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To the Reader

Before you lies my thesis, serving as the final act in the completion of the Research Master History (Europe 1000-1800), followed at Leiden University. Given that it is customary to write a few words for the interested reader, prior to the dense academic prose that comprises a thesis, I would be remiss to omit it here.

The greatest of praise has to go out to my supervisor, Dr. Raymond Fagel, the person closest involved in the creation of this thing. It has been a pleasure to have known him as a lecturer, a (brief) colleague and, finally, a tutor. Similarly, I have to thank Prof. Jeroen Duindam for suffering through, not one, but two of my theses, first during my Bachelor study as a supervisor, and now as a second reader. His hardships are appreciated.

I would like to mention the support from my parents, who – even though at times they had no clue what I was writing about, or what I was doing while being holed up in the attic – have never ceased to keep me fed, and for that I am grateful beyond count. Writing a thesis is solitary work, so I also have to thank Nick Ruhe and Clemens Deimann for keeping me sane. I dearly hope I have managed to make a story about the Dutch interesting to read – even for them.
Introduction

‘There is a certain Bogg-Land in the World, which, by the Lowness of its Situation, may justly claim the Honour of being the Sink of the Universe’.1

The playwright and pamphleteer Elkanah Settle wrote this line in 1688, giving a vivid, if not very flattering, description of the United Provinces. Reading the phrase, it is easy to imagine the English readers wondering what sort of vile people would live in such a wretched dwelling. They would have, if they had not already been exposed in the past fifty years to many libellous pamphlets expressing the same sentiment, giving an answer to just that question.2

In England, throughout the seventeenth century and beyond, the Dutch were the victims of hundreds of printed gibes, mockeries and volatile attacks, cursing them for all unholy and sinful things on Earth. The inhabitants of the Low Countries were depicted as drunks, boors, frogs, hogs and butter-boxes. Their character was described as prideful, covetous, perfidious, ungrateful, ungodly and non-European. This discourse of Hollandophobia was especially visible in times of conflict, such as the three Anglo-Dutch wars of the seventeenth century and the Glorious Revolution of 1688. During these periods, politicians commissioned, supported and encouraged the publication of anti-Dutch polemic, which drew from a long tradition of existing assumptions and conventions in English minds. Studying this Hollandophobic discourse provides us with insights into the way national stereotypes were constructed in early modernity, how they functioned and how they were spread through the medium of print.

Hollandophobia

The first modern historian who used the concept ‘Hollandophobia’ within his research was Simon Schama in 1987.3 The term has not been widely used in the field of national stereotyping, but it has proven to be a comprehensive denominator for the collection of anti-Dutch images expressed in early modern print. Few scholars define the concept explicitly, but it is mostly used alongside similar terms like Anglophobia and Francophobia, meaning it can

---

1 E. Settle, Insignia Bataviae: or, the Dutch trophies display’d (1688) preface.
2 All dates in this thesis follow the Julian calendar (Old Style) as was customary in England at the time – being ten days behind the Gregorian Calendar used on the continent.
best be described as a single strand of general xenophobia. This is how Hollandophobia is employed in this thesis as well: expressions of fear and hatred towards the Dutch, founded on a stereotypical and negative characterization present in popular minds. I do not uphold any notions of uniqueness of the concept. English Hollandophobia shared many similarities with other forms of xenophobic sentiment, such as the Hispanophobia that held England in its grip in the late sixteenth century, functioning in a similar way. Only the particulars and historical contexts of the concept can be considered to be unique.

When uttering the term for the first time Schama wrote that ‘Hollandophobia as a peculiar feature of seventeenth-century political culture in England and France has yet to receive proper treatment.’ Since then, plenty of academics have found their way to the material of print from those times, filled with anti-Dutch sentiment, yet there are still some steps to be made. Schama himself has only glanced through the available pamphlet material, without having too much attention for chronology or historical context. Before him, a number of scholars dedicated themselves to study Hollandophobia in English early modern print, such as Van Alphen and Coombs – respectively researching the reign of William III (1688-1702) and the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-1713). Despite being more than sixty years old, these works are still very insightful, with an excellent focus on the political contexts and events that shaped opinion in public print. For a work on the beginning of the century, one can look at Marvin Breslow, who studied Puritan views of the Dutch in the period 1618-1640. In his study on English satirical prints, Michael Duffy briefly discussed anti-Dutch representations in both the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

In his works on the causes and consequences of the seventeenth century Anglo-Dutch Wars, Steven Pincus has displayed an extensive knowledge on the available sources, studying pamphlets as well as periodical journals, books and traditional archival sources. Since Hollandophobia is not his primary focus, Pincus quoted a great deal of anti-Dutch polemic

---

4 Nigel Goose has pointed out xenophobia is mostly used to refer to hatred, and not so much fear. This is also true for this research. N. Goose, “Xenophobia” in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England: An Epithet Too Far?, in: N. Goose and L. Luu (ed.), Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England (Brighton 2005) 111.
5 Schama, The Embarrassment of Riches, 663.
without analysing the development of the discourse itself.\textsuperscript{10} Literary historian Marijke Meijer Drees has managed to capture a great deal of the anti-Dutch images floating around during the Anglo-Dutch wars in one of her studies. In it, however, she made very few distinctions between the different wars, disregarding changes within the anti-Dutch discourse. She also relied too heavily on secondary literature, only using quotes that have appeared in earlier works. Still, her concise overview is a useful starting point to grasp the notions of Dutchness that appeared in early modern England.\textsuperscript{11} Most recently, Carmen Nocentelli studied the phenomenon and characteristics of Hollandophobia, juxtaposing it to anti-Spanish sentiment in late sixteenth century England in a comparative analysis of the national stereotype. She concluded the anti-Dutch image shared a lot of similarities with this Spanish Black Legend, enlarging our understanding of its shape and origins.\textsuperscript{12}

This thesis studies the chronological development of the English national stereotype of Hollandophobia in the seventeenth century, as expressed in printed pamphlets – focusing on the three Anglo-Dutch wars of the century and the Glorious Revolution. The aim of this study is threefold. First of all, its goal is to give a comprehensive survey of all the building blocks of Hollandophobia: its tropes, images and commonplaces used to denote the Dutch.\textsuperscript{13} Secondly, it intends to shed some light on the origins of these building blocks, showing from what traditions they derived from. Lastly, it will reveal change and continuity within Hollandophobia, by comparing its shape and function during the different Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the century. By conducting a chronological analysis of Hollandophobia, this thesis provides insights in the manner how a national stereotype was constructed in early modernity through print.

Such a study complements existing historiography, because it will be solely concerned with the development of the anti-Dutch discourse, facilitating a focused and systematic research of the subject. Earlier works have made little effort to differentiate between different historical contexts and times, treating Hollandophobia like a motionless phenomenon.\textsuperscript{14} A chronological study makes it possible to discern changing characteristics and nuances in the anti-Dutch stereotype, which allows us to see how pamphleteers altered the discourse to their

\textsuperscript{11} M. Meijer Drees, Andere landen, andere mensen. De beeldvorming van Holland versus Spanje en Engeland omstreeks 1650 (The Hague 1997).
\textsuperscript{12} Nocentelli, ‘The Dutch Black Legend’.
\textsuperscript{13} When using the word ‘image’ I mean the representation of a person or nation in a literary discourse, ascribing certain characteristics and attributions to the subject.
\textsuperscript{14} Van Alphen and Coombs are exceptions, but they studied different periods of time.
own personal needs. After all, Republican polemists working in 1652 had widely different concerns than Restoration writers in 1665.

Studying the four Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the seventeenth century is useful, because in times of war politicians and pamphleteers were especially active in the public domain, trying to influence opinion. We can expect to find more explicit expressions of anti-Dutch sentiment during these times, vilifying the enemy across the North Sea. This in turn makes the discourse of Hollandophobia more visible to the eye of the historian. Studying only twelve years holds the added benefit of having a manageable amount of source material that will not be overwhelming. I can read all anti-Dutch pamphlets that appeared in these years instead of following a strategy of pick-and-choose, endangering the representativity of the research.  

There is a danger in studying periods of conflict, for negative opinions of foreignness are bound to be abundant in times when rivalry stands at the centre of the public stage. After all, propaganda accompanying wars tended to be rich in character assassination. Nigel Goose warns not to confuse this ‘politico-religious or economic rivalry’ with xenophobic sentiment, stating war-time propaganda can easily be misused by historians to paint a volatile society that absolutely abhorred foreigners. This thesis, however, is concerned with the study of a public discourse – not public opinion. It is very difficult to determine which published pamphlets reflected opinion and which were intended to shape it. Making conclusions about the success of these efforts is even harder. One can discern the extent of Hollandophobic beliefs in the pamphlet culture of seventeenth century England, not within English society itself. The overabundance of national prejudice caused by conflict, then, is an advantage, because it facilitates the analysis of this discourse. When mapping changes – and thus pamphleteers’ choices – within the discourse, we can infer indications concerning these efforts to alter the public domain, which tells us something about Hollandophobia in early modern England – even if these ‘conclusions’ remains somewhat oblique.

Nonetheless, we should not get lost in the torrent of unbridled degradations and insults spewed by English writers, without remembering the other side of the historical coin: enthusiastic praise and admiration of the Dutch, and the existence of close bonds between England and the United Provinces. Both countries were deeply intertwined in matters of politics, economy, migration, religion and culture. English admirers of the country across the

---

Channel were plentiful, seeing it as a historical ally, a Protestant sanctuary and a bulwark against Catholic Spain. This context of historical closeness makes Hollandophobia such a special discourse to study. Pamphleteers had to overcome many setbacks in order to construct and propagate anti-Dutch sentiment. These efforts were bound to leave its mark on history.

**Methodology**

The academic field that is concerned with the study of literary representations of national identities is known as imagology, first established as a specialization in comparative literature. Imagology studies ‘the origin and function of characteristics of other countries and peoples, as expressed textually’, focusing primarily on understanding literary discourses. The field is very weak in terms of theoretical substantiation, but it offers a useful methodological framework that can be used to analyse the corpus of Hollandophobic sources.

This framework centres around three methodological perspectives: text, intertext and historical context. The textual level looks at the content of individual sources, revealing constructions of national images, such as characteristics and attributes. The intertextual perspective analyses sources in relation to the larger corpus, in order to establish traditions of textual tropes and commonplaces. This level establishes how representative specific tropes are in a discourse and to which extent these have been echoed or changed throughout time. The third perspective offers historical contextualization to understand the meaning of these tropes and to explain continuity and change in the discourse, in relation to the political context of the time. The methodological lessons and perspectives imagology offers are used as a framework in this thesis, though the layered level of analysis is mostly implicitly weaved into its narrative. Studying the volatile discourse of Hollandophobia might also serve this larger field of image studies, for it is a useful case for understanding the development of early modern national stereotypes and the steering role of pamphleteers. The fact that these authors were tasked with vilifying a well-known and similar nation – instead of a distant and divergent one – only makes this case all the more interesting.

Pamphlets form a useful historical source to understand efforts to influence public opinion. Being a literary form, they fit perfectly inside the methodological framework of

---


imagology. Therefore, this thesis focuses on this medium of print to reveal the Hollandophobic stereotype. There existed no clear early modern definition for ‘pamphlet’, but as time progressed the word came to refer to: ‘a short, vernacular work, generally printed in quarto format, costing no more than a few pennies, of topical interest or engaged with social, political or ecclesiastical issues.’

When a printed work consisted of roughly more than ninety-six pages, it was too large and expensive to be a pamphlet. Because of their small size and low costs, they became widely available to a large audience – foremost in London, the centre of the English printing market. Pamphlet literature included a broad range of different genres. This study makes the distinction between four pamphlet types: accounts, political tractates, character pamphlets and poems. This categorization is based on the simplification of the numerous genres discussed in other studies, and on the differences in use and function of the Hollandophobic stereotype I have distinguished within these four types. This division will be further explained in chapter one.

Pamphlets were closely associated with slander and scurrility. As a result, it became a convention in the seventeenth century for pamphleteers to work anonymously, even when censorship and threats of prosecution were absent. Works were never printed without a reason, since publishing did not possess intrinsic value in itself. Their goal could be a multitude of reasons – usually financial gains, hopes of patronage or a genuine interest to promote a cause. By the second half of the seventeenth century, pamphlets played a crucial role in the efforts of those in power to generate popular support for their own political position. This purpose is vital to understand how the content of pamphlets were constructed: ‘the perceived need to rouse the public naturally involved putting forward arguments, and highlighting issues, which were thought likely to prove popular.’

English pamphleteers, writing in times of war with the United Provinces, shaped the discourse of Hollandophobia in a way it would best resonate in peoples’ minds as a familiar, understandable and convincing narrative. As historical contexts changed, pamphleteers continuously had to consider which

---


descriptions of the evil Dutchman would have the greatest effect on their audience to fulfil this function.

Roughly two thousand different pamphlets were printed on average per year during the latter half of the seventeenth century – only including those that have survived time. With such large amounts of source material, it is necessary for every study to limit itself in scope, yet at the same time maintain representativity in its research. I have limited myself to four three-year periods of Anglo-Dutch conflict. In terms of source material this thesis is solely concerned with pamphlet literature; books over a hundred pages will only be discussed if they still possess the appearance of a cheap pamphlet or if they are a collection of shorter works of print. Periodical newsbooks are completely omitted from this study.\textsuperscript{26}

In order to prevent the aforementioned pick-and-choose strategy, I will study a clearly demarcated corpus of sources. The digital database Early English Books Online (EEBO) consists of collections of printed works, such as the Thomason Tracts (1640-1661) and Wing’s Short-Title Catalogue (1641-1700). Limiting myself to this database enables a systematic, thorough and consistent approach of the source material. This thesis cannot claim to represent all works of print ever published in seventeenth century England. Instead, it offers a representation of Hollandophobic pamphlets found in the (somewhat artificial) environment of a single extensive database of surviving sources, preventing randomness in its use of Hollandophobic print.\textsuperscript{27}

Denoting the Dutch

A question we first have to tackle is whether seventeenth century Englishmen saw the people living in the marshy corner of north-western Europe as a separate entity. English writers used a multitude of interchangeable names to refer to their neighbours across the North Sea, the most common being ‘Dutch’ and ‘Hollander’, but also ‘Netherlander’, ‘Belgick’, ‘Batavian’ and ‘Fleming’. Until the middle of the sixteenth century Englishmen made no distinction between Dutch, German and Flemish. With the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt emerged the need to separate the northern provinces in the Low Countries from the southern ones and the rest of the German territories. ‘Dutch’ came to be used to refer solely to the inhabitants of the

\textsuperscript{26} For a work that does use periodical newsbooks, see: Pincus, \textit{Protestantism and Patriotism}.

\textsuperscript{27} The database of Early English Books Online (http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home) is extensive, but by no means exhaustive. Pamphlets were a cheap mass commodity, reducing their survivability. The survival rate on a whole was uneven due to events such as the Great Fire in London of 1666. The database also contains a degree of error due to omission of works and possible duplication. Furthermore, the different collections could very well be biased through collectors’ personal preferences. Raymond, \textit{Pamphlets and Pamphleteering}, 161-172.
new republic, but the differentiation was only gradual. This is why some pamphleteers still name the Dutch ‘Flemish’ the following century, though this did not happen often.

In the latter half of the seventeenth century this difficulty of differentiation was no longer a large issue with English writers, who were well aware of the meaning of the words they put in print. This included the habit of using the provincial name of Holland to denote all of the Northern Netherlands, a practice that continues to this day. An anti-Dutch poem written in 1674 discussed the confusion in its explanatory appendix:

‘the Low Countries so called from the lowness of its Scituation [sic], vulgarly Holland; for as Flanders heretofore was taken for all the Netherlands, so now Holland is taken generally for all the United Provinces confederated in a League against the Spaniards.’

The merchant Slingsby Bethel explained the reason for this, stating the United Provinces were: ‘in ordinary discourse understood by the name of Holland, that Province, by way of eminence, giving denomination unto the whole’. Even though factually incorrect, naming the Dutch ‘Hollanders’ was a widespread practice in English print – to the chagrin of some. ‘To those English that are angry with the Hollander,’ Edward Cliffe complained:

‘exclaim against (they know not who, some) the Dutch, who are Germanes; others the Flemmings, who they are not (being a Province under the King of Spain) some against the Low Countries and the Netherlanders (of whom they are the least part) others more properly against the United Provinces, six whereof are as unwillingly entitled to the guilt’.

These few examples make it apparent that English writers were familiar with the Dutch and the different ways in which to describe them.

The following chapters will show how these pamphleteers described the Dutch in varying ways to depict them as evil and immoral. Chapter one discusses the so-called Amboyna Massacre and its importance in the Hollandophobic discourse in England. This

28 Haley, The British and the Dutch, 16.
29 Anon, Hogan-Moganides: or, the Dutch hudibras (1674) 104.
30 S. Bethel, The present interest of England stated (1671) 28. The other province sometimes used during the First Anglo-Dutch War was Zeeland, being the province, after Holland, that the English had most contact with.
31 E. Cliffe, An abreviate of Hollands deliverance by, and ingratitude to the crown of England and house of Nassau (1665) preface.
introductory chapter traces the development of a single anti-Dutch theme during the period 1623-1690, in order to show how images were transferred through different pamphlet types and how they could be rehearsed in later times. The four following chapters focus on the Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the seventeenth century themselves: the clash of the two republics when England was a Commonwealth (1651-1654), the wars of Restoration England (1665-1667 and 1672-1674), and the Dutch intervention during the Glorious Revolution and the first years of William III’s reign (1688-1690). In each of these chapters I will briefly outline the historical context, analyse my source material and discuss the characterizations, tropes and arguments used to depict the Dutch – all in order to understand how the discourse of Hollandophobia was constructed, rehearsed and shaped throughout the seventeenth century.
Chapter 1. The Amboyna Massacre in early modern print (1623-1690)

‘Amboyna always runs in my Mind’

The Amboyna Massacre was one of the most tenacious themes that reappeared throughout the seventeenth century in the discourse of Hollandophobia. Being such a widespread motif, it offers a useful insight in the use of an anti-Dutch image within the medium of polemical print. While discussing the Amboyna Massacre this chapter reveals the dynamics of early modern pamphlets, such as the different actors who influenced the publication of print, the importance of pamphlets in generating public support for political positions, and the way in which their contents were appropriated in later conflicts to serve the needs of new pamphleteers. The manner in which Amboyna was invoked in print depended on the pamphlet type that was used; historical accounts, political tractates, character pamphlets and poems all used the image of the massacre, but in different ways and for varying purposes. War-time pamphlets not only called upon the same images in Hollandophobic print, they also invoked traditions and existing narratives from older xenophobic discourses, such as Hispanophobia from the sixteenth century. All of this added to the repetitive and familiar nature of pamphlets condemning the Dutch.

The pamphleteering campaign

The Amboyna Massacre was an event in the East-Indies that seriously damaged the English public opinion towards the Dutch. In 1619 a treaty confirmed the right of Englishmen to trade on the Dutch-controlled island of Ambon in the Moluccas, allowing them one third of the spice trade. On 9 March 1623, the Dutch governor ordered the beheading of ten English merchants who were accused of plotting to take over a Dutch fort on the island. They were arrested when a Japanese soldier in service of the Dutch was apprehended for suspicious behaviour, after which he implicated the merchants in the plot. Under pain of torture, the Englishmen confessed their guilt and were promptly executed.

