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Friedemann Pestel’s *Kosmopoliten wider Willen* (“cosmopolites despite themselves”) derives from a Ph.D. dissertation that he defended in Freiburg. The author’s goal is to explore the fields of action French political emigrants had during the Revolution and how the émigrés made sense of the situations in which they lived. The book thus studies political emigration as such, and the constructions of space and time linked with it. How did emigrants in exile position themselves towards France, other émigrés, and the societies in which they were living? Pestel analyzes political strategies and ideas, processes of inclusion and exclusion, perceptions of, and cooperation between political actors, as well as the visions and narratives they produced.

*Kosmopoliten wider Willen* explores a topic that has never been at the center of scholarly interest in the French Revolution. That historiography has tended to focus on events in Paris. To be sure, there are important studies about the émigrés in some regions, especially in London and in Switzerland, but Pestel focuses not on a particular region, but on a group of politicians that still has not been studied thoroughly: the monarchiens, who played a great role in the National Assembly during the summer of 1789 but did not succeed in convincing their colleagues to adopt the king’s absolute veto and the bicameral system in October of the same year. To be more precise, Pestel explores the story of five persons: Pierre-Victor Malouet, Jacques Mallet-du-Pan, Thomas Arthur de Lally-Tollendal, François Dominique de Reynaud de Montlosier, and Jean-Joseph Mounier. Following these politicians in all their travels, he uses an impressive sample of printed and handwritten sources preserved in thirty-seven archives and libraries in five countries, above all foreign affairs records and correspondence.

Pestel’s book invites us to decenter our gaze on the French Revolution in two ways. It makes clear that the traditional focus both on France (above all on Paris) and on the years 1789-1794 does not allow us to understand the political evolution of France in the medium term. In most monographs about the French Revolution, an actor who leaves France disappears from the narrative. *Kosmopoliten wider Willen* shows, on the contrary, that the monarchiens continued to influence the course of events. Emigration was thus not so much a sign of failure as a source of innovation and new activities that could have a large political impact. As Pestel explores the years 1788-1830 (and even gives insight into the monarchiens’ reputation during the July Monarchy), he spans a much longer period than the historiography on the French Revolution usually studies. In this book, the Jacobin regime appears as a short-lived phenomenon that shaped France less than the monarchiens. Indeed, the constitutional monarchy instituted in 1814/1815 was very much what the monarchiens had supported in 1789.

*Kosmopoliten wider Willen* has three parts. The first and the third are chronological and explore the periods before and after the exile. The second part is much longer and concerns the thoughts and deeds of the monarchiens in exile. It is not organized chronologically, but geographically and thematically. It
offers chapters on the *monarchiens* in England, Switzerland, and the Holy Roman Empire, on their (especially Malouet’s) policy towards Saint-Domingue, and on their communication strategies. Within each chapter, the style is more narrative than argumentative. As the chapters have no introduction, it is not always easy to understand the author’s specific theses. Since the section on the exile is not organized chronologically, the overall narrative is not always as coherent as it could be. Furthermore, the book is not only very long (over 500 pages), but written in a somewhat convoluted manner that sometimes obscures its overall argument.

Nonetheless, if there is a thread running through *Kosmopoliten wider Willen*: it is the story of how the *monarchiens*’ worldview enabled them to influence French politics. Although Pestel does not want to write an apology, he tends to stand up for the *monarchiens*. He rejects the accusation of opportunism and stresses the coherence of their actions. For him, the *monarchiens* were pragmatic and able to learn. Because of that, they were flexible and capable of changing projects, alliances, and narratives. On the whole, this thesis is convincing, but it shows its limits when it comes to their attitudes towards Saint-Domingue/Haiti. Malouet was evidently unable to grasp what was going on in Haiti. He always perceived the events as a part of the French Revolution and refused to acknowledge any agency of the Haitians themselves. Pestel warns us against treating Malouet’s extermination plans (1814) too seriously because the French government lacked the means to implement them, but it remains nonetheless that Malouet had such visions. Pestel could have explored in greater detail the racist worldview that prevented Malouet from understanding the Haitian revolt.

Concerning the *monarchiens*’ room for manoeuvre between 1791 and 1795, Pestel is perhaps slightly too optimistic. As royalists rejected by the other royalists, they were rather isolated within the French émigration. Although Pestel makes clear that the émigré factions made several attempts to cooperate with each other, the influence of the *monarchiens* was limited. They did not fit into any categories and were thus rejected even by critics of the French Revolution with similar political ideals like Edmund Burke. An interesting theme in the book is the difficulty contemporaries had in understanding diverse political views in the different European countries. The *monarchiens* did succeed, however, in gaining the support of the British government. They became informants, unofficial diplomats, and journalists. Malouet was recognized as a representative of Saint-Domingue’s planters. Pestel reconstructs all these activities and the European entanglements resulting from them with great precision.

Pestel also analyzes the *monarchiens*’ frequent strategic changes of direction. At first proponents of a violent counter-revolution, they sought to gain power through democratic means after 1795, but again championed violence against revolutionary France after 1797. After Brumaire (1799), they sought an agreement with Bonaparte and came back to France without fully supporting the new emperor. They triumphed in 1814-1815 when they were appointed to high state positions, above all during the Hundred Days. In the 1820s, they criticized the liberal opposition, although they did not fully endorse Charles X’s reactionary policies either. Notwithstanding their ambiguous position, they were considered to be fathers of the July Monarchy. Across all these ruptures, Pestel analyzes how the *monarchiens* and other émigrés adjusted their conception of time and their historical references. Seventeenth-century English history provided them with a framework for making sense out of the events with which they were confronted. The *monarchiens* experienced 1789 as a Glorious Revolution, but soon decided they were living in a period similar to English history from 1649 to 1660. Unlike the royalists, they did not have a cyclical vision of history, and they always believed that history moves forward and that it is impossible to restore the past.

*Kosmopoliten wider Willen* is a rich and important study that fills a gap in the history of France between 1789 and 1830. It is to be hoped that it will receive a broad reception beyond German-speaking countries.
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