



BRILL

JOURNAL OF EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY 11 (2021) 193–234

JOURNAL
OF EARLY
AMERICAN
HISTORY
brill.com/jeah

Book Forum



The Global Refuge: The Huguenot Diaspora in a Global and Imperial Perspective

*A Discussion of Owen Stanwood's The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age
of Empire*

Bertrand Van Ruymbeke (introduction)

Professor of American History, Département des Etudes des Pays
Anglophones, Université de Paris, Paris, France
bertrand.van-ruymbeke@univ-paris8.fr

David van der Linden (review)

Assistant Professor of Early Modern History, Department of History,
University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
d.c.van.der.linden@rug.nl

Eric Schnakenbourg (review)

Professor of History, Centre de Recherches en Histoire Internationale et
Atlantique (CRHIA), Université de Nantes, Nantes, France
eric.schnakenbourg@univ-nantes.fr

Ben Marsh (review)

Reader in American History, School of History, University of Kent, UK
b.j.marsh@kent.ac.uk

Bryan Banks (review)

Assistant Professor of History, Department of History & Geography,
Columbus State University, Columbus, GA, USA
banks_bryan@columbusstate.edu

Owen Stanwood (response)

Professor of History, Department of History, Boston College, Newton, MA, USA
owen.stanwood@bc.edu

Abstract

Huguenot refugees were everywhere in the early modern world. Exiles fleeing French persecution, they scattered around Europe and beyond following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, settling in North America, the Caribbean, South Africa, and even remote islands in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. This book offers the first global history of the Huguenot diaspora, explaining how and why these refugees became such ubiquitous characters in the history of imperialism. The story starts with dreams of Eden, as beleaguered religious migrants sought suitable retreats to build perfect societies far from the political storms of Europe. In order to create these communities, however, the Huguenots needed patrons, and they thus ran headlong into the world of empires. The refugees promoted themselves as the chosen people of empire, religious heroes who also possessed key skills that would strengthen the British and Dutch states. As a result, French-Protestants settled around the world—they tried to make silk in South Carolina, they planted vines in South Africa; and they peopled vulnerable frontiers from New England to Suriname. Of course, this embrace of empire led to a gradual abandonment of the Huguenots' earlier utopian ambitions. They realized that only by blending in, and by mastering foreign institutions, could they prosper in a quickly changing world. Nonetheless, they managed to maintain a key role in the early modern world well into the eighteenth century, before the coming of Revolution upended the ancien régime.

Keywords

Huguenots – refugees – empires – political economy – colonization – Protestantism

Owen Stanwood, *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), xi + 320 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-0-26474-1 (hbk)

Introduction by Bertrand Van Ruymbeke

The Huguenot diaspora, known to French historians as *le Refuge*, is an old topic. Or so it seems. The term Refuge, in that sense, was coined by Alsatian historian

Charles Weiss in his 1853 book *Histoire des réfugiés protestants de France de la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes jusqu'à nos jours*, translated into English in an expanded edition a year after.¹ In the second half of the nineteenth century, as Huguenot Societies were founded (New York, 1883; Charleston, South Carolina, 1885; London, 1885; Berlin 1890) to maintain an institutional and genealogical memory of the dispersion, studies were published on the Huguenots in the British Isles, in Germany, and in the United States.² Those works, however, were largely laudatory and filiopietistic, and even patriotic as they saw the diaspora through a national lens.

A century later, the 1985 tercentenary commemorations of the Edict of Nantes (1685) launched a salutary series of academic works—dissertations, articles, books—as well as exhibits that fundamentally and durably changed the historiography.³ The Huguenot diaspora no longer was the exclusive domain of Huguenot studies, local historians, and genealogists but became a true academic topic and deservedly so. Most prominent among the books published in the 1980s for America and beyond is Jon Butler, *The Huguenots in America. A Refugee People in New World Society*.⁴ Butler's main argument lies in the way the Huguenots in a matter of a single generation fully assimilated into North American colonial societies from Massachusetts to South Carolina. Butler's stand was rather negative in the sense that to him (being primarily a religious historian) the Huguenots failed to maintain their Calvinism and French linguistic and cultural ways and consequently disappeared not only

1 Charles Weiss, *Histoire des réfugiés protestants de France de la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris: Charpentier, 1853). Available in several reprint editions and in translation as *History of the French Protestant Refugees from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Present Time* (first edition 1854).

2 Samuel Smiles, *The Huguenots: Their Settlements, Churches and Industries in England and Ireland* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1867), Charles W. Baird, *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1885).

3 Janine Garrisson, *L'Edit de Nantes et sa Révocation. Histoire d'une intolérance* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1985), Elisabeth Labrousse, "Une foi, une loi, un roi?" *Essai sur la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes* (Genève: Labor et fides; Paris: Payot, 1985), Bernard Cottret, *Terre d'exil. L'Angleterre et ses réfugiés huguenots et wallons, de la Réforme à la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes, 1550–1700* (Paris: Aubier, 1985), Myriam Yardeni, *Le refuge protestant* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1985), *Le Refuge huguenot*, ed. Michelle Magdelaine and Rudolf von Thadden (Paris: Colin, 1985), Robin Gwynn, *Huguenot Heritage: The History and Contributions of the Huguenots in Britain* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), *Huguenot Refugees in the Settling of Colonial America*, ed. Peter S. Gannon (New York: Huguenot Society of America, 1985), *The Huguenots and Ireland: Anatomy of a Migration*, ed. C. E. J. Caldicott, H. Gough, and J.-P. Pittion (Dun Laoghaire: Glendale, 1987).

4 Jon Butler, *The Huguenots in America. A Refugee People in New World Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983).

from the colonial scene but also from the academic horizon. Since its publication Butler's book and thorough, voluntary, and quick assimilation thesis have been the benchmark for all serious work on the Huguenot Diaspora whether in America or elsewhere, even in Europe where refugees were much more numerous. Did the Huguenots really disappear that quickly everywhere they settled? If so, why and how? These are the main questions that have led the historiography for decades.

Owen Stanwood's *Global Refuge. Huguenots in Age of Empire* also challenges Butler's assimilation thesis, as he sees it as a strategy rather than a weakness, and takes stock of the works published on the Huguenot dispersion in the 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s. Yet it goes beyond. Two words are essential in Stanwood's work: global and empire. A weakness in Huguenot diasporic studies has been to always dissociate Europe from colonial and oceanic worlds when not just studying one country in particular without any attempt at comparative analyses. Susanne Lachenicht's comparative studies of the German States and North America was a true attempt at envisioning, as a sole author, the Refuge in a wider context.⁵ Stanwood went further as he followed Huguenot refugees in continental Europe, the British Isles, North America, the Caribbean, Surinam, southern Africa, the South Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Indian Ocean. This is quite a feat in terms of ambition, approach, historiography, and especially archives as Huguenot refugees can be elusive even though they appear almost everywhere. For the first time a historian has intricately tied—and not simply juxtaposed—Huguenot refugee individual and collective experiences nearly worldwide and has analyzed the Huguenot diaspora on a truly global scale through enlightening parallels and interactions.

The second innovative aspect of Stanwood's work is the imperial perspective. He shows quite clearly how imperial strategists and colonial projectors—Huguenots and others—made use of the refugees to promote faraway lands, plan and finance colonial projects, and settle overseas in frontier outposts. This imperial issue had been studied before but only punctually as in the case of Purrysburgh or New Bordeaux, both in South Carolina, in the 1730s and 1760s respectively. For the first time Stanwood went further and solidly pieced together areas, periods, and empires. The place that new worlds held in the Refuge in reality and in imagination is here efficiently articulated. A third dimension that makes Stanwood's book so novel and effective is the *longue durée*. The Refuge has always been studied primarily—and at times

5 Susanne Lachenicht, *Hugenotten in Europa und Nordamerika: Migration und Integration in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2010).

exclusively—from the late 1670s to the early 1710s with a focus on the 1680s, when most Huguenots left France. Very rarely has the Refuge been studied continuously over a century from the 1680s to the 1780s as Stanwood does.

Global is therefore to be understood not just in a geographic sense as the Refuge is analyzed in all its traits, including its utopian dimension, and periods. Finally, Stanwood revisited old sources and uncovered new ones. In sum, Stanwood offers us a uniquely geographically, topical, and temporal broad sweep on the Huguenot diaspora enameled with quasi worldwide fascinating individual stories. As the reviewers all stress in their essays this book is quite an accomplishment and will long remain a landmark in the historiography of the Huguenot diaspora.

Review by David van der Linden

The story of the Huguenot refugees is well-known. Following the forced conversion of French Protestants and the subsequent revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, an estimated 150,000 Huguenots fled abroad. They settled mostly in Switzerland, the British Isles, the Dutch Republic, and the German lands, with smaller groups travelling to colonial America and South Africa. It is remarkable, however, that this story has hardly ever been told from a global perspective. Most studies of the Huguenot diaspora (including my own examination of the Dutch Refuge) are written along strictly national boundaries, chronicling the history of the refugees in a single nation.⁶ As a result, scholars of the Huguenot diaspora have often viewed exile as a one-way street, leading to the gradual integration and assimilation of refugees into their host nation—a linear trajectory “from strangers to citizens.”⁷ Another consequence is that historians ignored the long-distance ties that still bound Huguenot refugees to the families and friends they had left behind in France, or the bonds forged between refugees across the diaspora.

Fortunately, these tendencies have been increasingly challenged in recent years, as historians acknowledge that the Huguenot diaspora should be studied from a transnational and global angle. Susanne Lachenicht and Ullrich

6 David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680–1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015). See also the recent study by Robin Gwynn, *The Huguenots in Later Stuart Britain*, 2 vols. (Sussex: Sussex Academic Press, 2015–2018).

7 The term is borrowed from the conference volume *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland, and Colonial America, 1550–1750*, ed. Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton (London: The Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 2001).

Niggeman have paved the way by comparing the Huguenot exile experience across the European and colonial world.⁸ It is within this emerging global narrative that Owen Stanwood has also situated his phenomenal study *The Global Refuge*. His book focuses not on the well-known European heartland of the Huguenot diaspora, but compares the overseas colonies settled by the refugees, stretching from the Caribbean islands and Surinam to North America and the Cape of Good Hope. As Stanwood aptly notes, “it is only by looking beyond any one nation’s boundaries, however, by viewing connections across borders and even across oceans, that the Huguenots’ larger significance becomes clear” (8).

Indeed, the global diaspora uncovered in this book suggests that the Huguenots were more than simply religious refugees. Whereas until the 1980s Huguenot refugees were habitually portrayed as a strong-minded minority that had been the victim of religious persecution, Stanwood follows the more recent approach that views the Huguenots as migrants who struggled to rebuild their lives far away from their homeland, separated from their friends and family they had left behind.⁹ In abandoning the strictly confessional perspective, Stanwood argues that the refugees were in fact “agents of empire” (9) who made a major contribution to the Dutch and British Atlantic empires that emerged in the eighteenth century. Their contribution was mostly economic. By the early eighteenth century, the notion of mercantilism had firmly taken hold among European political elites, who believed that population growth and a positive balance of trade would strengthen their economy. Refugees were seen as beneficial to this grand design, Stanwood argues, because they could populate the colonies without draining resources at home, just as they sapped French economic power. Moreover, it was believed the refugees’ specialized skills could benefit the colonies, in particular the production of silk, wine, and olive oil, which otherwise had to be imported from France. “They were chosen people, therefore, in economic as well as religious terms” (4).

Stanwood pursues this argument chronologically. Chapter one discusses the first Huguenot colonies established in Europe, which allowed the refugees to maintain their own identity. Already in October 1685, for example, Elector Frederick of Brandenburg issued the Edict of Potsdam, offering the refugees advantageous settlement, including the right to set up their own

8 Lachenicht, *Hugenotten in Europa und Nordamerika*; Ulrich Niggemann, *Immigrationspolitik zwischen Konflikt und Konsens: Die Hugenottenansiedlung in Deutschland und England, 1681–1697* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008).

