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In December 1801, one of the largest fleets that France ever assembled gathered in Brest, Cherbourg, Le Havre, Flessingue, Rochefort, Toulon and Cadiz. Napoléon Bonaparte, First Consul of France, had instructed General Victoire Leclerc to sail to Saint-Domingue (Haiti), France’s most valuable colony in the Caribbean, and wrest it away from Toussaint Louverture, who had governed Saint-Domingue quasi-independently for the past three years. The mission was not an easy one, as black officers and soldiers were expected to fight any white army suspected of restoring slavery. Altogether, 43,830 soldiers (not including sailors and local militia) would sail for Saint-Domingue over the next eighteen months.¹ Few would return alive.

Ships-of-the-line, generals and soldiers: one might expect such martial terms to apply to a male-only world. Yet, Napoleonic-era armies carried with them a substantial contingent of wives, cooks and prostitutes, and numerous women and children could be found on the overcrowded decks of the French men-o’-war.² Many officers had brought their families on board, along with valets and maids.³ Some soldiers also brought their wives, who were entitled to an extra food ration at the army’s expense.⁴ Exiled planters, anxious to return to their estates after ten years of revolutionary upheaval, sneaked on the military vessels to cross the Atlantic free of charge. The captain of a later troop transport even brought his pregnant wife with him, though she died in labour during a frightful storm.⁵ Official documents list between 641 and 688 civilians in the Brest squadron alone. Of these, 103 were wives; 59 were children; another 214 were servants and individuals of undetermined sex.⁶ The actual numbers were probably higher, since many opportunists trying to join the expected gold – or rather sugar – rush travelled illicitly. Shortly after leaving Brest, the captain of the 74-gun Patriote found two young stowaways, one of whom, on closer inspection, turned out to be a woman who had sneaked on board disguised in sailor slops to follow her lover bound for Saint-Domingue.⁷

Women were equally present in Paris, where French authorities rushed through last-minute preparations. Unsure about the expedition, Leclerc requested to stay in France so that he could look after his sister Aimée. Bonaparte did not object to Leclerc’s argument that a woman could not live without male supervision; but he cleverly ordered that another man be in charge. ‘Tomorrow, your sister will be married. I don’t know yet who the husband will be, but she will be married’.⁸ Pauline Bonaparte, triply famous
as Leclerc’s wife, Bonaparte’s favourite sister and the most beautiful woman in France, was next on the First Consul’s to-do list. Fond of Paris’s nightlife, she was not eager to exile herself to the colonies, but eventually she, too, had to yield to her brother. The fleet finally sailed on 14 December.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Louverture was also preparing for the expected French invasion. On 20 December 1801, in a proclamation that made intriguing use of gendered language, he tried to defuse rumours that the French were about to attack, while calling on his followers to prepare for exactly such an eventuality. ‘A good child must show submission and obedience to his mother’, he explained in reference to the colonial bond. ‘But should the mother become so denatured as to seek the destruction of her child, the child must obtain vengeance, god willing. Should I die, I will die as a brave soldier, as a man of honour; I fear no one’. In preparation for the French invasion, Louverture tried to mend fences with the mixed-blood population he had just defeated in the bitter War of the South, created a national guard, bought weapons from US merchants, and even courted Jamaica’s British governor for support. Women would play a crucial role in Louverture’s defence strategy. He would retreat to the interior of the island to wage a guerrilla war against France and instructed women of colour to grow crops for his troops. By the time the French fleet sighted Cap Sâmâna in February 1802, the stage was set for Bonaparte’s most ambitious, and costliest, colonial venture.

The war of independence that followed in 1802–03 is too often portrayed as a Manichaean conflict pitting black slaves yearning for their freedom against white planters eager to deny them this right. But Saint-Domingue, the battleground where the armies of Louverture and Bonaparte fought for supremacy, was an Atlantic society at the crossroads of European, African and American influences and fragmented along racial, social, political, national and gender lines. Race was an important dividing line, as blacks and whites battled each other and the mulâtres (mulattoes) while internecine warfare pitted Creole blacks against their African-born brethren. But one’s class affiliations also mattered; Saint-Domingue’s planters (or grands blancs) were a world apart from the colonial rabble derisively known as petits blancs. Among the population of colour, those, like Louverture, who had been emancipated in the pre-revolutionary era (anciens libres) often looked down upon those who had only been freed by the 1793 decree that abolished slavery in Saint-Domingue (nouveaux libres).

To these racial and social divisions inherited from the slavery era, the French Revolution added political ones. Radical revolutionaries granted legal equality to free-colours and freedom to slaves, but conservative planters continued to lobby for the restoration of slavery. Leclerc and Louverture believed in an intermediate labour system that forced former slaves to remain on plantations while paying them a portion of the crop as salary. The rise of nationalism added another element to this combustive mix. Many people of colour were eager to remain French as long as the metropolis renounced slavery and racism; others dreamed of outright independence. On the opposite side, the Polish, Swiss, Spanish and German soldiers drafted in the French army were of dubious allegiance. The population of Saint-Domingue was divided along so many lines that its members could, and did, shift their allegiances from the French side to the rebel side on numerous occasions.

What, then, of the last dividing line in Saint-Domingue in 1802 – gender? First, were women’s roles shaped by the peculiar circumstances of the war, or did they...
build upon gender norms inherited from France, Africa and the pre-revolutionary colonial world? In particular, did the prevalence of extramarital unions, along with the unbalanced sex ratio in Saint-Domingue, allow women to trade sex for power? Second, how great a role did women play in sectors, war in particular, that were then male-dominated in France? Finally, were expectations regarding women’s roles distinct enough that women’s attitudes and destinies diverged sharply from those of men during the last years of the war of independence? Or did women consider class and race to be the paramount issues, for example concluding that the possible restoration of slavery was the main concern facing black farm labourers, whether male or female? Alternatively, did women navigate a complex web of competing, but not mutually exclusive, loyalties?

