

Chapter 1 : Jo o Alberto - Wikipedia

The War in the Vend e (; French: Guerre de Vend e) was an uprising in the Vend e region of France during the French Revolution. The Vend e is a coastal region, located immediately south of the Loire River in western France.

It was not until the social unrest and the fear of The Terror a period between 1793 where tens of thousands of people were beheaded by use of guillotine combined with the external pressures from the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the introduction of a levy of , on the whole of France, decreed by the National Convention in February , that the region erupted. All but seven of the bishops refused the oath, as did about half of the parish priests. Nonjuring priests were exiled or imprisoned and women on their way to Mass were beaten in the streets. Many lived on monastery properties, and they overwhelmingly embraced the Revolution after these lands were seized and redistributed among them by the republican government. There were other levy riots across France when regions started to draft men into the army in response to the Levy Decree in February. The reaction in the northwest in early March was particularly pronounced with large-scale rioting verging on insurrection. In February, the Convention had voted to approve a levy of three hundred thousand men, to be chosen by lot among the unmarried men in each commune. Thus, the arrival of recruiters reminded locals of the methods of the monarchy, aroused resistance nearly everywhere in the countryside, and set in motion the first serious signs of sedition. Much of this resistance was quelled quickly, but in the lower Loire , in the Mauges and in the Vendean bocage , the situation was more serious and more protracted. Youths from communes surrounding Cholet, a large textile town on the boundary between the two regions, invaded the town and killed the commander of the National Guard, a "patriotic" pro-revolutionary manufacturer. Within a week, violence had spread to the Breton marshlands; peasants overran the town of Machecoul on 11 March, and several hundred Republican citizens were massacred. By mid-March, a minor revolt against conscription had turned into full-fledged insurrection. The first pitched battle was on the night of 19 March. In the north, on 22 March, another Republican force was routed near Chalonnes-sur-Loire. The main clash took place on the Pont de Vrigne, the bridge over the stream leading into Thouars. The Republicans there were taken from behind by the cavalry under Charles de Bonchamps , which had crossed the river at a ford. Despite the arrival of reinforcements, the Republicans were routed and withdrew towards the city. The insurgents, headed by Henri de La Rochejacquelein , took the rampart by force and poured into the city, and the Republican troops quickly capitulated. Likewise La Rochejacquelein wore his distinctive three red handkerchiefs on his head, waist and neck even though the gunners in the Republican forces were aiming for them. Following the victory his friends decided to copy him and all decided to wear three red handkerchiefs too so that La Rochejacquelein could not be distinguished by the enemy in the future. The victory gave the insurgents a massive supply of arms, including 50 cannons. This was the high point of the insurgency. Many prisoners were taken, some of whom went over to the Vendean cause, while many of the citizens fled to Tours. Inside the city were Republicans from the surrounding countryside who had fled to Nantes for safety, fortifying the defenders with tales of the horrors that the rebels inflicted on towns they managed to take. Cathelineau himself was shot at the head of his forces, causing his men to lose heart and retreat; ultimately, the Vendean were unable to take the city. When this proved impractical, he had the prisoners rounded up and put out on the Loire river in boats equipped with trap-door bottoms; when these opened the victims were left to drown. Taken by surprise, this division fought back but lost men, including many captured. The Vendean leader Lescure was seriously injured in the fighting.

Chapter 2 : French invasion and occupation of Egypt in

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Edit In some ways, the supporters of Jacobitism may be placed in this category. The royalist legitimist counter-revolutionary French movement survives to this day, albeit marginally. This counter-revolution produced what is debated to be the first modern genocide. The most well-known was the Sanfedismo , reactionary movement led by the cardinal Fabrizio Ruffo , which dropped the Parthenopean Republic and allowed the Bourbon dynasty to return on the throne of the Kingdom of Naples. Another example of counter-revolution was the peasants rebellion in Southern Italy after the national unification , fomented by the Bourbon government in exile and the Papal States. The revolt, labelled as brigandage , turned in a bloody civil war that lasted almost ten years. The supporters of Carlism during the 19th century to the present day are perhaps the oldest surviving counter-revolutionary group in Spain. Supporters uphold the legitimist view of royal succession, as well as regional autonomy under the monarchy, tradition and Catholicism. The Carlist cause began with the First Carlist War in and continues to the present. Red Army troops attack Kronstadt sailors in March The White Army and its supporters who tried to defeat the Bolsheviks after the October Revolution , as well as the German politicians, police, soldiers and Freikorps who crushed the German Revolution of 1918-19 , were also counter-revolutionaries. General Victoriano Huerta , and later the Felicistas , attempted to thwart the Mexican Revolution in the s. Calles began carrying out anti-Catholic policies which caused peaceful resistance from Catholics in The counter-revolution began as a movement of peaceful resistance against the anti-clerical laws. In the Summer of 1926 , fighting broke out. The fighters known as Cristeros fought the government due to its suppression of the Church, jailing and execution of priests, formation of a nationalist schismatic church, state atheism , Socialism, Freemasonry and other harsh anti-Catholic policies. The Spanish Civil War was in some respects, a counter-revolution. Supporters of Carlism , monarchy, and nationalism see Falange joined forces against the Second Spanish Republic in The counter-revolutionaries saw the Spanish Constitution of 1931 as a revolutionary document that defied Spanish culture, tradition and religion. On the Republican side, the acts of the Communist Party of Spain against the rural collectives can also be considered counter-revolutionary. More recently, the Bay of Pigs invasion into Cuba was conducted by counter-revolutionaries who hoped to overthrow the revolutionary government of Fidel Castro. In fact, the Contras received their name precisely because they were counter-revolutionaries. These right-wing groups are opposition to the FARC , and other left-wing guerrilla movements. Some counter-revolutionaries are former revolutionaries who supported the initial overthrow of the previous regime, but came to differ with those who ultimately came to power after the revolution. For example, some of the Contras originally fought with the Sandinistas to overthrow Anastasio Somoza , and some of those who oppose Castro also opposed Batista. China Edit The anti-communist Kuomintang party in China used the term "counter-revolutionary" to disparage the communists and other opponents of its regime. Chiang Kai-shek , the Kuomintang party leader, was the chief user of this term. The Kuomintang had several influences left upon its ideology by revolutionary thinking. The Kuomintang, and Chiang Kai-shek used the words "feudal" and "counter-revolutionary" as synonyms for evil, and backwardness, and proudly proclaimed themselves to be revolutionary. Rich merchants, industrialists , and entrepreneurs were arrested by Chiang, who accused them of being "counter-revolutionary", and Chiang held them until they gave money to the Kuomintang. Chiang arrests targeted rich millionaires, accusing them of communism and counter-revolutionary activities. Chiang also enforced an anti-Japanese boycott, sending his agents to sack the shops of those who sold Japanese made items, fining them. Chiang also disregarded the Internationally protected International Settlement, putting cages on its borders, threatening to have the merchants placed in there. According to Article 28 of the Chinese constitution, The state maintains public order and suppresses treasonable and other counter-revolutionary activities; It penalizes actions that endanger public security and disrupt the socialist economy and other