9 Van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile*; Carolyn Chappell Lougee, *Facing the Revocation. Huguenot Families, Faith, and the King’s Will* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

administrative and judicial bureaucracies. By 1688, twenty-five French colonies had been established in Brandenburg. Many of these colonies have previously been studied by historians from a local or national perspective, but Stanwood breaks new ground by viewing them as a European phenomenon, arguing that they served as a blueprint for colonial ventures in the Atlantic world. These ambitions were most evident in Ireland, which by the end of the seventeenth century struggled with depopulation and was still overwhelmingly Catholic. The Huguenot leader Ruvigny, Earl of Galway, therefore championed the mass settlement of Huguenots who, he argued, would not only bring economic prosperity but also turn Ireland into a bulwark against Catholicism. Although little came of these plans, Ruvigny's scheme foreshadowed the Huguenots' role as agents of British empire-building in the Americas.

Chapter two examines why refugees decided to settle overseas, rather than in Europe. Stanwood rightfully points out that both push and pull factors played a role. On the one hand, the generosity of European states dissipated as ever more indigent Huguenots asked for financial support. The colonies thus provided an excellent opportunity for Dutch and British states to offload burdensome refugees, populate their overseas territories, and boost the Atlantic economy. The Dutch, for instance, struggled to populate their Cape colony, a crucial halfway station to their trading posts in the East Indies, but in 1687 the Dutch East India Company persuaded Huguenot refugees to settle by offering free passage and financial support for the establishment of a French colony. Colonial adventures were also driven by faith: the American mainland in particular offered freedom of religion, but even in the Caribbean refugees found a new home. One of the more intriguing episodes recounted by Stanwood is the settlement of Huguenots on the French sugar islands of Guadeloupe and Saint-Christophe. Although these islands were nominally Catholic, in practice French officials went easy on the Huguenots because they feared persecution would force them to decamp for nearby English and Dutch-controlled islands, taking their slaves and money with them.

In chapters three, four, and six, Stanwood offers us a *tour d'horizon* of the global diaspora, exploring the economic, geopolitical, and religious endeavors of the refugees. Economic ambitions largely revolved around projects to produce wine and silk, as Dutch and British authorities were persuaded that Huguenots possessed the skills necessary to cultivate vines and silk worms, making them less dependent on imports from France. Of course, most refugees had no such talents, but Stanwood argues that Huguenots quickly realized that "the language of wine and silk tended to open the purses of otherwise stingy patrons" (72). The British, for instance, had attempted to cultivate silkworms and vines in their American colonies from 1600 onwards, but due to a lack of expertise

these ventures had all failed. When in 1679 the Normandy refugees René Petit and Jacob Gérard petitioned the proprietors of Carolina to settle in their colony to produce wine and silk, their demands for land, transport, and tax benefits were thus quickly granted. The Dutch pursued a similar logic when they offered financial support to refugees settling in the Cape: the East India Company in particular believed that the Huguenots would be able to produce wine for its passing ships.

Besides economic considerations, Huguenot refugees were also welcomed as colonial settlers because Dutch and British leaders viewed them as helpful “pawns in a great geopolitical game” (135). The Nine Years’ War (1689–1697) in particular had seen the creation of an Anglo-Dutch coalition to halt French advances, not just in Europe but also in the American colonies. As Protestants, the Huguenots were seen as useful agents in this global geopolitical struggle. The main proprietor of the Dutch colony of Surinam, for example, Cornelis van Aerssen van Sommelsdijck, favored the settlement of Huguenot refugees precisely because he believed they could serve as a bulwark against French Catholics in the nearby colony of Guyana. Likewise, the British governor Daniel Coxe—who had inherited a claim to a colony named Carolana, in America’s southeast—wanted to settle 250 Huguenot families, in an attempt to prevent the French from extending their presence and halt the advance of Catholicism. Even so, Stanwood reminds us that the Huguenots were often treated with suspicion, seen as French rather than as Protestants. The relationship between Dutch and French settlers in the Cape thus quickly soured, as the local governor believed the Huguenots could not be trusted.

One of the most exciting parts in *The Global Refuge* is Stanwood’s discussion of the refugees’ religious schemes in chapter six, “Making the Empire Protestant.” Their Protestant heritage made the Huguenots attractive agents not just in the struggle against French hegemony, but also against Catholicism. This was particularly true for those refugees who settled in the British colonies, where they came to share the British dream of turning the empire into a force for the advancement of godliness, especially by taking territories that belonged to the French. Historians are well aware of the crucial role played by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG), an Anglican missionary society founded in 1701 to spread Christianity in the British empire. Less well known, however, is the Huguenots’ participation in the SPG. It is a story that Stanwood paints with verve, demonstrating that large numbers of refugees joined the society as ministers, missionaries, or supporters who travelled to America to evangelize and further the Protestant interest. The career of Élie Neau is a case in point. A former galley slave whose writings had become a best-seller after being translated into English, Neau left the French Reformed

Church in 1705 to join the Church of England. He subsequently served as SPG catechist in New York, converting slaves to the Protestant faith and trying to convince other refugees to join the Anglican church.

Neau's career also exemplifies the process of assimilation that took place among Huguenot refugees. Scholars have argued that over the course of the eighteenth century, Huguenot refugees in the American colonies—and in Europe, for that matter—lost their distinct identity, as they began to speak English, intermarried with other colonists, and abandoned the French Reformed Church. Yet as Stanwood demonstrates in chapter five, assimilation did not necessarily mean the refugees abandoned their heritage. Many merely adapted to local circumstances in order to survive, as colonial authorities viewed the Huguenots as French rather than Protestant. Such dilemmas were more pronounced in the colonies, where Huguenot colonies were increasingly mistrusted as “states within a state,” in particular at a time when British authorities sought to impose greater control on their overseas territories. Integration helped to dispel such fears, but the colonists never forgot their French heritage.

Stanwood also nuances the notion that European Huguenots lost interest in the colonies as the century wore on. While it is true that most Protestants focused their energy on rebuilding an underground church structure inside the French kingdom, known as *l'église du Désert* (“the Church in the wilderness”), the continued lack of toleration in France meant that by mid-century some Huguenots were turning their eyes west again. Chief among them was the Huguenot minister Jean-Louis Gilbert, who in the 1760s toured the Poitou and Saintonge provinces convincing Protestants to settle in the Americas. Once in England, he persuaded the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Secker, that 60,000 Huguenots were willing to leave France and settle in British colonies to produce silk, provided they received financial support—an exact copy of the story fed to British authorities a century earlier. In the end, just a handful of families crossed the ocean, settling in South Carolina, where Gilbert founded the Huguenot colony of New Bordeaux.

Like any stimulating study, *The Global Refuge* also raises questions for further research. As the case of Gilbert's faltering plans for mass emigration demonstrates, the actual impact of Huguenot refugees as “agents of empire” was rather negligible at times. To begin with, only a small number of Huguenots went overseas. Stanwood estimates that between 5,000 and 10,000 refugees settled in the colonies, ranging from the Caribbean islands and Surinam to British North America, the Cape of Good Hope, the island of St. Helena, and the Mascarene islands off the Madagascar coast. Of course, it is entirely possible that they made an impact far beyond their numerical strength—an argument often made of the Huguenots in other host societies—but as Stanwood

admits, many of their ventures came to a sorry end. For instance, economic schemes for wine and silk production in the Americas were doomed to fail due to unfavorable climatic conditions. Only the Huguenot colonists in the Cape managed to produce wine, but Dutch colonists proved equably adapt—if not more successful—at growing vines. The same can be said for the Huguenots' missionary efforts: despite their dream of converting colonial populations to Anglicanism, Catholic missionaries were far more successful, while French Catholic communities by and large resisted conversion. In other words, although the Huguenots were undeniably *seen* by the British and Dutch as potential agents of empire—and were certainly keen to portray themselves as such—their actual track record suggests they were not as crucial to the actual development of the Dutch and British empires.

This observation also raises another question: how should we define “agents of empire”? It could be argued that military personnel, commercial trading companies, and colonial authorities also pushed the colonial agenda, but without a comparison between these different groups it remains difficult to assess the unique contribution of the Huguenots. Indeed, Stanwood's global treatment of the Huguenot diaspora invites research that moves beyond a single refugee group. In recent years, the “comparative turn” in refugee studies has resulted in studies that seek to understand the Huguenot Refuge as part of the wider phenomenon of early modern exile movements.¹⁰ This is particularly true for the Dutch Republic, which played host to religious refugees of all persuasions, including Calvinists from the Southern Netherlands, Puritans from England, Jews from the Iberian Peninsula, and Lutherans from the German lands. Whereas these groups have often been studied in isolation, historians are now beginning to explore the connections between these refugees, who, they have shown, compared their experiences with those of others and seized upon common narratives of suffering to advance their position in the Dutch Republic.¹¹ Building on these trends, the global Refuge may also be compared to other transnational diasporas in the colonial world, such as the Moravian brethren, Jews, and Jesuit missionaries. It is by comparing these groups, I

10 Nicholas Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Mathilde Monge and Natalia Muchnik, *L'Europe des diasporas, XVIe-XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: PUF, 2019). See also the special issue “Rethinking the Refuge,” in *Church History and Religious Culture* 100, no. 4 (2020).

11 Johannes Müller, *Exile Memories and the Dutch Revolt: The Narrated Diaspora, 1550–1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Geert Janssen, “The Republic of the Refugees: Early Modern Migrations and the Dutch Experience,” in *Historical Journal* 60 (2017), 233–252.

suggest, that the Huguenots' contribution as "agents of empire" comes into sharper focus.

These questions merely demonstrate that Stanwood has written an important study of the Huguenot diaspora. *The Global Refuge* brilliantly succeeds in bringing back to life a group of refugees so often lost in the grand narrative of America's early immigration history. It also forces Huguenot scholars to look beyond the narrow national limits of the European host societies they have often studied, inviting them to compare the Huguenot exile experience to other "agents of empire" in the long eighteenth century.

Review by Erich Schnakenbourg

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes on 18 October 1685 is a major milestone in the history of Louis XIV's reign. The king's decision was a final step after years of harassment of his Protestant subjects, particularly during the 1680s. From this period onwards Huguenots left France on a quest for security and freedom to practice their faith. Their escape to foreign countries has been an attractive topic for a long time. Many places have studies devoted to the history of "their" Huguenot refugees, whether they relocated in Europe (Prussia, England, Ireland, Switzerland, the United Provinces, Sweden) or outside Europe in some specific places (New York, New England, Virginia, South Carolina, the Cape colony in southern Africa). Although there are valuable books on the Huguenots in Europe and North America, and in the Atlantic world,¹² we lack a real global study of the Refuge. "Telling the Huguenots' story requires a vast chronology and an even vaster geography" (5), Owen Stanwood posits. His book lives up to this ambitious program by embarking upon a truly global expose from three points of view. First, it takes into account all the areas where Huguenots sought refuge. Second, the author leads a really extensive study of all the actors, including Protestants fleeing France as well as their hosts. Third, the period studied, from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, allows the author to go beyond the first generation of Huguenot refugees of the 1680s.

12 Among others Lachenicht, *Hugenotten in Europa und Nordamerika*; Catharine Randall, *From a Far Country: Camisards and Huguenots in the Atlantic World* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009); *Les Huguenots et l'Atlantique*, volume 1, *Pour Dieu, la cause ou les affaires*, ed. Mickaël Augeron, Didier Poton, and Bertrand Van Ruymbeke (Paris: Les Indes savantes and Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2009), and volume 2, *Fidélités, racines et mémoires* (idem, 2012); *Figures huguenotes dans les Amériques: De l'histoire à la mémoire*, ed. Mickaël Augeron (Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2020).