Using a narrative of the events dating from the arrival of the French expedition in Saint-Domingue (February 1802) to the Haitians’ victory (November 1803) and their declaration of independence (January 1804) as a thread, the essay will cover three specific issues that correspond to the three questions outlined above. It will first analyse women, particularly white widows and mulâtres, as objects of sexual desire for the newly arrived French officers. The politics of extramarital and interracial sex were nothing new and could be traced back to plantation society, where men of all colours had competed for access to the few women available, especially attractive women of colour and land-owning Creoles. The struggle continued unabated during the war, as access to prominent ‘trophy mistresses’ remained a yardstick by which to measure a man’s position in the colony’s social hierarchy.

Women were not always the passive victims of male fantasy, however, and occasionally used their liaisons to exercise political influence or gain economic favours. Historians of the French Revolution frequently criticise revolutionaries for refusing to extend the principles of legal equality to women, resulting in ‘the end of women’s serious involvement in political, public life’. The Revolution did bring debates on women’s political role into the open for the first time, but only to offer a negative response to requests for gender equality. With the exception of allegorical figures, Lynn Hunt writes, ‘for both the Jacobin leaders and their sans-culotte followers, politics was a quarrel between men’.

These conclusions, however, are valid only when one studies conventional venues of power (such as parliamentary chambers and the law), less so when examining alternative modes of political expression. Dominique Godineau has shown that during the early Revolution (1789–93), lower-class Parisian women could, and did, influence historical events, albeit not through standard political channels and in ways that reflected gender roles. Similarly, Suzanne Desan has shown that revolutionaries viewed the family as a microcosm of French society, and that the battle against absolute monarchy was paralleled by an attack on patriarchy. The same distinction can be applied to the situation in Saint-Domingue, where women held no military or administrative office, yet played a significant role in the sentimental rivalries that paralleled the colony’s power struggles.

As the second part will show, taboos on female war-making also receded into the background, particularly among women of colour who were more accustomed to participate in food production and military combat. Women thus occasionally took a direct part in combat, or resorted to the channels specific to their group to make a unique contribution to the war of independence. Farm labourers acted as de facto
quartermasters. Market women and courtesans used their access to French strongholds to work as spies for the rebellion.

The third question – whether gender was as operative a concept as race, citizenship or class – calls for a careful response. The Leclerc expedition quickly turned into a war of extermination in which crucial issues – freedom and slavery, France’s Caribbean empire – hung in the balance. Given this context, one’s race, nationality and class frequently trumped one’s gender, and some women defined themselves primarily as members of a social grouping (for example, pro-British émigré white planters) that included men and women sharing identical interests. The process was particularly evident when the two camps executed their enemies, regardless of their sex. And yet, women often acted, and were treated, in very distinct ways within the general confines of their social grouping. Executions of female planters, for example, were often preceded by rape and sexual mutilation, a telling detail given past sexual abuses of female slaves. A woman’s various affiliations were not either/or categories but instead simultaneous identities that together defined an individual’s actions and treatment.

Social, gender and racial histories always labour against the paucity of sources written by dominated groups; virtually all former slaves in Saint-Domingue were illiterate. Previous scholars such as John Garrigus and Doris Garraway have tried to circumvent this problem by dissecting chronicles written by white males, or even using literary sources as windows into a contemporary frame of mind.22 To these sources, Joan Dayan added oral history and local cultural artifacts, particularly Vodun (Vaudou, Voodoo) practices, which she sees as ‘ritual reenactments of Haiti’s colonial past’.23 The approach is innovative but opens itself to criticisms that one is guilty of over-interpretation of unreliable sources. It also overlooks the passing, but numerous, references to women one encounters in standard primary sources found in the French and colonial archives that form the basis for this essay. These were primarily written by male officers, often newcomers from the French métropole, and must thus be checked carefully for racist or nationalist bias, or simply ignorance of local cultural practices. Still, they provide a wealth of material (such as espionage reports) on the fate of a group that has authored frustratingly few documents of its own. Unfortunately, the predominance of third-party accounts also means that the innermost hopes and motives of female actors, particularly lower-class blacks, will always remain difficult to ascertain beyond doubt.

**Love in the time of malaria: women as objects of sexual desire**

The women of Saint-Domingue had a well-established reputation for sensuality by 1802.24 The most detailed account of white sexual mores during the War of Independence is a series of letters written by Mary Hassal in Cap Français in 1803. Looking back, Hassal described colonial Saint-Domingue as a place where ‘libertinism, called love, was without restraint’.25 ‘Libertinism’ had a long history. Myriam Cottias has pointed out the hypocrisy of the colonial system that castigated women of colour as courtesans while ensuring that interracial sexual intercourse could only take the form of an affair because whites could not marry their slaves (after 1685) or free women of colour (after 1778).26 The hot tropical climate was often cited as the cause for sexual hyperactivity, leading to fears that white Creole women would eventually adopt the
style, language and habits of their slaves. Wartime dislocation did little to reform the colony’s famously lax mores. Even Louverture, an outwardly devout Catholic who railed against ‘prostitutes’ and ‘libertinage’, had multiple affairs during his tenure as governor in 1798–1802.

Enforcing stricter moral and racial norms in Saint-Domingue was integral to Bonaparte’s pre-war planning. In his secret instructions to Leclerc, an article specifically addressed the issue of white women who had ‘prostituted themselves’ to black officers. Promiscuity and miscegenation were such grave crimes that they would be punished with deportation, the same penalty Bonaparte envisioned for the rebellious black officers themselves. Bonaparte’s soldiers and officers, however, had no intention of ending Saint-Domingue’s famously extroverted sexuality, which they considered one of the major benefits of joining the expedition in the first place. A Polish officer fighting on France’s side fantasised about ‘naked Negroes and Negresses who throw their breasts about the shoulders’, while a French officer marvelled at the ‘little childlike hands and . . . cute feet, which only the charming Creoles of our French colonies possess’ (Figure 1).

