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Bertrand Goujon’s contribution to the “Histoire de la France contemporaine” series from Editions du Seuil is a comprehensive treatment of the early nineteenth century. It updates André Jardin and André-Jean Tudesq’s two-volume *La France des notables* from 1973 that covered the period in Seuil’s previous iteration of the series. Forty years ago, Jardin and Tudesq structured their history of postrevolutionary France through the separate, though occasionally intersecting, trajectories of Paris and the provinces. Volume one laid out “l’évolution générale” of Parisian-oriented politics, while volume two examined “la vie de la nation” in a series of regional chapters focused on economic development. Goujon brings the pieces back together, and although he draws his examples from across France, *Monarchies postrévolutionnaires* is a history of the nation, which clearly transcends that of its regions.

Goujon’s main interest, and the strength of *Monarchies postrévolutionnaires*, is political culture and the establishment of parliamentary practices in early nineteenth-century France. Often seen as a “parenthèse dans l’histoire nationale,” (p. 7) postrevolutionary monarchies in Goujon’s treatment appear as important stages on the way to a stable parliamentary system. Both a parliamentary regime and spaces for public debate put down durable roots in this period, and Goujon presents these as the most important results of these years of experiments with monarchy. In a sense, Goujon has adapted Maurice Agulhon’s concept of 1848 as an “apprentissage de la république,” as Agulhon’s contribution to the 1973 Seuil series was titled. The Restoration and July Monarchy were certainly not schools of republicanism, but they were occasions to come to terms with representative government and to practice parliamentary negotiation. As Goujon acknowledges, his synthesis owes a great deal to the work of Pierre Rosanvallon and other scholars who, beginning in the 1980s, engaged with cultural history and renewed the history of political ideas. Goujon’s work is an excellent synthesis of this scholarship.

Goujon arranges his narrative around political events and divisions and organizes his book in six chapters that trace the stabilization and destabilization of the two monarchies. The first chapter focuses on the initial return of the Bourbons and the Hundred Days (1814-1815), and the second examines how Louis XVIII’s regime faced the challenge of reconciling the nation behind a Bourbon king (1815-1820). In the third chapter, we follow the shift toward ultra-royalism under Charles X following the assassination of the duc de Berry (1820-1828). Rather than treating the July Revolution separately, chapter four focuses on the instability of the period 1828-1832, ending with Louis Philippe firmly on the throne, having survived insurrectionary challenges from the Left (the abortive June 1832 revolt) and the Right (the attempted uprising led by the duchesse de Berry). Chapter five covers the period from 1832-1840 which saw the consolidation of the July Monarchy, while the final chapter, which ends in 1848, examines the growing sclerosis of the regime’s conservative liberalism and its final crisis. Goujon’s emphasis is less on monarchs than on categories like “stability,” “turmoil,” and “stagnation.”

Goujon uses the metaphor of a *passage*—“le lieu urbanistique emblématique par excellence” of the period—to describe postrevolutionary monarchies (p. 14). Just as *passages* fit themselves in the interstices of
existing buildings, postrevolutionary politics were located in spaces shaped by the experience of the Revolution and the Napoleonic years—no fresh start was possible for any of France’s nineteenth-century kings. Although they accommodated themselves to the exigencies of the existing urban landscape, _passages_ were nonetheless the site of many of the nineteenth century’s most important experiments in consumerism, class society, and urban design. Goujon argues that France’s early nineteenth-century monarchies were similarly innovative as they formed a relatively stable framework for constitutional experiment, industrialization, urbanization, and a reinvigorated colonialism.

Although political culture is at the center of Goujon’s work, as the image of the _passage_ suggests, his synthesis is quite wide-ranging, and _Monarchies postrévolutionnaires_ reflects recent scholarship on a variety of topics. He gives extensive coverage to economic history and the origins of French industrialization. Urban history is a particular strength of the book, and Goujon makes a strong case that the origins of Haussmannization lay in the infrastructural improvements of the July Monarchy. Colonial history is another strength, and Goujon discusses both the invasion of Algeria in the final days of the Restoration and the more deliberate adoption of an aggressive colonial policy, notably in the Pacific, under Louis-Philippe.

Goujon’s efforts to weave all of these elements together are, not surprisingly, uneven. At times, he succeeds exceptionally well, as in the chapter on the transition from Restoration to July Monarchy, in which the theme of generational conflict brings together disparate threads of the narrative. Parisian students and young romantics both felt stifled by both economic recession and what one 1828 pamphlet referred to as France’s gerontocracy. They organized their opposition around newspapers, banquets, and secret societies, and in July 1830 they invented what became the quintessential symbol of revolution—the barricade, where the aspirations of young bourgeois and workers met. These elements of youthful opposition politics continued to challenge the July Monarchy for its first two years. In 1832, however, the duchesse de Berry’s disastrous attempt at invasion ended legitimists’ belief that their movement could succeed through insurrection. At the same time, the regime demonstrated its willingness to use force to protect the “juste milieu,” and its violent response to revolts in Lyon and Paris stabilized Louis Philippe’s throne, temporarily quashed popular insurrection, but also marked a permanent rupture with working-class interests. Goujon’s narrative strategy works best for periods in which political tumult provides a focus for the various elements of his comprehensive treatment of the early nineteenth century.

At other, more stable, times, however, Goujon’s effort to cover all bases has a more labored feel to it. The organization of the book is not as effective a structure for intellectual and cultural developments, for instance. Romanticism did not develop along the same timeline as French parliamentarism, and fitting novelists, playwrights, philosophers, and visual artists into the timeline of the rise and fall of monarchies leads to some repetition. Developments in the arts and sciences tend to appear toward the end of each chapter in sections with subheadings like “le bouillonnement des esprits.” The romantics, Victor Cousin and eclectic philosophy, Orientalism, professional historians, learned societies, and much more all appear, but presenting intellectual and cultural developments from 1815 to 1820, then from 1820 to 1828, etc., is unlikely to generate any new insight into artistic or philosophical responses to the postrevolutionary situation.

Ultimately, Goujon makes a convincing case that France’s two postrevolutionary monarchies saw a major and lasting reassessment of the relationship between government and citizens in France. Scholars with an interest in political culture will especially welcome this volume, and many others will want to dip into _Monarchies postrévolutionnaires_ for its comprehensive coverage of the period.
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