

H-France Forum
Volume 14 (2019), Issue 3, #5

Christine Haynes, *Our Friends the Enemies: The Occupation of France after Napoleon*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018. 404 pp. Notes and index. \$39.95, £31.95, €36.00 (cl). ISBN 978-0-674-97341-5.

Response by Christine Haynes, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

I am grateful to *H-France Forum* editor Rachel Chrastil for commissioning such thoughtful and generous reviews of my new book. It is immensely gratifying and humbling to have my book read by four scholars whose own work I have long admired, each with a particular expertise in some of the subjects and approaches I sought to bring together in this work, including: the military history of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars; the experience of ordinary soldiers and civilians in these wars; international diplomatic relations beyond the Congress of Vienna; the aftermath of the wars, including economic crisis, not just in France but also in the German lands and elsewhere; and the social and cultural history of the Bourbon Restoration. If anything, these reviewers are perhaps too sympathetic and friendly to me. In my response to them, rather than quibbling over minor differences in interpretation regarding the occupation of 1815-1818 and its legacy, I will thus focus on using their comments to highlight some questions and themes that I was not able fully to explore in the book, on which I hope this work will inspire additional research in the coming years.

Above all, I am pleased to see that the main claims of the book made sense to a diverse group of scholars, particularly to those with expertise in German and military history, which were new fields to me when I began this project. In particular, I am glad to see these reviewers note my attention to the distinction between occupation for military and occupation for peace-keeping purposes, which was indeed a creation of the “occupation of guarantee” of 1815-1818; the variety of attitudes and experiences among the German and other allied occupiers; the role of sociability in international relations in this period; and the economic consequences of occupation, including not just the financial reparations imposed upon France by the victors but also the valuable—and contested—byproduct of the *manure* generated by the 50,000 horses stationed alongside the occupying troops in northeastern France. (Among other things, my research thus reminds us to take seriously the role of animals in history.) I am also glad that they appreciated my use of visual sources, including maps, on which I spent considerable time and effort in order, as Thomas Dodman so nicely notes, to “see” the occupation spatially as well as materially. For these visual sources, I must credit my editor at Harvard University Press Kathleen McDermott, who allotted me a generous number of illustrations; my college dean Nancy Gutierrez, who funded most of the reproduction and permission fees; and cartographer Patrick Jones, who had the computer skills to transform my historical data into visual form.

To “see” the occupation on the ground as well as from above necessitated mixing a variety of historical approaches, topics, and sources. In addition to employing the methods of social and cultural history, with which I was most familiar, this task required me to familiarize myself with economic, military, and diplomatic history, which were new fields to me when I began this

research. To illuminate the texture of everyday life in the occupied provinces and in the capital of Paris, I scoured not only dozens of archives in Germany and Britain as well as France but also a wide variety of non-archival sources, including diaries and memoirs, pamphlets, newspapers, plays, prints, and songs. The latter type of source, a *chanson* by Béranger about the prostitutes of the Palais-Royal welcoming “Our Friends the Enemies” again in 1815, inspired the title of the book.

Inevitably, this *mélange* of methods and sources, including this song, led me to highlight some topics and points at the expense of others. As Thomas Dodman notes, in my goal of reconstructing the daily experience of the “occupation of guarantee,” I skim quickly over the role of this peace-keeping operation in the long-term legal history of what I term a shift from *jus ad bellum* to *jus in bello*—or what Dodman more aptly labels *jus post bellum*. Insisting that this shift was related to a rise in humanitarianism, he remains skeptical that the architects of the post-Napoleonic occupation were concerned about “total peace.” Based on my reading of the papers of the main proponent and commander of this occupation, the Duke of Wellington, the peace-makers of 1815 did anticipate the more humanitarian approach to war and its aftermath that we tend to associate with later conflicts, in Crimea and after. However, the aims and terms of this “occupation of guarantee” certainly deserve to receive more attention from legal and intellectual historians to better understand their exact place in the long-term development of the law of war. Building on the recent work of Christy Pichichero and Huw Davies on “military enlightenment,” we need to carry this story across the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars into the early nineteenth century. [1] While the reviewers seem to accept my related assertion that the post-war settlement promoted a new idea of “Europe” as a political entity, the role of the occupation in the long-term evolution of this concept also deserves elaboration.

Similarly, Katherine Aaslestad questions my assertion that memory of the occupation provided a “fountainhead for nationalism” among the peoples involved across the nineteenth century. This point—for which I rely largely on previous scholarship by Karen Hagemann, Volker Wacker, and David Hopkin—indeed needs to be interrogated and complicated. As I try to emphasize in the book and have elaborated upon elsewhere, the “national” identity of the various protagonists in the occupation of 1815-1818 was largely constructed well after the fact, through the lens of later conflicts, beginning with the Franco-Prussian War. [2] Nonetheless, because the memory of this event was revived and refigured in these later conflicts, its role in the rise of nationalism requires further examination—within as well as outside of France, as Dodman suggests in his off-hand comment that the use of Joan of Arc as a rallying point for the French nation deserves further attention. As Denise Davidson recognizes, the subsequent forgetting and re-remembering of the occupation has long blurred our understanding of political and cultural identity in this formative period—which will take more research to remedy.