Bonaparte, who remained in Paris as his troops sailed away, was unable to alter the sexual norms prevalent in the colony; if anything, the unequal sex ratio that prevailed after the landing of French troops only added to the fiery mix. Stories about the sexual escapades of prominent women, particularly Leclerc’s wife, Pauline, abound in Hassal’s and other accounts. Because of her passionate past, gossipers quipped that Leclerc would have a dual mission while in Saint-Domingue: to take the island from Louverture while defending his own bed from rival officers. It was not long before rumours spread that Pauline Bonaparte had begun an affair with Leclerc’s chief of staff Pierre Boyer and another general, Jean Humbert. When Leclerc succumbed to yellow fever, observers dismissed the young widow’s displays of grief as a public show; as if to prove them right, she re-married less than a year later.

Pauline’s conduct in Saint-Domingue seemed designed to confirm contemporary prejudices about women’s natural tendency to slide into shallow immorality. The following year (November 1802–November 1803), during which General Donatien de Rochambeau took over as general in chief following Leclerc’s death, proved that men were not immune to the temptations of the flesh either. Colonial Prefect Hector Daure compared Cap Français to a ‘new Capua’ in which Rochambeau and his officers were surrounded by ‘shameless women’. Rochambeau amused himself with endless parties and balls, even assembling a harem that followed him as he changed headquarters. Creole planters frequently complained that the officers sent to recover their land and slaves had, in fact, mounted a concerted assault on the virtue of their wives.

Historians delving into Bonaparte’s own sentimental life could counter that there was nothing uniquely Caribbean about infidelity. Joan Dayan has noticed that Creole and metropolitan mores had much in common, yet ‘what is allowed, admired, or unquestioned in Europe becomes ludicrous in the colonies’. Some scholars go further and dismiss Saint-Domingue’s sensuous reputation, and particularly that of the mulâtres, as a colonial construct. Caribbean voluptuousness, in that reading, is a pendant to the eroticisation of the Orient that had marked the earlier Napoleonic expedition to Egypt and that underpins Edward Said’s concept of Orientalism. John Garrigus has argued that the mulâtres’s reputation as a depraved seductress was
invented in the 1770s by whites who feared the growing influence of the free-coloured population and used accusations of promiscuity to cast aspersion on the moral worth of mixed-race individuals of both sexes.\textsuperscript{40} Similarly, Doris Garraway has noticed that colonial laws restricting interracial sex punished the coloured partner, not the white planter, on the ground that they were naturally libidinous – yet another way of reinforcing racial prejudices, writes Garraway, who generally dismisses Caribbean sensuality as a myth.\textsuperscript{41}

It seems excessive, however, to conclude that accounts of colonial libertinage must be cast aside altogether because they were written by people with an agenda. Libertinage was prevalent in the plays, novels and secondary accounts studied by Garraway and Garrigus; but primary sources amply back the claim that extra-marital affairs were unusually common in Saint-Domingue before and during the

\textbf{Figure 1:} Women of colour in Saint-Domingue (original found in Box 1Ad./34, Rochambeau Papers, University of Florida), photo: author.
Leclerc–Rochambeau expedition. A historian can accept these events as historical facts, even as they dissect the motives of the sexual partners who indulged in such affairs and of the writers who related them. Hassal, for example, wrote under a pen name; Joan Dayan has shown that she really was Leonora Sansay, the wife of a French planter whose letters were based on real-life experiences but attributed to a fictional sister to hide the author’s own romantic involvement, not with a lusty French officer, but with US Vice-President Aaron Burr.42

In Saint-Domingue, affairs were not simply about sex. Saint-Domingue was by far France’s richest colony, and much money was at stake in deciding who would control the land. Eighteenth-century laws discriminating against illegitimate mixed-race offspring were not merely the product of a moralistic and racist bias against mistresses, bastards and mixed races; they were also designed ensure that the legitimate (that is, white) spouse and children would inherit the valuable sugar estates. Similarly, the French officers who seduced and married orphaned Creole women in 1803 did so not only out of fascination for Creole sensuality, but also to inherit the substantial estates the women had inherited from relatives killed in the slave revolt.43 Inhabitants of Gros Morne complained that some white officers were happy that Louverture’s subordinates had massacred white planters when the French expedition landed, ‘since this left them many widows they could marry’.44 The criticism was not far off the mark: a French officer noted matter-of-factly that a planter ‘died this morning at ten and left without any relatives or friends his demoiselle, who is very pretty’.45

In addition to money, sex represented power. The ultimate symbol of a planter’s domination of his female slaves in colonial times, and of his male slaves’ powerlessness, was his ability to have intercourse with a slave of his choosing.46 Similarly, male planters’ interest in mistresses of colour had led to a steady rivalry between female planters and their coloured rivals for sentimental, but also political, supremacy in the last years of colonial rule.47 Louverture’s escapades during his tenure as governor of Saint-Domingue, often viewed as hypocrisy on the part of the moralistic statesman, may be analysed as personal revenge for a former black slave whose wife Suzanne had borne a mixed-blood child. The pattern continued during the Leclerc expedition as generals like Rochambeau now abused martial law to accumulate mistresses. Then, as before, the ability to gain access to a woman’s sexual favours served as a measure of one’s position in colonial society. The severity of Bonaparte’s instructions regarding white ‘prostitutes’ was also an indication that interracial affairs had to be denied to black officers to symbolise their lesser status. When searching Louverture’s headquarters in Port-au-Prince in February 1802, the French generals Jean Boudet and Pamphile de Lacroix came across ‘a multitude of love notes that left no doubt as to the immense success the old Toussaint had enjoyed with ladies’.48 Boudet and Lacroix chose to burn the mementos and dispose of the ashes at sea. They did not explain their motive in doing so, but one may surmise that Louverture’s mistresses had belonged to the island’s most prominent planter families and that hiding any proof of the affairs was a necessary step for the restoration of white rule.