News of the incident reached England a year later on 29 May 1624, leading to a furious clash between pamphleteers from both countries. Authors writing for the Dutch East India Company justified the executions by providing (flimsy) proof of a covert design,

---

whereas the English fiercely denied the existence of a plot.33 One of those Dutch pamphlets was soon translated into English and appeared across the Channel. Feeling necessitated to go public as well, the East India Company (EIC) published its own account, *A true relation of the unjust, cruel, and barbarous proceedings against the English at Amboyna*, written by John Skinner (see image 1). The pamphlet provided a graphic account of the torturing of the English merchants, blaming the ‘barbarous and tyrannous proceeding’ on the ‘unsatiable covetousnesse of the Hollanders’.34 Two thousand copies were printed in English and one thousand translated copies were sent to the United Provinces, with the purpose of infuriating the people and soliciting popular support.35 As the seventeenth century progressed it became, in Joad Raymond’s words: ‘self-evident that any attempt to generate public support for a political initiative, party or position, would have to exploit the persuasive powers of the press.’36 The pamphlets printed in the EIC’s publishing campaign were nothing short of propaganda to win the battle over English public opinion. Political figures, such as members of the EIC and court officials, deliberately commissioned, supported, or simply encouraged the publication of Hollandophobic polemic during times of Anglo-Dutch conflict.37

This official propaganda campaign by the EIC sparked the publication of pamphlets from independent authors, taking up the Hollandophobic glove and condemning the Dutch, often in more volatile language than the original accounts.38 These authors were generally either enraged by what they had read, feeling the need to contribute to public efforts, or they were aware of the commercial benefits of adding their voice to popular anger.39 The same process of unaffiliated pamphleteers supporting coordinated propaganda, joining together in a

---

35 Because of a lack of evidence, there is little that can be said about the range of other individual pamphlets. In the seventeenth century licensed works tended to have print runs of around 1,500 with an exceptional reach of double that number for popular items. A *true relation* was thus quite widespread. Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, 183. L. Schwoerer, ‘Liberty of the press and public opinion: 1660-1695’, in: J. Jones (ed.) *Liberty secured? Britain before and after 1688* (Stanford 1992) 210.
37 Here I use the definition of propaganda Peacey formulated in his research on the relation between seventeenth century pamphlets and politicians: ‘polemical works which appeared with the connivance of those political figures whose interests were best served by the existence of such books, tracts and pamphlets.’ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 2.
growing campaign of xenophobic sentiment, was at play during the Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the seventeenth century.

The EIC also tried to enlist the support of the English government, to punish the Dutch for their crimes, but James I was not forthcoming. In 1624 whipping up Hollandophobic sentiment was undesirable for the English king, given that he was negotiating an alliance with the United Provinces against Spain at the time. Afraid for rioting in the streets and diplomatic repercussion by the States General, James repressed anti-Dutch sentiment. The EIC commissioned a large and dramatic painting to depict the massacre, but the inflammatory picture was banned before it could be exhibited. James also suppressed a play and other independent pamphlets that contained hostility towards the Dutch Republic. The king of England curbed Hollandophobia, because it was not politically opportune. 40

Image 1: Cover sheet of J. Skinner, A true relation of the unjust, cruell, and barbarous proceedings against the English at Amboyna (1624). The woodcut on the left-hand side depicted the manner of torture with fire and water that the English merchants were exposed to. It was a popular image and resurfaced throughout the seventeenth century.

The response of the English government in 1651, when confronted with the same expressions of anti-Dutch sentiment, could not be more different. During the breakdown of Anglo-Dutch relations prior to the outbreak of the First Dutch War (1652-1654), the EIC’s account of the Amboyna Massacre was reprinted to stir up xenophobic sentiment. John Hall, a writer with a history of making commissioned defences of the newly established republic, wrote a new preface for the pamphlet, most likely to influence peace talks between the two countries.\(^{41}\) On the cover sheet was printed ‘Published by Authority’, denoting the connection between polemic and government.\(^ {42}\) ‘See here a piece of Babarism [sic],’ he wrote, ‘which hath lain so long both as an injurie, and a dishonor to our Nation brought again to light’.\(^ {43}\) Hall criticized the dishonourable inactiveness both James and Charles had displayed in the aftermath of the massacre. He was confident the new republican regime would hold the Dutch accountable. Dutch ambassadors, who were in England to smoothen diplomatic waters, saw the pamphlet as an attempt to rekindle animosity. They demanded the reprint of the account to be forbidden, but, as Hall’s contemporary biographer stated:

> ‘the Parlement on the other side, thinking it a seasonable service done the Publike, took no notice of the proposal, and so it died; the Ambassadours returning not long after without any conclusion of peace.’\(^ {44}\)

Parliament threatened the States General with war if they did not accept English demands, meaning extra pressure in the shape of a popular outcry of vengeance for the murdered merchants was far from unwelcome.

Enjoying governmental approval, Hollandophobic pamphleteers continued to exploit the horror story once war had officially broken out. When authors wanted to show Dutch treachery, they only had to invoke the image of innocent Englishmen being tortured out of their trade and lives. ‘witness that bloudy and unparalel’d Butchery of the English at Amboyna in the East Indies’, a pamphlet stated, using the incident as an example of Dutch


\(^ {43}\) J. Hall, *A true relation of the unjust, cruel, and barbarous proceedings against the English at amboynas* (1651) preface.

cruelty.\textsuperscript{45} When another writer claimed there existed a Dutch plot to butcher the English colonists in New-England, he casted the story as ‘The Second Part of the Tragedy of Amboyna’, describing how the treacherous cruelty of the massacre had extended from the East-Indies to the west.\textsuperscript{46} Parliament itself invoked the image in official declarations, reminding the people that: ‘Neither is it pleasant to remember that cruel and bloody Business of Amboyna towards the English, for which no Satisfaction at all hath been given, though often demanded’.\textsuperscript{47}

**Amboyna as Hollandophobic image**

The First Anglo-Dutch War was the first occasion in which the massacre was appropriated on a large scale by anti-Dutch propaganda. Printed sources discussing Amboyna more than doubled in 1652 when compared with 1624, the year the massacre first appeared in print as actual news. We see similar peaks during the other Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the century (see Appendix 1). Every time conflict broke out, the ghost of Amboyna was dug up to serve as a volatile testament of Dutch treachery. The maxim that best summarized the moral pamphleteers propagated when invoking the massacre, has to be a verse from a collection of follies from 1667: ‘For justice now Amboyna calls: / Who sins anew, by old sins falls’.\textsuperscript{48} The past could not be forgotten, for it proved the true nature of the Dutch.

The Amboyna Massacre evolved into a central theme in the negative characterization of the Dutch in the seventeenth century and beyond. It was a go-to card whenever other arguments against the Dutch were flimsy or nigh absent, or whenever there was a need to quantify general and sweeping accusations of Dutch immorality. This importance has not been overlooked by scholarly research. Carmen Nocentelli called it the centrepiece of the Dutch Black Legend.\textsuperscript{49} According to Meijer Drees the incident grew into the symbol of Dutch betrayal and cruelty that was repeatedly used in the century.\textsuperscript{50} Jojakim van der Welle stated the massacre had become almost proverbial.\textsuperscript{51} Even after a century had passed, it still possessed its polemical power and was relentlessly referred to, for instance to criticize the Dutch alliance of the 1710s.

---

\textsuperscript{45} Anon, *Amsterdam and her Hollander sisters put out to sea* (1652) 10.
\textsuperscript{46} Anon, *The second part of the tragedy of amboyna* (1653).
\textsuperscript{48} J. Raymond, *Folly in print* (1667) 115.
\textsuperscript{49} Nocentelli, ‘The Dutch Black Legend’, 365.
\textsuperscript{50} Meijer Drees, *Andere landen, andere mensen*, 123. She discussed the theme in one paragraph, quoting from only three historical sources.
\textsuperscript{51} Van der Welle, *Dryden and Holland*, 22.
Gregorius van Alphen rightly commented it was remarkable that a relative minor incident continued to hold such significant polemical power, more so than other colonial incidents, even while the dispute itself had been officially settled at the Peace of Breda in 1667. Why was the Amboyna Massacre so popular amongst Hollandophobic pamphleteers? First of all, it was a concrete historical example of Dutch hostility towards the English, that was widely reported on at the time of occurrence. The EIC appealed to popular opinion, making it a public subject, and discussion of the event slumbered over the years. In 1632, for instance, Amboyna became topical again after Dutch authorities cleared the accused of any wrongdoings. It was not yet appropriated as Hollandophobic propaganda, but it meant the incident already had a life in print and enjoyed some familiarity in the public. Secondly, the incident fitted neatly within general criticism against the Dutch, centring around commercial rivalry and unfair trading practices. Thirdly, it functioned as an illustration of the characteristics ascribed to the Dutch; it showed Dutch cruelty with its description of how innocent Englishmen were tortured; it revealed their treachery in murdering peaceful merchants even while a treaty of friendship existed; it signalled Dutch avarice, since they desired to conquer all trade in the Indies; it was a testament to their ingratitude, since the English had aided the Dutch in the past; and it proved the Dutch were ungodly, because they denied the condemned prisoners the sacraments, and storms and sickness struck the island as providential retaliation. The polemical power of the incident only increased through the repetition of the story. Pamphleteers simply had to slip the name into their work and it would unlock a torrent of Hollandophobic images and accusations that could not be invoked through another colonial dispute.

Pamphlet types
There existed many forms of polemic in the literary culture of England, from lengthy tractates to simple ballads, and everything in between: ‘single-sheet broadsides, prints, newsletters, pamphlets, tracts, treatises, confutations, animadversions, contestations, riddles, libels, scandals, squibs, lampoons, allegories, reflections, advices, confessions.’ Throughout the seventeenth century, English pamphleteers continuously invoked the image of the Amboyna Massacre to attack the Dutch. The use and function of the event varied in the four pamphlet types that this thesis focuses on. Descriptive accounts of the incident could be reprinted in later times, allowing the audience to relate them to current events. Political tractates used the

52 Van Alphen, De Stemming van de Engelschen tegen de Hollanders, 75.
massacre as a piece in their argumentation, meant to increase support for a political position. Character pamphlets included it in order to exemplify general Dutch vices. Lastly, poems made short remarks about Amboyna, using it as a trope that invoked a strong image in peoples’ mind, as a result of the attention it had already received in public print.

The account of Amboyna

Accounts provided descriptions of historical events, meaning their political topicality was more implicit than the usual pamphlet. Sometimes authors altered these older accounts, changing prefaces or adding pages, to connect them more explicitly to the period of republishing. The function of these accounts was to provide their readerships with a concrete historical episode of Dutch wrongdoing. If this was done right, readers would infer the relevance of the source for their own contemporary time.

Skinner’s original account of the massacre did not just reappear in the First Anglo-Dutch War. Reissuing old pamphlets, shaped and altered to cater to the needs of pamphleteers and the historical context of the time, was a useful tactic for Hollandophobic propagandists to hammer down their point. Skinner’s account was first reprinted in 1632, when a Dutch verdict acquitted the perpetrators of the massacre. After Hall’s licensed version from 1651, there appeared another slightly reworded account in 1653, its first title A memento for Holland – this time without proper license. The printer, James Moxon, wrote a new preface, voicing accusations of Dutch ingratitude. When war broke out between Restoration England and the United Provinces in 1665, Skinner’s account resurfaced in its original form. In 1672 the account was republished by Beaumont as The emblem of ingratitude (with the old title under it), by authority. He did not write a new preface for the piece, but he did add four short texts after the original account, naming even more perfidious acts committed by ‘our ignoble and ill natured Neighbours the Netherlands’ in the East-Indies and beyond, to make sure the message of the pamphlet was not lost on its readers.

The last reprint of the account was published on the eve of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, with allowance (see image 2). Elkanah Settle, whose first published work was an anti-Dutch poem in 1666, renamed the pamphlet Insignia Bataviae: or, the Dutch trophies display’d, possibly influenced by another popular Hollandophobic pamphlet with a similar

Settle’s subtitle was especially telling: ‘Whereby is plainly Demonstrable what the English must expect from the Hollanders, when at any Time or Place they become their Masters’, clearly referring to the feared invasion of the Dutch Stadtholder William III. Settle wrote a new preface, describing the treatise of 1624 like ‘an old long-silenc’d Fiend, (…) to walk abroad again, and new terrifie the Trembling World.’ He revived the account to show the new generations of Englishmen how devilish the Dutch had proven themselves to be in the story:

‘The Marks of the Beast in it are only peculiar to it self; and to shew Mankind its more particular Characteristicks, I need but name its Nativity, and say, ‘Tis of the Holland Breed.’

---

Image 2: Cover sheet of E. Settle, *Insignia Bataviae: or, the Dutch trophies display’d* (1688), the last reprint of the account of the Amboyna Massacre in the seventeenth century. The image on the cover sheet had been renewed, but the composition remained mostly the same.
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56 O. Felltham, *Batavia: or the Hollander displayed* (1672). This well-known work went through many reprints, the last one prior to Settle’s pamphlet being in 1680. It is likely Settle mimicked the name for extra exposure.

Political tractates

Many of the Hollandophobic pamphlets were political tractates. These type of sources were common throughout the century, with a somewhat decreased importance in 1665-1667 and bumped relevance in 1688-1690. They were large works of print, consisting of a coherent argument that defended a political stance. Tractates worked from a very specific agenda, trying to convince different audiences of the necessity of a certain course of action – usually propagating war. The story of the Amboyna Massacre could be used as part of this argumentation, forming concrete evidence of Dutch designs in the Indies and their hostility towards the English nation.

Authors wrote that all conflicts caused by the Dutch in the East-Indies were led by their designs of gaining the dominion of the whole trade in the region. Robert Codrington reflected: ‘to Improve their Interests, they have added Hypocrisie to their Avarice, and to their Ambition, Murder. The Innocent Blood which they have spilt, doth cry aloud for Vengeance’. The political implication was clear; the Dutch murdered Englishmen for their own interests. This meant war was unavoidable. If readers still doubted the validity of the argument, they could be convinced by the sheer maliciousness the Dutch had displayed. William de Britaine described how the Dutch had ‘most treacherously murthered, and with Fire and Water tortured the English, there (far exceeding the Barbarity of all Nations) (…) An Act so horrid!’ The butchery was described so often, some authors preferred to simply mention the island and move on: ‘Their Barbarities at Amboyna I pass over, because they were enough to make a Book by it self.’ Henry Stubbe explained in 1672 the core message of these descriptions: ‘The Hollanders are the self-same People still; As much Hollanders in Europe, as they are at Japan, or ever were at Amboyna’. If made possible, they would exert the same cruelty again.

This was precisely the favoured tactic of pamphleteers writing in 1688, when England was threatened to fall under the rule of a Dutch king. The Amboyna Massacre was equated with contemporary times, showing the direness of the situation: ‘what must we expect of them Now,’ a writer wondered, ‘but the same Fate with our Fellow Subjects at Amboyna. Blood,
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Rapine, Violence, and a whole Chain of Mischiefs, are the usual effects of Conquest." The author of *The Dutch design anatomized* suggested that supporters of the Dutch invasion:

‘may sit down with folded Arms, and with horror see the Massacres of their Fellow Subjects, and at last be Butchered themselves with such Torments as the Hollanders have used to the English at Amboyna, or elsewhere.’

**Illustration of character**

A grouping of pamphlet genres, that I will refer to as ‘character pamphlets’, used the Amboyna Massacre to exemplify the Dutch nature with a useful episode from the past. Characters were sketches of people’s defining qualities – exaggerated and ironic – serving both as polemic and entertainment. The genre became popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These sources varied from direct descriptions or lists of statements regarding the Dutchmen’s character, to more playful works of print such as fictional conversation, letters, travel observations and plays. Being more creative and entertaining works of print, they tended to be much shorter than the average treatise. Character pamphlets consisted of more general and sweeping remarks on the Dutch, with less topicality and the call for urgent action that we see in political tractates. Amboyna served to provide texts with a vivid story that gave strength and grounding to these stereotypical characterizations.

*Quaeries: or a dish of pickled-herring* was a list of satirical questions, posed to show the Dutch were far from moral. The author wondered: ‘Whether we mortals may not reckon the Hollander in the Massacre at Amboyna amongst the Gods, since they did there put off all humanity?’ Another pamphlet, *Strange newes from Holland*, was written in the shape of a letter, giving a brief description of the country of Holland. Its writer got straight to the point, by proclaiming:

‘they are a State not fit to live in the World, by reason of their Treacherous dealings with all Nations, witness (...) their Murderous and Tyrannical dealings with our English in the West-Indies, as Amboina, (...) their cruelties have made themselves odious, and their Pride hath raised them to that height that their fall must be great.’

---

64 Anon, *The Dutch design anatomized* (1688) 19.
65 Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, 220.
66 Anon, *Quaeries: or a dish of pickled-herring* (1665) 5.
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News from Sherburn-castle depicted a fictional conversation between the Protestant Frank and the Catholic Tom, wherein Frank enlightened his friend about all the crimes the Dutch had perpetrated. He discussed Amboyna as well, speaking of barbarous inhumanity, cruel tortures and wicked murders. In this pamphlet genre a naïve but kind-hearted person, representing the reader, is being educated by a rational acquaintance (the author), explaining why things were the way they were. The original account of the massacre was also transferred into a play by John Dryden, romanticizing and inflating it with theatrical conventions and fiction. In 1673 Amboyna: a tragedy was hurriedly published as a pamphlet to serve as anti-Dutch propaganda in the Third Anglo-Dutch War. It was definitely meant as a piece of Hollandophobia; the prologue fitted perfectly with the common themes and accusations present in anti-Dutch print. The play itself used the Amboyna Massacre as a background to display Dutch vices, such as treachery, ungodliness and cruelty.

The poetics of Amboyna

Polemical poems in the seventeenth century tended to be short ballads, printed as broadsides or short pamphlets, and consisted of witty rhymes that were built around tropes. A trope was a literary device, constituting a reoccurring theme in a work of literature or genre, invoking meaning via a word or image, through familiarity. A grisly event, such as the torture and execution of honest Englishmen, could be surprisingly well translated into verse. Authors made short references to the Amboyna Massacre in a stanza or two, describing the outrage Englishmen should feel at so much injustice. In 1666, for instance, a poem addressed the Dutch, lamenting: ‘Your Sea-rapes, and Amboyna’s murders stand / The dire account of your perfidious land’. Off-handed remarks to the event such as these were enough to invoke the image of Dutch brutality, since readers already possessed strong associations with the name, a result of their familiarity with the theme from other works of print. The Amboyna Massacre thus served as another trope in anti-Dutch poems.

The trope centred around the idea that vile acts should always be remembered. John Crouch phrased the general notion perfectly in 1665: ‘While man has mem’ry, may that
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hellish Plott / Of curs’d Amboyna never be forgott’. These propagandistic poems were connected to the conflicts with the Dutch by a clear call for action. ‘Ah!’, the author of *Bellum Belgicum Secundum* cried out, ‘Shall our friends, our Countreymens dear Ghosts, / Lie unrevenge’d upon Amboyna’s coasts?’ Elkanah Settle wrote in 1666: ‘Blood call’d to Heaven, blood for Revenge did cry, / Amboyna’s fact, Amboyna’s remedy’. The remedy he spoke of was, of course, war. By engaging the Dutch, the English nation could bring about their much awaited vengeance.

**Repetition and familiarity**

Hollandophobic pamphlets from the seventeenth century did not simply sprout from the ground like fresh flowers (poisonous ones at that); they were written in a specific print culture, with literary conventions and historical traditions of style and genre. Not only that, but authors intentionally copied older works, causing a large resemblance amongst pamphlets. It was this repetition of prose, images and narratives that caused readers’ familiarity with tropes such as Amboyna, enabling them to comprehend the full meaning of texts – the very reason why polemic was so powerful. In the following chapters we will see many pamphleteers who copied old sources to revive their contents. These anti-Dutch narratives and commonplaces also borrowed heavily from pamphlets outside their own discourse. When we look back at the original account of the massacre, for example, we see that *A true relation* largely echoed works of martyrdom, casting the English merchants in the role of godly paragons who died by the hands of the blasphemous Dutch. The woodcut of the pamphlet’s image seems to have been inspired by John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, the figure of a Roman-Catholic executioner changed into a Dutch one.