The Revocation resulted in an exodus of nearly 150,000 people by land and sea in the course of a decade. They were just a minority of the French Protestants as around 80% of them decided to give up their Protestant faith and become Catholics. The first shelters of the fleeing Huguenots are to be found in the neighboring Protestant states from Switzerland to England. During the 1680s all around Protestant Europe a genuine feeling of solidarity arose toward the Huguenots, who became a symbol of the long-lasting struggle between Protestantism and Catholicism. The Huguenots' suffering was mentioned even in sermons in Boston, a sign that from the very beginning concerns about the fate of the French Protestants were not limited to western Europe. But beyond the discourses dealing with Protestants' confessional solidarity other issues were at stake. Some are related to the economy especially in the cities of Switzerland and the United Provinces, which suddenly had to deal with thousands of refugees to be housed and fed. Other issues were related to domestic issues. Owen Stanwood rightly shows how the hospitality extended to the Huguenots was linked to the host country's agenda, interest, and priorities. Charles II of England aimed to strengthen the Anglican church against Protestants' dissenters and therefore expected French Calvinists to conform to Anglicanism. He also hoped to attract refugees with manufacturing skills to improve his kingdom's textile production. In Brandenburg the conditions for the new arrivals were even better. As is well known, the French Protestant workforce and its skills were in demand for the domestic colonization of the eastern part of the Electorate. The elector, Friedrich Wilhelm I, did not require a confessional test and granted Huguenots land, tax relief, and some degree of self-governance. He was even ready to pay for their transportation thither. In Brandenburg, Huguenots were allowed to form "colonies". They profited from autonomy with their own administrative and judicial bureaucracies and could maintain their own churches. From the perspective of a quick return to France, these conditions were very attractive and coveted by many of the Huguenots regardless of the country where they settled.

The accurate description of Huguenots' Refuge in France's Protestant neighbors is a necessary initial step in Owen Stanwood's reflection. He shows how Huguenots' hopes and disappointments dovetailed with the priorities of the host countries. Little by little, French refugees resigned themselves to the idea that they would never return to France and accepted that their future had to be built abroad. Some of them made their home in Protestant Europe but others were still unsatisfied. Some of them decided to go home and face the cost of an abjuration while others looked beyond Europe and extended the Refuge to a global scale. How many people were engaged in this global scheme? It is, of course, difficult to ascertain, but Owen Stanwood estimates the number of

people to have been between “five to ten thousand, which would have been three to six percent of Europe’s refugees” (6). This is the topic at the very heart of the book and it constitutes a major contribution to the history of Huguenots, as well as to the history of the Atlantic World and of European empires.

Many factors enabled this Huguenot quest for a distant refuge. The first was their overrepresentation in French colonial overseas enterprises since the sixteenth century. Protestant privateers had been very active in the American seas and admiral de Coligny, the leader of the French Protestant party, supported an important expedition intended to found a colony in Brazil in 1555 and in Florida in 1564. Ports such as La Rochelle, Rouen and Dieppe had a large stake in the trade in the Atlantic and beyond as well as an important Protestant population. This link to the sea and the wider world reinforced the myth of a Protestant Eden. In that context, Owen Stanwood underlines the importance of the utopian belief in a free safe place where Huguenots would be able to worship as they wished and create a new society according to their faith. The opening up of new horizons beyond the seas made these hopes come true. It is especially manifest in examples presented in Stanwood’s book. The first is the case of Charles de Rochefort, who visited the Caribbean and published his *Histoire naturelle et morale des îles Antilles de l’Amérique*, for the first time in 1658. In the 1667 edition he added pages about the kingdom of the Appalachites where French Protestants of the Florida experience of 1564–1565 had been welcomed after being expelled by the Spaniards. The 1681 edition included nearly 40 new pages devoted to the English colonies in North America, presented in a favorable way. With this example Stanwood shows how the idea of a distant Refuge evolved as harassment of Protestants increased in France. It connected with the projects of utopian societies that were especially persistent in Huguenots writings. Places other than America could offer safe shelters for the Huguenots, such as the Dutch Cap of Good Hope colony under the Dutch East India Company or the Isle of Eden somewhere in the Indian Ocean, probably Île Bourbon, nowadays French Île de la Réunion. By highlighting these examples, the author reminds us of the importance of of imagination and hope in the process of migration, even today. Historians of migration have to account of the importance of refugees’ images of the world before they embarked on their journey.

Unlike Brandenburg, England and the United Provinces had colonies they wanted to develop. Thus, they were more interested in helping French refugees to settle overseas than keeping them in Europe, all the more so as the late seventeenth century was a time of crises all around western Europe. As unsettled people who had already left their home country, Huguenots were supposed to be more willing than others to accept work in faraway places. By sending

them to their overseas possessions, the English and Dutch gained workers and skills and avoided the risk of native depopulation, a frequent argument against colonial enterprises. Some young Huguenots enlisted in the Dutch and English East Indian Companies, which were always in need of recruits, and served in Asia. Others tried their luck in America and took refuge in English and Dutch colonies. French Protestant communities were established in the Caribbean and even in Dutch Suriname.

On the North American mainland Huguenot settlements followed two trajectories. Several hundreds of refugees in small groups voluntarily settled in the English colonies of Massachusetts and New York in the 1680s. But things were different in the British colonies to the south where flattering leaflets were published to attract new settlers. A few pamphlets were specifically aimed at Huguenots. As Virginia and South Carolina were at the same latitude as the Mediterranean Sea and enjoyed a similar climate as in the Cape colony, using Huguenots with supposed specific skills for the production of commodities such as wine, silk, and olive oil, could be a way to compete with Mediterranean produce and thus reduce imports from France and Spain. In some ways it worked out, as shown by the increase of the production of Cape wine and brandy in the 1690s, in which Huguenots played a decisive role. Throughout the eighteenth century, the production of silk and wine remained of major interest to British American colonies. In the 1760s the Board of Trade continued its attempts to draw French Protestant emigrants able to produce wine and silk. Indeed, in Virginia and the Carolinas, Huguenots developed vineyards on the eve of the Revolution.

One of the major contributions of Owen Stanwood's book is the demonstration that, beyond confessional solidarity, the Dutch and the English support for Huguenots was directly connected with imperial expansionist projects. On the one hand they had to contribute to the economic improvement of the colonies, on the other hand they had to be settled on the frontier to strengthen the edges of empires. Such was the case for young colonies in need of settlers, such as South Carolina where four hundred Huguenot families arrived between 1680 and 1718. In like Virginia, an older colony, French refugees founded Manakintown at the beginning of the eighteenth century, located in the upper reaches of the James River in order to fend off attacks by the French or Native American enemies. On a larger scale, England and the United Provinces were also eager to settle Huguenots in faraway locations where they could be useful to their long-distance shipping and trade. Like the Dutch at the Cape colony, the English also employed Huguenots at the refreshment stations on the sea routes to Asia, such as St. Helena or the Mascarene islands in the Indian Ocean. The author clearly demonstrates that "strategic considerations moved

hundreds if not thousands of Huguenots to the edges of empires. If political economic visions of silk and wine propelled one wave of migrations, the geopolitical interest of defending and expanding borders inspired another, with small cadres of refugees heading off to any number of vulnerable frontiers" (105). This is why Owen Stanwood's book is a history of the Refuge as well as a study in imperial history.

The parts of the book devoted to the negotiations between Huguenots and their host powers particularly highlight this very important point. By adopting this perspective, Owen Stanwood shows how each party combined its agenda to transcend confessional solidarity. Huguenots understood very well that they needed to make themselves useful and productive if they wanted good opportunities to rebuild their lives. They had to convince their interlocutors, such as colonial proprietors, to grant them aid so as to combine their status as the people of God with their expertise in various industries. That was why many Huguenots introduced themselves as knowledgeable in the production of wine and silk, commodities of interest to the proprietors of Carolina for example. Migration was a costly undertaking: the journey to America was expensive, land had to be acquired, and once settled it could take months before new arrivals would be able to sell any of their own produce. Huguenots therefore required guarantees before crossing the ocean. In England, they entered into negotiations with colonial proprietors as well as with the Board of Trade. Huguenot leaders did their best to present support to the refugees as a worthwhile investment as the newcomers would soon be able to provide England with commodities that up to that point had to be purchased from imperial competitors. "Huguenots forged a place in the world by advocating for a new kind of Protestant imperialism. Though French, they offered their bodies and their skills to other states. Their implicit, and sometimes explicit, argument was that they would make the world more Protestant and more productive, two goals that most assuredly went together," as Owen Stanwood states (9).

The depth of Stanwood's study of the Huguenots' Refuge comes to the fore in the author's able reconstruction of specific case studies. One of the most extraordinary of these is the story of Jacques de la Case. Originally from Nérac, in the south of France, his life from 1683 onwards was a real Odyssey over no less than four continents. The first stop was Brandenburg where he served as a soldier before going to Amsterdam. He then sailed to the deserted island of Rodrigues in the Indian Ocean. After a few years he reached Mauritius and was sent to Batavia to stand trial. After being acquitted, la Case returned to Amsterdam in 1698. He subsequently made his way to London and crossed the Atlantic to arrive at the new refugee colony of Manakintown, Virginia, in 1700, where he died in 1708. The stories of Jacques de la Case and others like him allow

Stanwood to point out two things. First, the importance of the Huguenots' global peregrinations within the framework of European empires; and second, how imperial powers—in this case England and the United Provinces—used hundreds, even thousands, of French refugees to strengthen their colonial settlements. Thus the welcome extended to harassed Protestants became a building block of imperial strategy, either by strengthening strategic locations in global navigation (Mascarene Islands, Cape colony and Saint Helen) or by populating the farthest edges of colonization, such as Virginia (Manakintown), Carolina and Florida for the English empire, or Suriname for the Dutch. Owen Stanwood thus summarizes: "In sum, la Case's global journey reflected far more than his own preferences; he traveled almost exclusively to the places where Dutch and English leaders wanted to strengthen their borders" (105).

The observations the author makes for the last decades of the seventeenth century are still true for the eighteenth century. French Protestant leaders continued to plan new projects for refugees in America into the 1750s and 1760s. For example, Purrysburgh, South Carolina, was designed to be an outpost of colonization where its founder, Jean-Pierre Purry, hoped to develop a Huguenot plantation of wine and silk. Owen Stanwood provides an important contribution to the scholarship on the Refuge in North America as he demonstrates the lasting impact of the Huguenot colonial project in the eighteenth century. At that time, French Huguenots, mixed with German and Swiss Protestants, established refugee communities in the New World such as New Bordeaux, in the South Carolina upcountry. They also settled in West Florida, Nova Scotia, and Maine. These communities followed the footsteps of their seventeenth-century predecessors by putting their ability to produce Mediterranean commodities to good use and providing essential manpower in strategic areas on colonial frontiers.

One of the main topics of Owen Stanwood's book is the issue of assimilation. In other words: how long did the French refugees remain Huguenots? It is often stated that the Huguenot migration, in particular that to America, was in this respect a failure. It is true that, after a brief time, the use of the French language declined and marriage partners were frequent found outside of the community. Many of the French Calvinists in British colonies adopted Anglicanism. It is also true that original Huguenot settlements became less French over time. For example, in Manakintown, Virginia, refugees eventually began to leave the colony and abandoned the production of wine and silk to take up the more lucrative cultivation of tobacco. In fact, Huguenots engaged in a balancing act between assimilation to the colonial majority and the preservation of their own identity. One of the major issues for the Huguenots communities was the nature of their relations with colonial authorities as this

determined the extent of political and religious autonomy they could enjoy. In the Cape colony, for example, Huguenots expected to form a coherent community and to enjoy some autonomy alongside the dominant Dutch population. But for the governor this was out of the question. He wanted to rule over a single homogeneous settlement and was reluctant to allow an autonomous French settlement in his colony. In Virginia the council used the word “colony” to indicate Huguenot communities and took measures against the use of the French language. In some places, Huguenots were denied the right to vote and hold office while remaining French. It is important to keep in mind that up to 1713, Huguenot refugees resided in colonies of countries at war with Louis XIV. Even though they were Protestants, they were also French and they were perceived as such whether they were naturalized or not.