Women were also used as bargaining chips in conflicts involving military and civilian authorities. One revealing tug of war pitted Grand Judge Ludot to his subordinate, Judge Minuty. The feud began when Ludot obtained the position of Grand Judge – the island’s highest judicial officer – that Minuty had coveted for himself as a long-time resident of the colony. Such clashes of ambitions were nothing new, but
more intriguing was the fact that Minuty’s wife was the key prize in the two men’s turf wars. In Port-au-Prince, where the trio had to share accommodation due to the housing shortage, Ludot told Mrs Minuty that he would promote her husband only if she agreed to share his bed.⁴⁹ Rochambeau, called in to arbitrate this administrative tangle cum domestic quarrel, fired Ludot and promoted Minuty to Grand Judge.⁵⁰ Given Rochambeau’s own fondness for mistresses, one may surmise that the bureaucratic reordering had little to do with the wronged virtue of Mrs Minuty and much to do with Ludot’s opposition to Rochambeau’s dictatorial leadership. Bonaparte had ordered that Saint-Domingue be ruled by a triumvirate consisting of a Lieutenant-General drawn from the military (Leclerc, then Rochambeau) and two civilians (a Colonial Prefect and a Grand Judge). But Leclerc and Rochambeau had imposed martial law, much to the dismay of civilian administrators like Ludot who complained bitterly in letters to Paris about such abuses of power.⁵¹ The affair must thus be understood as part of a much larger struggle over civilian–military relations. After his promotion, Minuty promptly agreed to surrender his judicial prerogatives to Rochambeau and the pliant judge kept his job – and his wife – until the French defeat.⁵²

The ancients libres, many of whom had owned slaves before the revolution, generally sided with the French in the early months of the expedition. Their wives’ social status thus mirrored that of white Creoles, and they were similarly instrumentalised by male officers trying to make an unrelated point. Leclerc jailed the black wife of Louverture’s white paymaster and diplomat Joseph Bunel, for example, to force her husband to pay an indemnity.⁵³ In one bizarre incident, Rochambeau invited the wives of prominent colonial officers of Port-au-Prince to a macabre ball in which the dancing room was decorated with funerary paraphernalia ranging from skulls to black shrouds. Rochambeau savoured the women’s unease for hours, then led them to an attendant room in which their husbands’ and brothers’ bodies lay in coffins. The women had unknowingly attended their loved ones’ funeral.⁵⁴ One mulâtre officer saw the incident as a continuation of the ancient rivalry between white women (who planned the cruel joke) and their quarteronnes rivals.⁵⁵ It is also possible that Rochambeau sought to scare the mulâtres officers, whose relative importance in the French army grew as newly arrived white officers succumbed to tropical fevers.

As temptresses and bargaining chips, women’s roles were fairly limited: inviting male attention and occasionally being drawn into political conflicts over which they had no control. But scholars such as Arlette Gautier have shown that some women of colour used interracial sex to gain significant sway in Caribbean slave societies. In colonial times, slave women had been able, and at times willing, to trade sexual favours for important rewards, like manumission, that men more rarely obtained.⁵⁶ Pregnancy and a master’s sexual demands were added burdens that male slaves did not have to endure, so Garraway has countered that ‘far from being mitigating factors in structures of oppression, desire and sexuality contributed in fundamental ways to practices and ideologies of domination’. She agrees that interracial sex was designed to empower one of the partners – but, in her analysis, it was the male planter.⁵⁷

During the Haitian war of independence, the historical record backs Gautier’s analysis more than Garraway’s. In 1802–03, some women – walking in the footsteps of slave and free-coloured women of the pre-revolutionary era – concluded that sexual favours were a valuable product that they could trade for money, power or mercy for their loved ones. In November 1802, a mulâtresse obtained her mother’s release from a
ship in Cap Français’s harbour, quite a feat considering that rebels were besieging
the city and that Leclerc had ordered in the panic that all people of colour be drowned. In his damning report on Rochambeau’s taste for ‘shameless women’, Daure only briefly made his case on moral grounds. The main problem, he asserted, was that ‘pliant women, who had lost their honour in the court of public opinion, obtained such credit with the highest authorities that they arbitrated favours, promotions, and even military decisions’. A French planter also charged that Rochambeau removed, ‘according to [his lovers’] caprices, the best generals and most active officers, to make room for the beloved protégés of the worthless creatures with which his seraglio was filled’. Similar accusations of uxoriousness were levied against General Louis d’Arbois in Jérémie and General Jean Lavalette in Port-au-Prince. The accusations drew on a long and rich tradition; in the eighteenth century, it was common in both metropolitan and colonial France to attribute poor decisions on a ruler’s part to the unseemly influence of a female courtesan.

**Amazons of the Caribbean: women as warriors**

In the fluid environment typical of guerrilla wars, women often found themselves in the midst of a combat zone. A favourite tactic of the rebels in the early part of the conflict was to burn plantations, which were as likely to house women of all colours (planters and loyal farm workers) as men. During the insurrection of La Tortue, the French planter Labatut escaped with his life, while his wife remained a prisoner of the rebels. The same could be true of the latter part of the war, when the rebel army besieged French towns filled with soldiers and civilians. Combat at sea was no different. One merchant brig from Le Havre was attacked by rebel barges and all its passengers and crew, women and children included, were killed or captured within sight of Port-au-Prince. White women only rarely took a direct part in the fighting. A detailed roster of the second Polish demi-brigade lists many children, serving as drummers, but only two women in combat roles, Jeanne and Andrée, both serving as riflemen in the second company. The rebel army, by contrast, incorporated many women of colour. Concluding that their own freedom was at stake in this momentous conflict, they took over tasks that were essential to the ultimate victory, such as growing provisions, spying on the French and even fighting.

