Reason of State and Predatory Monarchy in the Dutch Republic, 1638-1675

The Legacy of the Duc de Rohan

Marianne Klerk

Reason of State and Predatory Monarchy in the Dutch Republic, 1638-1675

The Legacy of the Duc de Rohan

Staatsraison en Roofzuchtige Monarchie in de Nederlandse Republiek, 1638-1675

De erfenis van Duc de Rohan

Marianne Klerk

Reason of State and Predatory Monarchy in the Dutch Republic, 1638-1675

The Legacy of the Duc de Rohan

Staatsraison en Roofzuchtige Monarchie in de Nederlandse Republiek, 1638-1675

De erfenis van Duc de Rohan

THESIS

To obtain the degree of Doctor from the Erasmus University Rotterdam

By command of the rector magnificus

Prof. dr. H.A.P. Pols

And in accordance with the decision of the Doctorate Board

The public defense shall be held on

Thursday 27 October at 11.30 hours

By

Marianne Barbara Klerk

Born in Middelburg, the Netherlands

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Doctoral Committe:

Promotor:

Prof. dr. R.C.F. von Friedeburg

Other Members

Prof. dr. H.J.M. Nellen

Prof. dr. L. van Bunge

Prof. dr. K. van Berkel

Co-promotor:

Prof. dr. C. Condren

Hawk Roosting

I sit in the top of the wood, my eyes closed.

Inaction, no falsifying dream

Between my hooked head and hooked feet:

Or in sleep rehearse perfect kills and eat.

The convenience of the high trees!

The air's buoyancy and the sun's ray

Are of advantage to me;

And the earth's face upward for my inspection.

My feet are locked upon the rough bark.

It took the whole of Creation

To produce my foot, my each feather:

Now I hold Creation in my foot.

(…)

by Ted Hughes (1930-1998), *Lupercal* (London: Faber and Faber, 1960).

Table of Contents

This research was funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The study is part of a larger research project *'Reason of state' or 'reason of princes'? The 'new monarchy and its opponents in France, Germany and the Netherlands, during the seventeenth century* (2011-2016). The research was supervised by prof. dr. R.C.F. von Friedeburg and comprised four projects of which the present study is one. Ingmar Vroomen examined the use of fatherland rhetoric in Dutch pamphlets (1618-1672) as a response to foreign threats and internal strife. Annemieke Romein studied the employment of fatherland-terminology in estate debates in Jülich and Hesse-Cassel between 1642-1655, and in Brittany France in the period 1648-1652. Jesper Schaap examined the use of the idiom of reason of state in the political writings of Henri Duc de Rohan (1579-1638) and Gabriel Naudé (1600-1653).

Chapter 1
Introduction

A common view among historians has been that in there was a disintegration of the late medieval and renaissance *regimen politicum et regale*, based on Christian humanism, rule of law (divine, divinely natural and partly positive), and on virtue essentially based on Christianity, as illustrated by Erasmus' *Institutio principis christiani* (1516); and that in its place arose the polarities of absolutism and republicanism, with France and Spain versus England and the Netherlands as foremost examples.[1] This view has slowly collapsed: the historiographical concept of absolutism has been rather eroded or demythicized, at least in the sense of a monarch being free from law– Louis XIV scrupulously followed positive law and ruled with consent or consultation of the Estates and *parlements*;[2] and recently the notion of republicanism has been challenged –Helmer Helmers has convincingly argued that the Dutch were full-heartedly 'Royalist Republicans' after the execution of Charles I; or it has been qualified as entailing by degrees a monarchical element, as is suggested by Patrick Collinson's notion of the English 'monarchical republic'.[3] And republics might be no less shy of asserting a principle of absolute

[1] See in particular Helmut G. Koenigsberger, 'Monarchies and Parliaments in Early Modern Europe Dominium Regale or Dominium Politicum et Regale', *Theory and Society* 5:2 (1978), 191-217.

[2] See for instance Robert von Friedeburg and John Morrill (eds.), *Monarchy transformed: princes and their elites in early modern Western Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, forthcoming), in particular introduction and conclusion; Nicholas Henshall, *The Myth Of Absolutism: Change And Continuity In Early Modern European Monarchy* (London: Longmann, 1992); Ronald G. Asch and Heinz Duchhardt (eds.), *Der Absolutismus--ein Mythos?: Strukturwandel monarchischer Herrschaft in West- und Mitteleuropa (ca. 1550-1700)* (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Bölhau, 1996); Johan Sommerville, 'Early Modern Absolutism', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), 117-130. Sommerville (re)defines absolutist political thought in line with revisionist socio-economic historical research as a model of 'social collaboration' between the Crown and its elites.

[3] Helmer Helmers, *The Royalist Republic. Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). Helmers persuasively explained the staunch support amongst the Dutch for Stuart royalism under the 'republican' (stadholderless) regime of 1650-1672 after the regicide; Patrick Collinson has stressed the republican character (high level of social collaboration between Crown and its elites) of the English monarchy for Elizabethan England. Patrick Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* LXIX (1987), 394-424. Mark Goldie stressed this republican character of the English monarchy on a more general level. Mark Goldie, 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England', in Tim Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 153-194. See Sommerville's critical remark on the overlapping definition of republicanism and absolutism in terms of the social collaboration model. Sommerville, 'Early Modern Absolutism', 118-119. See also in the same volume Michael J. Seidler's comment that the contestation of 'absolutism' as political language 'has also undermined the counterpart language of "democracy" or "republicanism" (…) the opposition assumed in such discussions is misconceived.' Michael J. Seidler, 'Monstrous' Pufendorf: Sovereignty and system in the Dissertations', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), 159-176, p. 159; See for instance Perez's Zagorin review of the two volumes from 2002 on republicanism by Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, in which he stressed the variety of understandings of 'republicanism' and the subsequent confusion of what republicanism entails; it may be read as a general critique on the concept. Perez Zagorin, 'Republicanisms', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 11:4 (2003), 701-712; Robert von Friedeburg, 'Republics and Republicanism', in: Hamish Scott (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 538-559.

sovereignty as a monarch. For writers like Hobbes sovereignty was a principle defining a polity beyond the vagaries of particular form. In addition, enlightened thought as that of Pufendorf or Montesquieu is perceived as monarchy constrained by law rather than absolutism or republicanism.[4] Perhaps we should keep in mind that early modern Europeans shared a much broader consensus about the necessity of the accountability of government than the notion of 'republicanism' as a subversive ideology suggests, so helping to create an exaggerated dichotomy between it and the concept of 'absolutism'. The ruptures in confessional Christianity of the Reformation and the growing scale of European warfare brought forth a perceived crisis of the rule of law beyond modern ideological divisions. Authors struggled to reconstruct and defend a rule of law, while its own basis, confessional Christianity and Aristotle, slowly dissolved.

The purpose of this thesis is to explore changes in understandings of 'interest' and 'reason of state'; not as abstract and coherent theories about modernisation and a secularised conception of the political, but as responses to very practical and immediate political problems, challenges and crises, producing quite unintended consequences. It does so through the adaptive reference to and reliance upon Henri Duc de Rohan who provided, as it is argued, a vocabulary organised into a way of seeing the political world that was itself stimulated and constrained by a perceived crisis, both national and 'international', secular as well as religious. Through the subsequent use of Rohan and the employment of his vocabulary of interest we can see something of the ingenuity of argument under direct pressures. The result was both to establish Rohan as an authority, providing a seminal and persuasively inescapable text that shaped and constrained argument; and as resource for adaptation. In all the cases discussed and cohered by reference to Rohan, the stimulus to argument was a sense of immediate and dire threat, best summarised by the notion of a predatory monarchy, sometimes deemed despotic, sometimes tyrannical, usually arbitrary in its actions or anticipated conduct, sometimes all three, but always endangering a fragile peace, and a sense of acceptable order. Such a postulated order was often taken as involving a rule of law, sometimes a moral regime shielded from corruption, sometimes a putative balance of power between competing interests. In all cases what mattered was specifying and analysing the danger, the predator. What it threatened could often be relatively unspecific, even open to the reader to identify for himself. This focus on the evils of a predatory monarchy was central to Rohan's whole understanding of interest—interest was the means of casting light on its dangers. But having set the tone in demonising Habsburg-Spain with the concomitant imperative to France to stand opposed in its own true interest, Rohan's perspective was complimented by the wealth of evidence provided by the imperial diplomat François-Paul

[4] Seidler, "Monstrous" Pufendorf'; Paul A. Rahe, *Montesquieu and the Logic of Liberty: War, Religion, Commerce, Climate, Terrain, Technology, Uneasiness of Mind, the Spirit of Political Vigilance, and the Foundations of the Modern Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

de Lisola, who turned the force of argument against France. The notions of interest, reason of state and predatory monarchy could be given different, even opposing content, as is clear from the contrasts between Rohan and Lisola, the Dutch authors Pieter de la Court and Petrus Valkenier.[5]

The result is a textual history through crises that adds a different dimension to expressions of 'reason of state' and 'interest', established law as a social norm, political society as more than dependent on the morality of a ruler, and the ambiguities of secularisation, in some ways a process that was the unintended consequence of deeply held religious beliefs.

This general picture of a secularising change in the terms through which the rule of law could be reformulated will be discussed more below. Immediately, however, it should be said that it provides less a direct context than a background for this study. That is, the texts studied did not share a preoccupation with a crisis in the rule of law. Rather, by their concern with predatory monarchy, with arbitrary conduct and tyranny, that knows no boundaries, they presupposed the existence of laws and norms that could be violated and emphasised the dire consequences of doing so. Thus as an unintended consequence of particular and even opposing concerns with the predatory, they helped establish a space in which attempts to reconceptualise the rule of law could be played out. In other words, the general picture concerns what overall was happening, this concerns what people were doing, responding to what worried them in ways that facilitated such changes.

1.1 The crisis of the rule of law and the struggle to restore order

The rule of law in the seventeenth century was a highly evocative expression and entailed not necessarily a conceptual content with which we are familiar, not least the independence of a judiciary and an agreement on constitutional ground rules; it rather amounted to a variable *topos*, sustaining authority, directly or indirectly from Aristotle's insistence that law made for better rule than men (*Politics* bk 3*)*.[6] Medieval commentators moulded from ancient Greek and

[5] Henri de Rohan, *De l'interest des princes et estats de la Chrestienté* (1638); François-Paul de Lisola, *Bouclier d'Estat et de justice contre le dessein manifestement découvert de la Monarchie Universelle, sous le vain prétexte des pretentions de la Reyne de France* ([Brussels: François Foppens], 1667); V. D. H., *Interest van Holland ofte de Gronden van Hollands-Welvaren* (Amsterdam: 'Cyprianus van der Gracht', 1662); Petrus Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa ofte politieke en historische beschrijvinge der waare fundamenten en oorzaken van de oorlogen en revolutien in Europa voornamentlijk in en omtrent de Nederlanden zedert den jaare 1664. Gecauseert door de gepretendeerde Universelen Monarchie der Franschen* (Amsterdam: Hendrik en Dirk Boom, 1675).

[6] See for instance Martin Krygier, 'The Rule of Law: Legality, Teleology, Sociology', in Gianluigi Palombella and Neil Walker (eds.), *Relocating the Rule of Law* (Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2009), 45-69. Krygier stresses the difference with a rule by law, which refers to political power exercised by legal means, but requirements of the rule of law are lacking; for example, the ruler is not reliably and effectively constrained by law, or laws are secret, impossible to know, to understand, to perform; Valkenier, 't Verwerd Europa, 13; Aristotle, *Politics, Politics: Books III and IV,* translated with

Roman sources and from Roman Law a divine and divinely inspired natural law. Although the Fall obscured it to some extent, commentators such as Thomas Aquinas argued that God imprinted on mankind virtues and knowledge on how to live together in society. All men had to operate under divine natural law. During the second half of the sixteenth century scepticism arose towards the extremely broad Aristotelian-Christian notion of the rule of law, of rule bound society.[7] From the late sixteenth up to the end of the seventeenth century incessant warfare, confessional strife, civil wars and coercive princely politics gave rise to a perceived crisis of order, much of which focussed on the absence or erosion of reliable law. The 'crisis of order' culminated in the numerous revolts throughout Europe in the 1640s and 1650s. In England, for instance, the killing of King Charles I and Archbishop Laud ruptured and even subverted basic assumptions about hierarchy, discipline and order, about social and political legitimacy.[8] From the last third of the seventeenth century onwards authors, such as Pierre Bayle, increasingly blamed confessional propaganda and clergy (instead of political actors) for the strange upsurge of conflicts and civil wars from the 1620 until 1650s. Moreover, contemporaries more and more underlined the danger of political disintegration under the rising burden of taxation and debt, brought forth by the intensification of warfare.[9]

The picture was as confused as it was enriched through the printing press, but Michael Stolleis has suggested a general trend that makes sense of much that was written: 'As the foundations of Christianity were increasingly undermined in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the formation of different confessions and by successive wars of religion, so too did modern politics and the rule of law determined by principalities become increasingly emancipated from prescribed religious content.' He observes two shifts accordingly. There was an increasing stress on experience and observation to examine the nature of the political (temporal) world. The historical example functioned to determine natural law or to predict behaviour of political actors as in interest analyses. Second was 'an erosion of the Christian element in the justification of law.' The growing practice of 'communal and territorial laws'

---

an introduction by Richard Robinson and a supplementary essay by David Keyt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), Book III, 1287a-1278b, p. 58-63.

[7] Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 31-64.

[8] Robert von Friedeburg, 'How "new" is the "New Monarchy"? Clashes between princes and nobility in Europe's Iron Century', in *Leidschrift. Aan het hof. Rivaliteit, legitimiteit en successiestrijd aan de Euraziatische hoven, 1250–1750* 27 (2012), 17-30; Justin Champion, "Religion's Safe, with Priestcraft is the War": Augustan Anticlericalism and the Legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720', *The European Legacy* 5:4 (2000), 547-561, 'crisis of order' on p. 548-549; Blair Worden, 'Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism', in: David Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 45-81, a 'crisis of monarchy' 1640s-1650s on p. 72; Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: an Introduction to English Political Thought 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), for the ideal of the 'pacified polity 'p. 159-164 and for the crisis of that the ideal, the 'crisis of the common law' chapter VII and VIII.

[9] Heinz Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', in Thomas A. Brady, Heiko Augustinus Oberman, James D. Tracy (eds), *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation, Volume 2* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 641-682, p. 667-670; Robert von Friedeburg, 'How "new" is the "New Monarchy"?', 17-30; Michael Sonenscher, *Before the Deluge. Public Debt, Inequality and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

undermined the invocation of God and differentiated notions of legality.[10] As a result, the rule of law survived as a basic normative issue despite the breakdown of the major religious foundations it had in confessional Christianity**.** The two shifts he notes are certainly pertinent to the writers discussed here. They do put faith in the details of empirical experience; and albeit for very different reasons marginalise confessional divisions. In the case of Rohan, this has given rise to the myth of objectivity in his conception of interest; in the case of Petrus Valkenier, the distinction between the universal content of religion from institutionalised confessions, (derived very much from Hugo Grotius) was a means by which he could assert a genuine piety while isolating religious sects as part of a crisis of order.

At different levels of formality writers in the late seventeenth century were concerned with a crisis of order, more or less systematically focussing on conceptions of law. At the most sustained level of philosophical coherence Samuel Pufendorf remains the most significant. Pufendorf's natural law argument was a consciously laundered version of Hobbes's arguments in *De cive*; the 'state' as legal person as guardian of law was the solution to disorder; the state held undivided sovereignty and was likewise represented by the ruler. Unlike Hobbes, however, Pufendorf stressed the faculty of a peaceable sociability that enables humans living in the state of nature to associate and establish a state for a thorough protection of life and property, choose a form of government and be subject to the ruler, -a situation that could be reversed if the sovereign subverted the fundamental laws, or the overriding purposes for which society was instituted.[11] Pufendorf's empirical-historical analysis of interest of Europe in *Einleitung zu der Historie der vornehmsten Reiche und Staaten so itziger Zeit in Europa sich befinden* (1682) was rooted in his natural law theory.[12] Pufendorf stated that rulers had their (natural law) obligations, particularly to provide security, for their subjects. To this end, it was necessary to analyse and adapt to the 'true' interests of state as determined by its particular characteristics

[10] Michael Stolleis, 'The Legitimation of Law through God, Tradition, Will, Nature and Constitution', in Lorraine Daston and Michael Stolleis (eds.), *Natural Law and Laws of Nature in Early Modern Europe Jurisprudence, Theology, Moral and Natural Philosophy* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 45-55, p. 46.

[11]Hans Erich Bödeker, *Debating the respublica mixta: German and Dutch Political Discourse around 1700*, in Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 219-246, p. 229-237; Robert von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy. The Thirty Years War and the Modern Notion of 'State' in the Empire, 1530s to 1790s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 315-317.

[12]Michael Seidler points to other writers before Pufendorf, who had studied the histories of European polities or had written contemporary interest analyses of Europe exemplified by one of the authors of this thesis, Petrus Valkenier. Seidler argues that Pufendorf's innovation was his analysis of interest (stress on modern history) rooted in his natural law theory; 'The latter is an internal, constitutive matter involving a state's legitimate claim to sovereign authority over its members, while the former is externally oriented and concerns the effective performance of its natural law obligations (particularly security) in an international context, on which the claim to internal sovereignty rests. In short, a state's raison d'état is rooted in its raison d'etre.' Michael J. Seidler, 'Introduction' to Samuel Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, translated by Jocodus Crull (1695), edited by Michael Seidler (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2013), ix-xl, quoted from p. xxxii and for the association with Valkenier p. xvii; See also Friedrich Meinecke for the positioning of Petrus Valkenier's '*t Verwerd Europa* in the tradition of Pufendorf's interest analysis of European regimes. Friedrich Meinecke, *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'État and Its Place in Modern History*, translated by Douglass Scott, introduction by Werner Stark (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1997), 287-288.

and circumstances, as well as relations with other rulers. He distinguished a real from an imaginary reason of state, such as the pretended interest of 'universal monarchy' to which states were inclined; and a perpetual interest (geography, character of the people) from a temporary one (external relations).[13] Interestingly, in the tradition of Lisola and Valkenier, he assessed the predatory nature of the French monarchy that ruled a densely populated territory with a passionately warlike people given to robbery by conquest and threatened the survival of neighbouring polities. Foreign policy implied a careful consideration of external affairs, which could easily transform into domestic conflicts and vice versa, and demanded a constant adaption to changing circumstances. However, in such a world of change and conflict the Christian moral duty of men towards their fellowmen remained the basis of security within societies.[14]

Perhaps because he did not pretend to the sort of philosophical coherence we find in Pufendorf, Valkenier offered his readers no explicit conception of the rule of law; but he did share contemporary concerns for the consequences of expanded warfare and fractured confessional religion: mob rule, meddling priests, power-hungry regents and plunder princes, for all of which the imperatives of divine law and the order that might stem from it was inadequate protection. For Valkenier, the evocation of the rule of law was a means of combining a reassuring appeal to justice with reason of state, and of urging the necessity of a powerful prince (with prerogatives of action) while castigating the arbitrariness of predatory monarchy.

1.2 Restating 'state building': dynastic agglomerate, society of princes and monarchy transformed

Historians have argued that the intensification of warfare in early modern Europe pressed rulers to develop standing armies and administrations eventually leading to the establishment of modern bureaucratic tax states. This transformation was defined as early modern 'state building' in which rulers built up their state apparatus by coercive extraction of resources, e. g. through taxation of their unwilling subjects and insubordinate elites, which increased the ruler's means to coerce them even more. [15] Historians have also claimed that the growing use of the

[13] Pufendorf thirdly distinguished between a private and public interest concerning the danger of the pursuit of the personal interests of domestic factions or the ruler in opposition to the common welfare. Samuel Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, translated by Jocodus Crull (1695), edited by Michael Seidler (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2013), 5-9.

[14] See for this assessment Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 324: 'To be sure, Pufendorf stressed that monarchy and the establishment of unity in a 'state' were indispensable given the predatory nature of kingdoms like France and Spain'; Seidler, 'Introduction', xxv-xxxii.

[15] See in particular Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and the Rise of the state* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990); Regarding the concept of the 'coercion-extraction cycle' read Samuel E. Finer, 'State- and Nation-Building in Europe: the Role of the Military', in: Charles Tilly (ed.), *The Formation of National States in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 84–163.

vocabulary of reason of state mirrored the early modern transformation of Christian Europe into a European system of sovereign 'states'.[16] Regarding the history of political thought, Maurizio Viroli has rightly pointed to the seventeenth-century shift from the notion of politics based on consent and divine law, to 'reason of state', i.e. government based on coercion.[17] However, when discussing 'reason of state', authors addressed the notion of rulers pursuing their interests, not 'states' pursuing 'national interests'.

Since the 1950s the received notion of 'state building' as an intentional or strategic activity has come under question.[18] Institutionalised 'states' with self-conscious knowledge of their 'reason' did not develop. First, historians have increasingly stressed the heterogonous nature of European principalities.[19] John Morrill recently coined the term 'dynastic agglomerates' to address that dynasties ruled over multiple lands with each polity having its own customs, laws and societal power structures. Morrill wants to underline particularly the unstable nature of dynastic rule and the instability of how these agglomerates were formed or rather collected by the ruling dynasties, and how they constantly changed form through marriage politics, warfare, and inheritance; the success of modern states should not be interpreted as an inevitable product of their early modern predecessors.[20] Furthermore, early modern rule entailed primarily sovereign acts by rulers as bearers of sovereignty (excluding the few republics). As such, Europe was a 'société des princes'[21] more than a system of 'states' in the modern sense of a unity of law, territory and nation. Rulers belonged to the society of princes through bounds of kinship and marriage; and it determined largely the motivations and aims of rulers' 'foreign' policy in relation to the struggle over territories, resources and status. Therefore, the administration of the different agglomerates, the relation with the local elites, was of vital importance for ruling dynasties. Moreover, the number of members of this society had

[16] As one of the first modern historians, Friedrich Meinecke addressed early modern commentaries on 'reason of state' as products of the assumed rise of the modern state. Meinecke, *Machiavellism. The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 1-22; See for instance William F. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 13-101, who wrote: 'For this reason, his [Richelieu's] massive program of state-building was accompanied by an unremitting effort to articulate the concept of reason of state.' Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 101.

[17] Viroli argues that the late sixteenth and seventeenth century witnessed 'a revolution of politics', i.e. 'the triumph of the language of reason of state'. This revolutionary triumph was based on an ideological transition from the notion of 'politics as the art of preserving a *res publica*, in the sense of a community of individuals living together in justice' to 'politics as the art of the state-the art of preserving a state, in the sense of a person's or group's power and control over public institutions'. Maurizio Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State. The Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics 1250–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 2-3.

[18] For an early commentary see Kordula Wolf, 'Il X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche, Roma, settembre 1955. Un bilancio Storiografico, Convegno Internazionale', accessed May 7, 2016, http://dhi-roma.it/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf-dateien/Tagungsberichte/2005/tagung_1955.pdf.

[19] Within the historiography a transition in addressing early modern polities is observable, from Richard Bonney's 'dynastic states', *via* John Elliot's term 'composite monarchies', to Morrills 'dynastic agglomerate'. This later covers the origins as well as the nature of these polities: Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); 'Composite monarchies' was first formulated by H. G. Koenigsberger in 1975, see: John H. Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite monarchies', *Past & Present, No. 137, The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe* (1992), 48-71; John Morrill, *"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown". Dynastic crises in Tudor and Stuart Britain 1504– 1746* The Stenton Lecture for 2003 (Reading: University of Reading, 2005), 11.

[20] John Morrill, *"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown".*

[21] Lucien Bély, *La société des princes XIVe-XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 1999).

decreased after the 1650s as the European military competition took its toll in respect of the defeat of many small polities effectively subjected by the powerful dynastic agglomerates.[22]

What is more, the true innovation brought forth by the growing scale of European conflict was governmental debt on an unprecedented scale, which consequently *transformed* monarchies into war-driven and debt-ridden regimes. Since the 1490s, European rulers were sucked into a maelstrom of military competition, not least fuelled by the dynastic competition between Habsburg-Spain and Valois/Bourbon-France fought in the European arena. To finance their costly warfare, rulers had to find new, substantial resources beyond revenue taxes: sale of lands and offices, such as tax farming, and borrowing huge amounts of money. This resulted in new collaborations with old and new elites, which took up the financial restructuring - government became increasingly reliant on its elites. However, these new resources never filled the rapidly growing gaps in the budgets and bankruptcy was a recurring issue for early modern monarchies. Monarchies were transformed, based on a necessarily successful participation in the war competition. Within these monarchies the politics of selling off lands and offices resulted in debates about such practices: about the favouring of new investors over the old elites; about the misuse of offices; about the best course in foreign policy; about the prince undermining the rule of law and endangering the rights and properties of the elites and subjects.[23] At last, controlling rising 'opinion', especially amongst those who ought to be persuaded to supply resources, became another crucial issue for dynasties.[24] In such debates arguments of reason of state took centre stage. What, in short, has been seen as state building—the business of striving towards the consummation of a modern state, was largely the contingent outcome of trying to deal with such a welter of specific issues and crises confronting governmental continuity. Thus rather than reflecting an intention to build states, reason of state must be reconsidered.

1.3 The early modern fashion of reason of state

The success of 'reason of state' was indebted to the prior, European-wide acceptance of the terminology of 'state'. In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, Italian authors began

[22] Von Friedeburg, 'How 'new' is the 'New Monarchy'?', 22-23; Confessionalisation contributed to politics of reason of state, not chiefly in accordance with dynastic interests, but with the interests of the different agglomerates. Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen. Internationale Beziehungen 1559-1660* (Schöningh: Paderborn, 2007).

[23] Von Friedeburg and Morrill (eds*.), Monarchy transformed,* in particular introduction and conclusion.

[24] Successes in the military competition were of grave importance for ruling dynasties as it contributed to their position in the society of princes as well as their status of being a favorable investment. See in particular Tim C. W. Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture. Old Regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). One important aspect were the new manifestations of political legitimations, especially that of 'national identity' in the sense of the monarchy as useful and vital for the nation. He argues that Prussian and British monarchies eventually succeeded in this, while the French Crown was unable to legitimise itself. For his argument on the French Revolution see chapter 8, pages 357-427.

discussing the ways to maintain the 'state' of the *parvenu* 'new princes' such as the Medici, without relying on more traditional idioms of legitimation provided by appeals to civic virtue. From the 1550s authors in Spain, France and the United Provinces and England accepted the terminology of 'state' in all its ambiguous range of meanings from princely status to regime, and would adopt the terminology of reason of state in the extraordinary circumstances of religious civil strife from the end of the sixteenth century onwards. Harro Höpfl argues that 'reason of state' became part of the 'vocabulary of fashionable political cynicism' about the 'true' motives of rulers spurred by the experiences of religious wars, especially in the Low Countries and France. This vocabulary encompassed popular aphorisms and maxims such as *necessitas non habet legem* and *oderint dum metuant*, and was closely associated with the terminology of 'politics' (politics, policy, *politica*, *politicus*, *politique*), 'statecraft', 'statism, 'Machiavellism', 'interest of state', the Tacitist term *arcana imperii*, 'secrets' and 'mysteries'. All these terms were fluidly related and often interchangeable. Moreover, 'reason' and 'state' could mean many different things. 'Reason' could refer to reasoning, or the outcome of such argumentation, the intellectual capacity to reason, plain knowledge, a rationale or purpose**,** and legitimation of certain actions. 'State' could mean status, a condition of something, princely status, an office, regime, *respublica*, commonwealth and dominion.[25] Höpfl argues that 'reason of state' had a precarious identity and was a highly suggestive term of art; and, therefore, it ought not to be seen as a theory or concept.[26]

Yet, exactly because of its opacity reason of state became fashionable. Reason of state was employed and theorised by different, mostly Italian authors earlier in the sixteenth century and became a popular phrase from the 1590s onwards. In 1589 the ex-Jesuit Giovanni Botero published his famous work *Della Ragion di Stato*, in which he defined reason of state as: 'State is a stable dominion over people, and Reason of State is knowledge of the means suitable for founding, conserving and augmenting a dominion established in this way. (…) Although everything done with these ends in view is said to be done for Reason of State, nevertheless this term is used rather about things which cannot be reduced to ordinary and usual *ragione*.'[27] In this sense, politics concerned the management of the state that is created and build further, a

[25] Harro Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', *History of Political Thought* 23:2 (2002), 211-237, p. 216–219.
[26] Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 215; Likewise argued by Conal Condren, 'Reason of state and sovereignty in Early Modern England: a question of ideology?' *in Parergon* 28:2, 2011, 5-27; I want to thank Harro Höpfl for allowing me to use his paper on 'reason of state' given at the conference *Monarchy Transformed in Western Europe: its "reason of state" and its opponents (1620s-1720s)* in Rotterdam, May 11-14, 2016.
[27] Cited from (and translated by) Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 213. Giovanni Botero, *Della ragion di stato e delle cause della grandezza delle città* (Venice, 1598) was the first writing with the term in its title and established reason of state as a European *topos*. It quickly went through several editions and translations into German, French, Spanish and Latin; Peter Burke, 'Tacitism, scepticism, and reason of state', in J. H. Burns / Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 199), 479–498, p. 479-480; Höpfl points to Botero's explanation of 'ragione' as equivalent to *notizie*, which his translators took to mean knowledge; he mostly used it to mean 'reasons', i.e. reasons why things happened, causes, but also reasons in the sense of good reasons, i.e. justifications. Paper given at the conference 'Monarchy transformed'.

resource only other rulers had.[28] According to Trajano Boccalini (1556–1613), even the porters at the marketplace discussed 'reason of state'. In 1621, Lodovico Zuccolo wrote that barbers and other humble artisans thought themselves fit to deliberate on 'reason of state'.[29] Authors all over Europe began to employ this 'vogue term', adapting it to their own specific contexts.[30]

Before the vogue of reason of state took off, 'Machiavellian' or 'Machiavellist' was already employed on a grand scale in France, notably by Innocent Gentillet. In his famous *Anti-Machiavel* (1576) Gentillet blamed 'Machiavellian philosophy' for the Bartholomew's Day Massacre of French Protestants in 1572, and explained it as a set of practices equal to tyranny and above all against three foundations of a commonwealth: religion, morality and legality. Neither he nor Machiavelli actually used the expression reason of state, but nevertheless contemporaries associated it with them to which was added the accusation that reason of state meant the use of religion for political ends; and politica, so strongly linked to Tacitus, could also be collapsed into reason of state.[31] At the end of the sixteenth century, religiously orthodox writers (e.g. Botero, Ribaneira, Possivino) began to theorise reason of state to cope with its, as they understood, Machiavellian and *politiques* perspectives of politics. Its canonical author, the ex-Jesuit Botero condemned its popular meaning, i.e. political actions, executed with a complete disregard for moral, legal and religious constraint, as Botero believed to be prescribed by Machiavelli and Tacitus. However, due to Machiavelli's controversial reputation, Tacitus was often used, as Botero already observed, as a supplementary or even alternative authority to Machiavelli. Most authors as Botero and Justus Lipsius might pursue anti-Machiavellian arguments, yet were fully

[28] David Wootton, 'Machiavelli and the Business of Politics', in Timothy Fuller (ed.), *Machiavelli's Legacy: 'The Prince' After Five Hundred Years* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 87-104, p.92.

[29] Meinecke, *Machiavellism. The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 78; Trajano Boccalini , *Ragguagli di Parnasso e scritti minori*, ed. Luigi Firpo, 3 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1948); Ludovico Zucculo, *Considerazioni Politiche e Morali sopra cento oracoli d'illustri personaggi antichi* (Venice, 1621).

[30] Guicciardini's unpublished work *Dialogo del Regimento di Firenze* from the early 1520s is to be believed the first recorded use of the term. Although Höpfl argues that Guicciardini's use does not suggest that the term was already established, by 1547 Giovanni della Casa used the term in oration to Charles V without feeling the need to explain it, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 214; Botero wrote that, after visiting several European courts he had 'been greatly astonished to find Reason of State a constant subject of discussion', quoted from Noel Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War, an unknown translation by Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 92; see for the German introduction of the terminology of 'reason of state' Horst Dreitzel, 'Reason of State and the Crisis of Political Aristotelianism: an Essay on the Development of 17th Century Political Philosophy', in *History of European ideas* 28 (2002), 163-187 and Michael Stolleis, 'Arcana imperii und Ratio status. Bemerkungen zur politischen Theorie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts', *Veröffentlichung der Joachim Jungius-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Hamburg* 39 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 5-12; for the English reception of 'reason of state' see Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War*, especially on Hobbes and 'reason of state' argumentation and Condren, 'Reason of state and sovereignty in Early Modern England; for its introduction in early modern France read Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, Étienne Thuau, *Raison d'état et pensée politique à l'époque de Richelieu* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1966) and Laurie Catteeuw, *Censures et raison d'État. Une histoire de la modernité politique (xvie-xviie siècle)* (Paris: Albin Michel, 2013).

[31] Jan Waszink, 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', in *History of European Ideas* 39:2 (2013), 151-168, p. 158; See for the fact that the *Politica* was placed on the Index categorised as 'reason of state', Jan Waszink, 'Introduction' to Justus Lipsius, *Politica. Six books of Politics or Political Instruction*, ed., transl. and introd. by Jan Waszink (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004), 120-122, 173-187; Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 223; [Gentillet, Innocent.] *Discourse sur les moyens de bien gouverner et maintenir en bonne paix un Royaume ou autre principauté […] Contre Nicholas Machiavel Florentin* (1576).

familiar with the contents of *The Prince*, since refutations demanded a text and there were no existing texts for reason of state other than Machiavelli's *The Prince*.[32]

One thing can safely be claimed about reason of state: it was presented as relevant to the practice of politics (unlike the 'mirror for princes' literature). Reason of state taken negatively, it was a matter of evil advice, positively, it offered *prudence*, a means to practice politics intelligently to the ruler and his advisors and a matter of wise counsel taken from experience and history. In its more narrow understanding, reason of state entailed the 'Machiavellian' claim that in cases of necessity rulers had room to manoeuvre beyond the bounds of normal legal, moral and religious constraints. The practical reflection was often summarised in 'maxims' and frequently accompanied by fashionable terms such as 'interest'. A crucial difference with mirror for princes literature is that, because of confessional strife and incessant warfare, reason of state could no longer rely on the premise that the ruler could enhance the common good and the virtue and piety of the subjects by upholding the true religion *without* endangering the 'state'. Thus, authors could reason for a merciless restoration of confessional unity, but when it endangered the 'state' religious toleration became a necessary or acceptable evil. Furthermore, arguments on the moral responsibility of the ruler to execute questioned conduct in emergency circumstances, frequently resulted in downplaying of the traditional princely virtues (e.g. clemency and liberality).[33]

Conal Condren argues that to understand reason of state properly, historians have to dissect this casuistic reasoning in regard to the stress on a devilish/bad reason of state distinguished from a true/good one. The latter was mostly defined as serving the common good and virtuous rule, it could be called prudence and was based on 'tenuous and highly fragmented' evidence. Whereas authors usually paraded a bad reason of state in 'detailed, graphic and unreliable' terms of a ruler following his own private interests that led to the destruction of the common good. Expressing a bad reason of state was 'a means of mobilisation and encouragement in times of deep division'.[34] Reason of state was most often touched upon in the context of accusations against certain factions or officeholders in terms of neglecting or subverting the princely duties towards the divine and natural law. However, as Von Friedeburg stresses, such arguments could contribute to the crisis of the rule of law. Furthermore, certain authors indeed attempted to overstretch the licit scope for room to manoeuvre to free rulers

[32]Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 216-217; Harro Höpfl, 'Reason of State', in Henrik Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy* (Dordrecht/Heidelberg/London/New York: Springer, 2011), 1113-1115; Jan Waszink underlines the attractiveness of Tacitism, and that of Justus Lipsius for contemporaries; it offered the 'true' causes and (self-interested) motives of famous political actors in history and the historical workings of power politics, which encompassed prudence utilisable for political practice. Waszink, 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', 156-158.
[33]Höpfl, 'Reason of State',114: 'In these conflicts religion, relied on by all known people as the principal social cement, was in itself the foremost cause or justification of division and insubordination.'; Conal Condren writes: 'the personae occupying any office, as a sanctioned realm for responsibility, might claim a "reason" for it in order to justify questioned conduct.' Condren, 'Reason of state and sovereignty in Early Modern England', 13.
[34]Condren, 'Reason of state and sovereignty in Early Modern England', 16-17.

from the constraints of confessional religion, law, and collaboration with elites.[35] Appeals to reason of state could both seem in opposition to and support of a rule of law.

From the late sixteenth century onwards, 'interest (of state)' became a term that was more or less synonymous or associative to 'reason of state'. Already in the course of the sixteenth century 'interest' was depicted as the driving force behind princely politics, based on a pessimistic view of politics and human nature often with reference to Aristotle and Augustine. As David Wootton argued the idiom of *ragion di stato* was derived from commerce, taken from merchant's balance sheets that tried to establish profit and loss with regard to the *stato* (estate) of princes; politics concerned the business of maximizing 'interest', making profit and avoiding loss.[36] In his *Discourse* of 1516 that discussed the means for the Medici to maintain their 'stato', Guicciardini assumed that 'particular interest is the true motive of men's actions.'[37] The justifiable notion of profit or utility for reason of state became increasingly integrated in the term 'interest'. The term originated in Italy and moved more slowly than 'state' or 'politics' to the northern parts of Europe –in England it was only established in the 1640s.[38] In 1588 the French ambassador René de Lucinge wrote that princes were driven by honour or profit and because profit was prevailing, he claimed that: 'We shall therefore concern ourselves only with profit, which we may call "interest".'[39] Botero likewise defined interest as the leitmotiv for princely politics. Claiming that prudence and valour were the two pillars of government, Botero remarked that concerning the first and basic maxim of prudence: 'it should be taken for certain that in the decisions made by princes, interest will always override every other argument; and therefore he who treats with princes should put no trust in friendship, kinship, treaty nor any other tie which has no basis in interest'.[40] In a slightly more disgruntled manner Boccalini wrote: 'It is self-interest that inspires the tongue of princes, not justice and not a love of the common weal.' However, Boccalini asserted that 'The prince, who rules according to necessity and not as

[35] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 199-201.
[36] *Una ragion* was also a term for an account book as well as business enterprise, in which one can invest. In this sense, reason of state translates in the business of politics and was concerned with the pursuit of interest: making profit and avowing loss. Wootton, 'Machiavelli and the Business of Politics', 96-97.
[37] Quoted from Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State*, 140; Whereas Guicciardini underlined the Aristotelian argument of the legitimacy of self-interest when it served the common good, his use of vocabulary of interest was 'quite novel' according to Lionel A. McKenzie. Guicciardini borrowed this vocabulary from commercial language, and therefore defined interest as 'the material advantage that a political agent could expect to gain from adopting a specified course of action, whether in domestic or in foreign affairs'. L. A. McKenzie, 'Natural right and the emergence of the idea of interest in early modern political thought: F. Guicciardini and J. de Silhon', *History of European Ideas* 2:4 (1981) 277-298, 279.
[38] Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War*, 94; Wootton, 'Machiavelli and the Business of Politics', 95.
[39] Quoted from Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War*, 94.
[40] Quoted from Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Volume 1: The Renaissance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 249.

his spirit wills, is obliged to do things which he hates and abominates.'[41] Botero claimed in a later work that reason of state was little less than reason of interest.[42]

Rohan popularised the term 'interest' in his *De l'interest* that became the blueprint for writings on 'the (true) interest of states of Europe'. Rohan's famous interest analysis complimented critical analysis of the moral person of the ruler with close attention to the nature of the societies he ruled (e.g. the present geographical position, political structures, religious make-up, military prowess and relations with other rulers), so adding a further dimension to interest as reason of state. According to Meinecke, these interest analyses resulted from 'the spirit of modern historical research' emerging within reason of state writings.[43] More recently, Richard Devetak has similarly traced back the foundations of the late seventeenth-century notion of European 'states-system' in Renaissance humanist history writings, which attacked claims to universal authority of the Church or Empire as well as legitimised a political rule and its 'state interests' by historical analysis. Such critical historical analyses 'allowed for the international dimension (…) to be more clearly distinguished', and meticulously explained and analysed.[44] Starting in the 1630s, authors like Rohan, began to consider the characteristics of various dynastic agglomerates, from which allegedly objective 'true interests of states' of Europe were derived. In doing so, they could defend one political faction as most likely to pursue a certain 'foreign' policy, consequently delegitimising another. What is more, Rohan diminished the guiding importance of the ethics of office by primarily focusing on the ruled societies.[45]

From the 1650s onwards, such interest analyses often were complemented with explicit criticism of princely coercion and sovereign authority and defences of the rule of law, as we will see in the chapter on De la Court. Historians have underlined the fundamental influence of Rohan on English civil war debates, but his influence on popular Dutch debates on the true

---

[41]Quoted from Meinecke, *Machiavellism. The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 82.

[42]Botero wrote: 'In their friendships and enmities, princes are guided by what is advantageous to them. Just as there are foods which, though unpalatable by nature, are made palatable by the seasoning the cook gives them; so they are turned, by their nature or their emotions, to this side or that, according as self-interest directs their minds and emotions; because in the last resort ragione di stato is little less but ragione d'interesse.' Quoted from Meinecke, *Machiavellism. The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 68–69.

[43] Its chapter six Meinecke discusses 'The Doctrine of the Best Interest of the State in France at the time of Richelieu''. Meinecke, *Machiavellism. The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 146-195. Meinecke believed that interest of state writings found its origins in Renaissance Venetian *relatione* reports estimating 'the inner motives of its rivals' by looking into 'the particular situation of a particular individual country', but gained its full potential under Richelieu's government, when France re-entered the European war competition; See also Christian Lazzeri, 'Introduction' to Henri de Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1995), 87 for locating the origins of interest analyses in Venetian *relatione* reports.

[44] Richard Devetak, 'Historiographical Foundations of modern International Thought', *History of Ideas* 41:1 (2014), 62-77, quote on p. 64. Notably, by 'international dimension' Devetak means 'the external interactions of sovereigns, republics, empires and principalities with other such public and private actors.'

[45] Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge 2006), 344: 'this ambivalent relationship with and development from notions office allowed office and interest to rub along almost in as complementary a fashion as *honestas* and *utilitas*. But it also allowed for forms of explanation independent of any ethics of office.'; Ryan Walter, 'Slingsby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests', *History of European Ideas* 41:4 (2015), 489-506, 495.

interest of state is hardly researched.[46] This thesis will suggest his legacy for Dutch writings intertwined with the English debates and re-worked by authors such as Lisola and Valkenier, which provided a foundation for anti-French writings in the late seventeenth century, not least in depicting Louis XIV's monarchy as a predatory monarchy.

1.4 Predatory monarchy

For all the writers discussed in this work, the very real fears of a breakdown of social and political order, of there being no effective legal constraints, focussed on the threat of violent military activity, a fear of catastrophic and exorbitantly expensive warfare. Central to this was the fear of the predatory monarch: for Rohan the Habsburg-Spanish ruler; for De la Court the internal threat of the House of Orange; for Lisola, and Valkenier, Louis XIV. Analyses of interest of state enabled authors to stress the specific nature of a polity and by that an explicit system of government. In all cases the predator's circumstances, interests and use of reason of state explained and heightened a sense of immediate danger. The specific characterisation of the demonised enemy varied from writer to writer and indeed within each of the texts discussed. Sometimes the enemy's actions were tyrannical or despotic, sometimes arbitrary; expressions such as 'arbitrary rule', 'tyranny', 'war-tyranny', 'the utmost tyranny', 'new monarchy', 'conquest', 'Turkish rule', and 'slavery' are freely distributed throughout the texts and many others in their idiom. Accusations of despotic rule were favoured by many during the seventeenth century, as it was activity explicable in terms of a type of rule, the rule over a household of slaves, and also because it enabled easy comparison with the feared and unchristian Ottoman Turks. Sometimes despotism amounted to tyranny, which also, by its

[46] Rohan's *De l'Interest* was the likely source of this influential 'maxim' for English authors during the Civil War according to Gunn. According to the historian J. A. W. Gunn, Rohan's maxim 'interest will not lie', 'emerging near the middle of the seventeenth century, was of greater import in England than the well-known dicta about princely virtue, the arts of war, or the management of court factions'. John A. W. Gunn, "Interest will not lie", A seventeenth-Century Political Maxim', in: Journal of the History of Ideas 29:4 (1968), 551–564, 552. Two English editions of *De l'Interest* were published in London in 1640 and 1641 and reprinted in 1663, *A treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, translated by H. Hunt.; Alan Houston, 'Republicanism, the politics of necessity, and the rule of law', in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2001), 241-271; For literature on Dutch usages of the idiom of reason of state see Johan C. Boogman, 'De raison d'état-politicus Johan de Witt,' in J.C. Boogman, *Van spel en spelers* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982); Ernst H. Kossmann, 'Some late 17th-century Dutch writings on Raison d'Etat', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staatsräson: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begriffs* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975), 497-504; For an comparison between Dutch and English expressions of interest see Jonathan Scott, 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands,' in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Jan Hartman and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade: Commercial Reason of State in Seventeenth-Century Holland', in Sophus Reinert and Pernille Røge (eds.), *The Political Economy of Empire in the Early Modern World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 11-31; Hans W. Blom, 'The Republican Mirror, The Dutch Idea of Europe,' in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 91-115.

nature knew no bounds and also created a world of slaves. Arbitrariness was often the first sign of tyranny**.** The expression 'war despotism' (explained in chapter 3) has been coined recently to cover critiques of the range of policies and practices that were so much feared, but although valuable, it can obscure the fluidity of the vocabulary of accusation, and where rulers alienated or sold off their assets, part of the household, to raise money to fight, despotism hardly seems appropriate.[47] Predatory monarchy is used here as a more general term that captures something of the bestial imagery of the tyrant, without excluding the tyrant as despot and the arbitrariness of the passionate and lawless.

In its most well developed examples, the image of predatory monarchy was a complex, partially explanatory but ultimately condemnatory social construction. The predatory monarchy had a defining interest in waging war in order to supress and delude its people, to extract money and to pursue further warfare, as Von Friedeburg has shown for Pufendorf's interest analysis of the 'predatory nature' of Rome, Spain and France.[48] To unmask such informing interests was also to reveal a cohesive reason of state, negatively understood. Particularly in the case of Valkenier, the promotion of Louis XIV's nefarious interest was facilitated by a barbaric household rule based on the nature of slavish subjects, who carried the war burdens willingly, on power-hunger priests, who instrumentalised religion for political gain, on France's relentless soldiers, who plundered and raped the conquered peoples, and on the favourites at court, as beneficiaries of war profit. For De la Court, the predatory House of Orange required a similar network of facilitating minions, but whose existence corrupted citizens rather than simply exploited the slaves of an existing polity as household. In short, regardless of specifics the posited interest and reason of state of the demonised predatory monarch provided a way of redescribing a whole society, so magnifying the dangers to the threatened.

---

[47] Jean Marie Constant used the term for French critiques against allegedly 'despotic' practices of the Crown taking money, property and privileges to fund warfare. Jean-Marie Constant, 'Der Adel und die Monarchie in Frankreich vom Tode Heinrichs IV bis zum Ende der Fronde (1610-1653)', in Ronald Asch (ed.), *Der europäische Adel im Ancien Regime. Von der Krise der ständischen Monarchien bis zur Revolution (1600-1789)* (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 129-150, the term p. 146; This term is furthered by Robert von Friedeburg in his *Luther's Legacy* in a much more systematic definition used for French and German sources as a new interpretative heuristic tool (rather than a paradigm).

[48] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 322-324. Von Friedeburg argues a gradual shift in accusations of tyranny based on the moral person of the ruler, i.e. his lack of virtues and neglect or even subversion of the divine and divinely-inspired natural law as a pious prince, to political delegitimations based on analyses of a particular system of government, which has been asserted for critiques of despotism as examinations of societal developments depriving people, both within a country and outside, of their property. The argument by Pufendorf on necessary predatory behaviour of these kingdoms sees Von Friedeburg in line with earlier German (chapter 6-7) and French sources (chapter 8); See also Joan-Pau Rubiés, 'Oriental Despotism and European Orientalism: Botero to Montesquieu', *Journal of Early Modern History* 9 1/2 (2005), 109-180, wherein he explains despotism (by examining Montesquieu and earlier critiques of despotism) as 'a *system* of rule, and that it should be therefore (unlike tyranny) be seen as a structural feature of certain polities.' Rubies, 'Oriental Despotism', 169; For the seventeenth-century tendency to conflate tyranny with despotism see Mario Turchetti, 'Despotism' and "Tyranny" Unmasking a Tenacious Confusion', *European Journal of Political Theory* 7:2 (2008), 159-182.

1.5 Approach and contents

This thesis examines four interest analyses rich in such accusations. It aims, as we saw above, to explore changes in understandings of 'interest' and 'reason of state' as arguments under pressure responding to very practical and immediate political problems. Each chapter studies the function of reason of state in the respective source against the background of its specific context(s) of crisis and contemporary usages of the idiom of reason of state. But the texts are not as disparate or isolated as it might seem. On one level, they each employ much the same conceptual, explanatory vocabulary to pinpoint the nature and extent of the problem of the predatory monarch. More specifically as all rely on and in different ways use Rohan, and Valkenier also engaged with or is dependent upon the other authors discussed, we have what might amount to a tradition of speculation, or a sub-genre of political thought. As the references in the chapters make clear, these were not lone voices and so the genre requires considerably more work.

In the second chapter, the famous book *De l'Interest* (1638) by Henri de Rohan is examined. It has been assessed as a secular, rational and objective work. However, this chapter reinterprets it as a work belonging to the 'genre of critical current-affairs commentary' emerging during the Thirty Years' War in which a satiric employment of reason of state (in terms of implicit criticism) was combined with reports on current affairs. It is studied against the backdrop of pressing factional debates in France over the pursuit of warfare intertwined with debates about much needed financial reform and the issue of French Protestantism, *and* Rohan's dire need for a prestigious office as an exiled ex-Huguenot leader. From this follows that the seemingly objective and supra-confessional interest analysis enabled Rohan, firstly, to implicitly accuse Spain of pursuing unrestricted and universal tyrannical control, while correspondingly sidestepping religious polemics; and, secondly, to envisage a patriotic French unity in which the former Huguenot rebel could re-claim an office.

Pieter de la Court's successful work *Interest van Holland* (1662) will be treated in the following chapter. This chapter reassess his alleged 'republicanism' or 'anti-monarchism' in terms of 'war despotism'. To diminish the threat of an Orange restoration, De la Court vigorously attacked the Orange dynasty by identifying the interest of the plunder prince, who pursued foreign warfare to extract exorbitant taxes, supress the fundamental laws and the authority of the civic assemblies, subject the legal subjects, consequently enslaving them all. His argument on the need to harmonise the interests between rulers and ruled was at one with contemporary English arguments on interest grounded on Rohan's idea that the prince may rule the people, but that interest ruled the prince. From this follows the second argument, that the *Interest van Holland* is better seen as a distinct variation on the themes enunciated by Rohan. Although he preferred the republican constitution for the Dutch Republic, kingship in itself was legitimate

and in other polities monarchy was simply acceptable. De la Court suggested an ideal order for Holland where the privileges and properties of citizens were protected against raids of the plunder prince and the power-hungry members of his household (priests, soldiers, favourites) in order to promote effectively the foundation of the true interest of Holland: commerce.

In the fourth chapter the international bestseller *Bouclier* (1667) by François-Paul de Lisola will be examined. Historians have shown its significance for later anti-French writings in rejuvenating the notion of universal monarchy power by turning it against France and stressing the necessary maintenance of the European balance of power resulting in a secular and modern notion of Europe. However, this chapter proposes a reinterpretation of Lisola's argument. It argues that it rested on a deliberate reversion of Rohan's interest analysis of Spain and France. The imperial diplomat required a supraconfessional argument for persuading foreign rulers of various confessions to assist in the battle against Louis XIV. He literary copied arguments of Rohan, but turned these with a great flair for irony against France as the blueprint for Louis XIV's universal monarchy. The result is effectively, perhaps self-consciously a satiric parody of *De l'interest*. In a more systematic manner he assessed the French system of rule, not only based on the rule of conquest, but, echoing De la Court's argument, on the slavish nature and its inherent household rule, robbing the privileges and properties of peoples at home and abroad, to finance warfare for universal dominion. Against this, the European legal order should be guarded by a mutual pursuit of reason of state and justice.

Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675) will be scrutinised in the fourth chapter. This book is a response to the 'Year of Disaster' 1672 inflicted upon the Dutch Republic by the invasion of Louis XIV resulting in massive civil riots and the restoration of Orange. His work has been (dis)credited as a mere anti-French pamphlet and his thought qualified as 'Orange republicanism', but this chapter will re-evaluate his argument against the background of the perceived crisis of the rule of law and within the international context of the idiom of reason of state. He used and transformed the arguments of Rohan, De la Court and Lisola. This chapter pinpoints two continual problems in Valkenier's work: how to support Orange princely rule deeply rooted in the army yet attacking the belligerent princely interest of France. Valkenier's preoccupation was with the French despotic beast. It necessitated the prince of Orange as supreme commander, yet constrained by the republican constitution and without interference of confessional religion. Orange princely rule could steer the Republic in a middle course, between anarchy and oligarchy, between libertine tendencies and priestcraft, and between plunder princes and power-hungry regents, and effectively represent the Republic within the fierce dynastic competition of Europe. As so many of his contemporaries, he struggled to restore order.

Finally, the conclusion assesses the significance of these interest analyses. The use and reuse of the exact method and type of argument for different, even opposing objectives shows the

highly polemical function of interest analysis and its European context rather than solely localised context. Furthermore it suggests that the modern constructions of absolutism and republicanism may distort the core of its argument. Above all, it demonstrates a preoccupation with predatory monarchy, painted with Rohanesque maxims and concerted interest in dominance and destruction, tyranny and despotism. In this way this thesis expands our understanding of early modern usage of the idiom of reason of state and in conclusion ushers that much more research is necessary on this tradition of speculation.

Chapter 2
De l'interest (1638) by Henri de Rohan: satire through interest analysis

Although genealogies hold no exact beginnings, one can safely argue that Valkenier's work on reason of state is hugely indebted to the book *De l'interest des Princes et les Etats Chrestienté* (1638) by the Huguenot leader Henri Duc de Rohan (1579-1638).[49] *De l'interest* was one of the first writings in which Europe was analysed as an interdependent political order of rivalling 'states', each pursuing its own specific 'interests'. Rohan's interest analysis functioned as a prime example for numerous seventeenth-century writings on 'interests of states'.[50] His opening statement was frequently quoted:

> 'The *Princes* commaund the *People*, and the *Interest* commaunds The *Princes*. The knowledge of this *Interest* is as much more raised aboue that of *Princes actions,* as they themselves are aboue the *People*. The *Prince* may deceiue himselfe, his *Counsell* may be corrupted, but the interest alone can neuer faile. According as it is well or ill vnderstood, it maketh *States* to liue or die. And as it allwaies aimeth at the *augmentation*, or at leastwise the *conseruation* of a *State*, so likewise to get thither, it ought to varie according to the times. So that to consider well the interest of the Princes of this time, wee need not remount very high, but onely take the standing of the present affaires.'[51]

Almost forty years later, Petrus Valkenier imitated Rohan's interest-analysis and literally copied whole passages from *De l'interest*. The Dutch jurist did not even feel the need to mention Rohan's

---

[49] Its first publication was anonymously in the *Mercure François*, nr 20 (Paris, 1937), 46 – 126 (for the years 1634 – 1635). *De l'Interest* was posthumously republished together with another writing of Rohan, *Le Parfait Capitain* in 1638 en 1639. These two editions include a dedication to Richelieu signed by Rohan. John Hearsey McMillan Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', in Roman Schnur (ed.), Staatsräson*: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begrifss* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975) 121-140, p. 132.

[50] Rohan's *De l'Interest* was the likely source of this influential 'maxim' for English authors during the Civil War according to the historian John Alexander Wilson Gunn, "Interest will not lie", A seventeenth-Century Political Maxim', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29:4 (1968), 551-564, p. 552.

[51] Henri Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome. Written in French by the most noble and illustrious Prince, the Duke of Rohan.* Translated into English by H.H. (Paris, 1640) 2-3. In this thesis all references are to the English edition translated by Henry Hunt and published in 1640, except when differences between the English and French versions occur; The French text reads: 'Les princes commandent aux peuples et l'intérêt commande aux princes. La connaissance de cet intérêt est d'autant plus relevée par-dessus celle des actions des princes qu'eux-mêmes le sont par-dessus les peuples. Le prince se peut tromper, son conseil peut être corrumpu, mais l'intérêt seul ne peut jamais manquer. Selon qu'il est bien ou mal entendu, il fait vivre ou mourir les Etats. Et comme il a toujours pour but l'accroissement ou, pour le moins, a conservation, aussi pour parvenir faut-il qu'il se change selon te temps. De sorte que pour bien considerer l'intérêt des princes d'aujourd'hui, il n'est point besoin de remonter fort haut, mais seulement de prendre sur le pied des affaires presents.' Quoted from the modern edition and annotated version by Christian Lazzeri of Henri de Rohan*, De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté* (Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1995), 161. Lazzeri used the edition of 1646, published in Paris, and which contained a dedication to Richelieu with the note 'Dernière édition', 'jouxte la copie imprimée'. It was bound with five other writings, as Rohan's *Memoirs*, *Le parfait Capitaine* and *Discours* that described issues happened after Rohan's death and entailed a long introduction by Jean Silhon or Daniel des Perreau. Christian Lazzeri, 'Introduction' to *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, by Henri de Rohan (Paris: Presse universitaires de France, 1995), 154.

name in echoing his famous sentences: 'Of this Interest a certain very wise and experienced military officer attempted to say; that it rules over the Princes, alike they over her Subjects (...).'[52]

As explained in the introduction, the dynastic rivalry between Habsburg-Spain and Valois/Bourbon-France triggered the early modern military competition between European rulers as they were forced to participate for their survival. From this conflict, the Habsburg-Spanish dynastic agglomerate emerged, with lands scattered over Europe, even over different continents, bringing new riches, peoples and polities under its rule. Rohan reflected upon this volatile situation and offered counsel to the French monarchy, and specifically to Cardinal Richelieu, on two related fronts: to follow an anti-Spanish and pro-Protestant course abroad, and indirectly to accommodate Huguenots at home. Each was presented and analysed as a matter of 'interest', a concept taken over and refined from earlier writings (see below) that he held to be central to understanding all counsel and policy. Rohan claimed that every ruler and regime, whether Catholic or Protestant, should fear the 'secret design' or 'true interest' of Habsburg-Spain to establish a 'new monarchy', i.e. a political and military hegemony in Europe, which could only be effectively opposed by the French monarchy taking up arms. The 'true interest' of each independent European 'state' depended on a careful management of the fragile equilibrium of power between Habsburg-Spain and Bourbon-France or as Rohan wrote: 'there be two Powers in *Christendome*, which are as the two *Poles*, from which whence descend the influence of peace and warre upon the other states, to wit, the houses of *France* and *Spain*.'[53]

Commentators on *De l'interest* have emphasised its great significance for the history of political thought. Historians have described Rohan's writings as essential for the (modern) analysis of foreign politics in terms of 'interests of states'.[54] *De l'interest* is 'one of the earliest and ablest' writings on the interests of states according to William Farr Church.[55] Friedrich Meinecke regarded Rohan as one of the, but most influential, founders of 'the Doctrine of the Best Interest of the State' and in his elaborate study of reason of state under Cardinal Richelieu, Étienne

---

[52] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 24. The entire passage: 'Of this Interest a certain very wise and experienced military officer attempted to say; that it rules over the Princes, alike they over her Subjects; And how much higher a Prince is above her, so much greater becomes the knowledge of State demanded of him [the prince, MBK], as of all his other issues. A Prince can be deceived, and his councillors can be misguided, the true Interest can never deceive or be false; because as much as the Interest is wrongly observed, so much will the State decrease or increase.'; 'Van dit Interest pleeg seeker seer wijs en ervaren Veld-Oversten te seggen; dat het regeert over de Princen, gelijk die over hare Onderdanen; En hoe veel hooger een Prins boven haar is, so veel grooter kennis van Staat word in hem vereyst, als van al sijne andere saaken. Kan een Prins altemet bedrogen, en sijne Raads-luyden verleyt warden, het waare Interest kan noyt missen of bedriegen; want voor so veel het Interest wel of qualijk word waargenomen, voor so veel neemt den Staat daar door af of aan.'

[53] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 2.

[54] Noel Malcolm stated that 'by the 1630s, when the eminent Huguenot Henri, duc de Rohan, made it ['interest'] the basis of his influential treatise *L'Interest des princes* (...), the analysis of geopolitics was unthinkable without it.' Noel Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 95; In an recent, introductory overview of the history of international political thought, Edward Keene wrote: 'Rohan captured the central thrust of a new way of thinking about international politics which took the "interest" or "reason of states" as its central concept (...)', *International Political Thought, and introduction* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), 107.

[55] William F. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1972), 352.

Thuau called Rohan's book the 'chef-d'oeuvre' of this new 'genre' in political literature.[56] Besides Rohan's value for the modern analysis of foreign politics in terms of 'interests of states', he is praised for his allegedly objective and rational analysis of the practice of foreign policy, cleansed from considerations of morality and religion. For Meinecke 'pure empiricism has triumphed'[57] in Rohan's examination of foreign power politics. Albert Otto Hirschmann and Quentin Skinner credit Rohan to be the first author who opposed passion to interest, since, according to Rohan, the interest is interpreted by true reason independently of erratic passions, prejudices and other human defects.[58] Nannerl Overholser Keohane writes that for Rohan 'interests of state are objective facts that can be discerned or misunderstood'.[59] Thuau follows Meinecke in claiming that *De l'interest* 'vise à être un tableau objectif de la situation en Europe', although his 'objectivité a des limites' because it is viewed from a French perspective and attempted to justify direct warfare against Spain in the Thirty Years' War.[60] Church states that 'Rohan's book is significant, not for its positive influence but for its frankly secular and pragmatic view of French state interests and the appropriate means of implementing them.'[61] According to Heinz Schilling, *De l'interest* is a token of the notion of state's interests as 'säkulares Prinzip und oberste Handlungsmaxime der Politik', executed programmatically by Rohan.[62] In his annotated version of *De l'interest,* Christian Lazzeri addresses a 'moment Rohan', echoing Pocock's 'Machiavellian moment', by arguing that Rohan redefined the concepts of interest as a rational category, without any considerations of moral or legal obligations.[63] In a recent biography on the Rohan familiy, Jonathan Dewald writes that 'Rohan presents a radically secular vision of political life as centering on self-interest and rational calculation rather than piety, tradition, or morality.'[64]

---

[56] Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 162-196; Étienne Thuau, *Raison d'Etat et pensée politique à l'époque de Richelieu* (Paris : Éditions Albin Michel, 2000 [re-edition of 1966]), 312.

[57] 'When one reads Rohan, it is as if one were stepping over from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century. The principle of pure empiricism has triumphed, and there is a fundamental rejection of the old tendency to follow famous examples and cling on to the past. He accords importance only to the fresh spring of life around him, constantly gushing anew.' Meinecke compared Rohan with Machiavelli, Bodin, Botero and Hugo Grotius, the important authors on 'state power' who all 'still' used historical examples and the authoritative authors from antiquity. Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 166, 19. See footnote 60 for Meinecke's critique of Rohan's empiricist capabilities.

[58] Albert Otto Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before Its Triumph*, 20th ed. (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997), 42.

[59] Nannerl Overholser Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France. The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980), 174.

[60] Thuau, *Raison d'Etat*, 313; Meinecke, almost disappointedly, had to admit that Rohan was 'incapable of complete objectivity', since he analysed the interests of other rulers from a French perspective. Besides, the underdeveloped stage of 'historical knowledge at his time' did not benefitted Rohan's analysis according to the German historian. Moreover, he directly criticised Rohan 'for the way in which these [Rohan's basic ideas and intentions] are carried out and applied in concrete instances.' Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 170, 169, 170.

[61] Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 354. Church rejected Meinecke's treatment of Rohan's and Richelieu's perspectives on interest as one singular concept of reason of state. Richelieu's writings were in contrast to Rohan's, imbued with his religious and moral beliefs, according to Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 352.

[62] Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen. Internationale Beziehungen 1559-1660,* vol. 2 (Schöningh: Paderborn, 2007), 152.

[63] Lazzeri, 'Introduction', 145-146.

[64] Jonathan Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France: the Rohan family (1550-1715)* (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2015), 71.

The argument of this chapter is that these assessments need to be reconsidered; Rohan's emphasis on examining current political affairs in order to determine the interest of states appears much less to involve principles of objectivity or political autonomy when placed in the context of, what Noel Malcolm calls, 'a genre of critical current-affairs commentary'.[65] This extremely popular body of propagandistic literature evolved during the Thirty Years' War, claiming to publicise the truth, the secret advice of princely councils and to unveil evil counsel, the *arcana imperii* of inter-princely actions or 'mysteries of state', the 'reason of state' or 'interest' of princes, while simultaneously criticising opponents in a satiric manner. By satiric I am alluding to a conventional style of moral critique familiar in the early modern world from Roman culture, rather than to more recent understandings that have taken it as a largely humorous literary genre. Satiric writing as relevant to the argument here involved exaggeration and even fabrication in order to create an image of a target designed to discredit, and exposing it to ridicule and distrust.[66] As explained in the introduction, the vocabulary of reason of state was used not only to defend a certain policy or rule, but also, and perhaps more so, to condemn one, often satirising the alleged enemy as Malcolm shows. Machiavelli's *The Prince* would also be called a satire in this sense of unmasking of evil, as Henry Neville in a prefatory letter (allegedly written by Machiavelli) to his translation of Machiavelli's works from 1675 writes that it was 'both a Satyr against them, [tyrants] and a true Character of them.'[67] Although some commentators point rightly to Rohan's propagandistic aim to justify an offensive anti-Spanish foreign policy,[68] they have overlooked the satiric exaggeration and demonization in his interest analysis of Spain.

This seemingly objective and supra-confessional interest analysis enabled Rohan, firstly, to implicitly accuse Spain of pursuing unrestricted and universal tyrannical control, while correspondingly sidestepping religious polemics; and, secondly, to envisage a patriotic French unity in which the former Huguenot rebel could re-claim an office. This chapter aims at elucidating this twofold function of 'reason of state' terminology in *De l'interest.* To begin with, it presents a biographical sketch suggesting that his misfortunes provide a partial context for the writing of *De l'interest.* At the very least, a work of political advice that studiously avoided the predictable and conventional recourse to religious polemic was ideally suited to Rohan's own difficult position and confessionally uncertain history. This section is followed by an short

---

[65] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 34.

[66] On the difficulties involved in defining satire read Conal Condren, 'Satire and definition', *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 25:4 (2012), 375-399. On page 389 Condren writes: 'What has been designated satire has not always been intended as in any way humorous or joking. (…) It may well be the case that over its long history, the humorous has become increasingly important in satire beyond the Mennipean, yet to read humour back as an essential feature of anything called satire, let alone define satire in terms of it, is bound to distort.'

[67] *The Works of the Famous Machiavell, Citizen and Secretary of Florence* (London: John Starkey, 1675); Felix Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli: a Changing Interpretation, 1500-1700* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964) 219-221, 267-272.

[68] As Thuau, *Raison d'Etat*, 313; Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 163, 170.

outline of the use of reason of state terminology in France in the first half of the seventeenth century, the political debates triggered by the European war competition and confessional strife in France during the 1620s and 1630s, the genre of critical current-affairs commentary, and the propagandistic tradition of accusing the opponent of aspiring to 'universal monarchy'. In these contexts, the function of reason of state in *De l'interest* will be analysed.

2.1 Henri de Rohan: Huguenot warrior, noble prince and famous author

Rohan's misfortunes as a noble prince, losing the patronage of King Henry IV after the king's assassination in 1610, and as a military officer in his ultimately failed Huguenot rebellion against Louis XIII in the 1620s, relate to his *seemingly* objective and secular, or as this chapter argues, his satirical and supra-confessional account of the interests of Spain of France.

Rohan picked up his pen to influence 'opinion' in France, i.e. to steer opinion towards an anti-Spanish and pro-Huguenot policy while simultaneously applying for a position to help further this policy. *De l'interest* was written on the eve of the direct military intervention of the French monarchy in the Thirty Years' War against the Habsburgs dynasty in 1635.[69] After Sweden's devastating defeat at the battle of Nördlingen on 5 and 6 September 1634, the French pawn on the chessboard of the Thirty Year's War was severely blocked. From June until October of 1634, Rohan stayed at the royal court in Paris, hoping to convince Richelieu to offer him a military office and, perhaps not coincidentally, incite him to undertake a direct military stand against Spain.[70] As an eminent Huguenot military leader, Rohan was Richelieu's former antagonist in the three Huguenot rebellions (1620-1622, 1625, 1627-1629). After the decisive Huguenot defeat in 1629 and Rohan's subsequent exile to Venice, Rohan sought the patronage of Richelieu and although receiving several military assignments, Richelieu had never entirely trusted the ambitious Rohan.[71] During his stay at court Rohan finished his book, probably added a dedication to the Cardinal and presented it to Richelieu.[72] In this dedication, Rohan wrote that although Richelieu was not expressly present in the entire treatise, it would speak of the

[69] Lazzeri argues that the editing of the work began in 1630, which Rohan followed through in different phases up till 1634. He gives an overview of the difference in opinion amongst historians about the period of writing. Lazzeri, 'Introduction', 153–154.
[70] Richelieu did not follow Rohan's counsel and exhausted all other alternatives before entering the Thirty Years' War. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State,* 354.
[71] Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 164.
[72] The historian Petitot reported of the existence of a manuscript of *De l'Interest* in the royal Library in Paris with the date of Paris, 1 August 1634, at the end of the dedication. Lazzeri, introduction, 154*.* Meinecke wrote: 'Rohan wanted to influence him by means of the book, to establish himself as a man who could be trusted, and at the same time incite the cardinal.' Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État,* 165.

cardinal, to whom Rohan exclaimed his eternal loyalty as Richelieu's very humble, very affectionate and obliged servant.[73]

Besides an iconic Huguenot, Rohan was a famous nobleman. He was honoured publically in Geneva, Venice and Paris after his death in 1638. Duc de Saint Simon praised Rohan: 'whom all Europe admired for his wisdom and honoured for his virtue'.[74] The Rohan family belonged to the high nobility of France, with their estates predominantly based in Brittany. They turned to Protestantism in the 1550s and became a highly visible Protestant noble family after the Bartholomew's Day Massacre 1572, when a great number of high Protestant nobles converted to Catholicism. The Rohans had important connections to the royal court, e.g. Françoise de Rohan was a permanent *dame d'honneur* of Cathérine de Médicis in the 1550s and the family was related, close cousins, to the later King Henry IV (1553-1610) through the female line.[75] Therefore it is not so remarkable that Henri de Rohan dreamt of becoming a military leader like Caesar and an independent prince, as Jonathan Dewald argues.[76]

Unfortunately for Rohan, his life took a different turn. Under the Huguenot King Henry IV, he enjoyed royal patronage and favouritism, being made Duc de Rohan, and was strongly supported in his unsuccessful marriage plans with the sister of the Swedish king and later in his marriage to the daughter of Henry's principal adviser Maximilien de Béthune, Duc de Sully. After the assassination of Henry IV in 1610, however, Rohan lost his high and beneficial position. Whereas the Huguenot nobility had profited from their newly formed collaboration with the Crown under Henry IV, now their standing was severely diminished. Within the Protestant nobility, factions arose between those who wanted collaboration with, and a more moderate policy towards the Crown, and those expressing the need for a more radical and offensive policy as Rohan supported. Simultaneously, the regency of Maria Medici brought forth several aristocratic factions in which Rohan was variously involved. He first fought against the regent, but with her after her exclusion and imprisonment by her son King Louis III in 1617. One consequence of these shifts in allegiance was the nickname 'Catiline' for his intrigues and ruthless ambition.[77] After 1610, the Huguenot's religious freedom and property rights were severely reduced by the French Crown. Over the course of the 1620s civil wars broke out, in which Rohan switched sides between the divided Huguenot power groups on a number of occasions. Within the Huguenot camp Rohan was mistrusted and accused of treachery for

[73] The closing sentences were as following: 'Vous vous verrez donc dans peu de lignes représenté tout entier: en tout ce traité, il ne sera parlé que de vous, bien qu'il n'en soit jamais parlé. Votre modestie et ma franchise ne me permettent pas de m'exprimer en autre façon, tenant que les louanges ordinaires font tort à ceux desquels les actions parlent si clair. Ce n'est pas aussi par là que je me veux rendre digne de vos bonnes grâces. Mais bien par des services proportionnés aux obligations que vous avez acquises sur moi, qui serai tout ma vie, Monsieur, Votre trés humble, très affectionné et obligé serviteur Henri de Rohan.' Henri de Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté,* 160.
[74] Quotation from De Wald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 35.
[75] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 17-19.
[76] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 38.
[77] Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 123.

negotiating truce with the Crown of France. In September 1629 Rohan signed the Peace of Alès, agreeing on the restoration of the Rohan family properties, as a compensation for his wartime losses and for his exile to Venice. Here he started writing the *De l'interest* amongst other treatises.

Perhaps it is not surprising that Richelieu mistrusted Rohan when he sought a prestigious office after 1629. Nevertheless, at the end of 1631, he was sent as a French envoy and lieutenant general to assist the canton of Grisons in expelling the Spanish forces from the Valtelline passes. These passes formed not only the stage of several brutal confessional conflicts between the Catholic inhabitants and their Protestant rulers, but also a strategic passage between the Habsburgs' Austrian and Spanish territories, important to the competing parties within the Thirty Year's War and accordingly much fought over.[78] There, he was suspected of being a spy by another French envoy and subsequently lost his post in 1632. A year later he resumed his post, but lost his ambassadorial status. In the summer of 1634 he stayed at the royal court in Paris, where he finished and presented *De l'interest.* Soon after his visit, he was recruited for the French campaigns against the Habsburgs and achieved some great successes, but he constantly clashed with the royal council over finances and further military support. After his forces collapsed in the Valtelline in the beginning of 1637 and Condé's attempt to arrest him in 1637, Rohan joined the forces of Bernard of Saxe-Weimar as a gentleman-ranker. He died on the battlefield in Rheinfelden in 1638.[79]

In the years of his exile in Venice between 1629 and 1634, Rohan wrote his three most famous treatises: *De l'interest, Le parfait capitaine* (1638) that embodied admiring commentaries on Julius Caesar and reflections on military practice, dedicated to the French king, and his *Mémoirs* (first three books printed in 1644) of the Huguenot rebellions of the 1620s.[80] The first publication stream of *De l'Interest* occurred from 1637 to 1639, when after Rohan's defeat, the issue of control over the Valtelline passes rose again in France.[81] In 1637, it was anonymously published with a royal privilege in the *Mercure François* for the years 1634 and 1635. Most treatises in this edition deal with current political affairs regarding the Thirty Years' War, but the volume also contains news of royal politics, and even mentions Rohan's return to

[78] After the revolt of the Catholic inhabitants against the Grisons Protestant rulers, Habsburg-Spanish forces occupied the Valtelline. In 1623 France Habsburgs-Spain turned it to the Papal forces under pressure of France. The following year an alliance of French and Swiss troops expelled the Papal forces, but the peace treaty of Monzon in 1626 between France and Spain forced the withdrawal of French troops in the valley. However, in 1631 Rohan's troops restored the French control until 1637, when a substantial part of the military forces of the Grisons rebelled and stepped over to the Habsburg side.

[79] David Parrott, *Richelieu's Army: War, Government and Society in France, 1624-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 489-490.

[80] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 70.