criminal activities, and punishes and reforms criminals. Usage of the term Edit The word counter-revolutionary is often used interchangeably with reactionary ; however, some reactionary people use the term counter-revolutionary to describe their opponents, even if those opponents were advocates of a revolution. In general, the word "reactionary" is used to describe those who oppose a more long-term trend of social change, while "counter-revolutionaries" are those who oppose a very recent and sudden change. The clerics who took power following the Iranian Revolution became counter-revolutionaries; after the revolution the Marxists were driven out of power by the mullahs. Thousands of political prisoners who opposed the Islamist regime were killed especially during the Massacre of Iranian Prisoners. Sometimes it is unclear who represents the revolution and who represents the counter-revolution. In Hungary, the uprising was condemned as a counter-revolution by the ruling Communist authorities who claimed to be revolutionary themselves. However, thirty years later, the events of were more widely known as a revolution. Hour after hour they marched by [in the May Day Parade] When not otherwise occupied I have a subconscious habit of counting. It had not been difficult to estimate the number of the military because of the regularity of their formations I arrived at an approximate total of the paraders. That evening, I dined with friends at the Metropol Hotel. Among them was a new acquaintance, a Communist official. Three of the party guessed. Each said a million. I was surprised at such unanimity. The atmosphere of the room changed instantly. There was a dead silence of extreme tension. Then, like a whiplash, came the voice of the Communist official. It is vital to know the truth. With you it is only a bourgeois concept. With us it has a different meaning. When we go before the world and say a million workers marched in Red Square today, that means something.

Chapter 3 : Cuban Revolution - Wikipedia

A counter-revolutionary or anti-revolutionary is anyone who opposes a revolution, particularly those who act after a revolution to try to overturn or reverse it, in full or in part. The adjective, "counter-revolutionary", pertains to movements that would restore the state of affairs, or the principles, that prevailed during a prerevolutionary era.

Fulgencio Batista , a former soldier who had served as the elected president of Cuba from 1934 to 1940, became president for the second time in 1940, after seizing power in a military coup and canceling the elections. In the months following the March coup, Fidel Castro , then a young lawyer and activist, petitioned for the overthrow of Batista, whom he accused of corruption and tyranny. Batista was known as a corrupt leader as he constantly pampered himself with elegant foods and exotic women. He had around 100,000 factory and farm workers. After an hour of fighting the rebel leader fled to the mountains. In a highly political trial, Fidel spoke for nearly four hours in his defense, ending with the words "Condemn me, it does not matter. History will absolve me. The yacht arrived in Cuba on 2 December. After arriving and exiting the ship, the band of rebels began to make their way into the Sierra Maestra mountains, a range in southeastern Cuba. The dispersed survivors, alone or in small groups, wandered through the mountains, looking for each other. Eventually, the men would link up again with the help of peasant sympathizers and would form the core leadership of the guerrilla army. The attack ended in utter failure. The handful of survivors included Dr. S oil refineries and other U. A pirate radio station called Radio Rebelde "Rebel Radio" was set up in February , allowing Castro and his forces to broadcast their message nationwide within enemy territory. The Cuban air force rapidly deteriorated: The army sent some 12,000 soldiers, half of them untrained recruits, into the mountains, along with his own brother Raul. With his forces pinned down by superior numbers, Castro asked for, and received, a temporary cease-fire on 1 August. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. December Learn how and when to remove this template message The enemy soldier in the Cuban example which at present concerns us, is the junior partner of the dictator; he is the man who gets the last crumb left by a long line of profiteers that begins in Wall Street and ends with him. He is disposed to defend his privileges, but he is disposed to defend them only to the degree that they are important to him. His salary and his pension are worth some suffering and some dangers, but they are never worth his life. If the price of maintaining them will cost it, he is better off giving them up; that is to say, withdrawing from the face of the guerrilla danger. Nonetheless, the combined rebel army continued the offensive, and Cienfuegos won a key victory in the Battle of Yaguajay on 30 December , earning him the nickname "The Hero of Yaguajay". On 31 December , the Battle of Santa Clara took place in a scene of great confusion. News of these defeats caused Batista to panic. He fled Cuba by air for the Dominican Republic just hours later on 1 January Comandante William Alexander Morgan, leading RD rebel forces, continued fighting as Batista departed, and had captured the city of Cienfuegos by 2 January. The forces of Guevara and Cienfuegos entered Havana at about the same time. Castro himself arrived in Havana on 8 January after a long victory march. Tete Puebla , second in command of the Mariana Grajales Platoon , has said: Women in Cuba have always been on the front line of the struggle. There were many women comrades who were tortured and murdered. From the beginning there were women in the Revolutionary Armed Forces. First they were simple soldiers, later sergeants. Those of us in the Mariana Grajales Platoon were the first officers. We are telling these countries to make their own revolution. About of the accused people were convicted of political crimes by revolutionary tribunals and then executed by firing squad ; others received long sentences of imprisonment. This was part of a large-scale attempt by Fidel Castro to cleanse the security forces of Batista loyalists and potential opponents of the new revolutionary government. Laws were introduced to provide equality for black Cubans and greater rights for women, while there were attempts to improve communications, medical facilities, health, housing, and education. In addition, there were touring cinemas, art exhibitions, concerts, and theatres. By the end of the s, all Cuban children were receiving some education compared with less than half before , unemployment and corruption were reduced, and great improvements were made in hygiene and sanitation. His anti-discrimination legislation was his first and major attempt to give equality to the people of