Saint-Domingue had grown so rapidly in the 1780s that the majority of the slave population at the outbreak of the slave revolt was African-born. Standards of female behaviour imported from Africa are thus of great importance in understanding the conflict. One could easily assume that African women played no role in warfare, as European women have usually been excluded from combat (except in the direst circumstances like defending one’s home) and militarised societies enforce strict gender roles. But in West Africa, and particularly in Dahomey, women often served in combat. Dahomey invaded the Allada kingdom in 1724, around the time when Louverture’s father was captured and shipped to the New World as a slave, so the Dahomean precedent may have influenced Louverture’s views on women’s roles in wartime.

Also of note was the growing demographic weight of women as Saint-Domingue’s long slave revolt progressed. Before 1791, two thirds of the slaves imported from Africa were young males well suited for the rigours of sugar cultivation. By 1801, ten years...
of almost continuous fighting, which disproportionately affected the male population, had reversed this ratio, at least in the towns. ‘Since the revolution, it is obvious that war killed more men than women’, lamented Louverture; ‘there is a larger number of the latter in the towns, where they live solely of libertinage’. Women formed the majority of the population in the first post-revolutionary census.

Despite Leclerc’s and Bonaparte’s proclamations to the contrary, in the summer of 1802 the population of colour became convinced that the French army’s ultimate goal was to restore slavery, which, if true, would affect women as well as men. In his instructions to a field officer, the chief of staff Pierre Thouvenot explained that the war was ‘moral as well as physical’ and that his main task would be to convince the black labourers of France’s good intentions. It was particularly important to ‘keep the cultivators’ wives under close watch. They . . . are the ones who talk the rebels into fighting’. Grabbing an infant child by his legs, a female labourer told a French officer that she would prefer to ‘dismember him rather than see him enslaved’. Another told young women of colour walking to the scaffold to ‘take courage: your loins will never bear slaves’. Interrogations of male and female farm workers in the south show that they embraced the revolt when they concluded that ‘the French had come to re-enslave them, and that they absolutely had to fight to sustain their freedom’. Thirty-five field workers of both sexes who fled the French-held areas justified their action by saying that the French ‘wanted to exterminate them all’.

Louverture’s strategy was to burn the main towns, destroy all supplies, and wait for hunger and disease to take their toll. ‘The earth toiled by our own sweat must not provide a single morsel of food to our enemies’, he wrote. Obtaining food supplies while denying them to the French was the key to the rebel victory, and women – traditionally responsible for tending family’s gardens in sub-Saharan Africa – fulfilled this crucial logistical role (Figure 2). Louverture ordered his general in Jérémie to burn all the granaries and to ‘employ all the female cultivators to grow provisions in great quantities’. A French espionage report later indicated that the rebels were well provisioned, obtaining gunpowder from the British and food grown locally by women living in army camps. Women also helped carry ammunition and cannons. Gen. Jean-Jacques Dessalines’ wife, Claire Heureuse, even purchased a barge to trade salt along the coast. Some women prostituted themselves to French soldiers in the towns, asked for cartridges as payment, then passed the ammunition to mountain rebels. Women were also uniquely suited for espionage. To the end of the war, the French kept with them a significant number of women of colour serving as ‘coquines’ (prostitutes), maids and merchants who could easily serve as double agents. Selling on markets, then as today, is a female task in Haiti, so it was relatively easy for women to carry messages from the towns to the rebellious interior under the guise of commercial ventures. The French themselves used women of colour as messengers when negotiating with rebels. The wife of a rebel chief, for example, was caught with a valid passport as she carried salt fish. Dessalines escaped arrest when he was warned in time by a servant, Mrs Pageot. Town women also hid officers of colour scheduled for execution. Women of colour were sought after as nurses because of their knowledge of folk medicine, but the French made sure that black nurses in army hospitals would be deprived of all communication with the outside, presumably to avoid spying.
Spying was a dangerous task. During the siege of the black-held fort of Crête à Pierrot, French soldiers arrested two elderly blacks, one of them a woman, and tortured them as suspected spies before releasing them. Henriette, a woman of colour arrested in Cap Français as she was leaving for a rebel camp, was not so lucky. Accused of treason, she was hanged in December 1802 on the main market square – most likely as a warning to female merchants.

Information about the situation inside French towns was sensitive; the rebels could time their attacks to coincide with periods when the garrison was depleted by malaria and yellow fever. The French thus adopted a set of countermeasures, most of them aimed specifically at women, to limit their freedom of movement. Leclerc’s
regulations governing plantation labourers specified that female workers could not marry men working on another plantation, presumably so that women would have no excuse to go from plantation to plantation. Rochambeau passed a decree in January 1803, this time aimed at urban black women, to order them to declare their profession. Maids could continue working; but other professions would be regulated under a strict pass system, and women who could not justify why they were in town would be sent to prison. A month later, fearing a rebel attack against Cap Français, the commandant of the town’s garrison sent out patrols to ‘break out all gatherings of blacks and to force all women back in their houses, especially négesses’. Two weeks later, a general search of the black quarter led to the arrest of several black women. Rochambeau approved of the measures and insisted on ‘the most inflexible severity toward Blacks of both sexes’.