[81] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 37-84; Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 104–107; David Parrot, *Richelieu's army: war, government and society*, 114–122.

court in 1634 and the subsequent royal decision to send him to the Swiss Canton of Grisons.[82] After Rohan's death in 1638, *De l'interest* was re-published, but now named, and bound up with the *Parfait capitaine*. Dewald and Meinecke both argue that Rohan intended to publish *De l'interest*.[83] Dewald explains that in 1632 Rohan wrote to his friend, the theologian Théodore Tronchin, in Geneva that he was worried about publishing his writings on the state of political affairs in Europe. He suggested forging a story of accidental publication to avoid problems with, as Rohan wrote in his letter, the Estates of the Low Countries and other authorities and persons who might be offended. After his death, an edition (bound up with *Le Parfait capitaine*) was introduced by stating that it was not intended for publication and that it reached the publisher by accident. However, not only had Rohan suggested this, but he also wrote to Tronchin that he had already presented a copy to the king of Sweden and in his following letters, he oversaw the publication process closely.[84] Dewald concludes: 'he wanted to reach a wide audience, without regard to its social contours.'[85] It is also worth noting, however, that the fiction of accidental publication and the initial anonymity was entirely appropriate to the genre of propagandistic writing that unmasked secret designs. It would be resorted to again in Henry Neville's spurious letter by Machiavelli concerning his satiric intentions to expose evil and its invented provenance by his printer John Starkey.[86] Regardless of this possibility, all three exile writings became huge successes in the course of the seventeenth century. *De l'interest* had many editions and several later adaptions or imitations, which are, as Salmon states, often confusing, because they do not resemble Rohan's original treatise at all.[87]

2.2 The backdrop of Rohan's reason of state

Rohan's interest analysis on a European scale enabled him to criticise implicitly Habsburgs-Spain and to forge a patriotic unity for France by sidestepping the divisiveness that accompanied assertions of confessional integrity. To explain this, we have to sketch the backdrop against which Rohan produced his interest analysis. A closer look will be taken at the use of reason of state vocabulary in early seventeenth-century France and the political debates in France during the 1620s and 1630s. Then we will look into Rohan's interest analysis in relation to the genre of critical current-affairs commentary, and propagandistic accusations of 'universal monarchy', revolved around the Franco-Spanish rivalry in the early modern military competition.

---

[82] *Mercure François* (Paris 1637), for Rohan at court read 220-222.
[83] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 72; Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 174.
[84] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 72-73 and footnote 149 on page 209.
[85] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 73.
[86] *The Works of the Famous Machiavell, Citizen and Secretary of Florence* (London: John Starkey, 1675).
[87] Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 132.

2.1.2 French reason *or* interest *of state?*

Dewald regards Rohan's political thought, including his interest analysis, as Machiavellian,[88] but it reflects a much broader, contemporary vocabulary that Harro Höpfl defines as, a 'fashionable political cynicism' about the 'true' motives of rulers spurred by the experiences of religious wars, especially in the Low Countries and France. As explained in the introduction, the idiom of reason of state became integrated from the late sixteenth century onwards in this broad vocabulary resulting in several synonyms for 'reason of state' such as 'interest of state', the Tacitist expression *arcana imperii*, 'secrets' and 'mysteries'.[89] Before the reception of reason of state vocabulary in France in the late sixteenth century, the terms 'Machiavellism' and 'Machiavellist' were already established and in popular use.[90] During the religious wars in France (1562-1598), accusations of 'Machiavellism' thrived amongst all factions involved.[91] In the 1570s, Italians at the Parisian court defended the monstrosities of the religious wars with a cynical outlook on politics, using Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and Tactius or Tacitean language.[92] The reading of Tacitus' accounts of the misdemeanours of Roman emperors became extremely popular amidst the noble factions and courtly politics of the wars. The ancient historian was usually used as a supplementary or even alternative authority to the extremely controversial Machiavelli.[93] According to Jacob Soll, Justus Lipsius created an 'accessible version of political prudence for casuistically Christian monarchs', i.e. *prudentia mixta*, which became an essential element in French political thought, illustrated by Pierre Charron's *De la sagesse* (1601).[94] However, Tacitist

---

[88] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 47-49.

[89] Harro Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', in *History of Political Thought*, 23:2 (2002), 211-237, p. 216-217.

[90] Jan Wazink, 'Introduction' to *Politica: Six Books of Politics Or Political Instruction*, by Justus Lipsius (Assen: Royal Van Gorchum, 2004), 45.

[91] The preacher Boucher claimed that Henry III carried a copy of *The Prince* in his pocket and attempted to introduce Machiavelli's policies in France. The Catholic League accused the *politiques* of Machiavellism by allegedly subordinating the Catholic cause to political considerations. In turn, the *politiques* accused the League of conveying their personal interests, driven by power politics, under the cloak of appealing to the 'bien public'. In his famous *Anti-Machiavel* (1576) the Huguenot Innocent Gentillet blamed Machiavellian philosophy for the Bartholomew's Day Massacre of French Protestants in 1572. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 47-50; Harro Höpfl, 'Reason of State', in Henrik Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy Philosophy between 500 and 1500* (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2011), 1113-1115, 1113; Notably, Rohan's book inventory lists included a copy of the *Anti-Machiavel* as well as a French translation of Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Sven Stelling-Michaud, 'Le Duc de Rohan et ses livres', in *Revue du Vieux Genève* 14 (1984), 18-27.

[92] Jan Waszink, 'Introduction', 45.

[93] While a prosperous market for Machiavelli's editions existed in France, reading them was still forbidden. Jacob Soll, 'A Lipsian Legacy? Neo-Absolutism, Natural Law and the Decline of Reason of State in France 1660-1760', in Erik de Bom, Marijke Janssens, Toon Van Houdt, and Jan Papy (eds.), *(Un)masking the Realities of Power: Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe* (Brill, Leiden 2011) 307-323, 309; Read for a short discussion of Machiavellinism and reason of state in France, Marcel Gauchet, 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat: la France et la chrétienté', in Yves Charles Zarka (ed.), *Raison et déraison d'Etat. Théoriciens et théories de la raison d'Etat aux XIVe et XVIIe siècles* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994), 193-244.

[94] Pierre Charron outlined prudence as the legitimate scope for rulers to act freely from legal and/or religious constraints for the common good, which in his opinion ought to be analysed by reading Lipsius. Soll, 'A Lipsian

writings often were (dis-)qualified as reason of state, and associated with Machiavellism for recommending the use of religion for political gain.[95] Most readers on 'reason of state' would have been appalled by such recommendations,[96] which we ought to keep in mind when discussing Rohan's counsel of religious dissimulation for Spain. Tacitism (and reason of state) offered contemporaries the 'true' causes and self-interested motives of famous political figures in history and the historical workings of power politics. Such critical political history became a tool of early modern governments to legitimise their rule in external and internal power struggles, as Soll illustrates by the 'French Royal Tacitism', i.e. the royal promotion of editions of Tacitus and publications of Tacitist politico-historical studies starting from King Henry IV up to the 1660s.[97]

Another important aspect of French reason of state is the transition in French official political vocabulary from the 1560s onwards and completed under King Henry IV's, which James Collins has described as a linguistic shift from the 'monarchical commonwealth' to the 'monarchical state'. In the context of the disastrous and traumatic religious wars, royal officials searched for alternatives to the traditional vocabulary of the 'respublique françoyse' in terms of appealing to the 'bien public', adhering the 'true religion' and following the precepts of 'piety' and 'justice'. The notion of a French *respublica* as one political community of citizens, ruled by law and consent, striving to obtain the 'bien public', had become severely discredited, not least due to the extensive use of appeals to the 'bien public' by the Catholic League.[98] First the *politiques* and then the juridical elite increasingly promoted 'le bien de l'Estat' (and the intermediate 'le bien du service du roi'). The 'state' served as a conceptual solution to unify the shattered French society and the term became synonymous with the political community itself as well as with the government. The king was added to the 'state', considered as the source of this unity and by his 'puissance absolue', the ultimate source of the law. Notably, Collins writes of 'discourse confusion' in many French documents in the first third of the seventeenth century, since 'state' most often meant the government or the king's administration, besides addressing order, disposition or policies.[99] The 'commonwealth' gradually became the 'state' and rulers could henceforth claim to act *as*, rather than *for* the commonwealth. Appeals to the common

---

Legacy?', 309-311 and citation from 310; Jan Waszink, 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', *History of* Ideas 39:2 (2013), 151-168, 158; Particularly in France, 'Lipsian Tacitism' flourished, for examples see Jacob Soll, *Publishing* The Prince*. History, Reading, & the Birth of Political Criticism* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005), 36-37.

[95] Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 223; *Politica* was categorised as reason of state on the *Index*. Jan Wazink, 'Introduction', 120-122, 173-187.

[96] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 97.

[97] Waszink, 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', 157-158; Soll, *Publishing* The Prince, 38-40.

[98] This definition of political order developed from the middle of the fourteenth century until the late sixteenth century, influenced by Aristotle, Polybius and Cicero. Collins, *The State in Early Modern France* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 3-4.

[99] The vocabulary of the 'respublique françoyse' continued to be used especially for towns in economic matters such as corporations as guilds in charters. Collins, *Republicanism and the State in late medieval and early modern France* (forthcoming). 74; Rohan's memoirs shows this discourse confusion in using both elements of the vocabulary (commonwealth as well as state), according to Collins. Personal correspondence with James Collins.

good, based on ideas of the Aristotelian good life, shifted to justifications in the 'interest of state' or 'reason of state', defined by notions of utility and necessity.[100]

The terminology of reason of state was incidentally used in the 1590s, but two decades later Antoine de Lavall exclaimed that reason of state, this novel language from Rome and Venice, had become so popular that everyone, great as well as small men, discussed it everywhere. Even newspapers could speak of nothing else, according to Lavall.[101] The French term 'raison d'état' was a translation of the Italian 'ragion di stato' and the Latin 'ratio status', both sixteenth-century neologisms.[102] At the close of the sixteenth century, Botero's and many other Italian writings discussing reason of state became popular in France.[103] Similar to religiously orthodox writers such as Botero, Lavall and many other French authors condemned reason of state as Machiavellian immorality and indifference to law, while simultaneously elucidated and justified reason of state under the auspices of prudence and necessity.[104]

Rohan's usage of the phrase 'the (true) interest of state' was built upon existing ideas of interest. As clarified in the introduction, the justifiable notion of profit or utility for reason of state became increasingly integrated in the term 'interest', manifested in arguments of interest as the driving force behind princely politics and an increasing usage of 'interest of state' as more or less synonymous with 'reason of state'. The closely related, even sometimes synonymous expressions of interest and raison d'estat provided a well established currency of debate by the time Rohan wrote. In 1588, René de Lucinge (a friend of Botero) wrote that princes were driven by honour or profit and because profit was prevailing, he claimed that: 'We shall therefore

---

[100] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, xxiii; Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 94. This transition in French political vocabulary overlaps the late-sixteenth century shift, argued by Maurizio Viroli and described in the introduction, from a language of understanding politics as preserving the *respublica* (a community of citizens ruled by law and consent) to maintaining the *state*, (a ruler's dominion over political institutions and peoples, ruled by force) the latter expressed by reason of state vocabulary. Viroli, *From politics to Reason of State*; Lazzeri underlines this substitution of respublica by 'Estat' in French political thought and perceives Rohan's notion of 'Estat' as in line with the accounts of Richelieu, Naudé, Silhon, as they emphasise the necessity of sovereignty integrated in the state in order to maintain the rule of law. Lazzeri gives a similar overview of the changing definitions of 'state' in French political thought, from the thirteenth century descriptions of 'state' as the society of orders (social and legal condition of certain group as corporation) and the state of the prince as the condition by which he exercised his royal power via certain corporations, to the substitution of *respublica* by 'state' in the second half of the sixteenth century by 'constitionalist' writers as Claude de Seyssel, Theorore de Bèze and François Hotman. These authors, though somewhat differently, defined 'state' as a corporate body where the union of members was superior to the head, i.e. the king. This new understanding of 'state' was further transformed through the incorporation of the notion of sovereignty into such an idea of body politic by Bodin, and taken up by authors as Cardin le Bret, Jean de Silhon, Cardinal Richelieu and Gabriel Naudé in the time of Rohan. Lazzeri, 'Introduction', 120-125.

[101] Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 126; Antoine de Lavall, *Desseins de professions nobles et publiques* (Paris, 1605, 1612); The edition of 1612 encompassed a section on reason of state, in which Lavall reviewed several writings, was only to some extent pleased with Ammirato's commentary on Tacitus because it argued that reason of state had always be subordinated to religion. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 78-80; Gauchet, 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat', 195-196.

[102] Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 215-216; Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 44-47, see footnote 94 on page 45 for examples of early use of the phrase 'raison d'état' in France.

[103]The first translation of *Della Ragion di Stato* was made by Gabriel Chappuys and published as *Raison et gouverment d'estat* in Paris in 1599. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 62-72.

[104] Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 78-80.

concern ourselves only with profit, which we may call "interest".'[105] During the turbulent period of the regency of Maria de Medici from 1610 to 1617, the term 'interest' was more commonly used than 'raison d'estat'. Huguenot writings from Coligny in 1572 similarly argued in terms of interest and reason of state, with perhaps increasingly, interest being the notion to which greater attention was given.[106] Richelieu's publicists made intensive use of the terminology of 'interest' and by the time *De l'interest* was published (1638) it was well established.[107]

To state that Rohan's interest analysis should be seen in light of hyperbolic exaggeration (central to the Thirty Years' War genre of critical current-affairs commentary), is not to argue that *De l'interest* cannot be seen as a blueprint for writings on the interest of states of Europe. As explained in the introduction, Rohan's famous interest analysis represents the complementation in reason of state writings as examinations (and criticisms) of predominantly the moral person of the ruler, with critical analyses of the system of government, i.e. the features of his land, his rule vis-à-vis his subjects and relations with other regimes. These interest analyses resulted from the increasing employment of historical analysis, which enabled authors to indicate the circumstances and characteristics of the societies of the rulers and to distinguish these from 'foreign' polities.[108]

Moreover, in claiming that interest ruled rulers, he indeed diminished the guiding importance of the ethics of office. Conal Condren and Ryan Walter have pointed to Rohan's contribution to a gradual dissociation of 'interest' from 'notions of office'.[109] By primarily

---

[105] Quoted form Malcolm, '"Reason of State" and Hobbes', 94

[106] Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 102-103, 108, 126-127, footnotes 44 and 45; Maria's regency was pestered by rebellions of major nobles and ended with the murder of Maria's favourite Concino Concini, executed by Louis XII and his men. Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, xxix; In several writings of the 1610s, Rohan likewise argued for a pro-protestant foreign policy against France's belligerent Spanish neighbour. The Huguenot leader similarly pointed to the (mis-)use of religion as political pretext as it, according to him, had been uttered in the French Wars of Religion and by Habsburgs-Spain in its wars against foreign princes and peoples. See Salmon, for a short summary for each specific writing. Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 100-103. For a total overview of Rohan's writings and editions of *De l'interest* read Lazzeri, 'Introduction', 153-156; Étienne Thuau points to a particular collection of anonymous pamphlets from the 1610s and 1620s wherein the advancement of the Habsburg-Spanish monarchy was perceived as a grave threat to the existence of France and the rest of Europe, and that, consequently, the French monarchy should rise up against Spain. These discourses were bound up in a book published in 1632. Thuau, *Raison d'Etat*, 309-311.

[107] Malcolm, *Reason of State*, 94.

[108] Meinecke discusses in chapter six 'The Doctrine of the Best Interest of the State in France at the time of Richelieu 146-195'. Interest of state writings found their origins in Renaissance Venetian relatione reports estimating 'the inner motives of its rivals' by looking into 'the particular situation of a particular individual country', but gained its full potential under Richelieu's government, when France re-entered the European war competition. Meinecke argued that the Wars of Religion fostered the 'recognition of the true collective interest of the whole of France': anti-Spanish and religious toleration. These ideas were put into practice under the rule Henry IV, but during the regency of Maria de Medici, France neglected this interest until the growth of Habsburg-Spanish power, the Habsburgs geographical enclosure of the French monarchy and the marriage negotiations between the Spanish infant and the young Charles produced substantial fear amongst French politicians. Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 146, 147, 151; Lazzeri 'Introduction', 87 for origins of interest analyses in Ventian relatione reports; Richard Devetak, 'Historiographical Foundations of modern International Thought', *History of Ideas* 41:1 (2014), 62-77, quote on p. 64. Notably, by 'international dimension' Devetak means 'the external interactions of sovereigns, republics, empires and principalities with other such public and private actors.'

[109] Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge 2006), 344 'this ambivalent relationship with and development from notions of office allowed office and interest to rub along almost in as complementary a fashion as *honestas* and *utilitas*. But it also allowed for forms of explanation

focusing on the nature of societies of rulers, e.g. the present geographical position, political structures, religious make-up, military prowess and relations with other rulers, he was able to marginalise well-established questions concerning princely virtue, piety and confessional integrity. For an ex-rebellious Huguenot prince living under a Catholic ruler and desiring an office, any religious polemic ought to be avoided.

2.2.2 Monarchy in crisis and Richelieu's crisis management of reason of state

Most of the research into French usages of reason of state vocabulary focuses on the period of Richelieu's ministry (1624-1642), his 'monopolisation' of this terminology, and, subsequently on writings of his hired pens as Guez de Balzac, Jean de Silhon, Philip de Béthune, Gabriel Naudé as well as Richelieu's own memoirs.[110] During the first decades of the seventeenth century, Tacitist and Italian reason of state writings as by Botero and Boccalini were used to criticise the king and his advisers and 'unveil' their secretive political schemes. Richelieu turned this dangerous criticism into rather successful propaganda for the Crown by publication strategies and a system of censorship, reaching a relatively large readership.[111] Laurie Catteeuw argues that these outbursts on reason of state subsequently transformed the associated notion of *necessitas*: the extraordinary became ordinary. Under the auspices of the terminology of reason of state, the ancient maxim of 'necessity knows no law' gradually transformed into an argument that 'necessity makes law'.[112] Nonetheless, in the context of crisis, reason of state became quite openly and heavily debated, and Richelieu could not prevent critics from discussing reason of

---

independent of any ethics of office.'; Ryan Walter, 'Slingsby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests', *History of European Ideas* 41:4 (2015), 489-506, 495.

[110] Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 164-204; Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*; Gauchet, 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat'; Thuau, *Raison d'Etat*.

[111] Jacob Soll, 'Empirical History and the Transformation of Political Criticism in France from Bodin to Bayle', *Journal of History of Ideas* 64:2 (2003), 297-316, in particular 306, 309; Laurie Catteuw, 'L'inacceptable face aux nécessités politiques : les relations entre censures et raisons d'état à l'époque moderne' in *Les Dossiers du Grihl* [online], Les dossiers de Jean-Pierre Cavaillé, Les limites de l'acceptable, (14 juin 2013), accessed January 17 2016. URL : http://dossiersgrihl.revues.org/5978.

[112] Talking about an unacceptable reason of state formed a framework in which certain actions could be accepted and finally were accepted. Catteeuw, 'L'inacceptable face aux nécessités politiques'; Luc Foisneau, 'Sovereignty and Reason of State: Bodin, Botero, Richelieu and Hobbes', in Howell A. Lloyd (ed.), *The Reception of Bodin* (Brill; Leiden 2013), 323-342, p. 333; The most famous or notorious example of Richelieu's promotion of reason of state is probably *Considérations politiques sur les coups-d'état* (1639) by the Cardinal's librarian, Gabriel Naudé, who, inspired by Charron and Lipsius, extended the legitimate scope of prudence or political fraud to every member of government instead of solely to the prince, and distinguished between an 'ordinary' and moral prudence and 'extraordinary' and openly immoral prudence. The latter political fraud was not merely personal dissimulation of the prince but could involve bold and intervenient action, overstretching ordinary moral and legal boundaries, justified for the sake of the common good. It was however imperative for its success that such action was executed in the utmost secrecy, as he assessed the Bartholomew's Massacre as 'very just' but unfortunately 'done by halves'. Peter Burke, 'Tacitism, Scepticism and Reason of State', in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 479-498, p. 496-498; Soll, 'A Lipsian Legacy?', 312-315.

state.[113]

Instead of mirroring policies of 'statebuilding' or 'absolutism' of the Bourbon monarchy,[114] French use of reason of state vocabulary largely reflected pressing political problems, brought forth by warfare and its financial consequences. In the late 1620s, concerns about the rise in power of Habsburg-Spain, coincided with domestic political debates, wherein two ill-defined factions could be distinguished. The *dévots*, led by the Queen Regent Marie de Médicis and the keeper of the seals Michel de Marillac, favoured the superiority of the Vatican in domestic ecclesiastical matters and a pro-Habsburg, non-belligerent foreign policy that ensured time and money to initiate much needed internal reforms and to annihilate the Protestants at home. On the other side stood the *bons Français*, headed by Cardinal Richelieu, who argued for the relative autonomy of the French Church and, above all, the dire need for an offensive anti-Habsburg war and, therefore, a postponement of domestic reforms. This debate dominated French politics until the peace of the Pyrenees between Spain and France in 1659. According to Collins, the *dévots* reflected a renewed stress on personal piety and a more rigorous religion in France. William Church even claims that under his ministry, Richelieu dealt with a revitalised Catholicism 'which was stronger than any similar religious movement in the three earlier reigns.'[115]

Other crucial issues that pressured the Crown were dynastic fragility (the later King Louis XIV was born not until 1638), the powerful *grandees*, as well as the growing gap in the government's budget, illustrated by the partial bankruptcy of 1634. By the time *De l'interest* was published, France's involvement in the Thirty Years' War had severely affected its society by massively increasing taxation, introducing new taxes and selling offices as tax farming and lands, which led to increasing criticism of abuse of such offices, widespread non-payment of taxes and constant internal disorder as rebellions occurred in provinces and towns, eventually spreading to Paris, exploding in a series of revolts by officers and great nobility during the *Fronde* of 1648-

[113] Marcel Gauchet argues a transition from the idea of the secrecy of politics, mysteries of state decipherable solely by rulers and their advisors, to the notion of openly debating reason of state, analysed by rulers and ruled, and consequently reason of state developed into a weapon against the Crown. Gauchet, 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat'; Jacob Soll demonstrates the Crown's rejection of the idiom of reason of state from the 1660s onwards, largely set up by financial minster, Jean Baptiste de Colbert, who exclaimed the ineffectiveness and danger of Naudé's political views, and promoted a panegyric, more eloquently Ciceronian history-writing instead of a critically political and Tacitist one. Soll, 'A lipsian legacy?'.

[114] See for instance Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 'Part III Internal Affairs, State-Building, and Attendant Controversies, 1624-1632', p. 173-282; Soll, *Publishing the* Prince, see pages 7, 58 on absolutism and reason of state; Thuau, *Raison d'Etat*, 11.

[115] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, 35; Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 41, 93; The Cardinal introduced military and administrative reforms and created a vast client network in France, which was resented by many nobles, as the *dévots*, especially by Maria de Médicis and Gaston, the King's brother. Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, 59-68; Accusations of Machiavellism, allegedly fanatically practised by Richelieu, were not uncommon, e.g. the abbé de Choisy claimed that the Cardinal had a copy of *the Prince* on his bedside table. Soll, *Publishing the Prince*, 47.

1653. Collins even speaks of 'the twenty years crisis 1635-1654'.[116] These crisis years fuelled debates on reason of state, discussing and stretching the legitimate scope for the regime to execute extraordinary measures against domestic political agitators and competitors, and against foreign regimes generally.[117]

Church states that under Richelieu foreign affairs were more frequently discussed in French reason of state writings than domestic ones, however, such matters were most often than not intertwined as witnessed in debates between the *dévots* and *bons Français*.[118] The market was flooded with publications defending anti-Habsburg policies in the 'interest' of the French 'state' and, often added, in the interest of Catholicism.[119] The French Crown's return to costly anti-Habsburg foreign policy received massive criticism, but because the growing financial pressures were accompanied by resurgent Catholicism, it was far harsher than attacks on the anti-Habsburg policies of the reigns of Francis I, Henry II and Henry IV. After entering directly the war against Spain, the Cardinal was widely accused of placing the 'interests of state' above the Catholic faith. In his defence Richelieu emphasised a confessional dimension to his usage of reason of state in claiming that pursuing warfare against the grand Catholic monarchy of Spain was the divine mission of Catholic France, its ultimate interest of state, because defending the balance of power between European princes maintained the autonomy of the Catholic Church.[120]

2.2.3 Between fact and fiction: the threat of the 'new monarchy'

Apart from its domestic context, *De l'interest* may be understood as an extension of the genre of critical current-affairs commentary, fuelled by the Thirty Years', in which reason of state was a favourite subject, around which exaggeration and lurid accounts of dubious motivation easily

---

[116] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, chapter 2 pages 71-99, which ends with the coronation of Louis XIV at Reims in 1654, since the period of the regency of his mother Anne of Austria from 1643-1651 again produced internal power plays disastrously accumulating in the Fronde.

[117]General function of reason of state developed during religious civil wars according to Höpfl, 'Reason of State', 1114.

[118] Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 38; Read Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 197-282 on reason of state writings triggered by the power struggle between Richelieu, and Maria de Medici and her third son and heir-presumptive Gaston d'Orléans, escalating in the Day of the Dupes (±10 November 1630) and Louis XIII subsequent decision in favour of Richelieu and against Gaston and his followers, declaring them guilty of *lèse-majesté*, of which several high nobles were trialled and executed.

[119] Read for various examples such as Richelieu's own writings Thuau, *Raison d'Etat*, 308; Earliest examples from the Valtelline episode of 1624-1626. For pamphlets defending Richelieu's anti-Habsburgs policy in terms of reason of state vocabulary during this episode see Church chapter on 'the Valtelline episode', *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 103-172, especially paged 126-173. Notably, these defences were rather for a foreign readership than a domestic one since the *dévots* initially supported French intervention in the Italian valley. A famous example of a treatise defending an anti-Habsburgs-policy as the interest of France and of the Vatican as well: [Ferrier, Jérémie.], *Catholique d'estat ou Discours politique des alliances du roy très-Chrestien contre les calomnies des ennemis de son estat* (Paris 1625). Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 128-141.

[120] Church rejected Meinecke's treatment of Rohan's and Richelieu's perspectives on interest as one singular concept of reason of state. Richelieu's writings were in contrast to Rohan's, imbued with his religious and moral beliefs. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State,* 352; Foisneau, 'Sovereignty and Reason of State', 333-338;

gathered. Regimes strove to control rising 'opinion' and readers demanded news from the chaos of the many involved parties, interdependent conflicts and ever-changing alliances. Malcolm distinguished three groups of readers: the largest part may have read popular satire for their amusement, the elite may have rather read official declarations of both sides in order to validate the legality of the demands, and the major part of the educated reading public may have been fascinated, even exhilarated by reason of state. This latter group was already acquainted with many writings on the subject and could now, as the war evolved, delve deeper into the seemingly secretive princely politics of reason of state, which appeared to be tested and demonstrated in the, as Malcom writes, 'huge public laboratory' of the Thirty Years' War.[121] A famous example of this genre is *Mysteria politica* (anonymously published in 1625*),* written by Maximilian of Bavaria's publicist and Jesuit Adam Contzen, which criticised Richelieu's expulsion of Papal troops, supported by Spain, in the Valtelline of 1624 by offering eight 'genuine' letters revealing secretive political affairs at foreign courts, satirising French politics that were foolish and damaging to Catholicism, while displaying Spain as defenders of the religion. Counter-pamphlets were published in the *Mercure français,* suggesting the Crown's approval, and accused Spain by the commonly used argument of instrumentalising religion to expand their dominion, in this case in the Valteline,[122] as Rohan described the Spanish interest as well.

The propagandistic purpose of this genre does not imply that Rohan meant his interest analysis not to be taken seriously or to reject reason of state, nor that his display of European political affairs is false. Malcolm claims that this genre 'hovered somewhere between the publications of genuine documents on the one hand, and, on the other, the fanciful (and in this period, novel and entrancing) political fiction of Boccalini's *Raguagli di Parnasso*, with their shrewdly argued discussions between kings, philosophers, and other famous figures of both the present and the past. (...) [I]t was a genre that permitted some blurring of the borders between fact and fiction, between genuine analysis and satirical exaggeration.'[123] The unmasking of the opponent's dissimulations and simulations was even more effective when it told the truth, as Malcolm points to Rohan's advice that the French monarchy ought to expose Spanish and Papal misuses of the Catholic religion 'to make the *Catholickes* perceiue the venome hidden vndes (sic.) the same'.[124] Reason of state could be used 'to build on its credibility and exploit its disreputability'.[125] In some extreme cases a purely parodic version of reason of state could be presented, but one should be aware that contemporary readers familiar with reason of state arguments would not be shocked by many of the details, e.g. by recommendations to stir up conflict among the enemies. The Tacitist and Machiavellian precept of instrumentalising religion

[121] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 30-34, quote 31.
[122] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 32-33; Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, 121-126.
[123] Malcolm, *Reason of State*, 34.
[124] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 109; Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 14.
[125] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 34, 107-108.

for political gain remained, however, a controversial issue. Moreover, there existed a degree of argument by implication in this material. What was feared and must be taken seriously were the implications and extremes to which policy might lead, often attacked through urgent exaggeration as if they were already practiced. Thus, writings within this genre could involve satiric elements while simultaneously they were 'meant to be taken seriously'.[126] The integration of current political affairs granted such writings a sense of authority that accompanied the hyperbolically designed accusations.[127]

In the light of this intricate context of argument on interest and reason of state, it is now possible to suggest what precisely Rohan meant by calling Spain a 'new' monarchy, for it was not recognition of modern state building in the sense of an institutionalised fiscal-military state. Rohan's hostile image of Spain as the aspiring 'new monarchy' rested upon a longer tradition of propaganda on 'universal monarchy', which in early modern Europe was shaped by the intensification of warfare from which powerful dynastic agglomerates emerged. By the time of Charles V the notion of universal monarchy has lost its predominant theoretical nature in conflicts between the pope and the emperor and had been transformed into a subject for political debate regarding the organisation of European politics. Moreover, the notion was used prejudicially, suggesting that one power within Europe acted by 'illegal power politics', and occurred more often than not in debates about the French-Spanish rivalry. The association of universal monarchy with the imperial dignity of the Holy Roman Empire vanished, because the Spanish kings had taken over the original imperial duty to protect the Catholic Church and, subsequently, a similar claim over the other European rulers. In the context of the Thirty Years' War, the use of the universal monarchy argument exploded in pamphlets against Habsburg-Spain; its aspiration for universal monarchy seen as the prime cause of the war. Universal increasingly referred to a feared military hegemony.[128]

Rohan's hyperbolic portrayal of the Spanish interest, i.e. seeking 'new monarchy' by dissimilating piety and political and military oppression, illustrates this negative connotation of 'universal monarchy'. Since propaganda against Charles V, universal monarchy was often delegitimised as an unjust rule, motivated solely by the ruler's personal desire for glory and gain. This was considered to be, in the words of the historian Franz Bosbach, 'a mere tyranny, because the subjects were kept in unchristian slavery and treated as the personal property of the

[126] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 106, 34. Besides, as Malcolm stresses, the satiric effect could only work when readers at least could imagine that rulers and their advisors deliberated such Machiavellian politics of reason of state.
[127] Malcolm, *Reason of State,* 51.
[128] Bosbach, 'The European Debate on Universal Monarchy', in David Armitage (ed.), *Theories in Empire, 1450-1850* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 81-98, p. 84-92; It should be noted that Philip II likewise endorsed propaganda legitimising his claim for universal monarchy, for instance to justify his inclusion of Portugal. Martin van Gelderen, 'Universal Monarchy, the Rights of War and Peace and the Balance of Power. Europe's Quest for Civil Order' in Hans-Åke Persson, Bo Strä (eds.), *Reflections on Europe. Defining a Political Order in Time and Space* (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2007), 49-71, 55.

universal ruler.'[129] English literature on tyranny followed a similar pattern. A subordinate allegation to such charges of tyranny was rapacity creating slavery, a rule by accumulative conquest of each European polity.[130] Recent historical research has even qualified Habsburg-Spain as a monarchy based on violent conquest.[131] Famous examples are to be found in the so-called 'Black Legend' pamphlets, which usually conveyed accusations of Spanish universal monarchy through religious-apocalyptic imagery demonizing the Habsburgs rulers and the Spanish soldiers.[132] Furthermore, the accusation of Spain's (and later France's) usage of religion, a zeal for Catholicism to cover their desire for universal dominion instead of defending the *societas christiana*, was a recurrent argument in such propaganda.[133] Charges of tyranny were central to religious polemics, which can explain why Rohan, not wishing to excite confessional differences within France, refrained from overtly using this language. However, since the legitimating language of tyranny was extremely slippery, relating to a vast number of terms, there was no need to be explicit.[134]

Overall, I have suggested an inter-related set of contexts directly relevant to *L'interest*. Rohan grew up during the tumultuous period of civil wars, confessional strife, rebellious princely factions, and dynastic crisis. This fuelled the popularity of ideas on the utility and necessity of (princely) practical prudence, on dissimulation and simulation, on reading history to discover the 'true' causes and self-interests of rulers, on the 'state' as a *an* abstract unity, and, subsequently, brought forth the vogue terminology of reason of state, of which he made frequent

---

[129] Such accusations remained part of universal monarchy propaganda against Philip II and later against Louis XIV. Bosbach, 'The European debate on universal monarch', 89, 95-96; Lazzeri, 168 footnote 1 examples of defences for French anti-Habsburgs policy in French publications from the 1620s, but also the French translation of Boccalini's famous work, *La pierre de touche politique* of 1626 and Gabriel Naudé's *considerations.*

[130] Conal Condren has reported the wide range of accusations of 'tyranny' for seventeenth-century England and pointed to a certain subordinate accusation, tracing back to Platonic pleonexia, which meant enslaving oneself to 'a disordering of the soul, manifested by a licentious grasping, rapacity' that ultimately leads to violence and cruelty and the enslavement of others, i.e. unrestricted corruption. This fear of 'licentious rapacity and systematic interference with others' became embedded in the literature triggered by the French religious wars and in debates concerning Charles I's ship money tax of the 1630s. Conal Condren, 'The Uses of Tyranny, and Liberty in Seventeenth-Century England' *Louis Green Lecture on Intellectual History and the Social history of Ideas for 2013* (Melbourne, Monash University: Ancora Press, 2014), 1-31, quoted from 10, 11.

[131] José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez and Gaetano Sabatini, 'Monarchy as Conquest: Violence, Social Opportunity, and Political Stability in the Establishment of the Hispanic Monarchy', *The Journal of Modern History* 81:3 (2009), 501-536.

[132] In the Black Legend-literature, the Spanish were depicted as heathen and demonic, and King Philip II was portrayed as sinful, ambitious and greedy, as a tyrant enslaving subjects wherever he ruled, even more cruelly than the Ottomans. In both French and Dutch pamphlets the confessional differences between the Protestant and Catholic parties were camouflaged. Conversely, the Spanish were depicted as non-Christian and demonic derivatives of the barbaric Moors. The universal claim of the Spanish tyranny was dramatically portrayed by their dealing with the American Indians in the books of Las Casas, especially popular in the Dutch Republic, where they were translated *The mirror of the Spanish tyranny in the West Indies or A short account of the destruction of the Indies* (1606). On French Black Legend literature Judith Pollmann, ' Eine natürliche Feindschaft: Ursprung und Funktion der schwarzen Legende über Spanien in den Niederlanden, 1560-1581' in Franz Bosbach (ed.), *Feindbilder: die Darstellung des Gegners in der politischen Publizistik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Köln [etc.]: Böhlau 1992), 73-93. For French Black Legend literature read pages 84-87, and for Dutch pamphlets read pages 88-92; Van Gelderen, 'Universal Monarchy', 56.

[133] Lazzerri, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, 168, footnote 1 examples of defences for French anti-Habsburgs policy in French publications from the 1620s, but also the French translation of Boccalini's famous work, *La pierre de touche politique* of 1626 and Gabriel Naudé's *considerations.*

[134] Conal Condren, 'The Uses of Tyranny'.

use in his writings. During the 1620s and 1630s, Rohan faced resurgent Catholicism, the incredible rise in power of the Spanish-Habsburgs, the debates between the *dévots* and *bonne Français* over foreign policy, domestic reform and the persecution of his co-religionists, and the subsequent focus on the 'true' reason of state behind the princely politics in the contemporary constellation of European warfare. Against this background, exiled and in need for a prestigious office, Rohan wrote *De l'interest* and handed it over to Cardinal Richelieu in 1634. The ex-military Huguenot leader proposed costly, grand scale warfare against Habsburg-Spain, defending the construction of a war machine for France, while implicitly criticising the Spanish monarchy by accusations of unrestricted tyrannical control in the name of religion, hidden under his *seemingly* objective interest analysis of European princes and their societies.

2.3 Satire by interest analysis: Spanish unrestricted tyranny and French patriotic unity

Directly after his assertion of interest ruling princes and the irrelevance of classical history to interpret interest of state, Rohan declared that the Bourbon-French and Habsburg-Spanish dynasties were the two great powers in Christendom. They functioned as opposite poles and consequently decided the faith of the other princes in the European theatre of war. According to Rohan, the secret design of Habsburg-Spain was to further their advancement towards establishing a supremely powerful and grand new monarchy. However, Rohan stated that this design could no longer be hidden:

> 'This [Power] of *Spaine* finding it selfe augmented all at once, hath not beene able to conceale the designe shee had to make her selfe *Mistresse*, and cause the *Sunne* of a new *Monarchie* to rise in the West.' [135]

Being the opposite pole of Spain, Bourbon-France attempted to counterpoise this Spanish design, but as it becomes clear to the reader, this was not undertaken effectively. Rohan claimed that 'interest (as it hath beene well or ill followed) hath caused the ruine of some, or the greatnesse of others'[136] and, therefore, he would describe the 'true interest' of Bourbon-France and Habsburg-Spain and those of the other rulers who seemed to be dependent on these two great dynasties for their protection. In the second part he would show through recent historical cases how rulers had badly misunderstood or departed from the true interest of their states by following their passions, superstition, prejudice or personal interests, or had been misguided by

[135] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 2.
[136] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 2.

their corrupted ministers. Behind this seemingly objective and secular interest analysis of European 'states' lies his satiric account of the interest of the Spanish monarchy: its desire for establishing a 'new monarchy', a tyrannical control predominantly by dissimulating piety, backed by a highly developed machinery of war and intelligence. This interest analysis enabled him to implicitly criticise Habsburg-Spain and to forge a patriotic unity for France by sidestepping potentially divisive questions of confessional integrity.

2.3.1 'The interest of Spaine'

On the basis of his interest analysis of every European ruler and regime, Rohan claimed that they all should fear the concealed 'designe' of Habsburg-Spain to establish a 'new *Monarchie*', which only could be opposed by the French monarchy taking up arms.[137] Consequently, he starts *l'Interest* with 'the interest of Spaine'. He opened with emphasising the excellent geographical position of the Spanish monarchy, being 'the head of *Europe*' and protected by its natural boarders (the Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea and the Pyrenees) while 'so many *States* spread in diverse parts of the world' depended 'upon this great Country so well situated.' He continues by referring to the late King Philip II, who 'attempted to extend this vast power to the top of greatnesse.' He ironically praised Philip's statesmanship:

> '*Philip* King of Spaine (…) (finding himselfe lesse fitt for warre then *ciuill businesses*) judged that *Monarchies* got as it were in post, by the valour of warlike *Princes*, are not of like continuance as those which they get by establishingh a good *Counsell*, and which are founded vpon good *maximes*.'[138]

Rohan used, without reference, Machiavelli's famous argument that conquered polities that are accustomed to living under their own laws are difficult to maintain because less courageous men often succeed 'these great Conquerrours' and the conquered citizens tend not to forget their once beloved 'libertie'.[139] Machiavelli states that the conqueror could set up an indirect rule and allow them to live under their own laws, but believes it more efficient to live there himself or destroy these polities, scatter the inhabitants or create internal divisions.[140] Rohan underlined

---

[137] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 2.
[138] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 4. With 'as it were in post' Rohan refers to monarchies founded by the belligerent spirit of the ruler.
[139]Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 5.
[140] Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Chapter V, 'How cities or principalities should be governed that lived by their own laws before they were occupied' [translated and edited by Peter Bondanella with an introduction Maurizio Viroli] (Oxford University Press: New York 2005), 19-20; 'For in fact, there is no secure means of holding on to cities except by destroying them. Anyone who becomes master of a city accustomed to living in liberty and does not destroy it may

this counsel in believing that the once free citizens 'are easily carried to any change, seeing themselues deliuered from the feare of him that had subjected them'.[141] However, Rohan emphasised that Philip was perhaps not a warrior prince, but he was a true statesman and so he 'choose a course most agreeable to his impenetrable humour, that is, to prosecute his designes vnder a profound dissimulation.'[142] Most contemporary readers would have understood Rohan's implicit reference to infamous Machiavellian power politics and the imperative of concealing the truth.[143] The reader may conclude that the Spanish rule was established by conquest, opposite to the rule of law, seeing 'that these great *Conquerrours,* (…) thinke onely of vanquishing, and extending their dominions, and not of founding Lawes for their subsistence',[144] and that it was maintained through a calculated use of dissimulation, and therefore encompassed an unjust rule. Rohan continued this satiric picture of Philip II by stating that

> 'he fixed the seat of his dominion in *Spaine*, that he might from thence conuiegh warmth to the members loosened from his body, and might with more ease (conseruing peace by his presence) trouble all the rest of *Europe*.'[145]

Furthermore, Philip's statecraft had resulted in the growth of the Spanish monarchy to such a great extent that his successors had easily carried on his plans for universal hegemony.[146] This picture functions as a warning for France, not only against the dangers of being absorbed by Spanish rapacity but also, once conquered, of not being able to overthrow the Spanish universal tyrant. Rohan's use of 'domination' (also in original French text) may refer to 'rule', but is additionally suggestive of the Latin *dominatus*, a term in the ambit of tyranny and universal monarchy.[147] This negative association of 'dominion' with universal aspirations, seeking an unrestricted mastership or lordship over other sovereigns, stood in contrast with Rohan's outcry to protect the 'liberties of Christendome'. This argumentation of 'liberties' endangered by an aspiring universal monarch was an integral part in accusations of universal monarchy from the time of Charles V to the age of Louis XIV. Furthermore, as we will see in the following chapters,

---

expect to be destroyed by it, because such a city always has as a refuge in any rebellion the name of liberty and its ancient institutions, neither of which is ever forgotten either because of the passing of time or because of the bestowal of benefits. And it matters very little what one does or foresees, since if one does not separate or scatter the inhabitants, they will not forget that name or those institutions.'

[141] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 2.

[142] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 4, 5.

[143] Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, 164.

[144] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 5.

[145] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 5. Note that here, Rohan acknowledged the potential difficultly ruling such a dynastic agglomerate, underlined the heterodox character of early modern Spain, i.e. 'to the members loosened from his body', what John Morrill has described as 'dynastic agglomerate'.

[146] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 5.

[147] Bosbach, 'The European debate on universal monarch', 92; *Dominatus* was the Latin rendering for the Neo Latin 'despotism'. On the seventeenth century reappearance of the term 'despot' and its derivatives in attacks on princely rule to indicate a household rule, read the following chapter on De la Court.

particularly with De la Court and Valkenier, this argumentation would be developed into attacks on princely rule to indicate a household rule modelled on robbery by conquest; princes who, to finance their endless desire for warfare, robbed their subjects of their lives, livelihoods and liberties, eventually enslaving them.

Rohan distinguished five '*maximes*' which the Spanish interest embodied: 1) religion, i.e. falsely upholding a great zeal for the Catholic faith; 2) acquiring secret intelligence about current affairs in other 'states' by ambassadors, monks and priests and by bribery of counsellors of foreign princes; 3) signing (secret) treaties, feigning striving for peace, striking other dynasties when they least expect it, and acting as mediator between other princes in conflict; 4) maintaining a constant state of armament to repress their own subjects, to intimidate other princes, to oppose enemy plans and to surprise enemy princes; 5) carefully sustaining its reputation, which is dependent upon the first four maxims.[148] These five maxims were presented as recommended techniques, carefully analysed, by which Habsburg-Spain could maintain and extend its dominion. Each of these maxims has explicit reference to dissimulation or oppression, and by the application of them, Rohan was able to construe all Habsburg-Spain's policies and conduct as one great evil strategy, consequently hyperbole passes for simple analysis.

Religion was Spain's first maxim, its key principle in obtaining universal dominion by politics of dissimilation. Rohan underlined the controversial Machiavellian and Tacitist idea of the instrumental use of religion. Without any disclaimer or moral justification that one would expect, Rohan stated:

> 'The first is grounded vpon *Religion*, as that which for conscience sake does make people vndertake any thing.'[149]

Under their proclaimed zeal for Catholicism, Spanish rulers and their agents ought to seek support from the Pope to strengthen its power and stir up conflicts in other countries to destroy them from within. Rohan counselled that the Spanish monarchy should incite civil war by stimulating openly the French crown to persecute its Protestant subjects but at the same time secretly supporting the rebellious groups amongst the Protestants. With the English King he ought to make peace in order to protect his possessions in the Indies and to infiltrate in the realm by setting up Jesuits schools, giving free education to boys in the Catholic religion and training them to become martyrs for the Spanish monarchy against their own English king. In the Holy Roman Empire, with its powerful Protestant princes, the Spanish ruler ought to maintain the Austrian branch of the Habsburg dynasty 'as the sole bullwarke against the

[148] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 7-12.
[149] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 6.

Protestants, and he should augment it from their spoyles, vnder pretence of *Religion*, and a desire thereby to defend *Christendome* against the *Turks*.'[150] In the Swiss cantons, the Spanish ruler ought to keep Catholics in such a high distrust of their Protestant neighbours that differences might more readily be exploited to Spain's advantage. In the United Provinces, Spain ought to provoke a societal schism.

Although Rohan constantly wrote 'he ought', for the reader it was immediately clear that he was talking about actual recent events, such as the Spanish support for the Huguenot groups during the French Religious Wars and likewise for Catholic groups in certain Swiss cantons as the much fought over Valtelline passes. Similarly, this counsel could be witnessed in the Spanish involvement in the Thirty Year's War on the side of the Habsburgs emperors and during the religious and political upheavals of the Twelve Year's Truce in the Dutch Republic (1609–1621).[151] The unstated background of events marshalled through the use of maxims would have been familiar to readers; it constitutes a form of aposiopesis -leaving silent an obvious or inevitable conclusion, a rhetorical restraint from a total unmasking of the enemy. At the same time, Rohan's preference for an imperative idiom, what ought to be done in the true interests of Habsburg Spain, was a less objective analysis than a form of Devil's advocacy -a pretence of honest counsel in order to expose and condemn.

Rohan devoted fewer pages to the other four maxims of the Spanish interest, intelligence, negotiation of treaties, permanent armament and reputation. Compared to the maxim of religion, these descriptions were not clarified by indirect examples of polities that the Spanish monarchy recently had disrupted. Nevertheless, these four recommended techniques all encompassed, although not explicitly stated, calculated political action of dissimulation, by which, and again Rohan let the reader conclude this, the Spanish monarchy would attempt to bring down the European polities, and force them under its tyrannical rule. The third maxim (negotiation of treaties) dictates that the Spanish ruler 'must allway shewe a desire of peace, thereby to cast others asleepe, and in the meane time prepare himselfe to warre, for to surprise the vnprouided.'[152] Furthermore, the Spanish monarchy ought to act as '*Iudge* or *Arbitrator*' in conflicts between other princes for the sole reason to divide them, and consequently to conquer them all; 'incensing them (if he can) in stead of appeasing them, consentig with the one to diuide the spoiles of the other, and vpon the diuision dispossesse both two.'[153] A constant state of full armament, i.e. the fourth maxim, was to construct a reputation of invincibility towards the Spanish subjects as well al neighbouring princes and to attack the latter by surprise. Rohan also recommended evil secret strategies in Spain's second maxim on obtaining intelligence 'by

[150] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 8.
[151] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 6-9.
[152] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 9-10.
[153] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 10.

meanes of *Embassadours*, as persons towards whom respect is borne. Likewise by *Monkes* and *Preachers* that haue great power in their pulpits and also in particular families'. Another means was buying confidents and bribing foreign ministers or princes. For those who were found too faithful to be bought, the Spanish monarchy ought to 'ruine them in any wise howsoeuer.'[154] The (unstated) Spanish unrestricted tyrannical rule was practised by divide-and-conquer strategies hiding behind a careful constructed reputation as guarantor of peace and defender of the Catholic faith.

Rohan added 'reputation' as the last maxim that depended on the first four, but as he stated 'neuerthelesse being simply considered, it establisheth a fifth maxime, whereby *Spaine* gaineth as much, as by any of the rest.'[155] As most reason of state authors,[156] Rohan underlined the importance for a ruler of managing 'opinion' amongst subjects as well as foreign princes and their subjects, because it could command awe and fear, and therefore maintain and expand their 'state'. The first maxim of religion, of the Spanish ruler presenting himself as the true protector of the Catholic faith, is furthered by a representation of devout piety that constructs a powerful reputation, recommended in this fifth maxim;

> 'Considering that the opinion conceiued of the great zeale for the maintenance of the Catholicke Religion, couers with the cloake of pietie, all her other designes, and holds the people in a wonderfull awe.'[157]

Besides Spain's promotion of piety and the Catholic faith, other princes and their subjects feared the Spanish monarchy for their 'profound intelligences', their 'prudent dexteritie, (knowing how to advantage herself in Treaties)' and 'estate of her *armes*'.[158] The Spanish rulers built their reputation upon these prudent maxims. Rohan concluded his account of the Spanish interest by warning the reader of the nature of the Spanish reputation; 'From all these things results the reputation of *Spaine.* Her *interest* is, to manage well *this pietie.*'[159] The designs of Habsburg-Spain were much greater than those of other rulers and therefore the Spanish rulers had to be extra careful in managing their reputation, counselled Rohan ironically.[160] The reader had to derive from this counsel that the Spanish monarchy illicitly treated religion as a mere political instrument to cover up its rapacity in acquiring universal domination. Rohan ended his discourse on the Spanish interest with his hope for convincingly unveiling the Spanish designs to

---

[154] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 9.
[155] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 11.
[156] Malcolm, *Reason of State*, 104; Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', 234.
[157] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 11.
[158] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 11.
[159] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 12; Henri de Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, 18, 'son intérêt est de bien ménager cette piété.'
[160] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 12.

aid the downfall of its monarchy: 'This huge frame composed of so many parts, and as it were incumbered with its owne weight, moues by its secret springs, which loose their force euen as they are discouered.'[161]

That is not to argue that 'interest' was merely of instrumental value. As explained above, Rohan wrote on interest before and his oeuvre was imbued with 'interest' as category to discuss political action.[162] This disregard of moral, religious and legal considerations in unveiling the 'true interest' of the Spanish ruler (dissimulating piety and a zeal for Catholicism), exemplified by true events, is to turn interest to satiric effect: in line with the genre of critical current-affairs commentary, he simultaneously seeks to build on the credibility and exploit the disreputable connotations of reason of state.

2.3.2 'The interest of France'

Rohan deliberately and explicitly defined the true interest of France in opposition to Spain. It follows that the right course for France's dynastic policy was a belligerent anti-Spanish and pro-Protestant policy. Rohan started his analysis of the French interest with a geographical position of the lands of the French monarchy. He claimed that Spain was the natural enemy of France:

> 'France being seated betweene the *Alpes* and the *Pyrenean mountaines*, and flanked by two *seas*, seemes to be inuited by *nature* to oppose it selfe against the proceedings of this puissant Neighbourhood. For *shee* appeares like a banke against this *torrent*, and the opportunitie of her situation is such, that shee may hinder the distribution of the *head* to the *members* of the *Monarchie* which does oppugne her.'[163]

France dispatched the head of the Spanish political body from its members by which Rohan indirectly referred to the Spanish Low Countries, its Italian possessions and the dynastically related lands of the Holy Roman Empire. The hindrance of France for the Spanish dynastic agglomerate was, however, 'not sufficient' to oppose the Spanish design to universal monarchy.[164] Therefore Rohan stated that 'the interest of France is, to take all the *counter-course*

[161] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 12; Henri de Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, 19, 'Cette grande machine composées de tant de parties et comme empêchée de son propre poids s'émeut par ces secrets ressorts qui perdent leur force à mesure qu'ils sont découverts.'
[162] Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 121-140; Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 73.
[163] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 13.
[164] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 13.

(to impeach all shee may her designes) by *maximes*, which wee come now deliuer unto you.'[165] In stark opposition to his ironic praising of Philip II, Rohan heralded the late Huguenot King Henry IV for 'having better vnderstood them [maximes] then any other before him, (…) he first confirmed the true interest of *France*, which is to thwart or counterpoint *Spaine* in all these points.'[166] From all this, the reader should conclude that the current French King, Louis XIII, should oppose Habsburg-Spain by its own maxims. Citing Henry as an exemplum for Louis personifies the diminution of confessional difference and suggests a dynastic thread to tie the 'true interest' of the French 'state' together, as Collins argued that the French king became the source of the newly constructed fictive unity of the French 'state', justified in terms of its 'interest of state'.[167]

Regarding its first maxim, the French monarchy ought to show all Catholics 'the venome hidden vndes the same', i.e. under the Spanish zeal for Catholicism the Spanish monarchy persecuted Protestants for its own advantage. Similarly to Richelieu's interest argumentation for an anti-Habsburg policy, Rohan claimed that the authority of the pope 'never has more lustre, then wehen the power of the *Christian* Princes and *states* is ballanced'.[168] The great difference between Rohan's and the Cardinal Richelieu' defences for an anti-Habsburg policy was the fact that Rohan did not present it as a principal Catholic duty; and furthermore, he painted rather an evil picture of the Spanish motives for persecuting Protestants: 'to let the *Court* of *Rome* vnderstand that the hopes which *Spaine* giues her to augment her treasures by the ruine of *Protestants*, is not but to further her designe towards the *Monarchie*'.[169] From this the reader might infer that not only did the Spanish monarchy persecute Protestants solely for political gain, but that also the Pope had been duped into serving Spain's interest. As Rohan warned: 'the *Pope* must become her *Servant*'.[170] Thus the Spanish desire for universal monarchy constituted a political and military hegemony, and not at all a spiritual one. Secondly, the reader would understand that the French maxim of religion constituted essentially a necessary defence of the rule of law in all Christian polities, Catholic and Protestant. Besides convincing other Catholics of Spain's religious pretexts, the French monarchy should assure Protestant rulers and regimes that it was not intent on persecuting their Protestant subjects, but rather converting them. Moreover, the French monarchy should communicate its willingness to support Protestant rulers and regimes 'freely against all those that would trouble or change any thing in their States

[165] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 13.
[166] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 14.
[167] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, xxii-xxiii.
[168] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 14.
[169] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 14.
[170] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 14.

and liberties.'[171] Without naming these enemies, the reader would have known immediately that Rohan meant Habsburg Spain.

Interestingly, the following three maxims of France, i.e. intelligence, diplomacy and armament, constituted the equivalent of the Spanish ones in terms of contents. However, the language through which the French maxims are put forward is hardly as negative nor does it contains instructions of deep deceit and oppressive violence, but rather does it state defensive violence, to fight violence with violence. Rohan advised France to invest in a strong network of 'spies and pensioners' to attain detailed and accurate knowledge of the current political affairs across Europe, to construct new alliances and ultimately to block the Spanish methods of intelligence at every European court. Rohan offered the same advice for the third maxime: 'it ought not to be suffered, that Spaine meddle in any Treatie, but that France also step between on her part.' He stressed the grave importance of meddling in Italian affairs to counterpoise the almost prevailing standing of Spain there. He indirectly referred to the necessity of maintaining the Alpine passes of the Valtelline for survival of the whole of Europe: 'one *port* to enter there [*Italie*], which shee ought to keepe, euen so long as shee will oppose the others greatnesse'.[172] Likewise concerning the fourth maxim of France Rohan wrote: 'There ought to be opposed force to force. For neither perswasions (sic.), nor the *Iustice* of arms will awe him thats armed.'[173]

Especially the last maxim shows a rather cynical and pessimistic view of politics presenting his belief that to survive the European military competition, one should be heavily furnished with troops and arms. Thus, the Crown ought not to finance the enemies of Habsburg-Spain nor to attempt to control the passages between the different parts of the Spanish empire, but, in line with the argument of the *bons Français*, should invest as well in heavily armed French troops to oppose Habsburg-Spain on the battlefield;

> 'So as that France ought to cutt off all vnnecessarie expences, and be allwaies powerfully armed, hauing sufficiently to doe the same, without borrowing elsewhere *soldiers, munition and money*.'[174]

Unfortunately Rohan did not feel the need to explain exactly which budget cuts France ought to implement, but he may have been alluding to crippling interest rates from war debts that had weakened the French Crown in the 1620s.[175] He ended his account of the interest of France by arguing that the first four maxims would harm the reputation of Habsburg-Spain and elevate that of France. So, while satirising Spain for its Machiavellian techniques, he offered the French

[171] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 14.
[172] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 15-16.
[173] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 16.
[174] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 16.
[175] Collins, *Republicanism and the State in late medieval and early modern France* (forthcoming).

monarchy a counsel on 'statecraft' of almost the highest level, convinced that France could only survive the European war competition in this way. This would lead to France opposing the Spanish interest of carefully managing its reputation of the most pious monarchy, by gaining the reputation 'as the bullwarke of Christian libertie.'[176]

In presenting a 'true interest of France' in fierce opposition to the 'interest' of the Spanish monarchy, Rohan attempted to create a sense of collectively shared political aims. Such an interest overruled conflicting interests of Huguenots and Catholics within the 'state'. By this, Rohan, the Huguenot nobleman and ex-military officer, could present himself as a fully-fledged member of the French monarchy, defend a relative toleration towards Huguenots and attack the Catholic Spanish monarchy. In Rohan's *De l'Interest* the 'state' as a *persona ficta* is not clearly witnessed, yet we do find the more common definition for state as the political standing of a ruler. The political actions were still undertaken by princes, not princes as representatives of states as legal persons as becomes clear in the introduction: 'to consider well the interest of the Princes of this time', that is 'the howses (sic.) of *France* and *Spaine*' and the 'other *Princes*'.[177] Moreover as argued in the introduction, speaking of a 'Spaine' and a 'France' was a useful shorthand for rulers and did not symbolised the existence of institutionalised bureaucratic states. For instance Rohan wrote: 'And though all *Princes* hold for a general maxime, that they should carefully conserve their reputation, *Spaine* ought to (..).' 'Spaine' refers to the Spanish king. Yet Rohan recognised the existence of, what John Morril has called, dynastic agglomerates composed of different members each with its own legal and political system.[178] Consequently, he also wrote about the true interests of princes *and* states of Europe: 'when the power of *Christian Princes* and *States* is ballanced'; 'and the other *Christian Princes* and *States*'.[179] It could be that here Rohan rather referred to princes and other prevailing regimes or particular forms of government as republics. Moreover, it seems that Rohan also referred to states as the political dominion of the ruler in line with Botero: 'in their [*'Protestant Princes*] *States* and *liberties.'*[180] Apart from state as the political dominion, Rohan may also have used the word state to refer to areas over which a ruler ought to exercise control, combined with means of this control. State can even refer to a body politic, in writing:

> '*William* of *Nassau* Prince of *Orange*, who alone in this Age had the honour to found a State, [..] was constrained to assemble the peeces for to compose a bodie thereof, with

[176] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 16.
[177] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 2.
[178] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 12; John Morrill, 'Thinking about the New British History', in David Armitage (ed.), *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 44-45.
[179] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 14, 16-17.
[180] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 15.

such conditions as each Towne and Prouince required. For hauing met with people that haue euer affected their libertie more then their very liues, he could not alter the conditions whereupon they first joyned themselues vnto him.'[181]

Over all, the variation in Rohan's usage provides little evidence to justify to *De l'interest* the notion of the state as a legal person distinguishable from both ruler and ruled.

After unveiling the true interest of Spain that Rohan stated ought to be opposed in every maxim by France, he treated the interests of 'states' that were linked to the Spanish-Habsburg dynasty either by alliances or by warfare. So France's interest was followed up by 'the Interest of the Princes of Italie', 'the interest of the Sea of Rome' and 'the Interest of Germanie', and he ended his first part with 'the interest of the Swisses and of the United Provinces of the Low Countries' and 'the interest of England'.[182] For the argument of this chapter it suffices to say that Rohan presented England as the balancing party between Spain and France, a counsel that recurred in many later interest analyses such as the one by Valkenier. Every interference of Spain in the Italian polities ought to be hindered for fear of France's encirclement. In line with Richelieu's reason of state arguments Rohan believed the Papal States to be the beneficiary of anti-Habsburgs policy; and he treats them in a way at one with the *Gallican* defence of an independent French Church as a political entity. Regarding the Holy Roman Empire, the greatest threat to its 'libertie',[183] was the Austrian branch of the Spanish-Habsburgs, who made the imperial crown *de facto* hereditary and was determined to usurp the entire empire under Habsburg rule. The Swiss Confederation and the Dutch Republic served as two arms of the Empire, both were feared by others, and were defenders of liberty (the Swiss as mercenaries for others and the Dutch as defenders of their own liberty). Both are prosperous, since the Swiss have enriched themselves by peace and the Dutch by the continuance of warfare. Each should therefore ally itself with France against Spain. Rohan underlines the importance of moderate confessional policies within polities, such as the Holy Roman Empire, the Swiss Confederation and the Dutch Republic, for the sake of sheer survival.

2.3.3. Failed interest management: argument from history

[181] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 85.
[182] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 'of the interest of Spain' 4-12, 'of France' 13-17, 'of the Princes of Italie' 18-21, 'of the sea of Rome' 22-25, 'of the Duke of Savoy' 22-25, 'of Germanie' 26-30; 'of the Suisses and of the united Prouinces of the Low-Countries' 31-33, 'of England' 34-37. Note that in the French original text the interest of the Duke of Savoy is dealt together with the interest of the Pope.
[183] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 26.

The second part of his book includes a similar satirical exaggeration of policies and conduct by sidestepping confessional dispute, to hide his criticism against Spain and to refrain from directly criticising French persecution of the Huguenots. As Salmon remarks, historians have paid less attention to this second and larger part of the book.[184] Herein, Rohan presented seven discourses, which represented 'principall affaires agitated in *Christendome* for the space of fiftie yeares past' to illustrate the neglect of interest, established in the first part of the book. It encompasses a 'mirror device',[185] showing rulers that '*in matter of State'*, they should not be led by '*inordinate desires*', '*violent passions*', nor by '*superstitious opinions*' but be:

> 'guided by reason aloe (sic.), which ought to be the rule of our actions, to the end that by such examples, wee seeing (as in a mirrour) the faultes of others, may thereby benefit our selues.'[186]

These discourses sharply showcase the symbiotic relation between domestic political events and foreign affairs and *vice versa*, or how foreign princes, to protect their interest of state, meddle in domestic affairs of, or affairs between others. Historical analysis enabled a distinction between a domestic and international level, as Meinecke and Devetak argued. Moreover, instead of disqualifying these princes by their lack of listed virtues (as in mirror-of-prince literature or reason of state writings focusing on the moral person of the ruler), Rohan examines recent historical conflicts/crises and clearly outlines the failed interest management of the princes and factions involved. Princely success is founded upon following the 'true interest' of the entire 'state', instead of the prince's private passions, his lack of certain virtues or the advice given by his councillors. By focusing on the features of the ruler's societies, his rule vis-à-vis his subjects and relations with other regimes, Rohan could argue his pro-Protestant and anti-Spanish case independent of the ruler or 'any ethics of office', as Collins and Walter have argued,[187] and consequently to refrain from openly criticising the Spanish Crown as well as the French Crown while simultaneously presenting himself as a supporter of the French 'state'.

The reader was offered seemingly neutral historical analyses, but in every discourse, the Spanish monarchy emerged as the instigator or at least the supporter of conflicts, that had damaged or brought down the European polities from within. The illustrative material was designed to support the necessity of anti-Habsburg policy and of a stable civil order for France

[184] Salmon, 'Rohan and the interest of state', 139.
[185] Term by Ryan Walter referring to the mirror-of-princes literature from which reason of state writings developed. Walter, 'Slingsby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests', 5.
[186] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 39.
[187] Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England*, 344; Walter, 'Slingsby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests', 495.

across confessional lines.[188] An excellent example of this twofold argument is the first and one of the longest discourses, about the formation of the Catholic League.[189] Rohan explained that the religious wars under the rule of the French Kings Francis II (1559-1560) and Charles IX (1560-1574) were principally caused by dynastic fragility or 'the *youth* of these two *Princes*',[190] which led to rivalling interest groups, i.e. Queen Catherine de Medici against the princes of the blood and secondly, between the noble houses of De Guise and De Montmorancy, seeking control over the Crown. Rohan led the reader to believe that confessional differences were subordinate to these power struggles. As he summed up the series of confessional conflicts and monstrous events in a single diminishing sentence:

> 'Likewise there was amongst them difference of Religion. The warres about Religion were great and bloodie, and lasted euen to the death of *Charles* the *ninth*, and his brother *Henry* the *third* succeeded him. He was of age capable to gouerne, he had goodly qualities, and gaue hopes of a happy Reigne.'[191]

However, Henry III preferred to 'plunge himselfe in idlenesse and pleasures, [rather] then to reigne well.' Immediately hereafter Rohan introduced the second Henry, Duc de Guise: 'a Prince endowed with great qualities, and full of loftie thoughts'.[192] Since Henri III and his brother, Francis duke of Anjou and Alençon, did not provide an heir to the throne and 'the first Princes of the blood' professed Protestantism (referring to Henry de Bourbon), Henry de Guise saw opportunity to 'aspire vnto the *Royaltie*, and to get thither, makes himselfe Protecteur of the *Catholikes*, and the Persecutour of the *Protestats*'.[193] Dewald qualifies Rohan's analysis of (and praise for) Henri de Guise as 'to shock every seventeenth-century reader' and understands it as a product of his Machiavellian political views,[194] but it rather constitutes a critical exaggeration,

---

[188] Moreover, most discourses explicitly emphasised that since the Spanish power had rose considerably, it was in every ruler's interest, whether Catholic or Protestant to maintenance of the balance of power between Spain and France, as Rohan counselled for '*Italie*' and the Pope in the second discourse, in the fourth and fifth discourse for the Dutch United States to continue their warfare against Spain and for France, England and the German princes to assist the Dutch therein, and for France in the seventh discourse on the War of the Mantuan Succession (1628–31) against Habsburg-Spain described 'The revolution of France' and concluded in the last sentence of the book 'that the glorie of the King, the greatnesse of his State, and the eminent reputation that he now enjoyeth, will continue as long as he shall remaine constant in this resolution.' Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, cited from 127, first discourse 40-57.

[189] Under the title 'upon the affaire of the League.' Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 40-57.

[190] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 40.

[191] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 40-41; La diversité de religion s'y mêla. Les guerres des religions furent grandes et sanglantes et durèrent jusqu'à la mort de Charles IX et Henri III.'

[192] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 41.

[193] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 41.

[194] Dewald, *Status, power, and identity in early modern France*, 75. Rohan's analysis 'treated plans of regicide and usurpation as expressions of lofty ambition and greatness of spirit; it praised a likely organizer of the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of France's Protestant nobles, an event that had touched Rohan's own family and still frightened Protestants throughout Europe; and it presented a Catholic hero as moved by personal ambition rather than sincere faith. The account criticizes Guise only for hesitancy in executing his plan.'

presenting Henry de Guise as the Machiavellian prince who evilly used religion for his own personal gain and unscrupulously 'stirred up diuers warres' against the Protestants'[195]. Rohan's praise for Henry's good qualities should be understood as utterly ironic, while his praise for his former patron Henry de Bourbon, the legitimate heir of Henry II's, was simple and clear: '*King* of *Navarre*, first Prince of the blood, Chief of the *Protestants* partie and a Prince adorned with an heroïque vertue, successfully waged diuers warres in fauour of the *Protestants*.'[196]

The main subject of this first discourse, the War of the Three Henry's (1587-1589), was explained by their conflicting interests:

> 'The *King* to maintaine his lawfull authoritie. The *Duke* of *Guise* to possesse the Kings place, and the *King* of *Navarre* to hinder the King of *France* his ruine, which was indeed his owne, and of his partie which was made him subsist in reputation.'[197]

He describes the events, the assassinations of Henry de Guise, Henry III and the coronation of Henry IV, who by the changing situation of his office, quits his formerly followed interest and embraces the interest of the French 'state', which the reader should understand as proper interest management, by placing his own factional interest under the interest of 'state' once crowned King of France. Henry IV was however still thwarted by the League, but especially by the Spanish King Philip II, who did not acknowledge Henry's kingship on the grounds of his Protestant confession. The following pages Rohan devoted to Philip's strategies to obstruct Henry IV by supporting the League and Henry's other enemies with subsidies and troops, inciting the Pope to excommunicate Henry, even not stopping when Henry IV converted to Catholicism and the Pope, although for merely political reasons, acknowledged Henry as King of France. Eventually Henry declared war against Philip, obtaining many successes for France, which ended in the peace of Vervins signed in 1598, after which Philip soon died.[198] Again, a seemingly simple interest analysis covers Rohan's criticism, and the reader must conclude that Philip's actions were solely motivated by the Spanish design for universal monarchy, to conquer the French monarchy by inciting civil war and factional conflicts. Rohan leaves silent this inevitable conclusion, even when he writes quite cynically that Philip's support for Henry's enemies was motivated 'not to ruine the one in such sort, as that the other might subsist without him, willing to wearie them whom he maintained, to the end that they should be constrained to giue themselues vp to him', or, regarding Philip persuading the League-nobles to choose a new

[195] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 41.
[196] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 41-41.
[197] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 42.
[198] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 43-48.

King to whom he offered the hand of his daughter, 'So that *Philip* thought by this discord to draw them to make choice of *him*.'[199]

In the last part of the discourse Rohan offered the reader insight into 'the interest of the Princes inueloped in this affaire, what faultes they therein committed, and what were the euents thereof.'[200] The princes involved in the War of the Three Henry's were naturally the three Henry's, however, Philip II was also given a leading role. First Rohan ironically praised Philip for calculating his advantage in changing circumstances while continuing 'courageously his designe' almost as a predator enclosing its prey:

> 'No other consideration diuerteth him from his profound designe, he holds *that* allwaies couered vnder the vaile of *Pietie,* and of his great zeale to the *Catholike Religion*. He trauelles there step by step without being impatient through the length of the way, or precipitated through any accident.'[201]

Again, the analysis of Philip's interest management satirised the Spanish king as a power-hungry tyrant, whose fault it was wanting France entirely, instead of dividing the monarchy amongst factional League-nobles after the death of Henry de Guise. By such a distribution, Philip

> 'could more easily reduce them [League-nobles] to his owne will. […] And afterwards vpon the differences that are wont to happen betweene *usurpers*, it would haue beene farre more easie for him to gett by peece-meale, what he would haue carried all at once.'[202]

Rohan concluded this discourse by stressing the danger of letting in the Spanish enemy by division within the French monarchy: 'to *diuide* this mightie *Kingdome*, the which being *Vnited,* does euery where impeach the amplification of *Spaine*.'[203]

The experience of the shattering societal consequences of the religious wars and the subsequent establishment of a main confessional identity in polities brought forth 'interest of state' writings from the 1630s, such as Rohan's pivotal *De l'interest*, not per se reviewing such matters. This should not be interpreted as modern secularization or a diminution of religious controversy. Rohan sidestepped confessional arguments not because of their irrelevance, but because of their dangerous potency, especially in times of resurgent Catholicism. With *De l'interest* Rohan

[199] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 44, 46.
[200] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 48.
[201] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 55.
[202] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 56-57.
[203] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 57.

participated in contemporary French debates about foreign policy and domestic affairs, about the extent of warfare (defensive or offensive), which enemy to fight and who was the best candidate to lead the troops. Most probably, Rohan's personal interest was to reclaim an office as a military leader, a wish that might be realized through decisive warfare against Habsburg-Spain. He presented Europe as consisting of rulers and their lands, fighting each other in a war competition driven by understandings of their interests. A ruler's standing in the military constellation determined political actions, certainly not religion, which was used only as a mere political instrument as by Habsburg-Spain, or could shape a certain political faction as the Huguenots under Henry IV, being attacked by the noble house of De Guise in its search for control over the Crown.

The praise accorded to Rohan for his objectivity is one-dimensional and misleading, overlooking a number of factors as his circumstances and idiom of interest reveal—not least his own interest in not stirring confessional dispute in France, and assimilating that of Spain to established patterns of satiric denigration.

Chapter 3
Republicanism revisited: reason of state and 'war despotism' by Pieter de la Court

In 1662, there was outrage in The Netherlands at the publication of *Interest van Holland ofte Hollands-Welvaaren* [Interest of Holland or Holland's Wellbeing] that stated: '*the people of Holland* [sc. the province, MK] *could not encounter a greater evil than to be ruled by a Monarch, Prince or Head*.'[204] This statement was directed against the House of Orange, its princes being the historical officeholders of the stadholderate in the Republic of the Seven United Provinces. From 1650 until 1672 they were, however, excluded from this office by Holland and most other provinces during the 'First Stadholderless Era', or the epoch of 'True Freedom' as some contemporaries celebrated it.[205] The anti-Orangist polemic of *Interest of Holland* produced a vigorous political controversy.[206] Its blunt anti-Orangism and fierce anti-clericalism attracted ridicule and rebuke; its author was condemned for his 'false calumnies and adorned lies', 'hazardous writings', and described as a 'new born Dutch Cromwell alias Leiden Quaker' and a mere 'favorite' of Johan de Witt, the *de facto* leader of the contested stadholderless regime. [207]

Pieter de la Court wrote *Interest van Holland* during an Orangist revival in the Dutch Republic at the beginning of the 1660s. The Stuart Restoration across the North Sea and King Charles II's support for his young nephew William of Orange gave rise to high expectations among the Dutch about the future prospects of an Orange-stadholderate, backed by the Stuarts.[208]

This immediate context provides a stark contrast to Pieter's hostility to the very idea of a statdholder; and indeed, the historiography of the political thought of the De la Court brothers has predominantly focused on their 'republicanism', representing it as 'the first unequivocal

---

[204] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland ofte de Gronden van Hollands-Welvaren* (Amsterdam, 1662), Voor-Reede [preface].
[205] See Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 700 -726.
[206] Gerrit O. Klashorst, ' "Metten schijn van monarchie getempert" de verdediging van het stadhouderschap in de partijliteratuur' 1650–1686', in Hans W. Blom en I W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd (1680–1685) aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 93–136; Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age. The Political Thought of Johan & Pieter de la Court* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 56-58.
[207] Ingmar Vroomen, *Taal van de Republiek- het gebruik van vaderlandretoriek in Nederlandse pamfletten, 1618-1672* (PhD dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2012), 203; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 3, 58-59; *Haeghs Hof-Praetje, ofte 't samen-spraeck tusschen een Hagenaer, Amsterdammer, ende Leyenaar. Op ende tegens de valsche calumnien ende versierde leugenen van Pieter la Court, gestelt in sijn alsoo genoemde Intrest van Holland ende gronden van 't Hollands welvaren* (Leiden, 1662); *Hollands Op-Komst, of Bedenkingen op de schaadelyke Schriften, genaamt Grafelyke Regeeringe en Interest van Hollanduit-gegeven door V.D.H. ten dienste van alle liefhebers die het ware Interest van Hollandbeminnen* (Leden, 1662*);* J.C., *De gansche distructie van den nieuw-gebooren Hollantschen Cromwel alias Leydtschen Quaker, genaemt t'Intrest van Hollandt, ofte gronden van 's Hollants welvaren* (Schiedam, 1663); *'t Leven en bedrijf van mr. Jan van Oldenbarnevelt, over-eengebracht met dat van mr. Jan de Wit* (1672).
[208] See in particular Helmer Helmers, *The Royalist Republic Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 233-258.

expression' of Dutch republicanism,[209] as 'commercial'[210] and 'radical'[211] republicanism, or clear-cut 'anti-monarchism'[212] (unlike other, moderate defences of an Orange-stadholderate). This chapter aims to shift scholarly attention to De la Court's use of the terminology of reason of state in arguing against military belligerence and financial expropriation. In doing so, it questions the common image of the explicit or extreme republicanism of the De la Courts.