In his study, Stanwood asserts that Huguenots tried to be discreet in order to reduce suspicions that might impede access to important positions in their host society. Thus, instead of considering the Huguenot migration within the British empire as a failure, the author highlights the achievements of the first and second generations in the army, in the Church of England, and in the imperial administration. Indeed, Huguenots offered unique advantages to the British empire as they knew French and had relatives in foreign countries. This was even more obvious in the matter of business. The use of family and community networks allowed refugees to build trading connections that tied empires together. One of the more famous cases is that of Peter Faneuil, son of a Protestant family from La Rochelle but born in New Rochelle (New York), who became one of the richest men in New England in the 1740s. Merchants in particular used their French family connections on the other side of the ocean to strengthen their business networks.

But is that enough to consider them still Huguenots? Paul Mascarene, born in France, but British in his professional life as lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia in the 1740s, and British in his private life, eventually conformed to Anglicanism and married an English woman. But according to Owen Stanwood, Mascarene nevertheless “never stopped being a Huguenot” (190). But on what grounds? This is, according to me, an important point to discuss. Mascarene was not a Calvinist anymore. He built his career entirely in the service of the King of Great Britain. He made his life in America. He may have recommended to his son to get in touch with French refugees who had long been settled in London, but this does not mean that he was still a Huguenot. The use of networks of friends, family and business acquaintances does not necessarily mean that people shared the same identity. Nevertheless, in the eighteenth century even well assimilated Huguenots still paid close attention to the fate of French Protestant refugees and continued to advocate for

Huguenot colonization of the New World on the basis of their specific skills in the production of wine and silk.

One of the greatest contributions of Owen Stanwood's study is the long-term appraisal of Huguenots' migration and endeavors. He deftly establishes how Huguenots shaped a global network through the capacity of inventive people integrating foreign imperial structures, whether as settlers, merchants, soldiers, mariners, or administrators. They were able to combine their French Calvinist background with the requirements of their state as refugees seeking a place in the world. Finally, as the author states: "Still, even nearly a century after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, descendants of the original refugees possessed enormous influence in the Protestant Atlantic—and especially in Britain and its empire, where they had insinuated themselves in many leading institutions. British in almost everything but name, these seemingly assimilated French people used their influence to attempt to build a new Huguenot empire" (198).

Stanwood's research must have been challenging, as he focused not just on the first migration of Huguenots as they fled from France. For some of them, migration did not just consist of leaving their own country, it became a worldwide peregrination for several generations stretching over several decades after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It is especially striking to see how lasting the utopian dream of finding a shelter was in the Huguenot culture and how important the imaginary geography became. From this point of view the chapters devoted to the eighteenth century provide very important insights into the general Huguenot phenomena. The extensive archival materials researched for this book allow the author to connect large scale perspectives and transversal analysis with small scale perspectives and specific cases of idealistic and audacious Huguenots. Owen Stanwood shows his mastery in the fields of cultural, religious, commercial, imperial, and colonial history in a very impressive final reflection. Beyond a simple history of French Calvinist refugees in the world, he succeeds in clearly setting out the complexity of the issues involved in migration. In this brilliant study, Stanwood weaves a rich tapestry which evokes many contemporary echoes of the transformation of identities in the process of migrations, of the refugees' imaginary constructs, of the strategies of assimilation combined with the will to maintain identities, and, finally, of the interest of the States where the Huguenot refugees settled.

Review by Ben Marsh

As the Higher Education sector has discovered to its cost (in all senses) in recent years, good marketing agencies find it possible to brand almost anything.

Sometimes they are able to work with pre-existing reputations or notions of cultural pedigree, and other times they pivot towards the future, crafting slogans and narratives that adhere to aspirational forces.¹³ It is a headache that has lately energized my own institution, whose longstanding badge as “the UK’s European university” does not sit comfortably with a nation grinding towards Brexit and wracked by local divisions. In marketing, simple reductive framings are the most effective, like those harnessed by leaders of populist movements or their opponents who wish to signal affiliations in the era of Brexit, Trump, and new waves of global refugees: “Make America Great Again,” “Take Back Control,” “Je suis Charlie,” “Wir schaffen das.” Owen Stanwood’s probing analysis of Huguenot migration patterns in *The Global Refuge* demonstrates that there remains much to deconstruct beneath headline historical claims about religion, migration, and assimilation, especially at complicated European and global tipping points—in his case between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He explores not so much the well-known and nearby motions, but the distant, diminutive, and sometimes dysfunctional ones, complicating the complexion of the *Refuge*.

There is little doubt that the early eighteenth century witnessed a steep change in the impact of institutionalized Protestant imperialism, and that this coincided with a surge forward in the reach of print culture.¹⁴ For example, “Church in Danger” was one of the earliest political slogans of a unionizing Anglo world, used to great effect by the Tories to defend Anglicanism during elections in 1705 and 1710. In this case, the slogan was not rolled out in the mode of anti-Catholicism—though “anti-popery” had its own set of longstanding mantras and symbols that had been recently superheated in the British Isles under James II. These would go on to be reenergized throughout the Hanoverian empire, becoming a nucleus around which much of eighteenth-century “British” identity would coalesce. Rather, the Tories’ “Church in Danger” slogan of the 1700s was crafted in response to the Toleration Act of 1688, out of fears that Church of England congregation numbers (and

13 Victoria Neumark, “What’s in a name? The value of a good university brand,” *The Guardian*, 3 April 2012, <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2012/apr/03/branding-universities>.

14 See for example Carla Gardina Pestana, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2007); Jeffrey R. Collins, “Redeeming the Enlightenment: New Histories of Religious Toleration,” in *Journal of Modern History* 81, no. 3 (2009), 607–636; Charles E. Clark, *The Public Prints: the Newspaper in Anglo-American Culture, 1665–1740* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

coffers) were irredeemably declining, and that waves of sedition were in the process of being unleashed.¹⁵ By concentrating overwhelmingly on this period between c.1680 and 1715, Stanwood hovers productively around a timeframe that has long been understood as transformative in many facets of European history, but that until quite recently had been comparatively neglected in early American, Atlantic World, and global scholarship. During these decades, as Stanwood shows, Huguenots acted as transnational trailblazers, though not always in the ways they have been classically described—nor in the manner that people of Huguenot descent have retrospectively characterized their ancestry.

In effect, Stanwood places in the foreground not Huguenot-as-believer, Huguenot-as-refugee, or Huguenot-as-artisan, but Huguenot-as-projector. He meticulously locates these Protestant extra-European emigrants by following their pathways, their connections, their claims, and their correspondence—sometimes in the main thoroughfares of evolving French, Dutch, and English empires, and just as often in their murky oceanic backwaters. The methodology is both compelling and frustrating, built as the work is out of a kind of anti-network analysis that dances around the main vectors of the *Grand Refuge* while lingering on biographies and community microhistories. Having to adapt around the demographically limited overseas exploits of a minority of existentially-challenged Huguenots is a tall order, as is wrestling with the partial imprint they left in imperial archives and institutions (that were never really configured to contain them). Throw in multilingual and multid denominational challenges, and it is not hard to see why few others have made concerted attempts to Hoover this messy part of the diaspora back into interpretive coherence. The imaginative ethnic prosopography that Stanwood outlines, however, does have recent Atlanto-global counterparts in works of kindred spirit, tracking the likes of American Loyalists, Jews, Acadians, and Native Americans, to make sense of cultural commonalities and geopolitical transformations.¹⁶

15 James Richards, *Party Propaganda Under Queen Anne: The General Elections of 1702–1713* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1972), 111; *Against Popery: Britain, Empire, and Anti-Catholicism*, ed. Evan Haefeli (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2020).

16 Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011); Christopher Hodson, *The Acadian Diaspora: An Eighteenth-Century History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Jonathan Israel, *Diasporas Within a Diaspora: Jews, Crypto-Jews and the World of Maritime Empires, 1540–1740* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Jace Weaver, *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000–1927* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Coll Thrush, *Indigenous London: Native Travelers at the Heart of Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016).

Indeed, in some respects, Stanwood's work offers a Huguenot-centric answer to a call lately framed for scholars of Indigenous peoples to situate empire and ocean more categorically within "cosmologies, geographies, and historicities."¹⁷

Stanwood aims to make sense out of the mishmash of Huguenot involvement in colonial (and often corporate) outposts such as South Africa, Suriname, St. Helena, South Carolina, and Rodrigues—the last a small settlement in the Mascarene Islands, and a geographic outlier, which presumably helps to stretch the work from claiming an Atlantic to claiming a global vista. He does so by integrating these colonies-within-colonies into a staged process that reflected Huguenots' deliberate self-projection and their evolving self-conception. Analyzed through a colonial American lens, we might best explain this as follows. Global Huguenots began like non-separatist Puritans in the first stage—aiming to thrive in the wilderness with the earnest long-range intent of returning home to France when practicable (though given the scale involved, it was more a question of acting as Hills within Cities than staking grander claims to self-constituting as a singular City on a Hill). The second stage saw extra-European Huguenots behaving more in the manner of Chesapeake indentured servants: committing themselves opportunistically to servicing the socio-economic goals of their masters—in this case the English and Dutch states—for a time-limited period, with a view to cashing in on that patronage, and in due course developing independent estates. Finally, stage three involved the kind of cultural mutation performed by populations such as Atlantic Creoles of African origin or Dutch elites in New York, as the circumstantial benefits of conformism to new imperial flows prompted Huguenot communities to hybridize and set aside earlier aspirations or expectations. Overall, while superficially appearing to be a *declensional* process (a word which still sets pulses racing among Puritan scholars), Stanwood is at pains to emphasize how the Huguenots themselves were frequently in control of their transitions.¹⁸ The Huguenot-as-projector had chosen to blend in—an

17 Sami Lakomäki, "We Then Went to England": Shawnee Storytelling and the Atlantic World," in *Ethnohistory* 63 no. 4 (2016), 595–619, quote 597. See also Caroline Dodds Pennock, "Aztecs Abroad? Uncovering the Early Indigenous Atlantic," in *The American Historical Review* 125, no. 3 (2020), 787–814.

18 Mark Peterson, *The Price of Redemption* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); Sarah Rivett, *The Science of the Soul in Colonial New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Michael Winship, *Godly Republicanism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012). For the classic take on declension narratives, Perry Miller, *The New England Mind in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939).

opportunistic *coucou* (cuckoo) in the imperial nest, rather than the two-dimensional pietist, martyr, or industrious artisan of legend, or just another bad colonial egg.

In the process of crafting this set of transitions, Stanwood builds illuminating and fascinating profiles of some of the key proponents and agents of overseas diaspora. The leadership of religious figures and of regional gentry is perhaps unsurprising. But he tracks them through key geographic and intellectual juncture points (such as Geneva, Rotterdam, and Dublin), many of which would enhance the kinds of biconfessional and bicultural flexibility that would prove useful in colonial locales. Even more illuminating is Stanwood's tracking through generational cohorts, which shows how children of the *Refuge* found spaces to consolidate, such as Pierre (later Peter) Simond, born in the Dutch Cape Colony at Drakenstein in 1691 as son to the prominent minister, who was apprenticed to an Amsterdam merchant house, and later successful in English colonial commerce which culminated in ownership of extensive Caribbean plantations on Grenada.¹⁹ On Huguenots' arrival in new worlds, we are shown in a cycle of colonial-specific permutations how they negotiated as much autonomy as they could according to their social contexts—sometimes making odd bedfellows with other colonists but often building opportunistic profiles within local institutions. For example, Stanwood argues that Calvinist precepts were abandoned in moves to assimilate within the episcopal framework of colonial Anglicanism (in communities in Virginia, New Rochelle, South Carolina, or as individuals in Boston and elsewhere). But he notes that questions of ecclesiastical conformity—like those of naturalization—were carefully parsed, never universal, and often left space for the persistence of older practices, especially where Anglo-authorities were not sure of the meanings of French services. The work also reveals how overseas Huguenots were not static but dynamic—prone to seeking out greener pastures as the shape of colonial settler empires rose, fell, and spread. For instance, in the wake of the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, Huguenot women petitioned British authorities to seek the restitution of male relatives' sugar estates on St. Kitts, emphasizing their faith, zeal, and service, with a surprisingly high degree of success.