Mambos (Vodun priestesses) were similarly targeted as Vodun had underpinned conspiracies to revolt against or poison planters (according to the oral tradition, a mambo called Cécile Fatiman was the one who slit the throat of the sacrificial pig in the Vodun ceremony that preceded the 1791 uprising). In 1802, one mambo was hanged for organising a dance in which practitioners became possessed by lwas (spirits). The French stopped using black nurses when two of them were convicted of purposely administering the wrong medication to soldiers under their care (white paranoia about poison had been rampant in Saint-Domingue since the Makandal conspiracy of 1758, so it is difficult to assess the veracity of this particular accusation).

More surprisingly in European eyes, women of colour had joined in actual combat since the onset of Saint-Domingue’s slave revolt in 1791. During his tenure as governor, Louverture advocated restricting women to domestic and agricultural roles and ordered them to leave army barracks. But when the French landed in 1802, they made frequent references to ‘cultivateurs’ fighting with Louverture’s regular troops, which most likely included women since they formed the vast majority of field workers at the time (in French, the masculine tense is used to describe a mixed male and female group). One Frenchman who was a prisoner of Dessalines during the siege of Crête à Pierrot mentions that black women fought alongside the garrison. Relating a difficult assault on the mountain stronghold of the black chief Sylla near Ennery, a French officer was struck by the ‘women’s ferocious exclamations of joy that redoubled every time they saw one of our own get injured’. Writing from the same area three months later, Dessalines (who was then fighting for the French side) boasted that he had captured many women and children among the fighters, and had given no quarter to those found with guns in their hands. An ancien libre fighting for France explained that while ‘hunting maroons’ he had come across a camp where he found ‘23 guns and a prodigious quantity of women’. When their camp was taken, three men, five women, and three children chose to kill themselves by jumping from a cliff.

In the last three cases, the female warriors belonged to armed bands that fought independently of Louverture’s, then Dessalines’s, official rebel army. Usually referred to as ‘Congos’, ‘marrons’ or ‘Africains’, these groups were typically composed of African-born nouveaux libres and so may have abided by gender norms regarding female participation in war derived from their nation of origin (unfortunately, French accounts rarely identified tribal affiliations).

Contemporary documents abundantly prove that women of colour took part in the fighting, but sadly they too often refer to them as anonymous entities. The wives of

rebel officers are known by name, such as Sanitte Belair, who helped lead her husband’s ill-fated revolt in September 1802, and Dessalines’ merciful wife Claire Heureuse. Oral traditions are more informative but less reliable. The Vodun lwa (spirit) Marinét bwachèche is said to be based on a Haitian Marianne who fought with Dessalines’ army and lit its cannons. Défilée (also called Dédée Bazile), a revolutionary hero abundantly profiled in popular culture, joined Dessalines after she was raped by her white master (or when her parents were killed), then served in his army as a cook (or a prostitute). Several women (including Dessalines’ daughters) played roles in the popular version of the creation of the Haitian flag at the Arcahaye conference in May 1803, but the entire story is highly dubious. The Vodun lwa of maternal love, Erzulie Danto, is based on a black slave who allegedly fought in the Haitian Revolution, only to have her tongue cut out (interestingly, her rival Erzulie Freda, who personifies romantic love, originated as a mulâtresse seductress).

In some ways, fighting was even more dangerous for women than for men. The four male rebels who burned a sugar refinery in August 1802 all escaped to nearby woods; but their female accomplice, who had stayed behind, was caught and hanged. Four women and four children were caught as they tried to flee French-held areas to join up with their husbands already fighting on the rebel side. The prevalence of such incidents suggests that women fled less easily due to family obligations. Staying behind was no guarantee of safety either. When colonial officers defected to the enemy, the commander of Jacmel threatened to kill their wives and children as payback for the men’s treachery.

Equal-opportunity victims

The concept of race was still nascent in early nineteenth-century France. Theories of race were only one century old, and the term ‘race’ was often used interchangeably with what we would call today national affiliation or social class. Racial concepts in the colonies, by contrast, had hardened considerably since the 1760s. Moreau de St Méry’s classic account of late-colonial Saint-Domingue listed no less than 128 combinations of white and black blood and his contemporaries insisted on segregationist laws aimed at free people of colour. Even after the French Revolution banned slavery and racial segregation, many legal documents in Guadeloupe continued to list racial affiliations.

This dichotomy is reflected in the belligerents’ differing approaches to race and civilians in the early part of the conflict. Bonaparte wrote in a proclamation to the inhabitants of Saint-Domingue that ‘no matter what your origins and your skin colour might be, you are all French, you are all free and equal’. French troops took the Revolution’s colour-blind rhetoric at face value. When landing in Fort Dauphin, Leclerc reported, French troops ‘were assaulted by black troops who shot at them, saying that they did not want whites. Soldiers continued landing, without shooting, while shouting to the blacks that they were their brothers, their friends, and that they were bringing their freedom’. It was only six months into the war, as French policy hardened under Leclerc’s leadership, that large-scale massacres became commonplace.

Contrary to Leclerc, the rebels immediately assimilated the Haitian revolution to a class and racial war in which protections normally granted women and civilians were irrelevant. For the black population, white women were as much a part of the colonial order as the men were, because they owned slaves, benefited from their labour and
were stridently racist. From the very beginning of the slave revolt in 1791, accounts indicate that female planters were tortured and killed along with their husbands. They were also raped, often at the urging of female blacks who wished to avenge their own sexual exploitation as slaves. White chroniclers particularly emphasised the mutilation of wombs, infants and genitalia, possibly a metaphor designed to display the barbarism of rebels who violated all norms of gender and racial propriety.