This chapter argues the alleged 'republicanism' or 'anti-monarchism' of De la Court needs to be reinterpreted in terms of the new interpretative heuristic tool 'war despotism', contemporary polemics attacking a system of rule that by pursuing costly warfare robbed the citizens of their property and privileges, effectively enslaving them, polemics as witnessed in France and the Holy Roman Empire.[213] As will be made clear, Pieter argued that new monarchies were driven by an interest, namely the promotion of warfare and the necessary impoverishment of their peoples, contrary to the interest of a society like Holland.

From this follows the second argument, that the *Interest van Holland* is better seen as a distinct variation on the themes enunciated by Rohan. As I have argued, Rohan's understanding of 'interest' was developed within and from the casuistic and legitimating idiom of 'reason of state'. Reason of state entailed the claim that in cases of necessity rulers had room to manoeuvre beyond the bounds of normal legal and moral constraints. This particularly applied to the emergency circumstances brought forth by the intensification of warfare, that in the name of *interest* allowed the rule of law to be put aside and finances raised by extraordinary means. Starting in the 1630s, authors like Rohan, began to consider the characteristics of various dynastic agglomerates, from which allegedly objective 'true interests of states' of Europe were derived. In doing so, they could defend one political faction as most likely to pursue a certain 'foreign' policy, consequently delegitimising another. From the 1650s onwards, such interest analyses often were complemented with explicit criticism of princely coercion and sovereign authority and defences of the rule of law. For the English case, the research by Alan Houston

---

[209] Eco Haitsma Mulier, 'The language of seventeenth-century republicanism in the United Provinces: Dutch or European?,' in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 179-195, p. 188.

[210] Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*.

[211] Jonathan Israel, *Monarchy, Orangism, and Republicanism in the Later Dutch Golden Age*, Second Golden Age Lecture (Amsterdam: Amsterdams Centrum voor de Studie van de Gouden Eeuw, 2004). Israel argues on page 6 that Dutch republicanism compared to the English variant was 'more coherently radical, (…) more emphatically anti-monarchical, anti-hierarchical and more concerned with equality than English republicanism'.

[212] Wyger Velema, '"That a Republic is Better than a Monarchy": Anti-Monarchism in Early Modern Dutch Political Thought', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 9–25.

[213] Robert von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy: The Thirty Years War and the Modern Notion of 'State' in the Empire, 1530s to 1790* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 354-380; The historian Jean Marie Constant summarized this critique as attacking 'war despotism'. Jean-Marie Constant, 'Der Adel und die Monarchie in Frankreich vom Tode Heinrichs IV bis zum Ende der Fronde (1610-1653)', in Ronald Asch (ed.), *Der europäische Adel im Ancien Regime. Von der Krise der ständischen Monarchien bis zur Revolution (1600-1789)* (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 129-150, the term p. 146.

underlines this, but research on Dutch expressions of reason of state is thin.[214]

It is, as Hans Blom has argued, 'easy to overlook' the influence of the vocabulary of reason of state on contemporary debates, since Dutch authors were divided over the position of the prince of Orange, but 'united' in 'an interest-based conception of politics'.[215] Moreover, historians tend to examine Dutch pamphlet wars solely within a national framework; 'None of them refer to the fact that the major political debates *originated* in the context of international warfare.'[216] The fiercely competitive conflicts of European rulers that produced war-driven and debt-ridden regimes is precisely the historical context in which we will examine De la Court's usage of the language of reason of state in *Interest van Holland*. It is important to note that the small Dutch Republic participated in this competition.[217] Due to almost incessant warfare, it experienced an unprecedented level of public debt, and consequently an unparalleled rise of taxation, sale of public loans and annuities. Taxation per head was considerably higher in Holland than in other European polities and this province paid for more than half of the Union's war budget.[218] Consequently, the central issue for Dutch 'opinion' in the 1650s and 1660s was

---

[214] Alan Houston, 'Republicanism, the politics of necessity, and the rule of law', in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2001), 241-271; See for the reception of Rohan's understanding of interest in English Civil War debates also Gunn, "Interest will not lie"; For literature on Dutch reason of state see Johan C. Boogman, 'De raison d'état-politicus Johan de Witt,' in J.C. Boogman, *Van spel en spelers* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982) and Ernst H. Kossmann, 'Some late 17th-century Dutch writings on Raison d'Etat', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staatsräson: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begriffs* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975), 497-504; For an comparison between Dutch and English expressions of interest see Jonathan Scott, 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands,' in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Boogman, and to a greater extent, Hans W. Blom and Weststeijn have underlined De la Court's use of 'reason of state' terminology and have represented it as a special type of republicanism, i.e. reason of state adjusted to the mercantile Dutch Republic. Boogman, 'De raison d'état-politicus Johan de Witt', 382. Scott, 'Classical Republicanism', 63. Weststeijn, Commercial Republicanism, 205–283. Jan Hartman and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade: Commercial Reason of State in Seventeenth-Century Holland', in Sophus Reinert and Pernille Røge (eds.), *The Political Economy of Empire in the Early Modern World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 11-31, p. 12. H. W. Blom, *Morality and Causality in Politics. The Rise of Naturalism in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (PhD dissertation University of Utrecht, 1995), 157–182 and Hans W. Blom, 'The Republican Mirror, The Dutch Idea of Europe,' in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1999), 91-115.

[215] Blom, 'The Republican Mirror', quotation p. 110; Historians often present this division in Dutch political debates as two strands of 'republicanism' (a *respublica mixta* one including an Orange-stadholder and a anti-monarchical, stadholderless republicanism); Both Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism* and Jonathan Scott examined De la Court's political thought regarding the language of 'interest', but predominantly through the looking glass of 'republicanism'. Jonathan Scott, 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands,' in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 61–81.

[216] Blom, 'The Republican Mirror', 113.

[217] See for instance Maarten Prak *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age*, translated by Diane Webb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), especially the chapter on 'A world power (1650-1713)', 45-60.

[218] Oscar Gelderblom, 'Introduction', in Oscar Gelderblom (ed.), *The political economy of the Dutch Republic* (Surrey/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 1-18; Wantje Fritschy, 'The efficiency of Taxation in Holland', in in Oscar Gelderblom, *The political economy of the Dutch Republic* (Surrey/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 55-84; Jan Luiten van Zanden and Maarten Prak, 'Towards and economic interpretation of citizenship: The Dutch Republic between medieval communes and modern nation-states,' *European Review of Economic History* 10 (2006), 111-145, p. 130; Marjolein 't Hart, Joost Jonker and Jan Luiten van Zanden, 'Introduction', in Marjolein 't Hart, Joost Jonker and Jan Luiten van Zanden (eds.), *A financial history of The Netherlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1-10; Marjolein 't Hart, 'The merits of a financial revolution: public finances 1550-1700', in Marjolein 't Hart, Joost Jonker and Jan Luiten van Zanden (eds.), *A financial history of The Netherlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11-36, especially the section 'the burden of war in the republican expenses', 16-17.

the stadholderate linked to the pursuit of warfare: whether to pursue costly offensive warfare against the grand European dynasties under the military leadership of the prince of Orange and, by implication, to sustain large land forces and high taxes, *or* to strive for peace with a strong fleet to protect the prosperous trade without the need for an Orange-Stadholder and -captain general. These debates were informed by the popular European idiom of 'interest (of state)'.[219]

De la Court wrote principally as a citizen of the Dutch Republic, which was ruled by a minority regime. Johan De Witt estimated that only 0.1 per cent of the common populace supported the stadholderless regime.[220] The province of Holland constituted a closed oligarchy of *regenten*, controlled by certain families, who had made their fortunes through commerce in the early seventeenth century and divided amongst themselves offices in urban and provincial councils, in boards of trading companies and minor offices. These offices were viewed as negotiable private property. The magistrates even asserted their political legitimacy in terms of divine right and absolute entitlement.[221] The Dutch Republic became a true 'Royalist Republic' after the regicide of King Charles I for a diverse range of reasons, as Helmer Helmers has convincingly argued recently.[222] Civil disorder, especially the violent and enduring nature witnessed in the English Civil Wars, was greatly feared and in the *Interest van Holland* De la Court persistently expressed a contempt for the ignorant rabble easily incited to rebellion. The dynastic pretentions of the House of Orange and the pursuit of glory in the European military competition, gravely troubled the regents, especially those in Holland.[223] De Witt was supported amongst the ruling elite since it safeguarded, as Kossmann writes, 'its monopoly of power (..) for the time being.'[224] However, in times of emergency large parts of society could suddenly rise up against the regime for a complex number of reasons, but often conveyed through support for Orange. This was the republican reality of De la Court. The historian Herbert Rowen stressed that Organist pamphleteers used 'the familiar theories of kingship' in defence of an Orange-stadholderate, which led to counterattacks on the royal aspirations of Orange. He writes:

---

[219] Blom, 'The Republican Mirror,' 91-115; J. C. Boogman, 'De raison d'état-politicus Johan de Witt', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden*. Deel 90 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), 379-407, 380; Murk van der Bijl, 'Pieter de la court en de politiek werkelijkheid', in H. W. Blom en I. W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd (1680–1685) aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 65-93, p. 67; Klashorst, "Metten schijn van monarchie getempert", 135–136; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 42–50.

[220] Johan de Witt to Van Beverningh on 11 July 1653, *Brieven van Johan de Witt volume 1*, R. Fruin and G. W. Kernkamp (eds.), (Amsterdam: Müller, 1906), 96.

[221] Ernst H. Kossmann, 'The Dutch Republic', in F.I. Carsten (ed.), *The New Cambridge History Volume 5: The Ascendancy of France (1648-1688)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 275-300, p. 275-276; Ernst H. Kossmann, *Politieke theorie en geschiedenis. Verspreide opstellen en voordrachten* (Bert Bakker: Amsterdam, 1987), 136-138.

[222] Helmers, *The Royalist Republic*.

[223] Kossmann, 'The Dutch Republic', 276-281; The historian Herbert H. Rowen calls the princes of Orange 'quasi-dynasts'. Herbert H. Rowen, *John de Witt. Statesman of the "True Freedom"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 7.

[224] Kossmann, 'The Dutch Republic', 279. Furthermore, the Union's government was weak since each province sent its delegates to States General, who could only decide over military, federal and foreign affairs unanimously, and which was dominated by Holland.

'Because the participants in the debate knew all too clearly what was intended, no one was disturbed by this twisting of terms, and it is later generations of historians and their readers who have been led astray.' [225]

This chapter will elucidate the function of the language of reason of state in De la Court's critique of 'war despotism' in *Interest van Holland*. We will set out his background, sketching out his biography, the intellectual climate and an earlier version of his argument. Then, we will look into the historical context of the Orange Republic, the stadholderless regime and the Orangist revival of 1660-1661. But first, it is important to clarify the critical current against 'war despotism'.

3.1 'War despotism'

The term 'war despotism' is a new interpretative heuristic tool, coined by Jean Marie Constant to describe complaints of the assemblies and the published polemics in France against allegedly coercive practices by the regime, which through the pursuit of costly warfare, purportedly suppressed and effectively enslaved the subjects. It was then defined and used by Robert von Friedeburg for interpreting French and German sources with a rather more systematic definition in mind.[226] Before explaining this further, we must take note of the actual developments that were addressed and the use of the terminology in these critiques. As we have seen in the introduction, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, European governments were transformed under pressure of the intensification of warfare and the consequent unprecedented level of government debt. Regimes were forced to find new resources, for example, selling offices (as tax farming) and taking out high-interest loans. While new officeholders and creditors benefitted from the pursuit of warfare, others, such as the old landed gentry and urban merchant elites, felt excluded by these changes in government.

In France, the Crown was forced to take desperate financial measures to meet the immediate problems raised by the wars with the Habsburgs. From the 1570s, especially the unparalleled creation and sale of offices and mounting governmental debt were addressed in estate assemblies and structural reform demanded.[227] King Henry IV could not reorganise the Crown's financial infrastructure, and, as mentioned in the chapter on Rohan, even had to

[225] Rowen, *John de Witt,* 54-55.
[226] Jean Marie Constant, 'Der Adel und die Monarchie in Frankreich', 146; Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, in particular chapter 8 'Readings of Despotism: The Attack on "War-Despotism" between Bodin and Montesquieu', p. 336-36.
[227] Mark Greengrass *Governing Passions: Peace and Reform in The French Kingdom, 1576-1585* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*; Robert von Friedeburg, 'How "new" is the "New Monarchy"? Clashes between princes and nobility in Europe's Iron Century,' *Leidschrift. Aan het hof. Rivaliteit, legitimiteit en successiestrijd aan de Euraziatische hoven, 1250–1750* 27:1 (2012), 17–30.

undertake new loans with exorbitant interest rates and other actions to raise ready money. France's direct involvement in the Thirty Years' War ended all hopes for financial reforms. The French nobility resented the societal rise of new officers, but less prosperous nobles additionally faced increasing non-payments by their tenants who were burdened by new measures. France's participation in warfare was deemed the cause for the grave state of the monarchy. In various assemblies the nobility voiced its concerns and appealed for the restoration of ancient constitutional agreements that safeguarded the common good, the privileges and property of elites and subjects, and the political participation of nobility.[228]

The concerns generated a substantial polemical literature, typical of which was Jean Bourgoin's *La Chasse aux Larrons* [The Hunt for the Thieves.], its title proclaiming the imperative to hunt down the rapacious financiers who were doing so much damage.[229] Von Friedeburg stresses that in particular the polemics are addressed with this term. Although, the practices that generated the polemics might be seen as directly despotic, i.e. taking money, property and privileges; others, such as the sale of offices and out-sourcing, might have disastrous effects were not even slightly 'despotic'. From the 1630s, the adjective 'despotic' reappeared in polemics delegitimising a certain *system of rule* that undermined the property rights and privileges of its subjects. Authors conveyed their attacks through comparisons with a household government that treated its subjects as slaves exemplified by specific practices of Ottoman rule, to which the example of Christian Moscow was often added. They recapitulated sixteenth century tropes of 'Turkish tyranny' and applied them to Habsburg-Spain, thus depicting it as unchristian and illegitimate, with no regard for its subjects or the rule of law.[230] In the seventeenth century the voiced fear of domination and the loss of privilege, became central to certain practices of princely rule. Quentin Skinner has taken this to involve the defence of a specifically neo-Roman liberty, revolving around the stark contrast between free citizens (*sui iuris*) and slaves, those who are subject to the jurisdiction of another and so within the power of someone else (*alieni iuris*).[231]

Irrespective of whether there was a distinctly neo-Roman concept of liberty, the polemical focus on 'slavery' contributed to the erratic seventeenth-century practice of conflating 'tyrannical' with household i.e. 'despotic' rule. Aristotle had distinguished both notions. He designated tyranny as politically illegitimate, pointing to the situation when a particular ruler pursued his own interests instead of the common good and against the will of the citizens,

---

[228] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 346-349.

[229] *La chasse aux larrons ou avant coureur de l'histoire de la chambre de justice. Des livres du biens public, & autres oeuvres faits pour la recherche des financiers & de leurs fauteurs* (Paris, 1618). The title page has a telling quote from the Book of Isaiah (33:1): 'Malheur sur toi qui pille: car tu seras pillé' [Woe to you who plunder: for you will be plundered]; Von Friedeburg, *Luther's legacy*, 348.

[230] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 339-345.

[231] Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 40-41. Skinner refers to the *status homini* in the *Digest*.

against their nature. Despotic government constituted an arbitrary rule, but was legitimate, since it ruled according to the nature of the people, which in the case of the Persians, was inherently slavish.[232] Although medieval authors sometimes echoed this argument, the term 'despotic' almost disappeared in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Its seventeenth-century reappearance was not intended to restore its precise meaning but served polemical purposes, often supplemented attacks on tyranny and underlined the illegitimate system of rule, rather than illicit circumstances that turned a ruler into a tyrant. At the end of the seventeenth century the noun 'despotism' appeared with its qualifications of 'arbitrary', 'absolute', Turkish', 'Tyranny', which was often employed in propaganda against Louis XIV's regime, and found its quintessential reflection in Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* (1748).[233]

During the Fronde, several pamphlets appealed to the historically established privileges, and thus the right of participation of certain groups in France's constitutional framework and distinguished this constitution from 'despotic' rule, as allegedly found in the Ottoman Empire or Spain. Von Friedeburg stresses that these critiques did not entail a systematic critique of the institution of monarchy as such. The disintegration of civil order exemplified by the British Wars of Religion and the execution of Charles I in 1649 was feared among all in France and the Holy Roman Empire (as well as in the Dutch Republic as we will see below). Although in France, such critiques focused predominantly on the involvement of a group of royal officials and financers, German critiques against 'war despotism', e.g. by Ramsla and Seckendorff, directly attacked the princes.[234]

Pieter de la Court's interest analysis reflects the nature of these contemporary critiques and illustrates how French writing was a partial context for Dutch reflection. To diminish the threat of an Orange restoration in Holland, De la Court needed to go to extreme lengths. He warned the reader against the prince of Orange, who would build up a household government with 'leeches of state'[235] that sucked the resources out of the people of Holland, especially the merchants who create Holland's prosperity. An Orange-stadholderate would systematically result in the loss of freedoms and, ultimately, in the enslavement of subjects. The De Witt regime, although its high taxation policies agitated De la Court, safeguarded the interests of the merchants best: 'freedom of religion', 'freedom of trade' and 'freedom of government'. Note that

---

[232] Aristotle, *Politics: Books I and II*, translated with a commentary by Trevor J. Saunders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1252a31, 1256b23. However, Aristotle does adds nuances to this distinction as tyranny, and even polity, can turn into despotic rule. *Politics*, 1279b15-19, 1292a4-36. I owe this nuance to Paul A. Rahe.

[233] Mario Turchetti, 'Despotism' and "Tyranny" Unmasking a Tenacious Confusion', *European Journal of Political Theory* 7:2 (2008), 159-182, p. 169-171; Joan-Pau Rubies, 'Oriental Despotism and European Orientalism: Botero to Montesquieu', *Journal of Early Modern History* 9 1/2 (2005), 109-180, p. 115 and 169; Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 336-340; Paul A. Rahe, *Montesquieu and the Logic of Liberty: War, Religion, Commerce, Climate, Terrain, Technology, Uneasiness of Mind, the Spirit of Political Vigilance, and the Foundations of the Modern Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 95-98.

[234] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 346-358.

[235] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden [preface]. De la Court uses the Dutch term '*Bloedzuigers van den Staat*'.

in De la Court's view, the latter essentially means a regime *without an Orange-prince as stadholder and captain general* and contains neither a systematic rejection of monarchy nor a plea for political participation. De la Court even writes in his preface to *Interest van Holland* that Louis XIV's monarchy and other northern European monarchies are legitimate governments opposed to the 'absolute Monarchies' that ruled the Asian, African and southern European peoples.[236] Moreover, his argument against the closed trade companies and the closed regent offices is more concerned with attacking oligarchic tendencies than defending democratic ones and supports his own social aspirations as a textile merchant and the son of an immigrant.

3.2 Pieter de la Court: textile merchant, aspiring regent and controversial author

In 1618, in the year of the so-called *coup d'état* of stadholder Maurice of Orange, Pieter de la Court was born in Leiden. His father had migrated from Flanders to the Dutch Republic at the beginning of the century, and became a successful entrepreneur in Leiden's textile business by which he was able to buy citizenship rights. After finishing the Latin School in Leiden, De la Court went on a Grand Tour through Europe, visiting England, France, the Swiss Confederacy, the Rhine cities and the Spanish Netherlands. His diary reveals a keen interest in displays of the different confessional beliefs and 'foreign' political practices; he describes with scepticism belief in the devil, 'The divil was he ever seene?,' [237] and displays a certain cynical delight at the richly embellished royal entry of Charles I in London in November 1641.[238] Afterwards, Pieter de la Court joined his brother Johan, studying theology, at Leiden University, where Protestant Late Humanism prevailed. He followed in his father's footsteps after his studies and established a prosperous textile business together with Johan in Leiden. However, Johan died in 1660 and left Pieter his unfinished manuscripts.[239]

Against the wishes of Johan, Pieter published Johan's works, edited and added new passages and sometimes even made substantial changes. Consequently the exact authorship of the different writings of the brothers De la Court is contested. Twenty-five editions of six different titles were printed in 1662.[240] The bestseller *Interest van Holland* was part of this publishing campaign and received at least eight further editions in the same year. Pieter published in 1669

[236] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden [preface].
[237] Willem Frijhoff, 'De reisnotities (1641-1643) van Pieter de la Court. Uit het manuscript bezorgd en van commentaar voorzien', in Hans W. Blom & Ido W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam & Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 11-34, 32.
[238] Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 28.
[239] Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 30-31, 51.
[240] See the full overview of the brothers De la Court' publications in Ido W. Wildenberg, *Johan (1622 - 1660) & Pieter (1618 - 1685) de la Court: bibliografie en receptiegeschiedenis* (Amsterdam APA - Holland University Press, 1986), and pp 20-24 for the historiographical debate about the authorship.

a revision of the *Interest van Holland* under a new title: *Aanwysinge der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* [Demonstrations of the Beneficial Political Foundations and Maxims of the Republic of Holland and West-Friesland].[241]

The paradox of the brothers De la Court's life was their difficult standing as Walloons (a despised minority) while at that the same time they owned a flourishing textile business in Leiden, the centre of Europe's textile industry. Not surprisingly, they advocated unlimited immigration and economic freedom in their writings.[242] Apart from commercial success, Pieter pursued an office in the urban government, but he would never succeed. Blom describes the brothers as 'socially aspiring.'[243] Through his two marriages and his writings Pieter established contacts with the governmental elite. His second marriage of 1661 with Catharina van der Voort from an influential Amsterdam family connected him to the group of regents surrounding Johan de Witt. The couple moved to Amsterdam in 1662, where Pieter linked his economic activities to his political aspirations. From then on, the family name would be 'De la Court van der Voort' with a family estate 'Meerburg', situated near Leiden. In 1670 Pieter obtained a doctorate in law at the university of Orleans and two years later he took the oath as lawyer of the court of Holland. Sadly for him, it was too late to fill such an office, for the regime of De Witt collapsed under the invading armies of Louis XIV and the subsequent revolts in the cities of Holland and Zeeland. Four days after the first attempted assassination of De Witt, Pieter fled to Antwerp, where he was to stay for more than a year.[244] There is a long-standing but unconfirmed rumour that it was a death threat that prompted De la Court to flee. In the summer of 1672 a group of rebellious Orangists gathered at Pieter's house in Leiden. When they did not find De la Court, they tied a dog, with its belly cut open, to a tree. In the dog's stomach they put a candle with a note stating: 'La Court if you do not shut your mouth, we will treat you like this dog.'[245]

Already during his lifetime De la Court's writings met with harsh criticism and strong opposition. The anti-stadholderate perspectives in the *Interest* produced a vigorous political controversy and a flood of pamphlets were published in defence of the House of Orange. It was

---

[241] *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* (Leiden and Rotterdam, 1669), which went through a second edition in 1671 and was translated in German *Anweisungen der heilsamen politischen Grunde und Maximen der Republicqen Holland und West-Friesland* (Rotterdam, 1671) followed by an English and a French translation at the beginning if the eighteenth centuries that attributed the work to Johan de Witt, contributing to the contestation of authorship. *The True Interest and Political Maxims of the Republick of Holland and West-Friesland. Written by John de Witt, and Other Great Men in Holland* (London, 1702), and *Mémoires de Jean de Wit, Grand Pensionaire de Hollande, trans. M. de* *** [Mme. Van Zoutelandt] (The Hague, 1709).

[242] Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 25.

[243] Hans W. Blom, 'Democratic Tendencies in Anglo-Dutch Republicanism', in Dirk Wiemann and Gaby Mahlberg (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), 121-135, p. 125.

[244] Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 25-57; C.-É. Levillain, 'L'Angleterre de la Restauration au miroir de la "vraie liberté" (1660 – 1672). La rencontre entre républicanismes anglais et hollandais à travers les écrits de Pieter de la Court', E-rea [En ligne], 1.2 j 2003, mis en ligne le 15 octobre 2003, consulté le 08 mai 2014. URL: http://erea.revues.org/205; DOI : 10.4000/erea.205, 5; Blom, 'Democratic Tendencies in Anglo-Dutch Republicanism', 125.

[245] 'La Court zoo je niet snoert Uw mond, Doen we je als deezen hond.' Cited from Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 4; Wildenberg, *Johan & Pieter de la Court,* 45.

not only supporters of the House of Orange that disputed the writings of the brothers De la Court. Even Johan de Witt was concerned by its intransigent tones.[246]

Furthermore the orthodox Leiden consistory started an investigation into the contents of *Interest* and also the *Political Discourses*, also published in 1662. Rumours were circulating that Pieter was the author of both works, written by an anonymous author, V.D.H, the initials for 'Van den Hoven', the Dutch translation of De la Court. After two interrogations by delegates of the consistory, several attempts to ban publication of both books and De Witt's refusing to help him, De la Court claimed before the court of law that he was the author only of *Interest*. In fact, it has been shown that several important regents were implicated in writing *Interest*, such as Pieter de Groot and the Leiden regent Hendrick van Willighen. But Johan de Witt especially intervened substantially by correcting large parts of the work. Historical research has shown that he toned down De la Court's criticism of the oligarchic rule of Holland and its cities, deleted certain passages and that he even added two chapters justifying his rule. Yet, soon after the publication of *Interest van Holland* De Witt distanced himself from De la Court.[247]

3.2.1 Intellectual background: self-interest, reason of state and harmony of interests

It is crucial to present a brief sketch of the immediate intellectual background against which De la Court wrote, most importantly, the influence of the so-called 'new philosophy' on his political thought.[248] First of all, scholarship stresses the brothers' fierce criticism of Political Aristotelianism. De la Courts' writings, however, often employed Aristotelian traditions of structure and vocabulary, and were part of the tradition of *politica*.[249] Yet, both brothers did not assert natural sociability or the human faculty of reason. They were profoundly influenced by the new theories of the passions that dominated Dutch mid-seventeenth-century philosophy providing a crucial role for Descartes *Les Passions de l'âme* (1649).[250] De la Court even explicitly referred to Hobbes in arguing that man followed his passions with no effectively constraining role for reason provided, leading to a state of nature with a war of all against all. The inevitability

---

[246] Wildenberg, *Johan & Pieter de la Court,* 11-12.

[247] Johannes Herman Kernkamp, 'Pieter de la court, zijn aansprakelijkheid voor het *Interest van Holland*en de Politike Discoursen', in *Het boek* 22 (1933/34*),* 191-196; Wildenberg, *Johan & Pieter de la Court,* 37; Daniel Veegens, "Johan de Witt als publicist," in *De Gids* 31 (1867), 1-31; Herbert H. Rowen, *John de Witt*, 55-56.

[248] Wiep van Bunge, *From Stevin to Spinoza. An Essay on Philosophy in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 34-64.

[249] Martin van Gelderen, 'Aristotelians, Monarchomachs and Republicans: Sovereignty and *respublica mixta* in Dutch and German political Thought, 1580–1650,' in Van Gelderen and Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) 195-218, p. 214; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 37, 62-65.

[250] Velema, '"That a Republic is Better than a Monarchy"', 14; Eco Haitsma Mulier, *The Myth of Venice and Dutch Republican Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1980), 131; Van Bunge, *From Stevin to Spinoza*, 85–88; Ernst H. Kossmann, *Political Thought in the Dutch Republic. Three Studies* (Amsterdam: KNaW, 2000), 62–63.

of self-interest and self-preservation was the driving force behind all actions of government.[251]

Furthermore, the brothers De la Court were inspired by writings on reason of state, as those by Guicciardini, Botero, Boccalini, as well as Rohan. Throughout their writings, the De la Courts referred to Francesco Guicciardini's works, one of the first authors on *interesse del stato*.[252] The economic foundation of a city's well-being was already underlined in Botero's *Delle cause della grandezza delle città*, often published together with *Della ragion di stato*.[253] Although Botero had predominantly focused on how a prince and his court might maintain and expand the *grandezza* of cities, unlike Machiavelli he favoured commercial rather than military means to this end.[254] Boccalini similarly argued for defensive foreign policy to protect commerce, but he conveyed his view on contemporary politics through a satire of power-hungry rulers and their Tacitist courts in his *Ragguagli di Parnaso* (1612-1613). In the Dutch Republic Boccalini's writings were highly popular, especially in the 1660s. Scholars have often underlined Boccalini's praise for contemporary 'Germanic' republics such as the Dutch republic[255], but it is his aversion to the transformation of European government that is more relevant for De la Court's argument of the bellicose plunder prince. Boccalini wrote about the contemporary novelty of Habsburg-Spain, which was ruled by princes who were driven by self-interest and passions, seeking their glorious advantage in ruinous warfare, collecting lands to integrate into their monarchies and pursuing division amongst their subjects and other princes to maintain power.[256]

In addition, De la Court was acquainted with Rohan's writings.[257] These were extensively re-printed in Protestant Europe and in parts of the Holy Roman Empire during the second half of the seventeenth century and Elsevier was particularly active in their promotion; but although their impact in England has been extensively studied, Rohan's influence on Dutch political thought has received comparatively little attention. However, editions of *De l'interest* and updated versions by other authors flooded the Dutch book market;[258] and in the same year of

---

[251] Malcolm perceives De la Court's political thought as intermediary between that of Hobbes and Spinoza. Noel Malcolm, "Hobbes and Spinoza," in Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 27–52: 42–44; Hans W. Blom, *Morality and Causality in Politics. The Rise of Naturalism in Dutch Seventeenth- Century Political Thought* (PhD dissertation Utrecht University, 1995), 170-182.

[252] See for instance V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 183; 'Namely, *that all Supreme powers*, and especially the *Monarchs*, also in Europe, play with their alliances, like children's games, and establish and nullify these as they see please' as told in 'the histories of *Francisco Guicciardini*'.

[253] Giovanni Botero *On the Causes of the Greatness and Magnificence of Cities, 1588*, translated and introduced by Geoffrey Symcox (Toronto/ Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

[254] Hartman and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade', 14.

[255] Van Gelderen, 'Aristotelians, Monarchomachs and Republicans', 195; Hartman and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade'; Velema, '"That a Republic is Better than a Monarchy"', 15-16.

[256] Meinecke, *The Doctrine of Raison d'État*, 74-75. Meinecke wrote on page 74: 'Boccalini had a sense that the absolutist and courtly monarchy, which had developed in recent times, did, with its mortally ruinous effects, represent something historically new.'

[257] Weststeijn, *Commercial* Republicanism, 54, 174, 207, 221, 346.

[258] See in particular J.A.W. Gunn, "Interest will not lie", A seventeenth-Century Political Maxim', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29:4 (1968), 551-564; Jesper Schaap has listed all editions of *De l'interest* in his PhD dissertation (Erasmus University, forthcoming). The first separate edition of the work was printed by Elsevier in 1639 (2 editions), in 1641 two further editions were published, in 1645 a Latin edition printed by Justus Livius, and the years 1648, 1649 and 1659 all witnessed an edition. In 1654 the only Dutch translation was printed, *Den interest der princen ende staten van*

publication of *Interest van Holland*, a pamphlet was published echoing Rohan's interest analysis: *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* [The present interest of princes of Christendom]. Its headings were similar but it was much shorter than *De l'interest*, it reflected on recent events and added an emphasis on commercial interests. Thus, an important part of Spain's interest was to avoid offensive warfare now that the balance of power with France had shifted. France ought to entangle Spain in costly warfare to exhaust the Spanish resources and the kingdom should promote its seafaring and fishery. The Dutch interest was to maintain and promote seafaring, commerce and fishery, which De la Court likewise argued. But secondly, unlike De la Court's argument, the pamphlet urged the formation of defensive alliances with all neighbouring polities against offensive wars and 'other Banditries'.[259]

Moreover, the influence of contemporary English interest debates on contemporary Dutch analyses of the 'national' interest have not been examined, although several historians have pointed to notable similarities, most often in terms of their supposed 'republicanism', between De la Court's interest analysis and English ones by Marchamont Nedham, Algernon Sidney and Slingsby Bethel, [260] who all went into exile in Holland after the Stuart Restoration.[261] In particular, Nedham's interest analysis was explicitly indebted to Rohan's *De l'interest*.[262] The parallels between *Interest van Holland* and Nedhams's *Interest will not lie. Or, a View of Englands*

Christenrijck. In't Francoys beschreven door den Hertog van Rohan (Amsterdam, 1654), arguably to satisfy a broader demand of Rohan's interest analysis, which perhaps was brought forth by rising publications on the interest of the Dutch Republic in the re-instalment of the Stuart monarchy in 1653. See in particular: *L'interest des Provinces Unies du Pays Bas dans le restablissement de sa majeste de la Grande Bretagne* (1653) and its Dutch translation *Hoe veel de Vereenigde Provintien behoort gelegen te zijn, de her-stellinge van den coninck van Groot-Britangie* (The Hague: H. Cornelsz., 1653). Updated versions or writings echoing Rohan's interest analysis were for instance: *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* (Enkhuizen: Dirk Klaer-Oogh, 1662); *Maximes des princes et estats souverains* (Cologne, 1665 [Amsterdam: Daniel Elsevier, 1665]), which underwent further editions in 1665, 1666, 1667, 1670, 1676 and 1683.

[259] It encompassed eight pages and did not treat the interest of the Swiss cantons and of the Italian 'states'. *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* (Enkhuizen: Dirk Klaer-Oogh, 1662), quoted from p. 8 ['andere Rooverijen'].

[260] Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 300-301, 371-372; Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic 1623-1677* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 207-216, 301; Weststeijn, Commercial Republicanism, 352; Ryan Walter, 'Slingsby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests', *History of European Ideas* 41:4 (2015), 489-506, p. 280, 459; Charles-Édourard Levillain, 'L'Angleterre de la Restauration au miroir de la "vraie liberté" (1660-1672). La rencontre entre républicanismes anglais et hollandais à travers les écrits de Pieter de la Court' E-rea 1.2 (2003) from https://erea.revues.org/205; Jonathan Scott has even described Nedham as 'De la Court's most important predecessor (…) a decade earlier on the other side of the channel.' Jonathan Scott, 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands,' in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 61-81, p. 68; However, Nedham also responded to Dutch writings on 'interest', e.g. in *The Case between England and the United Provinces* (1652) he countered the *Justificatie voor de vereenichende Nederlandsten Provincien* that justified the Dutch refusal to ally with the English 'rebels' in terms of the law of nations and interest. Blom, 'Democratic Tendencies in Anglo-Dutch Republicanism', 129:

[261] Nedham went into exile in Holland after the restoration of Charles II from April 1660 until September 1660. Sidney and Bethel shared exile in the Dutch republic during the mid-1660s.

[262] Contemporaries closely identified Nedham's use of 'reason of state' with Rohan's writings. 'He was in 1647 already known as the 'chief "interest-mongers" in the land', writes J.A.W. Gunn, "Interest will not lie", A seventeenth-Century Political Maxim', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29:4 (1968), 551-564, 555; However, Nedham 'brazenly championed raison d'état as preached by the duc de Rohan, arguing that it is material interest, not justice, honour, or religion that makes the world go round.' Paul A. Rahe, *Against Throne and Altar Machiavelli and Political Theory Under the English Republic*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 181 – 182.

True Interest of 1659 are striking. Nedham examined the specific 'interests' of the different 'domestic' power groups, notably the royalists, parliament and the army, and concluded that it is in 'the Interest of every Party (except only the Papist) to keep him [Charles Stuart] out.'[263] As several historians have stressed, Algernon Sidney's *Court Maxims* (manuscript written in 1664-1665) and Slingsby Bethel's *The Present Interest of England stated* (1671) in turn drew heavily from De la Court's interest argumentation.[264]

The interest analyses of De la Court and those of the above mentioned English authors all urge the importance of a harmony of interests between rulers and ruled. Alan Houston has claimed that this emphasis on harmonization was a means of freeing interest from dynastic considerations, effectively delegitimizing Stuart rule. Royal government, argued Sidney and Nedham, unbalanced the constitution by pursuing only the interest of the ruler.[265] De la Court likewise argued that to acquire 'free' government was to ensure that rulers *and* ruled shared the same interests, as the merchant-regents ruled mercantile Holland. These interest analyses facilitated attempts to reconstruct the rule of law, i.e. government conceived under divine (natural) law, as Houston writes: 'Despite its modern association with conflict, discord and struggle, the language of interest was prized for its ability to illuminate new bases of political order and social cooperation.'[266] Amongst these was an emphasis on commerce and co-operation between those engaged in trade as a pivotal source for the country's welfare. In this sense, interest analyses came to serve advocacy of the rule of law against the background of the transformations in early modern governments, most notably the so-called 'crisis of monarchy' in mid-seventeenth century Europe.[267]

---

[263] Marchamont Nedham, *Interest will not lie. Or, a View of Englands True Interest in reference to Papist, Royalist, Presbyterian, Baptised, Neuter, Army, Parliament, City of London* […] (London 1659).

[264]Sidney, Algernon. *Court Maxims* [manuscript written in 1664-1665], edited with an introduction by Hans W. Blom, Eco Haitsma Mulier and Ronald Jansen (eds.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Slingsby Bethel, *The Present Interest of England Stated* (1671) and also Bethel's *The World's Mistake in Oliver Cromwell* (1668); Hartman and Weststeijn even conclude: 'Much more research can and should be done on the de la Courts' influence on this Whig economic and political thought', in 'An Empire of Trade', 24-25.

[265] Alan Houston, 'Republicanism, the politics of necessity, and the rule of law', in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2001), 241-271, p. 255-256. In footnote 255 Alan Houston also stresses the need for further research on interest analyses: 'The history of this process [interest of state analyses: it facilitated the reconsideration of a number of postulates or theorems that had long governed the conduct of states'] has yet to be written.'

[266] Houston, 'Republicanism, the politics of necessity, and the rule of law', 255, 256; See also John A. W. Gunn, *Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969) and Gunn, "Interest will not lie".

[267] To outline Nedham's context, Blair Worden writes: 'Since 1640s an epidemic of revolutions, from Portugal to Sweden, had produced a crisis of monarchy, in which contemporaries (Harrington among them) saw the hand of God.' Blair Worden, 'Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism', in: David Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 45-81, p. 72. This epidemic receded in 1656. Worden refers to Nedhams's newspaper *Mercurius Politicus*, where he warned for the overthrow of the tyrannies 'abroad', following the English overthrow of the monarchy in the 1650s-editions; Thomas Poole, *Reason of State: Law, Prerogative and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 127-131; Steve Pincus, 'From holy cause to economic interest: the transformation of reason of state thinking in seventeenth-century England', in Houston and Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 272-298; Victoria Kahn, 'The metaphorical contract in Milton's *Tenure of Kings and*

Finally, the teachings of the De la Courts' professor of rhetoric and from 1648 of history at Leiden University, Marius Zueris Boxhorn (1612-1653), are worth noting.[268] Boxhorn rejected the Aristotelian notion of human sociability and instead claimed fear and self-interest as the mechanisms behind the establishment of political government. He disputed the common belief in the viability of a mixed constitution, wherein the different elements, the stadholder (monarchical), the States (aristocratic), and the sometimes added town councils (democratic) naturally balanced each other.[269] Instead, Boxhorn based his interpretation of the mixed constitution on the notion of self-interest. Because stable government is based on the love of subjects for the ruler, he advocated involvement in government by each section of society. In practice, however, Boxhorn believed administrative offices should be assigned to the elite, the nobles and the wealthy, for they are likely to be more devoted to the common good, when it (and their own properties) would be harmed. In case of the Dutch Republic, the private interests of the rich merchants of the province of Holland corresponded to the greatest extent to the common interest, and therefore Holland's form of government was an aristocracy. Yet, due to the rise of commercial capital, revolts of politically excluded merchants could be expected and so he advised shifting to a more open aristocratic government.[270] Boxhorn echoed Hugo Grotius' argument about the capacity of the principal assemblies to restrain the stadholder. Grotius famously theorised in *De Antiquitate Reipublicae Batavicae* (1610) that since Batavian times the States possessed the sovereignty, which in day-to-day politics was shared with the prince of Orange with the States retaining the highest authority and power to command in times of disagreement. [271] In the literature Grotius's 'Batavian myth/model' is often taken as the dominant idea of Dutch republicanism, which eroded after 1650, not least because of De la Court's rejection of the mixed constitution.[272]

The themes of the 'new philosophy' outlined above were clearly apparent in De la Court's

---

Magistrates', in David Armitage, Armand Himy and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Milton and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 82-105, p. 103.

[268] His posthumously published *Institutiones politicae* (1657) reflect his lectures on the traditional *politica* genre combined with new topics such as reason of state, which he applied to Dutch current affairs. Jaap Nieuwstraten, *History and Politics in Seventeenth- Century Dutch Political Thought. The Case of Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn (1612–1653)* (PhD dissertation Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2012), 245-247; Moreover, historians have pointed to the influence of Heereboord, professor of philosophy at Leiden University, who echoing Descartes methods, attempted to form a 'new philosophy' freed from interference of theology. Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 32.

[269] This is often argued in terms of the stadholder constituting the monarchic element, the provincial assemblies the aristocratic and, sometimes added, the city councils the democratic elements. M. van Gelderen, 'Aristotelians, Monarchomachs and Republicans', 201-204. However, Justus Lipsius described monarchy as the best form of government in his book II of *Politica*. Justus Lipsius*, Politica. Six books of Politics or Political Instruction*, introduced and translated by Jan Waszink (Assen: Royal van Gorchum, 2004).

[270] Boxhorn criticised a small, closed-off aristocracy as easily corruptible and prone to oligarchic tyranny. The growth of private wealth of the citizens of Holland formed a major pillar of Holland's welfare. Nevertheless, a revolt could be expected, because the rich segment of the citizenry would no longer tolerate that they were excluded from government.

[271] Grotius stressed that in cases of disputes the individual provincial assemblies held the supreme power. Hugo Grotius, *The Antiquity of the Batavian Republic*, introduced and translated Jan Waszink (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000).

[272] Ivo Schöffer, 'The Batavian Myth during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,' in J. S. Bromley & E. H. Kossmann (eds.), *Britain and the Netherlands. Volume 5: Some Political Mythologies* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974), 78-101.

attack on early modern princes. As Ernst Kossmann states: 'Unlike Boxhorn (…) late seventeenth century writers of Huber's or De la Court's nature were far from amused at the viciousness of political affairs. (…) Unwarranted cynicism was an outcome of a profoundly pessimistic view of the human condition.'[273] Reason was neither the basis of political virtue nor the instrument to acquire the knowledge of the true interest of state. Rather, legitimate government was founded upon harmonizing of the (self-)interests of ruled and rulers. In this way, De la Court arguably contributed to the so-called 'crisis of Political Aristotelianism'.[274] But first and foremost, De la Court employed the vocabulary of reason of state in *Interest van Holland* to defend the political and military exclusion of the House of Orange. This brings to the fore De la Court's preoccupation with 'war despotism' that pre-dates *Interest van Holland.*

3.2.2 'War despotism' in Het welvaren der stad Leyden *(1659)*

Interest van Holland was actually based on an early work of the De la Court brothers, a manuscript titled *Het welvaren der stad Leyden* [The wellbeing of the city of Leiden], finished in 1659.[275] Johan most probably wrote the initial text that Pieter expanded into a sharp critique of the municipal government that allegedly constrained the economic, religious and political liberties of the citizens. It was**,** however**,** not published, but *via* his wife's brother-in law, Johan Eleman, the manuscript circulated in the *regenten*-faction surrounding De Witt. It found a keen audience amongst these powerful regents and so Pieter de la Court expanded the interest analysis to the entire province of Holland. In the summer of Johan de Witt received a first draft of *Interest van Holland*.[276]

Het welvaren der stad Leyden has been considered as part of the tradition of Italian *ragion di stato* literature, appropriating Italian reason of state to the seaborne, mercantile Dutch Republic constructing a 'commercial reason of state'. [277] The brothers explicitly stated in the introduction of this treatise that they would analyse the well-being of the 'republic' of Leiden, i.e. of rulers and ruled combined, 'sopra la raggion di Stato'.[278] *Het welvaren der stad Leyden* stated that the preservation and advancement of the inhabitants depended on unrestricted trade that

---

[273] Ernst H. Kossmann, 'Some late 17th-century Dutch writings on Raison d'Etat', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staatsräson: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begriffs* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975), 497-504, quotation on 499.
[274]Horst Dreitzel, 'Reason of State and the Crisis of Political Aristotelianism', Jonathan Scott qualifies it as a 'sceptical Dutch reason of state [that] eliminated the moral basis of Aristotle's theory'. Jonathan Scott, 'Classical Republicanism', 61-81, quoted from p. 69.
[275] First version was titled *Aenmerkinge op het welvaren en Intrest der Stad Leyden* [Comments on the Well-being and interest of the City of Leiden]. Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 54-55.
[276] Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 54-55.
[277] In this sense, Weststeijn and Hartman view the brothers De la Court as theorists of 'jealousy of trade' rather than of a prototype 'political economy'. Hartman and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade', 12.
[278] [De la Court], *Het welvaren van Leiden. Handschrift uit het jaar 1659*, edited F. Driessen (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911), 3.

needed favourable taxation and rules of immigration and a defensive foreign policy.

Already in this treatise we can observe elements of contemporary critiques, which have been defined as attacking 'war despotism'. In chapter 64, the De la Courts exclaim: 'a furore monarcharum libera nos Domine' [Save us from the fury of monarchs, oh Lord].[279] While a monarchic form of government has the advantage of effective rule, for it concerned one single man, 'no greater disaster can be thought, if a free City or Republic would fall into a Monarchic government, because generally all sciences, arts, virtues, Prosperity and commerce would be destroyed, yes the inhabitants would be devoured like bread.'[280] Interestingly, the brothers underline the contemporary transformations of European governments, appealing to ancient rights of certain parts of society to participate in politics, as contemporary French and German authors likewise argued. They write: 'In old times Europe was ruled satisfactorily by Republics, and which have left so many remnants of power to the subjects, Cities and Provinces' that the monarchs could not subvert.[281] Monarchical government had functioned perfectly well when it was part of a layered system of government by consent through city and provincial assemblies (a republican system/monarchical commonwealth), but conversely all *present* monarchs, the De la Courts write, follow the examples of 'Tartars, Turks, Persians, Muscovites, and all other countries, where a person without any contradiction rules and is obeyed'.[282] Without further explanation they assert that 'Spain, France, Sweden, the German rulers and the Netherlands' transformed into such illegitimate systems of rule, and instead concentrate on showing 'how disadvantageous the slavery or coercion of the same [absolute general freedom of inhabitants] for the rulers of Leiden is.'[283]

Here we witness the nature of the De la Courts' argument, in their attack on, allegedly, *new* practices of rulers. They make the standard comparison with Oriental regimes deemed despotic. Like the Orientals, the rulers of Christendom coerce and subvert the rule of law, they plunder the polity, effectively enslaving the subjects. For the De la Courts, these propensities characterised early modern rule; its newness lay in the shift from consent and the authority of law serving the *res publica* to arbitrary rule and enslavement. Rather than rejecting monarchy as such, it is the new despotisms that are attacked. Like Rohan before them on the 'new' monarchy of Spain, the De la Courts treated newness prejudicially. Indeed, the negativity surrounding innovation was entirely conventional, yet has been overlooked by modern commentators in their search for republicanism; the result has been a misplaced emphasis: it is not that new monarchy is a recent illustration of illegitimate rule, but that monarchy is evil insofar as it is newly transformed. In *Interest van Holland*, Pieter expanded on the earlier argument.

[279] *Het welvaren van Leiden*, 143 [Chapter 64].
[280] *Het welvaren van Leiden*, 143-144 [Chapter 64].
[281] *Het welvaren van Leiden*, 144 [Chapter 64].
[282] *Het welvaren van Leiden*, 144 [Chapter 64].
[283] *Het welvaren van Leiden*, 144 [Chapter 64]

3.2.3 The Orange-Republic

De la Court's severe criticism of certain corrupt practices of princes, in *Interest van Holland* essentially entailed anti-Orangism. It reflected a long-term constitutional crisis of the stadholderate in the Dutch republic, which usually erupted under foreign political pressures.[284] The stadholderate was created by Emperor Charles V to replace the absent Habsburg ruler and retained by the Union of Utrecht from 1579 onwards.[285] This office comprised a hybrid collection of powers, privileges and informal influences. Since in practice the princes of Orange successively occupied the office, the stadholderate was also a dynastic institution. The provincial estates chose the stadholder independently from each other. The States General awarded the stadholder with the highest military office of captain-general in the context of the war against Spain. Formally, the stadholderate was a civil office, which had developed de facto into an important military one.[286] Rowen calls the stadholderate therefore 'an improvisation' and states that 'it was difficult for contemporaries to fit it into the standard categories of political analysis'.[287]

The joint Orange-office of stadholder and captain-general proved to be a danger for the States of Holland in the crisis years of 1618 and 1650, when respectively the Stadholders Maurice and William II of Orange pressured successfully the provincial assembly by military force. During religious disputes in 1610s, a conflict rose between the States of Holland and the States General about the legal power to organize military forces to quell internal religious riots. On the authority of the States General, Stadholder Maurice pressured the States of Holland by military force and arrested the Grand Pensionary of Holland, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, in 1618, who was tried and executed in 1619. In 1650, Maurice's nephew, Stadholder William II and the States of Holland were involved in a conflict about reduction of the army, which resulted in William's attempt to take over the city of Amsterdam by force and the arrest of eight members of

[284] Klashorst, "Metten schijn van monarchie getempert", 99; Rowen stated that from the 1650s until the fall of the Dutch Republic in 1759, 'the central constitutional question became the stadholdership, its desirability and its very existence. It was not whether the country should be a republic or a monarchy, as in nineteenth-century France.' Rowen, *John de Witt*, 54; Wyger Velema underlines this: 'anti-monarchism was the outcome of a domestic political need.' He stresses that it would be 'incorrect to equate Orangism with monarchism'. However, Velema believes 'anti-monarchism' to be the essential aspect of a type of Dutch 'republicanism' that encompassed a systematic rejection of monarchy, as he observes in De la Court's writings. Velema, '"That a Republic is better than a monarchy"', 12.

[285] Actually Charles V installed three stadholders corresponding to the three administrative parts of the northern Netherlands in 1543. According to Jonathan Israel, the Union of Utrecht extended the powers of the stadholderate for it was decided that he must take up the mediator position between provinces in the absence of a king. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 301; For further information on the Union of Utrecht read Johan Christiaan Boogman, 'The Union of Utrecht: its Genesis and Consequences', *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 94:3 (1997), 377-407.

[286] Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 305; Levillain, 'L'Angleterre de la Restauration', 4; Velema, "That a Republic is better than a monarchy", 11 – 12.

[287] Herbert H. Rowen, *The Princes of Orange. The Stadholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), ix, 1.

the provincial assembly of Holland.[288] His premature death, however, paved the way for the stadholderless regime.

Rohan considered that it was Maurice's particular interest to pursue continuous warfare.[289] Interestingly, the princes of Orange themselves even argued that their aspirations benefitted from a strong army and an Orange-military command, as their most important power play was participating in the European wars. In 1674 Stadholder William III told the ambassador Gabriel Sylvius that 'He was right and it was in his interest (…) to favour the pursuit of war in order thereby to establish his authority.'[290] After the meltdown of the stadholderless regime in 1672, he was offered a range of noble titles but he constantly declined. According to Charles-Édouard Levillain, he preferred to stretch the stadholderate to its full capacity; 'Better a warrior king without a kingdom than a warrior king without an army.'[291] His father, William II of Orange, however, had severely overstretched the legitimate scope of the stadholderate in 1650. The peace with Spain was an utmost nuisance for William II as he tellingly wrote to the French ambassador d'Estrades: 'I wish that I could break the necks of all the villains that signed the peace.' [292] He stressed the importance of warfare for the Dutch nobility and the utter egoism of Holland merchant-regents: 'The Merchants never think of anything other than commerce and how to promote it, they do not look out for the rest of the country and the Nobility.'[293] Leslie Price argues that William II had acted rather rashly from sheer frustration at Holland's attempts to limit the number of his troops.[294] The stadholderless regime built on the recent memory of William's 1650 subversion of the rule of law, in the light of which Maurice's actions of 1618 looked a lot more sinister.[295]

---

[288] It was an 'attempt', for his land forces were spotted by a messenger on his route to Amsterdam. The messenger warned the city and so defensive measures could be taken. Israel, 'The Stadtholderate of William II, 1647–1650', *The Dutch Republic*, 595-609.

[289] However, Maurice's interest 'was joined with the true interest of the States', because the United Provinces 'flourish by the continuation of *warre*.' Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 84-85, 32; Dutch political debates regarding war and peace shifted after 1648, from an emphasis on the profit of warfare to a stress of the benefits of peace. Hans W. Blom, 'Oorlog, handel en staatsbelang in het politiek denken rond 1648', *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), 89-96.

[290] Quoted from Charles Édouard Levillain, 'William III's Military and Political Career in Neo-roman Context, 1672–1702,' *The Historical Journal* 48:2 (2005), 213–350, p. 322.

[291] Levillain, 'William III's Military and Politically Career', 327 and 333.

[292] Roeland Harms, *De uitvinding van de publieke opinie: pamfletten als massamedia in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011), 92: 'Ik wou dat ik allen schurken, die den vrede gesloten hebben, den nek laten breken.'

[293] Harms, *De uitvinding van de publieke opinie,* 92; 'De Coopluyden denkcen nievers op als op de trafyc en die te beneficieren, voor de rest van het landt en den Adel daer sijnse [zien ze, Roeland Harms]niet naer om.'

[294] The States of Holland only overstretched its authority when they *paid off* troops assigned to them in order to reduce the war budget and to block planned warfare against Habsburg-Spain. John L. Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Politics of Particularism* (Clarendon: Oxford University Press, 1994), 159, 163-164. Price states on p. 159: 'In any case, he was very much an exception among the stadhouders, who in general were no more likely to want, or to be able, to destroy the power of the regents than contemporary monarchs were able to contemplate ruling without nobilities.'

[295] Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 170.

3.2.4 The stadholderless regime: warfare, taxation, debating 'interest' and 'freedom'

All this is not to say that a militaristic aggrandisement was exclusive to the princes of Orange. The republican regime of Johan de Witt felt no less obliged to participate in the wars between European rulers. During the 1650s the Dutch Republic fought the English in 1652-1654, intervened in the Baltic area against Sweden and England in 1656-1659, planned to intervene in Münsterland in 1657 and pursued warfare against Portugal in 1657-1660.[296] During the 1660s, apart from tensions with England leading up to the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667), De Witt's main concern regarding foreign affairs was to keep a safe distance from the ascending French monarchy. Shortly after the Peace of Pyrenees in 1659, Spain halved the size of its army in the Spanish Netherlands, leaving the south of the Dutch Union vulnerable to a potential French invasion. Nonetheless, many Dutch regents shared scepticism about the usefulness of Spain as an ally against France and viewed the latter as a profitable business partner.[297] In 1662 a Franco-Dutch defensive alliance was signed. A famous Dutch slogan was: 'Gallia amica, non vicina' [rather France as friend, than neighbour].[298]

War related burdens brought great pressure to the Dutch inhabitants during the stadholderless regime. After the peace of 1648, Dutch war expenses fell drastically, but rose again due to the naval intervention in the Baltic in 1658 and peaked during the Second Anglo-Dutch War (over 30 million guilders in 1665 compared to 22 million guilders annually in the 1630s). Moreover, after 1648 debt charges, especially Holland's, rose, even though De Witt managed to lower them in the beginning of the 1650s until Dutch warfare increased at the end of the decade.[299] The subsequent rise in taxation, sale of loans, annuities and new short-term obligations produced a mounting discontent amongst Dutch inhabitants.[300]

Scholars have stressed the existence of a Dutch 'discussion culture' that could mobilise the population, largely through pamphlets.[301] Gert Klashorst remarks that particularly during the epoch of 'True Freedom' (1650-1672) pamphlet debates raged outside governmental bodies in the Dutch Republic and the regime attempted to influence Dutch 'opinion'.[302] The minority

[296] Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 637-638: in 1558 70,000 men, in 1661 33,000 men and soon after 20,000 men. Between 1667 and 1712 France repeatedly invaded the Spanish Netherlands, which will be discussed in the following chapters on Lisola and Valkenier.
[297] Israel, *The Dutch* Republic, 744.
[298] Rowen, *Johan de Witt,* 115-124; Gijs Rommelse, *The Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667) Raison d'état, mercantilism and maritime strife* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006), 73-75.
[299] The governmental debt of the Union had risen from 923000 guilders in 1596 to almost 14 million guilders in 1650, an amount that steadily grew during the 1650s. Provincial debt likewise rose, and Holland's debt was even tenfold the amount of the Union's debt in 1700 (200 million guilders). Marjolein 't Hart, 'The merits of a financial revolution', 16-20.
[300] Luc Panhuysen, *De Ware Vrijheid. De levens van Johan en Cornelis de Witt* (Amsterdam: Atlas, 2005), 296.
[301] Willem Frijhoff and Marijke Spies, *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective: 1650, hard-won unity* (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2004), 220; Michel Reinders, *Printed Pandemonium: Popular Print and Politics in the Netherlands 1650-72* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
[302] Klashorst, 'Metten schijn van monarchie getempert', 157.

regime of De Witt was fragile in times of foreign threat and economic distress. As stated before, De Witt himself even estimated the support for the stadholderless regime as only 'one-tenth of one per cent of the common people'.[303] Luc van Panhuysen argues that the primary reason for De Witt to add two chapters to *Interest van Holland* was 'specifically to defend the plague of excise duties, customs duties, tenth, twentieth, hundreds and two-hundreds pennies'.[304]

Thus, the stadholderless regime was stuck between intensified European warfare and growing hostility to high and new taxation, which was exacerbated by an Orangist revival in 1660-1661. As with the constitutional crisis of 1618, that of 1650 fuelled pamphlet wars about who possessed the supreme power over foreign policy and the Union's army.[305] From the 1650s onwards, an important trope in these pamphlets was 'interest', i.e. the self-interest of the prince or regents, as opposed to the 'true' interest of the different provinces or the United Provinces.[306] Against the claim that the princes of Orange were driven by self-interest to harm the 'true interest', many defenders of the stadholderate argued that in the 'mixed constitution' the passion and self-interest were subordinated to the common interest by the balancing dynamics of the monarchic and aristocratic elements. As stated above, the central issue in these interest debates was the role of the prince of Orange conveyed through foreign policy, whether to pursue an offensive warfare against the great European dynasties such as France, or resume war against Spain, and therefore necessarily to sustain large land forces and high taxes; *or* to strive for peace supported by a strong fleet to protect the prosperous trade. Supporters of the House of Orange generally advocated the first option, arguing that only the prince of Orange with his combined political and military offices could protect the interest of the United Provinces. Authors opposing an Orange-stadholderate often promoted the second option, reasoning that given their warlike cast of mind, the princes would only further their self-interest and ruin the Dutch Republic. A

---

[303] Johan de Witt to Van Beveringh on 11 July 1953, *Brieven van Johan de Witt volume 1*, R. Fruin and G. W. Kernkamp (eds.), (Amsterdam: Müller, 1906), blz 96.

[304] Panhuysen, *De Ware Vrijheid*, 297. Pennies were different taxations on movable and real goods.

[305] The years 1650, with 1618 and 1672 were the three peak years of the Golden Age for both quantity and vehemence of political and theological-political tracts issuing from the Dutch presses.' Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 608.

[306]Although writings on reason of state, the arcana and Tacitism were previously available in the Dutch republic, the little scholarship there is on this topic observes a popular use of the idiom of 'interest' from the 1650s onwards, largely influenced by the peace negotiations at Westphalia and the consequent publication of 'critical-current affairs' writings, filled with foreign tracts and treatises using this idiom, such as the diplomat Lieuwe van Aitzema's political-historical *Saken van Staet en Oorlogh* (1657-1671). Blom, 'Oorlog, handel en staatsbelang in het politieke denken rond 1648', 89. Blom points especially to *Munsters Praetie: Deliberant Dum fingere nesciunt* (1646) in which the use of reason of state terminology takes center stage in explaining that solely 'personal benefit', which the French call *Interesse*' determines such negotiations; Other pamphlets are to be found: *Pierre de Touche. Des veritables Interests des Provinces Unies du Païs-bas: et Des Intentions des deux Couronnes, fur les traittez de Paix. Seconde Edition* (Dordrecht, 1647); *Lettre escrite par vn Gentilhomme Francoys faisant profession de la ReligionReformée, a vn amy Hollandois, au sujet des libelles diffamatoires qui se publient en Hollande contre les Francois, & pur faire voir que* l'Interest et seureté de la vraye Religion tant dehors que de dans les Provinces Unies […] de Paix sans elle (Hamburg, 1647); For a specific pamphlet as part of 'critical-current affairs' genre see: *Staet representerende de generale affairen, midstgaders d'hoedanicheden ende gestalenis van alle koninckrijcken, prinsdommen ende republiquen van Europa. Vanden Jaren 1654. Tot den jaere 1655* (The Hague, 1655); Notably, the influence of the 1648-negotitations should be researched further, as well as the earlier discussed similarities between 1650s-1670s English and Dutch interest analyses, wherein Rohan's *De l'interest* appears to have a key position.

famous early example of the use of 'interest' is De Witt's own *Deductie, ofte declaratie van de Staten van Hollandt en West-Vrieslandt* of 1654, justifying the exclusion of the House of Orange laid down in the highly controversial Act of Exclusion, signed with the Cromwellian regime. [307]

In the Dutch Republic the term 'freedom/liberty' was highly contested and used by many authors of different factions to state their respective claims.[308] Klashorst examined a diverse range of official documents and pamphlets from the period of 'True 'Freedom', and concluded that political 'liberty' meant primarily the secure possession and the unthreatened enjoyment of one's own special 'liberties', i.e. property and privileges. While documents of Zeeland stressed Orange as the defender of the ancient privileges against Spanish servitude and viewed the Union of Utrecht of 1579 as the constitutional restriction on Holland's provincial sovereignty, Holland's official papers argued for an absolute provincial sovereignty that chiefly entailed the right to refuse any financial request from other parties. Moreover, Klashorst suggests that the term 'free republic' in Holland's official papers, primarily meant freedom from interference of the House of Orange. In the pamphlets he investigated, Klashorst observed similar patterns. 'Orangists' usually applied 'freedom' to the entire Dutch Republic of the Seven United Provinces while pro-De Witt pamphleteers argued for the absolute supreme power of Holland.[309] Moreover, within the commercial Dutch Republic 'liberty' was also regarded as the rule of law that fostered crucial protection of trade and commerce.[310]

---

[307] Apart from defending provincial sovereignty, De Witt, similarly to De la Court, warned for coercive princely rule, forcefully overthrowing regimes ruled by consent and law, illustrated by many recent historical examples, especially William II's coup d'état of 1650. *Deductie, ofte declaratie van de Staten van Hollandt en West-Vrieslandt* (The Hague, 1654); Already during the first Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654), but especially after the publication of De la Court's *Interest of Holland* in 1662 and the French invasion in 1672, an explosive rise of Dutch publications with 'interest' in their titles is detectable, used in political and religious issues. See for instance: *Hoe veel de Vereenigde Provintien behoort gelegen te zijn, de her-stellinge van den coninck van Groot-Britangie* (The Hague: H. Cornelsz., 1653); *Hollands Op-Komst, of Bedenkingen op de schaadelyke Schriften, genaamt Grafelyke Regeeringe en Interest van Holland uit-gegeven door V.D.H. ten dienste van alle liefhebers die het ware Interest van Holland beminnen* (Leiden, 1662*)*; I.N.D.P. [Jean Nicholss de Parival], *Ware interest van Holland; gebouwd op de ruïnen van den Interest van Holland, onlangs uitgegeven door D.V.H.* (Leiden: Jan Princen, 1662); *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* (Enkhuizen: Dirk Klaer-Oogh, 1662); Johan Corbet, *Het interest van Engelandt, in de materie van religie* (Amsterdam: Steven Swart, 1663); Gelasius Mullens [Guilielmus Saldenus], *Neerlands interest, tot vrede der kercke, en wegh-neminge van alle opkomende misverstanden in de selve* (Middelburg: Yemant Hendricksz., 1664); *L'interest de l'Allemagne, en general et en particvlier* (Cologne: Pierre Marteau, 1668 [printed in the Netherlands by Weller]); Willem Guthry, *Het groote interest van een christen; ofte Het deel van een geloovige getoetst* […] *wie heeft ende hoe te krijghen*, *[…] En in 't Nederlandts vertaaldt door* Jacobus Koelman (Vlissingen; Abraham van Laren, 1669); David Montanus, *Stemme des gejuygs en des heils over't groote interest van een christen* […] *in gezangen vervat* (Vlissingen: Abraham van Laren, 1672); *Holland's interest, gestelt tegen dat van Jan de Witt; voor-gevallen tusschen Hans, raedts-heer, en Arent, een borger* (1672); *Engelands interest, ofte tegenwoordich waerachtig belangh. By een trouwhertigh lief-hebber van Engelands eere desselfs en gantsch christen-rijcks vrede, uit D'Engelsche spraeck in de Neder-duytsche overgeset* [Translated from English] (1672); *Discoursen over den tegenwoordigen interest van het landt. Tusschen een Zeeu, Hollander en raedsheer* (Amsterdam, 1672); [Joseph Hill], *The interest of these United Provinces. Being a defence of the Zeelander choice. By a wellwisher of the reformed religion, and the wellfare of these countries* (Middelburg: Thomas Berry, 1672); *De schoolen der prince, en interest der voornaemste potentate des werelts* (Cologne, H. Albedeuyt, 1673).

[308] Blom, 'The Republican Mirror', 97; For long-term Dutch intellectual tradition of arguing liberty see Eco Haitsma Mulier and Wyger Velema, and (eds.), *Vrijheid: een geschiedenis van de vijftiende tot de twintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999).

[309] Klashorst, 'Metten schijn van monarchie getempert', 165-176.

[310] Ida Nijenhuis writes, 'civil liberty –the rule of law- became an essential feature of commercial society' for the simple reason that trade needed the basic judicial protection of property and person. 'Republican liberty' in this sense, promoted 'wealth and numbers'. Ida Nijenhuis, "Shining Comet, Falling Meteor". Reflections on the Dutch republic as a

Constitutional debates on the 'free republic'[311] overlapped with debates about freedom of conscience which, as Martin van Gelderen states, 'was the core of all Dutch debates'.[312] In 1618 theological debates between orthodox Counter-Remonstrants and moderate Remonstrants led to discussions about who held supreme authority in confessional matters, the Church or the States General, or perhaps the individual provinces or towns? Hugo Grotius had provided a strong defence of freedom of conscience and for governmental authority over church affairs, deeming the church an intrinsic member of the *res publica*. However, Maurice of Orange successfully intervened on the side of orthodox Counter-Remonstrants.[313] Echoing these troubles, during the 1650s-1660s a 'Voetian-Cocceian controversy' raged in the Dutch Republic. It initially involved theological disputes about Sabbath observance, but developed into political debates. The orthodox Calvinist 'Voetians', strict anti-Cartesians and in favour of anti-Catholic legislation, attempted to enforce stricter reformed manners in society, regarded government as an instrument for this, and associated with Orangism to counter the political primacy of Holland. Orangist pamphleteers had practically monopolised the claim of being the 'protector of the fatherland' and Dutch Calvinism, both allegedly freed from 'Spanish tyranny' by the courageous princes of Orange.[314] The 'Cocceian' adherents, affiliated with De Witt-faction and against orthodox Calvinist primacy in society, proposed more moderate worship, and stressed careful reading by skilled philologists of the complex Bible. Pro-De Witt pamphleteers frequently argued along Grotian lines, defending the regents' power to mediate in church affairs, these being affairs of the *respublica*, and pleaded for greater freedom in worship.[315]

3.2.5 The Orangist revival of 1660-1661

De la Court wrote *Interest van Holland* at the height of an Orangist revival in 1660-1661, in defence of the stadholderless regime (1650–1672). After Stadholder William II of Orange suddenly died of smallpox in 1650, the majority of provinces, led by Holland, decided to leave the office of stadholder vacant, a decision that lasted for just over two decades. The Stadholder's son, prince William, was born eight days after his father's death. The presence of the young Prince remained a constant threat to the regime, especially in troubled times opposition to the

---

Commercial Power during the Second Stadholderless Era', in J. A. F. de Jongste and A. J. Veenendaal (eds.), *Anthonie Heinsius and the Dutch Republic, 1688-1720: Politics, War, and Finance* (The Hague: Institute of Netherlands History, 2002), 115-129, p. 120.

311 Blom, 'The Republican Mirror', 97-98.

312 Martin van Gelderen, 'Arminian trouble: Calvinists debates on freedom', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Freedom and the Construction of Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 21-37, p. 22.

313 Van Gelderen points to the irony that the intervention of Orange stressed the *de facto* power of civil government in church matters. Van Gelderen, 'Arminian trouble', 31-36;

314 Ingmar Vroomen, *Taal van de Republiek*.

315 Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 661-666; Klashorst, "Metten de schijn van monarchie getempert", 165-166.

regime often turned into fierce Orangism. In the beginning of the 1660s De la Court set out to diminish this threat. In this period, the fortunes of the House of Orange were reviving because of the restoration of the English King Charles II and his favouring of the interests and political prospects of the young Orange-Prince William, his nephew. Furthermore, Princess Mary, William's mother and Charles' sister, promoted her son's cause to each province. During this period of Orangist resurgence, De la Court sent parts of his manuscript to De Witt to be read and corrected before publishing it at the beginning of 1662.

However, Dutch Royalism was not co-extensive with Orangism, as adherents of the De Witt faction also supported the Stuart cause. Many regents were willing to support the house of Orange now that its fortunes were reviving. When in the spring of 1660 Charles spent two months in the Dutch Republic before sailing to England, provincial assemblies and town councils competed with each other in their efforts to please the king, culminating in the exorbitant 'Dutch Gift': this included several Renaissance paintings and a yacht. Jonathan Israel speaks of many opportunists among the regents, who were impressed by the advantages, political and economic, of better relations with England more than they feared any Orangist revival. [316] In 1661, the provinces of Zeeland, Friesland, Overijssel and Gelderland, and even the Holland cities of Leiden and Haarlem proposed the re-instalment of the Prince of Orange. In February of that year, William wrote to his uncle that 'there will never be a better opportunity to secure that designation'.[317] At the end of 1661, De Witt was saved by renewed Anglo-Dutch tensions over trade especially in the Caribbean and West Africa. The province of Zeeland had huge interests in these markets, which outweighed support for the Orange-Stadholder. Similar priorities were evident in Holland and so with the resurgence of Anglo-Dutch tensions there was a decline in Orangism.[318]

Recently, Helmer Helmers has explained the seeming paradox of a Dutch 'Royalist Republic' by researching a diverse range of sources from pamphlets to paintings. Widespread Stuart support in the Dutch Republic was formed from the late 1640s onwards, when both sides in the civil war issued ferocious propaganda campaigns to influence Dutch 'opinion', but after the execution of Charles I, the Dutch closed ranks. Royalist propaganda appealed to a wide range of Dutchmen, not only to the Orangists, but also to more moderate Remonstrant believers, who identified with the Church of England and the struggle against the political fanaticism of orthodox Protestants. Furthermore, the regicide, the total collapse of civil order and sustained

316 Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 751-758.
317 Wout Troost, *Stadhouder-koning Willem III: een politieke biografie* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2001), 44.
318 During the course of 1662, Anglo-Dutch negotiations in London stagnated (for the Dutch a major sticking point was Cromwell's protectionist Navigation Act). De Witt and his supporters, backed by the provinces of Zeeland and Utrecht, even preferred war with England. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 751-758.

civil war were strongly disliked by almost all Dutchmen. Charles I was widely seen as a political and religious martyr, whereas Cromwell largely emerged as a true tyrant in Dutch opinion.[319]

Moreover, Helmer underlines that 'monarchist and absolutist modes of thought were as deeply embedded in the United Provinces as anywhere else in Europe.' He also stresses the dominance of mixed constitution-arguments in Dutch political thought as a cause for Dutch resistance to English 'republican' arguments. Because of the Orangist revival of 1660 and its powerful dynastic connection to the Stuart monarchy, De la Court had to come up with a fierce attack on the mixed constitution, but notably avoiding references to English republicans and the English Commonwealth that, in the eyes of many Dutchmen, had turned out to be a corrupted kingdom in all but a name.[320] This may explain the lack of explicit references to English interest analyses, such as Nedham's, in *Interest van Holland*.[321] The allegation that a kingless polity -as the Dutch Republic was first and foremost an aristocracy- must have had a structural aversion to kingship might truly distort our understanding of comtemporary beliefs and practices.

In sum, De la Court wrote *Interest van Holland* in close cooperation with Johan de Witt in order to counter an Orangist Revival and mounting discontent with high taxation in the Dutch Republic. De la Court used the language of interest, influenced by new philosophical views on human nature, and complemented with elements of contemporary critiques of 'war despotism' to counter the public clamour for the re-instatement of the House of Orange in the offices of stadholder and captain general. The fact that the De Witt-regime ruled without the House of Orange made it no less a, though perhaps more reluctant, participant in the European military competition. Its inhabitants were oppressed by war-related tax burdens and called out for the illustrious House of Orange, by the Stuart Restoration even more illustrious, to defend their economic, political and religious liberties against the oligarchic regents. De la Court counterattacked with the argument that princes, courtiers, priests, nobles and soldiers with their lust for warfare, power and luxuries would destroy Holland from within, robbing

---

[319] As Helmers concludes: 'The Restoration symbolized many restorations at once. (…) Charles II's restoration was also the restoration of his father, whose fate had made such a profound impression in the Dutch Republic. (...) Secondly, friend and foe in the Dutch Republic agreed that the restoration of the Stuarts in England would lead to the restoration of the House of Orange in the Dutch Republic. (...) Dutch observers also read another restoration in Charles II's return to grace: that of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt [symbol for Remonstrant views] (…) The Restoration of Charles II, they believed, would bolster the Anglo-Dutch opposition to Anglo-Dutch-Scoto Puritanism (…). Lastly, the Restoration of Charles II, as a sign of God, also symbolized a general restoration of order.' Helmers, *Royalist Republic*, 259-261.

[320] Helmers, *Royalist Republic*, cited from 262, 313. Helmers points to the 'absolutist tendency in Dutch "republicanism", as some political writers such as Dirck Graswinckel applied divine right theories to regents and others argued a Hobbesian notion of sovereignty. Helmers, *Royalist Republic*, 132.

[321] Helmers' argument –because of the widespread Dutch support for Stuart, Dutch authors needed to avoid references to English 'republican rebels'- appears more convincing than that of Arthur Weststeijn, who claims that De la Court 'did not look westwards for any major inspiration.' By comparing writings on 'republicanism' in England and the United Provinces between 1650 and 1670, Weststeijn argues that De la Court radically differed from English 'republican writings' because De la Court categorically rejected any monarchical element in the mixed constitution and defended a republican self-contained city-state instead of a centralized monarchical republic, as Harrington. A. Weststeijn, 'Why the Dutch Didn't Read Harrington: Anglo-Dutch Republican Exchanges, c. 1650–1670', in Gaby Mahlberg / Dirk Wiemann (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 105 -120.

inhabitants of their liberties, livelihoods and lives and enslaving them all. His argument however entailed no rejection of monarchy as such, since his attack was directed specifically at a system of despotic rule that had only recently emerged in Europe, as we saw in his *Het welvaren der stad Leyden*. In *Interest van Holland* De la Court even deemed the monarchy of Louis XIV and other northern monarchies legitimate. He wrote against a hereditary kingly rule and office in the hands of the Orange dynasty. He proposed a harmony of interests between rulers and ruled that would uphold the rule of law and so could protect the freedom of trade and of religion. But how did the vocabulary of interest function in this treatise? On what grounds did De la Court attack the House of Orange? And how precisely did he perceive the relation between church and government? Furthermore, in what way should Holland function within the Dutch Republic and how should it, without the House of Orange, act in the European society of princes; what specific foreign policies should it follow? And, lastly, how did De la Court visualise 'true freedom' for Holland?