Cuba. His many reforms healthcare, education, and equality gave opportunities to those Afro-Cubans who lived in poverty because of the racial discrimination in Cuba. After he considered to have done everything in his power toward equality, he passed a legislation that counter-attacked his past anti-discrimination legislation. This law made it illegal to even mention discrimination or the topic of equality. One of the first policies of the newly formed Cuban government was eliminating illiteracy and implementing land reforms. Land reform efforts helped to raise living standards by subdividing larger holdings into cooperatives. Comandante Sori Marin , who was nominally in charge of land reform, objected and fled, but was eventually executed when he returned to Cuba with arms and explosives, intending to overthrow the Castro government. Cuba began expropriating land and private property under the auspices of the Agrarian Reform Law of 17 May Hundreds of members of the church, including a bishop, were permanently expelled from the nation, as the new Cuban government declared itself officially atheist. Education also saw significant changes – private schools were banned and the progressively socialist state assumed greater responsibility for children. Before he died Lansky said Cuba "ruined" him. Castro remained the ruler of Cuba, first as Prime Minister and, from , as President , until his retirement in February 20, I believe that we created, built and manufactured the Castro movement out of whole cloth and without realizing it. I believe that the accumulation of these mistakes has jeopardized all of Latin America. The great aim of the Alliance for Progress is to reverse this unfortunate policy. This is one of the most, if not the most, important problems in America foreign policy. I can assure you that I have understood the Cubans. I approved the proclamation which Fidel Castro made in the Sierra Maestra, when he justifiably called for justice and especially yearned to rid Cuba of corruption. I will go even further: Now we shall have to pay for those sins. In the matter of the Batista regime, I am in agreement with the first Cuban revolutionaries. In , the U. Embargo against Cuba – the longest-lasting single foreign policy in American history [77] – is still in force as of , although it has undergone a partial loosening in recent years, although it was recently strengthened in Influenced by the expansion of the Soviet Union into Europe after the Russian Revolution , Castro immediately sought to "export" his revolution to other countries in the Caribbean and beyond, sending weapons to Algerian rebels as early as The end of Soviet economic aid led to an economic crisis and famine known as the Special Period in Cuba. Operating out of the Escambray Mountains , these counterrevolutionary rebels, also known as Alzados, made a number of unsuccessful attempts to overthrow the Cuban government, including the abortive, United States-backed Bay of Pigs Invasion of

Chapter 4 : Sanctity: Our Counterrevolutionary Grand Strategy - calendrierdelascience.com

A counterrevolutionary revolt, by C. Tilly. Who were the Jacobins? By C. Brinton. Was there a Girondin party? By M. J. Sydenham.

Introduction My talk today will be a brief elucidation of the following thesis: Blessed Columba Marmion says this of sanctity, which we will make our definition: To be through grace what Jesus is by nature is the end-purpose of our predestination and the norm of our holiness. Human sanctity consists in a participation in this. The French and Russian Revolutions are the notable historical examples that clearly illustrate the evil of revolutions, but revolution, as a spiritual phenomenon, predates these: It is seen in the ideals of Freemasonry, in the Enlightenment, in Protestantism, in the Renaissance rejection of Medieval Christian Civilization – indeed, in the very Fall of Man itself, and in that earlier Fall of Lucifer and his rebel angels. Further, military historian B. Liddell Hart says about grand strategy: Grand strategy should both calculate and develop the economic resources and man-power of nations in order to sustain the fighting services. Grand strategy, too, should regulate the distribution of power between the several services, and between the services and industry. It should not only combine the various instruments, but so regulate their use as to avoid damage to the future state of peace – for its security and prosperity. What are our counterrevolutionary goals? As avowed counterrevolutionaries, we have goals. Let me state a few of them: Militating against the order of things that entered the world with the Outrage at Anagni in , which was an ill omen for the unity of throne and altar that had defined Christendom in the Ages of Faith. Militating against the heresies and social catastrophe wrought by the Protestant Revolt, improperly called a Reformation. Militating against the spirit of the French Revolution of and the Russian Communist Revolution of What are our goals positively stated? What we positively affirm against all these negations is principally twofold: First, it is effective and salvific Ecclesial Communion for all – that is, a life of union with the Holy Trinity for everyone through membership in the Mystical Body of Christ, which is, the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, outside of which there is no salvation. While distinct, these two goals are interconnected. In asserting these positive goals, we are effectively opposing all revolution in whatever form it may take: Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. It is a multi-generational goal that will only end when the Church Militant ceases to exist because it has been fully assumed into the Church Triumphant. Why is Sanctity our Grand Strategy for these goals? The French ultramontane thinker, Joseph de Maistre, said: The revolutionary tears down, while the counterrevolutionary builds up. The revolutionary is a bully, a murderer; he hurls Molotov cocktails and terrorizes noncombatants. Counterrevolutionaries may not descend to such methods. Jesus Christ has won. Saint Paul exhorts us to gratitude to our Heavenly Father for making us partakers in that victory; he says: For us, it is a matter of our abiding in Him and Him in us to ensure our participating in this victory. For this reason, remaining in Christ is not only a good strategy, it is a guaranteed strategy for achieving salvation. What can be said of the ultimate victory of salvation may be said mutatis mudandis of our quotidian battles in the Church militant – for these are, each and all, but smaller campaigns in an epic battle that began in Genesis and ends in the Apocalypse. The first and most important reason why sanctity is our grand strategy is that Jesus Christ is the first and ultimate Counterrevolutionary, and only as His members can we conquer the Revolution. If Lucifer is the first revolutionary, Jesus Christ is the first counterrevolutionary, for He came to restore the pre-revolutionary state of affairs. He is the ultimate counterrevolutionary because His victory over Revolution will be total. Saint Jerome, by the way, translated the passage from Ephesians into Latin as instaurare omnia in Christo, which was chosen by Saint Pius X as his episcopal motto. Original sin made him forfeit the likeness his participation in divine nature by grace, i. For it was for this end that the Word of God was made man, and He who was the Son of God became the Son of man, that man, having been taken into the Word, and receiving the adoption, might become the son of God. For by no other means could we have attained to incorruptibility and immortality, unless we had been united to incorruptibility and immortality. But how could we be joined to incorruptibility and immortality, unless, first, incorruptibility and immortality had become that which we also are, so that the corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruptibility, and the mortal by immortality, that