Hollandophobic pamphlets were inspired by other xenophobic works of print, and the brutalities exhibited in these were far from exclusively applicable. As Jennifer Airey concluded: ‘To read anti-Spanish tracts alongside anti-Irish, anti-Catholic, antiroyalist, and anti-Dutch documents of the period is to recognize the repetitive nature of early modern
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propaganda culture.’ Accusations of vile crimes could be easily transferred onto new enemies in new times. The discourse that influenced anti-Dutch sources the most was arguably that of the Hispanophobic sentiment that grew rampant in late sixteenth century England. Carmen Nocentelli reflected that the discourse of Hollandophobia returned ‘repeatedly, perhaps even obsessively, to that set of Hispanophobic stereotypes and prejudices that we have come to know as the Spanish Black Legend.’ Similarities could be seen by ‘the repetition of words, figures of speech, shapes, and positions’, but also on a larger scale by the duplication of ‘plots, characters, and settings’. The likeness between the two is so large, Nocentelli named the English anti-Dutch sentiment a Dutch Black Legend, which shared many of the themes common in the Black Legend narrative of Spain – such as aspirations of universal monarchy, accusations of ungodliness, non-European ethnicity and a natural cruelty exceeding those of other peoples, mainly expressed in the colonial theatre. In the Spanish Black Legend, the symbol of Spanish cruelty was Bartolomé de Las Casas’ account on misdeeds in the Americas. The Amboyna Massacre, in its turn, represented all Dutch crimes in the Indies, and was explained as a repetition of Spanish atrocities. English writers described – and condemned – both Spaniards and Dutchmen in very similar terms, from identical characteristics such as treachery, ungodliness and cruelty, to similar tropes of colonial crimes, showing the roots of Hollandophobia as a literary discourse were both old and extensive.

Chapter 2. Deconstructing Dutch closeness: the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654)

‘the red Crosse and white have kept their Quagmire for them, for better their Country is not then a Reformed Bog’\(^{81}\)

The outbreak of the First Dutch War in 1652 was a turning point in Anglo-Dutch relations. During the first half of the seventeenth century, England and the United Provinces experienced an increasing rivalry and growing irritations over commercial issues. Relations during these years were far from uneventful – the Amboyna Massacre was proof enough of that. However, these strained relations had never led to the decision to go to war to remedy perceived wrongdoings. When England became a Commonwealth in 1649 and the Dutch Stadtholder William II died a year later, leaving the States Party in power, few would have thought the two republics would end up fighting each other. After all, both were Protestant states, free from monarchical rule. Only in 1651 English emissaries had travelled to The Hague to propose a political union, believing the religious, cultural and economic closeness between the two republics could result in political closeness as well. This was not to be; negotiations broke down as a result of conflicting interests.\(^{82}\) English opinion turned as a consequence of frustrations with Dutch diplomatic neutrality, irritation over Dutch protection of royalist exiles who had fled the Commonwealth and increasing maritime incidents caused by commercial rivalry. All the while, antipathy towards the Dutch proliferated in public print.\(^{83}\) After an unplanned encounter in the English Channel between the admirals Tromp and Blake in May 1652, in which the Dutch lost two ships, official war was declared two months later by Parliament.

Most historians, such as Charles Wilson and Jonathan Israel, have argued that the eruption of war was the logical result of the commercial and maritime competition between the two rivalling republics.\(^{84}\) According to them, English politicians and merchants felt threatened by Dutch successes after 1647 in expanding their commercial activities, gaining a

\(^{81}\) Anon, *Amsterdam, and her other Hollander sisters put out to sea* (1652) 4.


firm foothold in English trade and shipping. Legislation intended to protect English interests and to decrease the Dutch dominance in shipping did not prove effective, and the growing frequency of incidents increased their willingness to seek out other means to curb the Dutch. Other scholars, such as James Jones and Steven Pincus, have stressed the importance of ideological differences in politics and religion as main movers of Anglo-Dutch relations.\(^8^5\) Parliament perceived the United Provinces as a danger to the Commonwealth, because it harboured royalist sentiment and showed little regard for the Protestant faith in foreign policy. The Dutch had proven as much by refusing the proposed political union. Clearly, they were no true Protestant and republican allies after all. Gijs Rommelse steered a middle course between these two explanations, believing war broke out because the English government held a mercantilist ideology based on national interest. The Dutch were seen as a danger, not because they were politically different, but because they undermined the very principles of English wealth.\(^8^6\) All three interpretations returned somehow in the pamphlet literature of the time.

**Distancing the Dutch**

Englishmen did not see the Dutch as natural enemies. England and the United Provinces shared a likeness to one another that was difficult to match. Historically, they had fought together for the same cause, the survival of Protestantism and liberty against the popish tyranny of Spain. Geographically, the United Provinces were arguably the nearest neighbours of England, with the North Sea functioning as a highway, not a barrier. Demographically speaking, there was a large exchange of migrants, with many Dutchmen living in London, and English dissenters, exiles and soldiers in Holland. Economically, both countries thrived on trade; this was bound to create some friction, but also understanding of each other’s means of wealth. When Parliament declared war on the Dutch Republic in 1652, English pamphleteers faced the challenge of cutting these ties in order to legitimize the conflict. Because this was the first time the two countries had to face each other in open warfare, it was necessary for them to distance themselves from the Dutch, to create differentiation between the two similar countries and, finally, to justify an actual war against another Protestant republic. This proved to be no easy task, and it was this difficulty that sparked the publication of many Hollandophobic pamphlets. The clergyman Donald Lupton, for example, wrote in his tractate


on English maritime sovereignty an entire chapter on Dutch wrongdoings, for the reason that ‘there be thousands who mutter at the businesse,’ referring to the war with the Dutch, ‘and seem to bear affection to their cause, though indeed without cause’. 87

**Accusations of ingratitude**

One way to distance the English from their neighbours across the Channel was to rewrite the shared past of historical amity. In the sixteenth century, England and the revolting provinces of the Low Countries possessed similar political aims and enemies. As a result, both countries had shown a great deal of amity towards each other, visible in English support during the Dutch struggle against the king of Spain. 88 One way to rewrite this past friendship was to deny its existence. This was a difficult strategy to accomplish, since the English people knew a great deal about the Dutch – they were neighbours after all. For a country like Spain, it was easy to shape public opinion; it was a far away country, seldom visited by English travellers, and Spanish print rarely found its way to England. Not so for the United Provinces. Existing knowledge about the country and its people could easily counter narratives trying to recast the past in an anti-Dutch light. Instead, pamphleteers harnessed this historical closeness, emphasizing the role of England in the Dutch Revolt and blaming the Dutch for betraying the old alliance. These accusations of ingratitude stood at the centre in the discourse of Hollandophobia in the 1650s.

Many pamphlets emphasized the English sacrifices made to liberate the Dutch Provinces from Spanish rule. ‘Oh my loving Countrymen!’ an anonymous writer lamented in 1653, ‘Should I but in part relate to you what we have done for them, and now (…) how basely, unjustly, and perfidiously have they requited us’. 89 The famous Commonwealth pamphleteer and propagandist Marchamont Nedham exaggerated Anglo-Dutch ties in theatrical language to propagate support for the war. Its purpose was to maximise the impact of the eventual Dutch treason that was to follow:

‘When the Spaniard was likely to have swallowed up the people of the United Provinces, (…) yet so open was the heart of the People of England to receive the cries
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of the United Provinces, so tenderly did they resent their Condition, that as if it were not now the Dutch, but the condition of England’.  

Nedham went even further by stating both countries seemed to be one nation, fighting for one cause. This cleverly referred back to the proposed union of both republics and the Good Old Cause the parliamentarians had fought for during the English Civil War. Implying the English were trusted allies consequently meant the Dutch were not. Lupton was aghast when seeing how much harm the Dutch had caused to: ‘their neighbors, their friends, their old and trusty friends, their conservators, both of life and liberty, of wives, children, towns, and all whatsoever at present they have’.  

Authors showed utter bewilderment when faced with the ingratitude their old allies displayed. The Amboyna Massacre was a prime example of the Dutch betrayal. Other episodes of colonial conflicts were dug up as well. Of course all pamphlets laid the blame squarely on the side of the Dutch. ‘Brothers saist thou?’ an English captain exclaimed in a fictional conversation when his Dutch associate spoke of the close bond between both countries, ‘What Brothers? Cain and Abel were Brothers; and the Hollanders may happily prove to be the Slayer of Abel.’ The poem *Brandy-wine, in the Hollanders ingratitude*, discussing the war, included another sarcastic question: ‘If this bee like the kisses of a Friend, / I prethce tell, how shall imbraces end?’ The war of 1652-1654 was the first time when the characteristic of ingratitude became dominant in the discourse of Hollandophobia. There are a few utterances of ingratitude prior to 1652 in scholarly works, but they do not refer to specific sources, making it difficult to qualify their importance.  

**Disproving sameness**

Ungrateful as the Dutch might be, this did little to disclaim the great likeness between the two countries; both were still Protestant republics. Fighting a war against an enemy that is similar to one self was not desirable. It was necessary for pamphleteers supporting the conflict to deconstruct the sameness of England and the United Provinces – to distance the Dutch from
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the English.\textsuperscript{96} Nedham did this uncommonly explicit in \textit{The case stated between England and the United Provinces}. The fifty-four pages long tractate discussed a wide range of topics that together formed the official narrative in parliamentarian declarations. He argued the United Provinces were neither true adherents of Protestantism, nor of liberty. ‘True it is,’ Nedham admitted about the Protestant faith, ‘that it hath been there for many years professed, and exercized’. However, the Dutch tolerated all other religions in their provinces as well, even the ones that were ‘most contrary to the Doctrine of the Gospel of Christ’. They did this not out of any moral principles, but because of the commercial profits toleration brought. Furthermore, the Dutch had done nothing to promote the true faith either inside or outside their borders; they showed no qualms about allying with Catholic forces to quash Protestant states when it was in their interest to do so.\textsuperscript{97}

In principle the Dutch Republic was also a free state, but it did nothing to defend liberty in the rest of Europe. Instead, Nedham argued: ‘their great designe hath been to be Free Men themselves, and to make the world (as far as they are able) their slaves and vassals.’\textsuperscript{98} The fact that the United Provinces aided the tyrannical Stuarts in their designs to retake the throne of republican England proved as much. By depicting the Dutch as ungodly hypocrites, pamphleteers also strengthened the image Englishmen had of themselves. This interplay between the self and Other is one dynamic in national stereotyping that the field of imagology traditionally studies.\textsuperscript{99} By formulating an Other’s hetero-image, a person (or people) also defined the auto-image of one’s self. The English affirmed their own righteousness as true Protestants and lovers of liberty – precisely because the Dutch were not. These images were not fixed; when England reverted back to a monarchy in 1660 pamphleteers described the English as loyal royalists and the Dutch suddenly became notorious republican radicals – even while the Dutch Republic had not undergone any political change during that period.

\textbf{The Dutchman’s character}

The database of \textit{Early English Books Online} contained twenty clear-cut Hollandophobic pamphlets published during the First Anglo-Dutch War. Only three poems could be truly called anti-Dutch polemic, instead of the more general rhymes focusing on English war prowess. Four accounts were published in the period 1652-1654, most of them relating to the
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Amboyna Massacre. The most common types of print were political tractates, concerned with the justification of the war or specific policies (six), and character pamphlets, ranging from broadside images to large booklets, displaying the different characteristics of the Dutch (seven). We can also find short references to Hollandophobic stereotypes in random works of print that are not concerned with anti-Dutch sentiment, such as rhyme books and other collections. These references consist of off-handed remarks, proverbs and well-known tropes, such as the lowness of the United Provinces.  

During this period, Hollandophobic pamphlets consisted mostly of negative character traits that were ascribed to the Dutch and political arguments justifying war. Textual tropes, such as name-calling and short references to larger-scale images, did appear in print, but their importance was limited. The low number of poems, wherein tropes usually were displayed, is a good indication of this. Descriptions of the Dutch character were not only limited to the ungodliness and false sense of principles we saw before. Hollandophobic pamphleteers pulled open an entire can of damning accusations to stereotype the Dutch as immoral enemies. The two pamphlets below illustrate the content and language character pamphlets used in their efforts to stereotype the Dutch.

The archetypical character sketch

The anonymous pamphlet Amsterdam and her other Hollander sisters put out to sea is one of the most comprehensive Hollandophobic character sketches of the seventeenth century, describing the Dutch in twelve clearly defined points (see image 3). The eleven page counting pamphlet was published in July 1652, at the onset of the war, to warn England of Dutch vices. It collected existing stereotypes of the first half of the century from older pamphlets and new characterizations that proved useful in the context of war, like ingratitude and cowardice. The concise and structured pamphlet was a useful source of inspiration for later pamphleteers and there are a few concrete examples of works being influenced by it.

The twelve points can be organized in six archetypical characteristics of the Dutch. As we have already seen, the Dutch were described as ungodly. They cared nothing for religion and tolerated every faith, as long as they would profit by it: ‘that’s their best God that brings the most Gold’. Instead, the Dutch were led by their insatiable covetousness for profit and
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power. They sucked like sponges all wealth of the world and would only release it after being squeezed tightly. No moral principles restricted them in their quest for profit, making them notoriously treacherous and cruel. From this immorality also stemmed Dutch ingratitude. It did not matter whether they betrayed allies or enemies, as long as the act was rewarding: ‘they deal with their best friends as they do with their Salads when they are ripe, cut them to pieces and devour them’. This greedy and unprincipled behaviour was accompanied by a great deal of misplaced pride. The insolent States General of the United Provinces called itself the High and Mighty, but was in fact little more than a distressed beggar in the streets. This was especially ironic, since the Dutch were in fact low; in their boorish behaviour, their drunken habits and simply because of the low marshland they lived in. ‘you may as well get a Wild Boar into a Dublet,’ the author finished his survey, ‘as to make one of those Borish Dutchmen to button his Dublet.’

There is not much information available to contextualize the source. It was, however, most likely not a piece of official propaganda. We do not know the author, but the piece was published by Richard Harper, a minor bookseller of popular ballads and pamphlets. There are no visible connections between him and the Commonwealth regime when studying his merchandise. In fact, Harper sold multiple works critical to the Parliamentarians during the English Civil War. The author himself criticised the Dutch for being traitors and rebels to their prince, which was hardly an argument that English republicans would propagate so soon after the execution of their own monarch, Charles I. It is therefore plausible that the pamphlet was an independent work, written after the author witnessed the publication of other Hollandophobic pamphlets in earlier years.
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Popularity of characterizations

One of these works that inspired the character sketch of the Dutch was the widely known travel account of Owen Felltham, *A brief character of the Low-Countries under the states*. It had the popular form of a character, giving a satirical and generalized impression of the Dutch people. Felltham was an essayist and poet with strong royalist sentiments. He did not participate actively in the English Civil War and following Interregnum, instead staying absent from political struggle. Felltham wrote the small booklet somewhere around 1623-1628, after visiting the country in a three week trip. It first circulated in manuscript form, before two pirated versions appeared in print in 1648 and 1652, without the approval of the author. This sparked the first authorized edition of the pamphlet in 1652, when war between England and the United Provinces had broken out and a good market had appeared in London for anti-Dutch books. The pamphlet was not initially written as Hollandophobic propaganda and it had not been the author’s intent to support the Commonwealth’s war. However, at the time of publication it could be appropriated as such. The pamphlet was extremely popular and went through many reprints, such as in 1659, 1660, 1662 and 1671. The work was renamed in 1672 as *Batavia: or the Hollander displayed*. More editions followed in 1675, 1677 and 1680, with the last one of the century appearing in 1697.

In the pamphlet we find – apart from the incidental praise of Dutch virtues – many of the stereotypical characterizations that Hollandophobic pamphleteers from the second half of the seventeenth century used to damn the Dutch. The pamphlet began with a much-quoted description of the Low Countries:

‘They are a general Sea-Land. The great Bog of Europe. There is no such another Marsh in the world; that’s flat. They are an universall Quagmire; A green Cheese in pickle.’

---


104 This last edition mentioned neither printer or seller, indicating the makers were not keen on publishing an anti-Dutch tract under their own names during the reign of the Dutch William III. Snippets of the book can also be found in *A trip to Holland being a description of the country, people and manners* (1699).


106 O. Felltham, *A brief character of the Low-Countries under the states* (1652) 1, 2.
The country was so low that the inhabitants of the wretched land were closer to Hell than any other nation in the world. This lowness was transferred onto the Dutch themselves, who were boorish and churlish, ‘bred before manners were in fashion’.\textsuperscript{107} Despite this fact, they still pretended to possess a noble ancestry, a testament to Dutch misplaced pride. Most likely fuelled by reports of Anglo-Dutch rivalry across the globe, Felltham already stated in the 1620s that the Dutch were foremost led by greed and self-interest. He commented, with no slight degree of jealousy, on the wealth that was openly displayed in Holland, tying perfectly within the English perceptions of the covetous Dutch who were hording gold.

Being a conservative Anglican, Felltham found the multitude of religions in Holland distressing. It seemed faith always came second in the United Provinces, for ‘Their Countrey is the God they worship.’\textsuperscript{108} Amsterdam was described as a marketplace for all sects. This toleration showed the Dutch lack of principles: ‘as the Chameleon changes into all Colours but white: so they admit of all Religions but the True.’\textsuperscript{109} The phrasing in 	extit{Amsterdam and her other Hollander sisters put out to sea} when discussing Dutch religion was very similar to Felltham’s pamphlet, showing the author was familiar with the popular travel account. Because 	extit{A brief character of the Low-Countries under the states} was written in the 1620s, without a historical context of open warfare, it lacked the principal focus on ingratitude that other character pamphlets displayed. Most of the other characterizations were already present at this time within the booklet’s pages, although less structured than the pamphlets from 1652.

\textbf{Ideology and trade as justifications of war}

Narratives ascribing negative attributes to the Dutch character, however, did not constitute a reason to go to war. Pamphleteers needed more acute arguments that would justify armed conflict with the detestable United Provinces. Two main reasons were brought forward in print why war was unavoidable, aligning neatly with the interpretations of causes the different historians have suggested. These revolved predominantly around ideology and trade, and were propagated in longer political tractates.

\textit{Royalism}

Many writers who looked favourable upon the Commonwealth accused the Dutch of being secret supporters of monarchy, fearing they would betray their republican ideals and attack England. Dutch actions had done very little to take away these fears. The United Provinces

\textsuperscript{107} Ibidem, 30.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibidem, 26, 27.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibidem, 46.
had remained neutral in Parliament’s conflict with the Stuarts, and after the English Civil War came to an end, it had opened its borders for royalist exiles. Historian Helmer Helmers showed that most Dutch people voiced support for the royalist cause in printed public opinion, even though they lived in a republic themselves. Furthermore, Helmers argued there existed a united *Anglo-Scoto-Dutch* public sphere, meaning English pamphleteers and writers were well aware of pro-royalist works circulating in print.¹¹⁰ This republican uneasiness in England with supposed Dutch royalist sympathies – corresponding to Pincus’ ideological explanation of the war – was clearly distinguishable as a justification of war in the Hollandophobic discourse.