Perhaps most seriously, at least two of the reviewers suggest that the book puts too positive spin on this post-war occupation. According to Alan Forrest, the label “Friends” overstates the relationship between the Allied troops and the occupied French. Or, in the words of Thomas Dodman, I am seeing the “glass” of this occupation as “half full,” rather than “half empty.” In writing the book, this is the criticism that I most anticipated. Indeed, this occupation can be interpreted in at least two different ways or was in fact, as Dodman suggests, two distinct occupations, depending on the location and class of the occupied (and occupier). At several

places in the book, I do emphasize this point (e.g., pp. 6-7, 72-73, 136-137, 212). However, as I also note, virtually all classes and localities experienced the entire spectrum of relations between occupiers and occupied, at various moments throughout the three years of occupation. While I by no means want to understate the violence, humiliation, and deprivation endured by many French civilians (and some Allied troops) under occupation, I was struck in my research by the remarkable amount of “accommodation” and “harmony,” if not always actual “friendship,” between peoples who just a few months before had been mortal enemies. And, rather than painting the occupied as victims as had most previous (mainly French) accounts of this event, I wanted to emphasize the progressive nature of this very forward-looking use of occupation for peace-making. I do not disagree with Thomas Dodman that the “occupation of guarantee” benefitted an international elite of financiers, diplomats, officers, and tourists, at the expense of ordinary soldiers and civilians—in a way that foreshadowed current European and global treaties and institutions. However, as Glenda Sluga has suggested, we should not underestimate the genuine humanitarian impulse behind such institutions [3] In the context of 1815, we must also recognize the other, even more harsh alternatives to the ultimate post-war settlement, advocated for instance by the revenge-hungry Prussian leaders. As Alan Forrest emphasizes, the history of France after Napoleon could have gone very differently.

While I hope that this book will stand as the accepted history of the occupation of guarantee for the foreseeable future, I also hope that it will open up some new avenues of research. By mixing so many different topics and sources together to illuminate the experience of this occupation, I aimed above all to reinvigorate the scholarship on a period that has until recently been neglected between the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, on the one hand, and the Belle Époque and the “Age of Extremes” in the twentieth century, on the other. In addition to raising some of the questions outlined above, this book is intended to (re-) open at least three main lines of inquiry. First, as Denise Davidson recognizes, it should push us to re-think how we understand and teach the Bourbon Restoration, a period that has begun to receive renewed attention from scholars interested mainly in political culture but that deserves much more study for its role in solidifying or initiating many of the diplomatic, economic, and cultural developments we associate with “modernity.” Second, my study generates numerous additional questions about how Europeans “exited” from war after the fall of Napoleon. In reconsidering the Restoration, not just in France but across the Continent, historians need to remember—as Katherine Aaslestad rightly emphasizes here and elsewhere—that this was a period of post-war reconstruction. Much more research needs to be done to understand the de- and re-mobilization of military forces as well as the reconfiguration of diplomatic, political, economic, and social institutions during this transition from war to peace.

Finally, in investigating this gradual “exit” from war, historians of this period should make even more use than they have so far of visual and material sources. While such sources have been explored by historians of political culture during the French Revolution and Restoration, they are less often utilized by military historians, who (with the exception of uniforms) have tended not to attend to the material culture of soldiering. But such sources can reveal much, not just about war itself, but also the transition from war to peace. For my book, two of the most evocative sources—curiously not emphasized by the reviewers here—were (visual images of) material artifacts: one, the Russian-inspired *montagnes russes*, or roller coasters, erected in parks around Paris between 1816 and 1818, which became a flashpoint for anxiety about foreign influence in

France (198-208); and two, the so-called “Liberation Scarf,” a full-color drawing of nostalgic French veterans surrounded by various contingents of departing Allied troops printed on silk and sold for use as a kerchief or wall-hanging, to commemorate the end of the occupation in November 1818 (309-312).

Alongside the maps emphasized by Dodman, such vivid material artifacts help us to “see” the post-war occupation of 1815-1818 in all its complexity. As this scarf literally illustrates, there were indeed multiple occupations, for the occupiers as well as the occupied. Recovering these various occupations, across nationalities, locations, classes, and genders, was my main goal in this book.

NOTES

[1] Christy Pichichero, *The Military Enlightenment: War and Culture in the French Empire from Louis XIV to Napoleon* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017), and Huw Davies, “The Military Enlightenment, Strategic Debate and the Foundations of Wellington’s Strategy in the Peninsular War,” unpublished paper presented at the Society for Military History, Columbus, OH, 10 May 2019.

[2] Karen Hagemann, *Revisiting Prussia’s Wars against Napoleon: History, Culture and Memory*, trans. Pamela Selwyn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Volker Wacker, *Die alliierte Besetzung Frankreichs in den Jahren 1814 bis 1818* (Haburg: Dr. Kovač, 1999); David Hopkin, “Legends of the Allied Invasions and Occupations of Eastern France, 1792-1815,” in *The Bee and the Eagle: Napoleonic France and the End of the Holy Roman Empire, 1806*, ed. Alan Forrest and Peter H. Wilson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 214-233; Christine Haynes, “Remembering and Forgetting the First Modern Occupations of France,” *Journal of Modern History* 88, no. 3 (2016): 535-571.

[3] Glenda Sluga, “‘Who Hold the Balance of the World?’ Bankers at the Congress of Vienna, and in International History,” *American Historical Review* 122, no. 5 (2017): 1403-1430, and “Economic Insecurity, ‘Securities’ and a European Security Culture after the Napoleonic Wars,” in *Securing Europe after Napoleon: 1815 and the New European Security Culture*, ed. Beatrice de Graaf, Ido de Haan, and Brian Vick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 288-305.

Christine Haynes
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
chaynes@uncc.edu

Copyright © 2019 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and its location on the H-France website. No republication or distribution by print media will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France.

H-France Forum Volume 14 (2019), Issue 3, #5