might receive the adoption of sons? Irenaeus of Lyons, St. We see here that God took on our corruptible and mortal human nature to make that nature incorruptible and immortal. Having accomplished this in His own sacred humanity, Jesus then bestows this incorruption and immortality upon us, His members, as a gift of divine grace. In other words, by divinizing his own human nature, Christ becomes the cause of our divinization — that is, of our sanctity. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in me. I am the vine: We cannot bear the fruit of counterrevolutionary victory without effective union with Jesus by grace. As for sanctifying others, we are equally, if not even more dependent of Christ. These, his sent ones, will spread His truth and conquer the world for Him. Imagine being preoccupied with secondary means in the great culture wars and missing out on the point of it all — the Kingdom of God and His justice. Saint Paul therefore warns us in these words to the Romans: Here is another reason why Sanctity is our Grand Strategy: If they are not doing so for themselves as individuals, and their families as small social units, then they are going about things the wrong way. I have no time to develop this theme, but it would be good to point out here that effective Counterrevolutionary movements have always employed this means. These would include the great movements of monastic reform emanating from Cluny, Citeaux, Vallombroasa, La Grande Chartreuse, La Trappe, and myriad other foundations; also the Mendicant Friars and their phalanxes of Third Orders in the High Middle Ages; and let us not forget the renewed religious fervor of the Counter-Reformation with its Jesuits, Theatines, Barnabites, and Capuchins. And what of those fighting for authentic political restoration? Gabriel Garcia Moreno — a man of great personal sanctity — comes to mind. Replies to Objections Some may object that effective counterrevolution in all the necessary fields of endeavor demands science, tactics, method, strategy — in short, a systematic approach requiring specialized knowledge. And sanctity, they would say, does not provide that. In response, I offer a few considerations: The first is of a speculative nature: The second response is more practical, albeit equally theological in its principles: At times, this happens with ease and sweetness, the more the resulting actions are results of the gifts. All this pertains to sanctity because it is a matter of practicing Christian virtue and being receptive to the gifts. Since the battle we are fighting against revolution is ultimately a supernatural one, we need supernatural means. Do not all the manifold episodes of the Israelites fighting and winning against impossible odds teach us that union with the First Cause of all Victory is the most prudent means of achieving victory? For those immersed in the practical end of things, let me declare that such Christian prudence is not opposed to common sense. We are not opposed to science, tactics, method, strategy, and specialized knowledge. A saint would not recommend that someone bring a knife to a gun fight. My thesis is not pietism: But if we do not do this in union with God, we are fighting as one beating the air. My thesis is not quietism: Nor do I exclude the necessity of activity on our part, both in the spiritual life itself and in the external life of our labors for the Kingdom of Christ. How to Achieve This Now we consider how to achieve sanctity. Evidently, we need to practice the fundamentals of a spiritual life: Beyond that quick summary, I have no intention of giving a systematic treatment on achieving sanctity. Rather, I would like to touch upon a handful of topics that may be helpful to you. The full scope of faith is not, therefore less than their contents, but it is more than their contents. Faith includes all that God has revealed of Himself and His works, from the most cosmically grand to the most intimately personal. That the trial of your faith much more precious than gold which is tried by the fire may be found unto praise and glory and honour at the appearing of Jesus Christ: Faith united to the gifts of knowledge and understanding, and a life of prayer, gives us a supernatural vision of the world. By this living and deep Faith, we see the same external realities that unbelievers see, but we see beyond the surface of things to the eternal verities not grasped by the natural man. We see this because our God is the true light, and He communicates this light to us in Faith. The Prayerful and Docile embrace of suffering. The Catholic counterrevolutionary has for his weapons the theological virtues, the moral virtues, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. He also realizes the value of the Cross. Seeing suffering in the supernatural light of Faith, Hope, and Charity, he realizes that the Cross is our way to salvation. The revolutionary aims to make a painless world, a utopia, and ends up causing everyone tremendous pain. He speaks of a bloodless struggle and ends up spilling gallons of blood. The counterrevolutionary is no utopian, and realizes that suffering is necessary for his aims, but he embraces that suffering himself, in union with that first

Counterrevolutionary. He knows that victory is not cheaply bought, and sees triumph in the midst of apparent defeat — for that is the Mystery of the Holy Cross. The revolutionaries and their revolutions will cause us suffering. Of this there can be no doubt. This is why Christ remedied the worst effects of the fall without getting rid of them all. Salvation is now possible through the Cross. If we profit from the suffering our revolutionaries inflict on us, we fulfill the words of the psalmist: We should practice a generous love of our enemies.

Chapter 5 : Project MUSE - French Peasants in Revolt

*counterrevolutionary - a revolutionary whose aim is to reverse the changes introduced by an earlier revolution
counterrevolutionist, counter-revolutionist revolutionary, revolutionist, subversive, subverter - a radical supporter of
political or social revolution.*

Counterrevolution, regicide, and the Reign of Terror The events in France gave new hope to the revolutionaries who had been defeated a few years previously in the United Provinces , Belgium , and Switzerland. Likewise, all those who wanted changes in England , Ireland , the German states, the Austrian lands, or Italy looked upon the Revolution with sympathy. A number of French counterrevolutionaries—nobles, ecclesiastics, and some bourgeois—abandoned the struggle in their own country and emigrated. The rulers were at first indifferent to the Revolution but began to worry when the National Constituent Assembly proclaimed a revolutionary principle of international law—namely, that a people had the right of self-determination. In accordance with this principle, the papal territory of Avignon was reunited with France on September 13, 1793. By early 1793 both radicals, eager to spread the principles of the Revolution, and the king, hopeful that war would either strengthen his authority or allow foreign armies to rescue him, supported an aggressive policy. France declared war against Austria on April 20, 1793. In the first phase of the war April—September , France suffered defeats; Prussia joined the war in July, and an Austro-Prussian army crossed the frontier and advanced rapidly toward Paris. At the beginning of September, the Parisian crowd broke into the prisons and massacred the nobles and clergy held there. Meanwhile, volunteers were pouring into the army as the Revolution had awakened French nationalism. In a final effort the French forces checked the Prussians on September 20, 1793, at Valmy. On the same day, a new assembly, the National Convention , met. The next day it proclaimed the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of the republic. Belgium , the Rhineland , Savoy , and the county of Nice were occupied by French armies. Despite efforts made by the Girondins, Louis XVI was judged by the Convention, condemned to death for treason, and executed on January 21, 1793; Marie-Antoinette was guillotined nine months later. Execution of Louis XVI, Austria, Prussia , and Great Britain formed a coalition later called the First Coalition , to which most of the rulers of Europe adhered. France lost Belgium and the Rhineland, and invading forces threatened Paris. These reverses, as those of had done, strengthened the extremists. The Girondin leaders were driven from the National Convention, and the Montagnards, who had the support of the Paris sansculottes workers, craftsmen, and shopkeepers , seized power and kept it until 9 Thermidor, year II, of the new French republican calendar July 27, 1794. The Montagnards were bourgeois liberals like the Girondins but under pressure from the sansculottes, and, in order to meet the requirements of defense, they adopted a radical economic and social policy. These exceptional measures provoked violent reactions: Opposition, however, was broken by the Reign of Terror 19 Fructidor, year I—9 Thermidor, year II [September 5, —July 27, 1794], which entailed the arrest of at least 17,000 suspects, 17,000 of whom were sentenced to death and executed while more died in prisons or were killed without any form of trial. At the same time, the revolutionary government raised an army of more than one million men. Victory made the Terror and the economic and social restrictions seem pointless. Soon after his fall the Maximum was abolished, the social laws were no longer applied, and efforts toward economic equality were abandoned. Royalists even tried to seize power in Paris but were crushed by the young Gen. A few days later the National Convention dispersed.