When explaining why war was necessary, the tractate *Englands command on the seas* criticised the Dutch in 1653 for: ‘the harbouring and maintaining the publick Enemies of our State, their common sending in Arms, and all manner of warlike provision into Scotland’.¹¹¹ Not only had the Dutch taken in royalists, such as Charles Stuart himself, they had also aided him in his efforts to retake the British Isles. Francis Osborne, a sympathiser of Parliament, wrote in 1652 a treatise on Dutch ingratitude. Claiming he was not paid for the work, he condemned Dutch closeness with Charles II: ‘you adhered to the King of Scots (…), you let the ribald Penne vomit out floods of reproaches, in hope to destroy this Nation’.¹¹² Ballads, too, took up the theme of royalism in their anti-Dutch rhymes. The war poem *Brandy-wine, in the Hollanders ingratitude*, observed that the High and Mighty States General were of a royal mind, inclined to monarchy. The author exclaimed baffled:

‘Thou meanst t’advance again the Progenie,  
of STUART’s Line, oh! that is brave I’le sweare  
To thinke that wee should a dead Lyon feare’.¹¹³

The author, only known as ‘J.W.’, discussed the harbouring of royalist exiles extensively, wondering what friendship was displayed when the enemies of the Commonwealth were allowed to take shelter in the bosom of the United Provinces from where they could conduct their harmful plots: ‘On all occasions, still thy Townes have bin / As Sanctuaries, to take Traytors in.’¹¹⁴ Commonwealth pamphleteers told the story of how the English had aided the Dutch to free themselves from monarchical tyranny. Now, when England was undergoing the

---

¹¹² F. Osborne, *A seasonable expostulation with the Netherlands* (1652) 7.
¹¹⁴ Ibidem, 7.
same struggle, the Dutch did not repay their debt. Instead, they turned to the deposed Stuarts, betraying their republican allies. This ingratitude endangered England and the newly established regime. Only war could put the Dutch back in place and revert them back to true freedom.

Commercial rivalry
The argument of royalism, which was used from 1649 onwards, was supplemented by the much older theme of Dutch trading practices. Maritime friction surrounding trade – the causes of the war that Israel and Wilson emphasized – was discussed substantially within print. Critique of this kind centred around the idea that Dutch avarice was insatiable and that they would labour to obtain all the trade in the world, to the detriment of English interests and prosperity. Already in 1600 there existed commercial objections against the Dutch. At the turn of the century anti-Dutch libel had mostly targeted the community of immigrants in London. As these migrants assimilated, attention shifted to Dutch merchants across the North Sea. The main commercial objections against the Dutch voiced by anti-Dutch pamphleteers in the First Anglo-Dutch War were foreshadowed by writing of the first quarter of the seventeenth century. These varied from the Dutch practice of trading with England’s enemies, fishing in British waters, the cheap and competitive shipping that limited English commerce, and the rivalry over trade routes in the East Indies.115 Charles Wilson stated that these commercial irritations formed something of an ‘embryo’ of the later Dutch wars.116 They did not amount to war sooner, because many in the English nation, especially the Puritan community, did not desire to jeopardize England’s necessary struggle against the true enemy, Spain. Dutch offenses were tolerated because the United Provinces were fighting against the Catholic power.117

When peace with Spain was concluded in 1648, this argument in favour of the Dutch fell away. This opened up the possibility for pamphleteers to use traditional enemy images that vilified the Spanish in their narratives, applying them to the Dutch instead (see image 4). The advocate, for instance, compared Dutch trading practices with Spanish tyranny. The work was written by Benjamin Worsley, acting secretary to the newly established Council of Trade. It was a defence of the Navigation Act, intended to limit Dutch shipping. The piece possessed very clearly governmental ties; the coat-of-arms of the Commonwealth adorned the cover

116 Wilson, Profit and Power, 23.
sheet and it was published by the printer of the Council of State. The pamphlet mostly rehearsed old arguments from the beginning of the century, without containing very volatile language, but one paragraph stood out:

‘It hath been a thing for many years generally received, That the Design of Spain (...) is, to get the Universal Monarchie of Christendom. Nor is it a thing less true (...) that our Neighbors (the Dutch) (...) have, likewise, for som years, aimed to laie a foundation to themselves for ingrossing the Universal Trade, not onely of Christendom, but indeed, of the greater part of the known world; that so they might poiz the Affairs of any other State about them’.\textsuperscript{118}

The Dutch were trying to gain as much trade as possible with the purpose of becoming masters over all, similarly to what the Spanish had attempted half a century earlier. Nedham voiced the same concerns. There could be only one purpose for the Dutch trying to monopolizing all trade: ‘to have all the world their slaves (...) and to shut up the commerce of the world from any but themselves’.\textsuperscript{119} This aim of mastery over the world was of course highly resented. ‘Was ever so high an Intrusion offered’, Osborne wondered in \textit{A seasonable expostulation with the Netherlands}, ‘as for a Neighbour to prescribe how another should be regulated in matter of Trade’?\textsuperscript{120}

\textbf{Image 4: The broadside \textit{Dr Dorislaw’s ghost} (1652).} The illustration represented Dutch crimes against the English, such as the Amboyna Massacre. The picture borrowed heavily from Hispanophobic sources, such as the composition of the Dutch ambassador and the image of admiral Tromp’s attack on the English fleet, resembling the Spanish Armada. See: Nocentelli, ‘The Dutch Black Legend’, 359, 360. Duffy, \textit{The Englishman and the Foreigner}, 29, 58, 78.

\textsuperscript{118} B. Worsley, \textit{The advocate} (1652) 1. The first edition appeared a year earlier.
\textsuperscript{119} Nedham, \textit{The case stated between England and the United Provinces}, 52.
\textsuperscript{120} Osborne, \textit{A seasonable expostulation with the Netherlands}, 8.
These claims of the Dutch trying to create a universal trade dominion were influenced by the notion of ‘universal monarchy’, present in the discourse of Hispanophobia at the beginning of the century. According to this argument, the foreign politics of the Spanish kings were aimed at creating a Spanish hegemony in Europe, dominating all other nations. This notion was transferred to the Dutch in the latter half of the seventeenth century, as a result of faltering Spanish strength and rapidly increasing Dutch commercial power. Around this time Europeans started to see commerce as the key to the accumulation of power, since the revenues of trade could be used to maintain large armies. It might seem odd to accuse a republic of establishing a universal monarchy. However, this notion was applied with relative ease by pamphleteers, since the United Provinces were considered to be more powerful than any monarch. The anonymous author of the emotion-filled *The seas magazine opened* warned his loving countrymen that action was vital to curb Dutch designs:

‘if we suffer them to climb to the height of their ambition, which no King nor Emperour can prevent, they will increase so great a strength (...) they will engross the trade of Christendome into their own hands, and upon the matter administer Laws to the most Kings thereof’. 

Both commercial and ideological interpretations of the First Anglo-Dutch War possess a grounding in the corpus of Hollandophobic sources, though the question remains how genuine both arguments were as a cause of war. Pamphleteers who depicted perceived Dutch royalism as a fundamental threat to English liberties served the clear purpose of deconstructing the closeness between England and the United Provinces in order to facilitate conflict. These concerns over Dutch apathy towards the English republican regime might have played a part in the decision to go to war, but without the material interests of English commerce and security, they hardly constituted reason enough to sever all cordial Anglo-Dutch relations.

**Pamphlets and authority**

In this chapter we have seen that pamphleteers used a wide range of different pamphlet types to propagate these arguments of war, each work of print having a different context of creation and connection to governmental authority. For example, information about *Amsterdam and
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her other Hollander sisters put out to sea is scarce, but the pamphlet was most likely written on the author’s own initiative. Felltham did not write *A brief character of the Low-Countries under the states* as Hollandophobic propaganda to support the republican regime. When his travel account appeared in print without his knowledge, he was forced to publish his own version. Financial incentives could have played an important role in this decision, since the market for anti-Dutch pamphlets was thriving in 1652. Francis Osborne wrote that he was not paid by the government, instead being motivated to write in its defence out of a genuine willingness to support the Commonwealth. There also existed closer connections between Parliament and pamphleteers. The republican regime took great efforts to legitimize the war with the United Provinces. In these efforts politicians depended on unofficial pamphlets, secretly commissioned by the state, to write the libel that a civilized state could not actively produce itself – lest it would lose its diplomatic credibility. This relation reveals itself when we look at the official declaration of war and Nedham’s *The case stated between England and the United Provinces* in tandem.

*A declaration of the parliament of the Commonwealth of England* was the official pamphlet that sounded the bells of war in July 1652. It was a relative mild work of print, lacking extreme volatile language. It discussed a number of familiar topics, from English aid during the Dutch Revolt, the horrors of the Amboyna Massacre, the proposed union of the two countries to Dutch encroachment upon the English seas. The pamphlet showed a great degree of reluctance in proclaiming the war. It suggested that Parliament had tried to maintain peace, but was in the end necessitated ‘into a most unwelcome War’. The declaration was primarily concerned with justifying war, not with vilifying the enemy. For this, Parliament relied on authors in their employ, such as Marchamont Nedham. Nedham was not restricted by diplomatic or pragmatic considerations and could act freely under the cover of anonymity. Published in the same year, *The case stated between England and the United Provinces* discussed exactly the same themes as the official tract, but in more detail and with more inflammatory language. Dutch ingratitude and betrayal figured largely within the pages, including: ‘the many intolerable injuries, depredations and Murthers committed on severall of the English Nation’. Nedham’s purpose was to distance England from ‘those People’ and show that an alliance between the two countries was far from possible. The pamphlet influenced people because it conformed to the official narrative of the war, repeating the same

---

themes over and over again. Nedham used more volatile language to whip up war fervour and anti-Dutch sentiment, necessary to overcome the perceived religious and political likeness of the two countries.

Vilifying the Dutch was still a novelty for most English people. That the proliferation of anti-Dutch pamphlets served mainly a political purpose can be seen by how quickly the negative stereotype subsided once peace was concluded. The majority of the Hollandophobic sources appeared in the initial year of the war. Political tractates and character pamphlets, used to disprove the sameness between the English and the Dutch, were the pamphlet types used most often. There was no place for entertaining ballads in the unprecedented propaganda campaign. Already in late 1653 we see few new sources appear, a sign that war was coming to an end. A year later, when peace was officially concluded, there were no new pamphlets with an outspoken Hollandophobic character published. In 1655, printed works mentioning the Dutch – either in a positive, negative or off-handed manner – were at an all-time low in the seventeenth century. Parliament was quick to forget the characterization of the Dutch it had propagated during the war. Oliver Cromwell, having become Lord Protector in 1654, reinstated the United Provinces as a Protestant state with a common foe; ‘our enemies’ no longer referred to Dutchmen, but to the Catholic states surrounding both Commonwealths.126 ‘This is the happiest Newes indeed,’ a celebratory poem repeated time after time, ‘The Dutchmen will be friends with us, / and wee’l be friends with them’.127 This friendship proved to be short-lived.

126 O. Cromwell, His highnesse the Lord Protector’s speech to the parliament in the painted chamber (1654) 37.
127 Wilson, Profit and Power, 76, 77.
127 Anon, Joyfull newes for England, and all other parts of Christendome (1654).
Chapter 3. Depicting the Dutch stereotype: the Second Anglo-Dutch War
(1665-1667)

‘Poor Flemish Frogs, if Your Ambition thirst,
To swell to English Greatness, You will burst’\textsuperscript{128}

When Charles II came to the throne in the Restoration of 1660, many in the States General had assumed relations with England would turn for the better. This proved to be a vain hope. There might have been a new government in England, old complaints troubling relations between the two countries still reigned supreme. Friction surrounding trade and the rights of fishing in the North Sea continued, and disputes about English sovereignty over the seas and colonial possessions around the globe impeded a closer union. When the English expanded their colonial ventures in West-Africa, seizing forts and ships – with the Dutch repaying in kind – war seemed imminent.\textsuperscript{129} The Anglican monarchy appeared just as willing to go to war to protect its interests as the Puritan republic a decade earlier. In 1665, war was officially declared by the States General, leading to multiple large naval battles, such as the Battle of Lowestoft (June 1665), the Four Days’ Battle (June 1666) and the St. James’ Day Battle (July 1666), culminating into the daring raid of the Dutch on the Medway in June, 1667.

Historians have discerned similar causes for the war of 1665 to the ones suggested for the First Anglo-Dutch War. Wilson and Israel stated the English merchants loathed the Dutch dominant position in overseas trade and were keen on levelling the playing field. Tensions increased over traditional trade conflicts, such as colonial rivalry. English merchants tried to gain a stronger foothold in Africa and the East-Indies, but these efforts were hampered by Dutch competitors. As a result, the London mercantile community put pressure on the new regime to start a war with the Dutch, hoping to weaken them.\textsuperscript{130} Rommelse believed court factions, consisting of ambitious courtiers and mercantile companies, lobbied for war in the name of national interest and mercantilism, accompanied with a healthy dose of anti-Dutch sentiment. They argued that the protection of English commercial interests was vital to the survival of the new Restoration government, hoping to gain personal profit from propagating war. Charles II supported this agenda because his incomes were tied to customs and excises,

\textsuperscript{128} R. Wilde, A gratulatory verse upon our late glorious victory over the Dutch (1665).
\textsuperscript{129} For a detailed survey of the war and its prelude, see: G. Rommelse, The Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667): Raison d’état, mercantilism and maritime strife (Hilversum 2006), especially chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{130} J. Israel, Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585-1740 (Oxford 1989) 269-279. Wilson, Profit and Power, 90-126.
and because he needed the extra funds to reward supporters and consolidate his reign. The king, most of his ministers, ambitious courtiers, naval officers and chartered companies were all eager to go to war.\textsuperscript{131}

Pincus argued that many London merchants were not enthusiastic about the prospects of armed conflict; they formulated few grievances against the Dutch and were well aware of the disrupting consequences war would bring for their businesses. Instead, Pincus explained the war with ideological considerations of the Anglican Royalists. The Dutch were seen as radical republicans and ungodly supporters of religious heterodoxy, which were the two beliefs that had engulfed England during the hated Interregnum. Anglican Royalist ministers, courtiers and merchants believed the Dutch were pursuing a universal dominion of the world’s trade and that they supported fanatical and republican friends in England.\textsuperscript{132}

Whoever the precise instigators were, the war proved to be very popular in its first years and sparked a whole range of enthusiastic war pamphlets, expressing war fervour and insulting the Dutch enemy. This altered self-image of the English also changed the way in which pamphleteers pictured the Dutch. Suddenly the United Provinces were no longer seen as covert allies of royalism, but as hated enemies of the English monarchy. The Dutch were radical rebels, even though the Dutch Republic was the same as it had been a decade ago. Since these depictions had not been a reflection of reality to begin with, such a stark shift could be made without serious repercussions.

\textbf{Restoration pamphlets}

During the Second Anglo-Dutch War more printed works depicting anti-Dutch images were published than a decade earlier. There appeared at least thirty-eight pamphlets that could be described as Hollandophobic for the period of 1665-1667. Almost all of these were poems (thirty-two), either broadside ballads or longer verses. These were supplemented by only three political tractates, two character pamphlets and one account. This corpus of texts thus differed widely with that of the First Anglo-Dutch War, where almost no anti-Dutch poems were printed. This difference is too great to be the result of random variation in the collections of sources, meaning it must be historically explained.


These Restoration poems were written as a reaction to specific historical events; they dealt mostly with naval battles and their aftermaths, celebrating English victories extensively. In the Puritan republic this practice of ridiculing the Dutch in victory poems was almost absent. This indicates that the new royalist regime placed more importance in the use of poems to propagate support for the war and the government. Furthermore, popular support for war with the United Provinces was higher in Restoration England than it had been a decade earlier. Englishmen in 1665 had a precedence of fighting the Dutch to fall back to, whereas the parliamentarian regime had been necessitated to break with the historical tradition of Dutch closeness. Ballads were short and accessible, but they lacked any coherent argumentation, meaning they were not well suited to convince a sceptic people of the righteousness of one’s own position. The large amount of entertaining poems and negligible number of political tractates suggests that Restoration pamphleteers were less concerned with creating popular support than they were with maintaining existing war fervour.

My proposition that Hollandophobia had become more widespread during the Second Anglo-Dutch War is supported by quantitative data from the EEBO database. In the period 1652-1654 more sources mentioning the Dutch (either positively or negatively) were published than in 1665-1667, both in absolute and relative terms (see Appendix 2). However, there appeared more clear-cut Hollandophobic pamphlets in this second period – even though the total amount of relevant topical works was lower (see Appendix 3). This means more authors expressed anti-Dutch sentiment in 1665 than ever before. The fact that they did so in entertaining works that were not intended to persuade readers with arguments, suggested this sentiment was shared with large portions of the English people.

The Hollandophobic stereotype: character and trope

The negative characterizations formulated during the First Anglo-Dutch War, such as ingratitude, ungodliness and boorishness, remained largely in place a decade later. Because of the many aggressive commercial conflicts prior to the official declaration of war in 1665, English pamphleteers depicted the Dutch insatiable covetousness for profit as a fundamental vice that caused many other shortcomings. The Dutch were untrustworthy neighbours, ungrateful allies and unbelieving Christians, since gain came before any moral or religious principle. The short character sketch Of a Dutchman, appearing in a political treatise on Dutch ingratitude, began its text with this argument:
‘He is an unfinisht man, or else one that Nature made less then [sic] others (...). A right Dutchman can never be a true Friend, a Loyal subject, or a good Neighbour; for his Trade carryes away his heart; riches his Allegiance, and thieving his soul’.133

A whole range of other characteristics was used to reinforce this notion of Dutch untrustworthiness. The manner in which these traits were described, however, was not identical to that of a decade earlier.

The change in pamphlet type highly influenced the way in which the anti-Dutch stereotype was shaped in this period. Existing Hollandophobic characterizations were expanded upon and enriched by literary tropes that were stereotypical in nature. The poems of Restoration pamphleteers were built around short, witty tropes, rehearsing numerous common names to denote and degrade the Dutch. They were often connected to individual character traits, meaning the whole Dutch nature could be reduced to a collection of unflattering textual images. Misplaced pride was described with the title of the States General, High and Mighty, and with the lion adorning the coat-of-arms of the United Provinces. Pamphleteers casted the Dutch as boors and boars to denote their low nature, and depicted them as frogs in a bog to ridicule their low land. Dutch Drunkenness was called upon whenever authors slipped the word ‘brandy’ into their texts. Furthermore, the Dutch were called ungodly, non-European and they were referred to as butter-boxes. These tropes also figured in the Hollandophobic sources of 1652-1654, but they played a much less prominent role than they did a decade later.

**Pride**

Restoration pamphleteers went to great lengths to reveal the unnatural pride inherent in every Dutchman. Accompanying this pride was the republican desire for a universal dominion, placing the Dutch Republic above all other states and kingdoms. These accusations of Dutch pride were already prevalent in Puritan England, but they surged to the forefront when England had reverted back to a monarchy. After all, English royalists thought, how could the republican Dutch justify their haughty behaviour in the face of a proper king? John Crouch, a royalist poet and bookseller, wrote in 1665 *Belgica Caracteristica*, possibly in an effort to acquire courtly patronage. The poem revealed the English concerns over republican pride:

‘Convince us why Republicks Priviledg’d are
T’usurpe the wide Sea, and the wider Ayre:? (…) You think the Narrow Seas for us too much,
Yet the whole Globe too little for the Dutch.’

The combination of pride and republicanism made the United Provinces a dangerous threat to Restoration England, and pamphleteers were keen on displaying this fact to their readers. The characteristic of ingratitude, the centrepiece of Hollandophobia in the 1650s, was woven into this narrative. In their pride, the Dutch laboured to put down the very people who had raised them up during their struggle against Spain. ‘Tell me (then Low-Dutch),’ Crouch continued, ‘Who you blest Midwife was; I trow, a Queen, / Or you had never High, and Mighty been.’