3.3 Reason of state and 'war despotism' in Interest van Holland

Interest of Holland consists of a long theoretical preface, in which De la Court's critique of certain princely practices is elaborated, and forty-seven chapters. First he analyses the interest of Holland, arguing that the foundations of Holland's splendour are fishery, commerce and manufacture (Chapters I-XII). It should be protected by the 'Freedom of all Religions', freedom of immigration and trade, and above all by a reduction of taxation (XIII-XVI). This splendour, however, is threatened by closed trade companies, by restrictions on immigration and religious worship, by heavy taxes and especially the high convoy burdens (XVII-XXI). The fundaments of Holland's interest are currently not maintained and certainly not enhanced, above all due to the pursuit of warfare by the Union (XXII-XXV). The analysis of Holland's interest is followed up with a profound critique of warmongering and robbing princes, explicitly condemning the princes of Orange as having robbed Holland of its liberties in their quest for military glory. De la Court backs this critique by stressing the fortunes the 'free government' (government freed from Orange) had produced by protecting the liberties of Holland's inhabitants (XXVI-XXI). After that, he offers his counsel on foreign policy and military affairs. Since external military invasion is very unlikely, the costly land forces are to be reduced. Military protection at sea, from a commercial viewpoint, is vital. He warns of alliances (defensive and offensive) with other rulers, since they contain a risk of being dragged into expensive and extremely destructive warfare (XXXII-XXXVIII). De la Court includes the other Dutch provinces in his anti-alliances view. Holland has no need for the Union of Utrecht since Holland is invincible with its fortified cities

and will no longer be forced into a war due to the dynastic ambitions and relations of the House of Orange, or be divided by internal rifts by the scheming of Orange (XXXIX-XLIV). He ends with three concluding chapters claiming that Holland's interest is best promoted through 'freedom, protection of the sea and peace'.[322] Throughout the entire contents of *Interest van Holland* De la Court identifies and underlines the greatest danger to Holland's splendour and inhabitants: the House of Orange.

His anti-Orangism in *Interest van Holland* can be divided into three parts conveyed through the terminology of 'interest'. Firstly, De la Court represented the province of Holland as a single political and societal entity, with its own 'interest'. In this way, he could present 'Holland' as a strong opponent of the House of Orange, and to a lesser extent of the other provinces, within the United Provinces. For his attack on the House of Orange, De la Court needed a proper protagonist, rather than some individual regents. Likewise, on a European level he presented 'Holland' as a force to be reckoned with, without the need for a prince of Orange leading troops into battle. Secondly, the author provided a critique of the nature of monarchical rule, which functioned as a theoretical framework for his rejection of the stadholderate. Thirdly, he analysed the interest of Holland in relation to the three 'super powers': Spain, France and England. He concluded that the only considerable external threat to Holland was Stuart-England, due to its dynastic connections with the House of Orange.

3.3.1 'Holland' unified in an 'interest'

In the first chapter, De la Court quite surprisingly wrote that because Holland was 'not one land, it cannot have one Interest.'[323] According to the author, historically the province of Holland consisted of multiple republics, by which he meant the cities, *poleis*. In line with Grotius' argument about Holland's ancient constitution, Holland's head of state was initially a count and this office was later filled by a stadholder, who was to be contented with his own domains, and as an administrator should accept the fact that every area and city ought to be ruled according to its own historically established laws and customs. It was immediately clear to the reader that the stadholder, however, had overstretched these legal limitations to his rule as the Spanish-Habsburgs Counts had done before him. Strategically, De la Court excused himself for his limited knowledge of all the multiple political bodies, which with 'diversity of Rulers, Subjects, lands, and situation caused necessarily a diversity of interests'.[324] So for the sake of argument he would go on to discuss all the specific interests of the different cities and areas under one title: 'the

[322] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 265.
[323] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 1.
[324] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 2.

interest of Holland'.[325] Viewing Holland as consisting of multiple republics was far from innovative, but his interest conception of Holland was a recent instrument in Dutch debates of the 1650s and 1660s, which De la Court presented in detailed analysis. Not civic virtues, but the interest of Holland formed the crucial analytical apparatus for asserting the province's supreme power.

Based on a geographical, demographic and historical analysis of Holland, De la Court argued that the foundations of Holland's splendour are fishery, commerce and manufacture, as well as extremely powerful and densely populated cities. From official documents, often appended to current affairs literature such as Aitzema's[326], he took various figures about Holland's population, economic activities and situation, such as fertile *morgens* of land (400,000), yearly income (11 million guilders), volume of salted fish or herring caught and sold (300,000 'lasten'), and men in whale trade traveling to the North (12,0000).[327] De la Court calculated the population of Holland, employment and profit rates in various sectors and concluded that Holland depended on fishery, commerce and manufacture (agriculture alone was insufficient to sustain its population). Fishery stimulated commerce and together they promoted manufacture, such as the fabrication of fishing nets, ships, salt, silk, flax, wool, which bound together the inhabitants of Holland. Furthermore, he explained in detail the historical rise of Holland as the most mercantile polity of the world.[328] He defined the interest of Holland as 'the conservation and expansion of the inhabitants of the Land, consisting of regents and subjects'.[329] The rich textile merchant described this splendour in demographic as well as economic terms, indeed, stressing a commercial interest for Holland. This splendour, however, was threatened by closed trade companies, by restrictions on immigration and religion, by heavy taxes, but above all, by warmongering princes, according to De la Court.

3.3.2 The 'interest' of 'war despotism'

The second part of De la Court's attack on the House of Orange was a fierce critique of certain coercive princely practices, i.e. his variation on attacks of 'war despotism'. This critique functioned as a theoretical framework for his rejection of the Stadholderate and the occupancy of the highest military office by a prince of Orange. In his preface, he provided a more general argument against bellicose policies of monarchies driven by self-interest. The reader was offered a detailed reasoning to show that Holland was better off without a prince of Orange in charge. De

[325] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 2.
[326] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 6, 65.
[327] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 5, 6, 10.
[328] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, [Chapters 2 – 12], 2-56.
[329] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.

La Court described the interests of monarchies and republics or as he called the latter: 'free governments'.[330] Interest meant the wellbeing of the rulers and subjects combined. He assumed that all men always preferred self-interest in all societies. Therefore he believed that a good government demanded that the rulers and the ruled had the same interests;

> 'While *any country's true interest* consists of the welfare of the *Rulers* and *Subjects* combined, and that in turn it evidently depends on *a good government*, so must men know that a good government is not where the well or ill-being of the subjects depends on the virtue or vices of the rulers; but (which is worthy of observation) *where the well or ill-being of the Rulers necessarily follows or depends on the well or ill-being of the Subjects*.'[331]

To follow the interest of state ought to be the object of government, as Rohan had argued, but for the Dutch textile merchant this explicitly meant the conservation and the numerical expansion of the inhabitants of Holland rather than the ruler's standing. Following recently articulated conceptions of human nature, De la Court regarded self-interest as an effective mechanism for constituting government, since he rejected Rohan's clear-cut opposition between erratic passions and guiding reason.[332] Therefore, De la Court argued for harmonising these interests of the rulers *and* ruled. Moreover, he reconstructed the Ciceronian notion of reconciling the self-interests of citizens with the general interest, not by stressing the primacy of the general interest, but taking private interests or self-love as the focal point to procure good government.

The harmony of interest argument, already present in the writings of Boxhorn and several English contemporaries, functioned primarily as a counter to the core Orangist argument. In the Orangist pamphlets three explicit tasks were emphasised for the stadholder. The first and most important was maintaining unity within the United Provinces; secondly, representing the *majestas* of the state; thirdly, supporting effective government by speeding up the execution of governmental decision-making. The strongest counterargument of anti-Orangist pamphlets was that the prince is driven by self-interest. By means of a comparable perspective of common interest versus self-interest, the stadholderless regime is justified and presented as necessary in these pamphlets.[333] In De la Court's case, under the rule of one, the prince's self-interest prevails over the self-interests of his subjects, making a harmonising of interests and therefore good government impossible. In this way, he radicalised Boxhorn's argument in

[330] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[331] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[332] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 39; See page 48 of this thesis for further explanation.
[333] Klashort, 'Metten de schijn van monarchie getempert', 111-112.

categorically rejecting the stadholderate or the command over the army for the prince of Orange within the Dutch constitutional framework.

Anti-Orangist arguments also expressed the fear that the pre-eminence of the stadholder would result in a monarchy; one way of making this point was to compare the office of stadholder and monarch, treating them as essentially the same. For De la Court the effective collapse of these offices into one was a means to accentuate the difference between a monarchy and a republic in the starkest of terms. The well-being of the people differed greatly in these forms of government. More importantly, the language of interest allowed him to frame his criticism of monarchical rule reflecting commentaries of 'war despotism'. De la Court delegitimised it by listing the specific mechanisms of a princely system of government that had deleterious effects on its subjects. According to De la Court, the first and true interest of all sovereigns was to build up their lands, empire or cities to such a powerful position, that these were protected against external violence. He contended that monarchs, lords and 'heads,' by their evil upbringing and living in splendour, followed their own lusts and handed over the government to favourites and courtiers, who would neglect this first interest. The interest of monarchs, and their favourites and court officials, was to maintain the powerlessness of their subjects. He defined the interest of church officials, courtiers and soldiers as follows: 'by corruption of government, enriching their selves, or seeking greatness, elevating the monarchic government to heaven for their own profit'.[334] Subjects of a monarch were deliberately deprived of knowledge and judgment by these 'leeches of the state'.[335] In contrast, the interest and '*the second duty of all Rulers of Republics* and *great Cities'* was to build and to maintain large and densely populated cities, in order that all governors, magistrates and inhabitants would see their profits rising. De la Court refers to existing and earlier European republics, where art, commerce and the population flourished extremely. With regard to the interest of Holland, he writes that: 'the people of the province of Holland couldn't encounter a greater evil than to be ruled by a monarch, prince or head.'[336]

De la Court promised the reader that he would conclude his preface with counterarguments against the commonly accepted view that a monarchy is the best form of government.[337] Actually, he aimed at rejecting the notion of the necessity of the stadholderate for the province of Holland, by explicitly questioning it. De la Court dismissed the idea of the blunt, factional and bad-tempered nature of Holland's men, which was often used as an argument for the necessity of an 'eminent head' backed by the rule of the Counts of Holland (King Philip II of Spain being the last officeholder) and their successors the Orange-stadholders

[334] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[335] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[336] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[337] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.

as historical proof. De la Court reversed this argument. Since Hollanders depended on fishery, manufacture and commerce, they were peaceful. Only in times of coercion and suppression by an eminent head would they rise up, and he referred to the period of the Counts as predecessors of the stadholders: 'The times of the previous Counts were *very horrifying times* […] with permanent abhorrent wars, revolts and atrocities caused by and solely to the benefit of the eminent Head'.[338] He continued this fictive debate by stating that one could argue that times have changed over the last century and so could ask himself if under the Orange-stadholders/captain-generals times were much happier than under the Counts. De la Court achnowledged the transformation of Holland by claiming that hundred years ago in the period of the Counts Holland largely depended on agriculture and its cities were militarily powerful, while the Counts had no great soldiers, fortified cities and finances, and could only rely on consent for troops and money. However, De la Court cynically followed this up by stating

> 'that Holland nowadays depends on *commerce*, and that an eminent *Head*, *Captain General*, or *Stadholder*, here would have a *bodyguard* in the *Hague*, place *of Summons*, as well as the favour of *a heavily financed army*, of all *Priests*, and through them, the favour of all *common inhabitants*. And that he, moreover, by the *Deputies* of the *Generalities*, could dispose as he pleases of *those invincible frontier-cities of non electing Lands* [Generality Lands under direct control of the States General, MBK], provided that he would enforce his power by no *foreign Alliances*. In this way he could in passing *overpower most of Holland's cities*, which *now lie open*, and therefor one could truly say: *that the Hollanders, by choosing such an eminent Head, would be ruled as ignorant lambs by an irresistible* [absolute, MBK] *Sovereign*.'[339]

With military and clerical support, the princes of Orange could easily conquer and coerce Holland's cities. He ends with the claim that 'a generation of people in freedom must *struggle*, before men can judge rightfully; in this way men must give the same to *God* and *time*, thereafter, if these *slavish adversaries* [Orange supporters, MBK] will be survived, to pass judgement *pro* and *con*.'[340] Freedom in this sense is simply defined as government without an Orange-stadholder and captain general and stands in strict opposition with servitude. The stark distinction he has drawn between monarchies and republics, is used above all to isolate the House of Orange as alien to Holland's interest. Rather than systematically rejecting monarchy, De la Court attacked the rule of the princes of Orange as necessarily enslaving peace-loving

[338] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[339] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[340] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.

Hollanders through military ambitions aided and abetted by religious indoctrination. It is a clear-cut example of what Marie Constant has called 'war despotism'.

An important part of De la Court's critique of the House of Orange was stressing the danger of the combined offices of captain general and stadholder being held by the princes of Orange. Opponents of *Interest van Holland* condemned him for this: 'under the pretence of political discourses, [De la Court] stirs up the state against the prince of Orange so that they will not make him captain general'.[341] De la Court regarded the offices of stadholder and captain general as incompatible, on the basis of a theoretical framework reiterating German and French critiques of 'war despotism'. He stated that even an 'eminent head' would always strive for a situation of continuous warfare with himself as supreme commander of the army. De la Court elucidated this statement in chapter 26, entitled: 'To disintegrate into a monarchy of one-headed government would mean an irreversible death.' First of all, De la Court sardonically wrote: 'Given that kings and captain generals are so unnecessary in times of peace and that their virtue is only obvious in times of war, so they forever cause strife throughout the world.'[342] Secondly, De la Court argued that when a great lord possessed an army, everyone's properties would be endangered even when his office was constitutionally restrained. Together with the soldiers 'the ignorant people will choose the side of a gentle, polite and courageous tyrant.'[343] The regents, including the wisest and most honest amongst them, would eventually have to accept violation of these constitutional restraints and eventually accept subjection.

Following this argument, De la Court stated that through his court and his army, a ruler would put a financial strain on all his subjects, but especially on its prosperous merchants. He made it clear that by ruler, he meant all monarchs, princes, dukes, counts, earls, but also and more importantly, 'stadholders and captain generals'. Their love for money was based on their love for luxuries and warfare.[344] As he had already said, warfare was a necessary means for a monarch to remain firmly on his throne. Interestingly, De la Court underlines the grave need for money of these war-driven regimes:

> '*Rulers*, their *favourites,* and *soldiers*, as being *evil householders*, continually seek money; at least to enrich themselves, at most to spend it to abundance and crazy wars and *nowhere could they find that more easily, than with the merchants,* who have many moveable goods, and are not part of government, these [goods/cash money MBK] are generally demanded to be loaned, or by refusal taken by force,

[341] Cited from Harms, *De uitvinding van de publieke opinie*, 155.
[342] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 70–71.
[343] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 71.
[344] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 71-72.

and in both cases the merchant has certainly lost his property.'[345]

Moreover, France, Spain, England, Denmark, Sweden and Poland also plunder the merchants at sea by their excessive tolls and their fleets,

> 'without protecting seaborne affairs, because the respective Rulers will not command the Fleets themselves, and thus must trust it to others; which neither they, nor their *favourites*, could be committed to, except that all crew and warfare at sea must be paid with cash; and *also because the favourites would rather plunder the treasuries of monarchs to enrich themselves, than to use this for the greater good of the country*.'[346]

In chapters 29 and 30 attributed to De Witt, the Grand Pensionary makes a case for, respectively, 'why the inhabitants of Holland, by the government of the princes of Orange, are no longer ruined by [the termination of] the government of the princes of Orange,' and 'what good fruit the principles of a free government have already yielded'. De Witt presents recent historical cases that demonstrate the war-despotic practices of the House of Orange. He states that the First Anglo-Dutch War and the wars in the Baltic region, which all happened during his regime, were the consequences of the dynastic relations of the House of Orange with the English king Charles II and the Elector of Brandenburg Fredric Wilhelm. The latter was married to Louise Henrietta of Nassau, daughter of Frederik Hendrik of Orange. After the death of the stadholder William II, De Witt had petitioned the English Commonwealth for renewal of the 1459-Treaty of Entrecours to protect Dutch commerce and fishery against the damaging Act of Navigation. He also asked the Rump Parliament for a friendship treaty. But according to De Witt, this was blocked by 'those who attached themselves as slaves to the house of Orange' and they instigated the 'dumb rabble' against the ambassadors.

In chapter 30 De Witt gives a few examples of the stadholders, driven by self-interest and passions and applying a divide-and-conquer policy in order to enhance their authority in the face of Orangist arguments about the necessity of the stadholder. The princes of Orange intervened militarily in internal conflicts not with the interest of Holland in mind, but purely on the basis of self-interest, producing chaos, civil disorder and bloodshed to subject the Dutch to their despotic rule. He states that 'the greatest rupture happened recently in the United Netherlands, [with] the sad division of the Province of Overijssel' in 1654. The stadholder of the northern provinces (Friesland, Groningen and Drenthe) William Frederick, Prince of Nassau-

[345] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 71-72.
[346] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 72.

Dietz and related to the House of Orange, had accepted the offices of stadholder and captain-general, offered to him by only a part of the provincial States of Overijssel. It led to extreme violence that lasted four years. Luckily, the intervention of 'the Grand Pensionary' brought the conflict to an end, as he praises his own actions. Worthy of observation is De Witt's reference to the ending of internal conflicts in Holland, which were in his opinion caused by the princes of Orange;

> '*all issues and disputes, which since the death of the late Prince of Orange have erupted in great numbers everywhere mostly by stirring up the desire for slavery, have been soothed and stopped with much better order and effect than in the past;* (…) whereas (…) the Stadholder often caused disputes, [and] always cherished [disputes], in order to further his interest and resources; (…) it being the maxim of all Grandees, *divide & impera*, divide and produce ruptures, so thy will rule'.[347]

Moreover, De Witt adds if the young prince had had the chance to stage a coup d'état in 1650, 'who could doubt, that the lust for revenge would have shivered the entire State [of Holland], and great quantities of Christian blood would have been sacrificed for that passion.'[348]

Besides countering Orangist arguments, De Witt also aims to justify the heavy tax burden of his regime. This, he argued, was a legacy of the rule of the Orange-princes, with their dynastic ambitions and lust for glory. Again, we encounter attacks on war-despotic practices of princes. The French piracy on Dutch commercial enterprises in the Levant during the years of 1650-51 had cost tons of gold. Nearly the entire treasury of Holland was spent on the ambition of the captain general to raise large land forces, amongst other things. The resources were squeezed from the Holland inhabitants uncompromisingly. As De Witt writes so powerfully: 'accepting that the sweat and blood of the good inhabitants of the same Province were squeezed.'[349] Under the pretext of peace with Spain parts of the fleet had been sold and the remaining fleet put towards fighting the Rump Parliament of England by the captain-general, to serve Orange family interests with the Stuart kings. To conclude the Grand Pensionary disqualifies the stadholder William II as one who is not interested in his political responsibilities. He describes monarchs such as William as mostly spending their time in 'hunting, bowling, dancing and other infamous debaucheries'.[350] The result was a massive tax burden for Holland amounting to thirteen million guilders in running debt and forty million in interest.

[347] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 127-128.
[348] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 129.
[349] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 100.
[350] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 101-102.

The stadholders and his flatterers financed large land forces, garrisons and citadels in order to threaten and eventually subject Holland. De Witt writes:

> 'And firstly, what concerns the aforesaid negotiated hundred and forty million guilders with the running debts, is it well known, and also easy to understand, that the same burden by the *Captain General* and his *flatterers*, strangles the good Regents, *because the aforementioned Capital has been wasted in the pursuit of ambition and glory by this said Captain General*, in order to set up large armies, and surprise sieges, which are still today, as said before, a heavy burden for Holland; and the thing to complain about the most was that when the abovementioned Frontier cities were placed at the disposition of the Captain General, with regard to the appointment of the *Governors*, or *Commanders*, and *the placement of garrisons* in the same [cities, MBK], when in every respect, this only served *to create so many citadels, in order to maintain Holland in shackles*.'[351]

De Witt writes about 'us ignorant poor Hollanders, who may rightly be called stupid Hollanders'. He makes a comparison to orphaned children who are unaware of the burdens they carry and have carried for the outrageous expenditures of the House of Orange, and even cry out for the experience of wealth under their previous guardian. He asks himself:

> '*how long shall we remain in our infancy, in our silly youth, without noticing that the splendour, that we experienced then, only came forth from the evil profligacy of that overspending guardian, who negotiated that Capital of hundred and forty million as our burden?* After all, we should understand, *that we first must be valued and trimmed, to yield and pay the interests of that Capital: from taxation only by our present wardens, otherwise the entire household would fall down*.'[352]

De Witt constantly referred to Holland's subjects under Orange as slaves or children, as legal possession or minors under a master or patriarch. Note that he defined the stadholderless rule as that of a warden, of a mere administrator of the household.

Interest van Holland is filled with references to slavery under Orange, with the Roman Law status of a slave, i.e. *alieni iuris* or being under the control and jurisdiction of another person, in contrast to the status of a free-men *sui iuris*, with the power over one's will and actions. De la Court equated the high politico-military offices of the princes of Orange with the

[351] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 96-97.
[352] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 99.

monarchical form of government, defining the latter simply as a one-headed rule. His argument was that the interest of all rulers was to coerce their subjects into powerlessness, in order that they would bear the war related burdens willingly as slaves. The combined offices of captain general and stadholder had proven to be the greatest danger to the privileges, properties and lives of Holland's inhabitants. The House of Orange had rapaciously taxed, stolen and extorted money. But what they amassed was always inadequate and so there were ever increasing debts. Orangist rule in the past had been a system in which courtiers, flatterers, soldiers and priests had played their destructive parts; and the stadholders now had to cope with the disaster that had resulted. De la Court's personal profit was made through commerce, which, he held, could provide the only justification for warfare. The intensity of the diatribe was partly driven by his own desire for office and partly by his knowledge that Orangist fortunes were reviving. He wished to come to the aid of an endangered ship of state and to alert wider opinion to the crisis of rule that might even see the re-instatement of a dynasty of Orange princes.

3.3.3 The 'interest' of Holland in Europe

The third part of De la Court's anti-Orangism was based on an interest analysis of 'Holland' in relation to other European rulers. In chapter 17 of the *Interest van Holland* De la Court explains that it is not his intention to analyse the interest of Holland in relation to the neighbouring countries for that 'will entail an endless knowledge and very great labour to develop and to devote to, which I find myself in every respect incapable of.'[353] This statement must be seen as an excuse, for he does try to sketch an interest analysis of Holland on a European level. In general, he discussed the desirability of forming alliances with neighbouring rulers, and in a more detailed manner he analysed the consequences of forming pacts with what he regarded as the greatest contemporary powers of Europe: 'France', 'Spain' and 'England'.[354] De la Court argued that no alliances (defensive and offensive) should be formed with any European ruler, to avoid the risk of being dragged into expensive and extremely destructive warfare. De la Court considers peace pacts acceptable, for they contain a mutual promise not to harm each other. But again, he emphasizes the disloyalty of princes, who would only use peace pacts to play for time before recommencing war. De la Court explains: 'because Kings feel never committed to any one, only to their *own greatness* and *lusts*, which they try to acquire [always]'.[355] He stated that by their nature, men pursue the improvement of their own position without regard for oaths, written pacts and seals. This Machiavellian maxim would not have shocked many readers

[353] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 145-146.
[354] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 145-146.
[355] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*151.

familiar with reason of state literature.[356] Rather cynically, he concluded: 'the State [has] neither blood nor religion', so '*trust not, then you won't be deceived*.'[357]

To protect the interest of Holland i.e., its fishery, manufacture and commerce, peace with other European rulers should be pursued at all times, and at almost any price.[358] Military protection of the sea, from a commercial standpoint, was very remote. Land forces were to be reduced to a necessary, but smaller number, for the costs are too high and the possibility of an external military invasion was very unlikely. De la Court included the other Dutch provinces in his vision. The defensive Union of Utrecht had proved to be highly unprofitable for the province of Holland, it paid the largest part of the Union's finances and received hardly any support, especially from the land provinces when Holland's interest was threatened.[359] Holland under (what he calls) the 'Free Government' can easily deal with external threats given its fortified cities, and will no longer be forced into a war by the dynastic ambitions and relations of the House of Orange. Internal conflicts cannot occur, because the princes of Orange with their combined offices of stadholder and captain general will no longer play the role of instigator in internal affairs.

Since the monarchies of Spain, France and England maintained a constant state of armament, they did not fear Holland. As Rohan had also stressed, a constant state of armament was a primal feature of the interest of every monarchy that wanted to thrive in European warfare. However, De la Court believed that Holland should not fear them. Holland could pursue its true interest in relation to the French monarchy, for France depended largely on the commerce with Holland. With regard to Holland's interest in the Spanish monarchy, De la Court tried to demonstrate why a war against Spain, much desired by the Orangist faction, would be mutually damaging. So in the interest of Holland, no alliances had to be made with the French and the Spanish monarchy.[360]

De la Court considered England to be the greatest threat to Holland. He warned the reader: 'Such an England now with *Scotland*, with extensive *manufacture* and shipping and greatly augmented in power will be formidable throughout Europe, especially as unlike *France* and *Spain* it is not ruled by *favourites* but by a king able to exert much force against his neighbours.'[361] However, just like Spain and France, England depended on the Dutch trade, so it would be reckless to declare war against Holland. Furthermore, the Dutch naval force could considerably damage the English fleet. Secondly, the treasury of Charles II could not support such warfare, and the Parliament would not easily grant him the necessary finances.

[356] Noel Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War*, 51
[357] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 151.
[358] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 151.
[359] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 145-159.
[360] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 60-164, 164- 167
[361] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 170.

Nonetheless, De la Court concludes that although Holland could significantly harm England, England could entirely ruin Holland. So the government of Holland should use soft and friendly words in their communication with Charles II. Cynically, De la Court adds that Holland should lay in wait, because it is, according to De la Court, only a matter of time before the newly restored English monarchy will degenerate due to the corruption of the king's favourites, and passions, or otherwise due to internal conflict and civil war.[362]

In Pieter's analysis of the English threat, the dynastic relations between King Charles II and his cousin the young Prince of Orange, are treated as an even greater danger.

> 'And above all, consider that we, to prevent a war with *England*, must not let ourselves be pushed into changing the State-wise Government [of provincial sovereignty, MBK] into a Monarchy, because *Leo vinciri liber pernegat*. The free lion must not be bound, is the motto Holland endeavours to live by. And if we, *with* a *free Government*, were to find ourselves compelled to meet the king in his wishes, (…) he would for his own self, desiring *absolute Sovereignty*, make us *the most wretched nation which could ever be governed by a Monarch*.'[363]

Interestingly, De la Court judged the French monarchy and other northern European monarchies as well governed by excellent rulers, under freedom according to the nature of the peoples. We have seen that in his preface De la Court gave counterarguments against the, by him asserted, common belief that a single rule should be preferred to a republican government, but actually he was concerned only with discrediting the notion that a stadholder was necessary for Holland. But he provided no systematic rejection of monarchy. He questioned the Aristotelian idea that by their nature some people must be ruled by a monarch, i.e. 'the peoples of Asia and Africa, as well as all European peoples situated toward the South'.[364] Since defenders of this idea had also to confess that 'the peoples situated more to the *North*, were more adequately governed by *an excellent Head* and enjoyed *more freedom*, likewise *from France onwards to the North luckily all absolute Monarchical Governments ceased to exist*'.[365] By this argument De la Court intended to discredit the notion of the necessity of an Orange-stadholderate and not to state a case for 'republicanism', as such. Remaining specific, he went on to reject the Orangist-argument that the allegedly factious nature of the people of Holland necessitated the rule of 'a very excellent Head'. i.e. an Orange-stadholderate. To the contrary, De la Court argued that the factious nature was the historically contingent result of the horrifying rule of the stadholders of

[362] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 168-179.
[363] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 176-177.
[364] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.
[365] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reeden.

Orange and their predecessors, the Counts of Holland.

This argument, which accepts, the existence of well governed monarchies and excellent monarchs is striking, for he claimed that 'freedom' could be pursued by subjects within a monarchy; for there was an essential difference in accountability between southern 'absolute', illegitimate and northern legitimate monarchical governments. Remarkably, as we have seen in *Het Welvaaren van Leiden*, De la Court had stressed recent developments of European monarchies, including France, Sweden and German princes, into barbaric and despotic governments, which is absent from *Interest van Holland*. Why did Pieter leave this argument out of *Interest van Holland*? Perhaps Johan de Witt regarded it as too diplomatically sensitive to be associated with such openly hostile critiques of neighbouring regimes, especially in view of De Witt's carefully defensive policy towards France; or perhaps it was the hands of his brother Johan de la Court in the respective treatises. The *Political Balance* even devoted a large section to the Turkish system of rule as 'the best monarchical government', although this praise is best seen as an ironic critique of a despotic system of rule.[366] In any case, De la Court acknowledged differences in the systems of government ruled by one person, but above all underlined the illegitimacy of bellicose despotic regimes. First and foremost, De la Court wrote *Interest van Holland* with the constitutional specifics of the Dutch Republic in mind; he wanted to diminish the Orange-threat and to justify the stadholderless regime, not to defend the moral superiority of republics over principalities.

3.3.4 Freedom of trade, religion and government

According to De la Court there were three policies necessary to sustain Holland's 'true liberty'. Firstly, the government had to improve commerce and reduce the land army, redeploying resources to strengthen the fleet. Secondly it should guarantee absolute freedom of conscience and private worship in order to stimulate the economy and temper the dangerous political influence of the clergy. The common people were blinded and stirred up by the preachers against their lawful government. Moreover, in light of their power-hungry ambitions, he claimed that the Reformed Church clergy, allied with the House of Orange, desired to overthrow the 'free government' of Holland. Thirdly and most importantly, all means must be used to exclude the stadholder and to protect the privileges, property and persons under the rule of law.

[366] V.D.H., *Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal* (Amsterdam, 1662), [Book 2] 172-229. This section was followed by Book 3 on monarchical government in Europe, in particular in France, explaining its high potential to disintegrate into a Turkish household rule, which had long been obscured by factional conflicts at courts and dynastic fragility.

De la Court devoted various chapters to restrictions, imposed by Dutch regents, which harmed the pillars of the *interest van Holland*: closed trade companies and guilds (chapter XV), high taxation (XVI), restriction of freedom of conscience (XVII), constraints on freedom of fishery and trade by the monopolies of the trade companies (XVIII), freedom of manufacture by restrictions on citizenship and membership of guilds (XIX). In view of his own social aspiration, his critique of Holland's regents who imposed limitations on citizenship to protect their monopoly of power, stands out.

However, given the present focus on De la Court's argument against destructive war policies of monarchs we will examine his critique of taxation. This was mainly directed against regents within Holland and other Dutch provinces who advocated military expenditures of Holland to the Union. In chapter 12 he exclaims: 'against these fundaments [fishery, trade and manufacture] many have erred'.[367] Taxation has been unreasonably increased over the past decades, so 'placing a strap around the neck through which all food should enter the body'.[368] He stresses that warfare maybe an excuse for raising and introducing taxes, as during the war against Habsburg-Spain**.** Then taxation on Holland's mercantile and manufacture activities was legitimated by the quintessential reason of state maxim, 'necessity has no law'.[369] However, 'it is now a great folly to maintain this (high taxation) when necessity has ended', when peace with Spain was concluded more than a decade ago.[370] Because the land provinces of Groningen, Overijssel, Friesland, Gelderland and Utrecht have always properly defended themselves against external land troops, they have not been pressured heavily by internal rifts. De la Court writes: 'as such there is no pretext of reason, to believe that these provinces, by Holland's money provided with bastions, artillery, weapons, and ammunition-buildings, now cannot protect themselves in full peace, with their own power and inhabitants against an attack by their much weaker neighbours.'[371] On the contrary, the land provinces do not want to contribute to naval forces, obstructing the much-needed defence for Holland's seaborne trade. And thus, he exclaims, now the time has come

> '*for Holland to manage its own interest*, to unburden itself of all expenses on those Provinces, and to spend that amount on its own defence on land, but predominantly at sea; because indeed, if that maxim of other Provinces, that the sea must support itself, is true; (…) then (...) Holland must always carry its own

[367] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 52.
[368] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 53
[369] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 54(Literally Dutch original expression: 'necessity breaks law')
[370] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 54.
[371] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 55

burdens, and those of the other Provinces; and in peace-time they should conversely fatten themselves with Holland's money in laziness and excess.'[372]

To defend Holland's reduction of land forces from the late 1640s onwards, De la Court also directs his critique of coercive war-tax politics against the other provincial States. Note that for the sake of argument, he conveniently left out the seaborne mercantile province of Zeeland. De la Court sets up an argument for Holland's absolute authority to decide over military matters and foreign policy interventions. As he says somewhat later in the text: 'Holland can perfectly maintain its *own interest*, [and] could make *a State on its own here in Europe*, without being dependent on any one else'.[373]

Remarkable in his attack on the house of Orange is his extreme anti-clericalism. Priests incite the common people in order to promote their own interests. He uncompromisingly advocates guaranteed freedom of religion as a counter to their power and it will attract immigrants no less than economic liberties.[374] He elaborates this in chapter XII titled 'Amongst the means to maintain this prosperous blessing of God, the first is the Freedom of all Religions'.[375] In this chapter he gradually intensifies his attack on Dutch orthodox Calvinist ministers. First he writes that the Reformed religion 'could not make up by far a hundredth part of the peoples' of the entire world and consists merely of one twentieth of all Europeans.[376] Moreover, hardly half of Holland's inhabitants are reformed, and following the contrary maxim of maintaining just one strictly exclusive denomination, the other half would have to be banished. Secondly, and more aggressively, he compares the Calvinist orthodox clerics and regents in the Dutch Republic to the Catholic Church and the Spanish Crown. Rome and the Spanish kings drove out adherents of other faiths and supported Catholic believers during uprisings in other polities. The chasing away of tenant-farmers, farmers and nobles is not only damaging, but cruel and unreasonable. This applies likewise for the regents and clergy of the Reformed Church:

'who always assert that *they have fought for the freedom*; that *in one country various public Religions can be practised peacefully;* (…) and that there [could be] *no bigger sign of a false Religion,* (…), than to prosecute dissenters: And that *by strict means of education the people are made averse, and obstinate in their own Religion. Persecutio est semen Ecclesiae*: persecution is always the seed of the church that is prosecuted; but after being persecuted because of religion the compliant attitude

[372] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 55-56.
[373] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 188.
[374] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 35.
[375] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 35.
[376] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 36.

> of the people generally change into power and violence, when they have become master themselves [over the religious affairs within a polity, MBK].'[377]

De la Court argues explicitly against the Voetian position of enforcing further orthodox reform of manners in society and of establishing one exclusive public church. He ties these hard-line arguments to the previous persecution of Protestants by Rome and the Spanish overlords in Holland, suggesting their tyrannical beliefs and actions and explicitly calling it a false religion. Cynically, he reasons that intolerant orthodoxy usually springs from suffering persecution as cruelty and violence could only bring forth the same rotten fruits. He ends this chapter condemning the clergy: 'Nothing pressures them, and they are free from inconveniences that plague other persons; to such an extent they [are] obsessed with arrogance, and violence. As covered with a garment.' [378] Here he refers to Psalm 73, echoing the jealousy towards the advantages and wealth of these non-believers. Not only does he equate the orthodox Calvinist clerics with non-Christians, he also calls them conceited, power-hungry and violent barbarians. In one of his letters, Pieter had even written that Voetians were 'godless men, much worse than atheists', who in their lust for power had ruined the fruits of the Reformation and Scripture.[379]

De la Court explains that the liberties upon which the interest of Holland depend, such as the freedom of private worship, are being violated. In chapter 17, titled 'That in Holland the freedom of Religion is troubled against all reason', he stresses that the great level of freedom of conscience in Holland, famously fought for during the Revolt and the focal attraction of many immigrants, is gradually diminishing. Along these lines, he sets himself in the tradition of Remonstrants like Grotius, who had famously argued for absolute freedom of conscience and governmental authority over church affairs (instead of church officials dangerously dividing the commonwealth by denominational disputes). Alluding to Maurice of Orange's interventionist actions in the religious troubles of 1618;

> 'since the year 1618 [government] gradually deferred from this praiseworthy maxim. (..) First by persecuting the Remonstrants, and banishing them to other Countries. Afterwards more and more thwarting the Catholics in their gatherings, that to enjoy this liberty, a heavy yearly taxation was imposed on the same [Catholics] in favour of the Bailiffs and Sheriffs; which is not less unreasonable than damaging to the Country; because in case we may not lose the advantages of

[377] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 36-37.
[378] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 37.
[379] Cited from Israel, *The Dutch* Republic, 673; Letter from Pieter de la Court to W. en J. van der Voort, Leiden on 27 September 1663, 'Brieven uit de correspondentie van Pieter de la Court en zijn verwanten (1661-1666)', J.H. Kernkamp (ed.) in *Bijdragen en Mededelingen van het Historisch Genootschap.* 70 (Groningen – Jakarta: J.B. Wolters, 1956).

> their residence and commerce, why should we prohibit that which without they cannot live here.'[380]

Thus, firstly Maurice's intervention on the side of the orthodox Counter-Remonstrants and then the gradual imposition of restrictions on Catholic worship undermined the freedom of conscience. Note that De la Court is not speaking of Catholic worship in public, but of 'small gatherings in the homes of known Citizens under the guidance of Clerics, dedicated to the Rulers.'[381] This last part underlines the importance, in De la Court's opinion, of priests loyal to De Witt-regime, instead of Voetians attacking the stadholderless regime with their dangerous mix of exclusive Orangism and orthodoxy. Finally, it is important to note that De la Court (like Hobbes) stresses the dangerous influence clergymen have on people's thoughts and actions through the pulpit and education. In his preface De la Court writes that the common people, 'barred from knowledge and judgment', is blindfolded and stirred up against the lawful regents by 'Clerics who strive for Dominion, of whom likewise some in Holland as well (God forbid), and the surrounding Provinces are found.'[382]

The title of chapter VIII grandly asserts: 'That all Inhabitants of Holland live in freedom, magnificently bound to each other by a shared well-being and ill-being.'[383] But it announces not smug self-satisfaction but an analysis in terms of fear and self-interest. According to De la Court, these dominate human nature and provide the driving force behind all actions of government, as Hobbes had argued. But it is not the sovereign that unifies society, but rather, the harmony of interests between ruler and ruled. Good government exists in such a way that the welfare of the subjects determined the welfare of the governors. In particular, fishing, manufacture and trade bind together the interests of the inhabitants of Holland in an economic chain. Thereupon De la Court deliberately misquotes Hobbes to oppose free government to an oppressive princely rule, or actually to oppose the stadholderless regime to an Orange-princely rule. He writes:

> '*Homo homini Deus in statu Politico*, man is a God to man under a good Government, which is for this Country an inexpressible blessing, that here so many people are fed by honest work, and primarily that the wellbeing of all Inhabitants (excluding the Nobles and soldiers) from the least to the most [fortunate, MBK], is

[380] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 43.
[381] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 43
[382] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, Voor-Reede. Hobbes likewise warns for the control priests have over the distribution of ideas, which can easily cause societal disintegration and opposition against governmental authority. Johan Sommerville states that in Leviathan, his main practical counsel is arguably the sovereign's control of the education and distribution of ideas. Johann P. Sommerville, 'Early Modern Absolutism in Practice and Theory', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), 117-130, p. 122-123.
[383] V. D. H., *Interest van Holland*, 15

so closely linked: and above all, *that no one truly is more committed to the country's wellbeing, than the Rulers of this Aristocratic government*.'

De la Court believed that the inhabitants of Holland were mutually interdependent and that the burdens were reasonably equally shared. Regents profit from the splendour of Holland's enterprises. Farmers can sell all their goods, for a large part of the population consists of non-agrarians. To procure good government was to ensure that the rulers and ruled shared the same interests. He concludes this chapter, again, with the greatest threat Holland's harmony of interests can encounter: re-installation of the House of Orange.

'Nevertheless this *praiseworthy harmony* could, and accordingly, will be broken, ruining all Inhabitants, none excluded, than courtiers and soldiers, by only one mistake, namely choosing a *supreme Head*, because given that the Lords, courtiers, nobles and soldiers necessarily prey upon the hard-working Inhabitants, they would use all their power to *their own benefit and to the disadvantage of the common* [people]; and in order that they would not be blocked by the great mighty Cities; they would obviously make all Cities small, and the inhabitants poor, in order that they without contradiction will obey. Such as men here always have to pray to God, *à furore Monarcharum libera nos Domine*, oh God *save Holland from a Head*.'

The last sentence we have already encountered regarding *Het welvaaren van Leyden*, wherein the brothers De la Court underlined the changes in early modern rule from rule by consent and law to a rule by coercion and domination as witnessed. In *Interest van Holland* Pieter did not stress this change, but simply equated such a belligerent and coercive rule with 'monarchical' rule, probably to further the polemical overtones of his anti-Orangist argument.

Like French debates during the 1630s, in the Holland pamphlet wars of the 1650s-1660s discussion was in terms of the interest of state, which course to follow in foreign policy, how this should be financed, which faction promoted it best, often in combination with a confessional allegiance. A great difference between Rohan and De la Court is in the handling of the nexus of aggressive war, wealth and oppression. Whereas Rohan delegitimised Habsburg-Spain as a tyrannical rule by conquest, a rapacious war machine, De la Court directly constructs the rule of Orange as a household government, robbing the inhabitants of their properties and privileges, effectively enslaving them all. With both writers interest (and the reason of state that comes with it), shapes an enemy, as it helps define a potential victim. Rohan, however, hides his attack

against Spain behind the form of satiric counsel. He stressed the misuse of religion by Spain. De la Court directly attacks the princes of Orange by asserting their despotic system of rule that is inherently destructive to the interest of Holland. Just as Rohan wants toleration of Protestants within France, De la Court goes further building on the tolerationist experiment of Holland by arguing anti-clerical liberty of conscience as part of Holland's interest.

Furthermore, De la Court presents a harmony of interests argument formulating his understanding of 'True Freedom' in Holland as the unspoiled possession and pursuit of privileges and property protected by the rule of law against warmongering princes, scheming priests and oligarchic regents. Henri Duc de Rohan had somewhat disassociated 'interest' from dynastic consideration, analysing the particularities of the lands of the ruler, which the ruler ought to consider in his policymaking. Yet, the Huguenot military leader primarily focussed on the standing of the French Crown in relation to its foreign counterparts and on the importance of a militarily strong anti-Spanish policy. By contrast, Pieter de la Court was extremely concerned with an internal threat.

The Orangist revival at the beginning of the 1660s dangerously pressured the minority regime of De Witt regime. Pieter had to make an exceptionally strong case for the stadholderless regime. Infused with new ideas of the passions, and the harmonising of interests, De la Court build up the case why Holland did not need an Orange-prince. The argument of Holland consisting of a nexus of great cities where the merchants controlled the political power was, however, conventional. The innovative part of his argument entails the combination of the idiom of interest with elements of contemporary critiques of 'war despotism', which transformed his case into the issue of why the House of Orange was Holland's natural enemy.

Already present in the earlier work of the brothers De la Court (*Het Welvaaren van Leyden*), 'monarchy' seems to be equated not so much with 'tyranny' as with a specific system of government, which robbed its subjects of their property and rights in order to pursue costly warfare. In *Interest van Holland* the features of this system are elaborated and applied to the Orange-Princely rule. Apart from the ruler, other important actors in this system are the 'courtiers', 'clergymen', 'soldiers' and 'favourites' and 'flatterers'. Because of the clergy, the ignorant rabble holds the prince in awe. Soldiers literally coerce subjects and together with the courtiers and the favourites, who practically run monarchical governments, they form the stakeholders of the war-despotic corporation.

The changes in early modern government were stressed and fiercely criticised, as we have clearly seen in De la Court's *Interest van Holland*. De la Court's attack on princely rule is extremely vicious, leaving out earlier views of the rise of a new type of monarchies to accentuate his anti-Orangism argument. However, Pieter does underline differences in monarchical governments, considering the western European monarchies as legitimate governments, where

subjects can enjoy their freedoms. His direct and open criticisms of *certain* coercive princely practices are not principally 'anti-monarchic' or 'republican'. The evils are common to different regimes; new and higher taxes, sale of and access to offices, state loans, state debts, and pursuit of warfare make the differences between republics and monarchies far less important than they have appeared in modern discussions of his work. How much, and for what purpose we might extrapolate a universalised republicanism from his work, is then, a moot point; but the relentless hostility to the 'new' monarchy of Orange is evident enough.

Chapter 4

Lisola and Louis XIV's French monarchy: universal monarchy and reason of state

Given his significance during the late seventeenth century, François-Paul Lisola's *Bouclier d'Estat* (1667) has been relatively little studied by modern scholars. There are, however, several more specific reasons for his inclusion in this thesis. First, the work exhibits an extensive use and criticism of Rohan's seminal *De l'interest*. As it used to be urged that Marx was Hegel stood upon his head, so Lisola inverted the whole thrust of Rohan's understanding of interest and reason on state. It is a relationship that has hardly been explored, and indeed it displays the polemical dexterity with which the topoi of interest and reason of state could be deployed. Second, Lisola is as important to Valkenier's rejection of De la Court's understanding of Dutch interest as Rohan. Third and more generally, an account of *Bouclier* illustrates how an international context of argument is important for understanding works with a Dutch domestic focus.

François-Paul de Lisola (1613-1674) was one of the first authors to warn Europeans about the French dangerous desire to erect a 'universal monarchy'. In 1667 his book was published (anonymously) with the telling title *Bouclier d'Estat et de justice, contre le dessein manifestement découvert de la Monarchie Universelle, sous le vain prétexte des prétentions de la Reyne de France*. It was a response to French propaganda justifying Louis XIV's invasion of the Spanish Netherlands in 1667. The military offensive was preceded by a propaganda campaign, wherein French publicists and lawyers claimed a territorial compensation for the non-payment of Queen Maria Theresa's dowry, Louis XIV's wife and daughter of Philip IV of Spain. Due to incessant warfare, Spain was bankrupt, as Mazarin had already predicted at the time. The French pamphleteers dug up a private inheritance law from the province of Brabant, the so-called 'right of Devolution' to nullify the Queen's renunciation of all rights to her deceased father's estate, renounced at the marriage of 1660. This 'War of Devolution' was a clear proof that after the Peace of the Pyranees (1659) the balance of military power between Rohan's poles of European politics, France and Spain had decisively shifted towards Louis and his expansionary policies. The fear generated by what was increasingly seen as an attempt to establish France as a universal monarchy helped make *Bouclier* an immediate bestseller. It was translated in six languages, including Dutch and English, and underwent twenty editions.[384] *Bouclier* turned out

[384]*Bouclier d'Estat et de justice contre le dessein manifestement découvert de la Monarchie Universelle, sous le vain prétexte des pretentions de la Reyne de France* ([Brussels: François Foppens], 1667); *Verdedigingh van staet en gerechtigheyt: tegens het baerblijckelijck ontdeckt voorneemen der gantsche monarchye, onder d'ydele deckmantel der pretentien, of eysschingen van de koningin van Vranckrijck. Mitsgaders De rechten der koningin van Vranckrijck, door de Franschen gepretendeert, &c. van hen selven krachteloos gemaeckt, en vernietight. Alles uyt de Fransche Tael vertaelt.* (Amsterdam [1667]); *The Buckler of State and Justice Against The Design manifestly discovered of the Universal*

to be the standard work for anti-French pamphlet literature in Europe during the later military conflicts with the Sun King.[385] In France it was a crime to read the work.[386]

As I shall show, much of Lisola's attempted refutation relied upon reason of state arguments he took directly from Rohan but gave them added force by turning them against France. Recent research has argued that during the seventeenth century there was an increasing stress on the 'economic (national) interest' at the expense of arguments reliant on notions of natural law; with this apparent shift went a fear of universal, effectively predatory monarchy and the need to maintain a balance of power.[387] Remarkably, *Bouclier* is largely overlooked in this dominantly Anglophone research. The historian Charles-Édouard Levillain, however, has studied Lisola and *Bouclier* as 'the intellectual origins of the Anglo-Dutch Alliance of 1677.' The historian remarks that the scholarship on early modern anti-French polemic is caught in national webs, as Dutch historians may claim Dutch Protestants founded this discourse, while English authors will say English Protestants originated it. Instead, Levillain stresses, 'the fuel for anti-French, anti-catholic and, by extension, anti-Stuart propaganda was provided by a publicist called François-Paul de Lisola, who was no Protestant but originally the catholic servant of the catholic Holy Roman Emperor.'[388] In his recent book Levillain even underlines an intellectual correlation between Lisola and Slingsby Bethel, both of whom were involved in the London radical underground. As we have discussed in the chapter on De la Court, Bethel's famous interest analysis was indebted to De la Court's one; and it appears that he probably was also inspired by Lisola's text.[389] The few references to Lisola encompass his revitalisation of Rohan's

---

Monarchy Under the vain Pretext of the Queen of France her Pretensions. Translated out of French. (London: James Flesher, 1667). All further references are to this English edition; Lisola wrote this work anonymously, but in the year of its publication, his authorship was already known. This appears from letters written by Lisola and later references of authors. Markus Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk des kaiserlichen Diplomaten Franz Paul Freiherr von Lisola (1613-1674). Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Absolutistischem Staat, Öffentlichkeit und Mächtepolitik in der frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1994),165. Read there p. 357-381 for an overview of every edition and translation of *Bouclier* and other writings by Lisola.

[385] Martin Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde. Politische Feindbilder in der reichspatriotischen Publizistik zwischen Westfälischem Frieden und Siebenjährigem Krieg* (Mainz: Philipp von Sabern, 2004), 48-49, 330-333, 379-381.

[386] A case is known of Charles Patin, the son of the celebrated physician and memorialist Guy Patin, who had to flee Paris because the book was found in his home. Herbert H. Rowen, *The king's State: proprietary dynasticism in early modern France* (New Brunswick, N.Y.: Rutgers University Press, 1980), 107.

[387] Steve Pincus, 'From holy cause to economic interest: the transformation of reason of state thinking in seventeenth-century England', in Houston and Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 272-298; Richard Devetak, 'The fear of universal monarchy': balance of power as an ordering practice of liberty', in Tim Dunne and Trine Flockhart (eds.), *Liberal World Orders* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 121-137; Slingsby Bethel, *The World's Mistake in Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1668); Slingsby Bethel, *The Present Interest of England Stated* (London, 1671); Slingsby Bethel, *The Interest of Princes and States* (London, 1680);

[388] Charles-Édouard Levillain, 'The intellectual origins of the Anglo-Dutch Alliance, 1667-1677', *Séminaire de recherché sur les îles Britanniques, XVIIe & XVIIIe siècle*, accessed February 9, 2016, URL http://britaix17-18.univ-provence.fr/texte-seance5.php.

[389] Charles-Édouard Levillain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV. Diplomatie et discours d'opposition à l'époque modern. Le cas François-Paul de Lisola (1667-1674)* (Paris, Tallandier, 2015), 183-184. With 'radical' Levillain refers to restoration radicalism; London was a hotbed of dissenters. Richard Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

notion of universal monarchy and the idea of the balance of power.[390] The importance of both of which are emphasised by Levillain and Markus Baumans.[391]

This chapter proposes a reinterpretation of Lisola's *Bouclier* precisely by examining how he employed *De l'interest* of Rohan. It argues that Lisola deliberately used Rohan's interest analysis to turn it against the French monarchy itself; the imperial diplomat presented the text as the blueprint of the French war machine. From this follows that he indeed rejuvenated Rohan's accusation of universal monarchy by reversing its application from Spain to France. As a corollary, France became the predatory threat to Christendom, Spain the peace-loving defendant of law and balance. In Spain lay the image of good government. Throughout irony was the principal trope used to invert Rohan's satiric condemnation of Habsburg Spain. The argument would form the basis for later anti-French polemics in the Dutch Republic and England, and would contribute to subsequent attempts to reconstruct the rule of law, such as in *'t Verwerd Europa* by Valkenier.

Before examining *Bouclier* in detail we will look into Lisola's diplomatic and literary career, then into the nature of the French pamphlet campaign leading up to the War of Devolution, which provoked his response. Thereafter we will discuss the rise of the French monarchy from the 1650s onwards and 'the myth of absolutism', as Lisola accuses Louis XIV of ruling as an 'absolute' monarch.

4.1 Illustrious diplomat and anti-French pamphleteer during the rise of Louis XIV

Three issues stand out when reviewing the biographical literature on Lisola. First his anti-French standpoint seems to be a thread common to his career as a publicist and imperial diplomat. Most of his diplomatic activities at several European courts are characterised by attempts to raise opposition and/or to form alliances against the increasing influence of Louis XIV, his ministers, diplomats and publicists in Europe. However, Lisola often instigated these anti-French activities on his own initiative and ignored orders from the imperial court in Vienna. As a result, he made a lot enemies. French diplomats, as well as prominent members of the

[390] Amongst others, Herbert H. Rowen, *The Ambassador Prepares for War: The Dutch Embassy of Arnauld de Pomponne 1669–1671* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957), 108; Michael Sheenan, *The Balance of Power. History and Theory* (London/New York: Routledge, 2004), 40-41; Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 177*;* John Roberston, 'Empire and union: two concepts of the early modern European political order', in John Robertson (ed.), *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3-36, p. 21; Wrede, *Politische Feindbilder,* 375; Charles-Édouard Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 5.

[391] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 198; Levillain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV*, 61, 177; Moreover, a nineteenth-century monograph on Lisola exists: Alfred F. Pribram, *Franz Paul Freiherr von Lisola (1613-1674) und die Politik seiner Zeit* (Leipzig: Verlag Von Veit & Comp., 1894).

imperial court and even Dutch and English officials were often frustrated by his relentless anti-French manoeuvring.

4.1.1 High-profile diplomat

François Paul de Lisola was born to a wealthy family in Salins in 1613. His father, Jerome Lisola, was of Italian origin and received citizenry of Besançon in the Spanish Franche-Comté in 1592. Jerome Lisola worked his way up from a clerk of the Archbishop to the highest magistrate at the representative Spanish-Habsburg court in Besançon. On 20 December 1633 François Paul de Lisola received a doctorate in law at Dôle and began practising law.[392] During this time a conflict rose between the Spanish King Philip IV and the city council over newly introduced taxes to finance the construction of fortifications in the battle against France. Lisola emerged as the leader of the city's faction that resisted these taxes by invoking the city's autonomous status, established under the Habsburg Emperor in the fourteenth century. The conflict escalated and the Spanish Governor decided to present the issue to the Emperor Ferdinand III. Consequently, Lisola travelled to Vienna to defend his case at the imperial court. There he was noticed by Count Maximilian Trautmannsdorf, who recommended Lisola to the emperor.[393]

Lisola became an high-profile diplomat, developed the reputation of a 'trouble-maker',[394] struggled with pro-French factions at foreign courts as well as in Vienna, and participated as an intermediary in many famous diplomatic issues, executing 'shuttle-diplomacy'[395] in the complexity of European negotiations. On his first mission Lisola was sent to London to attempt to persuade Charles I to take a neutral stand in the Franco-Spanish conflict. Yet due to the powerful French influence at court he was unsuccessful. The governor of the Spanish Netherlands, Manuel Castel-Rodrigo invited him to take part in the negotiations amongst the opponents of France in the Thirty Years' War. During his stay in Brussels, Lisola's London residence was looted, allegedly initiated by French envoys. In that same year, Trautmansdorff sent him to the negotiations in Münster, where he tried on his own instigation to forge an alliance between Brussels and Vienna, which Trautmansdorff forbad him in several letters. Moreover, the French diplomats complained about Lisola's hostile attitude towards their monarchy. After a quiet stay at the Polish court in 1648 and 1649, Lisola resumed his anti-French stand and supported Castel-Rodrigo in his effort to 'free' the cities of Breisach, Strasburg, Freiburg and Basel from French influence. At the peace dealings of the Second Northern War

[392] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 3.
[393] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 127-128.
[394] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 5.
[395] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 3.

(1655-1660), Lisola achieved notable success, as the Emperor was seen as the protector of peace and France as the war-monger. As a reward for his efforts, Lisola was granted the title of 'Freiherr' in 1659.

Throughout the 1660s, he faced fierce opposition at several courts, as in 1660-1661 when the Polish King requested Vienna to recall Lisola; and his desired diplomatic appointment in Regensburg was blocked by his enemies in Vienna several times. In particular Lisola encountered French obstruction, such as at the Court in Madrid in 1664, and, during his journey from Madrid to London in 1666. In this period, relations between the two Habsburgs branches were severely cooled and the Spanish court was dominated by a strong pro-French faction that successfully thwarted Lisola's attempts to revitalise the Habsburgs connection. During the journey to London, Lisola had taken caution to sail around France, however, several attempts on his life were made, supposedly organised by the French.[396]

In 1666 and 1667 Lisola stayed in London, from where he visited Brussels at the beginning of 1667, to promote peace talks between England and the Dutch Republic, designed to conclude the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667). In April and May he held several unsuccessful talks with Johan de Witt. In May, Louis XIV declared war on Spain and invaded the Spanish Netherlands. The emperor and his councillors were hesitant to take action, and the princes of the Holy Roman Empire, especially those in the, so-called, 'League of the Rhine' with Louis XIV, were reluctant to intervene, which rather frustrated Lisola and Frederico Castel-Rodrigo (the new governor of the Spanish Netherlands). Eventually Lisola succeeded in his mission as the Republic and England signed a peace treaty on 31 July 1667. During that summer, while Louis and his troops took city after city with little opposition, Lisola wrote *Bouclier*. In August 1667 it was printed, which marked the start of his anti-French publication stream.

In that month, he travelled back to London. The Under Secretary of State, Sir Joseph Williamson, received various anonymous warnings about his 'noxious underground influence'.[397] However, Lisola stood in direct and good contact with the Secretary of State, Henry Bennet, 1st Earl of Arlington, who was head of the Spanish faction at court and who sponsored the publication of Lisola's book. Besides Arlington, the imperial diplomat associated with George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham with whom he engaged (together with Bethel) in the radical circles of London. Through them he attempted to set up a pro-Habsburgs faction at court. Although England was technically at war with France (supporting its ally the Dutch Republic), the court was predominantly pro-French and, thus, Lisola's official mission, i.e. to promote a coalition between England, the emperor and other European powers, proved extremely difficult. What Lisola did not know, was that on 19 January 1668 the Emperor Leopold I signed a secret

[396] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 3-4; Baumanns , *Das publizistische Werk,* 129-131.
[397] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 5.

agreement with Louis for the partition of Spanish-Habsburg possessions expecting daily the death of the sickly five-year old Spanish King Carlos II. Moreover, Charles II was extremely reluctant to form a Habsburg alliance when he had already committed himself to France. France's military successes in the Spanish Netherlands, however, forced European regimes into action. The Dutch Republic and England had already signed the Peace of Breda in July 1667 and further negotiations between the two regimes resulted in a coalition treaty in January 1668, which Sweden joined soon afterwards. Lisola contributed profoundly to this Triple Alliance (that promised military intervention against French aggression), which eventually led to the peace treaty of Aachen in May 1668.[398]

Lisola had tried to include the emperor in the alliance, but Leopold was unwilling, and the pro-French faction at the Vienna court intensified their campaign against Lisola's diplomatic manoeuvres. Lisola seemed untouched by this and after his unauthorised stay in Aachen he went to The Hague to discuss matters of the alliance, especially subsidy payments. Although Lisola was called back to Brussels, his efforts for a strong anti-French alliance were not entirely unfruitful, because in January 1670 England, Sweden and the Dutch Republic signed a treaty, which assured military support should France violate the Treaty of Aachen. Spain joined the coalition in May 1670. Although the French occupation of Lorraine greatly concerned the Emperor, he was pressured, due to his fragile relationship with the princes of the Empire and severe lack of funds, to sign a treaty with Louis in November 1671, by which he promised not to intervene in conflicts outside the Habsburg dominion. In the run-up to the Franco-Dutch War (1672-1679), French diplomats locked in European rulers by various treaties and alliances, such as the secret Treaty of Dover (1670) with King Charles II to leave the Triple Alliance in exchange for substantial financial support. Moreover, Louis signed treaties with the Swedish King Charles XI and the Prince-Bishopric of Münster and Archbishop-Elector of Cologne. At the time of the French invasion in the Dutch Republic in the summer of 1672, Lisola stayed in The Hague. He discussed the Dutch defences with the reinstalled Stadholder William III of Orange and negotiated an alliance with the Emperor (military aid in exchange for considerable sponsorship), which was signed in October of that year. Yet, the treaty still gave Leopold room to manoeuvre towards France, against Lisola's counsel. The imperial military advance encountered many obstacles and Leopold was ready to join the peace negotiations in Cologne, organised by Sweden.[399] From June 1673 peace talks were held in Cologne. Lisola gained a few successes, in convincing the last reluctant German princes to join the anti-French coalition, but negotiations proved to be difficult, since France wanted to sign peace with each party individually, especially

[398] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 144; Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 7.
[399] Perhaps there he met Petrus Valkenier, suggested by Eco O.G. Haitsma Mulier, 'Die Politisch-historischen Ideen von Petrus Valkenier', in Albert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2004), 108-122, p. 118.

the Dutch Republic. In the summer of 1674, Lisola had to return to Vienna because of ill-health. He became one of the intimates surrounding Leopold and was finally given an office at court, which he had long desired. He died there on 9 December 1674, but even on his deathbed Lisola tried to convince Leopold that he ought to ally with the Swedish King. [400]

4.1.2 Polemical publicist

According to the historian Kenneth Haley, Lisola's 'greatness was as a publicist rather than an ambassador; *Bouclier d'Estat* was only the most famous of several directly propagandist writings which did much to influence European political opinion against France'.[401] Although Lisola was one of the most notable ambassadors of his time, by his unabashed and polemical anti-French actions and words, he was scolded for his undiplomatic francophobia by people, such as Johan de Witt and the English ambassador in The Hague, Sir William Temple.[402] After *Bouclier***,** Lisola wrote many other pamphlets, all including anti-French polemics and a call for a European wide coalition against the rise of France. The historian Markus Baumanns remarks that his later works are more refined; Lisola developed his ironic tone, and the rather obscure structure in *Bouclier* was replaced by more direct and clear argumentation.[403] Furthermore, Baumanns clarifies problems concerning the supposed authorship of Lisola's texts, which, he argues, have two causes. Firstly, printers and book traders often published under false names and feigned printing places. Many anti-French pamphlets were however printed in the Dutch Republic, for example by the printing house of Elsevier. Secondly, Lisola's fame led to contemporaries assigning randomly anti-French texts to him. Lisola complained about this practice and about the fact that printers and publishers falsified his writings or bound them together with other writings, attributed to him. [404] While many attributions to him are questionable, Lisola's authorship of *Bouclier* is certain and was established very early. Soon after its publication contemporaries knew that he wrote it.[405]

During the peace talks in Aachen in 1668 Lisola wrote *Remarques sur le Procedé de la France, Touchant la Negociation de la Paix*. He added to the text authentic documents and letters from the Spanish and French sides, in which he criticised French politics of consensus regarding the occupied parts of the Spanish Netherlands. Lisola stated that the talks in Aachen functioned

[400] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 149-157.
[401] Kenneth H.D. Haley, *An English Diplomat in the Low Countries: Sir William Temple and John de Witt, 1665-1672* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 317.
[402] Haley, *An English Diplomat,* 317-318. Temple and Lisola stayed in The Hague at the same time and negotiated about the Triple Alliance in 1668 in Brussels.
[403] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk*, 197-198.
[404] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk*, 165; Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 4.
[405] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 68 en 71.

as a pretext for Louis and his ministers. In reality France wanted to obstruct the negotiations.[406] On several occasions the imperial diplomat responded to current political affairs. The French advance in Lorrain of 1670 was discussed by Lisola in *Esclaircissements sur les affaires de Lorraine pour tous les princes chrestiens* (1671). The positive attitude of the Duke of Lorraine towards the Triple Alliance allegedly frustrated Louis. Lisola likewise warned about the consequences of the seizure of Lorraine for the rest of Europe, being a first step towards French universal dominion.[407] In various pamphlets Lisola tried to influence European opinion that France attempted to set a precedent by annexing the Spanish Netherlands, Lorraine and the Dutch Republic in order to take Europe in its entirety.[408]

4.1.3 Bouclier*: reason of state and legal argumentation*

French authors attempted to justify the new orientation of Louis's foreign policy from the mid-1660s onwards by presenting it as a necessity in a massive propaganda campaign. They often opposed the traditional image of the Spanish hegemony in Europe against the French monarchy.[409] In addition, they employed legal arguments to buttress Louis's claims on certain parts belonging to both branches of the Habsburgs dynasty. These legal claims had already been created by Cardinal Richelieu's jurists, based on feudal property rights, private law and natural law, and took centre stage in the War of Devolution.[410] Notably, Lisola read most of these authors at the university of Dole, a renowned law university. *After* the death in 1665 of the Spanish King

---

[406] *Remarques sur le Procedé de la France, Touchant la Negociation de la Paix* (1667); Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk*, 360.

[407] *Esclaircissements sur les affaires de Lorraine pour tous les princes chrestiens* (Strasbourg, 1671); Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 363.

[408] *Suite du dialogue sur les droits de la reine Très-Chrétienne. Par où se découvre la vanité des prétentions de la France sur les Pays-Bas* (Brussells : François Foppens, 1668); *Conférence infructueuse de Windisgrats, ou Violence de la France à obtenir la Lorraine avec ce qui s'est passé là-dessus d eplus remarquable* (Charleville, 1671); *La Sauce au Verjus*, Strasbourg, 1674. *Entretien sur les affaires du temps* (Strasbourg, 1674); *L'orateur français ou harangue de l'archevêque d'Embrun, interprétée par les événements de notre temps et l'état des affaires présentes* (Cologne: Martin Lambert, 1674); *L'apologiste refuté ou response aux calumnies de certain prétendant justifier les guerres de France contre les mouvements et la justice des armes de Sa Majesté Imperiale* (Cologne, 1674) ; see for a recent overview of texts by or attributed to Lisola, Levillain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV*, 373-374.

[409]Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde*, 327-328; Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, 118; Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 3.

[410] For example the jurists Pierre Dupuy and his co-author Denis Godefroy had to list all foreign polities and principalities, which the French Crown may claim. *Traitez touchant les droits du roy très-chrestien sur plusieurs estats et seigneuries possedées par divers princes voisins: et pour prouver qu'il tient à juste titre plusieurs provinces contestées par les princes estrangers* (3 editions : Paris, 1631; 3 editions : Paris, 1655; 2 editions : Paris, 1670); The jurist Jacques de Cassan wrote in 1632 a legal argument of the rights of the French king to certain Habsburg-Spanish dominions. *Recherches des Droits des Rois de France sur les Royaumes, Duchés, Comtés, Villes et Pays occupé par les Princes sur les Royaumes, Duchés, Comtés, Villes et Pays occupés par les Princes Etrangers* (Paris, 1632; Rouen, 1634;Paris, 1646, 1649 and 1663). Cassan also wrote a pamphlet in 1665 based on the Brabant law of devolution to substantiate the French claim on the Spanish Netherlands. *Deductio Ex qua probatur clarissimis Argumentis non esse Ius Devolutionis in Ducatu Brabantiae nec in allis Belgii Provinciis Ratione Principum earum, prout quidem conati sunt asserere* (1665). Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 83-84. Notably, Baumanns considers Rohans *De l'interest* as belonging to Richelieu's campaign as well. Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 84.

Philip IV, leaving the throne to the sickly minor Carlos II, Louis XIV seized the opportunity. However, he did not simply stake his claim by military force, but, first of all, attempted to persuade European rulers of his entitlement to parts of the Spanish Netherlands through a massive pamphlet campaign. Louis's lawyers presented the War of Devolution as no French invasion, but as reclaiming his wife's rightful inheritance. [411]

Lisola responded specifically to two of such French pamphlets. The first was *Traité des droits de la Reine Tres-Chrestienne sur divers Estats de la Monarchie d'Espagne* by the jurist Antione Bilain, commissioned by the French minster Colbert and published by the royal printer in Paris in various editions and translations including German, English and Spanish.[412] Bilain declared the Queen's renunciation of her inheritance rights null and void, based on natural law, *droit divin* and various other legal categories to defend the inalienability of these rights. Secondly, he legitimised Maria Theresa's rights by the Brabant law of devolution that property 'devolved' upon the children of a first marriage, whether female or male.[413] Bilain's tract was handed to the English ambassador in Paris by the foreign minister, Hugues de Lionne, to circulate the legal text in England. Copies were apparently found at every court in Europe.[414]

The second pamphlet was written Antoine Aubery's *Des justes Prétentions du Roy sur l'Empire*. This pamphlet was not authorised by the Crown for its strongly polemical contents. Aubery did not only claim the imperial throne for Louis XIV, but the entire Empire itself. According to French Salic Law, Aubery argued that the Merovingian, Carolingian and Capetian dynasties formed the 'present' French monarchy and thus their possession belonged to the French Crown. Notably, he defended the right to newly conquered lands by reason of state that subjects juridical considerations. He demonstrated Louis's direct descent from Charlemagne, thus deemed the Emperorship of no value without the rule of France. Moreover, the imperial title was chosen (unlike the French kingship), and consequently not sovereign by nature. French kingship was therefore of a supreme and stable quality compared to the German 'kingship'. Aubery concluded that every European ruler, including the Emperor, were mere vassals of the French kings, as the true descendants of Charlemagne. France was, according to Aubery, the first and most sovereign monarchy of Christendom. To reduce the potential for conflict with the German princes, he was put in the Bastille. Yet, five weeks later he was released. The Spanish

411 Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 81-83, 166-167; John A. Lynn, *The Wars of Louis XIV 1667-1714* (Routledge; New York 2013), 105-106.
412 Antoine Bilain, *Traité des droits de la Reine Tres-Chrestienne sur divers Estats de la Monarchie d'Espagne* (Paris, 1667).
413 Maria Theresa was the youngest and the only living child from the first marriage of the Spanish King Philips IV with Elisabeth of France. From his marriage with Maria Anna of Austria, two children lived in 1667, of which the youngest child became King Carolus II. Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk*, 88-91.
414 Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 4.

Governor apparently confronted Lisola with these French pamphlets at Lisola's arrival in Brussels in May 1667.[415]

The 'guerre de plume' escalated with Lisola's publication in August 1667. French troops entered the Spanish Netherlands in May 1667. He wrote *Bouclier* between May and July and in August it was published.[416] Herbert H. Rowen as well as Levillain state that, although Lisola rebutted the devolution claim on legal grounds, Louis made a strong legal case for his rights to the Spanish Netherlands.[417] Previous commentaries on Bilain's case of the right of devolution had deemed it 'plausible', as the diplomat-historian Lieuwe van Aitzema validated it, or, as the jurist Peter Stockmans, who had to admit the patrimonial character of the Low Countries, which Charles V had willingly given away at the marriage treaty between Philip II and Mary Tudor in 1554, favouring their children over Philip's son, Don Carlos, of his first marriage.[418] Lisola's reponse was preceded by the *Deductie* (1667) of Stockmans stating that customs in private property were not applicable to dynastic succession. However, *Bouclier* became the most important rebuttal of the devolution claim. Gottfied Wilhelm von Leibniz, for instance, wrote in 1696 that Lisola's legal was infinitely superior to that of Stockman's, and Pierre Bayle thought that *Bouclier* was unmatched in its fire and rhetoric.[419]

As we saw in the chapter on Rohan, under Richelieu's ministry, reason of state was appropriated by the government to justify certain political actions deemed illegitimate, but argued as necessity in extraordinary circumstances. The extensive debates on reason of state made the extraordinary ordinary and, furthermore, it became a popular tool to criticise government.[420] As a result, from the 1660s onwards the Crown began sponsoring 'royal panegyric' history writing celebrating the glory of Louis first and foremost, instead of Tacitist 'critical political history'.[421] The French minister Colbert placed numerous historians, poets, scholars and artists on the payroll, such as the Jesuit René Rapin, who in his *Instruction sur l'histoire* (1677) attacked Tacitus and criticised the use of reason of state in (political) writings.

---

[415] Antoine Aubery, *Des justes Prétentions du Roy sur l'Empire* (1667). The extremity of this is interesting in itself and would certainly have encouraged a paranoia about France's expansionist intentions—presumably why he was locked up for a while. It was a feature of late medieval religious polemic- papal apologists would claim for the pope direct control over everything precisely when Rome was having trouble getting its own candidates appointed to bishoprics- it alerts us to the fact that hyperbolic mismatch of right and reality was itself a part of polemics; Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde,* 328; Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 95-100, 165.

[416] Levillain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV*, 97.

[417] Rowen, *The king's State, 106;* Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 4.

[418] Rowen, *The king's State,* 104; [Pierre Stockmans], *Deductie, waar uyt met klare ende bondige bewijs redenen getoont en beweesen wordt, datter geen recht van devolutie is, in het hertogdom van Brabandt* (Amsterdam 1667).

[419] Rowen, *The king's State,* 105; On Leibniz, Levillain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV*, 307; Pierre Bayle in his correspondence to Minutoli on 1 Mai 1675, cited from Levilain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV*, 306-307: 'J'en ai lu quelques-uns qui m'ont paru bien frivoles. On n'y voit que des lambeaux de feu monsieur de Lisola, cousus fort grossièrement avec quelque lieu commun, et des redites perpétuelles.' ['I read a few which seemed to me very frivolous. We only see shreds of the fire of Lisola, very roughly stitched with some commonplaces, and perpetual repetition.']

[420]Catteeuw, 'L'inacceptable face aux nécessités politiques'; Gauchet, 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat'.

[421] Jacob Soll argues, 'to promote purely eloquent historical propaganda, while outlawing critical political history', *Publishing* The Prince, 50-51.

Colbert revitalised the royal Gallican tradition of collecting archival documents for propagandistic uses, legitimising military offensives and territorial claims by historical legal documents instead of reason of state.[422] Lisola tried to beat the French on their own grounds in *Bouclier* by countering French reason of state and legal argumentation. There exists no exact evidence on its sources. Levillain believes that the title of *Bouclier* ['shield'] was most probably inspired by the Fronde pamphlet *La raison d'État et Bouclier du Parlement* (1649).[423] It defends the parliament's actions in terms reason of state, as 'qu'ils n'avoient rien entrepris que pour le bien du public, & pour l'intérêt de leur Roy.'[424] The term 'bouclier', however, was used by various authors and this specific pamphlet does not present an image of a French predatory monarchy, unlike many other Fronde pamphlets as discussed in the chapter. Yet Lisola was probably acquainted with these polemics as he was with anti-French propaganda written in the Dutch Republic during the peace negotiations of the 1640s.[425] The idiom of reason of state combined with the image of a war-driven French regime entered in Dutch debates partly through such pamphlets.[426] For instance, the famous *Munsters Vrede-Praetje* [Munster's Peace-Talk] from 1646 discussed whether the country's welfare was founded on peace or war; it exclaimed that the French grandees necessarily pursued warfare to empower and enrich themselves, and that the sole rationale to maintain alliances and treaties was one's 'own Advantage, which the French call *Interest*.'[427] The function of reason of state in *Bouclier*, and its specific relation to French writings, in particular to Rohan's *De l'interest* has, however, not yet been studied and it needs to be read against the background of 'absolutism' so often seen as personified by Louis XIV.