Chapter 6 : War in the Vendée - Wikipedia

Start studying Western Civ II Midterm. Learn vocabulary, terms, and more with flashcards, games, and other study tools.

But we usually had no clear idea of what being a social historian might entail. Social history would mean moving beyond studies of politics and intellectual life, focusing on ordinary people rather than on elites and on aspects of their lives not covered by conventional historical accounts. It also seemed obvious to me that writing social history would mean having recourse to methods and theories borrowed from the social sciences. But most work in sociology, economics, geography, or political science was not very promising; it seemed deeply present-minded and unduly obsessed with technical questions and quantitative methods. What was lacking was research by social scientists that seemed genuinely historical—that, for example, was sensitive to such narrative problems as contingency, context, and agency or that made use of serious archival research. It tackled a major problem of historical interpretation, contained splendidly detailed archival research about ordinary people, and told a cracking good story—and it did all this from a distinctly sociological standpoint. Smelser had himself published an important historical- William H. An earlier version of this article was presented in Oct. French Historical Studies, Vol. But the existing historical literature on the nineteenth-century French working class did not impress me. To caricature the field only a little, one might say that typical studies of workers around claimed that the factory system had led to terrible urban poverty but that workers responded by forming unions and getting involved in early socialist and political movements. The problem was that the data used to demonstrate urban poverty typically concerned marginally employed subproletarians rather than factory workers and that the union and political movements were almost entirely staffed by artisans—who were neither impoverished subproletarians nor factory workers. In short, the supposed causes industrialization and poverty generally happened to different people than the supposed effects radicalization. I had already decided that what was needed was a serious study of variations in the experiences and political behavior of different sectors of the working class. I hoped to carry out such a study in some 2 Neil J. Smelser, Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: Smelser and Tilly had actually been graduate students together at Harvard University, but they were not friends. Smelser was recruited into the Harvard Society of Fellows and then the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley; Tilly got an assistant professorship at the University of Delaware. But models for sorting out the distinct historical experiences and behaviors of different groups of workers—thereby making possible a convincing explanation of working-class responses to industrialization—were simply lacking. Although Tilly was concerned with quite different problems, his book provided a splendid example of the sort of analysis I sought. I read it straight through as soon as it arrived. It quickly became the prime aspirational model for my dissertation research and has ever since resided in my personal pantheon of great books. Even though it mainly concerned peasants and bourgeois rather than workers, and the eighteenth rather than the nineteenth century, it supplied a brilliant model of the sort of detailed local social-historical inquiry that I had in mind. It appeared in a flurry of other books that also helped inspire my research. It seduced me all over again. Its principal seduction in had derived from its stunningly novel approach to historical social science. It helped inaugurate a new style of historical social science that has changed both history and historical sociology. History prior to this time tended to be long on description and narration but short on explanation, at least on the sort of explanation a sociologist might recognize as such. Most sociology at the time was highly ahistorical, and the few historical sociologists around tended to focus on large-scale and long-term transformations—and they rarely engaged in serious archival research. They saw their role as making sense of the myriad relevant facts that historian worker bees provided for their grand syntheses. Studies in the History of Labour London, Moreover, he tried to explain it by using archival evidence; in this respect, his research resembled that of historians. But it also differed from most historical research because it asked a different, fully sociological set of questions and pursued the questions by recognizably sociological methods—systematic comparison and quantification. But their typical question, he believed, was sociologically naive. First, he noted that not all peasants in the west of France revolted, but only those in certain subregions. His first question, then, was: How did the social

