Godineau, Dominique. “De la guerrière à la citoyenne. Porter les armes pendant l’Ancien Régime et la Révolution française.” *Femmes, Genre, Histoire*, no. 20, 2005. pp.1-18. doi: 10.4000/clio.1418.
- - - . “Femmes en citoyenneté: Pratiques et politique.” *Annales historiques de la Révolution française*, vol. 67, no. 300, 1995, pp. 197–207.
- - - . “La douloureuse épopée des femmes soldats de la Révolution.” *Retro News: Le site de presse de la BnF*, 2021, www.retronews.fr. Accessed on Feb. 14, 2022.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Gresle, François. “Le Citoyen-soldat garant du pacte républicain: à propos des origines et de la persistance d’une idée reçue.” *Année sociologique*, vol. 46, no. 1, 1996, pp. 105-125.
- Guillon, Claude. *Deux enragés de la Révolution: Leclerc de Lyon et Pauline Léon*. Éditions La Digitale, 1993.
- - - . “Pauline Léon, une républicaine révolutionnaire.” *Société des études Robespierristes*, no. 344, 2006, pp. 147-159. doi: 10.4000/ahrf.6213.
- Helvétius, Claude Adrien. *De l’Esprit*. 1758, Paris, Fayard, 1988, pp. 129–30.

- Hoffman, Léon-François. "Dumas et les Noirs" in *Georges*, Translated by Tina Kover, New York, The Modern Library, 2007, pp. 22-23.
- Hopkin, David. "Female Soldiers and the Battle of the Sexes in France: the Mobilization of a Folk Motif." *History Workshop Journal*, no. 56, 2003, pp 78-104.
- James, C.L.R. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. 2nd ed., Vintage Books, 1963.
- Jaucourt, Louis de. "Héros." *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, 1765, p. 8:182.
- Jenson, Deborah. "Beyond the Slave Narrative: Politics, Sex, and Manuscripts in the Haitian Revolution." *Liverpool University Press*, 2011, p. 73.
- - - . "Dessalines's American Proclamations of the Haitian Independence." *Journal of Haitian Studies*, vol 14, no. 1/2, 2009, pp. 72-102.
- Johnson, Ronald Angelo. *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance*. University of Georgia Press, 2014.
- Kaisary, Philip. "Hercules, the Hydra, and the 1801 Constitution of Toussaint Louverture." *Atlantic Studies*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2015, pp. 393-411.
- Knight, Cranston. "In the Name of Freedom: Women in the Haitian Revolution." *Youtube*, Haitian American Museum of Chicago, May 5, 2021, www.youtube.com/watch?v=ADtPU2lGlnU. Accessed March 1, 2022.
- Lacour, Auguste. *Histoire de la Guadeloupe*. Basse-Terre, 1855-1858.
- Lacour, Léopold. *La Revue Hebdomadaire*. Plon-Nourrit, Oct. 14, 1899.
- - - . *Les Origines du féminisme contemporain: Olympe de Gouges, Théroigne de Méricourt, Rose Lacombe*. Plon-Nourrit, 1900.

Lacroix, Pamphile. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la révolution de Saint-Domingue*. Pillet aîné, 1819.

Lamar, Celita. "Uncovering Heroines: Some Theatrical Perspectives on the French Revolution." *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 2, no.3, 1995, pp.17-30.

Lanza, Janine M. "'What Is the Law If Not the Expression of the Rights of Man and Reason?' The Champ de Mars Massacre and the Language of Law." *Law and History Review*, vol. 19, no. 2, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 283–310.

"Le Courrier de Strasbourg." *Retro News: Le site de presse de la BnF*, July 26, 1792, p. 695, www.retronews.fr. Accessed Feb. 17, 2022.

Le Menthéour, Rudy. "Le Paradis à portée de lance: Variations autour du modèle Spartiate à l'âge des Lumières." *MLN*, vol. 133, no. 4, 2018, pp. 914-936. doi: 10.1353/mln.2018.0060.

"Le Mercure Universel." *Retro News: Le site de presse de la BnF*, June 26, 1793, p. 411, www.retronews.fr. Accessed. Feb. 17, 2022.

"Le suicide de Louis Delgrès et ses 300 compagnons à Matouba le 28 mai 1802." *Madinin'Art : Critiques Culturelles de Martinique*, May 28, 2021, <https://www.madinin-art.net/le-suicide-de-louis-delgres-et-ses-300-compagnons-a-matouba-le-28-mai-1802/>. Accessed January 5, 2022.

Léon, Pauline. "Adresse Individuelle à l'Assemblée Nationale: Par des Citoyennes de la Capitale." *Bibliothèque Nationale Française*, 1792, pp.1-4, www.gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k42514b.texteImage. Accessed 31 March 2021.

Les Déclarations des droits de l'homme, edited by Lucien Jaume, Flammarion, 1989.