Elkanah Settle reminded his readers that it had been England that had aided the Dutch: ‘To change from poor distressed, by our Fates, / They’ve crown’d themselves the High and Mighty States’

Hollandophobic pamphleteers made much of the title the States General bestowed upon themselves. The ‘High and Mighty’, originally in Dutch ‘Hoogmogende’, became a popular trope in anti-Dutch rhymes, forming a byword for Dutch arrogance and misplaced pride. Often translated into bastardized Dutch, these ‘Hogan Mogan’ States used a title that was traditionally reserved for God Almighty alone, which fitted within the stereotype of Dutch ungodliness. ‘thy Pride hath ascended up to Heaven it self,’ the prophecy pamphlet The Dutch nebuchadnezzar proclaimed disapprovingly, ‘designing to [be] like the Most Highest, Thou alone intrenching upon Divine Omnipotency, in that haughty Title, (which other Princes blush to assume) High and Mighty.’

Robert Wilde was a satirical poet and nonconformist minister, but he supported the Restoration regime. He wrote a light-hearted celebratory poem on the occasion of the English victory at the Battle of Lowestoft in 1665, congratulating King Charles and his brother. The pamphlet made clever use of letter size, shrinking and inflating words to indicate how high the Dutch had risen – to England’s detriment, of course:
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‘Ingrateful Neighbors! ‘twas Our kinder Isle,  
With Her own Blood, made you Geneva Stile  
Writ in small Print (Poor States and sore perplex)  
Swell to the (HIGH AND MIGHTY LORDS) in Text’.\(^{138}\)

Proud as the Dutch might have become, pamphleteers promised their readers the English would set things right again. The officially approved broadside ballad *The Dutch damnified: or, the butter-boxes bob’d* celebrated Sir Robert Holmes’ raid on the Dutch Vlie estuary in August 1666. It repeated after each stanza: ‘Hogan Mogans b’ware your Pates, For now we shall make you distressed States,’\(^{139}\) In the same month, Andrew Marvell, the famous Commonwealth poet who survived the Restoration relatively unscathed, ended his licensed poem on the naval battles of 1666 by stating heaven itself: ‘will in time teach the proud Dutch to know / That Those who rais’d them High, can lay them Low.’\(^{140}\)

Another textual trope tied to the characteristic of pride was that of the ‘Belgick lion’. The coat-of-arms of the United Provinces sported a rampant lion, similarly to many of the individual Dutch provinces. It was ridiculed for its false pretensions; the proud beast was barely fitting to represent such a vile people. The lengthy poem *Seasonable thoughts in sad times*, printed in 1667, called the Dutch lion a ‘poor sneaking Curr’. The English had ‘succour’d him until he freedom knew, / Shook chain, and Master off, and Rampant grew’.\(^{141}\)

It was up to the English to tame the ungrateful beast back into submission. Pamphleteers depicted England as Sampson and the Duke of York as Hercules, since both had slain lions in myths.\(^{142}\) Other poems stated that England was the true lion, since it also displayed the noble beast in its heraldry. Abraham Markland, a young clergyman in Oxford, felt the need to contribute to popular war fervour by writing a poem of his own. In it, he argued:

‘The Belgians shall no more their Lyon bear;  
For now ‘tis plainly seen,  
That We the Lyons were,

\(^{138}\) Wilde, *A gratulatory verse upon our late glorious victory.*  
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And they but Asses in the Lyon’s Skin.¹⁴³

A low country, a low people

The impact of these accusations of pride was reinforced by depicting the Dutch as a complete opposite to that of a high and mighty people. Writers argued that the Dutch were low in nature and manners, likening them to the low and marshy land they lived in. They were more akin to frogs and boars than proud lions. The peculiar geography of the Low Countries, with its many marshes, swamps and polders, was well-known in England as a result of the many travellers visiting the country. Authors made use of this knowledge when describing how climate influenced the inhabitants of the swathe of marshland. The Dutch, for example, were closer to Hell simply because their land was so low. As a consequence, the Dutch were depicted as standing in lower regard than the English. An anonymous poem wrote after the Dutch defeat at the Battle of Lowestoft in 1665:

‘Holland which hence must know,
Why Natures hand plac’d her so low;
And thereby bids her to Obey,
Nor Scepter ever hope to Sway;
Since th’highest Fabricks of her Land,
Lie level with our low dejected Strand.’¹⁴⁴

It was a common practice to ridicule the amphibious nature of the United Provinces. Hollandophobic poets feigned difficulty when they needed to define the country, because it seemed both land and water at the same time. The quagmire of Holland was ‘A Country questioned in Geography / If of Gods making or of Mans it be’.¹⁴⁵ This trope was also prevalent in Andrew Marvell’s The character of Holland. He wrote the poem in 1653 to support his application for the office of Latin Secretary in the Commonwealth regime. It was printed for the first time after Lowestoft in June 1665, slightly edited to remove the obvious references to the Interregnum and to insert the names of the English admirals who fought in

¹⁴⁴ Anon, Upon his royal highnesse his late victory against the Dutch (1665) 3.
¹⁴⁵ J.H., Castor and Pollux.
the Second Anglo-Dutch War.\textsuperscript{146} It is unclear whether Marvell himself was behind the alterations and publication of his work, or if someone else sent it to the printer without his knowledge.\textsuperscript{147} Given the fact that Marvell wrote another anti-Dutch poem only a year later suggests the former. It shows, together with works like Felltham’s travel account, that earlier works of Hollandophobic print could be appropriated in later times to fulfil the role of polemic. The poem’s first verse already displayed its opinion on the Dutch country: ‘Holland, that scarce deserves the name of Land’. It was no more than ‘indigested Vomit of the Sea’, a mistake that nature itself was ashamed of. The amphibious country influenced the Dutch inhabitants greatly; it prevented them from accepting a proper monarch and it caused a multitude of false religions. The Hollanders were transformed into ‘Half-anders’, who were half wet and half dry, and consequentially did not adhere to either obedience or liberty.\textsuperscript{148}

Because the Dutch lived in a marshland, Hollandophobic poets enjoyed to depict them as frogs – rhyming of course nicely with ‘bogs’.\textsuperscript{149} Meijer Drees stated the publication that first sparked the frequent frog-symbolism in England was the fable of John Ogilby, \textit{Of the frogs fearing the sun would marry}, first printed in 1665 (see image 5).\textsuperscript{150} The work was certainly influential. Ogilby, tied loosely to the Restoration regime with some minor office titles, was a poet and publisher of classical works. In 1667 he reworked the classical fable into an anti-Dutch pamphlet on the occasion of the Second Anglo-Dutch War. \textit{The old exchange to the new stadt house}, its title referring to the scene wherein the froglike Dutch gather at the new town hall on the Dam to croak in panic, was filled with the frog-symbolism. The first two lines already set the tone: ‘Low Country Provinces, united Bogs, / Once distrest States, now Hogen Mogen Frogs’. The pamphlet told the story of how the wealthy frogs had heard the sun would marry. Fearing their marsh would dry up as a result of the increased heat, they gathered in front of Amsterdam’s town hall, praying to the heathen god Neptune for protection. He answered that they should not fear the sun in the sky, but that they should worry about a second sun that was rising in the west, referring to the English Charles II. Ogilby worried that

\textsuperscript{148} A. Marvell, \textit{The character of Holland}, 1-7.
\textsuperscript{149} Haley, \textit{The British and the Dutch}, 108. Schama, \textit{The Embarrassment of Riches}, 263, 264. For some references to the frog-trope, see: Gayton, \textit{The glorious and living cinque-ports} 1, 2. W. Smith, \textit{A poem on the famous ship called the Loyal London} (1666) 6. Wilde, \textit{A gratulatory verse upon our late glorious victory}.
\textsuperscript{150} J. Ogilby, \textit{The fables of Aesop paraphras’d in verse} (1665) 207-211. Meijer Drees, \textit{Andere landen, andere mensen}, 127-129. For further influence of this fable in Europe, see also: P. Smith, \textit{Embleemfabels in de Nederlanden} (1567-ca. 1670) (Hilversum 2006) 105-107.
the Dutch would ‘undo the World by Trade: / Four Frogs, two Tod-pols, and one greasy
Toad’. This leaves us to wonder which of the seven provinces was figured by the toad –
probably Holland as the most prominent one – and which ones by the two little tadpoles.151

Altough Ogilby’s altered fable perhaps used the literary trope of the Dutch frogs the
most extensive of all Hollandophobic pamphlets, it was not the first one to do so. Already
before the 1660s there existed works that depicted the Dutch as croaking creatures. Felltham
wrote in the first half of the seventeenth century that the Dutch ‘like frogs can live both on
land and water.’152 Due to the biblical plagues of Egypt, it was already common to use frogs
as a negative image. ‘Neither had I ever wished the charming of those Froggs’, Francis
Osborne wrote in 1652 about his Dutch neighbours across the sea, ‘but that I see them so
ready to become an Egyptian plague unto us, by croaking against us in our own Waters.’153 It
does appear that the use of this frog-symbolism increased during the Second Anglo-Dutch
War, but the same could be said about all other literary tropes, such as references to boars.

Image 5: Etching accompanying Ogilby’s original fable in The fables of Aesop paraphras’d in verse. It was not included in the reworked pamphlet of 1667. The image depicts an assembly of Dutch frogs on the Dam in front of the new town hall, surrounded by statues of the heathen god Neptune. Copied from: B. Westerweel (ed.), Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem (Leiden 1997) 80.

151 J. Ogilby, The old exchange to the new stadt house: or, the frogs are in fear that the sun should marry (1667) 2-4.
152 Felltham, A brief character of the Low-Countries, 41.
153 Osborne, A seasonable expostulation with the Netherlands, 2.
In the late sixteenth century Dutch pamphleteers had identified the Spanish enemy with boars and pigs.  

During the seventeenth century the English adopted this imagery to depict the Dutch rivals themselves. The main reason behind this appropriation was most likely the linguistic resemblance with the English word ‘boor’, which was traditionally used to describe the Dutch unmannered and lowborn nature in travel journals and the Elizabethan theatre at the turn of the century. The vulgar broadside *The Dutch boare dissected*, for instance, provided a description of Holland, or ‘Hogg-land’, rife with the boorish trope. The anonymous author called the Dutch quagmire: ‘A Land of Bogs / To breed up Hogs’. Dutchmen showed their low pedigree in their crude behaviour: ‘An Hollander is not an Highlander, but a Lowlander; for he loves to be down in the Dirt, and Boar-like, to wallow therein.’

Frogs or boars; some pamphleteers wondered whether the Dutch could truly be identified. *Quaeries: or a dish of pickled herring*, a collection of satirical questions, claimed it had been printed at Amsterdam ‘for the use of the High and Mighty States of Holland’, though this was likely just another sarcastic remark – the pages were filled with scurrilous polemic to ridicule the Dutch. It wondered for instance ‘Whether it would not puzzle a Phylosopher to define a Dutchman, whether fish or flesh’, since he drew his food and breath equally from water as from land.  

Likening the Dutch to fish was useful, because this way authors could connect their enemies to both naval battles and old irritations over the fishing trade. John Birkenhead wrote for instance after the English victory on St. James’ Day in 1666: ‘Six thousand Dutch (a Low Country Dish) / we sent to their own Cozen the Fish’. Literary tropes such as *frogs, bogs, boars* and *boors* were primarily used to ridicule the Dutch, reducing their worth and relevance on the international stage. This in turn inflated the English self-worth; England was much stronger than the half-drowning Dutchmen in their pitiful country. Thus, the Dutch *could* easily be defeated and, more importantly, they *should* be defeated. This was ordained by nature itself, after all.
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156 Anon, *Quaeries: or, a dish of pickled-herring*, 4.  
The drunken Dutchman’s spirit

Already in the early Elizabethan era existed the popular belief that the Dutch were notorious drunkards, even more so than the English themselves. This image was consolidated in theatre stereotypes of Dutch characters and in travel journals. Restoration England was no different in this respect and many poems commented on the Hollanders’ excessive use of brandy. ‘They hate Drink, as the parched Earth does Rain’, a short character sketch remarked, ‘they are a living Spunge soused in Liquour’. Markland satirized the English victory over the Dutch fleet during the St. James’ Day Battle by referring to Dutch drinking habits: ‘The leaking Belgian Fleet with Water fills, / As though its Masters too it would out-drink’. Markland also commented on the Dutch amphibious nature, stating Dutchmen: ‘drink so deep, you’d almost swear / The Fisher-men themselves the Fishes were.’

During the Anglo-Dutch conflicts this drunkenness was connected to accusations of cowardice. Pamphleteers argued the Dutch were natural cowards, only daring to face the brave English when being drunk. ‘How their lost Brandy troubles them we guesse’, the poem Bellum Belgicum secundum predicted at the start of the war, ‘Their sources of valour flows from drunkennesse’. Another war poem echoed the same sentiment when rhyming: ‘Dead drunk they are, when e’re they dare to die, / And will not Fight, but when they cannot flie’. Because the Dutch lacked natural spirit, they needed to digest a substitute. A pamphlet asked itself whether a Dutchman: ‘may be now said to be a man of Spirit, since that failing him he lost his courage; neither hath he seldome any but what he borroweth from Brandy?’

Appearing throughout all three Anglo-Dutch Wars in poems that glorified the own nation, the characteristic of cowardice seemed to be more of a general enemy image than a unique trait in the Dutch stereotype – though the connection with drunkenness was less generic. Indeed, ‘Dutch courage’ is still an expression in modern Britain today. The term itself did not originate in the seventeenth century, but the principle of alcohol-induced courage and its connotation with the Dutch did. This shows how a rather insignificant stereotypical image could survive for ages as long as it was rehearsed often enough to stick in people’s minds. In time, when the origin of the image was forgotten, the stereotype lost its Hollandophobic
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connotation and was given a second life as a general expression in the English language, without any meaningful feelings attached to it.

**Butter-boxes**

Derived from the Dutch habit of serving butter at every meal, Englishmen used the term ‘butter-box’ as a derogatory epithet to describe their neighbours across the North Sea.163 This trope already figured in the First Anglo-Dutch War. The pamphlet *Amsterdam and her other Hollander sisters put out to sea* wrote that the Dutch nature was difficult to determine: ‘Oh for an expert Chyrurgion to dissect this Dutch Bloat-Herring! Or a skilfull Cheesemonger to open this Great Butter-box!’164 *The Dutch-mens pedigree, or a relation, shewing how they were first bred* took the butter-box trope quite literally as it described an absurd account of how the Dutch were born. The broadside told the story of how a monstrous horse from Hell tried to drain the Low Countries from water, but died from a shitting before it could finish the task. Afterwards, the Germans collected the monster’s faeces and put it into a great butter-box. Nine days later people crawled out of it: ‘the Off-spring whereof are yet alive to this day, and now commonly known by the name of Dutchmen’.165 A pamphlet from 1666 was titled *The Dutch damned: or, the butter-boxes bob’d*, reinforcing the humiliation that was displayed in the ballad. The avid traveller Fynes Moryson gave an explanation for the nickname in a travel account after he visited the United Provinces at the end of the sixteenth century:

‘Butter is the first and last dish at the Table (…) and thereupon by strangers they are merrily called Butter-mouths. (…) Men and Weomen [sic], passing in boates from City to City for trade, carry with them cheese, and boxes of butter for their foode, whereupon in like sort strangers call them Butter boxes’.166

Moryson ascribed the term solely to these roaming traders, but by the time Hollandophobia surged in print it referred to the entire Dutch nation. In English drama Dutch characters were already called butter-boxes at the turn of the century – in *The Hollander* of 1635, and in 1604 in *Westward Ho!* – showing the nickname was publicly known decades before it would be
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164 Anon, *Amsterdam, and her other Hollander sisters put out to sea*, 3.
165 D.F., *The Dutch-mens pedigree, or a relation, shewing how they were first bred* (1653).
used in Hollandophobic print. These anti-Dutch pamphleteers held their own origin story for the trope. A collection of jests from 1674 explained:

‘A Dutch-man in Amsterdam having heated himself with Wine grew angry, and swearing Gods Sacrament, he would feign know, why the English called his Countrymen Butter-boxes, the reason is said a stranger by, because they find you are so apt to spread every where, and for your saueiness [sic] must be melted down.’

\textit{Ungodliness and foreignness}

In Restoration England the Dutch were continuously accused of being ungodly heathens. They were led by their base desire for wealth, instead by Christian values. Not God, but the heathen deity of gold, the ‘unrightious Mammon is their best of friends’. The shape of the ungodly stereotype did not seem to be affected by England’s change from a Puritan republic to an Anglican monarchy. Religious toleration was still condemned as the pinnacle of unchristian covetousness. In these accusations pamphleteers repeated Hollandophobic works of print form a decade earlier, most of all Felltham’s \textit{A brief character of the Low-Countries under the states}. The short pamphlet \textit{Quaeries: or a dish of pickled herring} copied many phrases from the travel account to illustrate the extent of the Dutch lack of faith. It stated that policy came before religion and that offending God was preferred over insulting the republic. The pamphlet also posed its readership the question whether the Dutch: ‘will not tolerate any thing rather than hinder Traffick; and will not stick to entertain the Devil (should they know him so) and trade with him’. Similarly resembling Felltham, Marvell’s \textit{Character of Holland} condemned Dutch toleration, calling Amsterdam a ‘Turk-Christian-Pagan-Jew, / Staple of Sects’, stating ‘The Universal Church is onely There.’ Christianity was but a mask to hide Dutch ambitions, covetousness and outright foreignness.

Pamphleteers also tried to deny the Dutch a European heritage. They were compared, juxtaposed or simply mentioned together with foreigners and heathens, with the purpose of distancing the United Provinces from European morality and diplomacy. The same fate had befallen the Spaniards at the beginning of the century, being structurally described as Moors, Jews and Africans. In the case of Hispanophobia this identification possessed an ethnic
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dimension; Spaniards were literally seen as the offspring of Muslims and Jews, a belief rooted in the Spanish history of the Reconquista.\textsuperscript{172} When discussing the Dutch, these references were more about similarity than ancestry. Authors questioned if a Dutchman’s ‘Body, Hands and Face are made of the same mole of composition; for his Body when naked seemeth a Christian-European, but the rest Hellish-Aegyptian?’\textsuperscript{173} John Crouch reflected on the Dutch behaviour in the colonies, coming to the conclusion they were more uncivilized than any natives: ‘Hire not the Blacks your Neighbours to betray, / Whites in your face, in soule more Blacks than they’.\textsuperscript{174}

Most of all, the ungodly Dutch were likened to the Muslim Turks, not in the least because there existed cordial relations between the United Provinces and the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, The Ottoman sultan was universally seen as Europe’s greatest threat during the early modern period. The East-India merchant John Darrell wrote a pamphlet explaining the historical wrongdoings of the Dutch in the Indies, in an attempt to justify the war. He compared the Dutch expansion on the seas with the Ottoman conquests in Europe, calling the United Provinces one of the ‘Powerful and Politique Universal Enemies (especially of England;) and who may compare their Conquest by Sea, with the Great Turk by Land’.\textsuperscript{175} Marvell exaggerated the English display of prowess at the St. James’ Day Battle, describing how they had fought against a much larger Dutch force (both fleets were actually equal in size). He described how the Dutch fought like their Ottoman friends with the tactic of using overwhelming numbers for victory: ‘Like the Great Turk, with Multitudes Oppress, / These, and their Brandy, make them hope success.’\textsuperscript{176} The Dutch, Hollandophobic pamphleteers argued, could best be understood with the aims, manners and morality of the foreign and heathen Turks.