Among the most original synthetic insights that *The Global Refuge* develops is through its triangulation of three sub-fields that have not always intermingled

19 Birth date and a fuller biography of Simond can be found in Maurice Boucher, *French Speakers at the Cape in the First Hundred Years of Dutch East India Company Rule: The European Background* (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1981), 342–388 (date given on 357).

effectively: political economy, colonial propaganda, and the lived experiences and responses of settlers on the ground. The work shows the common and often imaginative ways in which Huguenots latched onto imperial aspirations for managing supply and demand flows. They tapped into French vulnerability in the Antilles, tapped into British “dreams of silk and wine” in America (though as I have argued elsewhere, with deficiencies in regional fit for expertise), and tapped into Dutch and English East Indies Companies’ designs for trading waypoints to sustain transoceanic vessels—perhaps explaining why fortified spirits figured more frequently in these references to wine, as they were more suited to shipboard consumption (71).²⁰ The projective language of Eden was used figuratively by contemporaries, and the book sometimes borrows from this indistinction, especially when it comes to clarifying how far Walloon communities or Vaudois or others fed into Huguenot schemes and vectors (such as the eccentric Henry Duquesne’s). But Stanwood gives us an instructive differentiation between what we might describe as “instrumental zones”, such as the Cape and St. Helena with their overwhelming focus on gardening-as-maritime-provisioning, and the “sustainable zones” such as the southern British American colonies and Mascarene Islands with their longer-range ambitions of cultivating raw commodities in bulk, or religious exile. The only drawback of this framing is that it perhaps obscures some of the wider commonalities in the language of what Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra has described as the “early modern eschatological imagination”, for the Huguenots’ characterizations of Edens held striking resemblances not just with those of fellow Puritans (as we would expect) but also Catholic typological renderings of Biblical gardening texts.²¹

To borrow from an appropriately hybrid global brand—the “Spaghetti Western”—Stanwood’s work leaves open comparative spaces in which other scholars may seek to locate the good, the bad, and the ugly. Perhaps the most fertile ground is the chance to elaborate on what followed from many empires and administrators coming to view Huguenots as assets—as “the most valuable Colonists”—in the words of Governor James Grant in 1763 (217). The fact that Huguenots who made it to the far-flung outposts of empire did not generally appear tormented by “Penury and Want” and retained respectable connections

20 On Huguenot and French regional involvement in silk schemes, see Ben Marsh, *Unravelled Dreams: Silk and the Atlantic World, 1500–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), esp. 166–178, 239–256.

21 Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550–1700* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 214–5.

(to kinfolk or institutions) by the early eighteenth century placed them in stark contrast to many of the other populations flooding overseas colonies—among them enslaved Africans, convicts, indentured servants, and new flows of European Protestant (largely German Palatinate) and British (largely Scottish and Irish) economic refugees. As Stanwood demonstrates, the Huguenot-as-projector was by and large a good template: one on which future French emigrants could depend to generate social capital for settlement schemes, such as those marshalled by Jean-Louis Gibert and Louis de Mesnil de Saint-Pierre in the 1760s. But to what extent did the model also implicitly or explicitly provide a knee-up for similarly configured migrant streams beyond the Confessional world of *Le Refuge*: Moravians, Mennonites, Salzburger, and others? Plenty of work has been done to assess and explore denominational similarities among minority religious communities in early America—some of it originating in grand schemes in the late nineteenth century to reunite a true church of persecuted dissenters descending from sixteenth-century radical reform. But taking a leaf out of Stanwood's Huguenot Eden(s) could branch into a more nuanced appreciation of economic parallels in the language of projection and performance.²² A willingness to read Huguenot virtues into other oceanic migrant groups helps to explain how some sites became more ecumenical than others, or some expectations were confounded about, say, French Swiss, Piedmontese, or Mediterranean populations in Georgia and East Florida.

Only with a comparative lens will it be possible to fully answer questions left somewhat hanging over the Huguenots, who benefited in different ways from the privileges of being Protestant, French, and white. Of that triad, being Protestant could prove problematic in France, and being French could prove problematic on account of xenophobia in English and Dutch polities. But by the turn of the eighteenth century on the front line of empire, being white overwhelmingly brought tangible benefits. That these Huguenots were loosed upon the Atlantic (and to a lesser degree Indian Ocean) world at the genesis of the codification of racial slavery deserves further elaboration. This was an institution, after all, that they successfully clambered into alongside the other imperial edifices that Stanwood describes—such as the Prussian military, the Church of England, or the Dutch East India Company. And perhaps

22 For useful thoughts on religious migrants and comparative agency in negotiating resettlement within empire, Susanne Lachenicht, "Refugee 'nations' and Empire-Building in the Early Modern Period," in *Journal of Early Modern Christianity* 6 no. 1 (2019), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jemc-2019-2004>. On nineteenth-century schemes, Donald F. Durnbaugh, "Relationships of the Brethren with the Mennonites and Quakers, 1708–1865," in *Church History* 35, no. 1 (1966), 35–59.

all the more resonant given that Robin Gwynn has lately compared English (especially Londoners') sympathy for Huguenot arrivals to Britain between 1680–1710 with the British public outcry against African slavery that gradually emerged a century later. Huguenots' slaveholding, shielded behind wider Anglicanism in much of the British empire, also carried a somewhat different trajectory into the later eighteenth century than that of their kindred colonial cuckoos, global Quakers, who retreated from it fast.²³ Slavery—especially in locales such as South Carolina, St. Kitts, and Suriname, but also in New Paltz (New York, somewhat neglected herein) since the 1670s—was unquestionably among the foundations that global Huguenots' "mastery had rested on" alongside their status as Protestant heroes and the strength of their family and community ties (232).²⁴

By no means does Stanwood ignore Huguenot slaveholding (of either African or Native American populations) or racial interactions, such as the Christianization of African-Americans by the likes of Élie Neau in New York and Francis Le Jau in South Carolina; the work notes Huguenots' own brutal punishment and servitude in Mediterranean galleys—and briefly, a small number's exile as "slaves" to the French Antilles in 1687. But there are hints that warrant more systematic development within the thesis—as when Stanwood observes that the governor of Saint-Domingue treated Etienne Serres and other "Huguenots with respect, probably happy to get white settlers of any kind" or references propaganda aimed at would-be refugees that stressed Carolina as "proper to the labor of Negroes." (51–52, 107)²⁵ The story of Huguenots' conversion to empire was in almost every locale a conversion from chasing liberty to settling for slavery—be it on St. Helena where Stephen Poirier struggled with his vines or in the better-known Caribbean and North American mainland. Perhaps this was too obvious to be worth making explicit—given what we know of Protestants' active role in establishing the French transatlantic slave trade out of ports such as Bordeaux.²⁶ Yet especially in locations such as Suriname where Huguenot emigrants from the 1680s reenergized earlier

23 Robin D. Gwynn, *The Huguenots in Later Stuart Britain: Volume II Settlement, Churches, and the Role of London* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2018).

24 On New Paltz, see e.g. *The New Paltz Register of Slaves (1799–1825)*, ed. Eric J. Roth and Susan Stessin-Cohn (New Paltz: Huguenot Historical Society, 2002), 2; for an argument that Huguenots "acquired slaves early, and may have had more of a penchant for slave ownership than other groups," see Sally M. Schultz and Joan Hollister, "Jean Cottin, Eighteenth-Century Huguenot Merchant," in *New York History* 86, no. 2 (2005), 133–167 (quote on 143).

25 Quote from *Plan pour former en Etablissement en Caroline* (The Hague, 1686), 1.

26 J.F. Boshier, "Huguenot Merchants and the Protestant International in the Seventeenth Century," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 52 (1995), 77–101 (esp. 84).

Walloon and French communities to reach a community of five hundred by 1700, their role in defending plantation slave colonies was an ugly reality. It was not a coincidence that where the logic of slavery already prevailed, fewer efforts were made to articulate other rationales by (or for) the French refugees—explaining Stanwood’s comment that “circumstances and motivations of the Suriname Huguenots remain somewhat mysterious” compared to others, and that there was no need to talk of olive oil, silk, or wine (111). As Ruth Whelan has argued in relation to Ireland, at times Huguenots leaned comfortably towards practices and “rights of exclusion” by virtue of drawing on particularities of their own histories of persecution, but myths of progress came with costs.²⁷

A connected point relates to the military experience and the military value of global Huguenots, which Stanwood neatly builds into his analysis at several junctures. He explains convincingly that at several sites that we might think of as militarized zones (particularly within and around the Greater Caribbean), post-Revocation Huguenots transformed their domestic histories of conflict against the French Catholic state, and their vocational roles (such as *troupes de la marine*) into colonial assets. These were Calvinists with insider knowledge and networks, skills and resources, and ideological axes to grind whose military service could prove strategically vital and (mostly) reliable. The idea that they could be counted on in a scrap, in worlds that were permanently racially militarized—setting aside the many wonderful cameos and exceptions that Stanwood excavates—opens the door to further important comparative insights. Between the *Code Noir* in 1685 that notionally Catholicized all enslaved people in the French empire and the British hope for a slave-free buffer zone between Spanish Florida and the Carolinas in the 1730s, imperial administrators designed key policies on the basis of assumptions about settler ethnicities and behaviors. Among these were Scots Presbyterians at Port Royal in South Carolina (the site of the earliest Huguenot colony under Jean Ribault), and Gaelic and Catholic Highlanders at Darien and Salzburger Lutherans at Ebenezer in Georgia, a colony initially prohibited from slaveholding. Stanwood’s descriptions of Huguenots bouncing around these settler regions reminds us that there is more to do to explain the way that understandings of empire, white ethnicities, and environments were co-configured.²⁸

27 Ruth Whelan, “Repressive Toleration: the Huguenots in Early Eighteenth-Century Dublin,” in *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, ed. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003): 179–196 (quote on 195).

28 *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, 1550–1900*, ed. Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

The Global Refuge is therefore in step with wider currents in scholarship in recent decades that have broadened (and in some respects liberated) religious subjects from intellectual and denominational subfields to engage wider social, political, and cultural questions. It will complement other new studies emerging to round out our understanding of the character of Huguenots' vocational and demographic maturation in the eighteenth century, and—having done the hard work of connection and contextualisation—opens further doors for comparison and elaboration.²⁹ As Stanwood ably demonstrates, the Huguenots played with both reputational-historic and aspirational-future marketing frameworks to support their resettlement and open new opportunities, linked to the promise of geopolitical transformation. If one were to summarize what slogan best fits Stanwood's quirky, fast-moving, opportunistic diasporic generations of Huguenots, it might not be one forged in the toxic crucible of the political and refugee crises around us, but one borrowed from environmental campaigns that touch and translate into many parts of the world: "Think global, act local."

Review by Bryan Banks

The nascent American Republic represented a beacon of religious toleration in France in the 1780s for three reasons. First, an American Enlightenment tradition had begun its disestablishment, which would craft a distinctly American balance between church and state. Second, the French Catholic crown had aligned itself with the enlightened upstart, crossing confessional lines to destabilize its British imperial rival in the north Atlantic. And third, the history of Protestant imperialism in North America had depended, in part, on the Huguenot diaspora, as Owen Stanwood shows in *The Global Refuge: Huguenots in an Age of Empire*, and as such, seemed a likely ally for the French who wanted to see Louis XIV's 1685 Revocation undone and the return of Huguenots to France.