4.1.4 The rise of the French monarchy: expansionist and 'absolute'

Nicolas Henshall speaks of a 'zenith of European monarchy and its elites' meaning the period after the mid-seventeenth crisis of monarchy that was tempered by newly restored and re-strengthened power structures between the Crown and its elites (estates, church, land propertied nobles). However, as we have discussed in the chapter of De la Court, certain developments disadvantaged the old elites, especially the rise of lower social groups in the

[422] Soll, *Publishing* The Prince, 41-55, on p. 51 on René Rapin, *Instruction sur l'histoire,* (Paris: Sebastien Marbre-Cramoisy, 1677).
[423] Levillain, *Le Procès de Louis XIV*, 28.
[424] *La raison d'État et Bouclier du Parlement* (Paris; Jean Hénoult, 1649), p. 6.
[425] Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 100-101.
[426] Hans W. Blom, 'Oorlog, handel en staatsbelang in het politiek denken rond 1648', *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), 89-96.
[427] *Munsters Vrede-Praetje. Vol alderhande Opinien/ off d'Algemeene Wel-vaert deser Landen in Oorlogh off Vrede bestaat. Deliberant dum fingere nesciunt* (1646). Quotation from C3 left page and on war-driven French grandees see C2 right page: 'om onder die pretext den Oorlogh te continueren. Want de Groote in Vranckrijck soecken haer self deur der Oorlogh noodtsaeckelijck besaemt, rijck, ende machtich te maecken. *l'Appetit vient en mangeant*.'

abundantly sold or newly created offices. This should, nevertheless, not be interpreted as a triumph of the monarch over its elites, but rather as a relative re-stabilisation of European monarchies. The revitalised co-operation and consensus resulted in the capacity to maintain larger armies and pursue prolonged warfare. Stable monarchies were based on the secure relationship between its rulers and elites, i.e. negotiated power-sharing with churches ('confessionalisation'), with nobles (army offices) and with new power groups (creditors).[428]

In the combination with the urge for dynastic acquisition and the European war competition, these revitalised monarchies could attract accusations of 'despotic' or 'absolutist' rule, and Louis XIV's reign formed the pivotal example. However, scholarship has debunked the the modern notion of 'absolutism' and underlined that while Louis presented himself as an 'absolute' ruler and the Sun King (although most images represented Louis as Mars not Apollo[429]), *in practice* he did not rule without consent or consultation of the Estates and *parlements* (provincial high courts). 'Absolutism' (a late-eighteenth century coinage), or 'absolute' rule was executed *in theory*.[430] After periods of severe civil conflicts and political factions, not least by the regencies of the 1610s and 1640s, the image of the Louis's Bourbon monarchy was marketed on an unprecedented level from the 1660s onwards. Yet, stressing the absolute nature of monarchy was no new argument nor archetypal for the Bourbons. It served the restoration of the 'natural' order of society, an obsession for Louis and many of his contemporaries.[431] At the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, 'absolute' was used as a legitimate adjective, meaning the Crown had no superior within or without the realm, a single ultimate source of law (nevertheless subjected to divine and divinely-inspired natural law), but in the course of the seventeenth century under polemical manipulation it became defined as arbitrary, and thus as illegitimate rule, often in conjunction with 'tyranny' and 'despotic' rule.[432] It is then, important to keep distinct the negative use of terms in the ambit of absolute from claims actually made in the name of sovereign, legal authority. It is confusion on this score that construes recognition of co-operation between monarchs and elites as exposing a myth of absolutism. Co-operation hardly compromised the principle of an ultimate sovereign authority, it was rather a means by which it could be exercised

---

[428] Henshall, *The Zenith of Monacrhy*.
[429] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, 104.
[430] Nicholas Henshall, *The Myth Of Absolutism: Change And Continuity In Early Modern European Monarchy* (London: Longman, 1992); Richard Bonney, *The Limits of Absolutism in Ancien Régime France* (Aldershot, 1995); Ronald A. Asch and Heinz Duchardt, *Der Absolutismus--ein Mythos?: Strukturwandel monarchischer Herrschaft in West- und Mitteleuropa (ca. 1550-1700)* (Bölhau, 1996); S.J. Barnett, *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); Collins, *The State in Early Modern France;* William Beik, 'The Absolutism of Louis XIV as Social Collaboration', *Past and Present* 188:1 (2005) 195-224; Sommerville, 'Early Modern Absolutism'.
[431] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France,* 101-102.
[432] Glenn Burgess, 'Tyrants, Absolute Kings, Arbitrary Rulers and The Commonwealth of England: Some Reflections on Seventeenth-Century English Political Vocabulary', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 147-158.

or expressed, especially in a world in which bureaucratic apparatus of the state was rudimentary, erratic or hardly existent. Co-operation was, however, something that sat ill with absolute rule construed as tantamount to tyranny. But it is equally important not to take the legitimating claims of absolute sovereign rule at face value.

The twenty years' crisis of the French monarchy (1635-1654) was followed by a period of restoration in which the government was restructured from the late 1650s onwards, a relative peace was returned, tax declined, and commercial activities increased to new heights. The year 1661 marked supposedly a sharp discontinuity in which Louis XIV seized 'personal rule'. However, what was attacked by the Fronde pamphlets in 1648-1652, was not Louis XIV himself, but the earlier influence of the first Minister Richelieu and now Mazarin. In a way the personal rule from 1660s onwards was what these pamphleteers had wanted. Louis XIV did make himself chief minister after Mazarin's death in that same year, and formed a new council of state, cleansed from potential factions of the princes of the blood, the Queen Mother and the chancellor of France. The new Council of State had four members: Fouquet, quickly followed up by Colbert (finances), Michel Le Tellier (war), Hugues de Lionne (foreign affairs) and Louis himself. Financial reorganisation entailed replacement of the older council of finances and a reduction the number of *intendants*. However, Louis could not run government without the cooperation of the many established offices held by the local elites of the realm. The Crown ruled not by a supposed build-up of the standing army and bureaucracy, but through collaboration with the various societal groups in order to respond more adequately to immediate problems raised by warfare.[433]

Although we should not overstate Louis's power in military appointments (in practice arranged by the local ruling military elite through family connections), under Louis the military was further reformed, rooted in Louis XIII's abolition or curtailment of some independent high military offices. During the 1660s and 1670s France had a more efficient and better supplied army than in the Thirty Years' War, which served Louis's major wars, i.e. the War of Devolution, the Franco-Dutch War (1672-1679), the War of the League of Augsburg (1689-1697), and the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-1714), of which the first two wars resulted in considerable advantages for the French monarchy. After the Peace of Pyrenees in 1659 the French forces were reduced to a size of around 50,000 men, but after 1665 Louis increased it and by 1667 he had massed an army of 80,000.[434] The death of his father-in-law, King Philip IV, the heavy reduction of army troops in the Spanish Netherlands and the favourable circumstances of other European regimes locked in warfare or in France's diplomatic schemes, paved the way for Louis's quick successes, in sixth months capturing the most important cities, such as of Douai,

[433] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France,* 100-115.
[434] Lynn, *The Wars of Louis XIV*, 106.

Lille, Courtai, and Tournai. The signing of the Triple Alliance between the Dutch Republic, England and Sweden obstructed Louis's plans, for the time being.

Louis gained the conquered northern cities, but had to return Franche-Comté. As his successes in the war were not matched by the territorial gains, his ministers prepared for further warfare, against the Dutch Republic. This marked a change in France's orientation in foreign affairs from aligning with the Dutch Republic since the 1560s and with the German Princes against its natural enemy, the Habsburg. Collins distinguished three elements of French thinking on foreign policy, which reflected the change in European order after the decline of Spain: the reduced Spanish threat, the domination of Dutch commerce, and the need for expansion and stabilised northern frontiers to protect Paris. The main threat to Louis's claims to the Spanish-Habsburg estates was formed, not by Spain, but by the Dutch Republic (especially Holland) and the German princes, who annulled the League of the Rhine with Louis in 1668.[435]

4.2 Bouclier: reason of state, European legal order and the French hazard

The present analysis of *Bouclier* will unravel Lisola's specific reversal of Rohan's *De L'interest* that led to a revitalisation of accusations of universal monarchy and defences of the balance of power in late seventeenth-century anti-French propaganda. Secondly, it will scrutinize Lisola's negative image of France; how he complemented Rohan's portrayal of Spain, as a predatory monarchy based on the rule of conquest with implicit accusations of a despotic rule. However, this reversal occurs predominantly in the culminating sixth and last part of the book, in which he presents his interest analysis of Spain and France. So, first we will discuss the preface, wherein the former lawyer colourfully orates about the French legal tracts defending Louis XIV's claim on the Spanish Netherlands and very gently builds up his case that the alleged glorious and most Christian King Louis was in fact the instigator of these defamatory booklets. Then we will look into a part of Lisola's legal rebuttal that outlines his supposed design for universal monarchy.

4.2.1 Preface: a gentle attack on Louis XIV

Lisola opened *Bouclier* with a vivid image -which we observed in Rohan's depiction of the Spanish interest[436] and we will see later revived by Valkenier- of rulers lulled into sleep by seemingly assured alliances and treaties. The imperial diplomat spoke about 'we' meaning

[435] Collins, *The State in Early Modern* France, 116-118.
[436] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 9-10: 'shewe a desire of peace, thereby to cast others asleepe, and in the meane time prepare himself to warre, for to surprise the vnprouided.'

Habsburg-Spain, *'rested quietly under the shade of Peace*' (of the Pyrenees) but awakened by French war preparations and by '*diverse Libells*'. These libels were: '*the usual fore-runners of War* (…) *spred up and down promiscuously amongst the Nobility and the Common people to seduce his Majestie's faithful Subjects, under colour of some Pretensions of the most Christian Queen upon all these Provinces.*'[437] And he immediately named three titles, one of which we have discussed above, *Traité des droits de la Reine Tres-Chrestienne sur divers Estats de la Monarchie d'Espagne* by Antoine Bilain and yet another by Bilain titled *Dialogue sur les droits de la reine Très-Chrétienne* (1667) and the anonymous *Soixante-quatorze raisons qui prouvent plus clair que le jour que la renonciation faite par la reine Marie-Thérèse d'Autriche en son contrat de mariage aux couronnes et Estats de feu Philippe IV, son père, est nulle* (1666). Lisola used these primarily to sum up the *'Pretentions*' of the French Crown, which were argued by the alleged invalidity of the Queen's renunciation of her rights to the Habsburg possessions, and to warn of the extensive territorial compensation France claims.[438]

With sustained irony and considerable reliance on the trope of litotes Lisola argued that '*the most Christian King*' could have never authorised the publication of 'such Writings'. Note that he not once named Louis XIV but persistently called him by this traditional French royal title purportedly accorded by the Papacy to the Frankish King Clovis. Lisola built up this case so colourfully that in the end the reader would have assumed that the opposite was in fact true; Louis XIV authorised the writing and distribution of these texts and the French king was no guardian of peace, justice or religion. First of all Lisola argued that the pamphlets were mere 'passe-volants', and 'the effects of some idle Pens', their contents 'irregular' and 'brittle' and their style 'unhandsome'.[439] Besides, arguing from the standpoint of justice, and the ties and bonds between the French and Spanish Kings, it is pure logic to believe that Louis would first exhaust all means before pursuing warfare. Moreover, the French King had guaranteed the preservation of the signed peace between the two dynasties. Thus, Lisola reasoned that the Spanish Crown could only believe the good intentions of France, adding the infancy of the Spanish King Carolus II, Louis brother-in-law, as a further reason not to expect any intended harm from France. As the French invasion in the Spanish Netherlands was already in process by the time of publication of *Bouclier* the reader would definitely know that the French indeed pursued warfare in contradiction to their peace treaties. Lisola restated that by pointing to the French support to Portugal in its revolt against Habsburg-Spain (1640-1668). This proved that 'Faith of Treaties of Oath were much inferior to the Interest of State' in (as the reader would have to conclude) French politics. But the belief that Louis did not authorise these writings crumbled, when word

[437] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface. [italics in original quotes]
[438] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[439] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.

was received that these libels were presented at the States General of the Dutch Republic, the Imperial Diet and even to some princes of the Holy Roman Empire.

He ventured on by claiming his patriotic duty towards: '*my King, my Country and the Publick*' to rebut '*false impressions which the artifice of a slight Eloquence, much more then the solidity of Reasons, might produce in the opinion of credulous spirits, not thoroughly versed in our Laws and Customes*.'[440] By analysing the primary legal tracts, such as the peace and marriage treaties, he allegedly discovered factual '*Falshoods*', '*malicious Artifices*' and '*hyperbolic Exaggerations*' in these legal analyses of the French publicists, especially slander towards the person of the previous Spanish King Philip IV. The reader had to understand it as treacherous propaganda '*to cast dust in the eyes of the neighbouring Princes*' and '*to pervert the people*'.[441] Conversely, but surely most deliberately, he ended his preface with several hyperbolic exaggerations regarding Louis XIV's demeanour. Instead of displaying some respect and credit for Louis XIV, Lisola mocked Louis XIV through embellished praises:

> '*Though we cannot doubt of the Approbation which the most Christian King hath given to those injurious Writings, I cannot yet be persuaded that he ever took the pains to reade them over, and will rather believe (to his honour) that his weighty Affairs, and his great application to this loftie Arming, have so taken up all his time, that he had none to spare to cast his eyes upon works which have so little sympathy with his genius and Qualitie.* (…) *he has too much Generosity, and Love for the Queen his Consort, to suffer that any should so unworthily defame the Reputation of his Father-in-Law* (…) *he hath too much Justice, to permit that they should make the most tender Father and best of Kings pass for a Tyrant, constraining his Daughter, by a barbarous Disinheriting her, or a Cheater* (…) *he hath too great a minde, to approve of trifling upon Jewels, or to desire that an accompt by way of Inventory should be given him of all the Knacks which belonged to the Queen his Mother-in-Law, and that all the Earth should be alarmed about a Domestick concernment* (…) *he hath too much Prudence and love for Truth, ever to consent to the publication of so many false Allegations so inconsiderately packed together one upon the back of another; not questioning at all, but if that he had attentively considered them, they would have touched him with just indignation against those who have so impudently abused his Name*'.[442]

[440] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[441] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[442] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.

These considerations, Lisola claimed, were much easier to believe, leaving the reader to assume that the opposite is actually true. He even wrote that his rebuttal might convince the King: '*the soliditie of our reasons will not onely conduce to fortifie the People, and persuade the neighbour-Princes, but even pierce the heart of the most Chiristian King;* (…) *and having overcome by Reasons, we hope that the Arbiter of Sovereigns and supreme Protector of Justice will not let us sink under the weight of his arms.'*[443] The indirect criticism of Louis in the preface ended with a rather incredible disclaimer, but traditional in the sense of not blaming the ruler but his advisors instead: '*I pretend the most Christian King's Sacred Person to be excepted; and that I do ascribe all the Evils which are intended towards us onely to those mean Incendiarie Writers*'.[444]

One other issue of the preface deserves our attention, i.e. the use of the vocabulary and imagery of reason of state. After claiming his patriotic duty Lisola exclaimed that he has a further obligation towards the neighbouring rulers to '*let them evidently understand, that all the Pretexts with which the French do labour to disguise the vast Designs that they have in hand, are but false colours to mask the true Spring which gives the Motion to this Machine, and to make an Ambition which goes at a great pace to the* Universal Monarchie *pass under the veil of Justice.'*[445] As we witnessed in the chapter on Rohan, a common *topos* of reason of state writings was the unveiling of the malicious motives and actions of rulers and/or his advisers, hidden behind masks or covered under cloaks of morality, legality and religion. More interestingly, in this exclamation Lisola used the conclusive phrase of Rohan regarding the Spanish interest: 'This huge frame [the French original text states 'machine', MBK] composed of so many parts, and as it were incumbered with its owne weight, moues by its secret springs, which loose their force euen as they are discouered.'[446] But whereas Rohan's argument was to unveil Spain's vast designs of universal monarchy hidden behind a Catholic zeal, Lisola made his case of unveiling the French cloak of legality, of their legal claims which were a mere cover up for their plans to establish an universal monarchy.

4.2.2 First five articles: legal rebuttal and the image of a predatory monarchy

Painstakingly Lisola subjected Louis's legal claims to forensic legal analysis in the first five articles. He integrated the legal arguments of French writers as Bilain and Aubery and then rebutt these. The titles reveal well the content:

---

[443] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[444] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[445] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[446]Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 12; Henri de Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, 19; 'Cette grande machine composées de tant de parties et comme empêchée de son propre poids s'émeut par ces secrets ressorts qui perdent leur force à mesure qu'ils sont découverts.'

(1)'*Of the Ends which FRANCE doth propose unto it self in this War, and in these Libells*'; (2) '*That the Entry of the King of* France *into the Estates of the* Catholick *King in the* Low-Countries *is a evident Rupture*'; (3) '*That this Rupture is unjust, admitting that the Right[s] of the most Christian King were well founded*'; (4) '*That the Renunciation of the* French *Queen is just, irrevocable, necessary, and usefull to the Publick good, nor contains in it self any cause of Nullitie or Læsion; and that the Queen of* France *hath been duly Doted'*; (5) '*That the Succession of the Soveraigntie of the Dutchy of* Brabant*, and other Provinces, which are specified in these Libells, ought not to be regulated by particular Customs*.'[447]

Since we are more concerned with Lisola's use of the language of reason of state and his image of the French monarchy, we will concentrate on the first article in which he outlines Louis's design for universal monarchy.

Immediately Lisola attacked 'the dull conceit' of the writers of the French libels, and indirectly condemned Louis XIV's double-dealings:

> 'The author of these Libells (…) extolls the love which his Master hath for Peace, at the very instant when he is breaking it; (…) he requires Peace, and brings War; attaques without Rupture, forces without constraint, and plaies with so much contempt upon the Ignorance and Credulity which he supposes to be in the Judgment of his Readers, that he will needs (sic.) have the way of Fact to pass for Justice, Violence for Moderation, Usurpation for Title, and Defence for a Crime'.[448]

The purpose of the French propaganda was not only to soften the 'ugliness' and 'Scandal' of the military offensive, but also to legitimise war and mis-use the promotion of peace as a means to erect an '*Absolute Empire*'.[449] With 'absolute', Lisola referred to universal dominion, and as we will see below, in terms of arbitrary rule, in particular a household rule. Lisola argued that the promises of France, that they only pursued an honest treaty with Spain and that they pursued warfare against their will, were contrary to 'Actions and Motions [which] tend toward a vast and deep Design': to establish an universal monarchy.[450]

Lisola's case depends on the use of paradiastole, or subdistinctio, that is re-describing the evidence of his opponents to mean the opposite of what they claim; and by this he is

[447] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 1-19; 20-41; 42-84; 85-173;173-273.
[448] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 1-2.
[449] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 4.
[450] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 6.

continuing the established idiom of criticism by unmasking secret designs and evil intent. He referred to the considerable armature, the excessive expenditures in their foreign relations, forming alliances, instigating conflicts between other rulers, exemplified by their support for Sweden in the Thirty Years War and the French intermeddling in the issue of the Polish succession.[451] These were:

> 'proofs capable to convince the darkest understandings, that all this immense Preparation of Arms and Intrigues hath something in it of greater extent then the bare Conquest of some Provinces, (which our over-much Credulity hath exposed to them as a prey) and ends not in a simple desire of tearing away a few pieces of them by a Treatie. These huge Mountains are not to bring forth Mice, but to vomit out Flames as the *Vesuve*, to set the whole neighbouring Countries on fire.'[452]

Time and again Lisola put forth the image of France as a predatory monarchy, driven by rapacious conquest, not to be stopped after its violent plunder of the Spanish Low Countries.

Furthermore, Lisola discredited the person of the King. Louis XIV was spoon-fed with desires for conquest and military glory. Colbert supposedly educated him by virtue of the histories of the Bishop of Rhodes[453] in the spirit of Louis's great-grand father Henry IV, the first Bourbon King;

> 'He hath, in imitation of him, taken great care to accumulate much Treasure, sought for Alliances abroad, and at length hath raised most powerfull Armies. We must therefore conclude, that he acts upon the very same Draughts; and that all we see at present are but renewed Projects, and the effects of those Impressions which he hath sucked in with his milk.'[454]

Louis XIV set up similar war efforts to those of Henry IV: accumulation of money, external warfare, and controlling large armies. However, Lisola warned the reader that because Louis's reign entailed a longer period and a more powerful stand than that of Henry IV, and the desire of glory had no bounds, 'so we cannot reasonably expect that the swiftness of the *Rihne* shall be able to stop him'.[455] Moreover, Louis's writers had nourished him in these thoughts of military glory and conquests with great diligence, as Lisola referred to the previously discussed Aubery's *Des justes Prétensions du Roy sur l'Empire*.

---

[451] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 6.
[452] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 6-7.
[453] Paul Philippe Hardouin de Beaumont de Péréfixe, *Histoire du roy Henry le Grand* (Amsterdam 1661).
[454] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 7.
[455] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 8.

The imperial diplomat presented evidence that in fact France pursued no peace with Habsburg-Spain. The French support to the Portuguese in their revolt against Spain and, secondly, invalidating Maria Theresa's renunciation destroyed the entire Peace of the Pyrenees between France and Spain. The peace treaty that the War of Devolution would bring forth would only serve as a pretext for further conquests;

> 'The peace which shall be made cannot be but the seed of a new War; it will be impossible to cut the evil by the root. 'Tis here were the Mediators shall find themselves puzzled: and if all their Pretensions be granted, then will they be absolute Masters of the *Netherlands*, and in a condition to take possession by the same Title not onely of that part of *Brabant* of which the States of the *United Provinces* stand possessed, but also of all the rest of their Countreys'.[456]

He concluded the first article with an exclamation to all European politicians: France 'aims absolutely at the entire Destruction of a Monarchy which is the Bulwark of all the rest (...) It is left to wise Politicians to make necessary reflexions upon a matter of such high concernment.'[457]

In his legal rebuttal Lisola pinpointed the illegitimate rule of conquest by France. He emphasised the French breach of law, French war crimes, which would become recurrent themes in later anti-French polemics. Lisola likewise stressed France's threat to the European legal order. The invasion was contrary to the 'Law of Nations', to the 'customs and practice of the Civil and Municipal Laws'. Moreover, not to call it a war, according to Lisola, was to deny that the military offensive could be judged by the 'Law of War' and, consequently, rendered it:

> '… a Depredation and Piracie; and if it be not an infringing of the Peace, it is an unjust Attempt, which gives a shock to all Laws and Forms. (...) they destroy the principal Foundation of it, and take from themselves the means of establishing their Conquest upon the right of War, by declaring that they will Conquer without breaking the Peace.'[458]

Throughout *Bouclier* Lisola warned about universal loss of legality if Louis devolution claims and his invasion of the Spanish Netherlands were granted validity: 'If Sovereignties were regulated by Local Customs (…) The order of the World (…) must be absolutely overthrown'.[459]

---

[456] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 16.
[457] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 19.
[458] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 24-25.
[459] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 175.

4.2.3 Sixth article: interest of state

The sixth article of *Bouclier* is our main object of inquiry, since here Lisola puts forward an interest analysis of Spain and France, and presents the reader with his political argument against the illegitimacy of France's military offensive and in favour of an alliance between the different authorities of the Holy Roman Empire and Habsburg-Spain against Louis XIV.[460] Lisola understood well the power of the language of reason of state to influence the opinion of a broad public, more influential than his legal rebuttal and touching upon a European-wide readership. As he wrote tellingly 'Interest of State (…) is more universall, and more considered at this day in the World' than 'the strict Obligation of Justice.'[461] The lawyer explicitly distinguished this article from the previous five ones, claiming to 'resolve to shake off all manner of interessed thoughts which I may have for my parts; (…) I will found my Discourse on no other Principles but those which I shall draw out of *French* Authors.'[462]

It underlines what we already have discussed in the chapter on Rohan, that the idiom of reason of state was appropriated by the French Crown under Richelieu but increasingly turned into a weapon against government during, what Collins calls, 'the twenty years' crisis of 1635-1654'.[463] As has also been noted, from the 1660s the French Crown sponsored writings of panegyrics history principally celebrating Louis XIV and of archivally-based claims to Habsburg possessions, instead of employing reason of state.[464] Through ironic inversion, Lisola turned these features of French public discourse against France, just as he exploited and redirected Rohan's understanding of Spanish interest. As he asserted, 'they dare no longer make use of that ridiculous scarecrow of the Universal Monarchie aimed at by the Spaniards.'[465] As we read in the chapter on Rohan, interest analysis was a means to address the true chaos of interrelated European warfare and civil conflicts, and simultaneously to satirise certain political actions. We find both elements in *Bouclier*. As already stated, perhaps the pure irony for us is that Rohan also employed the language of reason of state in a satiric way, and that, furthermore, later anti-French polemics by Dutch and English authors were indebted to a French Huguenot author defending the Bourbon dynasty and a Spanish Catholic lawyer advocating the Habsburg dynasty. It is to the specific inversion of Rohan's case that we can now turn.

460 [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 273-311.
461 [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 274, 273.
462 [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 276.
463 Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, 71; Catteeuw, 'L'inacceptable face aux nécessités politiques'; Gauchet, 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat'.
464 Soll, *Publishing* The Prince.
465 [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 299.

First, Lisola re-employed Rohan's image of the 'common Bulwark' against a 'vast design for conquest',[466] an image that later anti-French writings often reiterated as the entity to be protected against the barbaric Frenchmen.[467] However, he enhanced the image of the rule of conquest with addressing its consequence for the liberty of Europe: slavery. He states in hyperbolic terms:

> 'It is our purpose to defend the common Bulwark against a vast Design, which hath for its cause nothing but the predominant desire of Conquests, for its end Dominion, for its means Arms and Intricacies, nor for its limits any thing but what Chance will prescribe. In fine, we are here to decide the fortune of *Europe*, and to pronounce the Sentence either of its Freedom or Slaverie.'[468]

'Common Bulwark' referred to the Habsburg estates in the Spanish Netherlands, as well as a more abstract notion of fencing off the European legal order against France's. Apart from slavery, Lisola complemented Rohan's image of the predatory monarchy by stating that France threatened to subvert the 'Law of Nations', 'Publick Faith of treaties', 'Law of Arms' established by the 'Universal Consent of all Nations', and to 'destroy the whole Commerce of mankind' and 'render humane Societies as dangerous as the company of Lions and Tigers.'[469] The French invasion in the Spanish Netherlands meant the first step towards their design of universal monarchy. This is also witnessed in his comparison of the French threat with the Turkish threat to Europe. With 'bulwark' Rohan had meant the French defence of the liberties of Christendom against Spain's rapacious tyranny. Lisola viewed the

> 'Union of the empire to the power of *Spain* in the person of *Charles* the *V th* was rather a step to the design of becoming greater, then any addition to his power (…) this powerful Monarchie seems to have been raised by God to be the Bulwark of the rest, against the *Turk* in *Hungarie* and in *Italie*, against the *Moors* in *Spain*, and against *France* both in the Low-Countreys and *Italie*'.[470]

---

[466] Both French originals uses 'boulevard'; Lisola, Bouclier, 317; Rohan, *De l'interest*, 17; Rohan, 'common bulwark': *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 16 and Spanish design for universal monarchy: 2,5, 7, 9 (a selection).
[467] Tony Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda 1689-1697, in Esther Meijers en David Onnekink, *Redefining William: the impact of the King-Stadholder in international context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 125-142, p. 140.
[468] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 275.
[469] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 274.
[470] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 281.

The 'rest' signifies the Freedom of Europe that was threatened with slavery by these Conquerors, including the French despotic monarchy. Note that Lisola did use the term Europe as an intellectual and political entity in danger of France's universal monarchy, as well as, although to a lesser extent, the word 'Christendom'.

Spain's ascendancy had caused 'Envy, we have seen growing in the heart of *France* the lamentable seeds of this unjust Emulation, which for so many years together hath produced all the Misfortunes & Troubles of Christendom.' Therefore, he argued that the principal motive of French publicists was 'to diffuse this Jealousy everywhere' rendering Habsburg 'a fearfull Phantasm' and France as 'the onely *Perseus's* able to deliver fettered *Europe* from the fury of this Chimerical Monster', but that in fact France did not want to protect the Europeans agaisnt the alleged Spanish enemy, but aimed 'to become their Masters, and make them the Instruments of their Ends.' Lisola contended that:

> 'This Artifice was so successfull, that a part of *Europe* put it self in Arms against the Valour and Good fortune of Charles the Vth, and the profound Wisedom of his Successour: and all this Commotion was founded upon one onely Principle of State which the *French* Writers have established with an extraordinary diligence, and upon which the Duke of *Rohan* had made [run] all his Treatise of the Interest of Princes; *That there are two Powers in Christendom which be like the two Poles, from whence all the Influences of Peace and War do descend upon the other States*. From whence he draws this Maxime to regulate the Conduct of all other Princes, [t]hat their principal Interest is to hold the Balance so equally betwixt these two Great Monarchies'.[471]

Thus French publicists stirred up European rulers against Spain keeping all European rulers locked in combat while they secretly set up their design for universal monarchy by the principles of interest of state. Rohan's *De l'interest* was the explicit blueprint of France's design. Although the imperial diplomat found that Rohan 'doth applie this Maxime [to maintain the balance of power between Spain and France through arms or negotiations] very ill to the particular use of *France*',[472] he believed that it entailed a certain truth. Yet, the effective propaganda of France led European rulers into believing that Spain functioned as the unbalancing factor 'and that by this very reason of State they were obliged to put the Counterpoise into the *French* Scale of Balance.'[473] Lisola referred to the balance of power only with direct reference to Rohan in order to transmit the threat of the impending universal monarchy from Spain to France. Therefore, to

[471] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 277-278.
[472] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 278.
[473] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 279.

persuade the European rulers of the error they had made in abandoning 'their true Reason of State'[474] he compared the systems of rule of France and Spain by their geographical situation, the nature of the rulers and peoples, the maxims of government and the specific history for each regime up till now. As we have discussed earlier, Rohan's interest analyses of the two monarchies contained exactly the same variables, but now Lisola had added an important component to the equation: the nature of the respective rulers and peoples. This will serve to set forth the monarchies as systems of rule according to the nature of the peoples: peaceful and law-abiding (the Spanish) in opposition to aggressive, rebellious and savage-like (the French), as a result rendering the French regime despotic.

4.2.4 The interest of Spain: good government versus France's predatory monarchy

Lisola turned Rohan's image of Spain's war machine around, by claiming that its situation 'is advantagious (sic.) for its own Defence, being compassed with the Sea and the *Pyrenean* Mountains: but it is inconvenient for invading other States, because of the defect of a nearer conjunction betwixt the Members thereof'.[475] The Spanish dynastic agglomerate was a nuisance for the Habsburgs, but given by God to act as the 'Bulwark of the rest' against the barbaric, brutal and bellicose Turks, Moors *and* French. Furthermore the Habsburg rulers 'are naturally Courteous, and inclined to Vertue', and more importantly not belligerent by nature at all. Although Charles V 'loved noble Glory', he 'had so little Ambition, that he resigned the Empire to his Brother, and all his Kingdoms to his Son'. Lisola directed his pen against Rohan's 'inconsistent' representation of Philip II.[476] The Huguenot warrior had written that Philip 'finding himselfe less fit for war than *civille businesses* (…) prosecuted his design under a profound dissimulation'[477], by which Rohan indirectly referred to Machiavelli's argument about the difficulties of maintaining conquered polities when 'great Conqeurrours' were succeeded, as Rohan argued was often the case, by less courageous rulers.[478] So how could it be that Rohan was able 'to represent him [Philip II] in one and the same time as an enemie to War, and yet ardent to obtain Conquests.' We have read Rohan's representation of Philip as satire, describing him as a shrewd Machiavellian conqueror, not as a peaceful prince, but the latter is exactly what Lisola attempt to underline, as he writes, 'according to the confession of the Duke of *Rohan* himself, [Philip II] had no inclination at all to Arms, nor ever took them up but for his Defence'.[479]

[474] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 279.
[475] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 280.
[476] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 282.
[477] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 4
[478] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 4-5.
[479] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 282.

The same 'rare Clemency' applied to Philip's successors, states Lisola.[480] Moreover, whereas Rohan speaks of the Spanish peoples on only one occasion, when pointing to the Spanish maxim of maintaining a constant state of armament 'to keepe his Subjects in obedience'[481], Lisola reversed this image; 'The people of *Spain*, and of the other Kingdoms which live under the same Dominion, are naturally friends to Quietness, enemies to Novelties, satisfied, with their present Condition, and have not the least propension or itching to trouble their Neighbours.'[482]

In Rohan's interest analysis the maxims (methods of government to achieve universal monarchy) of Spain stood in opposition to French rule; in Lisola's account the Spanish maxims 'oppose those of the Conqerours', i.e. the Bourbon-French dynasty. However, Lisola was not so much interested in the Spanish maxims, which usually took up a single sentence, but rather in making implicit comparisons with the French maxims and so indirectly asserting French designs of universal monarchy. The first Spanish maxim was 'to keep inviolably the Faith of publick Treaties, which are powerful bridles to the Ambition of a Prince who desires to extend his Limits, and do put great obstacles to his Designs, by making him a *Slave to his World*.'[483] Lisola claimed that not one Habsburg ruler has ever 'broken or prevaricated in any Treatie, nor began a War for the inlarging of their Limits.'[484] The reader could have easily guessed that Lisola was talking of the French dynasty, especially Louis XIV's actions concerning the War of Devolution. Louis appears as a rapacious conqueror, just as Rohan described Philip II, but Lisola added the component of a household rule that Louis as Master wanted to impose on Europe. Spain's second maxim was '[t]o prefer Religion always before Reason of State; which is directly contrary to the Rule of Conquerors, who do dexterously make use of all sorts of Sects to compass their own Ends.'[485] As Lisola had already stated before, France ruled solely by the principle of interest of state, and religion would only be used to serve their design, as also Rohan accused Spain of hiding their plans of universal monarchy under the pretext of defending Catholicism. The third Spanish maxim was 'Not to make use of their Victories, and the Advantages of their Arms, nor of those of their Allies'.[486] Yet again, the reader had already read that this was the exactly case with France.

The fourth method of Spanish government was:

> '[t]o rule according to the Laws, and leave their People in the peaceable possession of their Privileges; which amongst Conquerours would pass for an essential fault,

[480] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 282-283.
[481] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 10.
[482] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 283.
[483] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 283.
[484] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 283-284.
[485] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 284.
[486] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 284.

> against the first Principles of their Politicks, which require before all other things, that they make themselves absolute and independent at home, and that they break all the Chains of Domestick Laws which might hinder their actings abroad.'[487]

Here we find a good example of implicit accusations of war-driven despotic monarchy turned now against Louis's monarchy, that his rule undermined the rule of law by taking away the privileges of its peoples subverting internal law and destroying all internal obstacles to pursue its war politics. As we will see below, under the heading of France's interest of state Lisola discussed the process of making Louis XIV an 'absolute' ruler in order to impose its household rule on Europe. The fifth method of Spanish government was again an indirect attack on France's implicitly putative despotic rule:

> 'Never to admit neither League, nor Alliance, nor Commerce, nor peace with the common Enemie of Christendom. This is a bad undertaking of the Design of rendring (sic.) themselves Masters of *Europe*, when they draw upon themselves the emulation and the hatred of the Tyrant of *Asia*.'[488]

Lisola referred to the Franco-Ottoman alliance of the early modern period, famously endorsed by Henry IV and later by Louis XIV, and more often than not directed against the Habsburg dynasty.[489] He explicitly pointed to the results of French foreign policy, commerce and conduct of war, relying on comparisons with and insinuations of Turkish tyranny: French rule was unchristian and illegitimate, particularly cruel towards its subjects and had no regard for the rule of law or private property. As we know from the chapter on De la Court, German and French authors shaped their accusations of 'war despotism' through comparisons with a household government that treated its subjects as slaves exemplified by specific practices of Ottoman and Muscovite rule, comparisons that contributed to the erratic seventeenth-century practice of conflating 'tyrannical' with an household rule, i.e. 'despotic'.

4.2.5 The interest of France: 'Robberies', 'Conquerors', 'absolute', 'Masters of Europe'

Louis XIV's monarchy had the advantage that it:

---

[487] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 284-285.
[488] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 285.
[489] Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2007), 306; Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 73.

> 'hath all its Parts united, abounding with Men, industrious in Commerce, which gains with their Baubles[490] and their Modes the money of all other Nations, which hath considerable Harbours upon the Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, and in their neighbourhood no considerable powers to fear but that of the House of *Austria*.'[491]

Thus, France was powerful by its lands, men, commerce (note that he views French clothing fashion as an instrument to extract wealth from abroad[492]), and harbours all of which strengthened its position in European warfare. Whereas the Spanish people were naturally law-abiding and peaceful, the French, however, were war-minded by nature, almost savage-like men, raging with fire, directed by the natural urge of conquest and unconstrained by anything as, Lisola already stated, the precepts of religion, or legality.[493]

Lisola claims to have deduced the French maxims 'from their Conduct both passed and present, by their own Writers, and by the same Treatise of the Duke of *Rohan*.'[494] The first maxim of French rule is to 'entertain always War abroad and exercise their young Nobility at the expence of their Neighbours'. For the reason that 'the Genius of the Nation is such, that it cannot endure to subsist long in the Idleness of Peace; there must be Aliment for this Fire (,..), or it would form to is self matter at home.' Suiting the customes of noble succession leaving 'almost nothing to the younger [brothers] but their Industry and Sword (…) there is nothing left to them but the Warrs or Robberies, to preserve themselves from Miserie.'[495] Thus besides the natural belligerence of Frenchmen, the financial weakness of the younger sons of the nobility requires they be distracted from causing domestic harm by being diverted to aggression abroad; 'the Polititians of *France* held it necessary to furnish them with another gate by which they might evaporate this Flame, which would gnaw their Bowels if it did not find another vent.'[496] Furthermore, Lisola explicitly states:

> 'as the greatest Revenues of the Crown of *France* consist in the Purse of the People, and that the excessive Contributions cannot be exacted in times of Peace, without making a great many Malecontents; it is necessary to feed them with the smoke of

[490] A 'bauble' is a 'small, showy trinket or decoration'; 'something of no importance or worth'. Angus Stevenson (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010; third edition), 140.
[491] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 285-286.
[492] This became a commonly given feature of the French system of rule in anti-French polemics, as we will see in the chapter on Valkenier.
[493] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 286. 'The genius of the Nation is naturally inclined to arms, full of heat, unquiet, lovers of Novelty, desirous of Conquests, quick, active, and inclinable to all manner of Expedients which they conceive to be advantageous to their particular Ends.'
[494] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 286.
[495] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 287.
[496] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 288.

> some Conquests and always to have pretexts to remain in Arms, and maintain by force the Royal Authority, which hath so strangely overflowed the limits of their fundamental laws.'[497]

In the first maxim of France we observe the social construction of the predatory monarchy: the warlike nature of the people and the financial weakness of parts of the elite demand war (to keep them satisfied and occupied, and to keep disorder out), that in turn justifies further taxation by the Crown, which finances further warfare. A vital part of this construction is the subversion of the rule of law to create absolute authority; as incessant warfare needs a constant state of armature, upon which coercive force the masterly rule relies to plunder at home, as well as abroad.

The second maxim of the French system of rule was to interfere in other rulers' affairs under the pretext of defensive alliances, being an 'Arbiter' and 'Mediator',[498] a maxim that Lisola relocated from Rohan's interest analysis of Spain and that in this sense was not a new element added to traditional debates on universal monarchy.[499] France's third method of government is:

> 'To have for their onely Rule the Interest of State, so that the Faith of Treaties, the good of Religion, or the ties of Bloud an Amitie cannot hold them. 'Tis this that the Duke of *Rohan* puts for the fundamental Principle of all his Work; *The Princes command over the People, Interest commands over Princes*.'[500]

Whereas mid-seventeenth century English authors rejuvenated the axiom in defence of the rule of law arguing that the ruler should abide by the 'true' interest of state, Lisola turned it into the allegedly guiding principle of the French monarchy, unconstrained by the rule of law and religion. As prime example Lisola gives the France-Ottoman alliance. France's fourth maxim was to divide and conquer 'as much as they can forrein States'.[501] Duplicitous diplomacy and incitement to domestic revolt or external wars Lisola took to be a persistent feature of French policy, citing as instances of interference in England, the Holy Roman Empire, the Italian polities, Denmark and Spain, and in the present times in Poland (French meddling at the Polish court during the Second Nothern War) and the United Provinces (Franco-Dutch defensive alliance 1662). As a diplomat Lisola witnessed the power of French diplomacy, in isolating Habsburg-Spain and later, the Dutch Republic. He concluded:

---

[497] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 288-289.
[498] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 289.
[499] Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome,* 9-10.
[500] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 291.
[501] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 293.

> 'All these Maxims are proper to Conquerours, and as many infallible marks of a vast and profound Design long ago contrived. The Predecessors of the most Christian King could not bring it to perfection, because the Civil Wars, the power of *Spain*, and the just Limits which the Royal Authoritie then acknowledged, were powerful Barrs to stop them: but at present, having imposed at home an absolute Law over all their Subjects, and having put Dissention amongst all Strangers, there remains nothing but that they overcome the third Impediment [the power of *Spaine*], by compleating the overthrow of the Monarchie of *Spain*.'[502]

As Lisola had already stated, 'absolute' rule was the first principle of conquerors to rule independently at home, break all the domestic laws and render all property of subjects as theirs.[503] 'Absolute' rule, arbitrary rule or the subversion of the rule of law was the foundation of the French predatory monarchy.

Lisola's interest analysis of France puts forth an illegitimate system of rule, absolute, barbaric, arbitrary, unchristian, tyrannical, belligerent, according to the nature of the peoples and the elite. It is, effectively, a despotic war machinery pursuing warfare abroad to plunder foreign polities to finance French noblemen and coerce taxation on its own subjects. Against this hostile image Lisola presented an example of good government, the Spanish monarchy that ruled according to precepts of law and religion, and that conducted warfare for the sole purpose of defence. These differences in maxims emphasised that the real danger to European powers was not Habsburg-Spain, but France. French publicists, in particular Rohan, had deceived European rulers and their nations by propagating the idea of the hazardous Habsburg-Spanish monarchy. He had never used the term 'despotic' to designate France, but as Rohan, he referred to 'the Conquerors'.[504] However, he furthered this idea of a rule of conquest: exemplified by the Turks and Moors and outlined in terms such as 'Tyrants', 'absolute', 'Masters (of Europe)', 'Slavery', 'Piracie', and 'robberies'.[505] The most plausible explanation for the absence of the terminology of 'despotic' is a matter of aposiopesis- the trope of leaving unstated a conclusion an audience should draw for itself. It thus implicated the reader in the accusation and was at one with Lisola's reliance on irony, litotes, and the studied interplay with Rohan's text, with which he assumed the reader was familiar. Furthermore, he assessed the French regime as even more

---

[502] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 293.
[503] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 284-285: 'The fourth [maxim of the Spanish interest], To rule according to the Laws, and leave their People in peaceable possession of their Privileges; which amongst Conquerors would pass for an essential fault, against the first Principles of their Politicks, which require before all other things, that they make themselves absolute and independent at home, and that they break all the Chains of Domestick Law which might hinder their actings abroad.'
[504] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, for instance on pages 283, 285, 292, 298.
[505] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, tyrant: 285; absolute: 4, 15, 16, 68, 285, 289, 293, 294, masters: 277, slavery: 275, piracy: , robberies: 286 (amongst other pages).

evolved, and, consequently, being a greater threat than these Oriental regimes;

> 'All the Maximes which I have above related are those of Conquerours; but their [France's] manner of executing them is so much the more to be feared, as it consists altogether in Quickness and Activity, and that no Reason of Justice, nor any Condescension to the Interposition of Neighbours, and of their own Allies, is able to stop the current of it.'[506]

He used the language of reason of state to persuade rulers, especially the German princes to ally with Habsburg against France, that is their 'true Reason of State.[507] In the last part of the sixth article that centred on 'the precise Obligation of the Estates of the Empire for the Warrantie of the Circle of Burgundy',[508] he opposed the French system government ruled by the 'sole and supreme principle of Rule of Interest'[509] to the 'Body' or the 'Union' of the Holy Roman Empire, which includes the Circle of Burgundy as a 'Member' and of which every part is obliged to defend the Spanish Netherlands according to 'the rule of Law'.[510] With this argument he even turned the secret treaty between Louis and Leopold of not meddling in affairs outside their dominion into a positive argument; since the Burgundian Circle belonged to the Empire, the Emperor had to take action.[511] The European legal order should be protected against the French predatory monarchy striving for universal monarchy, and in particular the princes and rulers of the Empire should form an alliance with Habsburg to counter the French offensive in the Spanish Netherlands; their very interest of state required it. Therefore, Lisola reasoned at the very beginning of the sixth article that:

> 'There are two Motives of different nature which ought to incite the Princes of Christendom to undertake the defence of our Cause; the one is the Interest of State, the other is a strict Obligation of Justice. The first regards generally all the Potentates of *Europe*; the second is particular onely to the Princes and States of the Empire: the one [interest of State] depends upon the foresight and their wise conduct; the other [a strict Obligation of Justice] is joined to the duty of the last, to the Fundamental Laws of their State [Princes and States of the Empire], to the

[506] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 298-299.
[507] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 279.
[508] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 273.
[509] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 300.
[510] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 303.
[511] [Lisola], *The Buckler*, 304-307.

> Treaties of peace and Warrantie, and the reciprocal bond which unites all the Members of this vast Body'.[512]

By turning French reason of state against Louis XIV, Lisola constructed the nature of later anti-French polemics: the *topos* of fear of universal monarchy, the notion of a European balance of power and, ironically, reason of state vocabulary. Its foundation was the Huguenot Rohan's *De l'interest* whose supraconfessional and indirect attack through a putatively objective interest analysis served the purposes of Lisola well. The two major elements of his argument are that he turned the Spanish case against France and enriched it with implicit accusations of despotic rule; the result is effectively, perhaps self-consciously a satiric parody of *De l'interest.* Lisola presented a social construction of a predatory monarchy that needs to wage war in order to delude its people to extract more taxes, and, consequently, to make more wars. The inherent enemy image was transformed from a Spanish war machine misusing religion to a French despotic system of rule, based on the nature of the peoples, who were ruled as slaves and held no property rights.

Like Rohan, Lisola required a supraconfessional argument for persuading foreign rulers of various confessions to assist in the battle against the aspiring universal monarchy. The French predatory monarchy was opposed to the European legal order, to Christianity as well as a hazard to its commerce. The term Europe was used as a political and spiritual entity and interchangeably with Christendom, although Lisola employed the first term substantially more often. The notion of balance of power did not take centre stage in *Bouclier*; it was only referred to in countering Rohan's interest analysis of Spain's desire to conquest and its design for universal monarchy. However, he did associate this image explicitly with the threat of slavery for all of Europe.

Lisola's whole case reconfiguring Rohan's seminal study, struck a nerve and it proved central to anti-French arguments for the rest of the century. *Bouclier* produced serious commotion in the Imperial Diet as well as in France, where it was forbidden to read Lisola's book.[513] During the War of Devolution Lisola's observations and plea for blocking Louis's expansionist plans gained no hearing, but from the Franco-Dutch War onwards his arguments resounded in numerous pamphlets: French breach of law, French war crimes, 'French tyranny' and the imminent French universal monarchy. In the Holy Roman Empire pamphleteers defended the 'German liberty', and from the status of *Protector Germaniae* Louis XIV was turned

[512][Lisola], *The Buckler*, 273-274.
[513] Within the Imperial Diet debates evolved, initially about the precise authorship of *Bouclier* and when it was known who wrote the work, the debates centred on removing Lisola from his diplomatic office. The Emperor, however, remained very reticent. The Imperial Council officially proclaimed that *Bouclier* was written without authorisation or consent and that it did not embody the vision of Leopold. Rowen, *The king's State,* 107; Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk,* 165-166, 197-198, 312-314.

into the 'Erbfeind' and 'Antichrist'.[514] As we will see in the chapter on Valkenier, the anti-French argument of *Bouclier* developed into more vicious and direct attacks on Louis's rule after the French invasion in the Dutch republic of 1672. New elements were integrated in accusations of universal monarchy, such as Louis's design to subject Europe through the misuse of the, claimed, office of *arbiter belli et pacis*; and the metaphor of the balance of power became the ideal opponent of the French predatory monarchy.[515] Louis's threat to 'Christendom' was emphasised, in order to place his regime outside of the European Christian order, and it often implied accusations of an Ottoman system of rule, cruel, antichristian and barbaric, a theme underlined by references to the early modern Franco-Ottoman alliances. [516] In addition, the term 'Europe' finally established itself in the struggle against Louis XIV.[517] Levillain concludes that under the effect of Dutch propaganda (following the 1672 French invasion in the Republic) Lisola's ideas about French universal monarchy transferred into a Protestant tale and permeated Anglo-Dutch political culture.[518] Dutch and English pamphleteers appealed to the defence of the 'Liberties of Europe' often in conjunction with the rationale of the freedom of commerce, the Protestant religion (especially after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685), and the 'interests' and 'balance of Europe'. Helmut Schmidt believes Lisola lay the foundations of these new political overtones of 'Europe' by addressing the threat of Louis's striving for a universal monarchy to Europe's liberty, religion and commerce.[519] It is in this context of highly structured hostility to French policy that we can partially place Valkenier.

[514]Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde,* 48-49, 325-327, 330, 332-333, 337, 378-380.
[515]Bosbach, 'The European debate on universal monarch', 84.
[516] Tony Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom', 125-142.
[517] Already used in the wars with the Ottomans received various connotations from the late fifteenth century onwards. See the collection of essays in Heinz Duchhardt and Andreas Kunz (eds.) *Europäische Geschichte als historiographisches Problem* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1997).
[518] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 11, 6-7.
[519] Helmut Dan Schmidt, 'The Establishment of "Europe" as a Political Expression', *The Historical Journal* 9:2 (1966), 172-178. On Lisola and his *Bouclier* Schmidt writes on page 173: 'The publication of the *Buckler* (…) in French, German and English in that year had the purpose of changing that view of the international scene. (…) [Lisola] alleged that [France] was planning the establishment of a Catholic Universal Monarchy and becoming a threat to the liberty of Europe, to religion, and commerce. He thus forged an association which linked Europe with the concept of religious liberty, balance of power, and expanding commerce, ideas that commented themselves at once to men like Arlington and Sir William Temple.'

Chapter 5.
Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675): reason of state to restore order[520]

As an eyewitness of the so-called 'Year of Disaster' in 1672, Petrus Valkenier had seen the powerful Dutch Republic succumb under the invading armies of Louis XIV and his allies. The coastal provinces including Holland were not conquered, but within their cities massive riots broke out. These disastrous events prompted the breakdown of the stadholderless regime (1650-1672). Prince William III of Orange was appointed stadholder and captain general; the House of Orange-Nassau as officeholders of the stadholderate was restored. The Grand Pensionary of Holland, Johan de Witt, who was generally regarded as the leading symbol of the stadholderless regime, and his brother Cornelis were brutally slaughtered by an angry crowd in The Hague.[521]

In the successful book *'t Verwerd Europa* of 1675 Valkenier accused De la Court of attacking with malicious intent the good name and reputation of the princes of Orange and serving as a publicist of Johan de Witt.[522] Valkenier believed that De Witt's regime was to blame for the quick downfall of the Republic. In his large treatise Valkenier tried to give a 'Political and Historical Account Of the true Foundations and Causes of the Wars and Revolutions in Europe, predominantly in and surrounding the Netherlands since 1664, caused by the pretended Universal Monarchy of the French'.[523] This was attempted through an empirically based interest analysis of every European polity combined with an in-depth historical analysis of the regimes of Louis XIV and De Witt, and of the events of 1672, with the aim of helping to restore order. He relied upon and engaged with the other writers who have been central to this thesis:—because

---

[520] I have published on Petrus Vakenier's use of the vocabulary of reason of state in 2015. Marianne Klerk, "The unheard Changes in Europe, and the strange Revolutions which happened in our United Provinces in our times": reason of state and rule of law in Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675)', in Robert von Friedeburg and Matthias Schmoeckel (ed.), Recht, Konfession und Verfassung im 17. Jahrhundert. West- und mitteleuropäische Entwicklungen (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2015), 285-335. In this chapter I add the case of Lisola's *Bouclier* and several Dutch writings on reason of state in the 1670s to the context and further the general argument of this thesis on Rohan's legacy of reason of state and predatory monarchy as a sub-genre of political thought.

[521] Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic,* 796-806; For the important role burghers played in the events of 1672 read Michel Reinders, 'Burghers, Orangists and "Good Government": Popular Political Opposition during the 'Year of Disaster' 1672 in Dutch Pamphlets', *Seventeenth Century Journal* 23:2 (2008), 315-346.

[522] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 236. On this page, Valkenier referred to the re-edition of *Interest van Holland*, entitled *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* (Leiden 1669), which embodied a rearrangement of the chapters, some up-to-date information and a new preface. In De la Court's excused himself for the controversial contents of *Interest of Holland* for which the printers were to blame. Nevertheless, *Aanwysing* also received sharp criticism by the Church authorities and consequently was prohibited by the States of Holland. Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 61-62; Valkenier mentioned De la Court and his writings on pages 236-237, 246, 249 and 669; Jill Stern remarks that the 'contrast [of *'t Verwerd* Europa, MK] with the *Interest van Holland* was deliberate.' Jill Stern, *Orangism in the Dutch Republic in Word and Image, 1650–1675* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2010), 102.

[523] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, [title page].

of his reliance on these previous works he may be seen as part of a tradition of reflection, and provides a suitable terminus for the argument.

In the course of the eighteenth century Valkenier's favourable reputation declined, especially regarding his chronology of the French invasion in 1672.[524] Several historians considered his historical description of the Year of Disaster as extremely biased.[525] Albert de Lange suggests that together with the dismissal of his historical credentials, Valkenier's defence of republics together with his fierce stand for the House of Orange has helped consign his political theory, prominent in the earlier parts of *'t Verwerd Europa*, to relative obscurity.[526] The historiography on Valkenier's political thought is indeed very thin; recent commentaries revolve around his alleged 'republicanism', or his '(secular) Orange republicanism'. Thomas Maissen argues for the fundamental influence of Valkenier's republicanism on Swiss political discourse; Jonathan Israel claims 'secular Orange republicanism' found its most developed form in *'t Verwerd Europa*; and Jill Stern states that his defence of the mixed constitution galvanised the Orangist struggle from party-faction to the battle against France, conveyed through the dichotomy of freedom versus slavery.[527]

Valkenier's employment of the idiom of reason of state has likewise hardly been researched. Hans Blom believes that *'t Verwerd Europa* does not belong to 'the tradition of reason of state', since Valkenier supposedly understood the notion only negatively; concentrating on 'the dutiful

---

[524]Albert de Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier. Ein Überblick über sein Leben und Werk', in Albert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2004), 61-107, p. 75.

[525] The historian Petrus Johannes Blok (1855-1929) judged Valkenier's writing as 'without any literary value and obviously characterised by his intention to present the statecraft of William III in the most positive manner.' Petrus J. Blok, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche volk. Deel 3*(Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1925, third revised edition) 708; Mathijs Bokhorst called the work 'a large pamphlet' that contained two main themes: 'Orange-love and French-animosity'. Matthijs Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen voor en na 1700* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1930), 31, 1; Daniel Roorda described Valkenier as not being objective and accused him of deliberately withholding information in favour of the Orange-Faction. Daniel J. Roorda, *Partij en factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties.* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1978), 12-14.

[526] De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 75.

[527] Thomas Maissen, 'Petrus Valkeniers republikanische Sendung. Die niederländische Prägung des neuzeitlichen schweizerischen Staatsverständnisses', *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 48 (1998), p. 149-176; Israel, *The Dutch Republic,* 674, 786; Jill Stern, *Orangism in the Dutch Republic in word and image, 1650-75* (Machester: Machester University Press, 2010), 21, 102, 113, 151-152; Jonathan Israel claims that Eric Walten 'respected (…) the Orangist republican Petrus Valkenier' as his political ideas (unlike De la Court's) enabled Walten to support Orange and its cause of 1688, while simultaneously advocating a form of popular sovereignty. Israel, Jonathan. *Monarchy, Orangism, and Republicanism in the Later Dutch Golden Age* (Amsterdam: Amsterdams Centrum voor de Studie van de Gouden Eeuw, 2004), 21; In Walten's popular and often cited pamphlet *Spiegel der waarheyd* [Mirror of truth] of 1690 *'t Verwerd Europa* is one of the most important sources for his claim that the bad policy of the Amsterdam regents caused the present and previous wars with France. *Spiegel der waarheyd, ofte t'samensprekinge tusschen een armiaan ende vroom patriot, waar inne krachtig vertoont ende bewesen word, dat door de quade directie ende toeleg van eenige heerschende regenten tot Amsterdam, ons land in* (…) *desen oorlog is ingewikkelt met Vrankryk* (1690). Many pamphlets were published in that year of the conflict between Amsterdam and William III on Amsterdam's refusal to send the nomination list for magistrates to England**,** on the grounds that in the absence of the stadholder, the (High) Court of Holland could decide. A satiric pamphlet called *De Politicque Lotery* (1690) stated that Amsterdam would sell twelve raffles in favour of the 'repressed Truth', one of which was a golden statue with in the one hand the *Spiegel der Waerheyt* and in the other 'the famous Book by Valckenier'. *De politicque lotery, bestaende in vier en twintigh noyt gesiene, onwaerdeerlijcke en onschatbare looten, welcke ten voordeele van de verdruckte waerheyd en gerechtigheyt, konnen getrocken werden.* (1690). I would like to thank Frank Daudeij for this reference.

administration of the Dutch interest, not its cunning promotion.' Valkenier's 'preference for the stadhouder-system (…) is but a tame affair compared with the reason of state-based arguments for absolute monarchy.' Moreover, Blom discredits Valkenier's equation of 'interest of state' with 'reason of state' overlooking the interchangeable use of these expressions by contemporaries. Instead, and implausibly, he wishes to restrict the rise of reason of state to an expression mirroring self-conscious state building and the 'programmes of political modernisation' lacking in the decentralised Dutch Republic.[528] In a short article, Friedrich Meinecke paid exclusive attention to Valkenier's 'Lehre von den Interessen der Staaten'. He praised Valkenier for expanding Rohan's interest analysis of European rulers and their societies, for theorising interest of state and for constraining it by legal claims and ethics. He found Valkenier's tendency to discuss economic factors in his interest analysis instructive. Conversely, he held that Valkenier's treatment of France lacked the penetration and value of Lisola's, and criticised his political thought for its subjectivity, which the German historian discerned 'in many modern war writings', and judged it as containing 'not very original ideas.' Above all, Meinecke accused Valkenier of copying entire passages of *De l'interest* without substantiating this.[529]

This chapter argues that Valkenier's political thought should be re-assessed. First, his derivative argument shows the highly polemical function of interest analysis – the exact method and type of argument was used and re-used for different, even opposing objectives; Rohan's juxtaposition of interest analyses of rulers *with* surveys of the societies they ruled, as a means of denigrating Spanish, was, as I have shown, reapplied to the princes of Orange (De la Court) and Louis XIV (Lisola). Valkenier employed the same Rohanesque *modus operandi* against what he deemed the ruthless predatory monarchy of France and the oligarchic decadence of the De Witt regime. Secondly, it underlines the international context of the idiom of reason of state and his argument should be understood accordingly. It requires more than a local Dutch context. Last, *'t Verwerd Europa* exhibits several potentially tensile themes. Behind the politico-historical account of 1672 appears the feeling of the crisis of the rule of law and how order should be restored. Valkenier defended the stronghold of the Dutch Reformed Church in society, and

---

[528] H. W. Blom, *Morality and Causality in Politics. The Rise of Naturalism in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (PhD dissertation Utrecht University, 1995), 162-166, quotation 164. Blom sees in De la Court's use of the terminology as the only relevant contribution to the 'doctrine' in the sense of the formulation of reason of state doctrine within the Dutch debate, which led to a republican positive interest of state theory (unlike Valkenier's supposedly negative theory).

[529] 'Man erwarte von dem patriotischen Holländer nicht sehr tiefe und auch nicht sehr originelle Gedanken. Er kämpfte pro aris et focis gegen einen flagranten Exzess brutaler Interessenpolitik, und sein Buch zeichnete sich, wie so manches Erzeugnis moderner Kriegsliteratur, mehr durch eindringliches Pathos und Wärme der Empfindung als durch eine rein aus Erkennen gerichtete Gedankenschärfe aus.' Friedrich Meinecke, 'Petrus Valckeniers Lehre von dem Interesse der Staaten', in *Aus Politik und Geschichte. Gedächtnisschrift für Georg von Below* (Berlijn: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1928) 146-155, quote 147; In Meinecke's *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte* Valkenier's reason of state employment was addressed in a footnote. Meinecke, *The Age of Machiavellism,* 230-231 footnote 5: Eco Haitsma Mulier (wrongly) rejected Meinecke's accusation of copying Rohan. Eco Haitsma Mulier, 'Die Politisch-historischen Ideen von Petrus Valkenier', in Albert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2004), 108-122, p. 146.

attacked the alleged atheism and libertinism of *politiques*, such as De Witt; yet he also criticised theologians of dividing society with their quarrels and inciting princes and peoples into warfare. He rejected De la Court's full-frontal attack on war-mongering princes, yet condemned plunder despots. He favoured Orange princely rule powered by expanded military and financial resources, yet within the constraints of the established republican constitution. It was operating within such an order, protecting persons, property and privileges that stopped a prince becoming a predatory monarch. Furthermore, Valkenier not only stressed that interest should be pursued as a matter of justice (as had Lisola), but he attempted to specify how this should be done by theorising reason of state. In this sense, reason of state was seen at one with the rule of law.

His argument reflects the genuine struggles of political thought in the 1650s-1680s; a search for alternatives to civil order and the European legal order, for stability. The breakdown of regimes and the consequent crisis of order in the mid-seventeenth century gave rise to drastic theories of political legitimacy; such as strong royal authority (e.g. Hobbes) -as 'older resistance theories' (e.g. Beza and Althusius) had proven to be lethal for upholding civil order. It also fuelled vicious attacks on princely coercive practices (e.g. De la Court) and on the danger of religious fanaticism and superstition. Conversely, the political thought of the 1680s was characterised by a stress on the danger of such extreme theories and on arguments towards stabilising society (e.g. Pufendorf's laundered version of Hobbes's theory).[530]

As Valkenier alludes to it, the rule of law is a variable *topos*, sustaining authority, directly or indirectly from Aristotle's insistence that law made for better rule than men (*Politics* bk 3*)*. For Valkenier, this involved above all else, a rejection of arbitrary rule, the unrestrained will of the ruler with the consequent unpredictability of the exercise of power. As, however, 'arbitrary' rule was an entirely prejudicial formulation, some sense of an opposing rule of law was a commonplace, giving it substance was a more tricky matter. As such it did not necessarily amount to any fixed set of laws, or a faith in the independent authority of lawyers; for Valkenier, its evocation was a means of combining justice with reason of state, and of urging the necessity of a powerful prince (with prerogatives of action) while castigating the arbitrariness of predatory monarchy.

5.1 Valkenier and 't Verwerd Europa*: anti-French diplomacy, crisis of order and Lisola's legacy*

[530] Von Friedeburg and Morrill, *Monarchy Transformed*, introduction and conclusion.

The tensions and potential fault lines in Valkenier's arguments suggest a turbulence of intellectual context, and it is to this that we will turn, supplementing the partial context already provided by the previous writers discussed in this thesis. But first, something needs to be said of Valkenier's career. Valkenier's text was, like Lisola's at one with his diplomatic experience, but its francophobia informed his diplomatic career rather than being shaped by it. Then we will look into the perceived crisis of order and how Valkenier's professor at the university of Franeker, Ulricus Huber, attempted to restore it. Furthermore, the events of 1672 and the responses it generated will be outlined before turning to Lisola's legacy in Dutch and English anti-French writings.

5.1.1 Petrus Valkenier and his anti-French and pro-Protestant diplomacy

Little is known about the life of Petrus Valkenier before writing *'t Verwerd Europa*.[531] After publication he was granted a diplomatic post in Frankfurt, presumably on grounds of its anti-French and pro-Orangist message. His diplomatic career in Frankfurt (1676-1683), Regensburg (1683-1690) and Zürich (1690-1704) is better documented, although no personal envoy archive of Valkenier is maintained. His period in Zürich is extensively researched by Matthijs Bokhorst, who in particular has made clear Valkenier's success in breaking up the French monopoly of the recruitment of troops in the Swiss Cantons.[532]

There has been some doubt as to Valkenier's year of birth,[533] but Bokhorst has established that he was born in 1641, evidenced by a personal letter of Valkenier to the secretary of the States General, François Fagel, of 1671, in which he wrote that he had reached the age of 60. Furthermore, the registration to the University of Leiden 22 October 1665 states the age of 24 and the city of Emmerik as his birthplace.[534] On 27 April 1661 Valkenier registered

---

[531] Abraham Jakob van der Aa, *Biografisch woordenboek der Nederlanden. Deel 20* (Haarlem: J.J. van Brederode 1877), 21; Christine von Honingen-Huene, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen der Schweiz und Holland im XVII. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Duncker, 1899), 125-195; Matthijs Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen voor en na 1700* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1930); Otto Schutte, *Repertorium der Nederlandse vertegenwoordigers residerende in het buitenland 1584-1810* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983), 152 (nr.100); Eco Haitsma Mulier and Anton van der Lem, 'Petrus Valkenier', in idem, *Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland* (The Hague: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1990), 414-415; Albert de Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 61-107.

[532] Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen*; Albert de Lange en Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg/Ubstadt-Weiher/Basel: Regionalkultur, 2004).

[533] Hajo Brugmans, 'Valckenier, Pieter', in P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok (eds.), *Nieuw Nederlands Biografisch Woordenboek* deel 5 (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1921), 988-989.

[534] Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen*, p. 1 footnote 3; Willem Nicolaas Du Rieu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batave MDLXXV-MDCCCLXXXV: accedunt nomina curatorum et professorum per eadem secula* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875), 526; There exists a presumption of Petrus' kinship to the famous Amsterdam regent family Valckenier, to which the famous Amsterdam mayor Gillis Valckenier belonged, yet no convincing evidence can be found. Although Bokhorst underlined this, he assumed the probability of the relationship, since Petrus Valkenier used the coat of arms of the Amsterdam regent family and, moreover, referred to A. Ferwerda research who claimed that both Gillis and Petrus represented two branches of the offspring of Gillis Valckenier who lived in Kampen around 1500. In Elias' *De Vroedschap van Amsterdam 1578-1795* Petrus Valkenier does not appear. Bokhorst moreover

at the Protestant university of Duisburg, and after a first year of philosophy, Valkenier began to study law. On 30 October he enrolled as a law student at the university of Franeker in Friesland. On 5 July 1666 he obtained his doctorate with the thesis *De officio judicis* at Ulricus Huber, who had become professor in law in that same year. The manuscript, however, is lost. One year before attaining his doctorate, Valkenier registered at the university of Leiden. Albert de Lange believes that here he probably met Gisbert Cuper, who studied at Leiden in the same period and of whom a correspondence with Valkenier is kept.[535]

In the 1670s, Valkenier practised law in Amsterdam, which also appears from the caption of his portrait 'olim celebrr. Reipubl. Amstelodamensis Advocatus'.[536] In all probability he moved to Amsterdam in the beginning of 1670, where later that year he married Charlotte Becx van Oersbeek (1652-1722), a daughter of the bookkeeper of the powerful merchant and canon-producer Louis de Geer. On 19 December 1676 Valkenier was registered as a citizen of Amsterdam, after he was appointed as the representative (resident) of the States General in Frankfurt a few months before.[537] The anti-French and pro-Orange contents of his book *'t Verwerd Europa* written after 1672 probably contributed to his appointment.

After its publication in 1675 *'t Verwerd Europa* became an immediate success and it was reprinted in that same year. A German translation was published in 1677. In his preface Valkenier wrote that he set out to treat the events of 1672 up to 1675, but people had pressured him to publish his writings immediately. Perhaps this was an overstatement, nevertheless *'t Verwerd Europa* was one of the first systematic interest analyses of the causes of the Year of Disaster written in the Dutch language complemented by a theoretical deliberation on reason of state. He promised the reader that a second edition about the events of 1673 and 1674 was already with the printer, but it was never published. In 1667 Valkenier received a diplomatic office in Frankfurt. His secretary Andreas Müller fulfilled Valkenier's promise and published two folio editions in 1680 and 1683.[538] The book was also given a sequel in the year of the Orange

---

stressed that contemporaries regarded Petrus Valkenier related to the Amsterdam burgomaster. Albert de Lange pursued this direction further in his biographical essay on Petrus Valkenier. A. Ferwerda, *Adelijk en aanzienlijk Wapenboek van de zeven provincien; waarbij gevoegd zijn een groot aantal Genealogien van voornaame Adelijke en Aanzienlijke Familien* (Leeuwarden, 1760-1781); Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen*, 2; Johan E. Elias, *De Vroedschap van Amsterdam 1578-1795*, Vol. 1 and 2 (Haarlem: Loosjes, 1903-1905). Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen*, 2, footnote 1; De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier,' 61-67.

535 Sybrandus Johannes Fockema Andreae and Theodorus Josephus Meijer (eds*.), Album studiosorum Academiae Franekerensis (1585-1811, 1816-1844): naamlijst der studenten* (Franeker: Wever, 1968), 196; Thedorus Josephus Meijer (ed.), *Album promotorum Academiae Franekerensis (1591-1811)* (Franeker: Wever, 1972) 42; Nationaal Archief (The Hague) *Collectie Cuperus*, 1.10.24; Koninlijke Bibliotheek (The Hague) *Collectio Cuperus*.

536 De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 67; Haitsma Mulier and Van der Lem, *Petrus Valkenier*, 414-415; Brugmans, *Valckenier*, 988-989.

537 Petrus and Charlotte had four children, of which only Ida Charlotte (1671-1702) reached adulthood, but died on the age of thirty-one, childless. De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 67.

538 Petrus Valkenier, *Das verwirrte Europa : oder, politische und historische Beschreibung der in Europa, fürnehmlich in dem Vereinigten Niederlande, und in dessen Nachbarschaft, seither dem Jahre 1664 entstandenen, und durch die gesuchte allgemeine Monarchie der Frantzosen, verursachten blutigen Kriege, und leidigen Empörungen, nebenst den authenticquen Copeyen der Briefe und gewissen Berichten* (Amsterdam: Jacob von Meurs/Johannes von Someren/ Hendrich and Diederich Boom, 1677); Matthijs Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen voor en na 1700*

rise to the English throne in 1688, and was reprinted in 1742 at the end of the Second Stadholdersless period (1702-1747), in which the Dutch Republic suffered severe losses in the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748) and opinion rose in favour of the re-instalment of Orange.[539]

His entire diplomatic career is marked by his defence of the Protestant faith, and in particular his anti-French perspectives. In Frankfurt Valkenier enjoyed no successes; his advocacy of an anti-French coalition was not sympathetically received by German princes.[540] In this period, his secretary Andrea Muller continued his writings and published two folio volumes in 1680 and 1683.[541] Valkenier was promoted to Regensburg in 1683. Bokhorst describes Valkenier's correspondence from this time as 'a weak effort to present the State General a clear image of the chaos of these conflicts.'[542] From 1685, however, Valkenier started a secret correspondence with Johan Heinrich Heidegger, professor of theology, representative of the city of Zürich. Only Stadholder William III and the secretary of the States General were informed. The cause for this correspondence was Louis XIV's expansionist policies (he had already annexed neighbouring Franche-Comté and Strasbourg) and, in particular, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in October 1685. The revocation had resulted in an influx of Huguenot refugees in Zurich and other Swiss Protestant cities. Valkenier was incensed by it. Heidegger belonged to a group of Protestant clergymen, with great political influence, which defended a confessional alliance. The central issue of this pro-Dutch lobby entailed chiefly the French monopoly in recruitment of Swiss troops, in the Catholic as well as the Protestant cantons, and the presence of Swiss troops

---

(Amsterdam 1930), 3; Andreas Müller, *Des Verwirreten Europæ Continuation, oder Wahre Historische Beschreibunq Derer in der Christenheit/ fürnehmlich aber in dem Vereiniqten Niederlande Teutschland/ und henach in den angräntzenden Reichen Fürstenthümerh und Herrschafften/ zeither dem jahre 1673. biß auff das jahr 1676. dureh die Waffen des Königes in Franckreich erregter blutiger Krieqe/ Empörung und Verwüstung. Abgetheilet in drey Theile* (Amsterdam: J. van Sommeren/Henrich and Diedrich Boom, 1680); Andreas Müller, *Das Verwirrte Europa dritter Theil: Wahre Historische Beschreibung Derer in der Christenheit, fürnehmlich aber in dem Vereinigten Niederlande, Teutschland, und hernach in den angräntzenden Reichen, Fürstenthümern und Herrschaffen, zeither dem Jahre 1676. biß auff das Jahr 1682. durch die Waffen des Königes in Franckreich erreichter bluhtiger Kriege, leidigen Empörungen und erschrecklicher Verwüstung. Abgetheilet in drey Theile* (Amsterdam: J. van Sommeren/Henrich and Diedrich Boom, 1680).

[539] *Vervolg van 't verwerd Europa, of Politijke en Historsiche Beschryving van alle gedenkwaardige Staats- en Krygs-Voorvallenzoo binnen, als buyten 't Christen-Ryk, Voornamentlijk in en omtremt Hoog- en Neder-Duytsland, en derzelver aangrenzende Rijken en Staaten, zedert den Jaare 1672 tot 1675. Door de Fransche Wapenen veroorzaakt.* (Amsterdam: Hendrick and the widow of Dirk Boom, 1688); *Vervolg van 't verwerd Europa, of Politijke en Historsiche Beschryving van alle gedenkwaardige Staats- en Krygs-Voorvallenzoo binnen, als buyten 't Christen-Ryk, Voornamentlijk in en omtremt Hoog- en Neder-Duytsland, en derzelver aangrenzende Rijken en Staaten, zedert den Jaare 1672 tot 1675. Door de Fransche Wapenen veroorzaakt.* (Amsterdam: A. Schoonenberg and J. Rotterdam, 1742); Petrus Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa ofte politieke en historische beschrijvinge der waare fundamenten en oorzaken van de oorlogen en revolutien in Europa voornamentlijk in en omtrent de Nederlanden zedert den jaare 1664. Gecauseert door de gepretendeerde Universelen Monarchie der Franschen* (Amsterdam: A. Schoonenberg and J. Rotterdam, 1742).

[540] Moreover, his children died at a very young age in Frankfurt. Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse Betrekkingen,* 2; De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier,' 78-79;

[541] Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen,* 2-3; Albert de Lange stresses the limited material on Valkenier's time in Frankfurt, but he ascertains that Valkenier often attended the Dutch reformed services in Hanau and that he held private services in his home. De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 82.