\textit{Individual Dutch devils}

In Hispanophobia, Spanish leaders and their private vices were vilified to depict all of the Spanish people as evil – for instance Philip II during the second half of the sixteenth century. In the discourse of Hollandophobia this focus on individual persons is nearly absent. Pamphleteers did not use Dutch leaders to represent the greater flawed nation, most likely because the United Provinces lacked a nominal head of state which could function as the
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embodiment of the Dutch people. Instead, pamphlets mentioned Dutchmen who were known to the English audience, primarily naval admirals whose names resounded in news reports of the Anglo-Dutch battlefields. In the 1650s this was Maarten Tromp. A decade later these were Tromp’s son Cornelis, Michiel de Ruyter and most of all Jacob van Wassenaer Obdam, whose flagship exploded memorably during the Battle of Lowestoft (together with Obdam himself). However, these men were not nearly as reviled as the Spanish lead characters. Instead they were more often than not simply the enemy commanders who needed to be fought, routed and defeated.

**Literary origins of Hollandophobia**

Many of the tropes described in this chapter did not originate in the latter half of the seventeenth century. Instead, they were already known to the English people as common stereotypical assumptions about the Dutch, voiced in the late sixteenth century in travel literature, Elizabethan drama and classical theories trying to categorize the world. These literary traditions housed strands of a Dutch stereotype, which were collected, unified and appropriated by war-time propagandists in the Hollandophobic discourse. During this process, these largely innocent commonplaces were changed into a unified volatile image of the Dutch that could be used in times of war to vilify the enemy.

**Rehearsing travel accounts**

Hollandophobic pamphleteers knew a lot about their writing subject, not in the least because the United Provinces had been visited often by their literary predecessors. Observations made during these visits were often written down in travel accounts. In between 1550 and 1652, before the outbreak of the First Anglo-Dutch War, accounts of at least sixty-two travels to the United Provinces were written down on paper. These included many of the stereotypes that would later be made into propagandistic polemic. They commented on the country’s climate and the habit of drunkenness. The boorish behaviour of the Dutch tended to be attributed to either the cold and foggy climate or to the diet the Dutchmen had grown accustomed to. English visitors already observed hints of Dutch profit-oriented minds at the beginning of the century, manifest in the fact that they seemed to prefer the marketplace over the church.
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179 Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 190.
Characteristics of ingratitude and cowardice were not yet commented upon extensively, since there was little reason to depict the Dutch as unthankful cowards prior to the outbreak of war in 1652.

In his study on the genre of seventeenth century travel accounts, Van Strien warned about the originality of these observations: ‘Many of the remarks on the ordinary Dutch people can be found in contemporary literature on Holland, and travellers did little more than rephrase familiar themes.’ Travel accounts were built around clichés, and individual observations were formulated with the help of guidebooks, making them rarely unique. Existing images were repeated and reinforced. In a way, travel accounts were constructed quite similarly to Hollandophobic pamphlets. The same process of intertextuality and repetition of narratives can be discerned in both genres. A good example of this is Felltham’s travel account, which was innovative in the way the book was organized, but its observations were very much in line with traditional views. Later Hollandophobic character sketches took their inspiration from the clichés in these travel accounts; in a sense they were just built from the conclusions about the Dutch without using any positive observations, such as the industriousness of the people.

The influence travel accounts had on Hollandophobic pamphlets can be clearly seen in both genres’ focus on the habits of the Dutch diet. War-time pamphlets extensively referred to traditional ‘Dutch’ food, such as cheese, butter, bread, herring and brandy, to characterize Dutchmen, even to the extent that the people were made from the food they digested. The Dutch boare dissected, for example, described the Dutchman as a: ‘Lusty, Fat, two Legged Cheese-Worm: A Creature, that is so addicted to Eating Butter, Drinking fat Drink, and Sliding, that all the World knows him for a slippery Fellow.’ English travellers had discussed this diet extensively half a century before, universally despising it for its frugal nature.

Dutch Hans in Elizabethan drama
If reading about Dutch stereotypes was not their fancy, Englishmen could always watch them at home on the London stage. From the Elizabethan age onward, theatre had formed a comprehensive and tenacious characterization of Dutchmen, inspired by domestic issues.

181 Van Strien, British Travellers in Holland, 212.
183 Anon, The Dutch boare dissected, or a description of hogg-land.
After war broke out in the Low Countries in the late sixteenth century, many political and religious refugees fled the continent and found their way to the English capital. By far most of the aliens living in London were of Dutch origin; nearly 75 per cent, numbering around two thousand by 1567 – with even more migrants living in the provincial communities around the capital. This large presence of Dutch aliens inevitably led to social and economic tensions, accompanied with efforts to generalize the migrants as a demarcated group. So too on the theatre stage.

One of the earliest instances of the Dutch stereotypical stage character was ‘Hance Berepot’ in the drama *An enterlude of welth and helth* from around 1554-1557. This Low Countries character was described as unlikable, perpetually drunk, speaking in a garbled speech of broken English and Dutch, and posing an economic threat to England. The role eventually evolved into the common Elizabethan stage character of ‘Hans’, who by 1600 was seen as unmannered, boorish, drunk and crafty when doing business. The stereotype was constructed as a result of the emergence of ‘stock national traits’ as part of the character composition, which prescribed how for instance a Dutchman needed to act on stage for the audience to recognize him as such. By the time of Charles I, Dutchmen were presented even more critical, caused by international confrontation relating to trade, fishing and the Amboyna Massacre of 1623. Hollandophobic depictions by pamphleteers in the seventeenth century rehearsed the stereotype of the Dutchman in English drama, referring to drunkenness, boorishness and the incidental mention of ‘Hans’ himself.

*Climate theory*

Another literary tradition that offered inspiration to the formulation of the Hollandophobic stereotype was the theory of climate. The theory centred around: ‘the assumption that the climate of a particular region or country significantly affected the physical appearance, the character, and the temperament of its inhabitants.’ Its foundation lay in the classical medical science. Hippocrates had developed the division of the globe in three spheres – the
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cold north, warm south, and an ideal middle zone. Galen and his theory of humorism added to the belief that climatological conditions determined the physical, mental and moral characteristics of the people living in these zones. Traditionally, the Low Countries were placed in the cold and wet climate of the north, giving the people a phlegmatic nature that made them hardy, dull-witted, lovers of freedom but lacking political skill. Hollandophobic pamphleteers implicitly weaved these climatological explanations into their narrative when discussing the amphibious country and its influence on the Dutch character, as we have seen above. The Dutch were described as dull and muddy. Their thirst for brandy was a direct consequence of the wretched conditions they lived in. This made the Dutch inherently inferior to Englishmen, who did not suffer from the same geographical or climatological setbacks.

In these three discussed traditions we find similar characterizations that placed the Dutch in a somewhat negative light. Hollandophobic pamphleteers used these as sources of inspiration for their own purposes. The large amount of knowledge and pre-existing stereotypical images of Dutchmen made it possible for English writers to formulate a comprehensive enemy image, which proved to be coherent across a large spectrum of authors and different literary sources. This was only reinforced through the rehearsing of contemporary tropes and characteristics from the Anglo-Dutch conflicts themselves.

**Intertextuality**

Pamphleteers from the 1660s had no difficulty echoing existing themes and tropes established during the First Anglo-Dutch War. In a few occasions this even went as far as the copying of entire sentences and phrasings from older pamphlets. It is useful to the historian that this was a common practice, since one cannot find any clearer signs of intertextuality within the discourse of Hollandophobia, and of the influence older works of print possessed over newer ones. This, in turn, tells us a lot about the connectivity of the different groups of authors and pamphlets throughout the seventeenth century, displaying there was indeed one large discourse of Hollandophobia that spanned the four periods of this study, ever changing but indebted to the traditions of past works of print all the same.

Besides the many pamphlets discussing the Amboyna Massacre, another clear example of intertextuality in Hollandophobic sources was *Quaeries: or a dish of pickled-herring* (see image 6). I have referred to the pamphlet several times throughout this chapter, since it commented on wide-ranging topics. It could do so because it borrowed numerous
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phrases from other works of print. Glancing through the sixty-three remarks we can easily
discern at least eighteen quotes that appeared in Felltham’s travel account from 1652, either
directly copied or slightly rephrased. The twenty year old law student Charles Molloy went even
further in the political tract he wrote in 1666, discussing traditional accusations of Dutch
ingratitude, titled Holland’s ingratitude, or, a serious expostulation with the Dutch. The first
half of the pamphlet borrowed heavily from the tract Francis Osborne wrote in 1652, A seasonable
expostulation with the Netherlands. Osborne’s influence can be seen immediately when comparing
both titles. Molloy copied many of the work’s passages into his own pamphlet, rehearsing the exact same
sentences when reflecting on the English sacrifices that had been made to liberate the Dutch from the Spanish
and when depicting the Dutch as a croaking Egyptian plague – to name just two. Writing in Restoration
England, Molloy could expand on Dutch wrongdoings by accusing the Dutch Republic of having provided an
example for the English rebels to create the accursed Commonwealth.

War poems shaped the way in which the Hollandophobic stereotype was propagated in
Restoration England. Textual tropes, ridiculing the Dutch through short and witty references,
prevailed in these works of print. There was less attention given to persuasive justifications of
war, indicating support for the government’s decision to steer for another war with the United
Provinces was already high. Both historiographical interpretations of the war were, however,
somewhat present in the corpus of studied texts. The commercial causes reappeared in
traditional complaints about the Dutch ruthless trading practices in Europe and the colonies.
The characteristic of covetousness loomed large in anti-Dutch verses. Similar to the war
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before, Pincus made much of pamphleteers’ efforts to distance the Dutch from the reigning self-image, depicting them as a radical threat and as worshippers of Mammon trying to achieve a universal dominion. The republican card was used numerous times to place the United Provinces below Restoration England in international standing. This made ideological explanations of the war at least more credible than during the republican war of the 1650s.

Because many of the celebratory ballads were written anonymously, it is difficult to determine the extent of organization behind the publication of Hollandophobic pamphlets. Three pamphlets were written by young students while still in college. We can assume that men like Settle, Markland and Molloy were not in the employ of Restoration politicians, but instead wrote on their own initiative, trying to make their mark on English society in the hopes of gaining recognition and patronage. The fact that they added their full names and initials on the cover sheets of their works suggests as much. Other authors, such as Birkenhead, Ogilby and Crouch, possessed closer relations with the Restoration regime. It is likely they either wrote in collaboration with government officials or out of a desire to support the regime without direct steering from above. Both booksellers and government licensers were satisfied with the publications of Hollandophobic pamphlets. Three broadside ballads were made by the same printer on three different occasions in 1665 and 1666. All three possessed the same style, font type and pictures, they were published with allowance and all were sold by the three same booksellers.195 This indicated celebratory ballads ridiculing the Dutch proved popular enough for booksellers to re-order similar ones whenever events during the war made them topical again.

195 Anon, The royal victory. Anon, The English seamans resolution (1666). Anon, The Dutch damnified: or, the butter-boxes bob’d. The first ballad was sold by four different booksellers. These four men collaborated in the publication of the same pamphlets, mostly broadside ballads, from 1654 onwards. All three ballads were printed with multiple pictures. These were rather generic, depicting a soldier, a ship and a marching band of pike-men, being re-used from earlier ballads published in 1655-1660.
Chapter 4. Debating the Dutch threat: the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674)

‘either we must be the Distressed Kingdom of England, or they once more the Distressed States of Holland’\textsuperscript{196}

In ideological outlook, the conflict that broke out in 1672 can be considered a continuation of the Second Anglo-Dutch War. There were few new arguments brought forward to defend the new clash with the Dutch, and the political lead actors in both countries were the same as they had been five years ago – Charles II and the Stadholderless States General. In terms of popularity, the conflict was widely different. There existed less war fervour in Parliament and on the streets than during the previous clash, which had ended in disaster for the English, with the raid on the Medway. Initial enthusiasm and cravings of vengeance were quickly tempered as a result of the conduct of the war, with public hatred veering from the Dutch enemy to the French ally. Covertly supported by the French king, Charles had steered for another war with the Dutch, seeking a just casus belli to declare war. England did so on the 27\textsuperscript{th} of March, a day after France had officially informed the Dutch of its hostile intentions. The shift in popular support was already apparent in the summer of 1672, and a year later there was no doubt about the widespread opposition against the war with the United Provinces.

Apart from the traditional interpretations of English reasons to go to war, which changed only little in this period – such as faction struggles at court and commercial interests – other explanations were more influenced by this change in popular support.\textsuperscript{197} According to Pincus, this shift in support, which can be seen as the most characteristic element of this war, mainly revolved around the question which country was aspiring to create a universal dominion – the republican Dutch or the absolutist French.\textsuperscript{198} This notion, stating that an expansionist rival who would dominate all other states was the greatest threat for a country, was already voiced in the 1650s, though it changed as a result of England’s return to monarchy. At the onset of the war the Dutch could still be seen by royalists as the contenders for universal dominion, trying to control the world’s trade through unfair trading practices. In

\textsuperscript{196} Stubbe, A justification of the present war, preface.

\textsuperscript{197} For commercial explanations, see: Israel, Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 292-299.

this narrative, the States Party posed a threat to monarchy, since it would spread its republican
thought until this universal empire would be achieved.

As the war progressed, this notion lost credibility and gave way to the belief that
France was in fact England’s greatest enemy. This shift in opinion occurred because the
French campaign had been alarmingly successful, leaving most of the Republic occupied and
crippled. Furthermore, the disastrous war led to a regime change in the United Provinces in
the summer of 1672, with the appointment of William III, Charles’ nephew, as Stadtholder of
Holland. The Grand Pensionary John de Witt was murdered prior to this Orangist rise,
reducing the threat of unbridled republicanism. Lastly, Pincus mentioned English frustration
about the conduct of the allied French fleet, which refused to engage in battle, increasing
suspicions that France was waging war to dominate both the Low Countries and England. In
light of these events, English moderates had difficulty seeing the Dutch as the universal threat
they had once been. Instead, they joined with political and religious radicals, arguing for a
quick conclusion of the government’s wrongful war.199

David Onnekink agreed with Pincus’ reading of the war, stating Englishmen and
‘foreigners feared Dutch economic hegemony – and acted accordingly.’200 He stressed that
alongside the fear of Dutch aspirations to a universal dominion, there was a just as large
dynastic interest in seeing the nephew of Charles become Stadtholder. In contemporary
sources this purpose could be seen when pamphleteers explained Dutch immorality not as a
natural given, but as a consequence of political misfortune. One of these authors filled his
entire pamphlet with libellous anti-Dutch condemnations, but he reduced the sting of the
insults in the last pages, stating the distressed Dutch had once been ‘well meaning people of
themselves’ – it was the States General who had plunged Europe into chaos since they had
revolted from their prince.201 The poet Matthew Stevenson depicted the same point in an
illustrated allegory (see image 7). In the pamphlet, he satirized the traditional symbol of state
of the United Provinces, the Dutch virgin. By 1672 the fair maid had turned into an ancient
and ailing countess who was lying on her deathbed, sickened by spices, in her fever fancying
herself to be the sovereign of the seas. She was past recovery and had been bankrupted by the
doctors’ bills. The poem under the illustration ended with the arrival of a certain doctor from

199 S. Pincus, ‘From butterboxes to wooden shoes: the shift in English popular sentiment from anti-Dutch to anti-
French in the 1670s’, The Historical Journal 38:2 (1995). For an example of a literary discussion between a
moderate Englishman and an Anglican courtier about France, the Dutch Republic and universal dominion, see:
S. Bethel, The present interest of England stated (1671), G. Villiers, A letter to sir Thomas Osborn (1672) and S.
Bethel, Observations on the letter written to sir Thomas Osborn (1673).
and Foreign Policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750) (Farnham 2011) 134.
201 De Britaine, The Dutch usurpation, 33. This prince could either refer to the princes of Orange or Philips II.
The Hague and the not-so-hidden message: ‘An Orange only ‘tis can make her well.’ Once William of Orange was made Stadtholder, he would lift the plague that had struck the Dutch countess – and war with England would come to an end.  

Image 7: Illustration accompanying Stevenson’s *The low estate of the Low-Countrie countess*. The countess of Holland, the allegorical representation of the Dutch Republic, is lying on her deathbed, surrounded by clueless doctors. Some utter ‘she is past recovery’ and ‘she is damnably inflamed’. Notice the catholic priest at the bed’s foot end, offering the sacraments.

### Popularity and pamphlet type

The sheer amount of Hollandophobic texts published in the 1660s could not be matched during the second confrontation between royalist England and the United Provinces. More than half of the twenty-eight researched sources were poems, showing the medium remained popular in Restoration print to transfer anti-Dutch sentiment. These poems rehearsed the common textual tropes from the previous war, focusing especially on the characteristics of pride and treachery. The sources gave general descriptions ridiculing the Dutch, without paying much attention to specific contexts or topicality. This was caused by a lack of noteworthy historical events worth showing to the English audience; no victorious naval battles could enliven verses with sweeping narrations of English prowess. Compared to the previous war, the balance in pamphlet types became more even – with a total of six political tracts, five character pamphlets and one account. These larger pamphlets provided Englishmen with a coherent justification of the war. They followed the line of the official arguments; of the Dutch undermining English naval dominion, the loss of trade and wealth, the breaking of agreements and of the Dutch spreading perfidious libel about the king.


203 This total number includes three reprints of older pamphlets discussed in this chapter.
Political tractates were tasked to convince the people of the war’s necessity – which was not a given. Literary tropes insulting the Dutch formed a subsidiary role in these aims.

As time progressed, the Third Anglo-Dutch War became notoriously unpopular under the English people, being more and more seen as a private war, dictated from court. This reality changed the purpose of Hollandophobic propaganda. There was less demand for groundless enemy-bashing with short and entertaining tropes; calling a Dutchman a boar or butter-box might inflame Hollandophobic followers, it would hardly alter the political convictions of Englishmen who did not support the war to begin with. They had to be convinced by pamphleteers, debating that war with the Dutch was both justified as beneficial – not unlike the Commonwealth and its struggle to deconstruct Dutch closeness in the 1650s. If war was largely unopposed, one could make do with superficial poems filled with witty tropes, to stir up hatred against the enemy and maintain a climate for conflict. When war was contested by ideological or political considerations, one had a need of printed material that justified war with a narrative of arguments, in order to convince people of the rightness of the proposed course of action.

This dynamic between popularity and propagandistic substantiation surged to the forefront during the Glorious Revolution of 1688, but it was also visible in the government’s struggles of 1672 to continue its anti-Dutch policy in the wake of popular opposition. The corpus of source material hints at this quick decrease in popularity when comparing the print output in the two wars between Restoration England and the Dutch Republic. In the initial year of both conflicts nearly 1.5 per cent of all printed publications in the collections of EEBO can be identified as outright Hollandophobic. Whereas this percentage remained stable in 1665, the second year of the previous conflict, the number plummeted to 0.25 per cent in 1673 (see Appendix 3). This suggests that independent authors lacked the financial or emotional urge to criticize the Dutch, and that Restoration politicians themselves had given up on trying to persuade the people otherwise.

**Continuation of the Hollandophobic character and tropes**

Since half of the studied sources were poems, we can find plenty of textual tropes from previous chapters in the verses of 1672. In their core, these ballads and longer poems differed
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205 Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, 30, 44.
206 It is difficult to determine whether the percentage of poems decreased as well during the conflict – indicating a change towards more argumentative tractates – since few sources appeared in 1673 and 1674. This makes comparison tricky (the difference was marginal; 56 per cent of the source material consisted of poems in 1672, compared to 50 per cent in 1673).
only slightly when compared with the corpus of sources a decade earlier. For this reason I will
only briefly glance over these literary tropes, indicating which of these were emphasized,
before moving on to the longer tractates whose importance grew in this period. Similarly, the
Hollandophobic characterization of the Dutch remained familiar, with different accents that
highlighted specific elements so that it would fit within the historical context of 1672.