The Marquis de Lafayette had been the French face of the American Revolution and when he returned to France after the war, he became one of the most pronounced advocates of Huguenot toleration. In 1785, Lafayette wrote to George Washington to bemoan the "intolerable despotism" faced by Huguenots in France, which rested on the "whim of king, queen, parliament,

29 For a summary, Evan Haefeli, "Toleration in the Atlantic World," *Oxford Bibliographies in Atlantic History* (2017). DOI: 10.1093/obo/9780199730414-0176; Tessa Murdoch, *Huguenot Refugee Art and Culture 1530–1780* (London: Victoria & Albert Museum, forthcoming 2021).

or any of the ministry.” Huguenots had no protection under the “law, their children are to be bastards, their parsons to be hanged.”³⁰ French Calvinists were stranded in the *Désert*. The *Désert* referred to both a temporal period of persecution ushered in by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 as well as those rural spaces in southern France pockmarked by clandestine religious meetings in barns, caverns, and forests.³¹ Lafayette aimed to be the leader of a cohort of French establishment figures, most notably, Guillaume-Chrétien de Lamoignon de Malesherbes, who had spent the better part of the early 1780s writing tracts on Protestant marriages and the need for toleration in order to guarantee inheritance rights. Lafayette was also in contact with Huguenot leaders, including the Calvinist pastor and later President of the revolutionary National Constituent Assembly, Rabaut Saint-Étienne. In the traditional historiography of the Huguenot eighteenth century, the 1787 Edict of Toleration, signed by Louis XVI, represents the culmination of the efforts of enlightened figures like Lafayette, Malesherbes, and Saint-Étienne and the denouement of the *Désert* period of Huguenot persecution in France.³²

In *The Global Refuge*, Stanwood offers a new emplotment of the Huguenot eighteenth century and returns a sense of agency to Huguenot refugees in the process. He refocuses our attention away from figures like Lafayette and towards figures like the Jean Herni de Bérenger, a Huguenot who made a career in the eighteenth-century Prussian army. Bérenger’s uncle, Hector de Bérenger, had moved to the Carolina Lowcountry, along the Savannah River, to experiment with silk production. After his death, Henri de Bérenger sought to collect his inheritance from across the ocean. Huguenots had learned to appeal to imperial authority in the decades after the Revocation to accomplish such goals. Bérenger appealed first to British monarch George III, but after the American Revolution began, the imperial scales broke. Bérenger tried again, this time reaching out to George Washington in 1788, the year before Washington’s inauguration as the first President of the United States, but to no avail. Stanwood’s chronology extends the traditional narrative of the Huguenot Refuge past the

30 *The Letters of Lafayette to Washington, 1779–1799*, ed. Louis Gottschalk (New York: Hubbard, 1944), 296.

31 See Yves Krumenacker, “Une perception protestante de l’espace au XVIII^e siècle?,” in *Évolution et représentation du paysage de 1750 à nos jours* (Montbrison: Ville de Montbrison, 1997), 146–7.

32 Daniel Ligou and Philippe Joutard, “Les déserts (1685–1800),” in *Histoire des protestants en France*, ed. Robert Mandrou (Toulouse: Privat, 1977); Geoffrey Adams, *The Huguenots and French Opinion, 1685–1787* (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1991); Catherine Bergeal, *Protestantisme et tolérance en France au XVIII^e siècle: De la Révocation à la Révolution, 1685–1789* (Carrières-sous-Poissy: La Cause, 1988); David Garrioch, *The Huguenots of Paris and the Coming of Religious Freedom, 1685–1789* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Revocation and the reign of Louis XIV, and into the Enlightenment and revolutionary eras, which scholars like Maya Jasanoff have called an “age of refugees,” thus linking the retrospective construction of “refugee” identity the Huguenots created in the Revocation era to that of the revolutionary epoch.³³

Whereas scholars have often seen the Huguenot diaspora in the eighteenth century as one awaiting the “coming of religious freedom,”³⁴ Stanwood encourages us to view the period as one of perseverance rather than mere survival—one of new networks and innovation rather than dislocation and dissolution. The revolutionary period appears less a clarion call for toleration and more a death knell for the structures and conditions that made a global Huguenot diaspora possible. “Empires made the global Huguenot Refuge; the age of Revolution left it in tatters” (232). Empires fostered Huguenot visions of Edenic worlds where the Reformed might escape persecution and support themselves through their commercial ties, as well as their wine and silk experimentation. Through both the English and Dutch empires, Huguenots forged a parallel universe. In short, Stanwood offers an interpretation of the Huguenot diaspora in the eighteenth century with which scholars of all stripes—of Huguenot history and the early modern period, more generally—will need to contend.

The Global Refuge pushes the field in several interesting directions and rejuvenates some older debates about the effects of the Revocation on the eighteenth century. The book is composed of seven chapters with an introduction and an epilogue. Stanwood threads several key themes through each chapter, with particular emphasis placed on the theological beliefs of the Huguenot population and the power religion played in shaping the diaspora, the political economy of the Huguenot international, as well as the importance of imperial geopolitics. It is a book with wide-applicability, and its use of sources in English, Dutch, and French establishes a foundation for Stanwood’s argument and his focus on religion, geo-politics, and political economy provide a model for scholars looking to write global histories of displaced peoples.

The study of Huguenots and the economy represents a strong undercurrent in the field, especially as scholars have turned to the rise of the mercantilism and world history. Readers will want to pay close attention to the footnotes in Stanwood’s introduction to see how the author envisions his work contributing to these larger debates around early modern economic development,

33 Maya Jasanoff, “Revolutionary Exiles: The American Loyalist and French Émigré Diaspora,” in *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context*, ed. David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 38.

34 Garrioch, *The Huguenots of Paris*.

colonization, and imperial expansionism. Stanwood's focus on networks and transnational political economy offers refreshing insight to the French Huguenot historiography, which in some ways has been stuck on one of two questions. First, did the Revocation and the loss of 200,000 Huguenots damage the French economy after 1685? And if so, why? Late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century critics of the louisquatorzean regime argued that the loss of talent, commercial ties, and knowledge proved irrevocable to the French economy. Individuals from the Marquis de Vauban to Voltaire advanced this argument in one form or another preserving a perception of Huguenot loss that would last for more than two centuries. In the twentieth century, Herbert Lüthy published his two-volume work on the subject, entitled *La banque protestante en France* (1952) and Warren C. Scoville published his *The Persecution of Huguenots and French Economic Development, 1680–1720* in 1960. Both Lüthy and Scoville seemed to put this question to bed in the historiography and yet, the business acumen of the Huguenots remains a potent topic in the field.³⁵ Stanwood avoids the question of whether the Huguenot expulsion damaged the French economy, relegating the hexagon for the international, imperial world order.

Stanwood also offers an interesting alternative to the classic argument of Max Weber in his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Weber argued that forms of Protestant asceticism (which Calvinists maintained) and belief in election created a culture that eschewed material wealth in favor of hard work and success.³⁶ The latter stood as proof of favorable predestination. Stanwood argues “[w]hile there was no particular reason that Eden and profit could not coincide, the political economic logic of empire did not always dovetail with the refugees’ desires for *salut*,” safety, nor strict theological adherence (73). Stanwood views Huguenots as agents, who used their commercial networks and willingness to experiment with silk, wine, and olive oil around the Atlantic World; however, their theological beliefs did not drive labor and wealth accumulation. Economic success was integral to the maintenance of the clandestine church. In France, such associations between business acumen and

35 Herbert Lüthy, *La banque protestante en France de la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes à la Révolution*, 2 vols. (Paris: S.E. V. P. E. N, 1959–61); Warren C. Scoville, *The Persecution of Huguenots and French Economic Development, 1680–1720* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960). For the most thorough critique of Scoville's monograph, see R. Grassby's review in *Economic History Review* 14 (1961–2), 360–2.

36 Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Chicago: Taylor & Francis, 2001). Originally published as *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus* (1905). See Margaret C. Jacob and Matthew Kadane, “Missing, Now Found in the Eighteenth Century: Weber's Protestant Capitalist,” in *American Historical Review* 108, no. 1 (2003), 20–49.

Protestant theology persisted throughout the eighteenth century and were regularly a part of the anti-Protestant rhetoric used by the Catholic Church. Even today, commercial wealth and business acumen remain stereotypes of French Calvinists in France. Historians from as E.G. Léonard and Myriam Yardeni have taken up this cultural argument concerning the economic predilections of Huguenots and both maintained that such a connection did not truly exist, or at the very least could not be substantiated through the lens of theology.³⁷ In many ways, turning to the mercantile sector and burgeoning imperialism seems like the place where a Protestant ethic might be located. “If France was lost, then the Reformation would need to move to new lands” (39). While Weber emphasized the asceticism of denominations like Calvinism to create a direct link between theology and commercial success, Stanwood maintains that theology took precedence and economic vitality was necessary to sustain their Edenic visions. “Huguenot commercial links gave them the necessary tools to strike out overseas, and their utopian mindset allowed them to imagine what they might find there”(42).

If economic worth was not inherent to the Calvinist faith, it was a useful piece of propaganda and one that facilitated the movement of Huguenots from European metropolises out through imperial avenues to uncharted European lands globally. “As French people the refugees could build the imperial economy in particular ways that the king and his ministers would find especially valuable.” (83) To this end, Huguenots often found themselves on the “edges of empires,” in contested territories, pushing into lands and vying for control from indigenous populations. Here a familiar cast of Huguenot characters and some not so familiar ones provide great insight into peripheral spaces and the forging of a global refuge. Pierre Simond, the Huguenot reverend in the Dutch south African Cape Colony, and Manakintown colonists in the English colony of Virginia, Charles de Sailly and the marquis de La Muce, all struggled against their respective empires, as they moved into un-colonized spaces, demanding liberties as representatives of the empire and in the name of their commercial efforts (142–3, 150).

I wonder what Stanwood’s study would have looked like if he had decentered the imperial narrative for a “frontiers” one and if doing so would have integrated the *Désert* more fully into his analysis. Imperial histories, even as much as they stress the overlapping of empires and unsettled spaces, tend to assert monolithic categories like sovereignty over spaces that did not

37 Émile G. Léonard made this case forcefully in 1953. See Émile G. Léonard, *Le Protestant français* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1953), esp. chapter 4. Yardeni, *Le refuge huguenot*.

necessarily operate in such a way. *Le Désert* in France is a classic example of this. The French monarchy technically laid claim to these spaces, but they did not control them in an absolutist fashion, but rather depended on local aristocratic families to maintain control and to carry out their religious duties or face dereliction that may or may not result in any official sanction. Here we may chart another similarity between Huguenots in the Refuge and those in the Diaspora. Pierre Serna, for example, argues that we should understand the French provinces as operating in a similar fashion as the colonies, with their own centers of power, their own autonomy, and their own political actors.³⁸ If we take Serna's assertion and apply it to the *Désert*, we may begin to see Huguenots establishing themselves in increasingly rural spaces, depending on their trade positions as well as new forms of agrarianism. Huguenots concealed in the Cévennes mountains and along the plateau of the Massif Central found refuge in space from their Catholic neighbors and the long arm of the Bourbon law, while still having to navigate hostile relations in the name of trade and survival. It would have been ideal for Stanwood to push beyond Huguenot elites in France and port cities. How did lower-class Huguenots in France understand the global refuge? How did Calvinists in the *Désert* build their own Persian towers like Jean-Baptiste Tavernier literally did in the Aubonne, in their small clandestine meetings? (58) In many ways, asking Stanwood to take a deeper dive into the lower-class Calvinists in France is simply wishful thinking given the paucity of sources.