[542] The National Archives in The Hague holds diplomatic letters by Petrus Valkenier to Gaspar Fagel, Coenraad van Heemskerck, and Anthonie Heinsius; Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen,* 3.

in the Protestant Republic. The correspondence ended when Valkenier was transferred to Zürich in 1690.[543]

The archive of Gisbert Cuper at the National Archives in The Hague holds an anti-French and anti-Catholic satire by Valkenier, accompanied by a copied letter to the States General from 11 April 1686. In their correspondence they shared their obsession for antiquities, especially for ancient fossils and coins, and kept each other informed about current political affairs. In the tradition of the *Iulius exclusus e coelis* of 1514 (a satire on Pope Julius II not being allowed into Heaven), Valkenier satirises Louis XIV who 'could attain no place in heaven when he fulfilled his destiny', but Father Pope felt sorry for his son and beatified him on earth; 'And so Louis resides as exile far from heaven, but credulous Rome honours him as a saint.'[544]

In Zürich Valkenier fought relentlessly against the presence of Swiss troops in Louis's armies, which is documented in detail.[545] In the first years of his stay, Valkenier often complained at the Swiss *Tagsatzung* in Baden, where representatives of all the thirteen cantons gathered, about this transgression. Swiss participation in Louis's wars was offensive, while the treaty between France and the Swiss Confederacy of 1663 stresses the defensive nature of the Swiss support. In line with this argument, Valkenier pointed to the 'false' neutrality of the Swiss cantons. In 1691 he distributed an appeal, addressing this.[546] It appeared successful. In March

---

[543]Amongst other Dutch representatives, Valkenier promoted the publication of a treatise by Heidegger, in which he pleaded for an alliance between the Dutch Calvinists and the Lutherans against the Catholic (French) threat. Johan Heinrich Heidegger, *In viam concordiae protestantium ecclesiasticae manuductio* (Amsterdam 1687); De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 84-85, Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse Betrekkingen,* 2-3.

[544] The correspondence between Cuper and Valkenier covers the period from Valkenier's period in Regensburg until his death in 1712. NA, collection Cuperus, 1.10.24, inv.nr. 12: 3; 'Valkenirus eodem tempore sequentes versus ad Ordines misit

Ludovicus Canonizatus

1 In coelis decimus Ludovicus in ordine quartus
non potuit fato functus habere locum
3 Vidit id, et doluit Romanae presbiter aulae
Papa pater nati tristia fata sui.
5 Hinc eris, in coelis si non potes esse, beatus
In terris, igitur Te mea Roma colet,
7 Dixit, et aeternis Ludovici nomina fastis
inscripsit, sanctis inseruitque choris,
9 Sic coelo procul exul agit Ludovicus, at illum
Sanctorum numero credula Roma colit.'

[545] Von Honingen-Huene, *Beiträge zur Geschichte*, 125-195; Matthias Senn, *Petrus Valkenier: Erster niederländischer Gesandter in Zürich und Mahner der Eidgenossenschaft* (Zürich: Niederländisches General-Konsulat, 1990), 1-15; Heinzpeter Stucki, 'Pieter Valkenier in Zürich,' in Labert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg/Ubstadt-Weiher/Basel: Regionalkultur, 2004), 123-140; Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse Betrekkingen,* 28, 103; Thomas Maissen, 'Petrus Valkeniers republikanische Sendung'; Thomas Maissen, '"Par un pur motief de religion et en qualité de Republicain." Der außenpolitischeRepublikanismus der Niederlande und seine Aufnahme in der Eidgenossenschaft (ca.1670-1710)', in: Luise Schorn-Schütte (ed.), *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts: Politische Theologie – Res Publica-Verständnis – konsens gestützte Herrschaft, Historische Zeitschrift. Beihefte,* 39 (München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 2004), 233-282.

[546] Petrus, Valkenier, *Des Hoch-Edlen, Gestrengen Herrn, Herrn Petri Valkeniers (…) Mündlich geführte Klage Uber die vielfältige Frantzösiche Contraventions deß mit der Eydgnoßschaft habende Bunds und über den stätigen Mißbrauch der Eydgnößsischen Völker wider die samtlich Hohe Allierten, Samt der darauf begehrter gebührender Remedur* (Baden, 1691); Translated into Dutch *Klagte van den heer Petrus Valkenier, extraordinaris envoyé van (…) op den 8 Maart*

1693 Valkenier signed several treaties with Zürich, Graubünden and secret treaties with Bern. In May the first troops were recruited by the States General. By the end of 1695, Valkenier had recruited four regiments, two from Bern, one from Zürich, and one from Graubünden. Eventually, 9,000 Swiss soldiers were stationed in the Dutch Republic in 1698, and a varying number of 20,000 to 25,000 soldiers during the War of Spanish Succession. Notably, their contribution to the latter war was more decisive than to the Nine Years' War (1688-1697).[547]

In the Swiss historiography Valkenier is additionally praised for his efforts for the Waldensian refugees from Piedmont, whom the Duke of Savoy had banned after signing an individual peace with Louis XIV in 1696.[548] In 1698-1701 Valkenier lobbied actively for them in the Holy Roman Empire, in particular at the Landgrave Ernst Ludwig von Hessen-Darmstadt and Duke Eberhard Ludwig von Württemberg. It took Valkenier only a few months to obtain preferable privileges for the religious refugees from the Landgrave, the Duke and other southern Hessian princes, probably attracted by the enforcement of an alliance with the Dutch Republic. De Lange points to Valkenier's numerous portrayals of the Waldensian communities as 'our' colonies in his correspondence to the Grand Pensionary of Holland, Antonie Heinsius.[549]

About his life in Zürich little is known. According to Bokhorst, his 'deep devoutness and his strict ecclesiastical life' connected him to a group a powerful priests and professors of theology in Zürich. His efforts for the Waldensian brought him high esteem. Concomitantly, his reputation with the Catholic cantons was bad.[550] Although he carried credentials for all cantons, Valkenier focused mostly on the Protestant authorities. Moreover, the States General granted him the secret task of organising a pro-Dutch lobby amongst the magistrates of Zürich, Basel, Bern Schaffhausen and other Protestant cities. In 1704 the States General called him back. He spent the last years of his life in The Hague, where he died on 15 July 1712 and was buried in the Great Church.[551]

5.1.2 The Crisis of Order and the 'Year of Disaster', 1672.

---

mondeling gedaan. Over de veelvuldige Fransche contraventien des verbonds dat zy met het loffel: eedgenoodschap zijn hebbende ... Beneffens aanwysinge der remedien welke daer op verzocht worden, (Amsterdam, 1691), 1-12.

[547] Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse Betrekkingen,* 77-101.

[548] See for instance Von Honingen-Huene, *Beiträge zur Geschichte*; Theo Kiefner,'Die Waldenser auf ihrem Weg aus dem Val Cluson durch die Schweiz nach Deutschland 1532-1820/30,' in *Endgültig nach Deutschland 1690-1820/30* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); De Lange en Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700;* De Lange points to the exclusively German literature about this subject. De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 93.

[549] De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier', 92-93.

[550] This was not least because of his mediation between the Holy Roman Empire and Zürich escaping an imperial ban on wheat in 1689. The Emperor issued this ban after France used Swiss troops in battles against him. Bokhorst, *Nederlands-Zwitserse Betrekkingen,* 29-30.

[551] De Lange, 'Pieter Valkenier,' 96.

From the late sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century incessant warfare, confessional strife, civil wars, and coercive princely politics gave rise to a perceived crisis of the rule of law; it became increasingly detached from revealed religion.[552] As a result, the rule of law survived as a basic normative issue despite the breakdown of the major religious foundations it had in confessional Christianity.

The 'crisis of order', as Justin Champion argues, culminated in breakdown of regimes in the 1640s and 1650s. In England the killing of King Charles I and Archbishop Laud ruptured and even subverted basic assumptions about hierarchy, discipline and order, about social and political legitimacy. Champion writes: 'After 1660 the cultural and political instrument for reconstructing order were continually contested. The most difficult and complex procedure for re-establishing and "neutralising" power involved bringing conscience back into deference to authority: this can be most imaginatively conceptualized in the form of the relationship between church and state, and that between priest and people.'[553] Anticlericalism intensified in the second half of the seventeenth century, attacks on the church moved from purely theological premises towards arguments posed in more political (still religious) terms, as the mid-seventeenth century witnessed the coinage of 'priestcraft' for which Hobbes laid the groundwork. The term became the utmost manifestation of anticlericalism in the 1690s and 1700s.[554] In the Dutch Republic during the last decades of the seventeenth century, authors abhorred the alleged medieval heritage of 'priestcraft' (clerical meddling in secular affair's), scorned 'fanaticism' (theologians, who brought their doctrinal conflicts to the political authorities and public, such as in the Arminian troubles of 1618), and condemned 'superstition' (quarrels about extremely precise interpretations of faith or worship considered to endanger the very foundations of faith, e.g. the Voetian rigidity).[555] The nature of priesthood and ecclesiastical power remained central to the political debates of the late seventeenth century. Attempts to reconstruct order consequently involved arguments on true religion based on understandings of sacerdotal nature of the church**,** or notions of true religion as still the foundation of morality and the social cement of society without the necessary involvement of the

---

552 Michael Stolleis, 'The Legitimation of Law through God, Tradition, Will, Nature and Constitution', in Lorraine Daston and Michael Stolleis (eds.), Natural Law and Laws of Nature in Early Modern Europe Jurisprudence, Theology, Moral and Natural Philosophy (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), 45-55.

553 Justin Champion, "Religion's Safe, with Priestcraft is the War": Augustan Anticlericalism and the Legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720', *The European Legacy* 5:4 (2000), 547-561, 'crisis of order' on p. 548-549: 'Given that early modern understandings of confessional nature of the state insisted that religious orthodoxy was the premise of civil citizenship, and that consequently politics was infused with Christian meaning, then struggles over the power, significance and nature of religious institutions were not marginal to political conflict, but in most cases constitutive tot it.'

554 Champion, "Religion's Safe, with Priestcraft is the War", 549.

555 Joke Spaan, *Graphic Satire and Religious Change: The Dutch Republic 1676-1707* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 199. Spaans also mentions 'enthusiasm' as one of the three which were seen as 'false religions' by 'enlightened observers: 'the attempt to overturn public order and establish the rule of saints, as part of a divinely ordained mission, was the one they abhorred the most.' as witnessed in the English Civil War.

confessional churches.[556] It is within this broad framework of concern that reactions to the brutal and surprising French invasion of the Republic can be placed.

In March 1672 Louis XIV declared war on the Dutch Republic,[557] followed by an English attack on a Dutch convoy in the Channel. Via the French allied territories, of the bishoprics of Münster and Cologne, Louis's troops attacked the Republic from the east at the end of May 1672; and by the end of June Louis XIV and his allies occupied the provinces of Utrecht, Gelderland, Overijssel. William III's small army had retreated behind the 'Holland water line', the flooded zone spanning from the Zuyder Zee to the Rhine. The rapidity of the invasion, subsequent massive looting in the conquered areas, and the revolts in Holland and Zeeland of 1672 marked the beginning of anti-French foreign policy for the ensuing forty years. The United Provinces fought three wars against Louis XIV: the Franco-Dutch War (1672-1678), the Nine Years' War (1688-1697) and the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714). After experiencing the French force in 1672, Dutch foreign policy shifted from one primarily based on defensive alliances and active neutrality towards an offensive policy under William III strengthening the army, diplomatic network, and setting up offensive treaties and propaganda campaigns directed against Louis XIV.[558]

In February 1672, William III was appointed captain general for one season only.[559] De Witt organised the Dutch defence. However, the Republic's quick downfall, and the subsequent rising opinion in favour of Orange led to the restoration by Zeeland and Holland of the prince of Orange in the offices of stadholder and captain general. Cornelis de Witt was arrested and while Johan visited his brother in prison, they both were taken by an angry crowd (including burghers) and lynched.[560] William's power grew rapidly. He was granted the authority to appoint urban magistrates (although traditional 'Orangist' cities as Leiden and Haarlem

---

556 Champion, "Religion's Safe, with Priestcraft is the War", 547-561; Joke Spaans, "Hieroglyfen. De verbeelding van de godsdienst," in Henk van Nierop, ed., Romeyn de Hooghe. De verbeelding van de Gouden Eeuw (Amsterdam: Waanders, 2008), 48-57.

557 Louis XIV was determined to diminish the power of the small maritime Dutch Republic, repelled by its diplomatic schemes during and after the War of the Devolution. The historian Paul Sonnino, however, stresses that Louis XIV's 'most immediate objective (…) was the acquisition of the Spanish Low Countries, but the Triple Alliance still stood in his way, and Louis' only option was (…) to seek to enlist Charles II of England in a war against the Dutch.' Paul Sonnino, '*Plus royaliste que le pape*: Louis XIV's Religious Policy and his *Guerre de* Hollande', in David Onnekink (ed.), *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1723* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2016), 17-24, p. 21.

558 Although after 1667 the policy of active neutrality could no longer be retained. Simon Groenveld, 'William III as Stadholder: Prince or Minister?', in Esther Meijers and David Onnekink, *Redefining William: the impact of the King-Stadholder in international context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 17-37, p. 25-26; Wout Troost, 'To restore and preserve the liberty of Europe': William III's ideas on foreign policy', in David Onnekink and Gijs Rommelse (eds.), *Ideology and foreign policy in early modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 283-303.

559 The province of Holland, led by De Witt faction promoted the dictatorship *ad tempus*, or De Witt's own term '*ad expeditionem'* opposed to the other provinces. The fear for the duration of the powers of the stadholder appeared the real issue. On this issue re-appearing in anti-Wlliamnite propaganda during the standing army debates of the 1690s in England, see Charles-Édouard Levillain, 'Cromwell Revidivus? William II as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality', in Esther Meijers and David Onnekink, *Redefining William III: the impact of the King-Stadholdet in international context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 159-176.

560 See in particular Michel Reinders, *Printed Pandemonium: Popular Print and Politics in the Netherlands 1650-72* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

opposed) and received the extraordinary power of dismissal from office in time of necessity. And he exercised these powers: in Holland he changed 130 of the 460 regents, installing his partisans or regents who had advocated the Orangist cause during the tumultuous period. He set up a network of clients throughout the provinces promoting his supporters in high offices. He also sidestepped the nomination lists for urban offices made by the magistrates. In foreign affairs, likewise, the prince started to assume power, as William created his own diplomatic network of agents alongside the traditional one. Through both networks, William set up a diplomatic offensive sponsoring alliances against Louis XIV, in which context we may interpret Valkenier's diplomatic appointment. In 1674 the prince was appointed hereditary stadholder by the States of Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht, not least due to the recent purges of the assemblies, as he for instance took over power in Utrecht after the withdrawal of French troops in 1674. Simon Groenved concludes: 'Thus William, unlike his predecessors, systematically integrated his private court and the governmental machinery of the state. (…) [H]e extended the limits of his powers, on the basis of what he himself regarded as the urgency of the moment.'[561]

Nonetheless, warfare against Louis demanded vast land forces and high investments. The Union's troops exploded from 32,5000 men in the relative peaceful year of 1670 to 93,5000 in the Franco-Dutch War, up to 102,000 in the Nine Years' War, and 119,000 men during the War of the Spanish Succession. Yet, the French troops were significantly larger: 280,000 during the first war against the Dutch republic and 420,000 in the Nine Years' War. The province of Holland had to find 10 million guilders in 1670, but four years later they had to pay 21 million. The regents imposed new taxes and raised existing ones. However, these new resources could not fill the growing budget gaps and the government had to borrow substantial amounts of money. In 1713 the debt of the province of Holland was 310 million and 70 per cent of revenue taxes was used to cover interest. The wars against Louis XIV had severe financial consequences for Dutch society at large: trade and manufacturing suffered, and unemployment and poverty increased in the cities. Contemporaries related the arising civil upheavals to increasing tax burdens.[562]

The direct stimulus for the publication of *'t Verwerd Europa* was the planned peace negotiations between France and the Dutch Republic and its allies, including the Spanish King and the Emperor, in the spring of 1675. In June 1672 the Emperor had already come to the aid of the Dutch Republic and in October 1673 the Spanish monarchy joined the war on the Dutch side. Moreover, in the beginning of 1674 the English King Charles II was forced to pull out of the war by his parliament, in March 1674 the peace of Westminster was signed and in April 1674 Münster and Cologne likewise concluded peace with the Dutch Republic. In the course of 1674 Louis XIV had to retreat from Dutch soil. Yet, Stadholder William III continued to pursue allied

[561] Simon Groenveld, 'William III as Stadholder: Prince or Minister?', quotation from 23, 37.
[562] Donald Haks, *Vaderland en vrede, 1672-1713: publiciteit over de Nederlandse Republiek in oorlog* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2013), 9-10.

warfare. He argued that the fragile southern boarders should be secured first.[563] The majority of the States General, however, favoured peace with France due to the costs of war. Even the staunchest Orangists of 1672 questioned the prince's costly bellicose foreign policy, which revealed the fragility of factional allegiance under pressure of a (perceived) crisis. It was openly discussed who profited from the war. The cities of Amsterdam and Leiden not only favoured peace, but also opposed the planned appointment of William III as Duke of Gelre, so challenging his power.[564] The point of publication of Valkenier's book was to shore up William's position by influencing opinion in favour of a grand scale coalition war against France with all its budgetary implications.

In the course of the seventeenth century authors reflected on theoretical solutions to the crisis of order. To examine the nature of the political realm authors increasingly began to employ historical analysis; history served to determine natural law and the specific laws belonging to a polity, or to predict behaviour of political actors as in interest analyses. Moreover, the growing practice of communal and territorial laws undermined the invocation of God and differentiated notions of legality.[565] At different levels of formality writers in the late 17th century were concerned with a crisis of order, more or less systematically focussing on conceptions of a rule of law. As we saw in the introduction, Samuel Pufendorf is the most significant at the most sustained level of philosophical coherence with his laundered version of Hobbes's arguments in *De cive*. His argument was rooted in his empirically based analysis of the specific interests of European dynastic agglomerates, which was founded on the origins, character and changing circumstances of its societies, claiming that it was the natural law obligation of the ruler (particularly security) to ascertain the 'true' interest of state. As Lisola and Valkenier before him, he assessed the predatory nature of the French kingdom: densely populated, warlike, passionate people, and robbery by conquest. However, in such a world of change and conflict, the Christian moral duty of men towards their fellowmen remained the basis of security within societies.[566] In a number of respects both his works and those of Valkenier's professor at Franeker University, Ulricus Huber (1636-1649) overlap thematically with *'t Verwerd Europa*[567] and therefore we will outline Huber's work before turning to the

[563] Charles-Édouard Levillain, 'William III's military and political career in Neo-Roman context, 1672-1702', in *The Historical Journal* 48:2 (2005), 321-350, p. 333 reference to a letter from Gabriel Sylvius to Arlington of 6 April 1674.
[564] Eventually William had to accept that in 1678 the Dutch Republic, led by Amsterdam and Leiden, signed a separate peace with France; Peter Rietbergen, 'Persuasie en Meditatie: de Republiek en de Vrede van Nijmegen (1678)', in Simon Groenveld, Maurits Ebben and Raymond Fagel (eds.), *Tussen Munster en Aken. De Nederlandse Republiek als grote mogendheid (1648-1748)* (Maastricht: Shaker Publishing, 2005), 21-30, p. 25-26; Simon Groenveld, *Evidente factiën Evidente factien in den staet: Sociaal-politieke verhoudingen in de 17e-eeuwse Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1990), 213-245; Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 159.
[565] Stolleis, 'The Legitimation of Law', 46.
[566] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 322-324; Seidler, 'Introduction', ix-xl.
[567] Meinecke, *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'État,* 287-288; Seidler, 'Introduction', xvii.

work's immediate context of the pamphlet wars of the 1670s concerning the future of the Republic.

Another author trying to reconstruct order was Ulricus Huber.[568] Kossmann claims that Huber took the 'middle ground', mixing 'Aristotelianism' with 'Cartesianism' into a *philosophia novantiqua*, argued in his magnum opus *De jure Civitatis Libri Tres* (1673) and taught at Franeker University.[569] He believed that Grotius' law of nature (to which he added divine inspiration) could be combined with Hobbes's sovereignty theory, but he rejected Hobbes' method of hypothesis by stressing historical empiricism to explain the establishment of government. He mixed the perspectives from Althusius on inalienable popular sovereignty with Hobbes' ideas of inalienable and absolute sovereignty of the state; Huber found many historical examples to invalidate both such general theories and, moreover, he could find none wherein a multitude of individuals gave up their sovereignty individually. However, he attributed certain inalienable rights to people when joined in a political society: freedom of conscience and the protection of life and property. Huber claimed that sovereignty was absolute, indivisible and inalienable, but sovereignty could be restricted by a constitution, since some rights could be partly shared with representative assemblies. Besides, rights of the sovereign could be breached, when necessity required it in accordance to the well-being of the people. Huber pleaded for constitutional aristocracy as most efficient and most stable because it tempered arbitrary rule by a prince or by a (anarchic) multitude. Instead of stressing human self-interest, Huber emphasised the subjection of government to norms set by God.[570]

Of more immediate and focussed importance for *'t Verwerd Europa* was the body of more occasional pamphlets generated by the crises of 1672. Regardless of whether their explicit concern was with a rule of law, the breach of norms and rules was presupposed in their

---

[568] Ernst H. Kossmann, *'De Dissertationes Politicae* van Ulric Huber' in Theodoor Weevers, P. K. King, and P. F. Vincent (eds.) *European context: studies in the history and literature of the Netherlands presented to Theodoor Weevers* (Cambridge: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1971), 164-177; Kossmann, *Politieke theorie in het zeventiende-eeuwse Nederland* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche uitgevers maatschappij, 1960), 59-102; E.H. Kossmann, 'Some late 17th-century writingson Raison d'Etat', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staaträso: Studien zur Gechichte eines politischen Begriffs* (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1975), 497-504.

[569] Huber believed himself to be the first who separated the *politica* from *ius publicum universale* as two related but distinct sciences. The politica was, in his opinion, a system of principles of utility, advising what was useful or necessary for the ruler to do, whereas universal public law was a science searching for the rights of the ruler and the subjects, teaching the ruler what he had the right to do. Huber claimed contemporaries incorrectly blended law and politica, such as Hobbes had done. Kossmann, *Politiek denken*, 59-60, 85; Ulricus Huber, *De jure Civitatis Libri Tres* (1673; re-edition 1684; definitive form 1694).

[570] Ernst H. Kossmann, *'De Dissertationes Politicae* van Ulric Huber' in T. Weevers, P. K. King, and P. F. Vincent (eds.) *European context: studies in the history and literature of the Netherlands presented to Theodoor Weevers* (Cambridge: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1971), 164-177; Kossmann, *Politieke theorie*, 59-102; E.H. Kossmann, 'Some late 17th-century writings on Raison d'Etat', 497-504; Theo J. Veen, *Recht en nut. Studiën naar aanleiding van Ulrik Huber (1636-1694)* (Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1976), 160-201; Hans Erich Bödeker, 'Debating the *respublica mixta*: German and Dutch Political Discourses 1700', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 219-246, p. 241-245.

preoccupation with the need to save their society from the arbitrary, tyrannical and despotic power of France as well as power-hungry regents or Orange plunder princes.

During 1672 there was a flood of pamphlets calling for the re-instalment of the House of Orange and blaming the brothers De Witt for the disastrous events swept over the Dutch Republic. Authors legitimised their claims in terms of being 'true patriots' defending the 'freedom' and 'fatherland'. Inhabitants were well informed on the course of the war through newspapers, newsprints and journals; and through days of prayer, processions and festivities, the regents attempted to influence opinion, whilst citizens attempted to as well, by debating the licit scope of the regents' offices and the significance of the murders of the brothers De Witt.[571]

The Year of Disaster fuelled publications using the popular idiom of interest. It appears that in 1672 a greater attention was paid to the general affairs of Europe in order to dissect the 'true' Dutch interest of state. Numerous pamphlets scrutinised the position of the Dutch Republic in the chaos of European warfare and promised to unveil the 'true' motives of all regimes involved. To this end, authors frequently employed the vocabulary of 'interest'. These interest analyses ordered the intertwined foreign and domestic events, pleaded a specific direction in foreign policy and, not to the least, in internal politics. They were usually fashioned into a short and seemingly objective overview of interests of European regimes in the tradition of Rohan's interest analysis or conveyed through a 'praetje' [pamphlet in the form of a fictive dialogue] between persona representing, for instance, the rival provinces Zeeland and Holland, or oligarchic regents and opposing citizens. A further use of the idiom was to prove, or to refute De la Court's deliberations on Holland's interest of state and to blame the De Witt regime for the condition of the country.[572] Valkenier most probably borrowed his title from the short tract

---

[571] See in particular Michel Reinders, *Printed Pandemonium: Popular Print and Politics in the Netherlands 1650-1672* (Brill: Leiden 2013); Ingmar Vroomen, *Taal van de Republiek. Het gebruik van vaderlandretoriek in Nederlandse pamfletten, 1618-1672* (PhD dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2012); Haks, *Vaderland en vrede*; Roeland Harms, *Pamfletten en publieke opinie. Massamedia in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011).

[572] See for instance *Consideratien over den Tegenwoordigen Toestant van het Vereenigde Nederland, Gesteld door een Liefhebber van 't Vaderland, Tot encouragement van sijne Lands-genooten, in desen bekommerlijken Tijd.* (1672); *d'Ontleding van Euroop. Dit is te seggen, De spreuken van alle de Vrije Vorsten en Vorstendommen van Euroop. Over den geheymen toestan der tegenwoordioge saken* (1672); Adolphus van Wolfshagen, *De Schoole der Princen, En interest der voornaemste Potentaten des Werelts.* (Cologne: Hermanus Albedeuyt, 1673);*Verhael van Staet-Saken (...) Seecker over d'Interesten van de Staet van Engelandt (...)* (Amsterdam: Jan Rieuvertsz. and Pieter Arentsz., 1673); *Hollands Interest, Gestelt tegens dat van Jan de Wit; Voorgevallen tusschen Hans, Raads-Heer, En Arent, een Borger. Waer in van woort tot woort verhaelt wert fijn perpetueel* Edict *of eeuwighdurende* Wet. (Amsterdam, 1672); *Discoursen over den Tegenwoordigen Interest van het Landt. Tusschen een Zeeu, Hollander en Raedsheer.* (Amsterdam, 1672); *Het Tegenwoordige Interest der Vereenigde Provincien. Nevens Verscheyde Aanmerckingen op de tegenwoordige, en Conjecturen op de toekomende Standt van zaaken in europe: voornaamlijck betreffende deze Republijke. Door een liefhebber van de Gereformeerde Religie, en 't welvaren dezer Landen* (Amsterdam, 1673), translation from the English original [Joseph Hill], *The interest of these United Provinces. Being a defence of the Zeelander choice. By a wellwisher of the reformed religion, and the wellfare of these countries* (Middelburg: Thomas Berry, 1672); *Den Grooten en Witten Duyvel* (1672) subtitled '*Better French than Prince, Incorrect Holland's Interest*', which stated on page 13: 'I shiver remembering that I was handed a little book a few years ago (in which the entire interest of our state was so incorrectly drawn up, and for the execution of this interest everything has been so wrongly constructed) which, instead of praising the virtues of our praiseworthy and never enough celebrated Prince of Orange, was written with a damned Devilish pen (...) and printed and published by the authority of the State.' Johan de Witt regime and his

Euroop vol Verwerring (1673) [Europe full of Confusion]. Instead of presenting the specific 'interests' of the different rulers of Europe, this author speaks of their 'secret passions', a vocabulary aligned with the terminology of reason of state, but he uses the same tropes, which were already present in Rohan's and to a larger extent in Lisola's treatise: 'Secret passions'/ 'motives for princely political actions'; 'Betrayal' of treaties by princes; 'Pretexts of striving for Peace and Unity' within Europe'; 'Pretext' of the 'well-being' of the princes' own principalities; French 'Staetszucht' [lust for 'state'/dominion/conquest]; 'oogmerck' [objective, which Valkenier describes as 'Interest']; 'Dissection of Europe'. The author claimed that Henry IV's blood runs to Louis XIV's veins making him aspire universal dominion; 'the king who already in his thoughts had swallowed up the Supreme-command over the entire Christian world'.[573]

In the years before and after 1672, a substantial part of the Dutch pamphlets was Orangist, which had successfully monopolised the idiom of fatherland and the association with the Reformed Church. In the Organist pamphlets the stadholder was presented as the only Dutch candidate to fight off foreign aggression and to break down the regent oligarchy, onto which the image of the former Spanish oppressor was often transposed; he would restore order, liberty and unity; and under his command the military forces would rise from the ashes.[574] These arguments were not particularly novel, but now Orangist pamphleteers had to deal with two difficulties: temper the civil disorder while simultaneously justify the forced breakdown of the De Witt regime. To this end authors employed historical analogies between 1672 and events of the Dutch Revolt (e.g. the citizens' captures of Brill and Flushing in 1572), explained the evil of the De Witt regime through historical writings, as Valkenier did, and stressed the distinction between the *populus* and *plebs*, and William III and the plebs.[575] Little scope was afforded for defences of a stadholderless regime.[576] William's extension of power through warfare, however, provoked opposition in provincial and urban assemblies, and also amongst previously loyal

---

helpers, notably Pieter de Groot as 'an atheist, a French Slave' degenerated the Dutch Republic, consequently facilitating the French invasion: 'Has he not under the pretext of liberty brought us the greatest slavery of the world?' Idem, p. 14, 12.

[573] *Euroop vol Verwerring, Waer in te sien zijn De heimelijkste driften van alle de Potentaten in Christenrijk* (1673), 4. The author of this pamphlet very briefly states the motives of the various European rulers (written in the first person from the King of Sweden onwards): Dutch Republic, Triple alliance, King of Sweden, King of England, King of France, Emperor, King of Poland, King of Denmark, King of Portugal, Prince of Braganza [Portugal], the Prince-Elector of Brandenburg, the Duke of Saxony, the Knight Grémonville, the Alliance in the Palatinate, the Prince-Electors and Princes of the Empire; Valkenier meant by 'verwerd' confused as to say Europe was perturbed by the French war politics and all the rulers were caught in the net French has thrown over Europe. And as he on page 68 writes: 'The pretext, that France always pretends, why it involves itself in the conflicts of Foreign Potentates, is the Peace and Unity, and by this bait and by many diversions and embellished performances [France] seeks to entangle the fighting parties in a web, well-knowing, that nothing sounds sweeter and more pleasant in the ears, because they listen to [that sound] more, than Peace and Unity.'

[574] Vroomen, *Taal van de Republiek*; Jill Stern, 'The rhetoric of popular Orangism, 1650-72', *Historical Research* 77 (2004), 202-224.

[575] Stern, 'The rhetoric of popular Orangism', 202-224.

[576] Reinders, 'Burghers, Orangists and "Good Government", p. 322: 'From the 956 unique Dutch pamphlets published in 1672, only 12 were aimed against William of Orange, while 160 pamphlets attacked a group of regents identifiable as "adherents of the True Freedom".'; Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 166.

Orangists.[577] Resistance rose against Orange's bellicose foreign policy, mounting war costs; and voices were heard in favour of peace that would enhance commerce and lower taxes. In the spirit of De la Court, attacks were written on the arbitrary rule of the prince of Orange allegedly usurping the sovereignty of the individual States and coercing opposition with his personal army forces.[578] Discussions of the extent of freedom of conscience remained an inherent part of the debates, especially since after 1672 Orangists within the Reformed Church displayed a growing fear and intolerance; the Voetian faction reclaimed centre stage, called for stricter reformed manners in society and launched attacks on Cartesians and Coeccians.[579] However, in light of the civil disturbances of 1672 most pamphleteers shared one concern: the danger of mob rule.[580]

The image of the new enemy, Louis XIV's France, was painted in full colours, often through critical current-affairs commentaries. In the famous news print *Spiegel der Fransche Tirannie* (1673) [Mirror of the French Tyranny], the engraver and pamphleteer Romeyn de Hooghe transferred the old image of Spanish Black Legend to the reportedly excessive and violent actions of French soldiers in the plundering of the villages of Swammerdam and Bodegraven. It was followed up by the internationally successful pamphlet *Advis fidelle aux veritables Hollandois* written by the diplomat and news agent, Abraham de Wicquefort, who, through a (seemingly) factual report of the events, sketched the image of an age-old French rapacious lust for power and conquest. In a print of 1674, De Hooghe explained the history of 'Dutch transformations' from 1668 to 1674. As in his other work, the French threat is the crucial problem, faith in the prince of Orange and obedience to government is the answer; even copying French culture is condemned as the cause of the degeneration of Dutch society.[581]

---

[577] Groenveld, 'William III as Stadholder: Prince or Minister?', 25, 37.

[578] Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 174; Levillain, 'William III's Military and Political Career', 327-329. Levillain cites on p. 328 the pamphlet *Some things concerning the prince of Orange worthy of great reflection* [no given date of publication, but probably written in the mid-1670s]; 'the prince is very absolute and does what he pleases (…) the States are now but *les huissiers du prince* (…) he intends to model an army after his own way, giving employment to strangers, daily rejecting the native subjects.'; for examples of mid-1670s pamphlets about the planned peace negotiations read *De wettelijcke verantwoordinge der Hollanders, ofte een Verhael van 't gepasseerde van den Jare 1624 tot desen tijdt toe. Doorgaens aengewesen werdende de trouloose Handeling van Vranckryck, die sy ontrent de opgherechte Tractaten hebben gehouden Met een klaar vertoogh, wat ontrent, voor ende no de Vrede-Handeling tot Ceulen is gepasseert, etc.* (Amsterdam: Cyprianus vander Gracht, 1674); *Extract uyt de Resolutien van de (…) Staten Generaal (…) Raeckende het subject van de Vredehandelinge* (The Hague: J.Scheltus, 1675); *Redenen en Middelen tot bevordering van d'algemene Vrede, en gemene Welstant, daar in door een onpartijdig persoon, die tot de gemene rust genegen is, aangewezen word door welke middelen men tot en (…) vrede (…) zou konne geraken. Uit het Fransch vertaalt.* (Amsterdam: Pt. Arentsz., 1675); *Hannibal noch in onse Landen, ofte Consideratien over d'onmogelijckheyt des Vredes, omme in dese tegewoord. Constitutie van tyden een vaste en bestendige Vrede met den Koning van Vranckrijck te bekomen.* (Cologne: Pt. de Vrede, 1675).

[579] Stern, 'The rhetoric of popular Orangism', 151; An interesting pamphleteer is Johannes Rothé, a self-proclaimed prophet and leader of a Fifth Monarchist movement in the Dutch Republic, who fiercely accused the clergy of the established Church and attacked the prince of Orange and the people's idolatry of him as causes for the delay of the millennial reign. Jan Rothé, *Refutatie, of Wederlegginge van de Brief, geschreen, van de Prins van Orange op den 18 Maert 1675, aen de Staten van Zeelant*; [Jan Rothé], *Het Bedrogh, en verkeert voorneemen van de Prins van Orange ontdeckt* (Antwerpen, 1675).

[580] Levillain, 'William III's Military and Political Career', 292.

[581] [AbrahamWicquefort], *Advis fidelle aux veritables Hollandois. Touchant ce qui s'est passé dans les villages de Bodegraven & Swammerdam* (The Hague, 1673). Haks, *Vaderland en Vrede*, 21-57. Haks demonstrates that the reported violent actions executed by the French were not far from the historical reality. The title is a deliberate turn

Portrayals of a French predatory monarchy were also highlighted by the idiom of reason of state. We can find some instances of this before 1672. In the chapter on Lisola we pointed to anti-French pamphlets of the 1640s, which arguably introduced the idiom of reason of state to a large scale audience in the Dutch Republic and entailed some elements of this image, as in the famous *Munster Vrede-Praetje* of 1646.[582] And in the chapter on De la Court we dealt with *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* of 1662 that roughly sketched an image of a French predatory monarchy through an European interest analysis.[583] In his 1669-revised version of *Interest van Holland,* De la Court even recalled his rejection of alliance-policy and pleaded for an coalition between the rulers of Europe against French expansionism by analysing the 'general and true political foundations and maxims of all countries (..) which most Peoples of Europe, such as the Spaniards, Italians and French, call *Interest*.'[584] Before 1672 the French threat was not expected to such a disastrous extent often arguing that the English would not participate in Louis's campaigns;[585] but after the disastrous events pamphleteers vigorously attempted to unravel the mysteries and maxims of France through its purportedly evil history of treacherous politics, breaches of law and treaties, and desire for universal dominion –themes which Lisola had orated diligently and entertainingly in *Bouclier*.[586] Moreover, Lisola's use of the idiom of reason of state in indicating the household rule of a conquest-driven French monarchy -its barbaric, cruel and unchristian nature, even more evil than the despotic oriental regimes- was reiterated in several Dutch pamphlets.

A good example is the *Fransche Machiavel* of 1675. The author dissected the nature of the monarchy by stating the 'Hundred French-Political State-Rules, in which the French State- and War-Maxims and Practices will be unveiled to everyone'.[587] After 1672 Machiavelli was

---

from the quintessential Balk Legend pamphlet *Den spieghel der Spaenscher tyrannye in West Indien [...]* (Amsterdam 1596) that was a Dutch adaption of Las Casas' report of the Spanish atrocities in the America's. The publication of this Dutch pamphlet led to numerous sequels that focused solely on Spanish violence in the Low Countries, as the *Spaensche triannije* (1621). Marijke Meijer Dress, 'De beeldvorming Nederland-Spanje voor en na de Vrede van Munster', in *De Zeventiende eeuw* 13:1 (1997), 163-172; Romeyn de Hooghe, *Schouburgh der Nederlandse veranderingen, geopent in ses tooneelen, Waer op de Wisselbeurten des Vereendigde Staets Door den Fransen Oorlog gebrouwen, in Historiele Sinnebeelden* (Amsterdam, 1674): Not to say that a colourful anti-French enemy image was solely employed by Orangist pamphleteers; intensive diplomacy for peace settlement could also be a strategy to hold Louis's expansionist policies in check. Levillain, 'William's III military and political career', 334-335.

[582] *Munsters Vrede-Praetje. Vol alderhande Opinien/ off d'Algemeene Wel-vaert deser Landen in Oorlogh off Vrede bestaat. Deliberant dum fingere nesciunt* (1646); Blom, 'Oorlog, handel en staatsbelang in het politiek denken rond 1648', 89-96.

[583] *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* (Enkhuizen: Dirk Klaer-Oogh, 1662).

[584] *Aanwysinge der heilsame politiken gronden en maximen van de republike Holland en West-Vriesland* , 1.

[585] Murk van der Bijl, 'Pieter de la Court en de politieke werkelijkheid', in Hans W. Blom and Ido W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam and Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 65-91, p. 83-85.

[586] See for instance Franciscus Ridderus, *Historischen Frans-Man. In bysondere Fransche Geschiedenissen Gepast op de onderdruckte staet van ons lieve Vaderlandt* (Rotterdam, 1674).

[587] *De Fransche Machiavel, of Hondert Fransch-Politique Staets-Regelen, Waer in De Fransche Staets- en Krijgs-Maximen en Praktyken aen een yder opentlijk voorgestelt worden.* (Utrecht: Iuriaen Poolsum, 1675).

perceived as the evil mind behind Louis XIV's expansionism.[588] It begins with Aubery's claims for Louis's supreme authority over other European rulers that displayed, in the author's opinion, the 'French lust for dominion'. Europe should fear Spain or the Turks no longer, but only the French strove for the 'fifth Monarchy'. The French Crown set up his system of rule by means of six methods: 1) removing external, and 2) internal obstacles; 3) offering money (e.g. bribery); 4) preparing the war campaigns (e.g. diplomacy, propaganda) 5) constructing pretexts (e.g. religion, protector of peace, reclaiming property), 6) organising a large army.[589] He lists the parts of societies subjected by the Crown, to be appropriated to the French reason of state to establish universal dominion: theology, privileges of subjects ('like knives to Children, which the father may take away, without accounting for to the child'),[590] small sovereignties, and the *Parlement* of Paris. Furthermore, the young nobility ought to be entertained abroad in peace time to release their diabolic nature, the nobility should be suppressed, and the subjects impoverished by 'taxation and heavy extortions'.[591] If the latter produced not enough money, Louis XIV would usurp the commerce, also abroad, to become 'Master over the world' and squeeze out his own treasurers.[592] The French monarchy felt not bound by any treaties, divine laws, the law of nature, and *ius gentium*. By divide-and-conquer methods they 'confused' foreign rulers, such as by bribery, diplomacy, conceit, secret treaties, to secure the promotion of the French interests. High clergymen were sent as representatives to areas where the French were distrusted. The French Crown extracted money through its manufacturing and clothing fashion, which was also a means to corrupt the nature of foreign societies).

More importantly, France had established a 'new Law of War' based on 'inhumane bloodshed, Killings, Cruelties and Destructions.'[593] France 'stirred neighbours in quiet peace' (image also seen in Lisola's and Rohan's works), used seemingly peaceful pretexts, dispatched large troops at the borders to exhaust the forces of its neighbours and then launched a surprise attack as the Ottomans likewise established their empire. In 1667 the pretext of reclaiming rightful property embodied in fact 'Robberies and Murders.'[594] The royal commander implemented a 'new French War-Tyranny' to extort money from conquered cities in three ways. A first method was to threaten with pillaging, extort money from the rich in return for their lives and properties and otherwise take them hostage in a manner worthy to Turks and Tartars, Second, they would imprison the opposing soldiers forcing them to sit in their own dirt and eat

[588] Although referring to him became less controversial than in the first half of the seventeenth century. Eco Haitsma Mulier, *Het Nederlandse gezicht van Machiavelli. Twee en een halve eeuw interpretatie 1550-1800* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1989), 10-11.
[589] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 3-8.
[590] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 6.
[591] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 6.
[592] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 6-7.
[593] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 15,
[594] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 16.

pests and lice until the soldiers pay a double ransom. The last method was to lock up the women and demand a ransom by threatening to hand them over to the lowest military ranks to be raped and eventually to be sold, 'which are such gruesome violations, that even the Turks, Tartars, and Pirates have never used in their sales.'[595] This new '*Reason of War*' is closely linked to the 'French *Reason of State*: and which both are so miraculous and peculiar, that they are not valid according to the old Pagan theses and the general welfare; but contrary to God, Justice, our conscience, humanity and probity.'[596] He concluded: 'To conduct similar horrible inhumanities, all the savage Pagan and Barbarian Peoples, Turks, and Tartars should attend school with these French.'[597]

The author of this pamphlet reiterated the themes mentioned by Lisola, fashioned the image of the French predatory monarchy in terms of maxims, as Rohan had did to describe the interest of European rulers, which De la Court in turn defined as interest. This shows the flexibility of the idiom of reason of state, and secondly its descriptive and normative use; the author rejected 'reason of state' as the basis of the *new* French 'War–Tyranny', while simultaneously described such a threat in terms of reason of state. Moreover, it underlines the polemical function of reason of state, often accompanied with implicit accusations mixing fact with fiction. Besides the idiom of reason of state the author's use of tyranny, or 'War-Tyranny' is worth mentioning. It entailed the cruel practices of the French monarchy (more cruel than the Ottoman despots), the novelty of Louis's monarchy (a Machiavellian new principality as Rohan also described Spain under Philip II), and its reason of state, which implied the overthrow of the rule of law and total subjection of all subjects and conquered peoples, rob them of their liberties, lives and livelihoods. Although the accusations imply those of an Aristotelian despotic rule, the term 'despot' is not used, while it appears that tyranny served the author's goals not entirely, since he felt the need to complement this tyranny with the terms 'war' and 'new'. It may strongly alludes to the recently coined term 'war despotism', but his use speaks for itself; an arbitrary household rule, a combination of despotic and tyrannical rule with an emphasis on necessary warfare, conquest to coerce much needed money to finance the war machine. What is more, it signifies the slippery language of tyranny in the seventeenth century as discussed in the chapter on Rohan, who used 'new monarchy' to signify an unrestricted tyrannical control, modelled on a Machiavellian rapacious lust for conquest. As in a later Dutch pamphlet *Suchtingen van het slafeachtighe Vrankryk* (1689) [Desires of slavish France], which furthered

[595] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 19.
[596] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 19.
[597] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 20.

French critiques of 'war despotism' of the 1640s, the French author used not the term despotic to indicate a French war-driven household rule, but he wrote: 'the utmost Tyranny'.[598]

5.1.3 Lisola's legacy: universal monarchy, balance of power and religion

From the Franco-Dutch War (1672-1678) onwards Lisola's anti-French arguments echoed in numerous pamphlets throughout Europe. In the initial phase of the war the anti-French pamphlet production reached its first peak in the Holy Roman Empire. Martin Wrede has shown the recurrent themes in the anti-French pamphlets produced in the Empire: French breach of law, French war crimes, 'German Liberty', 'French tyranny' and the impending French universal monarchy. France became a 'Reichsfeind' [enemy of the Empire], even a 'Erbfeind' [archenemy], and Louis degenerated from the 'Allerchristliche' [most Christian king] to the 'Antichrist', and a 'Kreuzzuges wider die Franken' [crusade against the French] was desired as the 'Substitution der Türken durch die Franzosen' [substitution of the Turks by the French] had allegedly taken place.[599] A difference with later anti-French pamphlets, is that in anti-French writings before the escalation of the Franco-Dutch War, Louis faced mockery and criticism as well as some gain in respect and credit. Even Lisola showed respect for the energy and vigour of Louis, according to Wrede, although we should view this largely in light of his sense of irony. [600]

As has been stated earlier, the historian Levillain has stressed Lisola's fundamental influence on anti-French, anti-Catholic and anti-Stuart propaganda in England and the Dutch Republic, and, consequently, his contribution to the political turn of the English parliament against France and the Anglo-Dutch alliance of 1677. One of the intellectual brokers of Lisola's ideas in the Dutch Republic was the diplomat and member of Amsterdam's city council, Coenraad van Beuningen. Van Beuningen was known as a fierce opponent of Louis's claims to the Spanish Netherlands. During the 1670s he was sent on several missions where he enjoyed the company of Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby (a prominent anti-French and anti-Catholic politician) and Denzil Holles, who published a letter to Van Beuningen of 1676 arguing a shared

---

[598] *De Fransche Machiavel,* 21-25: 'the Government of France is risen to the extent of Tyranny , that the Ruler regards everything as his own property. He draws up Taxes, as he pleases, without consulting the People, the Grandees, the Estates, nor the Parlements. (…) as the Mohammedan Rulers of *Turkey*, of *Persia*, and the *Great Mongolians* (…) having an absolute power over the Nobility, over the Members of the Judiciary, and over all the People (…) since the ministries of Richelieu and Mazarin is France loaded with heavy imposts. But it exhausted the kingdom, although it was unrightfully, in a lesser manner than now [under Colbert who] made a Reformation of Finances, and has executed with all strictness: (...) but not reduce the imposts on the People but to enhance it (…). The Nobleman has no longer credit to establish a reduction of taxation for his Parochy, his tenants pay already so much, and more than the other. (...) [Colbert] has enlarged the revenues of the Kingdom to the utmost extent. (…) It is in this way that the imposts will be furthered and extracted, and if this is not the utmost Tyranny, than I confess I do not understand anything about it.'; *De Fransche Machiavel,* 31: 'These mountains of money were spent to one purpose only: to erect the 'general *Monarchy*.'

[599] Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde*, 333.

[600] Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde,* 48-49, 325-327, 330, 332-333, 337, 378-380.

Anglo-Dutch Protestant interest against France. According to French diplomatic sources, Van Beuningen was obstructing De Witt's appeasing tactics to the French in foreign affairs.[601] Haitsma Mulier suggests that Valkenier got acquainted with Lisola in The Hague in 1672-1673.[602] After the French invasion, the anti-French argument of *Bouclier* developed into more vicious and direct attacks on Louis's rule in Dutch pamphlets, as we will see in the analysis of Valkenier's work. The influence of *Bouclier* in England was most probably enhanced by his own diplomatic missions to London. Levillain reasons *Bouclier* 'set the standard for anti-French propaganda in post-1667 England', for example an English pamphlet of 1668 titled *A Free Conference touching the Present State of England in order to the Designs of France*, in which the author promoted an alliance with Spain instead of with France and the legitimacy of the renunciation of Maria Theresa referring to *Bouclier*. Levillain concludes that under the effect of Dutch propaganda following the invasion of 1672, Lisola's ideas about French universal monarchy transferred into a Protestant tale and permeated Anglo-Dutch political culture.[603]

During Louis XIV's reign, Bosbach observed multiple variances in the definitions of 'universal monarchy', traditional ones were re-used, such as the desire for achieving the fifth empire, but also new elements added to, or replaced older ones, such as the claim that the French King would establish a universal monarchy based on political and military power, rather than founded on the dignity and spiritual authority of the Empire. New elements were integrated, such as Louis's design to subject Europe through the misuse of the claimed office of arbiter of war and peace; and through use of the metaphor of the balance of power as 'a new ideal for European politics and thus assumed French universal monarchy became the negative equivalent to that idea'.[604]

Moreover, in the second half of the seventeenth century religion remained an important rationale in works on foreign policy debating the impending universal monarchy, also those expressed in reason of state vocabulary and included or were adjusted to commercial factors.[605] Tony Claydon has stressed that late-seventeenth century English propaganda supporting William III's warfare against Louis XIV entailed a multifaceted mix of three discourses (even

---

[601] The French minister of foreign affairs, Hugues de Lionne, warned the new ambassador to the States General in 1669 of the dangerous effect Van Beuningen's anti-French words had. Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 6.
[602] Haitsma Mulier, 'Die Politisch-historischen Ideen von Petrus Valkenier', 118.
[603] Levillain, 'The intellectual origins', 6-7, 11, quoted from p. 8.
[604] Bosbach, 'The European debate on universal monarch', 84, quoted from p. 97.
[605]For instance, Louis XIV's French monarchy was accused of desiring universal dominion of trade, as in interest analyses by Marchamont Nedham and Slingsby Bethel in the late 1670s. From Steve Pincus, 'From holy cause to economic interest: the transformation of reason of state thinking in seventeenth-century England', in Houston and Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 272-298, p. 293; Marchamont Nedham, *The pacquet-Boat Advice* (1678) and Slingsby Bethel, *The present State of Chirstendome and the Interest of England, With a regard to France* (1677). From the 1650s onwards, English debates on foreign affairs identified two new contenders for universal monarchy, the French or the Dutch. After the French invasion in the Dutch Republic of 1672, the division in English political culture morphed into a fierce anti-French standpoint, except for the court of Charles II and his successor James II. The 'revolution' of 1688 had arguably 'an intended consequence': war against France. Steve Pincus, 'The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture', *The European Legacy* 5:4 (2000), 531-545, p. 535.

though seemingly technically incompatible): Protestant rhetoric (crusade against Louis, the popish Antichrist); the theme of Louis's drive towards a universal monarchy; and, far more prominently, Louis's threat to 'Christendom', a spiritually yet not specifically defined unity. The latter placed Louis outside of European Christian order and often implied comparisons with the Ottoman system of rule, cruel, antichristian and barbaric, a theme underlined by references to the early modern Franco-Ottoman alliances. Louis was even deemed by many writers more cruel than the Ottomans, an accusation that could lead to positive evaluations of the Ottoman rule as being humane and tolerant. Since the Turks stood at the gates of Vienna in 1683 and Louis did not help the Habsburgs but instead aided the Hungarian, allies of the Ottomans, this comparison functioned as a vivid image for Williamite propaganda.[606] In addition, the term 'Europe' finally established itself in the struggle against Louis XIV.[607] From the 1670s, anti-Stuart and later Williamite pamphlets justified anti-French policies in name of the 'Liberties of Europe' often in conjunction with the rationale of the freedom of commerce, the Protestant religion, the 'interests' and 'balance of Europe'. Europe became associated with ideas of a balanced system of 'states', religious tolerance and expanding commerce. Helmut Schmidt believes Lisola lay the foundations of these new political overtones of 'Europe' by addressing the threat of Louis striving for a universal monarchy to Europe's liberty, religion and commerce.[608]

Within these late seventeenth-century debates the notion of balance of power emerged as a vital justification. Richard Devetak has argued that contrary to what modern 'liberal internationalist theory' perceives, the balance of power discourse in English writings constituted an 'ordering practice in maintaining liberty and fighting tyranny'; this discourse centred on the protection of the 'liberties of Europe', i.e. the European legal order based on the right of regimes to self-govern under the rule of law, against allegedly arbitrary and absolute power. [609] Through interest analysis of the present affairs of Europe, the balance of power discourse increasingly assessed the level of threat to 'liberties of Europe' (rather than solely to England), exemplified by Slingsby Bethel's pioneering writings of the 1670s and 1680s. Bethel's earliest work *The Present*

---

[606] Tony Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda 1689-1697, in Esther Mijers en David Onnekink, *Redefining William: the impact of the King-Stadholder in international context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 125-142.

[607] 'Europe' was already used with various connotations in the wars against the Ottomans from the late fifteenth century onwards. See the collection of essays in Heinz Duchhardt and Andreas Kunz (eds.) *Europäische Geschichte als historiographischer Problem* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1997).

[608] Helmut Dan Schmidt, 'The Establishment of "Europe" as a Political Expression', *The Historical Journal* 9:2 (1966), 172-178. On Lisola and his *Bouclier* Schmidt writes on p.173: 'The publication of the *Buckler* (…) in French, German and English in that year had the purpose of changing that view of the international scene. (…) [Lisola] alleged that [France] was planning the establishment of a Catholic Universal Monarchy and becoming a threat to the liberty of Europe, to religion, and commerce. He thus forged an association which linked Europe with the concept of religious liberty, balance of power, and expanding commerce, ideas that commended themselves at once to men like Arlington and Sir William Temple.'

[609] Devetak, "The fear of universal monarchy", 122.

Interest of England stated (1671) demonstrates this.[610] Moreover, Bethel's text exemplifies the dominant theme in these analyses: the fear of French designs of universal monarchy threatening the individual and collective interests of European regimes.[611] As David Armitage states: 'the Treaty of Utrecht (..) enshrined the balance of power as the central regulating principle of the international order, in opposition to the threat of universal monarchy from a power such as Louis XIV's France. Reason of state after 1713 therefore made preventive aggression justifiable in defence of the balance against aspiring universal monarch.'[612] In this sense, the analysis of interest developed into a possible instrument to reconstruct the European order.

The function of the idiom of reason of state and the portrayal of the French monarchy in Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* will be analysed against the backdrop of the pamphlets fuelled by the French invasion of 1672 about the role of Orange in the Dutch constitutional framework, French (war-)tyranny, (French) reason of state/interest of state, universal monarchy, balance of power and religion. Furthermore, we will look into Valkenier's arguments from the perspective of the earlier analyses of Rohan's, De la Court's and Lisola's writings, especially their portrayals of predatory monarchy (including arguments on tyranny, absolute rule, rule of conquest, Ottoman rule, war finances, household rule and slavery) and will take into account its immediate context of publication: the planned peace negotiations, and the rising resistance against William III's bellicose foreign policy and mounting war costs in the mid-1670s. The larger context is the perceived seventeenth-century crisis of order that seemed threatened by confessional strife, intensified European warfare, and war-tyranny, all embodied by Louis XIV. Valkenier tried to restore order.

5.2 't Verwerd Europa: *the rule of law and reason of state*

In his preface Valkenier claimed that *'t Verwerd Europa* filled the void in Dutch historical literature about the contemporary complex and unstable European power constellation, because people could 'only read the few Historical Stories, which up to now have seen the light of day in

[610] Devetak, "The fear of universal monarchy", 128: 'As the Foreign Interest of a Nation look outward (…) so it is in the Interest of the King and Kingdom of England, to make use of the advantages of [the] strength [of the 'Princes and States' of Europe] and situation gives them, in weighing the imperial powers of Christendome, keeping the balance, by adding to, or diminishing from any of them, as best sits with Justice, and their own Interests.'
[611] Devetak, "The fear of universal monarchy", 131, quotes there also Bethel, *The Present Interest of England Stated* (1671); 'than to design an universal Monarchy, which consequently makes it the common Interest of all European Princes and States (as they value their own safety) to unite, for the keeping of him within bounds and limits'.
[612] David Armitage, 'Edmund Burke and Reason of State', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61:4 (2000), 617-634, p. 630.

the German and French language.'[613] Valkenier turned to his readers and stated that without properly investigating the histories of the '*unheard Changes in Europe and the strange Revolutions in our* United Netherland*, which we have experienced, still are experiencing, and only God knows when they eventually will end*,' later generations would find the current events hard to believe. He echoed the same introductory phrases of rulers fallen asleep by Lisola and Rohan by asking:

> '*who would believe, that most of the Potentates of* Europe *were barely awoken in extreme danger by murder-trumpets from her slumber-illness and improvidence, wherein they lied smothered? Yes that some had hastened their own downfall, that a Frenchman had confused all of* Europe *and by his money, trickery and violence had banned all uprightness and sincerity at almost every Court; that a Nation* [the Dutch] *raised to heaven by her valiant and incomparable bravery, and that was magnificent for the entire world, within 50 days could have lost more, than it had gained with the highest praise in 80. years by sword'.*[614]

Valkenier accounted for his interest analysis of Europe since *'now the whole of Christendom is torn by ruinous Factions, and since many* Arcana Dominationis *or* Cabinet-Secreeten *have been discovered, yet only with great difficulty and danger can they be investigated as they have been so cunningly concealed*.'[615] Besides, Valkenier felt obliged to defend '*as a* Miles Togatus *the Honour of our and other nations* (…) *by Pen against the superb French and other Envious* [men]'.[616]

In order to explain the 'confused state of Europe' and in particular the United Provinces in the beginning of the 1670s, he divided his 1000 plus page book into three parts. This work may be seen as the apotheosis of the stream of pamphlets unleashed by the French invasion of 1672; it combined most of the dominant themes and elements of the pamphlet literature, such as a historical analysis of the failure of De Witt and the triumph of Louis XIV, an taxation of European interests, a reconstruction of the affairs of 1672 substantiated with numerous documents and first-hand reports. His first part consisted of an interest analysis on a European level introduced by a theorisation of the interest of state. The second part dealt with 'the French Designs, Maxims, Schemes at all the Courts of Christendom, its State, Advantages, Wealth, Procedures and War Preparations against the Netherlands; as well as the Constitution, Alliances

---

[613] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, Aan den Leser. He probably referred to Wicquefort's treatise and definitely referred to Lisola's *Bouclier d'Estat*.
[614] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, Aan den Leser; Rohan, *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome*, 9-10; [Lisola], *The Buckler*, Preface.
[615] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, Aan den Leser.
[616] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, Aan den Leser.

and War Preparations of the United Provinces.'[617] In this part the two antagonists of Valkenier's story were presented: the French monarchy and the stadholderless regime of Johan de Witt. The last part entailed a chronological account of war actions executed by all the belligerents in the Republic during 1672 and the civil uprisings in the cities of the un-invaded provinces of Zeeland and Holland. Nonetheless, he also described the war between the Ottoman Empire and the Polish-Lithuania Commonwealth (1672-1676) and the Second Genoese-Savoyard War (1672–1673), which served as further examples of French scheming in Europe.[618]

First we will discuss Valkenier's reflections on interest of state through his explanation of the five foundations of political government, which sheds a light on how he envisaged civil order should be organised and how Louis XIX's monarchy and the De Witt-regime threatened this order. Then his image of France as a predatory monarchy will be analysed and finally Valkenier's interest analysis of Europe, especially of the Dutch Republic, will be taken into account.

5. 2.1 Five Pillars of every Political State

The framework of Valkenier's first part of *'t Verwerd Europa* is made up by his deliberations on 'interest of state'; 'which the contemporary politiques call *Ratio Status,* the old *Ius Dominationis* & *Arcana Imperii*, the Italians *Ragione di* Stato and the French *Raison d'Estat*'.[619] Valkenier referred to (and copied from) Rohan's *De l'interest*:

> 'Of this Interest a certain very wise and experienced military officer attempted to say; that it rules over the Princes, alike they over their Subjects; And how much higher a Prince is above it, so much greater becomes the knowledge of State demanded of him as of all his other issues. A Prince can be deceived, and his councillors can be misguided, the true *Interest* can never deceive or be false; because as much as the *Interest* is wrongly observed, so much will the State decrease or increase.'[620]

[617] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, [title page].
[618] These latter politico-societal consequences concerning the Polish-Ottoman War described Valkenier on page 869 of *'t Verwerd Europa*.
[619] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 24.
[620] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 24: 'Van dit Interest pleeg seeker seer wijs en ervaren Veld-Oversten te seggen; dat het regeert over de Princen, gelijk die over hare Onderdanen; En hoe veel hooger een Prins boven haar is, so veel grooter kennis van Staat word in hem vereyst, als van al sijne andere saaken. Kan een Prins altemet bedrogen, en sijne Raads-luyden verleyt warden, het waare Interest kan noyt missen of bedriegen; want voor so veel het Interest wel of qualijk word waargenomen, voor so veel neemt den Staat daar door af of aan.'

Contrary to Rohan, Valkenier exclaimed that the French monarchy had never been the true defender of the liberty of Europe and had even become Europe's greatest enemy in recent years. Furthermore, he stressed the importance of empirical historical analysis in accounts of interest, since 'all Rulers of Empires and Lands have been subjected to constant change and therefore they (…) expand, grow, reduce, age, die, and disappear (…), and if they would see themselves in the Mirror of old Histories, they would not recognise themselves at all.'[621] Therefore, the rulers should navigate 'the common Ship' through these stormy waters adjusting its course according to the obstacles it encounters and in direction of its true Interest, and they should not follow the stoics who would advise to not deviate from its course for a second. In line with reason of state authors, Valkenier wrote that interest of state excels all '*Civil*, *Public* and *Fundamental* laws' when 'the well-being of the State demands such', because 'necessity knows no laws.' Otherwise, a strict following of the laws in times of sheer danger would, as Tacitus also had argued, lead to the destruction of these laws and, consequently, the state.[622]

Though Valkenier emphasised that all political actions were steered by interest of state, he felt the need to explain it further unlike Rohan, De la Court and Lisola. The Dutch lawyer opened his treatise with the reason of state adage that the objective or interest of every 'Political State' was a matter of maintenance and expansion.[623] In this sense, 'state' referred to a polity. Valkenier asserted that the maintenance of every 'State' against external as well as internal injustice and violence was based on the law of nature. Every method (violent or gentle) to achieve this end (self-defence) was legitimate. The augmentation or territorial expansion of a polity was only acceptable when legitimate means were used, which did not go against the rights of another polity. According to the author, 'true interest of state' could be attained by a correct examination and use of the five 'common and true *State-Maxims* and *Foundations*': religion, justice, polity, army and finances. These were the five 'pillars of every political state' and decay of any of these pillars would lead to its ruin.[624] Moreover, 'true' interest of state was restricted by four conditions: protection of religion, faithfulness to alliances, honesty, and impeccable benevolent administration of justice. De la Court had summarised his analysis of Holland's interest in much the same terms; 'Hereby I pride myself that I said enough of *Holland's Polity, Religion, Finances, Military and Justice*', [625] yet without structuring his analysis in terms of these variables.

---

[621] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 25-26.
[622] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 1-25; Condren, 'The Uses of Tyranny', 11-12.
[623] Valkenier,*'t Verwerd Europa*, 1.
[624] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 1.
[625] V.D.H., *Interest van Holland*, 88; A century later (1763) Adam Smith scrutinised the same variables, excluding religion, in his *Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms. Delivered in the University of Glasgow by Adam Smith, reported by a student in 1763.,* edited and with an introduction by Edwin Cannan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869).

It was commonplace to bind government to religion, morality, legality. It was exemplified by writers like Claude de Seysell in positing the bridles of monarchy: religion, justice and polity.[626] Others, such as Botero and Clapmarius linked crucial virtues to the office of rule; and it was conventional to associate a justifiable reason of state with divine or natural law.[627] Lisola likewise had bound a pursuit of interest of state to legality, a mixture of natural law, *ius gentium* and divine laws.[628] However, as we will see, Valkenier envisaged the position of religion explicitly without any involvement of confessional theology and stressed the primary importance of protection of property, privileges and persons. With the untoward collapse of the Dutch Republic in mind, Valkenier deemed an army and its necessary finances as the most crucial pillars.

To be clear, arguments of reason of state inherently considered the room of *legitimate* manoeuvre for the ruler, albeit that these limits are deliberately being bended or stretched. The interest of state was based on the specific characteristics and circumstances of the societies of the respective ruler; every country had an interest of state that in itself was neither legitimate nor illegitimate. The normative nature of interest of state entailed the taxation of a true or an untrue interest, which was used to signify the failed policies of a ruler or his evil advisors. In Valkenier's case, De Witt was attacked for not following the true interest of the Republic. France, however, was a master in its management of reason of state, as we will see below. Valkenier used the five pillars and four conditions of governance to re-establish a sense of order in a world of change and conflict. Consequently, this gave him the munition to attack French war policies, notably Louis's expansionism.

'Religion' was the first pillar and provision of interest of state, 'as immediately beholding the Divine'.[629] He devoted most space to explaining the function of religion in a political state and the relation between religion and reason of state. Yet the attempt to reconcile a defence of the Dutch reformed faith with a high level of freedom of conscience and an attack on ecclesiastical interference in political affairs, proved problematic. His solution was to distinguish an inner from an outer religion. The first resided in the soul of mankind and was shared by all peoples according to the law of nature. The latter consisted of the different confessions, or 'customs' of

[626] Rebecca Boone, *War, domination, and the "Monarchy of France" : Claude de Seyssel and the language of politics in the Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 19. Religion entailed the Catholic Church, the police embodied the fundamental laws of the realm and justice referred to the division between the tree estates and the *parlements*.
[627] Botero also employed the metaphor of government resting on certain 'pillars', e.g. the two pillars of 'prudence' and 'valour'. Because princes are solely ruled by interest, the first maxims of prudence was, Botero claimed, that they ought to be approached by other rulers on the basis of interest alone, instead of trust, friendship or other bonds. Quentin Skinnner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Volume 1, The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 34, 41; Harro Hopfl, 'Orthody and reason of state', 236-237.
[628] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 20: 'The Political Government will not be sufficient, to maintain Religion, and the administration of Justice, unless it uses two necessary and inevitable means, as the Army and Finances.'
[629] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 2.

religion, written down in different holy texts.[630] In matters of interest of state, the natural religion predominated.

Believing in and serving God, were the two fundamental and universal aspects of natural religion. To maintain and expand 'a State', it was necessary that people did not only believe there was a God, but that they believed God as 'the Supreme Cause' ruled all human affairs. Inner religion promoted civil order: 'Because everything stems from the *Service* and *Fear of* God (...) many good successes in a State depend on it'.[631] When confronted by a truly mighty enemy, then men would rely on the inner religion, that informed external religious practices, such as prayer days, irrespective of denominational difference. What unified a people was not doctrinal difference but the internal religion they all shared.[632] After listing the four main confessions (pagan, Jewish, Christian and Islamic) and naming the ones worshipped in the Dutch Republic, he claimed that natural religion, or 'Piety was not only the foundation of all Virtues, bit likewise of all Dominions and States.'[633] The highest virtue was justice; justice was a product of piety and restricted the actions of princes when obtaining their interest. Moreover, it ordered civil society; men were forced by piety into 'Subjection to their princes; Obedience to their parents; Love for their neighbours; and the Justice towards all.'[634] Valkenier raged against Boccalini, who, he claimed, said that

> 'the interest of state is only a right of a Prince, and it is in conflict with all Divine and Human Laws. How could man call such *Interest* a *Reason* of *State* (*Ratios Status)* since it conflicts with all Reason, and always threatens to ruin the State? Why *Pope Pius de* V., rightly labelled it *Reason of the Devil*, or *Ratio Diaboli*, arisen from Tyranny and Arbitrary.'[635]

In this hyperbole Valkenier rejected the popular refutation of reason of state, as contrary to religion, morality and legality. But he went further, linking it to divine law as revealed by inner religion.

---

[630]Valkenier divided the outer religion into four religions. Firstly, he described pagan religions in Lapland, India, China, Japan, America and Africa. The Indians practiced their beliefs by the spiritual words, written down in the Vedan. Secondly, he described the Jewish faith that was scattered over Europe and repressed by so many governments according to Valkenier. Thirdly, he treated the Christian faith, which was spread over Europe and splintered into many different forms of religions. The Christian's holy texts consisted of the Old and new Testaments. Finally, Valkenier spoke of the Mohammedan religion that was practised in Asia, Europe, and Africa and had its Koran as holy book.

[631] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 3.

[632] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 3; As also the historian Donald Haks underlines that in years of warfare the amount of prayer days were substantially higher than in peace time, although the peak years in the by the Esattes General organised prayes days entailed years of military success, 1675 and 1676. Donald Haks, *Vaderland en Vrede*, 74.

[633] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 5.

[634] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 5.

[635] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 5

External religion, however, was another matter. Confessional religions were not so much political instruments to bring forth social unity and obedience, but rather hazards to society. Conflicting religious views, interpreted by quarrelling theologians and clergymen, could lead to severe societal conflicts, civil wars and even grand scale external warfare. Valkenier's use of the distinction between an inner and outer religion entailed not only a conventional appeal to piety,[636] but, more importantly, an increasingly heard plea against religious 'fanaticism' and 'superstition' generating chaos and bloodshed. In the 1620s Hugo Grotius likewise stressed the existence of natural religion as a set of universally valid norms independent of revealed religion to restore order in a world fractured by confessional strife and warfare.[637] Similarly to Valkenier, Lucius Antistius Constans employed an explicit distinction between internal and external religion in the controversial *De Iure Ecclesiasticorum* (1665) by arguing (in line with reformed tradition) for the authority of magistrates in religious and ecclesiastical matters. Constans enlarged it to the point that only God could judge if one's external religion corresponds with the true religion. Since outer religion was a public affair, God awarded the magistracy with the sole power to decide in these matters, and moreover, to constrain priestcraft.[638]

Regarding the outer religion. Valkenier wrote: 'every Political state is forced to uphold one specific Form of Religion above others to avoid the danger of innovation.' He claimed that not only Polybius, but also the *politques* had recognised this, but (wrongly) stressed the exception to the rule: 'the famous Machiavelli, who despised ever Religion, but nevertheless wants that all religion should be accepted.'[639] Valkenier believed the Dutch Reformed religion to be 'the soul of this State, the Fundament, whereupon this Prosperous Republic is built, and the eternal association by which the Respective Provinces will remain unified with each other in a State-wise Government.'[640] Consequently, the reformed religion ought to be maintained as the main religion within the United Provinces. But immediately Valkenier pointed to the impossibility of choosing one main religion in a polity, an issue fought over by 'the Theologians and the Politijken; the first fight for [confessions] of their own; the latter conceive such indifferently.' The product of these conflicts is the existence of 'an infinite number of Gods and Ceremonies.'[641]

---

[636] Ernestine van der Wall, 'The religious context of the Early Dutch Enlightenment: Moral religion and society', in Wiep van Bunge (ed.*), The Early Dutch Enlightenment 1650-1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 39-57.
[637] Henk Nellen, 'Hugo Grotius on religion as a motive for waging war', in Robert von Friedeburg and Mathias Schmoeckel (eds.), *Recht, Konfession und Verfassung im 17. Jahrhundert. West- und mitteleuropäische Entwicklungen* Historische Forschungen 105 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2015), 261-268.
[638] A pseudonym that is attributed to Spinoza, De la Court, Meyer, or Van Velthuysen. Henri Krop, "The General Freedom, which All Men Enjoy" in a Confessional State. The Paradoxical Language of Politics in the Dutch Republic (1700-1750)', in John Christian Laursen and Maria Jose Villaverde (eds.), *Paradoxes of Religious Toleration in Early Modern Political Thought* (Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2012), 67-90, p. 74-75.
[639] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 6.
[640] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 6.
[641] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 6.

Consequently, Valkenier asked himself whether '*a Political State may and ought to tolerate and to maintain the Freedom of all these, or of one alone?*'[642] Polities could benefit greatly by securing religious toleration, because it would stimulate immigration and consequently wealth. Valkenier observed Holland and the Ottoman Empire as havens for 'Freedom of Conscience and Religion'. The Ottoman Empire greatly profited from the Jewish refugees with their knowledge of many crafts and trade of weaponry; and the Ottoman emperors ridiculed the Christian Kings who persecuted such a numerous people.[643] In Holland the Catholic faith was tolerated and other religions enjoyed relative freedom of conscience, which produced great commercial prosperity. He called the province of Holland: 'the Inn of all sorts of Refugees'.[644] If Holland had maintained the Reformed faith as its main religion, it would have been subjected to the great powers of Europe. In line with many reason of state authors, such as Botero and Lipsius, Valkenier concluded that, though it was preferable for a government to maintain one main religion for preventing religious divisions in society, violently repressing religious factions led to civil wars and other unwanted disorders within society, e.g. the Dutch Revolt against Habsburgs-Spain.[645] However, in accordance with De la Court, he argued that diversity of religion and a relative freedom of religion led to prosperity and political stability.

Valkenier's religion argument climaxed in his fierce criticism of the political ambitions of clergymen. He warned rulers not to be seduced by '*Superstition of Religion*' for it would lead to 'the ruin of the State' and 'those who tried to persuade [the rulers, do] not have the right knowledge to conform the *Religion* to the true *Interest of State*'.[646] He exclaimed: 'It is highly regrettable that at many Courts such War-Priests are still listened to and praised, when nothing had been learnt from so many sad examples of disaster even in living memory. Have not by the machineries of Clergymen, by the pretext of Religion, Crown-baring-Heads, Born Princes, and so many infinite High Lawful Regents died a cruel death? Has it not repeatedly caused very heavy and bloody Wars and ruined Lands, Cities, Peoples, and States?'[647]

The fourth prescription and second pillar of a 'Political State' was 'Justice' by which is meant a universal virtue, its benevolent administration by judges to regulate legal issues between citizens and its proper distribution between government and subjects. According to Valkenier,

---

642 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 6-7.
643 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 8.
644 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 7.
645 Höpfl, 'Reason of State', 1114.
646 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 9.
647 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 9: '"T is ten hoogsten te beklaagen, dat sodaanigc War-Geestelyke in veele Hoven noch so veel gehoor en credit vinden, nademaal die behoorden geleert te zijn door so veele droevige exemplen, die ja selfs ten deele noch ten tyde van onse geheugenis zijn voorgevallen. Zijn niet door de machinatien der Geestelyken, op pretext van Religie, Kroon-draagen.' Examples of such superstition, using religion as a pretext for warfare, were numerous according to Valkenier: the Dutch Revolt against Habsburg-Spain, the Thirty Years War, the French religious Wars, the several wars against the Ottoman Empire, and the English Civil War. He pointed to horrible deeds, executed in the name of religion by many peoples, e.g. the wild Canadians believed that they offer the sick relieve by killing them immediately, Carthagians and Mexicans scarifying living and dead people to God, but also, in general, by every tyrant, who had made the pretext of religion as their highest designs for rule. Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 9-10.

not safeguarding the rule of law resulted in the necessary downfall of polities. He reiterated Aristotle's praise for the rule of law; 'Aristotles said, that no State can exist and continue to exist, where no Justice and Laws rule. Because what God is for the world (…), that is *Justice* and the *Law* in a City, without which neither House, nor City, nor State, nor World could exist.' In a humanist fashion, Valkenier complemented this by referring to Augustin: '[who said, without justice the world] would become a mere shelter and guesthouse of various worrisome sins; Because whoever rejects *Justice*, rejects God likewise, because God is *Justice* himself, which without he cannot rule.'[648] The emphasis of his argument was on the abuse of justice, or the abandonment of the rule of law by many contemporary European rulers, drawn in the vortex of European warfare. Law ought to be 'executed with justice and equity, not by hate, envy, ambitions, greed, and friendship.'[649] Valkenier exclaimed:

> 'This is the reason, why *Mars* is almost the only *Arbiter* and *Mediator* of all issues and differences between Kings and Peoples (…) and that Might today is more than the Law and Reason, which are of no worth in her [Might's presence], (…) some French *Politiques* dare to write, that a Prince must regulate all his actions in his *Interest*, without regard to any laws or obligations, which the French pursue so masterly on every occasion.'[650]

The French King, ministers and people play the leading parts in Valkenier's account of the misuse of the pillars of political government, of ruthless reason of state politics. For instance, throughout *'t Verwerd Europa*, Cardinal Richelieu and Mazarin were Valkenier's prime examples of 'War-Priests': his term for clerical meddling in secular affairs, i.e. clerics inciting warfare to enhance their power at court. The second regulation, faithfulness to alliances, played no part in the foreign policy of the French monarchy; 'But how little this is practised and accomplished, even by the one glorying with her Titles of most-Christian, Protector of Faith and Shepherds of the flock, will we point out in the third part.'[651] Echoing Lisola, Valkenier referred sardonically to the title of *Rex Christianissimus* and Louis's double-dealings under this pretext, which became a crucial argument in later anti-French writings.