*Popular tropes*

The trope most popular with Hollandophobic pamphleteers was that of the proud High and
Mighty, who had risen from a distressed state to a boastful beast at England’s expense. ‘Who
stile themselves the Hogan Mogan Dutch,’ the author of *Great Britains glory* wondered,
repeating the notion we have seen a decade earlier, ‘A stile too great for Mortals to assume, /And for this pride, Heaven may now them consume’.

This trope referred first of all to the Republic’s political elite, whose misplaced pride was a sore sight for the truehearted royalists in England. The ballad *The grand abuses stript and whipt*, for instance, specifically discussed the insolences of the ‘Hogen Mogen States of Holland’, its author asking who ‘Can Paint themselves in such high colour’d Pride?’ The republican regime was depicted as being lower in stature than the English monarchy, yet the Dutch still acted as if they were equals. Another poet reflected back on the Dutch Revolt, exclaiming baffled: ‘Did We for this knock off their Spanish-Fetters, / To make ‘um able to abuse their Betters?’

The pamphlet *Lucifer faln, or, some reflection on the present estate of the Low-Countries* was a representative example of the broadside ballads published during the Third Anglo-Dutch War. It was short and anonymous, with almost no surviving information to contextualize the source. Within the rhyming lines, the ballad played heavily with the Dutch duality of high ambitions and low nature, describing the Republic as a pathetic, shaky state, which had risen so quickly it was bound to explode in the Dutchmen’s faces. England, pamphleteers argued, would fulfil a central role in bringing down the haughty United Provinces. *Lucifer faln* rhymed about its title character:

‘To see their swelling High, and trebly Great,
Dwindle into a poor Distressed State:
Their Pageantry discover’d, and they be
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In true sense called Low Germany.
As High before as could Ambition rear
We’ll have them now as low as is Despair.”

In these threats, pamphleteers often used the derogatory term ‘butter-box’ to denote their hated enemy. ‘Affront too Hogan-Mogan to endure!’ a poet wrote in one of these instances, ‘Tis time to BOX these Butterboxes sure.”

It remained with boasting however, as no naval encounter ended in a conclusive English victory. This trope of the prideful High and Mighty was so popular amongst Hollandophobic pamphleteers, because war propaganda clearly possessed an anti-republican character directed against the States General and the dominant States Party. William of Orange was kept out of the polemical attacks, for political and dynastic reasons. The Dutch people themselves were somewhat involuntarily thrown into the mixture, with pamphleteers condemning the Dutch character and the Dutch state, whilst trying to leave open the possibility of Dutch absolution with the reinstatement of the Orangist Stadholdership.

Accompanying these condemnations of Dutch ambitions, authors ridiculed the Dutch low nature to emphasis their misplaced pride. Describing the wet climate of the country was the most popular way to transfer this message. Marvell’s *The character of Holland*, with its many references to climate and geography, was reprinted in 1672, alongside the publications of many new ballads commenting upon the bog that was Holland. The lengthy poem *Hogan-Moganides: or, the Dutch hudibras*, published in 1674, described the Dutch people and its country within its hundred pages. The anonymous author used many references for this, combining the tropes of climate and diet to depict the Dutch as an amphibious people:

‘Of Fish and Flesh a hotch-potch hash,
A Pickled-Butter-Brandy-Mash,
sad Souls Imprison’d in a Bog
Of Flesh, their Brains drencht in a Fog
Like to the Soyl; and as their Nation
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So was their place of Habitation’.  

Descriptions like these could only lead the reader to one conclusion: ‘They live in a Bog, as the people do tell; / For sure the Low Countries needs must be hell’. Depicting the Dutch as boorish boars had lost some of its esteem – only a few pamphlets referred to the trope. This could very well be because pamphleteers directed their inflammatory words towards the republican elite and its prideful ambition, instead of the general Dutch people. The emphasis on the haughty High and Mighty hinted at this. This would reduce the need to call the Dutch masses ‘boors’, since they were not the polemicists’ targets.

Imagery that depicted the Dutch as frogs was carried on in a pair of pamphlets which were very clearly influenced by the fable of John Ogilby from 1665. Ogilby’s own pamphlet was republished in 1672, under the name *The Holland nightingale or the sweet singers of Amsterdam*. This title used the mocking name given to croaking frogs – Dutch (or Holland) nightingales. The paraphrased pamphlet shared the single-sheet broadside form that was common for anti-Dutch ballads, instead of the form of a small booklet it previously had. This made the pamphlet cheaper and more accessible to a larger audience. Ogilby’s popularity also extended outside of England. Influenced by his work, the French Jesuit Jean Commire published the Latin fable *Sol et Ranae* in 1672, as part of the anti-Dutch propaganda campaign preceding the French invasion of the United Provinces. This widely popular version of the classical fable, in turn, was translated back into English in the same year, printed in London as *The fable of the sun and frogs*. The pamphlet shared many similarities with its forerunner. The poem told about a group of amphibious frogs, ‘those Fennish People, as from Earth / And Water mixt in Mud, deriving Birth’. They had been raised high by the protective warmth of the sun (in this narrative France). However, the frogs grew too proud and started to croak against the sun in their hubris. As punishment the sun burned brighter, boiling the ungrateful creatures in their own mud. The moral of the story was that an old protector could just as easily bring his ungrateful neighbours down if they made an enemy out of him. The allegorical meaning of the story of the sun and frogs was thus changed *thrice* within the time span of seven years. First, Ogilby had altered the classical fable to use it as anti-Dutch
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polemic, applying it to the United Provinces. Then Commire had changed the story, so that it would refer to Dutch ingratitude towards France, altering Charles’ sun into the embodiment of Louis XIV in the process. Once the version had proved popular, the English translator republished the text – its meaning changed again by the different audience and English context.

Importance of character
The immoral nature of the Dutch people was described in much more detail in longer pamphlets, ranging from brief character sketches to political tractates. These sources displayed specific characteristics relevant for the historical context of the time. They used vehement language, as if the short and witty references to traditional tropes no longer managed to convey the extent of Dutch devilry to the English audience. As always, the worst of Dutch vices – ingratitude – was reaffirmed. The pamphlet Poor Robins character of a Dutch-man gave a damning description of the Dutch character, centering around the ungrateful behaviour the Hollanders displayed. The pamphlet was written by the professional pseudonym of ‘Poor Robin’, the publisher of a series of satirical almanacs, supplemented by some character sketches – for example one of the old enemy France, in 1666. In the characterization of the Dutch, the author stated that a Dutchman could be recognized by two things: ‘The first is, that tell him of any benefit received, and he hath the art of forgetfulness at his Fingers ends’. The second one was his craving for brandy, and: ‘to perswade a Dutch man to thankfulness, is almost as hard a task as to disswade him from his dearest delight Brandy’.219

The most topical characteristic in Hollandophobic print of 1672, however, was that of Dutch perfidy. Pamphleteers continuously accused the Dutch of treacherous untrustworthiness in their dealings with England and the rest of Europe. The tractate Severall remarkable passages concerning the Hollanders, printed in 1673, listed many Dutch wrongdoings since the death of Queen Elizabeth. The breaking of treaties appeared prominently within the ninety-two pages. It was casted as the pinnacle of Dutch foreign policy:

‘It is an old dutch principall, where the Hollanders cannot accomplish their designes by force, they will indevor it by any sinister means, which makes the States Generall soe

219 Anon, Poor Robins character of a Dutch-man (1672) 3-5.
often pawne their soules their faith, and reparation, in publick treaties (...) when at the same instant they intend shall never be performed."220

The same point was propagated in other political tracts. No diplomatic dealings could be had with the Dutch, because it was the principle of their state, ‘that if they get the possession of any thing, never to dispute the right, so it be of conveniency or profit to them to keep it.’221 The Dutch were led by avarice and self-interest, and not by morals or Christian aspirations of peace. They made peace and war with enemies and allies alike, and they broke treaties whenever it suited them. Therefore, no genuine peace could be had with them. A Dutchman had, quite literally, shit for honour: ‘His Faith his Word was, and his Word / Was not Surreverence, worth a T—’222 I contend that this emphasis in the Hollandophobic discourse on Dutch perfidy was far from coincidental; supporters of the anti-Dutch policy were necessitated to propagate this treachery in order to delegitimize the unfavourable Treaty of Breda, which had concluded the Second Anglo-Dutch War in 1667. A renewal of war could only be justified if pamphleteers succeeded in convincing the English sceptics that the Dutch would never adhere to made agreements. This was all the more pressing, because Charles II and his government were not in the possession of a clear casus belli when they declared war upon the United Provinces. The Dutch had made very few transgressions after the peace of 1667, forcing pamphleteers to propagate rather shallow reasons and general accusations.223 By focusing on past examples of untrustworthiness, they argued that peace with the United Provinces was in fact no peace at all.

Apart from these accusations of ingratitude and treachery, ungodliness remained a stock theme for authors who wanted to criticize the Dutch enemy. The arguments of this religious immorality remained unchanged; profit came before faith, toleration was a commercial affront to God and the Dutch republic itself lay closer to Hell than any other nation in the world. One author explained to his readers about Dutchmen: ‘when Gain comes in competition, they do forgo not onely all Honour and Honesty, but even all Religion too.’224
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their measure of Religion by their interest.’ 225 Henry Stubbe, one of the government’s paid propagandists, proclaimed loudly: ‘No, no I should injure Christendom to reckon the United Netherlands a part thereof, such are their practices, that ‘tis a crime in them to profess that Religion’. 226 Placing the Dutch in a long line of wretched foreigners, such as Turks, Muslims, Africans and pagans, reinforced this notion of Dutch exclusion from the civilized and faithful of the world. Stubbe was one pamphleteer who had mastered this practice:

‘An Hollander! This is the Name of a People that esteem nothing sacred, but their own profit, and live under no obligations of Honour, Morality, or Religion, but Interest. I must ravage over Africk (so fam’d for Monstrous productions) and in the most inhumane parts thereof seek a parallel for these European Monsters’. 227

The treachery the Dutch had displayed was outright outlandish. The North-African pirates had committed less offensive injuries and the Moors were sincerer allies than the Dutch could ever hope to be. This also made them a greater threat to Europe than the Ottoman Turks had ever been. 228 When describing the inhabitants of the United Provinces as ungrateful, treacherous, and unchristian foreigners, Hollandophobic pamphleteers argued that the Dutch were the true danger. The political consequence was clear; war was the only way to protect England from such a perfidious threat.

**Convincing the critics**

Unfortunately for Charles, not all Englishmen accepted this interpretation of contemporary events. On the contrary, many believed that peace was the only way to protect both England and the Dutch Republic from an even larger threat – Louis XIV and his expansionist France. As a result of this internal division, many political tractates appeared in England to convince opponents of the Dutch war of the justness of the present conflict. Almost all of these pamphlets followed the line of argumentation that was set out in the king’s official declaration of war, published at the start of the conflict in 1672. War was justified, it argued, because after the peace of 1667 the States General had ‘returned to their usual custom of breaking Articles, and supplanting Our Trade’. 229 The given examples of these accusations were flimsy
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at best, so the declaration quickly moved to more concrete justifications. The first of these was the claim that England’s honour had been slighted by the proliferation in the United Provinces of abusive pictures and medals depicting Charles II – by the connivance of the States themselves. Furthermore, the Dutch refused to acknowledge English sovereignty over the seas surrounding the British Isles. The Dutch had violated the Treaty of Breda by ignoring the ‘Right of the Flagg’ – the lowering of their topsails for English ships of war. These arguments were repeated and expanded in unofficial pamphlets, showing close connections to the Restoration regime.

The pamphlet *A familiar discourse, between George, a true-hearted English gentleman: and Hans a Dutch merchant* was written as a fictional conversation between the two characters in the title – notice the stereotypical stage name. The rational George rehearsed all four official arguments in his (wildly successful) effort to convince the ignorant Hans of the righteousness of the war against the Dutch, stating they had broken treaties, supported slanderous libel, supplanted English trade and, above all, threatened the king’s dominion over his seas.²³⁰ The second part of the conversation was supposed to convince the readers that the English domestic situation would not be harmed by the conflict. Some sacrifices would be necessary, but the anonymous author stressed that: ‘it is the Peoples War as well as the King’.²³¹ The very fact he needed to emphasis this, suggested that this precisely was what the readers did not think.

Amongst these pamphlets following the official narrative, were the works of Stubbe and De Britaine, who both wrote two tracts in the government’s defence. Henry Stubbe was a physician and professional writer who had supported the Commonwealth before the Restoration. Afterwards, he became the chief government propagandist during the Third Anglo-Dutch War. There is no doubt about his relationship with the regime. Stubbe was commissioned by his patron, Secretary of State Arlington, to counter Dutch propaganda with his own writing, and he was paid handsomely for his services. In June 1672 his first pamphlet presenting the government’s position was published, *A justification of the present war against the United Netherlands*. In the summer of the same year he had finished another defence, which appeared in early 1673. During the writing process he had worked closely with government officials, for instance to provide him with useful illustrations. Both works gained

²³⁰ All four arguments were summarized in one comprehensive page: Anon, *A familiar discourse*, 16.
²³¹ Ibidem, 35.
wide circulation and were discussed extensively. It was indicative of the regime’s need for popular support that Stubbe tried to persuade dissenters and old Puritans, who were generally averse to Anglican royalism. He stated the present quarrel was in essence the same as it had been during the Commonwealth’s war in 1652. Those who had supported war against the United Provinces then so violently, should support this new conflict as well, since the ‘Hollanders are the self-same People still’.

William de Britaine also wrote two tractates in 1672, expanding on the official points, listing commercial and diplomatic wrongdoings to prove that the Dutch were untrustworthy. Unfortunately, there is nigh on nothing written about him in historiography, making it difficult to ascertain his relationship with the government. It is possibly his name was a pseudonym, explaining his absence in registers and accounts. This was already suggested in the latest work on De Britaine – encompassing a single preface written in 1897. His tractates resembled the official declaration to a high degree, which makes it difficult to see De Britaine as an independent pamphleteer. Somewhat suggestive, a version of his The Dutch usurpation included the same illustration that was used in Stubbe’s A further justification – a scene wherein four Dutch ambassadors grovel before high-ranking Commonwealth officials in 1654, petitioning for peace (see image 8). Stubbe had included the illustration to display the
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similarities between the Commonwealth’s and Charles’ war, trying to convince dissenters they were fighting for the same reasons. For De Britaine the illustration seemed like an afterthought, since it did not directly correspond with the pamphlet’s message. It is clear the engraving was first created for Stubbe’s pamphlet, provided by the government official Joseph Williamson, another one of Arlington’s clients.\textsuperscript{235} It is likely this was also where De Britaine received the illustration, since \textit{A further justification} was not published until 1673.

\textit{Universal dominion}

In these political tractates, authors elaborated on the notion that the Dutch had supplanted English trade and commerce, damaging the very foundations of England’s prosperity. They argued the United Provinces did not care how many laws it violated, as long as it could get all of the world’s trade into its hands. Authors like Stubbe and De Britaine rehearsed the narrative of universal dominion used in old pamphlets. George, the fictional Englishman in \textit{A familiar discourse} was quite convinced when telling his Dutch acquaintance that the English ‘cannot perceive a greater and more dangerous Enemy to our Nation, then your Countrey-men’.\textsuperscript{236} Similarly, De Britaine warned his audience of the Dutch designs:

\begin{quote}
‘we may perceive the sole design of the Hollanders is, to get the Riches, Trade and Dominion of the whole Indies into their own power. And therefore they think any medium just, subservient to that end.’\textsuperscript{237}
\end{quote}

This notion was supported by the popular trope of treachery. The Dutch followed but one principle, the acquisition of a universal dominion, and all other rules of morality and diplomacy had to make way for this. This was why De Britaine described the Dutch as: ‘a Generation which are born to be the Plague, Disquiet, and Scourge of Europe; and they gladly sacrifice the Publick Peace of Christendom to their own private Interest.’ The Dutch had elevated themselves in the East-Indies as the ‘Supreme Moderators of all the affairs of Christendom’, and it was only a matter of time before they would do the same in Europe.\textsuperscript{238}

Dutch crimes committed in the Indies were likened to Spanish cruelties of a century ago, showing the Republic’s true face. ‘For the Indians, though they have no kindness for the Spaniard’, De Britaine wrote about the inhabitants of the Americas, ‘yet they look upon him
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as a Gentleman, but the Hollanders they abhor, for their fordid acts, and unjust practices.²³⁹ It is interesting that De Britaine referred to Dutch cruelties in the West-Indies, whilst not actually discussing any crimes committed on the continent whatsoever – contrary to a long list of misdeeds in the East-Indies. Carmen Nocentelli suggested this tendency to invoke the Americas in stories about Dutch crimes constituted a conscious repetition of the Spanish Black Legend, such as its narrative of colonial cruelties and aspirations of universal monarchy.²⁴⁰ Popping up during every Anglo-Dutch conflict, references to Spaniards in debates about the Dutch reinforced the appropriating effect of the Hispanophobic narrative in the discourse of Hollandophobia. When discussing the tortures and murders of the English merchants in Amboyna and the rest of the East-Indies, George the Englishman reflected they transpired:

‘in a more cruel and horrible manner, then ever Turks used Christians, or the Spanish Inquisition ever treated those they called Hereticks: which Inhumanity of theirs was so monstrous, that the Dutch to this day are infamous for the same among the rude and savage Indians’.

Claiming Dutchmen were worse than Spaniards immediately opened up Pandora’s box of the English collective memory, which was filled with xenophobic sentiment, tropes and textual association used to depict the Spanish as the world’s most wretched people for nigh on a century. As Pincus stated, this familiar argument of universal dominion could also be applied to other contenders, especially France, meaning Hollandophobic pamphleteers constantly had to emphasize and repeat the notion that the Dutch truly were the threat that endangered England and all its people.

**Sovereignty over the sea**

Apart from the growing power of the United Provinces, there existed concerns over England’s own dominion over its direct vicinity. Complaints about Dutch encroachment upon the king’s sovereignty over the seas were very similar to previous periods. This dominion tied for example into the fishing debate, with the argument that the Dutch stole English fish without offering compensation. The most serious argument in favour of war – seemingly the most

²³⁹ **Ibidem**, 20.
trivial one as well – revolved around the symbolic representation of this sovereignty: the right of the flag. By the Treaty of Breda, as well as custom, Dutch ships were obligated to lower their topsails when meeting an English ship of war in the Channel. This obligation was disliked by Dutchmen for symbolic consequences. Acknowledging Charles II as sovereign over the sea was disputed by Hugo Grotius’ *Mare Liberum*, a work that the States General used as a shield against English efforts to hamper Dutch trade on the European stage. English authors were prickly about the right for the same reasons. No matter how small, each incident was used to reaffirm English dominion. ‘Rob’d of our Rights? And, by such Water-Rats?,’ the author of *Defiance to the Dutch* rhymed in 1672, ‘Wee’l doff their Heads, if they won’t doff their Hats’. Another poem described the case in a similar manner: ‘Come vail your Topsails, those that are ill bred, / And will not daugh their Hats, we’ll daugh their Head.’ The emphasis pamphleteers placed on this relatively minor issue served in all likelihood to distract their readers from the fact that more acute reasons for war were absent.