structure of rebellious regions differ from that of regions that stayed loyal to the French Revolution? He also noted that even within the rebellious areas, different towns or villages and different classes responded differently to the Revolution. Again, he asked how these classes and settlements differed from each other. His strategy of explanation was to establish first the gross differences between rebellious and loyal regions, then to establish what it was about the social structures of the rebellious regions that led to political conflicts, and finally to zero in on a few particularly conflict-prone localities to show how, in exquisite detail, the structure of local social relations—subjected to enormous economic, political, and religious stress in the first years of the revolutionary era—led to a spiral of conflict that finally burst forth into civil war. If most historical sociologists in the late 1800s or early 1900s aggregated local or regional studies upward into grand generalizations about macrohistorical trends, Tilly reversed the direction of inquiry, instead drilling down ever more deeply into local social relations to grasp the dynamics that led to a particular, highly consequential, local rebellion. In puzzling out the patterns of local social relations, Tilly showed great methodological flexibility and ingenuity. Wherever possible, he constructed quantitative measures, usually from raw data in the archives: For him the important thing was not the methodology but the object to be explained: Rather than presenting his account as a sequential historical narrative or as a systematic testing of a set of hypotheses, Tilly structured the rhetoric of his account around his inquiry. The structure of the book as a whole—its division into chapters—follows the structure of the argument. It begins with a brief account of what is to be explained the counterrevolution; proceeds to the organizing theoretical notion urbanization; then dissects the social structure of southern Anjou piece by piece cities and regions, classes, rural neighborhoods, religious organization, rural economy, and political organization; proceeds to show how the French Revolution intervened in the various spheres of social life economics, religion, and politics; and then, only in the final chapter, gives an account of the counterrevolution itself—which, given all that has come before, seems inevitable and entirely explicable. The rhetoric is also structured around inquiry within each of the chapters. Tilly tells the reader here, I can almost hear his engagingly didactic voice what he is attempting to explain, what evidence he is using, how he constructs the measures, what their shortcomings are, what is solidly demonstrated and what is merely a hunch, and so on. One feels not only that one is learning an enormous amount about a past society but also that one is learning how to go about social-historical research and how sociological reasoning works. Here are a couple of representative passages about patterns of intermarriage from his chapter on the rural neighborhood: Such simple percentages, however, are affected by the size of the group in question and do not reveal the choices that individuals make when they do venture outside their own group. For this, something subtler is called for. The pattern of marriages confirms the division of the rural community of southern Anjou into major classes, corroborates its broader division into agricultural and commercial complexes, and urges the conclusion that these divisions extended to personal friendship, access, and alliance. Indeed, the findings are sufficiently definite and provocative to leave one longing for an adequate comparison of the subregions of southern Anjou. The limits of the present sample, however, leave that admirable objective unattainable. Over time, I have come to see certain weaknesses. For example, it introduced an offbeat but interesting concept of urbanization that was never taken up by later researchers, Tilly included. It claimed that the difference between the revolutionary plaine region and the counterrevolutionary bocage could be summarized as a difference in levels and timing of urbanization rather than, as Marc Bloch had long since pointed out, a contrast between two distinct agrarian civilizations whose perduring differences go back into the mists of prehistory. *An Essay on Its Basic Characteristics*, ed. Janet Sondheim Berkeley, CA, Fields New York, It transformed historical sociology by opening up to sociology the archival study of the dynamics of past societies. And it demonstrated to historians that sociological concepts and methods could be applied to historical questions without stifling their historical quality. Historical social science was, I believe, enduringly transformed by the example of this splendid book, as the many historical studies influenced by Tilly attest. Although he never ceased to prowl the archives, his later work was much more in the mold of previous historical sociology: I miss, in the later work, the sense of creative tension between the particular and the general. For this book, Tilly took the time to gather copious data, to weigh and perfect his arguments, to carefully shape his rhetoric. Merriman, *The Agony of the Republic: Margadant, French*

Peasants in Revolt: Hanagan, The Logic of Solidarity: Lehning, The Peasants of Marlhes: Reddy, The Rise of Market Culture: A few fragments appeared as articles: Between and Tilly published thirteen books. There may still be more in the pipeline. There were, obviously, great gains from the speeding up of his productivity. But I think there were losses as well. Rather than structuring his account around the progressive unfolding of his argument, he announced his conclusion in the first chapter of each book and then proceeded to demonstrate in the remaining chapters that the conclusions were indeed sound. Tarrow, Markoff, and Beissinger used the same type of data, but they dug much deeper into it, producing more dynamic, nuanced, and surprising accounts of political contention. One of the conditions of their success, I am convinced, is the time and care these authors took in preparing their books—well over a decade of unstinting work in the cases of Markoff and Beissinger, and nine years in the case of Tarrow. During the years devoted to these two books from, roughly, the early 80s to the mid-90s he published another five sole-authored and two coauthored books, five edited books, and dozens of articles and chapters. None of the books received the attention, the reworking, the 11 Charles Tilly, The Contentious French: All of us who knew Tilly miss his eternally boyish character, his seemingly inextinguishable energy extinguished at last, his vast knowledge, his theoretical fertility, his unfailing scholarly generosity, and, yes, the incessant flow of stimulating books and articles. But I, for one, have been missing something of that unique and thrilling voice I discovered back in for a much longer time.

Counterrevolutionary definition, characteristic of or resulting from a counterrevolution. See more.

In one of his most famous arguments, Alexis de Tocqueville asserted that the administrative centralization most observers attributed to the Revolution of actually occurred under the Old Regime. The Intendants and other royal officers installed by Louis XIII and his successors had, he thought, almost imperceptibly supplanted a oncedominant aristocracy. They had adroitly erected an effective, centralized structure while edging great lords and parlements out of administration and into mere politics. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that whenever a nation destroys its aristocracy, it almost automatically tends toward a centralization of power; a greater effort is then needed to hold it back than to encourage it to move in this direction. All the authorities existing within it are affected by this instinctive urge to coalesce, and much skill is needed to keep them separate. Thus the democratic revolution, though it did away with so many institutions of the past, was led inevitably to consolidate this one; centralization fitted in so well with the program of the new social order that the common error of believing it to have been a creation of the Revolution is easily accounted for. At the top, French ministers and kings from Louis XIII onward cowed the haughty gouverneurs and grandes who had once administered much of provincial France and had frequently raised the standard of rebellion; great aristocrats became decorative adjuncts of royal officialdom. The Intendants who made the transition from roving troubleshooters to fixed regional administrators under Richelieu and Mazarin spearheaded the process of centralization. In important ways, as Tocqueville thought, that centralized structure provided models and precedents for revolutionary changes. Yet Tocqueville misperceived, or misrepresented, the Old Regime system in two significant ways. Only during the Revolution did these last barriers fall. To what extent, how, and with what political consequences, did the revolutionaries of "forward the centralizing effort of the Old Regime monarchy? In the process, it also 4 gives reasons for thinking that in the sphere of the state something like a bourgeois revolution did, despite all recent doubts, actually occur. Between and most European states shifted from indirect to direct rule. Up to the eighteenth century, all but the smallest states generally relied on privileged intermediaries—nobles, priests, municipal oligarchies, officeholders licensed but no more than loosely controlled by the crown—to collect taxes, contract loans, recruit soldiers, administer justice, and carry on the rest of royal business at the local level. Citizens dealt rarely and reluctantly with supervised full-time employees of the national state. Indirect rule included a wide range of social arrangements: States had substituted their own officials for the patrons of old, tax farming and similar practices had almost vanished, elected legislatures connected the more substantial citizens to the national government, and census-takers brought royal inquiries to individual households, as national bureaucracies attempted to monitor and regulate whole countries and all their residents. To be sure, landlords and tycoons still wielded disproportionate power and bent the state apparatus to their own ends. More than anything else, the exigencies of war, preparation for war, and payment for war drove the transition from indirect to direct rule. Before the French state, like almost all other states, ruled indirectly at the local level, relying especially on priests and nobles for mediation. At the same time, those whose social survival depended most directly on the Old Regime state—nobles, officeholders, and higher clergy are the obvious examples—generally aligned themselves with the king. With significant defections of military men from the crown and the formation of militias devoted to the popular cause, the opposition acquired force of its own. The popular bloc, connected and often led by members of the bourgeoisie, started to gain control over parts of the state apparatus. The lawyers, officials, and other bourgeois who seized the state apparatus in "rapidly displaced the old intermediaries: Village "republics" of the Alps, for example, found their ancient liberties—including ostensibly free consent to taxes—crumbling as outsiders clamped them into the new administrative machine. They installed direct rule. In the great commercial centers, where merchants, lawyers, and professionals already clustered, departmental officials who frequently came, in any case, from the same milieu had no choice but to bargain with the locals. In great mercantile centers such as Marseille and Lyon, the political situation was very different. By and large, the federalist movement, with its protests against Jacobin centralism