"Les Révolutions de Paris." *Retro News: Le site de presse de la BnF*, Feb. 1793, no. 189,

- www.retronews.fr. Accessed Feb. 17, 2022.
- Litwack, Leon F. *Been in the Storm So Long*. New York, Vintage Books, 1980, p. 223.
- Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government*. 1690. Hackett Publishing Company. Indianapolis. 1989.
- Loroux, Nicole. “Éloge de l’anachronisme en histoire.” *Espace Temps*, no. 27, 1993, pp.127-139, doi.org/10.3406/espat.2005.4369.
- Moore, Lucy. *Liberty: The Lives and Times of Six Women in Revolutionary France*. Harper Press. 2006.
- Nol, Jean-Marie. “La vérité sur l’histoire du sacrifice de Louis Delgrès en Guadeloupe.” *Fon das Kréyol*, Dec. 20, 2021. Accessed March 1, 2022.
- Oliver, Pamela. “Race Names.” *Race Politics Justice*. University of Wisconsin – Madison, 2017.
- Osman, Julia. *Citizen Soldiers and the Key to the Bastille*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- “Pauline Léon.” *Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Women’s Biography*, 4th ed., edited by Maggy Hendry and Jenny Uglow, Springer, 2005.
- Pichichero, Christy. *The Military Enlightenment: War and Culture in the French Empire from Louis XIV to Napoleon*. Cornell University Press, 2017.
- Plutarch. “Coriolanus.” *The Internet Classics Archive*, translated by John Dryden, par. 1, www.classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/coriolan.html. Accessed April 18, 2022.
- - - . “Sayings of Spartan Women.” *Moralia*, Loeb Classical Library Edition, vol. 3, Harvard University Press, 1931, www.loebclassics.com/view/plutarchmoralia_sayings_spartan_women/1931/pb_LCL245.463.xml. Accessed April 18, 2022.
- Plutarque, et al. *La vies des hommes illustres*. Gallimard, 1951, pp. 85-129.

- “Proclamation de Louis Delgrès le 10 mai 1802.” *Comité National pour la Memoire et l’Histoire de l’Esclavage*, www.cnmhe.fr/spip.php?article191. Accessed Jan. 25, 2022.
- Racault, Jean-Michel. “Mimétisme et métissage sur *Georges* d’Alexandre Dumas.” Paris, *Gallimard*, 1974, pp. 7-23.
- Rodriguez, Bárbara. “Alterity in Homer: A Reconceptualization of female marginalization.” *Journal of Research in Gender studies*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2017, pp. 83-122.
- Rosso, Maxime. “Les réminiscences spartiates dans les discours et la politique de Robespierre de 1789 à Thermidor.” *Société des études Robespierriistes*, no. 349, 2007, pp. 51-77.
- Roudinesco, Élisabeth. *Théroigne de Méricourt: Une femme mélancolique sous la Révolution*. Seuil, 1989.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. “Considérations sur le Gouvernement de Pologne et sur sa Réformation Projetée.” 1771. *Discours sur l’économie politique et autres textes*, Flammarion, 2012.
- - - . *Discours sur l’économie politique et autres textes*. 1755. Flammarion, 2012, pp. 59-76.
- - - . “Quelle est la Vertu le plus nécessaire aux Héros; et quels sont les Héros à qui cette Vertu a manqué?” *Collection complète des œuvres*. 1768. Genève, 1780-1789. vol. 7. no.4., pp. 12.
- Saint-Ruf, German. *L’Épopée Delgrès: La Guadeloupe sous la Révolution française*. L’Harmattan, 1977.
- Sarti, Raffaella. “From Slaves and Servants to Citizens? Regulating Dependency, Race, and Gender in Revolutionary France and the French West Indies.” *International Review of Social History*, 2021. pp. 1-31.
- Schama, Simon. *Citizens*. Knopf, 1989.

Smart, Annie. *Citoyennes: Women and the Ideal of Citizenship in Eighteenth Century France*.

University of Delaware Press, 2011.

Starr, Barbara, and Ellie Kaufman. "Woman qualifies for Naval Special Warfare Command crew for the first time." *CNN*, July 15, 2021,

www.edition.cnn.com/2021/07/15/politics/woman-navy-special-warfare/index.html.

Accessed March 2, 2022.

Ternaux, Mortimer. *Histoire de la Terreur Tome VII*. Hachette Bibliothèque Nationale, 1862.

Towers, Alicia. *The Society of Revolutionary Republican Women*. Florida Atlantic University, 1985.

Tozzi, Christopher. *Citizenship, Soldiering and Revolution: Foreigners and Minorities in the French Military, 1750-1831*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2013.

Walsh, John Patrick. *Free and French in the Caribbean: Toussaint Louverture, Aimé Césaire and Narratives of Loyal Opposition*. Indiana University Press, 2013.

- - - . "Toussaint Louverture at a Crossroads: The *Mémoire* of the 'First Soldier of the Republic of Saint-Domingue.'" *The Journal of Haitian Studies*, vol. 17, no.1, 2011, pp. 88-105.

Wendorf, Richard. "Declaring, Drafting, and Composing American Independence."

The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 2014, pp. 307-324.

Willink, John. "Jocko Underground 043: Dog Ownership. Personal Branding. Weapons and Tactics." *Apple Podcasts*, Feb. 28, 2022. Accessed Jan. 18, 2022.

Vita

Lucas Sharp was born in Nashville, Tennessee. He studied French language and literature at Middle Tennessee State University, where he received his Bachelor's degree. As an undergraduate student, he studied abroad in Caen, France. After receiving his degree, he studied French literature at l'Université de Grenoble in Grenoble, France. He then transferred back to Middle Tennessee State University where he received his Master of Arts in Teaching degree. He began his doctoral studies at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 2018. Here, as a graduate teaching assistant, he took courses to complete his degree and taught French undergraduate courses.