PROPOSITIONS

1. ‘Reason of state’ is neither a theory nor a concept.

2. The *Interest van Holland* (1662) by Pieter de la Court is better understood as a distinct variation on the themes enunciated by Rohan in *De l’interest* (1638), than as a quintessential example of Dutch ‘republicanism’ or ‘anti-monarchism’.

3. The assumption that a kingless polity, such as the Dutch Republic, must have harboured a structural aversion to kingship, truly distorts our understanding of contemporary beliefs and practices.

4. The fact that all authors (Pieter de la Court, François-Paul de Lisola, and Petrus Valkenier) rely on Rohan’s *De l’interest* (1638) to pin-point the nature of the predatory monarchy, amounts to a tradition of speculation, or a sub-genre of political thought.

5. The study of intellectual history gains by researching the thought of ‘mediocre, mainstream’ authors, instead of mainly focusing on a canon of ‘great thinkers’.

6. Political thought does not take place in ivory tower isolation, so one should examine the textual context, as well as the socio-economic and political context(s) of the posited argument.

7. To strive for ‘excellent education’ will bring the average down.

8. To claim that the glass ceiling has already been shattered, is to ignore the fact that although more than half of university students is female, only a very small percentage (17.1 %) of professors is female. (CBS, *Emancipatiemonitor*, 2014)

9. ‘Reason of state’ was a fashionable expression because of its accommodative nature; just like ‘sustainability’ is today.

10. Teaching is preaching.

11. ‘Sometimes you eat the b’ar and sometimes the b’ar, well, he eats you.’ The Stranger [Cowboy], *The Big Lebowski* (1998)