As French troops landed in 1802, Louverture following in the footsteps of his revolutionary forebears, ordered his soldiers to kill white planters, and joked that they now had carte blanche. Black farm workers, who were convinced that the French army had come to restore slavery, could not agree more. When French troops landed in Cap Francais, General Henri Christophe sent all women to a nearby hill where Commandant Ignace was to kill them in retaliation for the French invasion. The women survived by stalling long enough for French troops to save them, but others were not so lucky. Throughout the colony, Louverture’s men massacred white civilians accused of calling on France to intervene. In Petite Rivière, Dessalines encouraged his soldiers to kill women and children as well as men ‘by reminding them of what slavery had been like’. In Verrettes, French troops found no less than 800 victims of Dessalines’ wrath. ‘The butcher who committed this act had shown no compassion for either sex or age’, a French officer wrote in the most reliable account of the Leclerc expedition. Mirroring earlier accounts of abused female and child bodies, he was particularly taken by the fact that ‘girls, their breasts torn apart, looked as if they were begging for mercy for their mothers; mothers covered with their pierced arms the children slaughtered on their bosom’. Altogether, he estimated that 3,000 white civilians died in these early massacres (Figure 3).

The French army’s initial restraint was accordingly short-lived. A mere week after French troops landed, Leclerc issued instructions condemning his men’s exactions against female plantation labourers, especially rape, for fear that such incidents would upset potential allies and spread disease in the ranks. Leclerc was new to the colony and generally ignorant of its peculiar social standards; but he had quickly comprehended the political explosiveness of sexual misconduct given past sexual exploitation of female slaves. Deportation, a penalty Bonaparte had intended for Louverture’s most prominent black officers, was quickly extended to their wives as well. General André Rigaud’s pregnant wife was deported along with her husband and children. When General Jean-Baptiste Brunet captured Toussaint Louverture, he carefully set his trap to arrest Louverture’s wife Suzanne as well, and the entire family was deported to France together.

As women of colour took over strategic roles like provisioning, espionage and combat, the French command concluded that they were fair game for execution as well. Describing a ‘battue’ organised in August 1802 (the term usually applies to hunting down animals), Leclerc mentioned that fifty black prisoners had been hanged without any distinction based on sex. ‘The men die with incredible fanaticism. They laugh at death. Women act the same’. Wives of colonial officers were frequently executed when their husbands were suspected of defecting to the enemy. When the French uncovered a suspected conspiracy in Jacmel, they arrested and shot seven people on the main square, three of whom were women. Marie-Thérèse Ferrand, wife of the commandant of Jacmel, was drowned. General Paul Louverture’s wife and son were stabbed. General Charles Maurepas watched as his wife and children
drowned before he met the same fate.\textsuperscript{133} When General Charles Belair was arrested, both he and his wife Sanitte were put on trial as she was widely credited for playing the leading role in the insurrection they sponsored; Dessalines (still fighting for France at the time) called her ‘Belair’s ferocious wife’. Both of them were charged with treason and sentenced to death on separate counts.\textsuperscript{134}

The war reached new heights of horror in the autumn of 1802. Because of widespread desertion among colonial (black) regiments, the French systematically drowned thousands of black soldiers who were still serving the Republic but might be tempted to defect. When Cap Français was besieged in October 1802 and the French cause seemed hopeless, Leclerc ordered the entire 6th Colonial Regiment to be drowned in the harbour. He then added to the list a good proportion of the town’s population of colour, women and children included. ‘The colour alone condemned
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\caption{White victim of the Haitian Revolution (copied from Juan Lopez Cancelada, \textit{Vida de J. J. Dessalines, Gefe de los negros de Santo Domingo} (Mexico City: Mariano de Zúñiga y Ontiveros, 1806)), photo: author.}
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without a trial’, reported the Governor of Jamaica. Following the massive drowning in Cap, the rebel army retaliated by beheading four white women within a few miles of the city’s defences. By that time, Leclerc had concluded that even the death of all arms-bearing black males would fail to bring the rebellion to an end. ‘We must destroy all the Negroes in the mountains, men and women, keeping only infants less than twelve years old; we must also destroy half those of the plain . . . Without this the colony will never be quiet’. Earlier distinctions between male officers (who would be deported), soldiers (who would be executed only if they refused to surrender) and women (who should be protected from rape) had faded now that the war was a racial, and increasingly genocidal, war.

Leclerc’s campaign of extermination continued when Rochambeau took over in November 1802. Rochambeau even imported war dogs from Cuba to track down fleeing black soldiers and devour condemned prisoners. As he sent dogs to put down an insurrection in La Tortue in March 1803, Rochambeau ordered the French officer in charge of the operation to ‘get his hands on all the Blacks who took part in the insurrection, without regard to sex’. The cruel policy backfired as more colonial officers – even the ancients libres – joined the rebel side, citing atrocities against women and children as a prominent motive for defecting (Figure 4).

By early 1803, French losses to war and yellow fever left less than 10,000 soldiers and national guardsmen in the colony. Worse, renewed hostilities with the British Navy in May prohibited further reinforcements from France. In French-held towns, besieged by the rebel army and blockaded by the British Navy, the situation became hopeless. In June, Rochambeau allowed all women in besieged cities to leave the colony. The decision was based not on the notion that feeble women required enhanced protection, but on the pragmatic assessment that food supplies were running low and that it was best to keep only men of fighting age. Even then, bureaucrats frequently allowed men to leave on ships earmarked for women in exchange for bribes.

Hassal/Sansay’s letters relate that Hassal’s sister Clara Saint-Louis (modelled after the real-life Sansay), though married to a French planter, received numerous unrequited advances from Rochambeau. When it came time to evacuate, Rochambeau refused to let Clara leave for Cuba on the grounds that ‘he could only grant [passports] to the old and ugly’. The couple sneaked out nonetheless, at which point Rochambeau sent the few barges remaining from his once-proud fleet in a fruitless attempt to capture her. The tumultuous story followed one last twist as Clara reached Barracoa. Tired of her abusive husband, she ran away with a Cuban lover. Far from conforming to the model of the faithful wife rejecting Rochambeau’s adulterous proposals, she seems to have objected to the violent way in which men, whether Saint-Louis or Rochambeau, – courted her. In a later novel, also based on Hassal/Sansay’s experiences in Saint-Domingue, the heroine is even more independent and responds to Rochambeau’s advances to infuriate her husband.