and its demands for regional autonomy, took root in cities whose commercial positions greatly outpaced their administrative rank. In dealing with these alternative obstacles to direct rule, Parisian revolutionaries improvised three parallel, and sometimes conflicting, systems of rule: To collect information and gain support, all three relied extensively on the existing personal networks of lawyers, professionals, and merchants. As the system began to work, revolutionary leaders strove to routinize their control and contain independent action by local enthusiasts, who often resisted. Using both cooptation and repression, they gradually squeezed out the committees and militias. That shift entailed changes in systems of taxation, justice, public works, and much more. The Revolutionaries changed things. With respect to ordinary people, they moved from reactive to proactive policing and information-gathering: But with the Directory the state concentrated surveillance and apprehension in a single centralized organization. Going to war accelerated the move from indirect to direct rule. Almost any state that makes war finds that it cannot pay for the effort from its accumulated reserves and current revenues. Almost all warring states borrow extensively, raise taxes, and seize the means of combat—including men—from reluctant citizens who have other uses for their resources. Prerevolutionary France followed these rules faithfully, to the point of accumulating debts that eventually forced the calling of the Estates-General. Nor did the Revolution repeal the rules. The French used their own new system as a template for the reconstruction of other states. As revolutionary and imperial armies conquered, they attempted to build replicas of that system of direct rule elsewhere in Europe. Resistance and counterrevolutionary action followed directly from the process by which the new state established direct rule. Remember how much change revolutionaries introduced in a very short time. All this occurred between and All in all, these changes constituted a dramatic, rapid substitution of uniform, centralized, direct rule for a system of government mediated by local and regional notables. What is more, the new state hierarchy consisted largely of lawyers, physicians, notaries, merchants, and other bourgeois. Like their prerevolutionary counterparts, these fundamental changes attacked many existing interests and opened opportunities to groups that had previously had little access to state-sanctioned power—especially the village and small-town bourgeoisie. As a result, they precipitated both resistance and struggles for power. In such a region, large leaseholders *fermiers* dominated local politics, but only within limits set by their noble and ecclesiastical landlords. They survived the challenge, however, as a class, if not as a particular set of individuals: Yet their replacements came disproportionately from the same class of comfortable leaseholders. Although the larger farmers, viewed with suspicion by national authorities, lost some of their grip on public office during the Terror and again under the Directory, they regained it later and continued to rule their roosts through the middle of the nineteenth century. By that time, nobles and ecclesiastics had lost much of their capacity to contain local powerholders, but manufacturers, merchants, and other capitalists had taken their places. The displacement of the old intermediaries opened the way to a new alliance between large farmers and bourgeoisie. Jessenne tells us nothing about the political process by which direct rule descended on revolutionary France. His close kin were lawyers, notaries, and merchants in Forez, a region not far to the west of Lyon. The family was on the ascendant in the eighteenth century, and Claude himself was a well-connected thirty-year-old *avocat* at Montbrison in We see an almost unbelievable attempt to extend the direct administrative purview of the central government to everyday individual life. We therefore gain insight into the conflict between two objectives of the Terror: We discover again the great importance of control over food as an administrative challenge, as a point of political contention, and as an incentive to popular action. Most of the resistance, it is true, took the form of evasion, cheating, and sabotage rather than outright rebellion; it employed what James Scott calls "weapons of the weak. Counterrevolution occurred not where everyone opposed the Revolution, but where irreconcilable differences divided well-defined blocs of supporters and opponents. The departments having more than executions included: These departments accounted for 89 percent of all executions under the Terror. In the South and Southwest, Languedoc, Provence, Gascony, and the Lyonnais hosted military insurrections against the Revolution, insurrections whose geography corresponded closely to support for federalism. The autonomist movement peaked in commercial cities that had enjoyed extensive liberties under the Old Regime, notably Marseille, Bordeaux, Lyon, and Caen. In those cities and their hinterlands, France fell into bloody civil war. That phase saw massacres of "patriots" and

"aristocrats" as the proponents and opponents of the Revolution came to be called, invasion and temporary occupation of such major cities as Angers, and pitched battles between armies of Blues and Whites as the armed elements of the two parties were known. Historians have not disputed what happened in the West—especially south of the Loire—for fifty years or more. Even the militantly anticlerical Alphonse Aulard, writing eight decades ago, had the main sequence right: The Vendean, Breton, and Angevin peasantry did not at first rise in support of royalty, but in support of their clergy and against military service. Strongly attached to their priests, they were opposed on general grounds to the application of the civil constitution of the clergy, and had attended the Masses of non-juring priests at farm-houses, in chapels, or in the forest. Between March 10th and 15th a rising took place, to cries of *Pas de milice!* It was these priests who stirred the peasantry to anger, and presided over the first acts of civil warfare, and the first massacres of republicans. Since the s, furthermore, we have had a relatively clear idea of who participated on both sides, and when. The real controversies have concerned three issues: On those important scores, alas, little is settled: If the old ideas of a gigantic counterrevolutionary plot led by nobles and of a peasantry blindly loyal to king and country have almost disappeared from serious accounts, historians still disagree vigorously over sufficient causes and deep intentions. As it happens, the bicentennial-bound French have recently been debating the counterrevolution in a new light. Many "progressive" thinkers and historians still approve or justify the antireligious fervor of the revolutionaries. They are thus challenged by a recent discovery made by a year-old historian, Reynald Secher. Secher presented a remarkable doctoral thesis at the Sorbonne, subtitled "The Franco-French Genocide. About , civilians—including women and children—were massacred, in order that the "race" of Vendean be obliterated as a hindrance to the progress of the Revolution. They argued that the terrifying facts he exposed in his book were the logical and almost inevitable result of The Reign of Terror. As one of the author-critics who appeared on that fateful television broadcast with Reynald Secher, however, I deny both that we conceded his facts and that he has established them by means of precise reasoning and solid documentation. Michel Vovelle comments bitterly on the controversy: A whole literature is forming on "Franco-French genocide," starting from risky estimates of the number of fatalities in the Vendean wars: Despite not being specialists in the subject, historians such as Pierre Chaunu have put all the weight of their great moral authority behind the development of an anathematizing discourse, and have dismissed any effort to look at the subject reasonably. What did Secher do? First he completed a thoughtful, modest Third Cycle thesis rough equivalent of an American Ph. He described the bloody repression of counterrevolutionary La Chapelle-Basse-Mer but did not pronounce the fateful word "genocide. Although La Chapelle-Basse-Mer served him repeatedly as a reference point, Secher illustrated the arguments with wide citations of national and regional archives. Maniacal Carrier, who drowned boatloads of suspected counterrevolutionaries in the Loire, and ruthless Turreau, whose "infernal columns" of Republican troops undertook to level the whole region, have long burdened narratives of the counterrevolution. Secher broke with conventional historiography, nevertheless, in assessing the damage done by revolutionary repression. He then used dubious methods to estimate the losses of population and housing attributable to the counterrevolution and its repression.