---

[648] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 13; Aristotle, *Politics: Books III and IV*, translated with an introduction by Richard Robinson and a supplementary essay by David Keyt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), Book III, 1287a-1278b, p. 58-63.
[649] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 14.
[650] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 14; 'Dit is de oorfaak, waarom dat *Mars* byna alleen *Arbiter* en *Mediateur* is van alle questien en difterenten tusschen Koningen en Volkeren, gelijk *Horatiuis* van *Achilles* feyt: *jura negat sibi nata, nihil non arrogat armis*, en dat de Macht hedensdaags meer is als het Recht en Reden, die in haar selfs niets waardig zijn, 't en zy sy spreeken door de mond van het *Canon*, welker stemme mede brengt vrees en respect. So seggen en durven schryven eenige Franse Polityken, dat een Prins alle syne actien moet reguleeren na sijn *Interest*, sonde reguarde van eenige wetten of obligatien, waar van hoe meesterlijk de Franse haar by alle occasien bedienen'.
[651] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 12.

Concerning the third pillar, the polity, Valkenier discussed the traditional Aristotelian distinction of forms of governments and related these forms to the nature of the subjects, which was divided into three types: slavish, freedom-loving or somewhat in between. The polity is the necessary precondition for civil order and in its government strives to uphold the common well-being, as he refers to the Ciceronian axiom *Salus Populi suprema lex esto*.[652] Nowhere in Europe were monarchies, inherently based on the slavish nature of their subjects, to be found; 'Except in France, where the subjects as donkeys, willingly carry the burdens of an All-ruling Head, and pride themselves in their blindness in obeying their King and honouring him as a God.'[653] Furthermore, he denounced *all* monarchies as 'absolute monarchies' (unlike De la Court), and condemned absolute rule in the same manner as De la Court, as a household rule modelled on robbery by conquest and based on the slavish nature of the people, but now in line with Lisola's argument directed against Bourbon-France;

> 'And if such a rule entails a Generous *Sovereign*, experience learns us, however, that it generally tilts towards Tyranny, and that its Subjects experience seldom happiness but always disasters caused by the passions of the *Sovereign*, who for the satisfaction of his ambition, hands over his subjects to Poverty, robs their goods, and puts their children to the sword, plunders their cities, and leaves it all [unprotected] against his Enemies. And if in the best case, that the Sovereign is peace-loving, even so are the subjects suppressed by the Officers and Favourites, and robbed from properties, that it is impossible for them to negotiate with a liberal hand, which is the only cause (…) that commerce is never fully thriving under an absolute Sovereign, to the contrary it seems, that Commerce has always resided, not where the Subjects were slaves, but were they were free People'.[654]

Such a government, 'where a Potentate absolutely rules, and the entire Majesty exclusively possesses, is so imperfect, and in conflict with the Rules of Nature'.[655] In contrast, 'Aristocratic and Democratic Governments' were those 'where Rulers together as States [estates/assemblies], and where the People self-rule, and relate to the nature of the Nations that love their freedom as it was gold'.[656]

To underline his preoccupation with such a bellicose rule, he employed the neologism 'stratocracy' as an 'Extraordinary' governmental form 'that is, *Military Government,* when the Upper-Command lies with the Military, as in the times of the Romains after *Nero*, until the

[652] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 19.
[653] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 16
[654] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 16-17.
[655] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 16.
[656] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 16.

Government of *Constantius Maximus*, and with the *English* under *Cromwell*, who instead of the *Parliaments* had an Assembly of Military Officers, and the same happens today with the *Turks,* who have no Political Regents, but which great Dominion is being ruled by the most prominent Militaries'.[657] It should be noted that he did not use this notion for France; it substantiated his, as we will see below, relatively positive assessment of the Turkish Empire compared to the extreme rapacious nature of the French monarchy. Valkenier copied this analysis on stratocracy from George Hornius, professor of history at the University of Leiden from 1653 until 1670. Hornius discussed 'stratocracy' in a passage on the different forms of government, wherein he had listed examples of this type of rule, such as ancient Rome after Nero and the contemporary Ottoman Empire.[658]

Valkenier's argument for a mixed constitution or a 'tempered form' served to justify the Orangist rule over the Union of Utrecht. Whereas monarchies, aristocracies and democracies degenerate into respectively tyranny, oligarchy and anarchy, a mixed government balances the different forms so that none will degenerate. By this mixed constitution, stability for the state is secured and the common interest is served in the best manner as exemplified by Sparta, the Roman Republic, the Venetian Republic, the English Monarchy together with the Houses of Commons and Lords, and the provinces of Holland and Zeeland. For over 800 years these latter provinces were ruled by a mixed constitution 'in prosperity, which the *States of Holland,* by a certain Act *dating 16th October 1587* only ascribe the good *Concord, Love* and *Reason,* that have been between the Princes or Counts and the States of the same Country, etc.'[659] This is a tract of the States of Holland written by François Vrancken, which argued that the States General represented the sovereignty and so the regents and theirs assemblies held supreme power against any king or stadholder.[660] Valkenier underlined the necessary position of the princes of Orange within the harmonious 'mixed constitution' between the Counts of Holland or Princes of Orange and the provincial assemblies of the United Provinces. Between 1587 and 1651 'this praiseworthy Form of Government, under the *Princes of Orange* as *Stadholders of United Netherlands*, continued, with such prosperity, that the entire world admired [the Dutch Republic], and took it as an exemplary State', wrote Valkenier. He followed this line of argument by stating that since the Great Assembly of 1651, where representatives of the States of Holland,

---

[657] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 15.

[658] In turn, Hornius was probably influenced by Boxhorn, who in 1653 employed the term to debunk the Cromwellian regime as a historical anomaly. The term was coined by French scholar Claude Salmasius, also living in Leiden, in 1649. Salmasius used the 'stratocracy' to depict the new regime after the execution of Charles I. Jaap Nieuwstraten, 'Empire, Economy and the Dawn of the Enlightenment: Some Explorations into Seventeenth-Century Dutch Intellectual History', in Evert Schoorl (ed.), *The Enlightenment: Political, Economic and Social Aspects. Special issue of United Academics Journal of Social Sciences* 3:15 (2013), 30-47 p. 40. Nieuwstraten refers to Hornius commentaries in Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, *Institutiones politicae,* II.1 262-264, to Boxhorn, *Metamorphosis Anglorum* (1653) and to Clause Salminus, *Defensio regia*, (1649), 36.

[659] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 19.

[660] [François Vrancken], *Deductie ofte corte vertooninghe* (1587); Martin van Gelderen, *The Dutch Revolt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 199-207.

Zeeland, Utrecht, Overijssel and Gelre decided not to appoint a new stadholder after the death of prince Willem II of Orange in 1650, 'the great Ship of these Netherlands [was] jeopardised by such a dangerous constitution, that it seemed to strand on blind cliffs on every occasion.'[661]

The last two pillars of state, army and finances, were the most crucial pillars in practical terms, as Valkenier argued and 'as *Julius Caesar* always said: (...) That there are two things, by which a state can be established, maintained and expanded, namely: Soldiers and Money, which are Army and Finances.'[662] From a pessimistic perspective on human nature, Valkenier argued that because '*Justice* has always been repressed, and that Ambition and Desire have occupied and possessed the human mind' external and internal wars have occurred, and therefore men should always protect themselves against such evils. Internal conflicts were to be prevented by maintaining the proper form of government (mixed constitution); otherwise a polity would fall into a civil war as seen in the urban riots in Holland in 1672. Proper military forces and finances kept out external foes.

This argument again underlined the disastrous war politics of the stadholderless regime and the necessity of an Orange stadholderate. Valkenier argued along the lines of contemporary Orangist pamphlets; not only maintaining a strong fleet, as the stadholderless regime had done, but also strong fortifications, ammunition and disciplined land forces were needed to protect the United Provinces against such mighty land forces as those of Louis XIV. Moreover, a supreme commander must lead the troops into battle. Valkenier praised the military successes of the princes of Orange by disciplining the soldiers during the Revolt and suggested that the princes of Orange were the most adequate candidates for commanding the Dutch army. The stadholderless regime's foreign policy of defensive alliances failed as showcased by the first and second Anglo-Dutch wars (1652-1654; 1665-1667), the Dano-Swedish War (1658-1660), and the French 'piracies' on the Dutch Atlantic trade. A well-organised fleet and land army under the rule of a prince of Orange ought to defend the United Provinces against external threats.[663]

Following this argument, Valkenier referred to Cicero's famous saying by exclaiming that '*Money*, was the Sinews of War, that by the Late *Prince William I* was called the principal Buckle of the Suit of Armour.'[664] He pointed to the Spartan republic that raised no taxes for warfare, but was based on a prosperous agriculture, where harvests were equally distrusted amongst the citizens. However, the circumstances for the Dutch Republic differed; 'In this way people could live in a wealthy Republic, if they had no fear for powerful neighbours.'[665] Not only should princes have rich subjects or a well-supplied treasury, Valkenier emphasised that 'Finances'

[661] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 19.
[662] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 20.
[663] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 20-21.
[664] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 22; 'The sinews of war are infinite money,', famous words by Cicero spoken in his *Orationes Philippicae*.'
[665] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 19, 23.

should be promoted in an honest and honourable way; a prince should not squeeze out the means of his subjects and should not administer the resources either meanly or lavishly.[666] He did not explain this honourable and honest way, but throughout the entire book, Bourbon-France and the stadholderless regime served as prime examples of wicked, illegitimate organisations of finances.

These five pillars entailed an attempt to restore order. He fiercely attacked priestcraft, religious fanaticism, superstition, which was followed by a vision of true religion as social cement of society without necessary involvement of confessional churches. The Christian element in the justification of laws was eroded in the sense that only the inner religion promoted justice as a universal virtue; the confessional churches played no part. The rule of law was abandoned by self-interested rulers and their advisors, notably their 'war-priests', 'officers' and 'favorites', seeking personal glory and power. Especially by monarchies, which Valkenier denounced as 'absolute', arbitrary household rules driven by lust for conquest, for warfare and booty, robbing the subjects of their properties and treating them as slaves. France served as an example of a polity, which pursued a ruthless reason of state; and we will see below how he furthered this model of robbery by conquest in his analysis of the French interest. Due to the perilous state of Europe, regimes (monarchies and republicans alike) had to organise their army and finances, but he stressed that this should be done for security reasons only and with regard to the property and privileges of the subjects.

5.2.2 French Interest of State and Predatory Monarchy

After discussing the five pillars, Valkenier examined the interest of France, by a detailed historical depiction of the rise and characteristics of the French monarchy. Valkenier argued that the Secret Council of the French king (referring to Louis's restructuring of government after Mazarin's death in 1661),[667] which assembled each morning, effectively controlled the five pillars of the French interest. Except for religion, which was carefully managed by the French clergymen, the other four pillars were represented by the four French minsters installed by Louis XIV: 'Monsieur Tellier for *Justice*, Pompone for the *Polity*, Turenne for the *Army* and Monsieur Colbert for the *Finances*.'[668] Consequently, their interest of state was perfectly tended by this intimate group of stakeholders. His anti-French image resembled the works of Romeyn

[666] Valkenier,*'t Verwerd Europa*, 23-24.
[667] Collins, *The State in Early Modern France*, 110.
[668] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 24: 'Michel Le Tellier, Secretary of State of War (1603-1685); Simon Arnauld de Pomponne, Secreatry of State of Foreign Affairs (1618-1699); Henri de l Tour d'Auvergne, Marshal of France (1611-1675); Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Minister of Finances (1619-1683).'

de Hooghe and Wicquefort, and *De Fransche Machiavel* in the sense of the rapacious tyranny of Louis's monarchy, but it appears that his main foundations were Lisola's and Rohan's works.

Valkenier claimed to demonstrate how the interest of state was subject to constant change and consequently determine the rise and fall of polities by means of a historical account from the time of the Franks to Louis XIV, although the French, as he stated, themselves glorified their past as a constant history of power. The first function of this account was to indicate the predatory nature of France. His historical account France functioned moreover to undermine French claims, on, for instance Habsburg possession or on its alleged Trojan myth as we will see below. From the Franks and the claimed origins of the *Lex Salica*, through the first christened Frankish King Clodoveus (from whom purportedly the title most-Christian king came from), to the successive dynastic houses of Meroveus, Charlemagne, Capet and Valois, he described the history of the Kingdom in terms of conquest, partition of inherited lands amongst the sons, and conflicts amongst the elites.[669] Whereas Lisola claimed that French absolute rule was a recent phenomenon of Louis XIV, Valkenier argued that in 1460 Louis XI made French kingship 'absolute and sovereign'[670] and consequently established contemporary France.[671] He portrayed Louis XI as a Machiavellian monarch: 'the shrewdest and quickest of all French kings, whose art of dissimulation and simulation was not inferior to that of the Emperor Tiberius.' [672] The author warned the reader that the power of the king seemed to be divided amongst, and executed by, the church, parliaments, and provinces, but in fact the king commanded all. In Valkenier's opinion, the warfare politics of the French kings contributed profoundly to the accumulation of lands for the French monarchy, such as Louis XI's war against Burgundy and Charles VIII's war against Habsburgs-Spain. The cause of the '150 years' of rivalry was Spain's desire for the 'fifth monarchy' by their overseas conquests and profitable marriage policies; 'Emperor Charles V and King Francois turned almost entire Europe in a bloodbath without one decisive winner rising from the battlefields.'[673]

In his account of the French religious war he copied Rohan's version of the Wars of the Three Henry's, but changed the sequence and added some specific part to stress the inherent Machiavellian hazard of France. Valkenier, for instance, described in gruesome details the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre, whereas Rohan summarised the horrid events in one sentence. Valkenier wrote about the ruthless politics of King Henry III and Duc de Guise; 'When [King Henry III] found out that [De Guise] aimed for his Crown and Life, he put on a Lion and Fox skin, under which he let Duc de Guise stabbed to death at the Estates General in *Blois*, and while he lay

669 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 28-35.
670 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 41.
671 For the contemporary image of Louis XI see Adrianna Bakos, *Images of Kingship in Early Modern France. Louis XI in Political Thought, 1560-1789* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
672 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 40-41.
673 Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 44

there death, he stamped on his face, as *de Guise* had done to the murdered *Admiral Coligny* in the year 1572.' Yet, he shared Rohan's praise for Henry IV, who restored order but was sadly murdered by Jesuits leaving France again in chaos. The turbulent history of civil wars and regicides in France ended after Louis XIII, on the advice of Cardinal Richelieu, took away the privileges of the Protestants and eventually destroyed their power-base at Rochelle in 1628. This marked the start of the French striving towards a universal monarchy (which Lisola dated from the start of Henry IV's reign). He referred to French publications of 1666 and 1667 defending its 'pretentions to, not only, the entire Holy Roman Empire but to Christendom', such as Aubery's treatise, and rejected its fundamental justification of the Salic Law by claiming that it entailed 'a pure fiction', 'a *Chimera*' (as Lisola had done), that it conflicted with all other laws, and that the origins of the document were unknown.[674]

He systematically explained France's policies for obtaining universal monarchy; it entailed two methods: to remove domestic obstacles and, second, to obtain all necessary means (money and interest management). Here we witness a much more specified and enhanced account of Lisola's French predatory monarchy. The first obstacle was the conflict between Catholics and Protestants, which Richelieu had sorted out successfully in the 162os. Secondly, the Crown had to strip bare the Grandees of their power and property;

> 'To prevent disputes amongst the noble houses, King Louis XIII and Louis XIV have extracted the means and wealth of the most powerful Houses of France by which they try to pursue warfare, according to the lessons of the Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin; to his end they use many maxims (..) That they [the high nobility] always have to reside near the King at their own expense, and serve him slavishly (…) That they in order to expand the magnificence of the King, they must maintain very great and costly suites of *Pages, Valets, Coaches, Outfits etc.* (..), build excellent *Palaces* and *Pleasure houses* (…), they have to pay almost all of their tributes and pay their revenues and income of their estates to the *Tailles*, and they have been pressured by every tax one could think of, more than any other Christian Nation.'[675]

He expounded Lisola's argument of the make-up of the French household rule that effectively supported the ruler's warfare and was founded on the bellicose nature of Frenchmen;

> 'Furthermore, the French have always been agile and agitated, that they, similar to a *Perpetuum Mobile*, could never have been still, nor peaceful, but also were inclined to

[674] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 41-55; Lisola on 'Chimerical Monster', *The Buckler*, 277.
[675] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 54-55.

> Foreign and Domestic Wars, to factions of families, and to Duels (…) And to prevent these difficulties, the Kings follow the lessons of Richelieu that they have to change the Governorships frequently, and maintain their Subjects in constant actions of foreign Wars.'[676]

Although both authors referred to Rohan's *De l'interest*, Lisola perceived it as the evil blueprint for France's predatory monarchy. Valkenier, however, praised Rohan's take on interest and aimed his criticism directly and more vigorously towards Richelieu, Mazarin and Louis XIV, which in the context of the disastrous events of 1672 is well understood. Indeed, throughout Europe anti-French polemics became more colourfully, and the attacks on the French government more directly, after the French invasion in the Dutch Republic.[677]

Valkenier underlined the exploitation and suppression of the French population, as Lisola had done, but elaborated further on how the French Crown collected its excessive wealth by increased and new taxes, confiscations, tithes and relentless exploitation of royal domains (the second instrument to acquire universal dominion);

> 'The sale of various and extremely profitable honourable Offices and Dignities brings the Kingdom yearly almost as much as the entire income of a European Potentate, considering that *King Henry IV* in the last years of his reign made 70 Millions, as *l'Oiseau* tells in his Tract of the Offices, *;ib 3. Cap: 1*., which have been extremely augmented under King *Louis XIV*.' [678]

Furthermore, the French Crown extracted money by the 'extortion and suppression of the officers', and, as Lisola had argued likewise, by the production and sale of French fashion. Valkenier even viewed the latter as France's most important method, not least to stress the perverted nature of Frenchmen[679];

> 'the French have by their nature and frivolities blinded Christendom (except for Spain and Friesland) with their new *Fashions* and constant changes of clothing, and brought them the wrong opinion that a true Patriot (...) would be seen as a rough and obstinate head, when he does not imitate those abominable foreign kind of clothing, but wore down his old clothing that was for 2 and 3 Years in fashion, and was according to the country's customs.'

[676] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 55.
[677] Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde, 323-33.*
[678] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 58.
[679] As he likewise in his account of the third pillar 'polity' compared the French with the despotic Asian peoples and the African Moors 'who by lack of bravery, are effeminate and weak', Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 15.

Richelieu had moreover, extensively promoted the manufacturing of numerous cloths, which produced 40 million French guilders for the Crown. In total, Louis XIV had expanded the Crown's yearly income from 8/9 million to 80 million. He concluded: 'From this, we see, how the French mislead other Nations and blind them, how they by the same recklessness, have become enriched and armed. Because from this treasure France equips its terrifying Armies and Sea-fleets against those, from whom it extracts that treasure'.[680]

After listing the thirteen ways to obtain resources, Valkenier enumerated the twelve factors supporting the power of France compared to the rest of Europe. These involved geographical, logistical and demographical assets, which produced prosperity and included the benefits of France named by Lisola. The last factor was the most crucial:

> 'The willing slavery of the Subjects, who dare not to refuse the King's taxes, but as Donkeys load themselves until they collapse, therefore the King is called by Emperor *Maximilian de I* a King of Donkeys, as the *Emperor* (…) can bring forth nothing more than the German Princes, Spain allow him by the laws; France can do whatever he pleases, and England nothing more than which the People pleases.'[681]

Apart from acquiring money, maintaining its interest in relation with other regimes was the second instrument to obtain the necessary basis for warfare. First, Valkenier reiterated Rohan's (and Lisola's) words in claiming that 'Christendom contains two powerful Kingdoms, France and Spain, which together as a *Balance* deliver War and Peace upon all the other States.' As Rohan, he reasoned that England functioned as the balancer, but added that the United Provinces are 'the Tongue, in order to balance the three Kingdoms.' This was followed by a reverberation of Lisola's regulations/maxims of the French system of government to manage their interest; 'regulations, which were largely executed without any regard to Divine or Human Laws in order to fulfil its objective, i.e. *Universal Monarchy*.'[682] Promises were not kept, a key characteristic of the French since the origin of their existence. The French concealed their political hidden agenda with fine words, and religious and legal pretexts constructed by French political philosophers, who were on the payroll of the French monarchy. The French regime built fortifications along its borders to launch surprise attacks; and they

> '[w]eaken neighbours by chiefly unlawful means, incite neighbouring countries into Discord and War against each other, or instigate domestic Troubles, or divide

[680] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, first quote p. 56-57, second quote p. 60, all the thirteen means of extraction, 55-63.
[681] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 62-63.
[682] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 65.

> [society] into Factions (…). It is inherent to the Antichrist to create discord and disputes in the World, and if the King has to make do with that, [he] should not get angry, when someone calls him the first born of the Antichrist, instead of the first-born of the Church.'

Valkenier added another basic principle, which he sees as the primary French precept: the art of 'Blackmailing' and 'Corruption'. This was executed chiefly by the cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin, whom Valkenier sardonically called 'the two holy fathers'. French monarchs practised ruthless interest-politics based on the advice of these evil clerics. By means of bribery, secret correspondence, and other tricks, they played off European countries against each other. With this strategy the French managed to sabotage the Spanish courts, caused English uprisings and the downfall of the kingdom of Poland. Here Valkenier referred to 'the good policy of the High-Wise and Prudential Baron *Franciscus de l'Isola* Imperial Envoy' who saved the Polish court from the French hazard.[683] The last regulation of the French interest was the intimidation of his neighbours (also stated by Lisola); 'The French King always keeps in his service a great amount of Horsemen and Soldiers, whom by giving new *Patents* he gradually changes from Garrisons, and strategically manoeuvres entire Armies, not only to prevent his own subjects to rebel, but to demonstrate its great power to rest of the world as well, especially to his neighbours to provoke constant torments, threats, and fear, so they have to choose to join France for their own protection or to be attacked.'[684]

In the second part of the book, Valkenier dealt with the French war preparations against the Low Countries. Francois I strove for universal monarchy by conquering successively the small polities of Milan, Napels and the Low Countries; Henry IV did this through the conquest of Madrid, Louis XIII German princes; but Louis XIV, 'whose ambition and desire for glory surpasses no one (..), has maintained that no efficient way exists to obtain Universal Monarchy and [to be] Master of the World than by the conquest of the Seventeen United Provinces.'[685] He followed 'the Lesson of Coligny' that France needed foreign warfare to extract money and prevent domestic troubles.[686] The comparision with Asian despotism is almost axiomatic for this kind of argument since the second third of the seventeenth century.[687] The household rule was run on robbery by conquest; all members facilitated its interest under the plunder monarch: the (new) officers and favourites, the soldiers, the War-Priests, and the slavish subjects. Valkenier compared the crazy fury and sudden retreats of the French with that of 'Barbaric Nations as the

[683] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, quoted from p. 71, 64-74. On pages 71, 142 and 175 Valkenier likewise refers to Lisola's *Le Bouclier.*
[684] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 74.
[685] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 131.
[686] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 132.
[687] Von Friedeburg, *Luther's Legacy*, 339-345.

Moors, Tartars, and all Asian and African peoples, which is the cause that France conquers Countries without difficulty, but loses them as easily', such as the successors of the great conquerors 'Atilla and Tamerlan' could not maintain their vast captured empires.[688] Besides, Louis XIV, or the 'French Hannibal' and 'Xerxes'[689], was trained in the 'Lessons of Machiavelli' to become a supreme new prince, as Valkenier explained how the French cunningly managed a diplomatic entrapment of the Dutch Republic before the invasion of 1672.[690] Louis began with this scheme in the year 1664 by inciting war between England and the United Provinces (Second Anglo-Dutch War 1665-1667).[691] Through trickeries and offering money and weapons Louis persuaded the other rulers to plot against the Dutch Republic. Valkenier concluded that the French plans of universal monarchy could be stopped if every potentate would follow his advice; 'That they, within the capacity of each party, should prevent, that by the suppression of lesser Princes and States the *French* get elevated to such a height from which they can crush the others as by lightening.' He called out for a grand alliance of all European rulers against Louis XIV's France; 'they should form a front as oxes against the French wolf.' Valkenier remarked that in France's battle with Spain, other rulers followed France as defenceless animals. However, '[o]ne should put out the fire in his neighbour's house, because if the fire skips to his own house, it is too late.' [692]

5.2.3 Interest Analysis of Europe

In addition to Valkenier's historical account of the French system of rule, his explanation of the general 'ground rules' and specific foundations of the French interest, Valkenier furthered his attack on France by analysing the specific interests of the different European rulers and the few republics. Other than Rohan and Lisola, Valkenier stated that interest of state consisted of 'particular Regulations according to the specific Constitution of every State' and 'General Regulations'.[693] Every European ruler should manage well its foreign affairs, its secret diplomacy, maintain societal unity, protect its subjects from external violence, and rule according to the laws for the benefit of the people. These regulations echo the maxims of Rohan.[694] The different interests of the particular European polities were analysed by means of it recent history, the geographical position the relations with other rulers, and the economic

[688] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 267.
[689] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 189, 343.
[690] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 148, 158, 725.
[691] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 137-138.
[692] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 225-226.
[693] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 75.
[694] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 74, 75.

situation. Valkenier pointed out the specific interest of the French king concerning each particular polity. Consequently, the French hazard for Europe is highlighted. One by one he described the interests of states as Rohan did, although in more detail, dealing in turn with the interests of Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, the Italian areas, England, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Hungary, the Old Swiss Confederacy and the interest of the Dutch Republic.[695]

Interestingly, Valkenier added three regimes to Rohan's list: the Portuguese monarchy that was restored through its revolt against Spain 1640-1668, but also Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire. His accounts of the latter was remarkably positive, especially since the Turks were generally viewed as the pivotal example of despotic rule. *'t Verwerd Europa* was one of the earliest anti-French treatises in which the allegedly cruel practices of Ottoman household governments were sharply reduced in order to magnify the French despotic image. Although Muscovy did form a substantial threat to the northern European monarchies, the Ottoman Empire could shiver Europe to its core during the second half of the seventeenth century, culminating in the siege of Vienna in the 1680s. Valkenier viewed both regimes as absolute governments, freed from all laws and founded on the slavish population. '*Muscovy* is ruled by its *Tsar* so absolutely and free from all Laws as almost no other Empire in the World, and therefore its Grandees and Nobles, as well as its Subjects live a life of slavish servitude that is at one with their nature.'[696] The first maxim of the Tsar's interest is to be honoured as a God to prevent domestic rebellion and to enforce strict obedience to its orthodox confession producing absolute unity in society. Whereas Muscovy feared the Turks, Polish, Swedes, and in particular the Tartars, the Ottoman Empire was afraid of no one. The Ottoman Empire was extremely wealthy and was secured from internal division and revolts by its strict and unyielding political maxims and foundations; 'The *Turkish Sultan* is an absolute Sovereign, and all of his subjects are equal as slaves, whose Live, Goods and Fortune were subjected to his Power, which he can claim as he pleases and is free to dispose of.'[697] The sultan's authority rested on fratricide (oldest son of the sultan kills all his brothers), execution of the grandees by keeping the Janissaries and the *Spahi* (infantry and cavalry household troops of the sultan) engaged in warfare, and by the poverty of the subjects. Yet, the Ottomans enjoyed freedom of religion, lived soberly and modestly, were pious believers fearing God and striving to ascend into heaven, and because they were forbidden to drink wine, they were not driven by disobedience and tumults, which made them stable soldiers.[698]

---

[695] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 75-129. What is more, Valkenier discusses separately the interests of Sweden, Hungary, Poland, Denmark, and of the most important Italian princes, while Rohan discusses the first four under the heading of the Holy Roman Empire, and the latter under 'Italy' in general, of which he only pays exclusive attention to Venice. Yet, Rohan treats the interest of the Pope individually.
[696] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 99.
[697] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 101.
[698] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 100-105.

After the French interest, Valkenier first analysed the Habsburg-Spanish monarchy, because according to the author, it shared a similar political goal as France: the establishment of a universal monarchy. Therefore, Valkenier claimed that the interest of Spain would always conflict with the interest of France. As a result, the French monarchy fiercely opposed the Spanish monarchy. Valkenier copied most of Rohan's writing on the interests of Habsburg-Spain and Bourbon-France. He did not literally copy Rohan's depiction of the Spanish interest, but he copied the first 'points' and presented them in the same order. Yet, in his description of the Spanish interest, Valkenier copied almost letter for letter a passage from Rohan's account of the French interest. This passage described Henry IV as the first French King who understood that France should oppose the Spanish interest and that France had to show to the Catholic rulers that the venom hidden behind Spain's pretext of protector of the Catholic faith, as well as its secret support to Protestants in their conflicts with Habsburg-Spain.[699] Valkenier, however, observed that Spain had failed this first regulation in the last decade. Instead, France had taken it over by depriving cities, churches, and privileges of the French Protestant subjects, as well as foreign Protestants, referring to the French offensive in the Dutch Republic. Combining Lisola and Rohan, Valkenier argued that Spain, as well as France desired universal dominion.

Furthermore, France surpassed Spain in its cunning diplomatic polices of gathering information on the affairs in 'foreign' kingdoms, in its deceitful and power-hungry politics during peace negotiations, and in the composition of its monarchy. Spain suffered from the scattered lands of its monarchy, which made it extremely difficult to maintain internal concord, something Lisola also stressed. Valkenier pointed out that France already had made several attempts to spread discord between the different elites of the Spanish lands and the Spanish monarch. He

[699] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 75: 'So heeft Koning Hendrik de IV. de eerste onder allen recht aangeweesen, hoe dat het Interest van Vrankrijk daar in principalijk berust, dat het in alle poincten Spanjen so direct moet tegen gaan, dat, waar Spanjen Ja, het selve Neen toe moet seggen: Waar uyt dan volgt, dat gelijk de eerste regul van Spanjes Interest altijd voor desen is geweest de Protestanten ten uytersten te vervolgen, sich met haare goederen te verryken, en onder pretext van Religie de Catholyke Staaten met hem doen t'samen spannen, dat Vrankrijk even so in 't reguarde van Spanjen, altijd voor sijn eerste Regul van Interest heeft gehouden, dat het, aan de eene zijde, aan alle Catholyke Potentaten most toonen, wat quaat onder dien Spaanschen dekmantel verburgen lag, en insonderheyt aan den Paus, hoe sekerlijk dat hij, nevens alle andere Potentaten, een knecht van Spanjen soude moeten werden; als Spanjen door de schatten der Protestanten verrijkt, de Universele Monarchie soude oprechten; En dat het aan de andere zijde den Protestanten in alle voorvallen tegen Spanje moeste assisteeren, gelijk Vrankrijk om sijn interest getoont heeft aan de Vereenigde Nederlanden, en de Protestanten in 't Duytse Rijk.'; Rohan, *De l'intérêt*, 170-171: 'Mais cela ne suffisant pas pour traverser les progrès d'Espagne, l'intérêt de la France est de prendre tout le contre-pied des maximes que nous venons de vous déduire. Henri IV, comme celui sur lequel la souplesse de tous ces artifices a été exercée jusques au dernier point, les ayant mieux reconnus qu'aucun autre devant lui pour les avoir plus éprouvés, a le premier établi pour le vrai intérêt de la France de contre-pointer celui d'Espagne en tous ses points. De sorte que si la première maxime de l'intérêt d'Espagne est de persécuter les protestants pour s'accroître de leurs dépouilles, la première de celui de France est de fuire comprendre aux catholiques le venin caché là-dessous : surtout de faire voir à la cour de Rome que les espérances qu'elle lui donne d'augmenter ses trésors par la ruine des protestants n'est que pour avancer son dessein à la monarchie où elle ne peut parvenir que le pape ne devienne son valet, l'autorité duquel n'éclate point davantage que quand la puissance des princes et Etats chrétiens est balancée' et aux princes et Etats protestants qu'encore qu'elle soit de diverse religion à la leur, elle aimerait plutôt leur conversion que leur destruction, les assurant que cela n'empêchera point qu'elle ne contribue du sien pour leur conservation et ne les assiste franchement contre tous ceux qui voudront troubler ou changer quelque chose en leurs Etats et en leurs libertés'.

advised the Spanish monarchy to observe and secure the specific interests of the different Spanish lands (hereby underling the splintered nature of early modern 'dynastic agglomerates' and the inherent task to manage all those different parts). For instance, to protect Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia, Spain should ally with the Vatican and Toscana. Alliances with the Holy Roman Emperor and the Old Swiss Confederacy were necessary to protect Milan and Burgundy. The scattered composition of the Spanish monarchy was the greatest problem, which prevented Spain from optimally looking after its interests. The lawyer stated that Habsburg-Spain had weakened itself by incorporating several Italian polities and the Burgundy-Dutch provinces into its monarchy.[700]

Besides the interest of Spain and France, Valkenier plundered Rohan's account of the interest of the Pope, but supplemented it by arguing that in his time France formed its greatest threat. He also copied Rohan's interest analysis of the Swiss and Dutch polities as 'the two arms of the German Empire'.[701] Haitsma Mulier sees in this Valkenier's staunch defence for the republican government in general,[702] an evaluation which we should be careful to accept, especially when taking into account that the words were taken from Rohan's work, who was by no means a republican. As Lisola, Valkenier used Rohan's interest analysis to turn it against Louis's monarchy, but, unlike Lisola, he also echoed Rohan's negative account of Habsburg-Spain.[703] Rohan's elaborations on 'reason of state' and its employment by Lisola and Valkenier show how a rather similar 'reason of state' argumentation could result in totally different outcomes. Valkenier's practical goal was to block current plans for peace negotiations, to maintain a grand European alliance against France and William's military leadership. He used Rohan's and Lisola's arguments to indicate the predatory monarchy of France, but his analysis was far more detailed and amplified, and the implications of such rule were extremely more distressing.

5.2.4 Dutch interest of state

Apart from the lengthy analysis of the French interest, Valkenier dedicated a lot of pages to the interest of the Dutch Republic. His main objective was to defend the necessity of the stadholderate and to refute the idea of Holland's provincial sovereignty, so fiercely advocated by Pieter de la Court. He constructed a political entity of the Dutch United Provinces, which was based on the Union of Utrecht from 1579. Within the Union, the seven different provinces shared

[700] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 75-79.
[701] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 85 and Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté,* 176; Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 106-107 and Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté,* 181.
[702] Haitsma Mulier, 'Die Politisch-historischen Ideen von Petrus Valkenier', 119.
[703] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 44-48 and Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté,* 188-190.

the absolute power and *maiestas*, which was carefully balanced by the Stadholder.[704] The first interest of the Republic was to maintain the Union of Utrecht, and to prevent factions and conflicts between the different provinces. The stadholder served as the supreme arbitrator in the internal power struggles of the Republic. Valkenier wrote:

> '(..) and therefore a third neutral person is necessary, a Governor or Stadholder, who displays him, and to whom they give Power, Authority, and Command in order to calm and to moderate their respective fights and differences, and to avoid all disorder and mobs'.[705]

The second interest consisted of the stimulation and protection of maritime commerce. In order to safeguard this interest, the right of the 'free seas' should be protected, while wars should be prevented.[706] Valkenier argued for the commercial interest of the Dutch Republic along the same lines as De la Court's *Interest van Holland*, founding its prosperity on fishery, manufacturing and trade. Spain's embargo of Dutch commerce with Spain produced Dutch commercial prosperity; the Dutch had to find their own foreign goods and establish trading companies. Unlike De la Court, Valkenier viewed the two biggest trade companies VOC (United East India Company) and the WIC (Dutch West India Company) as the two essential pillars of trade. Moreover, Valkenier argued that Dutch prosperity was jeopardised by 'jealousy' between provinces and regents, and by jealousy and 'desire for state/dominion' [staatsucht] of foreign princes and rulers, especially France that threatened to take down the Dutch Republic as a second Cartago. The prince of Orange as stadholder and captain general formed the fundamental protection of the Dutch Republic against foreign as well as internal foes.[707]

Valkenier emphasised the importance of the stadholder for the Dutch Republic in times of war, as well as 'during peace time'. The wellbeing, in political and economic terms, of the whole Republic depended on the neutral position of the stadholder and the balance of power between the provinces. Valkenier examined the history of the 'factional government' of the 1650s and 1660s. As De la Court did, he took the crisis years of 1618 and 1650 to state his case, but instead legitimised the 'interventions' of the respective princes of Orange against the factious and oligarchic regents. In the 1610s the Dutch Republic was at its peak due to Maurice of Orange, who had 'stabilised the state', 'tempered government' and brought forth true military

[704] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 106.
[705] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 108.
[706] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 110.
[707] Valkenier,*'t Verwerd Europa*, 124-129; As De la Court, Valkenier may also be interpretetd as an author in the tradition of 'jealousy of trade' scrutunised by Istvan Hont, *Jealousy of Trade. International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); Hartman, Jan and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade: Commercial Reason of State in Seventeenth-Century Holland', in Sophus Reinert and Pernille Røge (eds.), *The Political Economy of Empire in the Early Modern World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 11-31.

success. Yet, during this period of peace with Spain (1609-1621), 'some people pretended *insolently* the unlimited Freedom, by which the most evil persons amongst the people, if their partiality and imaginary concepts had succeeded, would have discarded the people of their Freedom.'[708] By 'unlimited Freedom' Valkenier meant freedom of religion, freedom of provincial, even municipal, sovereignty in political and, especially, military matters, and freedom from the authority of the House of Orange. By the imprisonment of certain regents in 1618 and the execution of Oldenbarnevelt in 1619, Maurice restored order. After the peace treaty of 1648, some regents thought, yet again, that the Dutch government needed no 'Illustrious Person' and thus began to obstruct the House of Orange by taking away its 'Power and Authority' over the military. Valkenier slightly touched upon William II's siege of Amsterdam in 1650, but excused the display of force and the imprisonment of eight members of the provincial assembly of Holland as a sheer necessity. These Holland regents had threatened the interest of the Republic by the reduction of the army and severely limiting the power of the stadholder. The Year of Disaster was the result of not acting in the 'true' interest of the United Provinces. The power-hungry stadholderless regime of Johan de Witt, supported by publicists such as De la Court, was to blame for the disastrous state of the Dutch Republic under the invading armies of predatory King Louis XIV.[709]

In the second part of the book Valkenier attacked the confessional politics of the De Witt regime. The regents had suppressed the Reformed religion as the main religion of the United Provinces and even subjected it to their political rule. The Religious zeal degenerated during the 1650s and 1660s: '*In summa* they became so *Libertine* and *Free-Spirited*, that they followed no particular Religion whatsoever'.[710] However, Valkenier stated that

> 'the *Reformed Theologians* also were not without fault, since they [turned] against each other by unnecessary and vicious Disputes, and by mutual Divisions and Factions, which they often sought with heavy passions, [they] deprived the Church of the respect of its Enemies, and the Authority and the Respect, which, previously, it had received from the whole world. (…) And as long as this remains, the Church must be restored and maintained by good Orders of the Political government.'[711]

Valkenier wanted to explain how the government of De Witt had eroded the pillars of state and consequently ruined the state. The regents had a threefold programme to destroy the stadholderate and establish a aristocracy: 'to humiliate the House of Orange', 'to flatter

[708] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 112.
[709] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 112-113.
[710] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 229; Valkenier discussed the Dutch practice of religion under De Witt-regime p. 225-230.
[711] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 228-229.

provinces and cities with absolute sovereignty', and 'to caress the Community with the sweet name of Freedom claiming that they would enjoy more abundantly under a Aristocracy or Stately Government, than when they had a Stadholder.'[712] He wrote: 'The Community is always ruled since the time of Civilis by a Head under the title of a Count or Prince, who would always be subjected tot the Laws, Moral and Sovereign Power of the State.' 'The Community' he defined as: 'the joint Nation that actually is the Sovereign State as *Cicero lib. 3. De Republica* teaches us *Respublica est res populi, cum bene & juste geritur ab uno rege, sive a paucis optimatibus, sive ab universo populo.* That is: The Republic belongs to the People, as they will be served well and with justice by a King, or by a few of the most distinguished, or the joint People.'[713] However, 'Freedom of the Community is not compatible when the sovereignty lies with the regents, because when one falls the other falls as well,' as was witnessed during the lethal chaos in Zeeland and Holland in 1672.[714]

The faction surrounding De Witt had corrupted the legal system, coerced judges, and installed their partisans in judicial, military and political offices. Consequently, the aristocracy slipped into an oligarchy. When the oligarchic regents feared that their propositions would not find the desired support, they obstructed the States General waiting for the absence of potential opponents and for the substantial presence of their own faction members, 'which appeared from the granted privilege to the Book of *De la Court*.'[715] The De Witt faction promoted and worshipped such 'Defamatorious Libels', which slandered the reputation of the House of Orange and attributed to them 'the most wicked absurdities and crimes.'[716] Furthermore, they had turned the Republic into multiple republics, burdened the subjects with an unparalleled level of taxation. Yet, the regents were avaricious with certain necessary spending as the military forces and fortresses. Echoing Romeyn de Hooghe's anti-French arguments, Valkenier exclaimed that the magistrates had indulged themselves in excessive luxuries, copied French fashions of food, clothing and palaces as if they were princes, led society into a general decay of morals, and, consequently, let the enemy in.[717]

Against internal discord a prince of Orange in the office of stadholder ought to balance the factious political dynamics within the Dutch Republic. Against external enemies, a strong and large army and a healthy organisation of war finances should be maintained under the supreme command of the prince of Orange in the office of captain-general. Valkenier extolled the military qualities of the princes of Orange, which the success of the Revolt against Habsburg-Spain had

[712] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 234.
[713] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 234-235
[714] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 249-250.
[715] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 249.
[716] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 236.
[717] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 226-266.

demonstrated so well.[718] However, compared to the 'Absolute Monarchic Government' of France, the princes of Oranges were restricted by the constitutional arrangements of the Union of Utrecht, which, as we saw, he traced back in a Grotian manner to the times of the Batavians. Moreover, Valkenier propagated the 'Orangist' notion of the constitutional restraining function of the Union of Utrecht. He accused the stadholderless Regime of attempting to acquire absolute sovereignty for the individual provinces.[719]

Such arguments were in line with Dutch debates on the true interest of the polity; Valkenier argued for offensive warfare, strong land forces under the command of Orange, and used the conventional Orangist argument to back his claim. Yet, through his enhanced interest analysis and detailed image of the French predatory monarchy, he stressed the sheer necessity for the small Dutch Republic to enforce the military and to pursue allied warfare in order to survive the military competition between the powerful dynastic agglomerates, especially French expansionism. The year of 1672 had proven this once and for all. Valkenier intervened in debates on William III's enlarging his authority through the pursuit of warfare and planned peace negotiations in the mid-1670s. He underlined the popular argument that to defend the Dutch commerce wars should be prevented. Conversely, William III's grand alliance against France was a matter of sheer survival; the current war against Louis XIV should be pursued and the position of Orange maintained. The success of the prince of Orange was based on his authority, executed through the military and the political assemblies; his authority harmonised the constitution, moderated religious issues, and facilitated an impeccable legal system, a strong army and a proper financial organisation, which formed the protection of property and privileges of Dutch subjects against the Holland regent oligarchy, but, more importantly, against French war-tyranny. In this way, Valkenier propagated princely war politics under a rule law independent from revealed religion and shielded against the threat of predatory monarchy.

Valkenier dealt with two continuing issues: how to discredit the De Witt Regime and promote the princely rule of Orange; and simultaneously discredit Louis XIV? He delegitimised the De Witt regime by explicitly stating how they ruined the five pillars of state, but perceived that France was a genius in the management of its interest; its pillars were put in full service of its interest, i.e. universal monarchy; its religion was politicised and French priests fully served the French war effort, even advised the Crown how to become a Machiavellian new prince; no rule of law existed as the King could do as he pleased without consent or consult from the elites; he ruled arbitrarily, absolute in accordance with the slavish nature of his subjects; finances were extorted from its subjects as well as conquered peoples; and the military forces were abundant

[718] Valkenier,*'t Verwerd Europa*, 23-24.
[719] Valkenier, *'t Verwerd Europa*, 234.

in number and bellicose spirit. Though the French monarchy adequately pursued its true interest (establishing universal monarchy), it executed it without regard to the four bridles of interest of state (the protection of religion, faithfulness to alliances, honesty, and impeccable benevolent administration of justice). Through a historical analysis Valkenier determined its maxims of universal monarchy and indicated the predatory nature of its society driven by necessary warfare to supress its barbaric subjects and power-hungry elites, as well as to conquer other European polities. Rohan's rapacious tyranny inversed by Lisola's into a household rule served as the basis of Valkenier's expounded image of the French predatory monarchy; De la Court's account of the interest of Holland was deliberately reversed into an common interest of the United Provinces, and its vicious attack on priestcraft and princely interest was reiterated in Valkenier's attack on France.

Valkenier stated that interest of state surpassed all laws (divine, natural and positive). However, he stressed that interest of state should be pursued for security reasons only; self-defence according to natural law and the expansion of one's state should be executed with legitimate means without explain how precisely. So how was he able to condemn the French pursuit of interest; is the French interest of state rightful? At every step of his argument he tried to solve an individual problem by throwing in arguments from all sorts of sources, which led to an incoherence, a lack of propositional consistency. His concern was not with a conceptual reconstruction, but with the dire threat of the French predatory monarchy. The French interest of state stemmed from its circumstances, origins and nature of its society. In this sense it was a descriptive notion, but he also wrote about France's unrightful claims to Habsburg possessions, France's arbitrary rule that went against natural law, and the French maxims that were pursued without regard to any divine or positive laws. Valkenier tended to collapse interest into justice, not least since he needed a mark of respectability for Stadholder William III of Orange, whose princely rule and the pursuit of warfare he presented as limited and just. It appears that above reason of state a set of norms existed, God's morality independent of confessional religion.

His reason of state argumentation was highly derivative, for some historians unexciting or too subjective, yet it underlined the polemical function of reason of state, its international context, not least Rohan's legacy, and the contemporary preoccupation with predatory monarchy and the struggle to restore order.

Chapter 6
Conclusion

This research stems from the need for a reassessment of the idiom of reason of state. It has been perceived as mirroring an early modern programme of state building, but since the notion of state building as an deliberate or strategic activity has been undermined, the question arises on the reasons for its extremely popularity in political writings from the 1590s onwards, or to be more precise: what was the function of the popular vocabulary of reason of state in early modern political writings? This thesis focuses on specific appeals to a reason of state; that is, the analysis of what was claimed to be 'the (true) interest of state'. From the 1630s onwards authors complemented arguments on reason of state -examinations of the person of the ruler and his political practices- with analyses of the nature of the societies that he ruled. Each chapter considers an interest analysis of an author and scrutinizes the function of the vocabulary of reason of state within the respective source: Henri de Rohan's *De l'interest* (1638), Pieter de la Court's *Interest van Holland* (1662), François-Paul de Lisola's *Bouclier d'Estat* (1667) and Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1672). Every individual author intervened in political debates on immediate issues of warfare, foreign policy, mounting taxation, and governmental debt. From this emerges a shared preoccupation with the fear of predatory monarchy, which may be considered a tradition of speculation, or a sub-genre of political thought.

The background of the rise of the idiom of reason of state is the growing scale of warfare and confessional strife that not only brought forth transformations in early modern rule, i.e. war-driven and debt-ridden regimes, but also amounted to a perceived crisis of the rule of law, as laws to be found in scripture, Roman law, local precedent, deeply rooted in Aristotelian and confessional Christian notions. Reason of state was a highly suggestive term, as part of the 'vocabulary of fashionable political cynicism' about the 'true' motives of rulers prompted by the experiences of civil strife and continuous warfare. Its popularity sprung from its opacity; it could, and was made to mean different things to different people. Arguments of reason of state usually entailed practical counsel for the ruler on prudence often summarised in 'maxims' and in its most narrow, 'Machiavellian' understanding, authors gave advice on the room for legitimate manoeuvre in emergency circumstances beyond the bounds of normal legal, moral and religious constraints. It was most often used in accusations against certain officeholders in terms of neglecting or subverting the princely duties towards the divine and natural laws. Such arguments contributed to the perceived crisis of the rule of law. The fashionable term 'interest' was used interchangeably offering an insight into the motivations of ruler and a rationale to execute questioned politics. From the 1630s onwards, authors, such as Rohan, used the term to

dissect the origins and make-up of the ruler's societies offering seemingly objective counsel on how maintain and expand the 'state' (e.g. princely status, regime, polity,) in a world of constant change and conflict. The changing configurations of European dynastic agglomerates encouraged such attention. The specifics were derived from empirically-based analysis, which enabled writers to emphasise the current state of affairs and the distinction between a domestic and a foreign domain. Such counsel assumed that the ruler had an obligation to pursue 'true' interest of state freed from his personal interest, virtues, passions and relations. In political debates on the pursuit of warfare, authors employed interest analyses to promote a specific officeholder or political faction that was purportedly the most able candidate to defend a certain course in foreign policy, and simultaneously to attack the opposing faction as dangerously unsuitable for the 'true' interest of state; authors could address and criticise the conduct of regimes pressured by the military competition and subsequent mounting governmental debt, while simultaneously demanding a position within these transformed regimes. Interest analyses were taken on board in English civil war debates and Dutch debates during the stadholderless regime, offering authors an opportunity for criticism in the name of achieving order, harmony, and the true interest of the state, a rationale to criticise the conduct of the Stuart monarch or Orange prince, respectively, and to reconstruct order by arguing the need to harmonise the interests between rulers and ruled that formed the 'true' interest of state. From the 1670s onwards, such idioms of argument were directed against Louis XIV's expansionism in order to defend the European legal order.

Historians have commended Rohan for a seemingly objective and rational interest analysis on a European scale in *De l'interest* (1638), but behind his alleged Realpolitik lies the propagandistic function of reason of state; and as a Huguenot in search of an important office under Cardinal Richlieu, there was a particular need not to fan the flames of religious division in France. The purpose was to galvanize the confessionally divided French into mobilisation against Spain. This function is also witnessed in the way Rohan defined a national interest: always in opposition to interests of other regimes. He defined the 'true interest' of France as necessarily anti-Spanish (and subsequently pro-Protestant). The whole case was given urgency by the way in which Spain's geographic position, wealth and power was portrayed as being directed towards the total domination of Christendom. Its interest was shaped by five maxims or methods of government to obtain a 'new monarchy', of which a proclaimed zeal for Catholicism was the most notable one. It was a predatory monarchy, ruthless, dissembling and only feigning religion. The image was very much a satiric *reducio* having most of the features of the Black Legend without its divisive sectarianism. The apparent objectivity of Rohan's understanding of interest and reason of state may be the result of overlooking two aspects of his argument that have been stressed here: the satiric critique involved in outlining Spain's 'true' interest; and the

strategic displacement of confessional difference, something that should not be taken for religious indifference.

In the context of the upsurge of Organism in 1660-1661 fuelled by the Stuart restoration, the Dutch merchant Pieter de la Court employed an interest analysis to diminish the threat of the reinstatement of the young prince William of Orange in the offices of his forefathers: stadholder and captain general of the Dutch military forces. In his *Interest van Holland* (1662) the idiom of interest functions as a threefold means to construct an uncompromising anti-Orangist position. The mighty opponent of the House of Orange was the province of Holland. The historical, economic, political features of Holland suggested that the province had no need for the House of Orange. In fact, the Orange-dynasty was going to ruin Holland's splendour. Secondly, an alliance with Stuart-England was of no great value at all; by England's commercial activities it would always seek warfare with Holland. Furthermore, the dynastic connections with the House of Orange would bring Holland to ruin. Finally, it was argued that the Princes of Orange had abused their offices to promote internal strife in the Republic, to subject the inhabitants of Holland, and to pursue their own dynastic glory and passions in warfare and a luxurious lifestyle. Whereas Rohan's demonised image of Spain was of a rapacious tyranny, De la Court regarded the House of Orange as despotic -but the result was effectively the same in that both threatened to create a world of slaves. De la Court's accusation of predatory monarchy entailed, however, the more systematic aspect of a rule wanting war for reasons of stabilization of his rule within his own lands. Orange princely rule was constructed as a household government, robbing the inhabitants of their properties and privileges, enslaving them all. And it is in contrast to the despotic rule of Orange that De la Court specified the true interest of Holland, a harmonisation of specific interests that combined and fostered trade with religious toleration. Rather than by-passing confessional difference De la Court emphasised that the interests of divisive priests in the service of despotic rulers threatened the true interests of Holland.

After the French invasion in the Spanish Netherlands in 1667, the trained lawyer and imperial diplomat François-Paul de Lisola attacked the French monarchy by skilfully refuting Louis XIV's legal claims on these lands, as well as by pointing to the source of its evil: reason of state, especially that proclaimed by Rohan. By an ironic inversion of Rohan's maxims of Spains' and France's interest, Lisola implicitly argued for the illegitimacy of French conduct, its predatory nature from Henry IV onwards, feeding on its subjects and conquered peoples, endangering the 'liberty of Europe'. It was not the peace-loving Spaniards, but the French who were restless warlike savages, and the French Crown lived according to a Machiavellian rule of conquest. Whereas Rohan pointed to the power of Habsburg-Spain, with possessions scattered over the whole world, Lisola urged that Spain's dispersed territories constituted a military weakness at one with its quiet and peaceable nature. Echoing De la Court's argument, Lisola

added a social construction of predatory monarchy, one that requires warfare to suppress and delude its subjects in order to extract resources to finance further warfare. Lisola treated commerce as an instrument to further France's belligerence and one hat also threatened the more peaceful commercial practices of Europe. Lisola's motive was to persuade the Habsburg emperor and German princes to aid Habsburg-Spain, and argued this through appeals to justice defending the European legal order against French expansionism. Like Rohan, Lisola required a supraconfessional argument for this. Yet, whereas Rohan argued that Spain's zeal for Catholicism was merely a pretext, Lisola countered that justice was merely a pretext for France's expansionary policies; Rohan's *De l'interest* became part of his evidence. For Lisola, the Christian European order was fundamentally a political and spiritual entity, opposed to the unchristian French rule, unchristian as the Turkish household rule: it undermined the rule of law, robbed foreign peoples and coerced and abused its subjects, with no consideration for justice whatsoever. Europe was used interchangeably with Christendom; although Lisola employed the first term substantially more often. The notion of balance of power did not take centre stage in *Bouclier*; it was only referred to in countering Rohan's interest analysis of Spain's desire to conquest, and universal monarchy. However, Lisola did associate this image explicitly with the threat of slavery for all of Europe. The work of a Catholic Habsburg apologist formed the groundwork for later English and Dutch anti-French writings, often perceived as arising from within purely Protestant and commercial contexts of argument. Perhaps the fuller irony lies in the fact that Lisola's work was an inversion of the Huguenot Rohan's interest analysis together with its demonised image of the predatory monarch.

In the context of the 'Disaster Year', 1672, wherein Louis's troops and allied forces rapidly crushed the Dutch Republic Petrus Valkenier employed an analysis of interest to address Lisola's new predator: France. He accused De la Court of maliciously attacking the good name and reputation of the princes of Orange, on the orders of De Witt, whose 'libertine' and 'oligarchic' government was to blame for the quick and disastrous downfall of the Dutch Republic. However, in *'t Verwerd Europa* Valkenier deliberately mirrored De la Court's interest analysis to turn his arguments around in favour of a united Republic under a strong military Orange-princely rule. Furthermore he copied whole passages of Rohan's *De l'interest* to state that France had taken over from Spain as supreme threat to Europe. Accordingly, he inverted Rohan's maxims on Spain, and reiterated Lisola's image of the French bellicose household rule, but without Lisola's ironic touch; perhaps his sense of revulsion was too great to allow any illusion of dispassionate play. His image of France was far more detailed than Lisola's and the hazardous implications of its rule were stretched to a much greater extent. Valkenier's response to the enormity of the threat from France was to put his faith in a prince as supreme commander. This required a complete rejection of De la Court's attacks on the House of Orange,

its ambitions and the corruptions for which he had held it responsible. Internal corruption was rather the responsibility of war priests and the libertines of the Republic. The Reformed Church was needed as the main confession in in the Dutch Republic. Yet, in, as it were, opposing one prince with another, the problem was how to avoid both being equally predatory. Valkenier's solution was to urge that the Prince of Orange should, for all his power, be constrained by the constitution, and interest and reason of state ought to be in agreement with justice. His argument reflects the genuine struggles of political thought in the 1650s-1680s; a search for alternatives to civil order and the European legal order, for stability.

These four interest analyses display the highly polemical function of interest analysis – the exact method and type of argument was used and re-used for different, even opposing objectives. Above all, they exhibit a reliance on an image of the predatory monarch and although the target of hostility may vary, each image of the monarch is painted with Rohanesque maxims and concerted interest in dominance and destruction, tyranny and despotism. The similarities and the textual cross-references are sufficient to suggest that these writers may be considered part of a tradition of speculation, a sub-genre of political thought. It requires considerably more study. Rohan, of course has received much attention, but not in Dutch thought, Lisola's self-conscious appropriation and inversion of his work has been little noticed; and it is difficult to see how further examination would not also break down the unsatisfactory isolation of, for example, Dutch from English political thought or 'absolutist' reason of state from a 'republican' counter ideal. The predatory monarch was an international and European threat. If it sometimes looks like a creation of paranoia, it was widely shared and gave rise to powerful reflection and resourceful appropriation of remarkably flexible conceptual materials.

Sources and Bibliography

Archival material

The Hague, Nationaal Archief, *Collectie Cuperus*, 1.10.24, inv.nr. 12.

Koninklijke Bibliotheek (The Hague) *Collectio Cuperus*.

Primary printed sources

[Anonymous], *Conférence infructueuse de Windisgrats, ou Violence de la France à obtenir la Lorraine avec ce qui s'est passé là-dessus de plus remarquable* (Charleville, 1671).

[Anonymous], *Consideratien over den Tegenwoordigen Toestant van het Vereenigde Nederland, Gesteld door een Liefhebber van 't Vaderland, Tot encouragement van sijne Lands-genooten, in desen bekommerlijken Tijd.* (1672).

[Anonymous], *De Fransche Machiavel, of Hondert Fransch-Politique Staets-Regelen, Waer in De Fransche Staets- en Krijgs-Maximen en Praktyken aen een yder opentlijk voorgestelt worden.* (Utrecht: Iuriaen Poolsum, 1675).

[Anonymous], *De politicque lotery, bestaende in vier en twintigh noyt gesiene, onwaerdeerlijcke en onschatbare looten, welcke ten voordeele van de verdruckte waerheyd en gerechtigheyt, konnen getrocken werden.* (1690).

[Anonymous], *De schoole der princen, en interest der voornaemste potentate des werelts* (Cologne, H. Albedeuyt, 1673).

[Anonymous], *De wettelijcke verantwoordinge der Hollanders, ofte een Verhael van 't gepasseerde van den Jare 1624 tot desen tijdt toe. Doorgaens aengewesen werdende de trouloose Handeling van Vranckryck, die sy ontrent de opgherechte Tractaten hebben gehouden Met een klaar vertoogh, wat ontrent, voor ende in de Vrede-Handeling tot Ceulen is gepasseert, etc.* (Amsterdam: Cyprianus vander Gracht, 1674).

[Anonymous], *Den Grooten en Witten Duyvel, dat is: een klaer vertoon en aenwysinge dat den koningh van Vranckrijck niet door gewelt van wapenen, maer door de malitieuse directie van Mr. Jan de Wit [...] soo veel steden [..]. onder sijn gehoorsaemheyt heeft bekomen* (1672).

[Anonymous], *Den spieghel der Spaenscher tyrannye, in West Indien[…]* (Amsterdam 1596).

[Anonymous], *Den tegenwoordigen interest der Christen princen* (Enkhuizen: Dirk Klaer-Oogh, 1662).

[Anonymous], *Discoursen over den tegenwoordigen interest van het landt. Tusschen een Zeeu, Hollander en raedsheer* (Amsterdam, 1672).

[Anonymous], *Engelands interest, ofte tegenwoordich waerachtig belangh. By een trouwhertigh lief-hebber van Engelands eere desselfs en gantsch christen-rijcks vrede, uit D'Engelsche spraeck in de Neder-duytsche overgeset* (1672).

[Anonymous], *Esclaircissements sur les affaires de Lorraine pour tous les princes chrestiens* (Strasbourg, 1671).

[Anonymous], *Euroop vol Verwerring, Waer in te sien zijn De heimelijkste driften van alle de Potentaten in Christenrijk* (1673).

[Anonymous], *Extract uyt de Resolutien van de (…) Staten Generaal (…) Raeckende het subject van de Vredehandelinge* (The Hague: J. Scheltus, 1675).

[Anonymous], *Haeghs Hof-Praetje, ofte 't samen-spraeck tusschen een Hagenaer, Amsterdammer, ende Leyenaar. Op ende tegens de valsche calumnien ende versierde leugenen van Pieter la Court, gestelt in sijn alsoo genoemde Intrest van Holland ende gronden van 't Hollands welvaren* (Leiden, 1662).

[Anonymous], *Hannibal noch in onse Landen, ofte Consideratien over d'onmogelijckheyt des Vredes, omme in dese tegewoord. Constitutie van tyden een vaste en bestendige Vrede met den Koning van Vranckrijck te bekomen.* (Cologne: Pt. de Vrede, 1675).

[Anonymous], *Het Tegenwoordige Interest der Vereenigde Provincien. Nevens Verscheyde Aanmerckingen op de tegenwoordige, en Conjecturen op de toekomende Standt van zaaken in europe: voornaamlijck betreffende deze Republijke. Door een liefhebber van de Gereformeerde Religie, en 't welvaren dezer Landen* (Amsterdam, 1673).

[Anonymous], *Hoe veel de Vereenigde Provintien behoort gelegen te zijn, de her-stellinge van den coninck van Groot-Britangie* (The Hague: H. Cornelsz., 1653).

[Anonymous], *Holland's interest, gestelt tegen dat van Jan de Witt; voor-gevallen tusschen Hans, raedts-heer, en Arent, een borger Waer in van woort tot woort verhaelt wert fijn perpetueel* Edict *of eeuwighdurende* Wet. (Amsterdam, 1672).

[Anonymous], *Hollands Op-Komst, of Bedenkingen op de schaadelyke Schriften, genaamt Grafelyke Regeeringe en Interest van Holland uit-gegeven door V.D.H. ten dienste van alle liefhebers die het ware Interest van Holland beminnen* (Leiden, 1662).

[Anonymous], *L'interest de l'Allemagne, en general et en particvlier* (Cologne: Pierre Marteau, 1668 [printed in the Netherlands by Weller]).

[Anonymous], *L'interest des Provinces Unies du Pays Bas dans le restablissement de sa majeste de la Grande Bretagne* (1653).

[Anonymous], *La chasse aux larrons ou avant coureur de l'histoire de la chambre de justice. Des livres du biens public, & autres oeuvres faits pour la recherche des financiers & de leurs fauteurs* (Paris, 1618).

[Anonymous], *Lettre escrite par vn Gentilhomme Francoys faisant profession de la Religion Reformée, a vn amy Hollandois, au sujet des libelles diffamatoires qui se publient en Hollande*

contre les Francois, & pur faire voir que l'Interest et seureté de la vraye Religion tant dehors que de dans les Provinces Unies […] de Paix sans elle (Hamburg, 1647).

[Anonymous], *'t Leven en bedrijf van mr. Jan van Oldenbarnevelt, over-eengebraght met dat van mr. Jan de Wit* (1672).

[Anonymous], *Maximes des princes et estats souverains* (Cologne, 1665 [Amsterdam: Daniel Elsevier, 1665]).

[Anonymous], 'De l'Interest des Princes & Estats de la Chrestienté', in *Le Vingtiesme Tome dv Mercure François, ou Suite de l'Histoire de nostre temps, sous le Regne du Tres-Chrestien Roy de France & de Nauarre Lovys XIII*, continuation de l'an 1634 (Paris: Estienne Richer, 1637) 46-126.

[Anonymous], *Munsters Vrede-Praetje. Vol alderhande Opinien/ off d'Algemeene Wel-vaert deser Landen in Oorlogh off Vrede bestaat. Deliberant dum fingere nesciunt* (1646).

[Anonymous], *Mysteria politica* (1625).

[Anonymous], *d'Ontleding van Euroop. Dit is te seggen, De spreuken van alle de Vrije Vorsten en Vorstendommen van Euroop. Over den geheymen toestan der tegenwoordioge saken* (1672).

[Anonymous], *Pierre de Touche. Des veritables Interests des Provinces Unies du Païs-bas: et Des Intentions des deux Couronnes, fur les traittez de Paix. Seconde Edition* (Dordrecht, 1647).

[Anonymous], *Redenen en Middelen tot bevordering van d'algemene Vrede, en gemene Welstant, daar in door een onpartijdig persoon, die tot de gemene rust genegen is, aangewezen word door welke middelen men tot en (…) vrede (…) zou konne geraken. Uit het Fransch vertaalt.* (Amsterdam: Pt. Arentsz., 1675).

[Anonymous], *Remarques sur le Procedé de la France, Touchant la Negociation de la Paix* (1667).

[Anonymous], *Spaensche tirannije* (1621).

[Anonymous], *Staet representerende de generale affairen, midstgaders d'hoedanicheden ende gestalenis van alle koninckrijcken, prinsdommen ende republiquen van Europa. Vanden Jaren 1654. Tot den jaere 1655* (The Hague, 1655).

[Anonymous] *Suite du dialogue sur les droits de la reine Très-Chrétienne. Par où se découvre la vanité des prétentions de la France sur les Pays-Bas* (Brussels: François Foppens, 1668).

[Anonymous], *The mirror of the Spanish tyranny in the West Indies or A short account of the destruction of the Indies* (1606).

[Anonymous], *Verhael van Staet-Saken (…) Seecker over d'Interesten van de Staet van Engelandt (…)* (Amsterdam: Jan Rieuvertsz. and Pieter Arentsz., 1673).

[Anonymous], *Vervolg van 't verwerd Europa, of Politijke en Historische Beschryving van alle gedenkwaardige Staats- en Krygs-Voorvallenzoo binnen, als buyten 't Christen-Ryk, Voornamentlijk in en omtremt Hoog- en Neder-Duytsland, en derzelver aangrenzende Rijken en Staaten, zedert den Jaare 1672 tot 1675. Door de Fransche Wapenen veroorzaakt.* (Amsterdam: Hendrick and the widow of Dirk Boom, 1688).

[Anonymous], *Vervolg van 't verwerd Europa, of Politijke en Historische Beschryving van alle gedenkwaardige Staats- en Krygs-Voorvallenzoo binnen, als buyten 't Christen-Ryk, Voornamentlijk*

in en omtremt Hoog- en Neder-Duytsland, en derzelver aangrenzende Rijken en Staaten, zedert den Jaare 1672 tot 1675. Door de Fransche Wapenen veroorzaakt. (Amsterdam A. Schoonberg and J. Rotterdam, 1742).

Aitzema, Lieuwe van. *Saken van Staet en Oorlogh,* 14 Volumes. (The Hague, 1657-1671).

Aristotle, *Politics: Books I and II*, translated with a commentary by Trevor J. Saunders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

Aristotle, *Politics: Books III and IV*, translated with an introduction by Richard Robinson and a supplementary essay by David Keyt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

Aubery, Antoine. *Des justes Prétentions du Roy sur l'Empire* (1667).

Bethel, Slingsby. *The Present Interest of England Stated* (1671).

Bethel, Slingsby. *The World's Mistake in Oliver Cromwell* (1668).

Bethel, Slingsby. *The Interest of Princes and States* (London, 1680).

Bilain, Antoine. *Traité des droits de la Reine Tres-Chrestienne sur divers Estats de la Monarchie d'Espagne* (Paris, 1676).

Boccalini, Trajano. *Ragguagli di Parnasso e scritti minori*, ed. Luigi Firpo, 3 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1948).

Botero, Giovanni. *Della ragion di stato e delle cause della grandezza delle città* (Venice, 1598)

Botero, Giovanni. *On the Causes of the Greatness and Magnificence of Cities, 1588*, translated and introduced by Geoffrey Symcox (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

Botero, Giovanni. *Raison et gouverment d'estat*, translated by Gabriel Chappuys (Paris, 1599).

Boxhorn, Marcus Zuerius. *Institutiones politicae* (1657).

Cassan, Jacques de. *Recherches des Droits des Rois de France sur les Royaumes, Duchés, Comtés, Villes et Pays occupé par les Princes sur les Royaumes, Duchés, Comtés, Villes et Pays occupés par les Princes Etrangers* (Paris, 1632; Rouen, 1634; Paris, 1646, 1649 and 1663).

Cassan, Jacques de. *Deductio Ex qua probatur clarissimis Argumentis non esse Ius Devolutionis in Ducatu Brabantiae nec in allis Belgii Provinciis Ratione Principum earum, prout quidem conati sunt asserere* (1665).

Corbet, Johan. *Het interest van Engelandt, in de materie van religie* (Amsterdam: Steven Swart, 1663)

Court, Johan and Pieter de la. *Het welvaren van Leiden. Handschrift uit het jaar 1659*, edited by F. Driessen (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911).

Court, Pieter de la. 'Brieven uit de correspondentie van Pieter de la Court en zijn verwanten (1661-1666)', J.H. Kernkamp (ed.), in *Bijdragen en Mededelingen van het Historisch Genootschap.* 70 (Groningen – Jakarta: J.B. Wolters, 1956).

Dupuy, Pierre, and Denis Godefroy. *Les droits du roy très-chrestien sur plusieurs estats et seigneuries possedées par divers princes voisins: et pour prouver qu'il tient à juste titre plusieurs provinces contestées par les princes estrangers* (3 editions: Paris, 1631; 3 editions: Paris, 1655; 2 editions: Paris, 1670).

[Ferrier, Jérémie.], *Catholique d'estat ou Discours politique des alliances du roy très-Chrestien contre les calomnies des ennemis de son estat* (Paris, 1625).

[Gentillet, Innocent.] *Discourse sur les moyens de bien gouverner et maintenir en bonne paix un Royaume ou autre principauté […] Contre Nicholas Machiavel Florentin* (1576).

Grotius, Hugo. *The Antiquity of the Batavian Republic*, introduced and translated Jan Waszink (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000).

Guthry, Willem. *Het groote interest van een christen; ofte Het deel van een geloovige getoetst* […] *wie heeft ende hoe te krijghen*, *[…] En in 't Nederlandts vertaaldt door Jacobus Koelman* (Vlissingen: Abraham van Laren, 1669).

Hardouin de Beaumont de Péréfixe, Paul Philippe. *Histoire du roy Henry le Grand* (Amsterdam, 1661).

Heidegger, Johan Heinrich. *In viam concordiae Protestantium ecclesiasticae manuductio* (Amsterdam, 1687).

[Hill, Joseph.], *The interest of these United Provinces. Being a defence of the Zeelander choice. By a wellwisher of the reformed religion, and the wellfare of these countries* (Middelburg: Thomas Berry, 1672).

Hooghe, Romeyn de. *Schouburgh der Nederlandse veranderingen, geopent in ses tooneelen, Waer op de Wisselbeurten des Vereendigde Staets Door den Fransen Oorlog gebrouwen, in Historiele Sinnebeelden* (Amsterdam, 1674).

Huber, Ulricus. *De jure Civitatis Libri Tres* (1673).

I.N.D.P. [Jean Nicholas de Parival], *Ware interest van Holland; gebouwd op de ruïnen van den Interest van Holland, onlangs uitegegeven door D.V.H.* (Leiden: Jan Princen, 1662).

J.C., *De gansche distructie van den nieuw-gebooren Hollantschen Cromwel alias Leydtschen Quaker, genaemt t'Intrest van Hollandt, ofte gronden van 's Hollants welvaren* (Schiedam, 1663).

Lavall, Antoine de. *Desseins de professions nobles et publiques* (Paris,1605, 1612).

Lipsius, Justus. *Politica. Six books of Politics or Political Instruction*, translated and with an introduction by Jan Waszink (Assen: Royal van Gorchum, 2004).

[Lisola, François-Paul], *Bouclier d'Estat et de justice contre le dessein manifestement découvert de la Monarchie Universelle, sous le vain prétexte des pretentions de la Reyne de France* ([Brussels: François Foppens], 1667).

[Lisola, François-Paul], *Verdedigingh van staet en gerechtigheyt: tegens het baerblijckelijck ontdeckt voorneemen der gantsche monarchye, onder d'ydele deckmantel der pretentien, of eysschingen van de koningin van Vranckrijck. Mitsgaders De rechten der koningin van Vranckrijck, door de Franschen gepretendeert, &c. van hen selven krachteloos gemaeckt, en vernietight. Alles uyt de Fransche Tael vertaelt.* (Amsterdam, [1667]).

[Lisola, François-Paul], *The Buckler of State and Justice Against The Design manifestly discovered of the Universal Monarchy Under the vain Pretext of the Queen of France her Pretensions. Translated out of French.* (London: James Flesher, 1667).

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*, translated and edited by Peter Bondanella, with an introduction by Maurizio Viroli (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Montanus, David. *Stemme des gejuygs en des heils over't groote interest van een christen* […] *in gezangen vervat* (Vlissingen: Abraham van Laren, 1672).

Mullens, Gelasius [Guilielmus Saldenus]. *Neerlands interest, tot vrede der kercke, en weghneminge van alle opkomende misverstanden in de selve* (Middelburg: Yemant Hendricksz., 1664).

Müller, Andreas. *Des Verwirreten Europæ Continuation, oder Wahre Historische Beschreibunq Derer in der Christenheit/ fürnehmlich aber in dem Vereiniqten Niederlande Teutschland/ und henach in den angräntzenden Reichen Fürstenthümerh und Herrschafften/ zeither dem jahre 1673. biß auff das jahr 1676. dureh die Waffen des Königes in Franckreich erregter blutiger Krieqe/ Empörung und Verwüstung. Abgetheilet in drey Theile* (Amsterdam: J. van Sommeren/Henrich and Diedrich Boom, 1680).

Müller, Andreas. *Das Verwirrte Europa dritter Theil: Wahre Historische Beschreibung Derer in der Christenheit, fürnehmlich aber in dem Vereinigten Niederlande, Teutschland, und hernach in den angräntzenden Reichen, Fürstenthümern und Herrschaffen, zeither dem Jahre 1676. biß auff das Jahr 1682. durch die Waffen des Königes in Franckreich erreichter bluhtiger Kriege, leidigen Empörungen und erschrecklicher Verwüstung. Abgetheilet in drey Theile* (Amsterdam: J. van Sommeren/Henrich and Diedrich Boom, 1680).

Nedham, Marchamont. *Interest will not lie. Or, a View of Englands True Interest* (1659).

Nedham, Marchamont. *The Case between England and the United Provinces* (1652).

Nedham, Marchamont. *The pacquet-Boat Advice* (1678).

[Henry Neville], *The Works of the Famous Machiavell, Citizen and Secretary of Florence* (London: John Starkey, 1675).

Pufendorf, Samuel. *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, translated by Jocodus Crull (1695), edited by Micheal Seidler (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2013).

Rapin, René. *Instruction sur l'histoire,* (Paris: Sebastien Marbre-Cramoisy, 1677).

Ridderus, Franciscus. *Historischen Frans-Man. In bysondere Fransche Geschiedenissen Gepast op de onderdruckte staet van ons lieve Vaderlandt* (Rotterdam, 1674).

