

, Volume 5, Issue 3 (Summer 2010), No. 3

D. M. G. Sutherland,
Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. xvii + 316 pp. Figures, notes, appendix,
and index. \$95.00 U.S. (c). ISBN 978-0-521-88304-7.

Review Essay by Edward J. Woell, Western Illinois University

Such factionalism, however, was far from an isolated case in southeastern France. As Sutherland makes clear, Aubagne's factions often fell under the influence of their larger and more powerful counterparts in the cities of Marseille, Aix-en-Provence, and Arles. In such cities, those who later became Jacobins exerted extraordinary political force and were poised

Overall, Sutherland's work on Aubagne is highly meticulous. Those who have done laborious work in the archives cannot help but admire the extent of the analysis as well as the author's agility in constructing such a coherent narrative out of a remarkable array of sources. His points about how and why new democratic practices—elections, the formation of political clubs, popular protests, among others—only aggravated social tensions and created the space for spectacular murders to occur in the town are well argued and compelling. Precisely because this study is rich with implication and characterized by exquisite detail, however, it raises numerous concerns regarding its scope, conclusions, and scholarly engagement.

One is related to the genre itself. While Sutherland identified some important criteria for a successful microhistory, arguably he overlooked one as well. As Peter Campbell pointed out in his recent essay for *H-France* on current revolutionary historiography, microhistory usually involves "the technique of looking deeply at a particular problem . . . [1] Admittedly I have little knowledge of all the sources available for Aubagne. Even so, the dearth of information in the book regarding the town's religious institutions and developments during the Revolution is conspicuous. In the conclusion Sutherland assures readers that in no way were the murders related to religious conflict since the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was widely accepted in the region and all ten of the town's clerics took the 1791 Oath. As true as this is, though, there was much more to the Revolution's religious reforms and conflict stemming from it than just one oath crisis: the circumscription of parishes; the seizure, auctioning, and buying of . . . the suppression of religious congregations; the quashing of those penitential organizations that Sutherland suggested may have played a role in the drawing of political lines—just to name a few. Perhaps Aubagne was religiously indifferent. But if true, it would have mattered little that the anti-Jacobin "killers stretched the liminal period of mourning in a Christian culture to agonizing lengths" by not allowing Jacobin corpses to be buried properly (274). The broader point is that in many other French towns, political factionalism was augmented by a wide array of developments related to religious belief, practice, and institutions. [2] Whether this was the case at Aubagne is difficult to determine, in part because so little of the narrative addresses the town's religious complexion.

A second concern relates to a term appearing in the conclusion, namely "violent democracy" (p. 287). Although the author does not define the term, I take it to mean forceful and destructive acts—usually committed by large crowds—that were effected or justified by notions of popular sovereignty or majority rule. On page 75, for example, Sutherland surmises that "the [proto-Jacobin] seizure and attempted demolition of the forts [in Aix, Marseille, Toulon, and Arles] was also instructive of a style of democratic practice." No doubt some in the crowd perceived their actions as a kind of instantaneous democracy. For many today, though, "democracy" refers not only to a political process based on popular sovereignty, but also to a context where the rule of law, equality under it, political pluralism, civil liberties, and due process are observed. For this reason, to describe the thuggish actions of various political factions in and around Aubagne as "democratic" seems to stretch the term's meaning beyond its current usefulness. "Violent democracy," in other words, will come across to many as an oxymoron. Employing such a term, moreover, clouds what today we might recognize as genuine democratic accomplishment in the French Revolution. Although one could reduce this objection to merely one of semantics, there is more at issue here. We toil in a field where words matter, particularly when using them amid a broader audience that often condenses this revolution down to one big bloodbath.

Finally, there is the matter of engaging contemporary scholarship. Sutherland's incorporation of newer historiography as well as that standing the test of time is as it should be. Still, there were a few missed opportunities. In discussing the Terror not only in Provence but in the nation at large, Sutherland addresses the work of Donald Greer as a means of countering what he sees as apologetic arguments for it. Greer's work remains seminal, but missing is consideration of more recent work that makes better sense of the Terror, particularly the judicial side of it. Robert Allen's study of criminal tribunals during