Stanwood's choice to focus on political economy makes sense in the context of the sources produced during the time and maintained in archives over the last two to three hundred years. Economic actors attempting to establish themselves in foreign lands, to start-up economic ventures, and to gain some semblance of representation in their new polities produced the sources Stanwood works with. Stanwood mixes letters to magistrates written on behalf of new Huguenot communities with personal diaries of prominent businessmen with types of sources that leave only the faintest glimpses of Huguenot existence (i.e. maps, county court records...etc.). Writing histories of Huguenots in the global Refuge and Huguenots in the *Désert*, share the problem of a dearth of sources. Stanwood draws on an impressive array of printed and archival sources in English, Dutch, and French. Most of these sources were produced beyond France's borders. Huguenots in France rarely produced the kinds of

38 Pierre Serna, "Every Revolution is a War of Independence," in *The French Revolution in Global Perspective*, ed. Lynn Hunt, Suzanne Desan, and William Max Nelson (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013), 165–182.

documents of which Stanwood makes use. Those who remained in the *Désert* most often left archival traces when they encountered the state or the Church or when they interacted with Huguenots abroad. In colonial outposts, record production is equally difficult to come by. “The lives of the Huguenots once they reached the colony are even more difficult to recover. A plethora of French plantation names—from the classically Calvinist “La Providence” to “Picardie,” “Bellevue,” and the highly ironic “Liberté—testified to the presence and relative affluence of the Huguenot settlers in the colony as did the French surnames of several eighteenth-century governors.” (111) Doing such interpretation of names within France may prove difficult, but not impossible and represents a prominent strategy in tracing underground Huguenot communities.³⁹

Perhaps, one of the most daunting subjects to tackle when researching Huguenots in the eighteenth century is effectively outlining role of Huguenot women. This certainly can be explained by the Calvinist paternalism within the congregation and the pseudo-domestication of women in the eighteenth-century world. It might seem to the reader that Stanwood’s choice of political economy almost necessarily precludes women from the start, but we know this is not true. Recent work on the French eighteenth century, in particular, has shown how women carved out spaces for their own economic activity.⁴⁰ Durand of Dauphiné and his wife’s story prove illustrative and, on some level, indicative of the place of women in the larger work. Durand made his way to London in 1686, the year after the Revocation, like so many Huguenots. En route to London, he met a woman whose husband had abjured his faith and abandoned her. Durand and the woman stuck together and conjured up dreams of entering the silk business in Carolina. They read about the plentiful mulberry trees and imagined themselves raising silkworms. The woman died on their way to the Americas and the ship blew off course, taking Durand to Virginia instead. We never even learn her name in Stanwood’s account, if it exists anywhere at all. Female voices and their actions died in the archival record too often.⁴¹

Reading against the grain for the role of women would have strengthened Stanwood’s analysis, but so too might have decentering the imperial frame

39 See David Garrioch, “Suzanne, David, Judith, Isaac...: Given Names and Protestant Religious Identity in Eighteenth-Century Paris,” *French Historical Studies* 33, no. 1 (2010), 33–67.

40 In particular, I am thinking of Katie Jarvis, *Politics in the Marketplace: Work, Gender, and Citizenship in Revolutionary France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

41 On Montesquieu’s Calvinist wife, Jeanne de Lartigue and her archival silences, see Bryan A. Banks, “Jeanne de Lartigue, Madame de Montesquieu: Calvinist Refugee and Wife of an Enlightened Philosopher,” in *Wives of Western Philosophy* ed. Jennifer Forestal and Menaka Philips (New York: Routledge, 2021), 88–106.

of reference allowed Stanwood to focus on how Huguenots interacted and depended on other marginalized groups. Stanwood's imperial approach further effaces other groups from his analysis, including enslaved Africans and indigenous peoples. Simond, in South Africa profited from slavery, and certainly other Huguenot wine and silk settlements harnessed the labor of chattel slavery around the Atlantic World; yet very little prolonged discussion emerges on how these forms of enslavement might have supported the Huguenot refuge. Similarly, interactions with indigenous peoples on the periphery might have shaped and even bolstered Huguenot networks. So much work has been done on what Richard White has called the "middle ground" now, it was a bit surprising not to see this feature play out to a greater extent in Stanwood's analysis.⁴² Huguenot-indigenous relationships had proved integral to the survival of the Reformed around the Atlantic World in the first wave of Huguenots. After Villegagnon expelled Huguenots from the French colony of France antarctique, where Rio de Janeiro sits now, some fled inland, settling with the indigenous Brazilian population, the Tupinambá.

In offering a new periodization of the Huguenot global refuge, Stanwood has accomplished an incredible feat, focusing our attention away from the Franco-centric debates about religious toleration and finding Huguenot agents on the edges of empire forging their own international community in the wake of the Revocation. It would have been nice if Stanwood had brought France and the *Désert* bank into his analysis more, linking France to this global system. Doing so would have inevitably complicated his periodization further. Stanwood encourages us to cast our gaze on the Age of Revolutions as critical for understanding the ways that mercantile networks and imperial power geo-politics shifted and disrupted the structures that existed within the global Refuge or Huguenot Empire. The Age of Revolutions ended the integrated global Refuge in Stanwood's account. It is easy to see the rise of nationalism embedded into the American and French Revolutions as detrimental to the global features of the Huguenot tradition. Further connections might be made that would bridge the revolutionary with the post-revolutionary era. Huguenots learned to speak nationalist language at the time of the Age of Revolutions, as an extension of the theme of "assimilation," which Stanwood discusses in chapter five. This would surely account for the emergence of Huguenot societies in the second half of the nineteenth century, a generation removed from the White Fear of the French Revolution, at least, as well as concomitant with the emergence of ethno-nationalisms and other

42 Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

new international identities, as well as concomitant with the emergence of ethno-nationalisms that fostered by imperialism itself.

Again, I offer all these notes to further discussion, not to deride the quality of project Stanwood has produced here. Stanwood is breaking new ground. *The Global Refuge* is creative and faithful to the sources that exist, if not as critical of those sources and the power structures that led to their production, as one could be.

Response by Owen Stanwood

Beyond the Global Refuge

It all started with a book. As a graduate student I came across an imprint entitled *Echantillon de la Doctrine que les Jésuites enseignent aus Sauvages du Nouveau Monde, pour les convertir* ["A Sample of the Doctrine that the Jesuits teach to the Savages of the New World to Convert Them"].⁴³ It fit with one of the themes that interested me at the time—the Anglo-French-Indian encounter in the late seventeenth-century Northeast—but the book inspired me to think for the first time about a community that would eventually occupy most of my attention. Its author, Ezechiel Carré, was a Huguenot, the minister of Boston's French Church, and a refugee from southern France to British North America, where he ministered to a French congregation in Rhode Island before decamping to Boston. I soon became fascinated with his story, and the story of his community. How had a French minister even ended up in New England, and why did he collaborate with an English colleague—none other than the famous puritan Cotton Mather—to publish and interpret Jesuit religious texts? The answer, I thought, might reveal much about the place of New England in a wider Protestant Atlantic world.

As it happened, Carré's pamphlet was just the beginning of a journey that would take me far beyond New England. As I investigated, I found plenty of great scholarship on Huguenots in colonial America. Jon Butler's 1983 magnum opus admirably covered the social history of the refugees in New England, New York, and South Carolina, while later studies by Neil Kamil, Paula Wheeler Carlo, and Bertrand Van Ruymbeke filled in more details on the latter two

43 It was published in Boston in 1690. For a translation and thorough analysis see Evan Haefeli and Owen Stanwood, "Jesuits, Huguenots, and the Apocalypse: The Origins of America's First French Book," in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 116, part 1 (2006), 59–119.

regions.⁴⁴ Harder to find, however, were studies that connected any of these places to the wider Atlantic world. Van Ruymbeke provided a tantalizing suggestion of a linked “Atlantic Refuge” in a 1999 article but left it for others to fill in the details.⁴⁵ I set out to do so, but soon the Atlantic world proved too small to contain the refugees, so I expanded my gaze to include Europe and the Indian Ocean as well. The Huguenot vision was a global one, and by the time I finished *The Global Refuge* I had examined well over a century of history across multiple continents. That widened gaze was necessary to answer my original question, about why an obscure minister had found himself publishing a French-language tract in 1690s Boston—even if Carré himself barely even appeared in the finished product.⁴⁶

Sometimes it is only after books are done that authors realize what they are really about. That is always made easier, of course, with the help of brilliant readers like the ones in this roundtable, whose insightful comments have sometimes expressed the main points of my book better than I could hope to do myself. Some of them are not too surprising. David van der Linden notes, for instance, my desire to connect the histories of different parts of the Refuge, since so much of the field has fragmented around various national historiographies. Eric Schnakenbourg recognizes my desire to tell a story that is largely about the political economy of empire, something that I felt had been somewhat neglected in Huguenot historiography. Other readings are more unexpected. I had not realized that my book centered “the Huguenot-as-projector,” in Ben Marsh’s formulation, but he is undoubtedly right, as I used the stories of a number of eccentric people and far-flung communities to create a portrait of a world in motion. I also did not realize that I was engaging with Max Weber’s famous thesis about Calvinism and capitalism, but Bryan Banks convinces me that I did just that. Reading the reviews together, moreover, I am struck by the extent to which they view *The Global Refuge*, quite rightly, as the

44 Jon Butler, *The Huguenots in America*; Neil Kamil, *Fortress of the Soul: Violence, Metaphysics, and Material Life in the Huguenots' New World, 1517–1751* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005); Paula Wheeler Carlo, *Huguenot Refugees in Colonial New York: Becoming American in the Hudson Valley* (Brighton, Sussex Academic Press, 2005); Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, *From New Babylon to Eden: The Huguenots and their Migration to Colonial South Carolina* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2006).

45 Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, “Un refuge atlantique: Les réfugiés huguenots et l’Atlantique anglo-américain,” in *D’un Rîvage à l’Autre: Villes et protestantisme dans l’aire Atlantique (XVIe-XVIIe siècle)*, ed. Guy Martinière, Didier Poton, and François Souty (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1999), 195–204.

46 I do fill out Carré’s story in Stanwood, “Ezechiel Carré, New England’s Forgotten Minister,” in *Figures huguenotes dans les Amériques: De l’histoire à la mémoire*, ed. Mickaël Augeron (Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2020), 83–92.

beginning of a conversation rather than a final word. Indeed, I see a number of possible paths forward for scholars who hope to further explore aspects of the global Huguenot diaspora. Some of these undoubtedly represent subjects I could have more fully treated in my book, while others simply move off in directions I did not really consider, or I believed to be beyond my scope.

One key unexplored path, as Bryan Banks notes, is to more fully integrate France itself. I did not set out to write French history; the Refuge seemed big enough, and before writing this book I was far more comfortable in the British world. But moving into the eighteenth century I came to see the deep connections between what French historians call *le Désert* and the refugee diaspora, which I outlined in chapter seven of the book and more explicitly in a separate article.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, I intentionally limited my analysis of France, not least because of the major archival commitment to really understand the *Églises du Désert*. Banks convinces me that I should have done more, or that someone should perform that labor, challenging as it might be to find sources that reveal much about French Protestants who quite resolutely stayed in the shadows.⁴⁸ Especially fascinating is his suggestion to view frontiers within France as fundamentally similar to frontiers outside of it—especially in places like the Cévennes where Huguenots maintained *de facto* control for long periods of the *ancien régime*. Such a study would go a long way toward demolishing some of the artificial historiographical boundaries, usually corresponding to national borders, that have made Huguenot history so difficult to understand in its totality. I suspect that Banks is about to accomplish much of this in his own work-in-progress, which should do much to paint the picture of eighteenth-century French Protestantism *tout court*.⁴⁹

On the other side of the ocean, of course, there were frontiers as well, and that is another angle that, in retrospect, I could have explored more fully. As world travelers, Huguenots found themselves in the company of diverse populations. The story of how they interacted with indigenous peoples, from New England to South Africa, is difficult to find but could be teased out. Their

47 Stanwood, "From the Desert to the Refuge: The Saga of New Bordeaux," in *French Historical Studies* 40 (2017), 5–32.

48 In addition to official documents regarding Protestantism collected in Série TT, Archives Nationales de France, the obvious place to look is the Collection Court, Bibliothèque de Genève, which includes a plethora of correspondence from eighteenth-century Huguenot ministers, of which I was only able to scratch the surface.