Charles Tilly-and to a lesser extent, those of Marcel Faucheux-into the social and economic background of the counterrevolutionary move- ments.4 For Bois and Tilly, it was ultimately the relative degree of economic.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: However much Republicanism eventually acquired a rural following during the Third Republic , it is a commonplace of French historiography that left-wing opposition to the successive authoritarian regimes in nineteenth-century France was strongest in the cities and weakest in the countryside. Yet in I the cities were generally calm, while small towns and rural communities in obscure corners of the land raised the standard of revolt. One solution to this problem consists in reinterpreting the political protest as an outburst of social discontent in backward regions of the nation. If it can be shown that areas of revolt in I suffered from either chronic poverty or serious economic decline during the Second Republic, popular insurgency can be viewed as a displacement of economic grievances and social tensions into the realm of politics. Such an argument will be all the stronger if Republican resistance occurred in areas that had experienced riots and demonstrations against deteriorating economic conditions in previous years. Economic backwardness and endemic protest then become the underlying causes of popular violence in I. The search for economic causes of popular rebellion during the Second Republic finds powerful inspiration in the earlier history of France. IDuring the seventeenth century the insatiable fiscal demands of the Monarchy had provoked large-scale tax rebellions in many areas of the country. Among the causes of revolutionary and counterrevolutionary mobilizations were the high price of grain and the difficulty of provisioning to,vns; the burden of seigneurial dues, tithes, and taxes; restrictions on communal rights of usage to common lands; and collapsing markets for 1 Roland Mousnier, Peasant Uprisings in Seventeenth-Century France, Russia, and China, trans. Brian Pearce New York, , pp. Nor did economic protests cease with the reassertion of centralized authority. Direct action in defense of economic interestscheaper food, lower taxes, free access to forests-culminated in the mid-century crisis from to Only in the second half of the century did such traditional forms of popular protest disappear almost entirely from the French countryside. The Marxist scholar Albert Soboul was the first to make such a connection explicit. In a series of articles entitled "The Agrarian Troubles of ," he presented a general view of rural protest during the Second Republic as a defense of the traditional peasant community against the intrusion of capitalist agriculture. The saIne areas of central, southwestern , and southeastern France that witnessed riots against enclosures , forest disorders, labor agitation, and tax revolts in were the zones of insurrection in I. The small farmers and sharecroppers of these areas adopted a variety of forms of struggle, but their aim remained the same: You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Wars of the Vendée, (), counterrevolutionary insurrections in the west of France during the French Revolution. The first and most important occurred in in the area known as the Vendée, which included large sections of the départements of Loire-Inférieure (Loire-Atlantique), Maine.

It was not until the social unrest combined with the external pressures from the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the introduction of a levy of , on the whole of France, decreed by the National Convention in February , that the region erupted. All but seven of the bishops refused the oath, as did about half of the parish priests. Nonjuring priests were exiled or imprisoned. Many lived on monastery properties, and they overwhelmingly embraced the Revolution after these lands were seized and redistributed among them by the republican government. There were other levy riots across France, when regions started to draft men into the army in response to the Levy Decree in February. The reaction in the northwest in early March was particularly pronounced with large scale rioting verging on insurrection. The first pitched battle was on the night of 19 March. After six hours of fighting rebel reinforcements arrived and routed the Republican forces. The rebels advanced as far south as Niort. In the north, on 22 March, another Republican force was routed near Chalonnnes. Having secured their pays, the deficiencies of the Vendean army became more apparent. Lacking a unified strategy or army and fighting a defensive campaign, from April onwards the army lost cohesion and its special advantages. Successes continued for some time: But the Vendean army then turned to a protracted siege of Nantes. The Vendean army had its first serious defeat at the Battle of Cholet on 17 October; worse for the rebels, their army was split. In October the main force, commanded by Henri de la Rochejaquelein and numbering some 25, followed by thousands of civilians of all ages , crossed the Loire, headed for the port of Granville where they expected to be greeted by a British fleet and an army of exiled French nobles. Arriving at Granville, they found the city surrounded by Republican forces, with no British ships in sight. Their attempts to take the city were unsuccessful. During the retreat, the extended columns fell prey to Republican forces; suffering from hunger and disease, they died in the thousands. The force was defeated in the last, decisive battle of Savenay on 23 December. I do not have a single prisoner to reproach me. I have exterminated them all. General Hoche applied these measures with great success. Treaties were concluded at La Jaunaie 15 February and at La Mabillaie , and were fairly well observed by the Vendean; no obstacle remained but the feeble and scattered remnant of the Vendean still under arms and the Chouans. On 30 July the state of siege was raised in the western departments. One of the leaders of this school of thought, Charles-Louis Chassin , published eleven volumes of letters, archives, and other materials supporting this position. The Vendean were no more blameless than were the republicans. The use of the word genocide is wholly inaccurate and inappropriate. McPhee asserted that these errors are as follows: Despite not being specialists in the subject, historians such as Pierre Chanu have put all the weight of their great moral authority behind the development of an anathematizing discourse, and have dismissed any effort to look at the subject reasonably. It is set during the French revolutionary wars and very loosely based on the chapter of the same name in C. Midshipman Hornblower and on the actual ill-fated Quiberon expedition of