On 19 November 1803, following the battle of Vertières, Rochambeau signed a capitulation treaty with Dessalines that spared the lives of French soldiers as long as they left Cap. A total of 3,882 soldiers embarked on military vessels. The evacuation should have set male soldiers apart from the rest of the population, as military vessels were instructed not to board women and civilians. As before, however,
personal and class affiliations could subsume other categories. Despite orders to the contrary, many women were on board the military vessels.150 Most French troops were captured by British vessels as they left Saint-Domingue and sent to captivity in Jamaica. Only soldiers should have been taken captive, but British records list women among the prisoners held onboard the dreadful pontoon ships; most officers’ wives were probably paroled along with their husbands and allowed to live on land.151 Most civilians who chose to leave embarked on merchant ships and made it through the British blockade.152 No less than 16,000 Saint-Domingue refugees reached Cuba.153 Others left for the United States and France.154

As civilians prepared to evacuate Cap Français, Dessalines issued a proclamation unexpectedly promising mercy to all those who chose to stay.155 Many Creole planters,
wary of having to begin their life anew, trusted Dessalines’ promises and stayed behind as the remnants of Rochambeau’s army departed. They were immediately put to work on fortification projects. A month later, as Dessalines and his generals gathered in Gonaïves to formally declare Saint-Domingue (now renamed Haiti) independent from France, Dessalines angrily cited atrocities committed against Haitian ‘men, women, girls, and children’ and called on Haitians to avenge the dead by killing all white Frenchmen. Over the next four months, Dessalines travelled from town to town and personally supervised the extermination of most of the white population of Haiti. Only non-French whites and those with useful trades (such as doctors) were spared. Women were guilty as former planters and because they might call for more French expeditions, Dessalines explained. They thus shared the men’s fate, though women were also the victims of rape or threats that they would be killed if they refused to marry black officers. The pattern – forced labour accompanied by flogging, humiliation, rape and eventually death – was reminiscent of pre-revolutionary times, suggesting that white women were victims of a curious re-enactment of colonial crimes, in which all abuses, including sexual ones, would be repeated in reverse and thus avenged.

Dessalines’ 1805 constitution displayed the same ambivalence. Articles 12 and 14 specified that no white could settle in Haiti and that all Haitians would henceforth be known as ‘Blacks’. Yet, the constitution granted citizenship to German and Polish troops who had defected to the rebel side and to some white women – presumably those who had married black officers to save their lives (Art. 13). The latter provision meant that the attractiveness of female planters, particularly widows who had inherited estates after their relatives were murdered, had survived years of national and racial war.

Conclusion: essence and contours

This final, bloody epitaph showed that in Saint-Domingue, colour, class, nation and political views competed with gender as a woman’s defining characteristic. Despite the differences between men’s and women’s roles in colonial society and the Napoleonic army, white men and women were united by the fact that they formed a coherent social grouping threatened by common enemies, be they anciens libres, people of colour, the British or former slaves. Women of colour reached a similar conclusion: threats to their liberty or survival were too important to be addressed by men only. Quite uniquely in the annals of the French Revolution, women obtained rights and positions more commonly associated with the men of the era. They travelled on military vessels, supplied the army, spied and fought. They enriched themselves at the expense of their lovers, who occasionally consulted them on promotions and politics. But women’s political and military importance was much akin to a double-edged sword. Women were thrust into unusually prominent positions when their political or economic agenda matched that of men; but they also became equal-opportunity targets as the conflict plunged into an ever more brutal spiral of violence. Equality in times of war gave women the dubious privilege to suffer from execution, exile and genocide on an equal footing. Women obtained the equality of death. The pattern was particularly noticeable in the war’s last months, when the multiple affiliations inherited from the colonial and revolutionary eras increasingly took second place to the reality of racial war.
A black female farm labourer fleeing a plantation in early 1803, however, might have found academic debates on the various causal factors affecting her behaviour somewhat artificial. She fled a plantation because, as a farm labourer, she feared being re-enslaved, but also because, as a woman of colour, she was terrified by wanton French massacres, and because, as a civilian, she risked being mistreated by both sides’ rampaging armies. Meanwhile, she worked on a plantation because the French army had drafted so many men that womanhood and the *cultivateur* status were often synonymous. Her ability to run away, in turn, would be conditioned by the number and age of children under her care. Her various affiliations, not to mention her self-preservation, did not contradict but rather reinforced each other. This makes it difficult to identify the one identity that defined her actions, particularly given the dearth of first-person accounts available to the researcher.

More generally, while racial and social affiliations shaped the essence of one’s life, being a woman affected its contours – the manner in which events affecting a specific group unfolded. White women and *mulâtres* reached political prominence, but as mistresses and advisers to male bureaucrats and officers, not as office-holders, following a tradition of sexual upward social mobility whose origins harked back to colonial slave society. Black women were invited to play military roles, but within the guidelines set by standards of female behaviour in Africa and based on women’s unique access to French-held towns in Saint-Domingue. Female spies were executed – the same punishment earmarked for men caught with weapons in their hands – but on market day so as to serve as a warning to other market women. White women were massacred along with most Frenchmen, but following sexual abuses that were highly symbolic to the former male slaves who inflicted them. Being a woman mattered even in 1804, after thirteen years of political and military upheaval in which a mere slave uprising had morphed into a war of liberation designed to achieve nationhood, emancipation and racial supremacy. Gender added yet another strand to the complex web of interlocking allegiances that defined one’s destiny in Saint-Domingue’s dying days.
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