49 Banks is currently working on a project that will illuminate "Protestant Enlightenment on France's Frontiers." For a preview see Banks, "The French Protestant Enlightenment of Rabaut Saint-Étienne: *Le vieux Cévenol* and the Sentimental Origins of Religious Toleration," in *French History* 32 (2018), 25–44.

relationship to ideas of race and slavery, as both Banks and Ben Marsh note, is even more critical. It is doubtful that the refugees who left Europe had thought much about race, but they must have received a quick racial education once they traveled overseas. They adapted quickly to societies that embraced racial slavery around the world, becoming both slaveholders and slave traders. While I mentioned slavery in the book, I tended to gravitate to stories of Huguenot distinctiveness. So I focused on Élie Neau and Francis Le Jau's attempts to evangelize enslaved people, which placed them somewhat outside of the mainstream, but largely ignored the more significant number of refugees who owned or traded in slaves. I did this both because others have written about the phenomenon but also because I did not find it very surprising.⁵⁰ Huguenots embraced slavery because all their white neighbors with means did so as well. Nonetheless, the question of how, in Marsh's encapsulation, the Huguenots went from "chasing liberty to settling for slavery," is one that needs more unpacking. He is undoubtedly right that the refugees quickly benefited from their whiteness in an empire (or empires) where that was a great boon, but unfortunately they virtually never reflected on that fact in writing. Telling the story of the Huguenots and race thus will require reading between the lines, looking at what they did more than what they wrote. It might also require engaging more than I did with the non-white people whose lives they impacted, especially those they bought and sold. For instance, local records in South Carolina, or even social history sources like wills, might clarify patterns of Huguenot slave ownership, while records from the Slave Voyages database could further demonstrate the centrality of Huguenot merchants in the transatlantic slave trade.

The proper path, I believe, would be to integrate the history of Huguenots and racial thought into the story of their assimilation. That last word, of course, has been perhaps the central one in refugee historiography, since Butler proclaimed the most salient fact of the Huguenots' American story to be their quick disappearance as a coherent ethnic group. After all, the second generation of refugees often married outside the community, stopped speaking French, and abandoned specifically Huguenot communities.⁵¹ With other

50 The story of the Huguenots and slavery appeared in Butler, *Huguenots in America*, 121–126 and Van Ruymbeke, *From New Babylon to Eden*, esp. 216–19. See also R. C. Nash, "Huguenot Merchants and the Development of South Carolina's Slave-Plantation and Atlantic Trading Economy, 1680–1775," in *Memory and Identity: The Huguenots in France and the Atlantic Diaspora*, ed. Bertrand Van Ruymbeke and Randy J. Sparks (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 208–40.

51 Butler, *Huguenots in America*, esp. 199–208.

scholars, I have attempted to gently push back against this thesis, not denying the centrality of blending in, but also demonstrating the slow speed and incompleteness of that process. I should have also been more mindful of vocabulary; as Susanne Lachenicht has aptly noted, terms like acculturation or creolization might better represent the complex changes experienced by the refugees, who were engaging in a process of cultural change that was far from unique to the Huguenots.⁵² Nonetheless, I would continue to argue, in response to Eric Schnakenbourg's query, that Huguenot migrants remained French even if they embraced outward Englishness or Dutchness. To be more precise, they could serve as cultural brokers between French and non-French worlds. One additional example regarding Paul Mascarene, the soldier and eventual acting governor of Nova Scotia, might illuminate what I mean. Among his papers is a manuscript translation of Molière's *The Misanthrope*. Recently the literary critic Micah True has endeavored to analyze the translation and argues that it reveals Mascarene attempted to translate French culture to an English audience. In short, some of the Huguenot attachments to France were not limited to Protestant circles, and they lasted even long after the refugees seemingly assimilated. Such examples are hard to find due to the lack of many personal papers, but I suspect more are out there—and could help fill in the details of Huguenot adaptation to life in someone else's empire.⁵³

Speaking of empires, the reviewers point out the ways in which my imperial approach both opens new paths and closes off others. Other scholars such as John Boshier and Carolyn Chappell Lougee have privileged networks or families as the proper units of Huguenot analysis, and while I admire their work, I wanted to restore state power to the story, which I saw as shaping the refugees' destinies.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, I see that such an approach came with some collateral damage, since I depended on official sources that often elided the experiences of people on the margins, especially women. When they enter the narrative, like Durand of Dauphiné's unnamed companion or the women who claimed land in St. Kitts in 1710, they are often fleeting and poorly developed—because that is how they appear in the sources. And yet, even in an imperial story,

52 Lachenicht has made versions of this argument in a number of books and articles; see for example *Hugenotten in Europa und Nordamerika*; "Étude comparée de la création et de la survie d'une identité huguenote en Angleterre et dans le Brandebourg au XVIII^e siècle," *L'identité huguenote: faire mémoire et écrire l'histoire (XVI^e-XXI^e siècle)*, ed. Philip Benedict, Hugues Daussy, and Pierre-Olivier Léchoy (Geneva: Droz, 2014), 279–94.

53 Micah True, "British, but also French: Paul Mascarene's Translation of Molière's *Le Misanthrope* in Colonial Nova Scotia," *Quebec Studies* 71 (2021), 133–50. The manuscript itself is in Add. Mss. 19071 ff. 108–123, British Library.

54 Boshier, "Huguenot Merchants", 77–102; Lougee, *Facing the Revocation*.

women were important. Quite obviously, Huguenot colonies could not survive without female settlers, and prominent women, both Huguenot and otherwise, were omnipresent in the reform networks that sustained the Refuge. A possible study of women like the Marquise de Sommelsdijk, the Huguenot wife the Suriname governor who championed Huguenot settlement, could help illustrate how women participated in the tasks of empire. Of course, this would require new sources that I did not consider for this study, or the more imaginative use of existing sources. For instance, following the names of previously mentioned St. Kitts women in local records could help illustrate their importance on a local level.⁵⁵

Finally, perhaps the last great question involves the impact of the global Huguenots. David van der Linden points out that most Huguenot overseas colonies had little long-term consequence. The communities themselves faded quickly, and as previously mentioned, many individual refugees stopped being recognizably French. Given these facts, did the Huguenots really matter at all? Were they anything more than curiosities? Many historians have treated the refugees not much different from the nineteenth-century Bostonian Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr., who described the New England Huguenots as like “a flight of tropical birds [that] might alight on one of our New England pines.” They were interesting, perhaps, but out of place, and not terribly significant.⁵⁶

There are two ways to consider this question. On one hand, just because the Huguenot vision did not come to pass does not mean that it did not matter. The French historian Patrick Boucheron has recently written that history is not just one thing leading to another; it can be “an art of discontinuities.”⁵⁷ In short, what did not happen—or what almost happened—can be almost as instructive as what actually did. The fact that Huguenots wanted to remake the world, and that imperial patrons in several foreign kingdoms believed they could do so, says a lot about how empires worked, and what imperial planners hoped to build in their new settlements. It is also revealing, of course, that these visions ultimately failed, and goes back to Marsh’s point about the toxic

55 There are recent models of ways to integrate women into various imperial histories; see Emma Rothschild, *The Inner Lives of Empires: An Eighteenth-Century History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011); and Susanah Shaw Romney, *New Netherland Connections: Intimate Networks and Atlantic Ties in Seventeenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

56 *The Records of Oxford, Mass., Including Chapters of Nipmuck, Huguenot and English History from the Earliest Date, 1630*, ed. Mary de Witt Freeland (Albany: Joel Munsell’s Sons, 1894), 200.

57 Patrick Boucheron, *Of What is History Capable?* (Paris: Collège de France, 2018), online edition at <https://books.openedition.org/cdf/5876?lang=en>.

mixture of racial hierarchy and economic imperatives that shaped Atlantic empires. The Huguenot plan for the world was ultimately a utopian one: an attempt to remake the colonies in terms of demography, economics, and religion. These would be ethnically diverse places, responsive to the dictates of economic central planners, and reflecting the goals of a broader international Protestant cause that dovetailed nicely with British and Dutch imperialism. But in the end an empire of slavery, sugar, and other familiar cash crops won out over one of silk, wine, and the centrality of the Protestant cause. The Huguenots did not conquer the empire; instead, the empire conquered them.

Nonetheless, there *was* an impact, and Van der Linden himself highlights it in his review. The Huguenots provided a language of imperial belonging that influenced future groups of religious migrants, especially if they were Protestants. This is perhaps the most important path for future studies of refugees in the Atlantic and beyond: the links and commonalties between different groups of migrants. Put simply, the Huguenots discovered how refugees could be successful in other people's empires, most especially the British. They needed to first push all the right religious buttons—they had to prove that they were enough like their hosts that they would fit in and not be disruptive, which meant coming from one of the more or less responsible Protestant traditions. Then they needed to use the language of political economy to get land and aid, showing above all that they would not be a drain on resources. German migrants in the eighteenth century offer the most compelling comparative story. Waves of persecution combined with economic dislocation brought thousands of Germans to England—from the Palatines of 1709 to the Salzburger of 1734 to other less storied groups. In each case the refugees used language in petitions that mirrored or in some cases even copied that of the Huguenots in earlier times. Indeed, the Salzburger even ended up making silk in Georgia, while other Germans tried to make Carolina wine.⁵⁸

The next generation of historians, hopefully, will explore these connections more fully and integrate Huguenots into an empire, and a wider world, that included refugees of all stripes. Much like the history of the Huguenot Refuge has been fragmented into different national stories, the history of refugee groups in early America and the Atlantic has tended to be divided by ethnic groups. Historians of the German experience have rarely paid much attention

58 Philip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006); James Van Horn Melton, *Religion, Community and Slavery on the Southern Colonial Frontier* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). For an explicit comparison between Germans and Huguenots, see Alison G. Olson, "Huguenots and Palatines," in *The Historian* 63 (2001), 269–85.

to the French or Irish, and vice versa. While this is understandable due to linguistic challenges in accessing all these stories, we really need more comparative histories that place these experiences within a wider narrative. Such a study might begin with European sources, especially the phenomenal records of the Church of England in the Lambeth Palace Library, since it was there that so many charitable projects originated. The Huguenot records that I examined there were surrounded by reports on persecuted people around Europe; looking at all of them in tandem would make for a phenomenal comparative study. The end result, I believe, would demonstrate that despite their small numbers, the Huguenots played an outsized role in creating a world that was safe for refugees. After all, even in the 1760s, when only several hundred Huguenots crossed the ocean, central planners in London were still daydreaming of welcoming tens of thousands of them in their realms. The Huguenots still had a hold on the imperial imagination.⁵⁹

In sum, the larger lesson is that religious minorities mattered in the early modern Atlantic world, and recovering their stories helps us better understand both how that world developed and how it might have developed differently. Ezechie Carré, while a very atypical man, was one of many like himself, of many ethnicities, lurking on the edge of the European world. I am happy that my book has been able to shine some light on this forgotten world, and even happier that these reviewers' wonderful suggestions have identified new paths forward for future historians of refugee diasporas, in early America and beyond.

Acknowledgements

Bertrand Van Ruymbeke wishes to thank the editors of the *Journal of Early American History* for publishing this book forum and the four reviewers for their fine work and availability.

59 The closest thing to this so far is the work of Katherine Carté. See Carté, "Connecting Protestants in Britain's Eighteenth-Century Atlantic Empire," in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 75 (2018), 37–70; Carté, *Religion and the American Revolution: An Imperial History* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2021).