Rohan, Henri. *A Treatise of the Interest of the Princes and States of Christendome. Written in French by the most noble and illustrious Prince, the Duke of Rohan.* Translated into English by H.H. (Paris, 1640).

Rohan, Henri. Den interest der princen ende staten van Christenrijck. In't Francoys beschreven door den Hertog van Rohan (Amsterdam, 1654).

Rohan, Henri de. *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté*, edited with an introduction and annotation by Christian Lazzeri (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1995).

[Rothé, Jan.] *Refutatie, of Wederlegginge van de Brief, geschreven van de Prins van Orange op den 18 Maert 1675, aen de Staten van Zeelant* (1675).

[Rothé, Jan.] *Het Bedrogh, en verkeert voorneemen van de Prins van Orange ontdeckt* (Antwerpen, 1675).

Sidney, Algernon. *Court Maxims* [manuscript written in 1664-1665], edited with an introduction by Hans W. Blom, Eco Haitsma Mulier and Ronald Jansen (eds.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Smith, Adam. *Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms. Delivered in the University of Glasgow by Adam Smith, reported by a student in 1763.,* ed. and with an introduction by Edwin Cannan (Clarendon Press; Oxford 1869).

[Stockmans, Pierre.], *Deductie, waar uyt met klare ende bondige bewijs redenen getoont en beweesen wordt, datter geen recht van devolutie is, in het hertogdom van Brabandt* (Amsterdam, 1667).

Valkenier, Petrus. *'t Verwerd Europa ofte politieke en historische beschrijvinge der waare fundamenten en oorzaken van de oorlogen en revolutien in Europa voornamentlijk in en omtrent de Nederlanden zedert den jaare 1664. Gecauseert door de gepretendeerde Universelen Monarchie der Franschen* (Amsterdam: Hendrik en Dirk Boom, 1675).

Valkenier, Petrus. *Des Hoch-Edlen, Gestrengen Herrn, Herrn Petri Valkeniers (…) Mündlich geführte Klage Uber die vielfältige Frantzösiche Contraventions deß mit der Eydgnoßschaft habende Bunds und über den stätigen Mißbrauch der Eydgnößsischen Völker wider die samtlich Hohe Allierten, Samt der darauf begehrter gebührender Remedur* (Baden, 1691).

Valkenier, Petrus. *Klagte van den heer Petrus Valkenier, extraordinaris envoyé van (…) op den 8 Maart mondeling gedaan. Over de veelvuldige Fransche contraventien des verbonds dat zy met het loffel: eedgenoodschap zijn hebbende ... Beneffens aanwysinge der remedien welke daer op verzocht worden*, (Amsterdam, 1691).

Valkenier, Petrus. *Das verwirrte Europa: oder, politische und historische Beschreibung der in Europa, fürnehmlich in dem Vereinigten Niederlande, und in dessen Nachbarschaft, seither dem Jahre 1664 entstandenen, und durch die gesuchte allgemeine Monarchie der Frantzosen, verursachten blutigen Kriege, und leidigen Empörungen, nebenst den authenticquen Copeyen der Briefe und gewissen Berichten* (Amsterdam: Jacob von Meurs/Johannes von Someren/ Hendrich and Diederich Boom, 1677).

Valkenier, Petrus. *'t Verwerd Europa ofte politieke en historische beschrijvinge der waare fundamenten en oorzaken van de oorlogen en revolutien in Europa voornamentlijk in en omtrent de Nederlanden zedert den jaare 1664. Gecauseert door de gepretendeerde Universelen Monarchie der Franschen* (Amsterdam: A. Schoonenberg and J. Rotterdam, 1742).

V.D.H. [De la Court], *Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal* (Amsterdam, 1662).

V.D.H. [De la Court], *Interest van Holland ofte de Gronden van Hollands-Welvaren* (Amsterdam, 1662).

V.D.H. [De la Court], *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* (Leiden and Rotterdam, 1669).

V.D.H. [De la Court], *Anweisungen der heilsamen politischen Grunde und Maximen der Republicqen Holland und West-Friesland* (Rotterdam, 1671).

[De la Court], *The True Interest and Political Maxims of the Republick of Holland and West-Friesland. Written by John de Witt, and Other Great Men in Holland* (London, 1702).

[De la Court], *Mémoires de Jean de Wit, Grand Pensionaire de Hollande, trans. M. de* *** [Mme. Van Zoutelandt] (The Hague, 1709).

[Vrancken, François.], *Deductie ofte corte vertooninghe* (1587 [Ericus Walten], Spiegel der waarheyd, ofte t'samensprekinge tusschen een armiaan ende vroom patriot, waar inne krachtig vertoont ende bewesen word, dat door de quade directie ende toeleg van eenige heerschende regenten tot Amsterdam, ons land in (…) desen oorlog is ingewikkelt met Vrankryk (1690).

[Wicquefort, Abraham de.], *Advis fidelle aux veritables Hollandois. Touchant ce qui s'est passé dans les villages de Bodegraven & Swammerdam* (The Hague, 1673).

[De Witt, Johan.], *Deductie, ofte declaratie van de Staten van Hollandt en West-Vrieslandt […] is voortgebracht* (The Hague, 1654).

Witt, Johan de. *Brieven van Johan de Witt volume 1*, edited by R. Fruin and G. W. Kernkamp (Amsterdam: Müller, 1906).

Wolfshagen, Adolphus van. *De Schoole der Princen, En interest der voornaemste Potentaten des Werelts.* (Cologne: Hermanus Albedeuyt, 1673).

Ludovico Zucculo, *Considerazioni Politiche e Morali sopra cento oracoli d'illustri personaggi antichi* (Venice, 1621).

Secondary literature

Aa, Abraham Jakob van der. *Biografisch woordenboek der Nederlanden. Deel 20* (Haarlem: J.J. van Brederode 1877).

Armitage, David. 'Edmund Burke and Reason of State', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61:4 (2000), 617-634.

Asch, Ronald G., and Heinz Duchhardt (eds.), *Der Absolutismus--ein Mythos?: Strukturwandel monarchischer Herrschaft in West- und Mitteleuropa (ca. 1550-1700)* (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Bölhau, 1996).

Bakos, Adrianna. *Images of Kingship in Early Modern France. Louis XI in Political Thought, 1560-1789* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).

Barnett, S.J. *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Baumanns, Markus. *Das publizistische Werk des kaiserlichen Diplomaten Franz Paul Freiherr von Lisola (1613-1674). Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Absolutistischem Staat, Öffentlichkeit und Mächtepolitik in der frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1994).

Blanning, Tim C. W. *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture. Old Regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Beik, William. 'The Absolutism of Louis XIV as Social Collaboration', *Past and Present* 188:1 (2005) 195-224.

Bély, Lucien. *La société des princes XIVe-XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 1999).

Bijl, Murk van der. 'Pieter de la Court en de politieke werkelijkheid', in Hans W. Blom and Ido W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam and Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 65-91.

Blom, Hans W. 'Democratic Tendencies in Anglo-Dutch Republicanism', in Dirk Wiemann and Gaby Mahlberg (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), 121-135.

Blom, Hans W. *Morality and Causality in Politics. The Rise of Naturalism in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Political Thought.* PhD dissertation, University of Utrecht, 1995.

Blom, Hans W. 'The Republican Mirror, The Dutch Idea of Europe,' in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 91-115.

Blom, Hans W. 'Oorlog, handel en staatsbelang in het politiek denken rond 1648', *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), 89-96.

Blok, Petrus J. *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche volk. Deel 3* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1925, third revised edition).

Bokhorst, Matthijs. *Nederlands-Zwitserse betrekkingen voor en na 1700* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1930).

Bonney, Richard. *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Boogman, Johan Christiaan. 'De raison d'état-politicus Johan de Witt', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden*. Deel 90 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), 379-407.

Boogman, Johan Christiaan. 'The Union of Utrecht: its Genesis and Consequences', *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 94:3 (1997): 377-407.

Boone, Rebecca. *War, domination, and the "Monarchy of France" : Claude de Seyssel and the language of politics in the Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Bosbach, Franz. 'The European Debate on Universal Monarchy', in David Armitage (ed.), *Theories in Empire, 1450-1850* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 81-98.

Bödeker, Hans Erich. 'Debating the *respublica mixta*: German and Dutch Political Discourses around 1700', in Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 219-246.

Brugmans, Hajo. 'Valckenier, Pieter', in P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok (eds.), *Nieuw Nederlands Biografisch Woordenboek* deel 5 (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1921), 988-989.

Bunge, Wiep van. *From Stevin to Spinoza. An Essay on Philosophy in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

Burgess, Glenn. *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: an Introduction to English Political Thought 1603-1642* (Macmillan: Basingstoke, 1992).

Burgess, Glenn. 'Tyrants, Absolute Kings, Arbitrary Rulers and The Commonwealth of England: Some Reflections on Seventeenth-Century English Political Vocabulary', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 147-158.

Burke, Peter. 'Tacitism, Scepticism and Reason of State', in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 479-498.

Catteeuw, Laurie. 'L'inacceptable face aux nécessités politiques : les relations entre censures et raisons d'état à l'époque moderne' in *Les Dossiers du Grihl* [online], Les dossiers de Jean-Pierre Cavaillé, Les limites de l'acceptable, (14 juin 2013), accessed January 17 2016. URL : http://dossiersgrihl.revues.org/5978.

Catteeuw, Laurie. *Censures et raison d'État. Une histoire de la modernité politique (xvie-xviie siècle)* (Paris: Albin Michel, 2013).

Church, William F. *Richelieu and Reason of State*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970).

Claydon, Tony. *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Claydon, Tony. 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda 1689-1697, in Esther Meijers and David Onnekink, *Redefining William: the impact of the King-Stadholder in international context* (Aldershot: Routhledge, 2007), 125-142.

Collins, James B. *The State in Early Modern France* 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Collins, James B. *Republicanism and the State in late medieval and early modern France* (forthcoming).

Collinson, Patrick. 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* LXIX (1987), 394-424.

Condren, Conal. *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Condren, Conal. 'Reason of state and sovereignty in Early Modern England: a question of ideology?' *in Parergon* 28:2 (2011), 5-27.

Constant, Jean-Marie. 'Der Adel und die Monarchie in Frankreich vom Tode Heinrichs IV bis zum Ende der Fronde (1610-1653)', in Ronald Asch (ed.), *Der europäische Adel im Ancien Regime. Von der Krise der ständischen Monarchien bis zur Revolution (1600-1789)* (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 129-150.

Cuttica, Cesare, and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012).

Devetak, Richard. 'Historiographical Foundations of modern International Thought', *History of Ideas* 41:1 (2014), 62-77.

Devetak. Richard, "The fear of universal monarchy": balance of power as an ordering practice of liberty', in Tim Dunne and Trine Flockhart (eds.), *Liberal World Orders* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 121-137.

Drees, Marijke Meijer. 'De beeldvorming Nederland-Spanje voor en na de Vrede van Munster', in *De Zeventiende eeuw* 13:1 (1997), 163-172.

Dreitzel, Horst. 'Reason of State and the Crisis of Political Aristotelianism: an Essay on the Development of 17th Century Political Philosophy', *History of European Ideas* 28 (2002), 163-187. Duchhardt, Heinz and Andreas Kunz (eds.). *Europäische Geschichte als historiographisches Problem* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1997).

Du Rieu, Willem Nicolaas. *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batave MDLXXV-MDCCCLXXXV: accedunt nomina curatorum et professorum per eadem secula* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875).

Elias, Johan E. *De Vroedschap van Amsterdam 1578-1795*, Vol. 1 and 2 (Haarlem: Loosjes, 1903-1905).

Elliott, John H. 'A Europe of Composite monarchies', *Past & Present, No. 137, The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe* (1992), 48-71.

Ferwerda, Abraham. *Adelijk en aanzienlijk Wapenboek van de zeven provincien; waarbij gevoegd zijn een groot aantal Genealogien van voornaame Adelijke en Aanzienlijke Familien* (Leeuwarden, 1760-1781).

Finer, Samuel E. 'State- and Nation-Building in Europe: the Role of the Military', in: Charles Tilly (ed.), *The Formation of National States in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 84–163.

Fockema Andreae, Sybrandus Johannes, and Theodorus Josephus Meijer (eds.), Album studiosorum Academiae Franekerensis (1585-1811, 1816-1844): naamlijst der studenten (Franeker: Wever, 1968).

Foisneau, Luc. 'Sovereignty and Reason of State: Bodin, Botero, Richelieu and Hobbes', in Howell A. Lloyd (ed.), *The Reception of Bodin* (Brill; Leiden 2013), 323-342.

Friedeburg, Robert von. 'How "new" is the "New Monarchy"? Clashes between princes and nobility in Europe's Iron Century,' *Leidschrift. Aan het hof. Rivaliteit, legitimiteit en successiestrijd aan de Euraziatische hoven, 1250–1750* 27:1 (2012), 17–30.

Friedeburg, Robert von. 'Republics and Republicanism', in: Hamish Scott (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Europe* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2015), 538-559.

Friedeburg, Robert von. *Luther's Legacy: The Thirty Years War and the Modern Notion of 'State' in the Empire, 1530s to 1790* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Friedeburg, Robert von and John Morrill (eds.), *Monarchy transformed: princes and their elites in early modern Western Europe* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2017, forthcoming).

Frijhoff, Willem. 'De reisnotities (1641-1643) van Pieter de la Court. Uit het manuscript bezorgd en van commentaar voorzien', in Hans W. Blom and Ido W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam and Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 11-34.

Frijhoff, Willem and Marijke Spies, *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective: 1650, hard-won unity* (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2004).

Fritschy, Wantje. 'The efficiency of Taxation in Holland', in Oscar Gelderblom (ed.), *The political economy of the Dutch Republic* (Surrey/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 55-84.

Gauchet, Marcel. 'L'Etat au miroir de la raison d'Etat: la France et la chrétienté', in Yves Charles Zarka (ed.), *Raison et déraison d'Etat. Théoriciens et théories de la raison d'Etat aux XIVe et XVIIe siècles* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994), 193-244.

Gelderblom, Oscar. 'Introduction', in Oscar Gelderblom (ed.), *The political economy of the Dutch Republic* (Surrey/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 1-18.

Gelderen, Martin van. *The Dutch Revolt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Gelderen, Martin van. 'Aristotelians, Monarchomachs and Republicans: Sovereignty and *respublica mixta* in Dutch and German political Thought, 1580–1650,' in Van Gelderen and Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume 1: Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 195-218.

Gelderen, Martin van. 'Universal Monarchy, the Rights of War and Peace and the Balance of Power. Europe's Quest for Civil Order' in Hans-Åke Persson and Bo Strä (eds.), *Reflections on Europe. Defining a Political Order in Time and Space* (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2007), 49-71.

Gelderen, Martin van. 'Arminian trouble: Calvinists debates on freedom', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Freedom and the Construction of Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 21-37.

Goldie, Mark. 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England', in Tim Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 153-194.

Greaves, Richard. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

Greengrass, Mark. *Governing Passions: Peace and Reform in The French Kingdom, 1576-1585* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Groenveld, Simon. 'William III as Stadholder: Prince or Minister?', in Esther Meijers and David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: the impact of the King-Stadholder in international context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 17-37.

Gunn, John Alexander Wilson. "Interest will not lie", A seventeenth-Century Political Maxim', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29:4 (1968), 551-564.

Gunn, John Alexander Wilson. *Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969).

Haitsma Mulier, Eco. *The Myth of Venice and Dutch Republican Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1980).

Haitsma Mulier, Eco. *Het Nederlandse gezicht van Machiavelli. Twee en een halve eeuw interpretatie 1550-1800* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1989).

Haitsma Mulier, Eco, and Anton van der Lem, 'Petrus Valkenier', in Eco Haitsma Mulier and Anton van der Lem (eds.), *Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland* (The Hague: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1990), 414-415.

Haitsma Mulier, Eco. 'The language of seventeenth-century republicanism in the United Provinces: Dutch or European?,' in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 179-195.

Haitsma Mulier, Eco, and Wyger Velema (eds.), *Vrijheid: een geschiedenis van de vijftiende tot de twintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999).

Haitsma Mulier, Eco 'Die Politisch-historischen Ideen von Petrus Valkenier', in Albert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2004), 108-122.

Haks, Donald. *Vaderland en vrede, 1672-1713 : publiciteit over de Nederlandse Republiek in oorlog* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2013).

Haley, Kenneth H.D. *An English Diplomat in the Low Countries: Sir William Temple and John de Witt, 1665-1672* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Harms, Roeland. *De uitvinding van de publieke opinie: pamfletten als massamedia in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011).

Hart, Marjolein 't., Joost Jonker and Jan Luiten van Zanden, 'Introduction', in Marjolein 't Hart, Joost Jonker and Jan Luiten van Zanden (eds.), *A financial history of The Netherlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1-10.

Hart, Marjolein 't. 'The merits of a financial revolution: public finances 1550-1700', in Marjolein 't Hart, Joost Jonker and Jan Luiten van Zanden (eds.), *A financial history of The Netherlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11-36.

Hartman, Jan, and Weststeijn, 'An Empire of Trade: Commercial Reason of State in Seventeenth-Century Holland', in Sophus Reinert and Pernille Røge (eds.), *The Political Economy of Empire in the Early Modern World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 11-31.

Helmers, Helmer. *The Royalist Republic Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Henshall, Nicholas. *The Myth Of Absolutism: Change And Continuity In Early Modern European Monarchy* (London: Longmann, 1992).

Hirschman, Albert Otto. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before Its Triumph*, 20th ed. (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997).

Honingen-Huene, Christine von. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen der Schweiz und Holland im XVII. Jahrhundert* (Berlijn: Ducker, 1899).

Hont, Istvan. *Jealousy of Trade. International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

Höpfl, Harro. 'Reason of State', in Henrik Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy Philosophy between 500 and 1500* (Dordrecht/Heidelberg/London/New York: Springer, 2011), 1113-1115.

Höpfl, Harro. 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', *History of Political Thought* 23:2 (2002), 211-237.

Höpfl, Harro. 'Reason of State' (paper presented at the conference *Monarchy Transformed in Western Europe: its 'reason of state' and its opponents (1620s-1720s)*, Rotterdam, May 11-14, 2016).

Ibáñez, José Javier Ruiz, and Sabatini, Gaetano. 'Monarchy as Conquest: Violence, Social Opportunity, and Political Stability in the Establishment of the Hispanic Monarchy', *The Journal of Modern History* 81:3 (2009), 501-536.

Israel, Jonathan. *The Dutch Republic Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Israel, Jonathan. *Monarchy, Orangism, and Republicanism in the Later Dutch Golden Age*, Second Golden Age Lecture (Amsterdam: Amsterdams Centrum voor de Studie van de Gouden Eeuw, 2004).

Kahn, Victoria. 'The metaphorical contract in Milton's *Tenure of Kings and* Magistrates', in David Armitage, Armand Himy and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Milton and Republicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 82-105.

Keene, Edward. *International Political Thought, and introduction* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005).

Keohane, Nannerl Overholser. *Philosophy and the State in France. The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980).

Kernkamp, Johannes Herman. 'Pieter de la court, zijn aansprakelijkheid voor het Interest van Holland en de Politike Discoursen', in *Het boek* 22 (1933/34*),* 191-196.

Kiefner, Theo. 'Die Waldenser auf ihrem Weg aus dem Val Cluson durch die Schweiz nach Deutschland 1532-1820/30,' in *Endgültig nach Deutschland 1690-1820/30* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

Klashorst, Gerrit Onne. ' "Metten schijn van monarchie getempert" de verdediging van het stadhouderschap in de partijliteratuur' 1650–1686', in Hans W. Blom en I.W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd (1680–1685) aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Maarssen/Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 93–136.

Klerk, M.B., "The unheard Changes in Europe, and the strange Revolutions which happened in our United Provinces in our times": reason of state and rule of law in Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675)', in Robert von Friedeburg and Matthias Schmoeckel (ed.), *Recht,*

Konfession und Verfassung im 17. Jahrhundert. West- und mitteleuropäische Entwicklungen (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2015), 285-335.

Koenigsberger, Helmut G. 'Monarchies and Parliaments in Early Modern Europe Dominium Regale or Dominium Politicum et Regale', *Theory and Society* 5:2 (1978), 191-217.

Kossmann, Ernst H. *Politieke theorie in het zeventiende-eeuwse Nederland* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche uitgevers maatschappij, 1960).

Kossmann, Ernst H. 'The Dutch Republic', in F.I. Carsten (ed.), *The New Cambridge History Volume 5: The Ascendancy of France (1648-1688)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 275-300.

Kossmann, Ernst H. *'De Dissertationes Politicae* van Ulric Huber' in Theodoor Weevers, P. K. King, and P. F. Vincent (eds.) *European context: studies in the history and literature of the Netherlands presented to Theodoor Weevers* (Cambridge: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1971), 164-177.

Kossmann, Ernst H. 'Some late 17th-century writings on Raison d'État', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staaträson Stduein zur Gechichte eines politischen Begriffs* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975), 497-504.

Kossmann, Ernst H. 'Some late 17th-century Dutch writings on Raison d'Etat', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staatsräson: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begriffs* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975), 497-504.

Kossmann, Ernst H. *Politieke theorie en geschiedenis. Verspreide opstellen en voordrachten* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 1987).

Kossmann, Ernst H. *Political Thought in the Dutch Republic. Three Studies* (Amsterdam: KNaW, 2000).

Krop, Henri. "The General Freedom, which All Men Enjoy" in a Confessional State. The Paradoxical Language of Politics in the Dutch Republic (1700-1750)', in John Christian Laursen and Maria Jose Villaverde (eds.) *Paradoxes of Religious Toleration in Early Modern Political Thought* (Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2012), 67-90.

Krygier, Martin. 'The Rule of Law: Legality, Teleology, Sociology', in Gianluigi Palombella and Neil Walker (eds.), *Relocating the Rule of Law* (Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2009), 45-69.

Lange, Albert de, and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.) *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg/Ubstadt-Weiher/Basel: Regionalkultur, 2004) 61-107.

Lange, Albert de. 'Pieter Valkenier. Ein Überblick über sein Leben und Werk', in Albert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2004), 61-107

Lazzeri, Christian, 'Introduction' to Henri de Rohan, *De l'intérêt des princes et les Etats chrétienté* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1995), 1-156.

Lee, Daniel. *Popular Sovereignty in Early Modern Constitutional Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Levillain. Charles-Édouard. 'L'Angleterre de la Restauration au miroir de la "vraie liberté" (1660 – 1672). La rencontre entre républicanismes anglais et hollandais à travers les écrits de Pieter de la Court', *E-rea* 1.2 (2003), URL: http://erea.revues.org/205; DOI : 10.4000/erea.205.

Levillain, Charles-Édouard. 'William III's Military and Political Career in Neo-roman Context, 1672–1702,' *The Historical Journal* 48:2 (2005), 213–350.

Levillain, Charles-Édouard. 'Cromwell Revidivus? William II as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality', in Esther Meijers and David Onnekink, *Redefining William III: the impact of the King-Stadholder in international context* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 159-176.

Levillain, Charles-Édouard. 'The intellectual origins of the Anglo-Dutch Alliance, 1667-1677', *Séminaire de recherché sur les îles Britanniques, XVIIe & XVIIIe siècle*, URL http://britaix17-18.univ-provence.fr/texte-seance5.php.

Levillain, Charles-Édouard. *Le Procès de Louis XIV. Diplomatie et discours d'opposition à l'époque modern. Le cas François-Paul de Lisola (1667-1674)* (Paris, Tallandier, 2015).

Lynn, John A. *The Wars of Louis XIV 1667-1714* (Routhledge; New York 2013).

Malcolm, Noel. 'Hobbes and Spinoza', in Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 27–52.

Malcolm, Noel. *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Maissen, Thomas. 'Petrus Valkeniers republikanische Sendung. Die niederländische Prägung des neuzeitlichen schweizerischen Staatsverständnisses', *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 48 (1998), 149-176.

Thomas Maissen, '"Par un pur motief de religion et en qualité de Republicain." Der außenpolitischeRepublikanismus der Niederlande und seine Aufnahme in der Eidgenossenschaft (ca.1670-1710)', in: Luise Schorn-Schütte (ed.), *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts: Politische Theologie – Res Publica-Verständnis –konsens gestützte Herrschaft, Historische Zeitschrift. Beihefte,* 39 (München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 2004), 233-282.

McKenzie, Lionel A. 'Natural right and the emergence of the idea of interest in early modern political thought: F. Guicciardini and J. de Silhon', *History of European Ideas* 2:4 (1981) 277-298.

McIlwain, Charles Howard. *Constitutionalism: Ancient and Modern* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1947).

Meijer, Theodorus Josephus (ed.), *Album promotorum Academiae Franekerensis (1591-1811)* (Franeker: Wever, 1972).

Meinecke, Friedrich. *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'État and Its Place in Modern History*, translated by Douglass Scott, introduction by Werner Stark (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1997).

Meinecke, Friedrich. 'Petrus Valckeniers Lehre von dem Interesse der Staaten', in *Aus Politik und Geschichte. Gedächtnisschrift für Georg von Below* (Berlijn: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1928), 146-155.

Morrill, John. 'Thinking about the New British History', in David Armitage (ed.), *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Morrill, John. *"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown". Dynastic crises in Tudor and Stuart Britain 1504– 1746*, The Stenton Lecture for 2003 (Reading: University of Reading, 2005).

Nellen, Henk. 'Hugo Grotius on religion as a motive for waging war', in Robert von Friedeburg and Mathias Schmoeckel (eds.), *Recht, Konfession und Verfassung im 17. Jahrhundert. West- und mitteleuropäische Entwicklungen* Historische Forschungen 105 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2015), 261-268.

Nieuwstraten, Jaap. 'History and Politics in Seventeenth- Century Dutch Political Thought. The Case of Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn (1612–1653' PhD dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2012.

Nieuwstraten, Jaap. 'Empire, Economy and the Dawn of the Enlightenment: Some Explorations into Seventeenth-Century Dutch Intellectual History', in Evert Schoorl (ed.), *The Enlightenment: Political, Economic and Social Aspects. Special issue of United Academics Journal of Social Sciences* 3:15 (2013), 30-47.

Nijenhuis, Ida. "Shining Comet, Falling Meteor" Reflections on the Dutch republic as a Commercial Power during the Second Stadholderless Era', in J. A. F. de Jongste and A. J. Veenendaal (eds.), *Anthonie Heinsius and the Dutch Republic, 1688-1720: Politics, War, and Finance* (The Hague: Institute of Netherlands History, 2002), 115-129.

Panhuysen, Luc. *De Ware Vrijheid. De levens van Johan en Cornelis de Witt* (Amsterdam: Atlas, 2005).

Parrott, David. *Richelieu's Army: War, Government and Society in France, 1624-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Pincus, Steve. 'From holy cause to economic interest: the transformation of reason of state thinking in seventeenth-century England', in Houston and Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed. England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 272-298.

Pincus, Steve. 'The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture', *The European Legacy* 5:4 (2000), 531-545.

Pollmann, Judith. 'Eine natürliche Feindschaft: Ursprung und Funktion der schwarzen Legende über Spanien in den Niederlanden, 1560-1581' in Franz Bosbach (ed.) , *Feindbilder: die Darstellung des Gegners in der politischen Publizistik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Köln [etc.]: Böhlau, 1992), 73-93.

Poole, Thomas. *Reason of State: Law, Prerogative and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Prak, Maarten. *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age*, translated by Diane Webb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Pribram, Alfred F. *Franz Paul Freiherr von Lisola (1613-1674) und die Politik seiner Zeit* (Leipzig: Verlag Von Veit & Comp., 1894).

Price, John L. *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Politics of Particularism* (Clarendon: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Raab, Felix. *The English Face of Machiavelli: a Changing Interpretation, 1500-1700* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964).

Rahe, Paul A. *Against Throne and Altar Machiavelli and Political Theory Under the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Rahe, Paul A. *Montesquieu and the Logic of Liberty: War, Religion, Commerce, Climate, Terrain, Technology, Uneasiness of Mind, the Spirit of Political Vigilance, and the Foundations of the Modern Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

Reinders, Michel. *Printed Pandemonium: Popular Print and Politics in the Netherlands 1650-72* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

Reinders, Michel. 'Burghers, Orangists and "Good Government": Popular Political opposition during the 'Year of Disaster' in 1672 in Dutch pamphlets', *The Seventeenth Century* 23:2 (2008), 315-346.

Rietbergen, Peter. 'Persuasie en Meditatie: de Republiek en de Vrede van Nijmegen (1678)', in Simon Groenveld, Maurits Ebben and Raymond Fagel (eds.), *Tussen Munster en Aken. De Nederlandse Republiek als grote mogendheid (1648-1748)* (Maastricht: Shaker Publishing, 2005), 21-30.

Roberston, John. 'Empire and union: two concepts of the early modern European political order', in John Robertson (ed.), *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3-36.

Roorda, Daniel J. *Partij en factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties.* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1978).

Rommelse, Gijs. *The Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667) Raison d'état, mercantilism and maritime strife* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006).

Rowen, Herbert H. *John de Witt. Statesman of the "True Freedom"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Rowen, Herbert H. *The king's State: proprietary dynasticism in early modern France* (New Brunswick, N.Y.: Rutgers University Press, 1980).

Rowen, Herbert H. *The Ambassador Prepares for War: The Dutch Embassy of Arnauld de Pomponne 1669–1671* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957).

Rowen, Herbert H. *The Princes of Orange. The Stadholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Rubiés, Joan-Pau. 'Oriental Despotism and European Orientalism: Botero to Montesquieu', *Journal of Early Modern History* 9 1/2 (2005), 109-180.

Salmon, John Hearsey McMillan. 'Rohan and the interest of state', in Roman Schnur (ed.), *Staatsräson. Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Begrifss*. (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975), 121-140.

Salmon, John Hearsey McMillan. 'The Legacy of Jean Bodin: Absolutism, Populism or Constitutionalism?,' *History of Political Thought* 17 (1996), 500–522.

Schaap, Jesper. 'French Reason of State between the Fall of La Rochelle and the Frondes. The Political Rhetoric of *intérêt* and *raison d'état* in the writings of Henri Duc de Rohan (1579-1638) and Gabriel Naudé (1600-1653) [working title]', PhD dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, expected in 2017.

Schmidt, Helmut Dan. 'The Establishment of "Europe" as a Political Expression', *The Historical Journal* 9:2 (1966), 172-178.

Schöffer, Ivo. 'The Batavian Myth during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,' in J. S. Bromley & E. H. Kossmann (eds.), *Britain and the Netherlands. Volume 5: Some Political Mythologies* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974), 78-101.

Scott, Jonathan. *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic 1623-1677* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Scott, Jonathan. 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands,' in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Schilling, Heinz. 'Confessional Europe', in Thomas A. Brady, Heiko Augustinus Oberman, James D. Tracy (eds), *Handbook of European history, 1400-1600: late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation, Volume 2* (Brill: Leiden, 1995), 641-682.

Schilling, Heinz. *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen. Internationale Beziehungen 1559-1660,* vol. 2 (Schöningh: Paderborn, 2007).

Schutte, Otto. *Repertorium der Nederlandse vertegenwoordigers residerende in het buitenland 1584-1810* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983).

Seidler, Michael J. 'Introduction' to Samuel Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, translated by Jocodus Crull (1695), edited by Michael Seidler (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2013), ix-xl.

Seidler, Michael J. 'Monstrous' Pufendorf: Sovereignty and system in the Dissertations', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), 159-176.

Senn, Matthias. *Petrus Valkenier: Erster niederländischer Gesandter in Zürich und Mahner der Eidgenossenschaft* (Zürich: Niederländisches General-Konsulat, 1990), 1-15.

Sheenan, Michael J. *The Balance of Power. History and Theory* (London/New York: Routledge, 2004).

Skinner, Quentin. *Liberty before liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Volume 1: The Renaissance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

Soll, Jacob. 'A Lipsian Legacy? Neo-Absolutism, Natural Law and the Decline of Reason of State in France 1660-1760', in Erik de Bom, Marijke Janssens, Toon Van Houdt, and Jan Papy (eds.), *(Un)masking the Realities of Power: Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe* (Brill, Leiden 2011), 307-323.

Soll, Jacob. 'Empirical History and the Transformation of Political Criticism in France from Bodin to Bayle' in *Journal of History of Ideas* 64:2 (2003), 297-316.

Soll, Jacob. *Publishing* The Prince*. History, Reading, & the Birth of Political Criticism* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005).

Sommerville, Johann P. 'Early Modern Absolutism in Practice and Theory', in Cesare Cuttica and Glenn Burgess (eds.), *Monarchism and Absolutism in Early Modern Europe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), 117-130.

Sonenscher, Michael. *Before the Deluge. Public Debt, Inequality and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

Sonnino, Paul. '*Plus royaliste que le pape*: Louis XIV's Religious Policy and his *Guerre de* Hollande, in David Onnekink (ed.), *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1723* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 17-24.

Spaans, Joke. "Hieroglyfen. De verbeelding van de godsdienst," in Henk van Nierop, ed., *Romeyn de Hooghe. De verbeelding van de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Waanders, 2008), 48-57.

Spaans, Joke. *Graphic Satire and Religious Change: The Dutch Republic 1676-1707* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

Stelling-Michaud, Sven. 'Le Duc de Rohan et ses livres', *Revue du Vieux Genève* 14 (1984), 18-27.

Stern, Jill. *Orangism in the Dutch Republic in Word and Image, 1650–1675* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2010).

Stern, Jill. 'The rhetoric of popular Orangism, 1650-72', *Historical Research* 77 (2004), 202-224.

Stevenson, Angus (ed.). *Oxford Dictionary of English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010; third edition).

Stolleis, Michael. 'Arcana imperii und Ratio status. Bemerkungen zur politischen Theorie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts', *Veröffentlichung der Joachim Jungius-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Hamburg* 39 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 5-12.

Stolleis, Michael. 'The Legitimation of Law through God, Tradition, Will, Nature and Constitution', in Lorraine Daston and Micheal Stolleis (eds.), *Natural Law and Laws of Nature in Early Modern Europe Jurisprudence, Theology, Moral and Natural Philosophy* (Ashgate: Farnham, 2008), 45-55.

Stucki, Heinzpeter. 'Pieter Valkenier in Zürich,' in Labert de Lange and Gerhard Schwinge (eds.), *Pieter Valkenier und das Schicksal der Waldenser um 1700* (Heidelberg/Ubstadt-Weiher/Basel: Regionalkultur, 2004), 123-140.

Thuau, Étienne. *Raison d'état et pensée politique à l'époque de Richelieu* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1966).

Tilly, Charles. *Coercion, Capital and the Rise of the state* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990)

Tijn, Theo van. 'Pieter de la Court: een buitenbeen', in Hans W. Blom and Ivo W. Wildenberg, *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd (1618-1685) aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist* (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), xi-xiv.

Tuck, Richard. *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Turchetti, Mario. 'Despotism' and "Tyranny" Unmasking a Tenacious Confusion', *European Journal of Political Theory* 7:2 (2008), 159-182.

Troost, Wout. *Stadhouder-koning Willem III: een politieke biografie* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2001).

Troost, Wout. 'To restore and preserve the liberty of Europe': William III's ideas on foreign policy', in David Onnekink and Gijs Rommelse (eds.), *Ideology and foreign policy in early modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 283-303.

Veegens, Daniel. "Johan de Witt als publicist," in *De Gids* 31 (1867), 1-31.

Veen, Theo J. *Recht en nut. Studiën naar aanleiding van Ulrik Huber (1636-1694)* (Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1976).

Velema, Wyger. '"That a Republic is Better than a Monarchy": Anti-Monarchism in Early Modern Dutch Political Thought', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I, Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 9–25.

Viroli, Maurizio. *From Politics to Reason of State. The Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics 1250–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Vroomen, Ingmar. 'Taal van de Republiek- het gebruik van vaderlandretoriek in Nederlandse pamfletten, 1618-1672', PhD dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2012.

Wall, Ernestine van der. 'The religious context of the Early Dutch Enlightenment: Moral religion and society', in Wiep van Bunge (ed.)*, The Early Dutch Enlightenment 1650-1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 39-57.

Walter, Ryan. 'Slingby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests', *History of European Ideas* 41:4 (2015), 489-506.

Waszink, Jan. 'Introduction' to Justus Lipsius, *Politica: Six Books of Politics Or Political Instruction,* edited, translated, and introduction by Jan Waszink (Assen: Royal Van Gorchum, 2004), 3-221.

Waszink, Jan. 'Lipsius and Grotius: Tacitism', *History of* Ideas 39:2 (2013), 151-168.
Weststeijn, Arthur. *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age. The Political Thought of Johan & Pieter de la Court* (Brill: Leiden, 2012).

Wildenberg, Ido W. *Johan (1622 - 1660) & Pieter (1618 - 1685) de la Court: bibliografie en receptiegeschiedenis* (Amsterdam: APA - Holland University Press, 1986).

Wolf, Kordula. 'Il X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche, Roma, settembre 1955. Un bilancio Storiografico, Convegno Internazionale', URL: http://dhi-roma.it/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf-dateien/Tagungsberichte/2005/tagung_1955.pdf.

Wootton, David. 'Machiavelli and the Business of Politics', in Timothy Fuller (ed.), *Machiavelli's Legacy: 'The Prince' After Five Hundred Years* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 87-104.

Worden, Blair. 'Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism', in: David Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 45-81.

Wrede, Martin. *Das Reich und seine Feinde. Politische Feindbilder in der reichspatriotischen Publizistik zwischen Westfälischem Frieden und Siebenjährigem Krieg* (Mainz: Philipp von Sabern, 2004).

Zagorin, Perez. 'Republicanisms', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 11:4 (2003), 701-712.

Zanden, Jan Luiten van, and Maarten Prak. 'Towards and economic interpretation of citizenship: The Dutch Republic between medieval communes and modern nation-states,' *European Review of Economic History* 10 (2006), 111-145.

Summary

This thesis deals with the use of the vocabulary of reason of state within the writings of Henri Duc de Rohan (1579-1638), Pieter de la Court (1616-1685), François-Paul de Lisola (1613-1674), and Petrus Valkenier (1641-1712). The rise of this highly popular vocabulary has long been perceived as mirroring an early modern programme of state building, but since assumptions underlying the theory of state building have been undermined, reason of state must be reconsidered. The growing scale of early modern European conflict did not generate institutional bureaucratic states, but transformed polities into war-driven and debt-ridden regimes dependent on new collaborations with various powerbrokers to organise a (successful) participation in the European military competition. Moreover, the intensification of warfare and confessional strife amounted to a perceived crisis of the rule of law, as laws found in scripture, Roman Law, local precedent, deeply rooted in Aristotelian and confessional Christian notions. This thesis reassesses the idiom of reason of state within the context of this transformation (and consequent debates about mounting state debt, taxation and the reconfiguration of power), and against the intellectual background of authors struggling to restore political and social order. It asks what the function of reason of state is within each respective source, analysed within its specific context(s) of crisis and contemporary usages of the idiom of reason of state. The purpose of this research is to explore changes in understandings of reason of state; not as abstract and coherent theories about modernization and a secularized conception of politics, but as strongly polemical responses to very practical and immediate political problems, challenges and crises, brought forth by the intensification of early modern warfare.

Reason of state became *en vogue* in Europe from the 1590s onwards. In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries Italian authors began discussing the ways to maintain the 'state' of the 'new princes', e.g. the Medici, without relying on more traditional idioms of legitimation provided by appeals to civic virtue. Reason of state became part of a 'vocabulary of fashionable political cynicism' about the 'true' motives of rulers spurred by the experiences of the (religious) wars. This vocabulary included popular aphorisms and maxims, such as *necessitas non habet legem*, and was closely associated with the terminology of 'politics', 'statecraft', 'Machiavellism', and 'interest (of state)'. 'Reason' and 'state' could mean many different things (e.g. reasoning/the intellectual capacity to reason/ a rationale, and (princely) status/ condition of something/ an office/a regime, respectively). It had a precarious identity and was a highly suggestive term of art; and, therefore, reason of state ought not to be seen as a theory or concept. Yet, exactly its opacity was the reason for its early modern popularity. Furthermore, reason of state was presented as relevant to the practice of politics (unlike the 'mirror for princes' literature). In its most narrow, Machiavellian understanding, reason of state discussed the room for the ruler to manoeuvre, in cases of necessity, beyond the bounds of normal legal, moral, and religious constraints.

This thesis focuses on the specific terminology of 'interest (of state)', which from the late sixteenth century onwards became a more or less synonymous or associative term for 'reason of state' emphasising the justifiable notion of profit or utility. Rohan popularised the term in his famous *De l'interest* (1638) that became the blueprint for writings on the 'true interests of states

of Europe'. He complemented critical analysis of the moral person of the ruler and his politics with close attention to *the nature of the societies* he ruled (e.g. the present geographical position, political structures, religious make-up, military prowess, and relations with other rulers), so adding a further dimension to interest as reason of state. This complementation was founded on the growing importance of historical analysis, by means of which the international element could be more clearly distinguished from a domestic one. What is more, Rohan diminished the guiding importance of the ethics of office by primarily focusing on the ruled societies. Through the adaptive reference to and reliance upon Rohan' work, this thesis argues that Rohan provided a vocabulary organised into a way of seeing the political world that was itself stimulated and constrained by a perceived crisis, both national and 'international', secular as well as religious. Through the subsequent use of Rohan and the employment of his vocabulary of interest this thesis shows the ingenuity of argument under direct pressures. The result was both to establish Rohan as an authority, providing a seminal and persuasively inescapable text that shaped and constrained argument; and as resource for adaptation. In all the cases argued and cohered by reference to Rohan, the stimulus to argument was a sense of immediate and dire threat, best summarised as a *predatory monarchy*, sometimes deemed despotic, sometimes tyrannical, usually arbitrary in its actions or anticipated conduct, sometimes all three, but always endangering a fragile peace and a sense of acceptable political and social order. Such a postulated order was often taken as involving a rule of law, sometimes a moral regime shielded from corruption, sometimes a putative balance of power between competing interests.

Historians have commended Rohan for a seemingly objective and rational interest analysis on a European scale in *De l'interest* (1638), but they have overlooked the satiric critique involved in outlining Spain's 'true' interest; and the strategic displacement of confessional difference, something that should not be taken for religious indifference. His work should be assessed as belonging to a 'genre of critical current-affairs commentary' emerging during the Thirty Years' War, in which a satiric employment of reason of state (satiric in terms of implicit criticism) was combined with reports on current affairs. Studied against the backdrop of pressing factional debates in France over the pursuit of warfare intertwined with debates about much needed financial reform and the issue of French Protestantism, *and* Rohan's dire need for a prestigious office as an exiled ex-Huguenot leader, his use of reason of state shows the propagandistic function of this vocabulary, first and foremost. Written on the eve of France's direct intervention in the Thirty Years' War in 1635, the purpose was to galvanize the confessionally divided French into mobilisation against Catholic Spain. He defined the 'true interest of France' as necessarily anti-Spanish (and subsequently pro-Protestant). The whole case was given urgency by the way in which Spain's geographic position, wealth and power was portrayed as being directed towards the total domination of Christendom. The Spanish interest was shaped by five maxims or methods of government to obtain a 'new monarchy', of which a zeal for Catholicism was the most notable one. The image was very much a satiric *reducio* having most of the features of the Black Legend without its divisive sectarianism. Spain was a predatory monarchy based on a rule of conquest, ruthless, dissembling and only feigning religion. The seemingly objective and supraconfessional interest analysis enabled Rohan, firstly, to implicitly accuse Spain of pursuing unrestricted and universal tyrannical control, while correspondingly sidestepping religious polemics; and, secondly, to envisage a patriotic French unity in which the former Huguenot rebel could re-claim an office.

To diminish the threat of an Orange restoration in the early-1660s, the Dutch merchant, Pieter de la Court, vigorously attacked the Orange dynasty by identifying the interest of the plunder prince in his *Interest van Holland* (1662). The idiom of interest constructs an

uncompromising anti-Orangist position in a threefold way. By contributing to it an interest, De la Court made the province of Holland into the mighty opponent of the House of Orange. The historical, economic, and political features of Holland suggested that the province had no need for the House of Orange. In fact, he claimed that the Orange dynasty was going to destroy Holland's splendour. Secondly, an alliance with Stuart-England was of no great value at all; England's interest showed, especially through its commercial activities, that it would always seek warfare with Holland. Furthermore, the dynastic connections of Stuart with the House of Orange would bring Holland to ruin. Finally, it was argued that the Princes of Orange had abused their offices of stadholder and captain general. They had promoted internal strife in the Republic, subjected the inhabitants of Holland, and solely pursued their own dynastic glory, passions for warfare and a luxurious lifestyle. His argument on the need to harmonise the interests between rulers and ruled was at one with English civil war arguments on interest, which were grounded on Rohan's idea that the prince may rule the people, but that interest ruled the prince. *Interest van Holland* is better understood as a distinct variation on the themes enunciated by Rohan, than as a quintessential example of Dutch 'republicanism' or 'anti-monarchism'. Although De la Court preferred a republican constitution for the Dutch Republic, kingship in itself was legitimate and in other polities monarchy was simply acceptable. He mainly suggested an ideal order for Holland where the privileges and properties of citizens were protected against raids of the plunder prince and the power-hungry members of his household (priests, soldiers, favourites) in order to promote effectively the foundation of the true interest of Holland: commerce. Compared to Rohan's image of the rapacious tyranny of Spain, De la Court's allegation of predatory monarchy entailed the more systematic aspect of a rule wanting war for reasons of stabilization of the ruler's authority within his lands.

In the context of the War of Devolution (1667-1668) in which France invaded the Spanish Netherlands, François-Paul de Lisola, deliberately reversed Rohan's interest analysis of Spain and France in his international bestseller *Bouclier* (1667). The imperial diplomat Lisola required a supraconfessional argument for persuading the Habsburg emperor and German princes to aid Habsburg-Spain in the battle against Louis XIV. Historians have stated the significance of *Bouclier* in rejuvenating the notion of universal monarchy power by turning it against France and stressing the necessary maintenance of the European balance of power resulting in a secular and modern notion of Europe; but they have overlooked Lisola's reversion of *De l'interest*. Lisola attacked the French monarchy by skilfully refuting Louis XIV's legal claims on the Habsburgs possessions, as well as by pointing to the source of its evil: reason of state, especially that proclaimed by Rohan. Lisola literary copied arguments of Rohan and turned these with a great flair for irony against France, presenting Rohan's work as the blueprint for Louis XIV's universal monarchy. The result is effectively, perhaps self-consciously, a satiric parody of *De l'interest*. Whereas Rohan argued that Spain's zeal for Catholicism was merely a pretext, Lisola countered that legality was merely a pretext for France's expansionary policies; Rohan's *De l'interest* became part of his evidence. In a more systematic manner he assessed the French system of rule, not only based on a rule of conquest, but, echoing De la Court's argument, on the slavish nature of its people and its inherent household rule, robbing the privileges and properties of its subjects at home and abroad, to finance warfare for universal dominion. Against the French predatory monarchy, the European legal order should be guarded by a mutual pursuit of reason of state and justice. Recent scholarship has shown how *Bouclier*, the work of a Catholic Habsburg apologist, formed the groundwork for later English and Dutch anti-French writings, often perceived as arising from within purely Protestant and commercial contexts of argument. Perhaps the fuller irony lies in the fact that Lisola's work was an inversion of the

Huguenot Rohan's interest analysis together with its demonised image of the Spanish predatory monarch.

Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675) is a response to the 'Year of Disaster' in 1672, inflicted upon the Dutch Republic by the invasion of Louis XIV that resulted in massive civil riots and the re-installation of Orange. His work has been (dis)credited as a mere anti-French and pro-Orangist pamphlet, and his thought has been qualified as 'Orange republicanism' and an unoriginal employment of reason of state. These qualifications should, however, be re-evaluated. Valkenier's use and transformation of the arguments of Rohan, De la Court and Lisola show the highly polemical function of interest analysis – the exact method and type of argument was used and re-used for different, even opposing objectives. Valkenier employed the same Rohanesque *modus operandi* against what he deemed the oligarchic decadence of the De Witt regime and the ruthless predatory monarchy of France. He deliberately mirrored De la Court's interest analysis to turn De la Court's arguments around in favour of a united Republic under a strong military Orange-princely rule. Furthermore, Valkenier copied whole passages of Rohan's *De l'interest* to state that France had taken over from Spain as supreme threat to Europe. Accordingly, he inverted Rohan's maxims on Spain, and reiterated Lisola's image of the French bellicose household rule, but without Lisola's ironic touch; perhaps his sense of revulsion was too great to allow any illusion of dispassionate play. What is more, behind the politico-historical account of 1672 appears the feeling of the crisis of the rule of law and a search for how order should be restored. Consequently, *'t Verwerd Europa* exhibits several potentially tensile themes. Valkenier defended the stronghold of the Dutch Reformed Church in society, and attacked the alleged atheism and libertinism of the 'politiques', as he saw De Witt; yet he also criticised theologians, who purportedly divided society with their quarrels and incited princes and peoples into warfare. Valkenier rejected De la Court's full-frontal attack on war-mongering princes, yet he condemned plunder despots in a similar manner. He favoured an Orange princely rule with expanded military and financial resources, yet within the constraints of the established republican constitution. It was operating within such an order, protecting persons, property and privileges, which stopped a prince from becoming a predatory monarch.

For all the writers discussed in this thesis, the very real fears of a breakdown of social and political order, of there being no effective legal constraints, focussed on the threat of violent military activity, a fear of catastrophic and exorbitantly expensive warfare. In all cases what mattered was specifying and analysing the danger, the predator. What it threatened could often be relatively unspecific, even open to the reader to identify for himself. This focus on the evils of a predatory monarchy was central to Rohan's whole understanding of interest—interest was the means of casting light on its dangers. But having set the tone in demonising Habsburg-Spain with the concomitant imperative to France to stand opposed in its own true interest, Rohan's perspective was complimented by a wealth of evidence. All the authors (Rohan, De la Court, Lisola and Valkenier) exhibit a reliance on an image of the predatory monarch and although the target of hostility may vary, each image of the monarch is painted with Rohanesque maxims and concerted interest in dominance and destruction, tyranny and despotism. Regardless of specifics, the posited interest of the demonised predatory monarch provided a way of redescribing a whole society, so magnifying the dangers to the threatened. The similarities and the textual cross-references are sufficient to suggest that these writers may be considered part of a tradition of speculation, or a sub-genre of political thought. As the references in the chapters make clear, these were not lone voices and so the genre requires considerably more work.

Samenvatting

Deze thesis behandelt het gebruik van de vocabulaire van staatsraison in de werken van Henri Duc de Rohan (1579-1638), Pieter de la Court (1616-1685), François-Paul de Lisola (1613-1674), en Petrus Valkenier (1641-1712). De opkomst van dit zeer populaire vocabulaire wordt gezien als een literaire manifestatie van vroegmoderne processen van staatsvorming, maar aangezien de onderliggende aannames van de theorie van staatsvorming ondermijnd zijn, moet staatsraison worden herzien. De groeiende schaal van het vroegmoderne Europese conflict bracht namelijk geen geïnstitutionaliseerde en bureaucratische staten voort, maar transformeerde monarchieën en republieken in regimes voortgedreven door oorlog en schuld, en afhankelijk van nieuwe samenwerkingsverbanden met invloedrijke tussenpersonen om de deelname aan de Europese militaire competitie te organiseren. De intensivering van oorlogsvoering (en confessionele strijd) leidde tevens tot een crisis van de 'rule of law', gebaseerd op wetten gevonden in de Bijbel, Romeins Recht, lokale precedenten en diepgeworteld in Aristotelische en confessioneel Christelijke noties. Deze dissertatie re-interpreteert het idioom van staatsraison in de context van deze transformatie (en inherente debatten over stijgende overheidsschulden, belastingen, en de reorganisatie van macht), en tegen de intellectuele achtergrond van auteurs, die worstelden met het vraagstuk hoe de politieke en sociale orde te herstellen. Bij deze re-interpretatie staat de vraag centraal wat de functie is van staatsraison in elke afzonderlijke bron. Deze vraag wordt geanalyseerd in de specifieke context(en) van crisis en het toenmalig gebruik van de vocabulaire van staatsraison. Het doel van dit onderzoek is het exploreren van veranderingen in denkbeelden over staatsraison. Deze worden niet beschouwd als abstracte en coherente moderniseringstheorieën of een seculariserende notie van politiek, maar als sterk polemische antwoorden op zeer praktische en acute politieke problemen, op uitdagingen en crises, voorgebracht door de toename van oorlogsvoering in vroegmodern Europa.

Staatsraison raakte in de mode in Europa vanaf de jaren 1590. In de late vijftiende en vroege zestiende eeuw begonnen Italiaanse auteurs te discussiëren over de manieren van het behouden van de 'staat' van 'nieuwe vorsten', zoals de Medici, zonder hierbij terug te vallen op meer traditionele legitimeringsidiomen die de burgerlijke deugd centraal stellen. Staatsraison werd onderdeel van een 'vocabulaire van modieus politiek cynisme' over de 'ware' motieven van vorsten, voortgekomen uit de ervaringen van de vele (religieuze) oorlogen in Europa. Dit vocabulaire behelsde populaire aforismen en maximes, zoals *necessitas non habet legem*, en was nauw verbonden met de terminologie van 'politiek', 'staatskunde', Machiavellisme', en 'interest (van staat)'. 'Raison' en 'staat' droegen vele betekenissen (e.g. beredeneren/de intellectuele capaciteit on te redeneren/een grondgedachte en status/ conditie van iets/een ambt/een regime, respectievelijk). Staatsraison had een kritieke identiteit en was vooral een zeer suggestieve term. Daarom moet het niet worden beschouwd als een theorie of een vastomlijnd concept. De ambiguïteit van de term was de voornaamste reden voor de vroegmoderne populariteit van staatsraison. Staatsraison werd daarnaast gepresenteerd al relevant voor de politieke praktijk (in plaats van 'vorstenspiegel'-literatuur). In zijn meest nauwe, Machiavellistische betekenis behandelde staatsraison de ruimte voor de heerser om te manoeuvreren, in tijden van nood, over juridische, morele en religieuze grenzen.

In deze thesis ligt de nadruk op de specifieke terminologie van 'interest (van staat)', dat vanaf de late zestiende eeuw een ongeveer synonieme of associatieve term werd voor

'staatsraison' en daarmee de notie van winst of utiliteit voor de heerser benadrukte. Rohan populariseerde de term in zijn beroemde *De l'interest* (1638), dat de blauwdruk werd voor werken over de 'ware interesten van staten van Europa'. Hij vulde kritische analyse van de morele persoon van de vorst en zijn politiek aan, met nauwkeurige aandacht voor de aard van de maatschappijen waarover hij heerste (e.g. de huidige geografische positie, politiek structuren, religieuze opbouw, militaire kracht, en relaties met andere heersers). Op deze manier voegde Rohan een verdere dimensie toe aan interest als staatsraison. Deze nieuwe focus kwam voort uit een groeiend belang van historische analyse, waarmee het internationale domein makkelijker gescheiden kon worden van een intern domein. Daarnaast verminderde Rohan het leidende belang van de ethiek omtrent ambten door zich vooral te richten op de bestuurde gebieden. Deze thesis beargumenteert aan de hand van aangepaste verwijzingen naar en het voortbouwen op Rohans werk, dat hij een vocabulaire verstrekte, die georganiseerd was op een manier om de politieke wereld te kunnen begrijpen. Deze politieke wereld werd gestimuleerd en begrensd door een beleefde crisis, zowel nationaal als internationaal, seculier als religieus. Door het opeenvolgende gebruik van *De l'interest* en het gebruik van Rohans vocabulaire van interest, laat deze thesis de vindingrijkheid zien van een argument, die onder extreme spanningen staat. Het resultaat was het vestigen van Rohans *De l'interest* als een autoriteit: een rudimentaire en onvermijdelijke tekst, die argumentatie vormde en beperkte, en als een bron diende voor verdere aanpassingen. In alle onderzochte gevallen bestond de motivatie van schrijven uit een directe en onheilspellende dreiging, dat het beste kan worden samengevat met de term, *predatory monarchy*. Soms werd het gezien als despotisch, soms tiranniek, meestal arbitrair in zijn acties of verwachte gedrag, soms alle drie; maar altijd werd het begrepen als het in gevaar brengen van een fragiele vrede en een notie van orde. Deze orde omvatte een idee van de 'rule of law', i.e. een moreel regime beschermd tegen corruptie of een zogenaamd machtsevenwicht tussen strijdende interesten.

Historici hebben Rohan geprezen om zijn ogenschijnlijk objectieve en rationele interest-analyse van Europa. Wat zij echter over het hoofd hebben gezien is de satirische kritiek in Rohans beschrijving van het Spaanse interest en zijn strategisch ontwijken van confessionele verschillen. Dit laatste moet zeker niet worden beschouwd als een teken van religieuze onverschilligheid. *De l'interest* moet worden beoordeeld als behorende bij het 'genre of critical current-affairs commentary', dat onstond gedurende de Dertigjarige Oorlog en waarin een satirisch gebruik van staatsraison (satirisch in de vroegmoderne betekenis van impliciete kritiek) werd gecombineerd met actualiteitsverslagen. Zijn gebruik van staatsraison demonstreert allereerst de propagandistische functie van dit vocabulaire, vooral gezien de contexten waarin het geschreven is. Naast het feit dat Rohan dringend een prestigieus ambt nodig had na de recentelijk gefaalde Hugenotenopstanden onder zijn leiding, intervenieerde hij in de hevige debatten in toenmalig Frankrijk over het nastreven van oorlogvoering, de nodige financiële hervormingen en de kwestie van het Frans protestantisme. Hij schreef *De l'interest* op de vooravond van de Franse directe interventie in de Dertigjarige Oorlog in 1634 met als doel het confessioneel verdeelde Frankrijk op te zwepen tot een mobilisering tegen het katholieke Spanje. Hij definieerde het 'ware interest van Frankrijk' als noodzakelijk anti-Spaans (en dus ook pro-protestants). De gehele kwestie verkreeg urgentie door de wijze waarop Spanjes geografische positie, rijkdom, en macht werden afgebeeld. Spanje zou streven naar de totale overheersing van het Christendom. Het Spaanse interest werd gevormd door vijf 'maximes' (overheidsmethoden) van het verkrijgen van een 'nieuwe monarchie', waarvan een katholieke geloofsijver de meeste belangrijke was. Het beeld was een satirische *reducio*, die de meeste van de kenmerken van de Zwarte Legende bevatte zonder het bijbehorende, verdelende sektarisme.

De Spaanse monarchie was een predatory monarchy, gebaseerd op een heerschappij door verovering, meedogenloos en misleidend, en slechts vroomheid veinzend. De zogenaamde objectieve en supraconfessionele interest-analyse maakte het mogelijk voor Rohan om, ten eerste, Spanje te beschuldigen van het nastreven van ongelimiteerde, tirannieke wereldheerschappij, en tegelijkertijd religieuze polemieken te vermijden; en, ten tweede, om een patriottische Franse eenheid te creëren waarin de voormalige Hugenoot-rebel een ambt kon her-opeisen.

Om de dreiging van een Oranje-restauratie te verkleinen in de vroege jaren 1660, viel de Hollandse koopman, Pieter de la Court, de Oranje dynastie aan in zijn beruchte *Interest van Holland* (1662). Dit deed hij door middel van het identificeren van het interest van de plunderprins. Het idioom van interest werd drievoudig ingezet om een sterk anti-Orangistisch argument te creëren. Door het toeschrijven van een interest aan de provincie van Holland, vervormde De la Court 'Holland' tot de machtige tegenstander van het Oranjehuis. De historische, economische, en politieke kenmerken van Holland toonden dat de provincie de prins van Oranje niet nodig had. Sterker nog, Oranje zou Hollands weelde ruïneren. Ten tweede, het interest van Engeland wees uit dat een alliantie met Stuart-Engeland niet wenselijk was, want ter bescherming van zijn handel zou Engeland altijd oorlog met Holland nastreven. Daarnaast zouden de dynastieke relaties van Stuart met Oranje Holland in groot gevaar brengen. Het derde gebruik van interest kwam naar voren in De la Courts verklaring hoe in het recente verleden de Oranje-prinsen hun ambten van stadhouder en kapitein-generaal hadden misbruikt om interne conflicten in de Republiek te stimuleren, de inwoners van Holland te onderwerpen, en hun persoonlijke dynastieke glorie, en passies voor oorlogvoering en een luxe levensstijl na te streven. De la Courts argument over de noodzaak van het harmoniseren van de interesten tussen overheid en onderdanen kwam geheel overeen met interest-argumenten uit de Engelse Burgeroorlog, die op hun beurt gefundeerd waren op Rohans idee dat de prins inderdaad het volk bestuurde, maar dat het interest de prins bestuurde. *Interest van Holland* kan beter worden gezien als een variant op de thema's opgeschreven door Rohan, dan als een typisch voorbeeld van Nederlands 'republikanisme' of 'anti-monarchisme'. Ondanks dat De la Court het republikeinse staatsbestel prefereerde voor de Nederlandse Republiek, beschouwde hij koningschap als legitiem, en was monarchie in andere politieke eenheden simpelweg aanvaardbaar. Hij suggereerde een ideale orde voor Holland, waarin de privileges en eigendommen van burgers werden beschermd tegen strooptochten van de plunderprins en de machtswellustige leden van zijn huishouden (priesters, soldaten, en favorieten). Op deze manier kon de fundering van Hollands ware interest, namelijk handel, gestimuleerd worden. Vergeleken met Rohans beeldvorming over de roofzuchtige tirannie van Spanje, bevatten De la Courts beschuldigingen van predatory monarchy een meer systematisch aspect van een heerschappij, die gedreven werd door het stabiliseren van de vorst zijn autoriteit in zijn eigen gebieden.

In de context van de Devolutieoorlog (1667-1668) waarin Frankrijk de Spaanse Nederlanden binnenviel, keerde François-Paul de Lisola opzettelijk Rohans interest-analyse van Spanje tegen Frankrijk in zijn internationale bestseller *Bouclier* (1667). De keizerlijke diplomaat Lisola had een supraconfessioneel argument nodig om de Habsburgse keizer en de Duitse vorsten te overtuigen Habsburg-Spanje te helpen in de strijd tegen Lodewijk XIV. Historici hebben het belang onderstreept van dit werk voor de vernieuwing van de notie van universele monarchie en het aanscherpen van de idee van een Europees machtsevenwicht, dat zou hebben geresulteerd in een seculiere en moderne notie van Europa. Zij hebben echter Lisola's ombuiging van *De l'interest* niet opgemerkt. Lisola viel de Franse monarchie aan door zowel behendig Lodewijks juridische claims op de Habsburgse bezittingen te weerleggen, als door het wijzen

naar de bron van het Franse kwaad: staatsraison, voornamelijk datgene verkondigd door Rohan. Lisola kopieerde Rohans argumenten woord voor woord en draaide deze met kundige ironie om tegen Frankrijk. Hij presenteerde daarbij Rohans werk als de blauwdruk voor Lodewijks universele monarchie. Het resultaat is effectief, wellicht bewust, een satirische parodie op de *De l'interest*. Rohan beargumenteerde dat Spanjes geloofsijver voor het katholicisme slechts een dekmantel was voor het Spaanse, tirannieke streven naar de wereldheerschappij. Lisola's repliek was dat het Franse oogmerk van legaliteit slechts een pretext was voor de Franse roofzucht. Rohans *De l'interest* werd onderdeel van zijn bewijsvoering. Op een meer systematische wijze analyseerde Lisola het Franse overheidssysteem, die hij niet enkel verklaarde als een heerschappij door verovering, zoals Rohan had gedaan, maar als een heerschappij van een meester over zijn huishouden, die voortkwam uit de slaafse natuur van het Franse volk (een weerspiegeling van De la Courts argument). Het Franse overheidssysteem was gebaseerd op het roven van de privileges en eigendommen van onderdanen, zowel in Frankrijk als daarbuiten, om zodoende verdere oorlogvoering te financieren en een universele slavenheerschappij te vestigen. De Europese rechtsorde moest beschermd worden tegen de Franse predatory monarchy. Recent onderzoek stelt dat *Bouclier,* het werk van een katholieke, Habsburgse apologist, de fundering vormde voor latere Engelse en Nederlandse anti-Franse geschriften, die vaak worden beschouwd als voortkomend uit pure protestantse en commerciële contexten. Misschien het meest ironische hieraan is het feit dat Lisola's werk een inversie was van de Hugenoot Rohans interest-analyse, met zijn gedemoniseerde voorstelling van de Spaanse predatory monarch.

Petrus Valkeniers *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675) is een antwoord op het Rampjaar van 1672, waarin de Nederlandse Republiek werd aangevallen door Lodewijk XIV, wat resulteerde in gewelddadige, burgerlijke oproeren en het herstel van het Oranje-stadhouderschap. Zijn werk is beoordeeld als een zwaar gekleurd anti-Frans pamflet, en zijn politiek denken als 'Orange republicanism' en een onoriginele uiting van staatsraison. Deze visies moeten worden herzien. Valkeniers gebruik en transformatie van Rohans, De la Courts, en Lisola's teksten tonen de zeer polemische functie van interest-analyse – de exacte methode en het type argument werd gebruikt en hergebruikt voor verschillende, zelfs tegenovergestelde doeleinden. Valkenier gebruikte dezelfde Rohanesque *modus operandi* tegen, wat hij beschouwde als, de oligarchische decadentie van het De Witt-regime en de meedogenloze predatory monarchy van Frankrijk. Hij weerspiegelde bewust De la Courts interest-analyse om De la Courts argument om te draaien ter verdediging van een verenigde Republiek onder leiding van de prins van Oranje. Bovendien kopieerde Valkenier gehele passages uit Rohans *De l'interest* om zodoende te stellen dat Frankrijk het vroegere Spaanse streven naar universele monarchie had overgenomen. Hij draaide Rohans maximes van Spanje om, en herhaalde Lisola's beeld van de Franse slavenheerschappij, maar zonder Lisola's ironische stijl. Wellicht was zijn walging voor de Fransen te groot om elke illusie van speelse nonchalance te laten bestaan. Bovendien verschijnen achter het politiek-historische relaas van 1671 een gevoel van crisis van de rule of law en een zoektocht naar hoe orde hersteld moet worden. In *'t Verwerd Europa* worden dan ook verschillende potentieel contrasterende thema's behandeld. Valkenier verdedigde de dominante positie van de Nederlands Hervormde Kerk in Republiek, en bestreed het zogenaamde atheïsme en libertinisme van de 'politiques', zoals hij De Witt afschilderde. Tegelijkertijd echter, bekritiseerde hij theologen, die de maatschappij zouden verdelen met hun meningsverschillen en debatten, en vorsten en volkeren zouden aanzetten tot oorlog. Valkenier verwierp De la Courts botte aanval op oorlogszuchtige vorsten, maar ook hij ageerde tegen plunderprinsen en hun roofzuchtige huishoudens, die hij belichaamd zag in Lodewijk XIV en zijn monarchie. Voor

de Nederlandse Republiek prefereerde Valkenier een Oranje-heerschappij, die berust moest zijn op uitgebreide militaire en financiële middelen, maar wel beperkt moest worden door het constitutionele raamwerk van de Republiek. Zijn ideale orde begaf zich in een gematigd gebied tussen atheïsme en orthodoxie, en tussen oorlogvoering en roofzucht, en diende vooral de bescherming van de onderdanen, hun bezit en privileges. Deze orde zou de ontaarding van prins in een predatory monarch tegengaan.

Alle bestudeerde auteurs vreesden een ineenstorting van de sociale en politiek orde, het wegvallen van effectieve constitutionele beperkingen. Daarbij focusten zij zich op de dreiging van gewelddadig militaire handelingen en een angst voor rampzalige en exorbitant dure oorlogvoering. In alle gevallen draaide het om het specifiëren en analyseren van het gevaar, de *predator* (roofdier). Wat het exacte bedreigde, was vaak relatief onduidelijk en vaak zelfs aan de lezer om te bepalen. Deze focus op de gevaren van een predatory monarchy stond centraal in Rohans gebruik van interest – interest was het middel om zijn gevaren te belichten. Rohan zette de toon met het demoniseren van Habsburg-Spanje en het inherente advies voor Frankrijk om Spanje tegen te gaan, vanuit Frankrijks eigen interest. Rohans perspectief werd gecomplementeerd door een weelde aan bronnen. Alle schrijvers toonden een rotsvast vertrouwen in een beeld van de predatory monarch. En alhoewel het vijandelijk doelwit kon verschillen, toch werd elke beeld afgeschilderd met Rohanesque maximes en overeenkomstige interesten van dominantie en destructie, tirannie en despotisme. Het geponeerde interest van de predatory monarch verstrekte een manier om een gehele maatschappij te herschrijven en zodoende de gevaren te vergroten. De overeenkomsten en tekstuele kruisbestuivingen zijn voldoende om te suggereren, dat deze schrijvers kunnen worden beschouwd als behorende bij een traditie van reflectie of een sub-genre van politiek denken. En zoals de vele verwijzingen in de hoofdstukken laten zien, stonden zij niet alleen hierin. Dit sub-genre vereist daarom substantieel meer onderzoek.

Curriculum Vitae

Marianne Klerk was born in 1985 in Middelburg. She studied history at the Erasmus University Rotterdam and in 2010 she graduated *cum laude* on a study of the political thought of Petrus Valkenier, in particular his use of the vocabulary of reason of state. After graduation Marianne became a PhD candidate working on the NWO-funded research project *'Reason of state' or 'reason of princes'? The 'new monarchy and its opponents in France, Germany and the Netherlands, during the seventeenth century* (2011-2016). Marianne also lectured on several courses in the history curriculum at undergraduate and graduate level. From October 2017 she will work as a postdoctoral researcher on the project of *The Fiscal Military System, 1580-1850* at the University of Oxford.

Publications

Klerk, M.B., "The unheard Changes in Europe, and the strange Revolutions which happened in our United Provinces in our times": reason of state and rule of law in Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675)', Robert von Friedeburg and Matthias Schmoeckel (ed.), *Recht, Konfession und Verfassung im 17. Jahrhundert. West- und mitteleuropäische Entwicklungen* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2015), 285-335.

Conference Papers and Invited Talks (a selection)

Klerk, M.B., 'Reconstructing the Rule of Law and Reason of State in the Age of Louis XIV', *14th International Congress for Eighteenth-Century Studies* (Rotterdam, 27 July 2015).

Klerk, M.B., 'Reason of state debates in the Dutch Republic: Pieter de la Court's *Interest van Holland* (1662) and Petrus Valkenier's *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675)' at *Confessional Paradigms for European Politics and Jurisprudence in the 17th Century? Althusius Gesellschaft* (Rotterdam, 17 May 2013).

Klerk, M.B., 'From the Anti-Spanish Black Legend to Anti-French Constitutionalism', *XIII Seminario Internacional de Historia "Vísperas de Sucesión. Europa y la Monarquía de Carlos II"*: (Madrid, 30 November 2012).

Klerk, M.B., 'Anti-Monarchism in Pieter de la Court's *Interest van Holland* (1662): Republican Ideals or Anti-Orangism?', *Research Seminar the Erasmus Center for Early Modern Studies* (Rotterdam, 15 November 2012).

Klerk, M.B., 'Petrus Valkenier and Francois-Paul de Lisola: the menace of the French "New Monarchy"', *Oberseminar Frühen Neuzeit Justus-Liebig-Universität* (Gießen, 4 July 2012).

Klerk, M.B., 'Petrus Valkenier and *'t Verwerd Europa* (1675)', *Expert Meeting Fault line 1700, Early Enlightenment Conversations on Religion and the state* (Rotterdam, 21 November 2011).

Acknowledgements

Being a Ph.D. candidate is wonderful for one is given precious time to read and write, to spend the day contemplating thoughts and sharing these with others, and the priceless freedom to work whenever, wherever. And sometimes it is hard, –hard to explain to outsiders what it involves and simply just hard to undertake and complete. Luckily, I have received support and guidance from many people over the past few years.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor Robert von Friedeburg, whose first-year course inspired me to study early modern history and who has guided me ever since. Thank you for your support and giving me the opportunity to grow as a researcher. I am also greatly indebted to Conal Condren, my second supervisor, who intensively guided me through the last phase of writing and finishing my thesis. Thank you for your time, brilliant comments, endless suggestions and constant encouragements.

A great number of people have helped me along the way. I especially would like to thank Jan Waszink for his continuous guidance and companionship. And I am grateful to the kind support of Charles-Édouard Levillain. I thank Paul Rahe and Harro Höpfl for their comments, criticism and suggestions at the closing conference of the research project. And I am grateful to the NWO for funding the project. Ryan Walter kindly gave me the great benefit of his extensive knowledge on interest. I would also like to express my thanks to the Huizinga Institute for their graduate training program and organising the third-year seminar, where Wyger Velema refereed my research. Moreover, I thank the teaching staff of the London Summer School in Intellectual History (2015) for their excellent courses and counsels. The comments I received at the Erasmus Centre for Early Modern Studies were valuable thanks to the extensive knowledge of its members, in particular Wiep van Bunge, Jaap van Nieuwstraten, Henk Nellen, Adrie van der Laan, Edda Francke and Regina Boot. I want to express my gratitude to Evelien Koolhaas for her encouragements. And I thank Peter Wilson for giving me the opportunity to further pursue my academic career at the University of Oxford, which has made the time between handing in my thesis and defending it much more exciting.

In addition to research, I have taught undergraduate and graduate courses with great pleasure. My colleagues at the Erasmus University gave me valuable advice in teaching and helped me to succeed, in particular Evelien Hazewinkel, Hein Klemann, Ben Wubs, Theresa Oostvogels, Maarten van Dijck, Rudi Verburg, Karen Willemse, Dick van Lente, Brechje van Eekelen and Arianne Baggerman. While teaching, my students diverted (thankfully) my attention from my research and brightened up my day.

I am grateful for the glorious company of my Rotterdam PhD-posse, including Ingmar, Dirk, Laurie, Tina, Hilde S., Marten, Theo, Annemieke, Pieter B., Pieter v/d H., Robbert-Jan, Susan and Geerte. Your expertise, fun and friendship guided me throughout my research. I owe a special thanks to Norah and Maryse for their endless support in my last year, and also to my fellow 'Schnurbarts': Hilde Harmsen and Jesper Schaap. I couldn't think of two persons better to stand next to me during my defence. Moreover, I would like to thank David van der Linden, Frank Daudeij and Lieke van Deinsen, for the great times we shared while discussing the past and present.

I am also indebted to my friends outside academia. Tara, Wilma, Pauline, Lana, Lies, Megan, Marije, Kirsten, Revelino, Jan Pieter and Suzanne, you all have made my decade-long stay

in Rotterdam feel like home. Jeroen, the road to completing my Ph.D. would have been a lot bumpier without your love and friendship. To my boys from Vlissingen in Rotterdam, Jowan, Johan, Sijmen and Erik, thanks for your camaraderie. And Louk, I am grateful for our fifteen years of being together and apart in love. To my life-long friends, Cathalijn, Ellis, Isabelle and Hester, thank you for always being there, also when I was not. Charlotte, you are my 'sister from another mister'. And Wendy, I cannot imagine my life without your warm and loving friendship. Also belonging to this clan is the 'Singel 157' household; I thank you, Helge, Ruben, Tessel and Rover, from the bottom of my heart for making me part of your crazy family. You all have contributed more to this thesis than you will ever know.

I owe my greatest gratitude to my parents. You have constantly supported and encouraged me through good and bad times. You taught me to read, to write and to speak my mind. You both have shown me the power of integrity and perseverance. And, not to forget, you taught me the taste of good food. Above all, you gave me a big sister, Suzanne, who has always got my back against bullies on the playground and nightmares in general –Suus, I am grateful for your and your family's (Wouter and Esmée) love. Dear mom and dad, it is because of you that I am at this point in my life, thank you.