*Dishonourable Dutch propaganda*

This feeling only increases when seeing the level of attention pamphleteers displayed to condemn Dutch propaganda practices. It was not surprising that Dutch writers repaid their colleagues across the Channel in kind for their degrading depictions of the United Provinces. This had also happened in previous wars, and English pamphleteers tended to somewhat hypocritically comment on Dutch efforts to ridicule the English nation. However, in 1672 this focus on scurrilous works of print insulting England reached new heights. A *familiar* discourse, for instance, argued the United Provinces needed to be chastised:

‘for their most scandalous Libels, insolent and unmannerly Pictures, Verses, and Representations of our King and Princes. (which should make the bloud of every loyal, true-hearted, well-born English-man even to rise against them)’.

De Britaine, too, considered the libel directed against the king an affront to the whole English nation. Stubbe went as far as to include a few examples of Dutch prints so that his

---
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readership could see first-handed how the enemy had dishonoured them. The pictures were so abusive and gross, another pamphlet judged, ‘so none but a beastly boarish Flemming would do it.’ This focus on Dutch propaganda practices offers us a number of insights. First of all, works of print originating from the United Province circulated in England with a large enough quantity to be recognized by writers. Furthermore, English pamphleteers perceived Dutch propaganda efforts to be a genuine problem, large enough to bother warning their readership about it. Indeed, Stubbe targeted English dissenters in his works, specifically for the reason that Dutch pamphleteers had done the same. Support for war with the Dutch Republic was low, meaning anti-Dutch pamphleteers had to respond to counter-images that could temper English war fervour. Adding to this, Stubbe’s inclusion of especially derogatory images of the English nation could be used as proof of the Dutch perfidious nature, hopefully stirring up Hollandophobic sentiment. In reality, very few defaming pictures and medals had appeared in the United Provinces, but propagandists exaggerated the amount of abusive works to form another possible explanation for war.

Intertextuality
Pamphleteers in the second half of the seventeenth century were familiar with Hollandophobic publications from the past, and they both read and copied from printed works of contemporary colleagues. This is clearly visible once we start looking for similarities across the ranges of anti-Dutch sources. Three pamphlets, for example, referred to the same prophecy James I had supposedly uttered when hearing about the Amboyna Massacre of 1623, promising that: ‘My Son’s Son will revenge this bloud, and punish this horrible massacre’. There also was a sudden popularity in 1672 of a yet unexplored trope that depicted the Dutch as snakes in England’s midst. This imagery was connected to accusations of Dutch treachery and ingratitude. A familiar discourse lamented that the English had ‘breed up a Serpent in our bosome, that at length might devour us’. Another pamphlet in 1673 repeated the notion: ‘if any man (…) huggs a serpent in his bosome, he may be distroyed for his kindness and credulity’. The author of Poor Robins character explained he found the
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snake-image in another book, most likely Ogilby’s *The fables of Aesop paraphras’d in verse*, first printed in 1651:

‘We read in Aesop of a Man who found a Snake nigh dead with cold, which he kindly took home, warm’d and nourished, when growing lusty, instead of thanks it would have devour’d the man.’

It is likely that either *A familiar discourse* or *Poor Robins character* began the image in 1672 and that others copied it, since both pamphlets also used the same image of the Dutch as a thorn in the English side.

If ever a printed work could illustrate the extent of intertextuality between Hollandophobic pamphlets throughout the century, it would be *A discourse written by Sir George Downing*. With its 171 pages it could be considered a book, but it read very much like a pamphlet, mainly because the work was a hotchpotch of earlier Hollandophobic pamphlet. Its title is somewhat misleading, since only the first thirty pages contained a reprinted version of the discourse of the English ambassador in Holland. The other 140 pages were written anonymously ‘By a Meaner Hand’, with the purpose to ‘revive the memory of such execrable Cruelties, horrid Ungratitude, and insufferable Wrongs, and Abuses, the Dutch have exercised from time to time against us’. It did so by reviving Hollandophobic pamphlets themselves, from repeating sentences and paragraphs to entire works.

While leafing through the book, I easily recognized at least seven printed works that have been discussed in this thesis. First, the booklet summarized the well-known account from 1624 of the Amboyna Massacre, also reprinted in 1672. It elaborated on this traditional account by discussing a Dutch plot for a second Amboyna tragedy in North-America, copying four pages from *The second part of the tragedy of amboynas* of 1653 in the process. Like so many pamphlets before it, the work repeated phrases from Felltham’s travel account, such as the rumour of a Dutchman eating a Spanish heart during the Siege of Leiden or the notion that
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the Dutch were closer to Hell than their neighbours. A discourse also rehearsed many questions posed by the 1665 pamphlet *Quaeries: or a dish of pickled-herring shread*. The work quoted liberally from Molloy’s *Hollands ingratitude, or, a serious expostulation with the Dutch* from 1666 – who in turn had copied those phrases from Osborne in 1652 – such as the notion that ‘a foot of ground cannot be called theirs, that owes not a third part to the expence, Valour, or Counsel of the English’. The snake-symbolism was used from the pamphlets above, and A discourse ended with copying Codrington’s *His majesties propriety, and dominion on the British seas asserted* from 1665 in its entirety.

The amount of intertextuality found in A discourse was exceptional, and not representative for the larger corpus of sources. However, copying arguments and rhetoric from earlier publications was a common and accepted practice in seventeenth century England. The discussed book offers a useful insight into the extent of pamphleteers’ familiarity with old works of Hollandophobia, showing these pamphlet were known by, and influenced, English authors. It also shows that pamphlets written in the period of 1665-1667 could be effectively used within the context the Third Anglo-Dutch War. It is not a stretch to assume that the more obvious forms of repetition were also observed by contemporary readers, since the most recent war pamphlets were only seven years old, and because many publications were in fact reprinted in 1672 to stir up Hollandophobic sentiment.

The discourse of Hollandophobia was highly influenced in the Third Anglo-Dutch War by the lack of popular support for conflict. Many tropes and characterizations that proliferated during the 1660s reappeared a decade later, but these were complimented by political tractates attempting to come with concrete reasons why yet another war against the Dutch was justified. The narrative of universal dominion formed a central argument in this debate about England’s greatest threat, targeting the republican forces manifest in the United Provinces. The Prince of Orange was exempted from ridicule, since he could free the Dutch from the regents’ false pretensions. The unpopularity of the war lowered the willingness of independent writers to publish Hollandophobic works. Instead, more pamphlets appeared that were semi-official in nature, propagating the government’s line of argumentation to defend
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the anti-Dutch policy. This episode in Anglo-Dutch history showed the limitations of propaganda, since it proved difficult to convince an unreceptive audience with xenophobic sentiment, while struggling to find a strong grounding in quantifiable justifications. Thus, peace was concluded on 9 February 1674, with the approval of a jubilant parliament. It would be the last time in the seventeenth century when England tried to defeat the United Provinces through means of war. Next time it would the Dutch who managed to land an invasion force across the Channel, something the kings of England had always hoped to accomplish.
Chapter 5. Defying Dutch domination: the Glorious Revolution (1688-1690)

‘suppose that War ended, and the French humbled to our wish, we shall still have the Dutch to deal with: They have always been our Rivals, and are now our Masters.’

Traditionally, the Glorious Revolution is not included in historical research concerning itself with the Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the seventeenth century. After all, it was not a war against a foreign enemy, but a domestic regime change under pressure of a foreign intervention. The Dutch Stadtholder William III was raised to the English throne, marking France, not the United Provinces, as the country’s greatest nemesis. This episode in English history is highly relevant for this study, as it reveals how Hollandophobic pamphleteers developed the notion of a Dutch threat at the heart of the nation, and how they propagated this from a principal position of weakness. Previously, they had written in favour of the government, and sometimes directly on its behalf. Now they had to work against state apparatuses and censorship, which influenced the content and context of the Hollandophobic discourse.

In 1685, James ascended the throne after his brother Charles II died without a legitimate heir. The English political nation became increasingly dissatisfied with James’ absolutist tendencies, Catholic beliefs and foreign flirtations with France. When a son was born in 1688, Mary, wife of the Protestant William, would no longer succeed her father, and many perceived the creation of a Catholic dynasty as a threat to England. After receiving a self-orchestrated invitation to aid the English people, William crossed the Narrow Sea, landing with his army at Torbay on 5 November, 1688. His official declaration stated he had come to protect the English religion and liberty. Instead of contending with his son-in-law for the throne, James fled the country, abandoning the throne and paving the way for William’s accession. In early 1689, a parliamentarian convention proclaimed him and his wife king and queen of England.

The Glorious Revolution and its settlement was furiously debated between supporters of William III and adherents of the Catholic James. These Jacobites had to contend with William’s well-oiled propaganda machine in order to gain popular support. Supporters and opponents of the Williamite settlement formed diverse groups, divided by political and
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religious beliefs. Politically, there existed a division between poorly defined groups of parliamentarians with shared beliefs – the precursors of political parties. The conservative Tories believed in the divine authority of monarchy. Opposition to a legitimate sovereign was not allowed by the doctrine of passive obedience. The Whigs supported liberal ideas on civil rights and the will of parliament as the foundation of royal authority. Moderates of both groups tended to obey William as de facto king, being a protector of stability. Conservative Tories were inclined to obedience to James, their rightful monarch. Radical Whigs initially supported William, but later lost faith in him as a result of the limited amount of constitutional reform he brought about.\(^{263}\) Religiously, Catholics sided with their co-religionist James, though Jacobite pamphleteers tended to downplay their Catholic connections. Presbyterians and other Protestant groups sided with William for similar reasons. The large group of moderate Anglicans could go either way, based on their considerations on the survival of episcopacy or fear of a papist threat, and thus were often called upon in polemic.

Historians have defined the Glorious Revolution in wildly different ways. A long line of Whig historians saw the revolution as a inherent English event, in which parliamentarian sovereignty was established. Scholars like Jonathan Israel focused on the external elements of the conflict, seeing the Glorious Revolution in the first place as a Dutch invasion.\(^{264}\) Steven Pincus emphasized the role of the English and wrote about a ‘joint Anglo-Dutch venture against James II’s regime.’ According to him, the people wanted to protect the English liberty, religion and laws against James, who was an ‘un-English king.’\(^{265}\) Clearly, with the Dutch Stadtholder they had picked a peculiar protector for their Englishness. Anti-Williamite pamphleteers recognized this and attacked the new king and his invasion of foreigners in their efforts to gather support for James.

**Pamphlets and political context**

I have studied fifteen printed sources for the period of 1688-1690. Eight of these were political tractates, discussing the outcome of the invasion with anti-Dutch arguments. With only three ballads, none of them very rich in literary tropes, the dominance of the Hollandophobic war poem had come to an end. These were supplemented with three character sketches and one account. Hollandophobia during the Glorious Revolution was quite different


in appearance compared to previous episodes of anti-Dutch polemic. It consisted of less
textual tropes and stereotypical insults. Instead, anti-Dutch sentiment was incorporated in
larger political tractates whose purpose was to condemn the Williamite settlement. It was but
one of many arguments used in these debates, making it harder to characterize sources as
specifically Hollandophobic in outlook. Pamphlets did not support a straightforward war
that was fought safely out on the seas; they were written in a time of political upheaval in
England itself. The stakes were high and any clear distinction between us and them – English
and Dutch – was muddled by domestic differences. Pamphleteers had these diffusions in mind
when writing their works of polemic – and not just Hollandophobia. This low number of
Hollandophobic pamphlets can partially be explained by their subsidiary role in the political
debate on the condition of England. The other reason was that Jacobite pamphlets, the sources
that condemned Dutch influence, were in principle clandestine. They were suppressed by
censorship such as the Licensing Act, reducing the distribution and quantity of anti-Dutch
sources in the direct wake of the revolution. This can be identified by a lower quality of
print, smaller letter size to limit paper use and the lack of bibliographical information, such as
author, publisher, bookseller and year on the cover sheet – if there indeed was one.

This chapter is limited to the first three years of William’s reign following the
Glorious Revolution, mainly for uniformity’s sake and demarcation of comprehensiveness.
The output of printed material was much higher in the period 1688-1690 than any time before,
though the percentage of sources with a ‘Dutch’ topic was lower than in the previous Anglo-
Dutch conflicts. This was also the case for clear anti-Dutch pamphlets. During William’s
reign, which lasted until 1702, Hollandophobic sentiment flared up multiple times, whenever
a specific historical event called for it – such as the start of the Nine Years’ War against
France, or its conclusion in 1697 and the subsequent parliamentarian debate on England’s
standing army. This last decade of the seventeenth century falls outside the scope of this
thesis; for an excellent chronological survey of Hollandophobic expressions during William’s
reign, I suggest Van Alphen’s De stemming van de Engelschen tegen de Hollanders in
Engeland, a somewhat dated, but very extensive study on the polemical eruptions of anti-
Dutch images.
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Waning of the Hollandophobic character and tropes

The use of traditional tropes and general character descriptions were rare in the discourse of the Glorious Revolution. The many political tractates formulated new arguments to condemn the regime change and perceived encroachment of Dutch influence. They tended to merely allude to the narrative of Hollandophobia that had been built over the years into a vague commonplace in the early modern public discourse in England. This chapter briefly sketches the use of tropes and characteristics, before moving on to the larger discussion of the Williamite settlement and the anti-Dutch sentiment accompanying it. Because poems were no longer a popular vehicle for Hollandophobia, indicating division within the English borders, the visibility of textual tropes – such as hogs, frogs and bogs – was very low. For example, I have found only one obscure reference to the frog-symbolism, which stated that William III had brought his ‘Croaking Crew’ of Dutchmen with him. The same could be said about the tropes of the ‘Hogan Mogan’ and ‘Belgick Boors’. The practice to call the Dutch butter-boxes was somewhat more common. In general, however, literary tropes were no longer as dominant as they had been during previous Anglo-Dutch conflicts.

The different characteristics of the Hollandophobic stereotype remained in place. The character trait that was most relentlessly condemned after 1688 was the innate ungodliness that was displayed both outside of Europe as within. The motivation behind this, as always, was Dutch avarice. The *ballance adjusted*, a tractate in the form of a printed letter, was written to persuade the English readers that the Dutch did not have English interests at heart when crossing the Channel. The anonymous author, who multiple times referred back explicitly to Stubbe’s *A further justification* from 1673, wrote about the Dutch in the Indies:

‘they renounce Christianity in so intire and horrid a manner, That they make no manner of profession of their Religion at all, (...) the Indians themselves take them for Heathens; and all this merely for the sake of Trade’.271

Another pamphlet wrote about the persecution and execution of Christians in Japan. Instead of appealing to the Japanese government to aid their fellow believers, the Dutch declared that ‘they were Hollanders, and no Christians’, so that they might continue their trade. Sources repeated the thirty-five year old notions of Felltham and Marvell, arguing that the Dutch
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Republic itself was ungodly, proven by its toleration of ‘even the Rankest and most Blasphemous Hereticks in the World’. It was a widespread notion that ‘there were many Opinions in Holland, but one Religion, which was their Interest’. A letter from an English merchant in London, to his Dutch correspondent targeted dissenters when accusing the Dutch that: ‘you in Holland were never yet found guilty of that civil Sin of preferring your Religion to your Interest’. The author hoped to lessen some of the non-conformists’ sympathies towards the Dutch whose religion was akin to theirs. This was why he firmly stated: ‘the first Article of your Creed is INTEREST’.

The focus on Dutch ungodliness can be explained by the justification of William’s intervention in the English government. The Dutch Stadtholder declared he had crossed the Narrow Sea in defence of the English religion and liberty. By denying the Dutch (and William by extension) religious beliefs, pamphleteers discredited the public justification of the intervention, revealing the Dutch were actually led by much darker motives. The Dutch design anatomized stated in an often quoted passage: ‘none that know the Religion of an Hollander, would judge the Prince or States would be at the charge of a Dozen Fly-boats, or Herring Busses to propagate it’. The ballance adjusted explained more plainly:

‘it is improper and absurd to expect protection for our Religion from the Dutch, because the Dutch either have no Religion at all themselves, or pay no regard to it’.

Hollandophobic pamphleteers found it very hard to believe the invasion had been undertaken out of the goodness of Dutch hearts. To illustrate this writers could fall back on decades of history wherein the Dutch had shown they did not possess any gratitude, kindness or morality. Pamphlets referred to the past hostilities between the two countries in the seventeenth century, arguing Dutch ingratitude was proof enough that the United Provinces were England’s natural enemy. The pamphlet Fair warning to all English-men invoked in 1688 the history of Elizabeth’s and James’ reign, filled with ingratitude and cruelty. ‘Let us recollect what they have ever done to deserve our Friendship,’ the author asked his readers, ‘and make us forget so easily the many Notorious Injuries they have so long Loaded our

273 Anon, The ballance adjusted, 5.
274 G. M., A letter from an English merchant in London, to his Dutch correspondant in Amsterdam (1688) 1. See also: Anon, Englands crisis: or, the world well mended (1689) 1. G. Savile, A letter from a nobleman in London, to his friend in the country (1690) 7.
275 See for instance the official declaration that accompanied William into England: G. Burnet, The prince of Orange his declaration: shewing the reasons why he invades England (1688).
276 Anon, The Dutch design anatomized, 8.
277 Anon, The ballance adjusted, 4.
Nation with.’ If the Dutch had never displayed any kindness for being liberated by the English, pamphleteers argued, why would they invade England out of any feelings of friendship? *Englands crisis*, published a year later, told a similar tale, arguing the Dutch had already shown by many demonstrations – not in the least with the Amboyna Massacre – with what ‘Enmity to our Nation’ they regarded England. These pamphlets followed the conventional narrative of the distressed states who, by the grace of Elizabeth, made themselves a free state. Afterwards, they betrayed the English during James’ reign, robbing them of their fish and trade. These accusations were always followed by discussing Dutch crimes and cruelties in the colonies. *Englands crisis* rehearsed the snake analogy of the 1670s to describe the Dutch ingratitude, stating: ‘So soon like ungrateful Viper in the Fable, Did they hiss and offer to Sting that Bosom which Cherished and Protected them.’

**Struggle of allegiance**

A substantial portion of the English political nation supported William’s intervention in hopes of a reversal of foreign policy, a crackdown on Catholicism and the strengthening of parliamentarian competences. This left England divided and supporters of James isolated. When the king fled the country, he left his Jacobite supporters to pick up the pieces, trying to gain a larger following. Pamphleteers tried to convince the different political and religious groups that the Dutch invasion was *not* in the interest of England. Four themes loomed large in the anti-Williamite narrative they spread across the country. Pamphleteers discussed the role of religion in the intervention and in Dutch hearts. They reaffirmed the natural rivalry between both countries, revealing that the Glorious Revolution was a secret plot to ruin the country. They focused on foreigners flooding the kingdom, and they condemned the personal vices and ambitions of William of Orange, depicting him as an un-English and immoral king.

*The Dutch design anatomized, or, a discovery of the wickedness and unjustice of the intended invasion* was one of the first pamphlets to attack William and his intervention. The forty pages long tractate was published somewhere prior to the landing of William at Torbay, most likely in October, 1688. The work defended James whilst he was still in power, meaning it had passed the censor unopposed (see image 9). It was written to counter Williamite propaganda circulating in England, using the four aforementioned arguments. We can safely assume the pamphlet was coordinated from within the government, even though the author remained unknown. The influence of *The Dutch design anatomized* was great; it set the tone
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for future Jacobite works by denoting William’s intervention as a ‘Dutch invasion’ with the aid of only a few English components.\textsuperscript{280}

Once the revolution was completed in 1689, Nathaniel Johnston repeated the same arguments in The dear bargain, or, a true representation of the state of the English nation under the Dutch, a comprehensive and volatile piece of Jacobite propaganda. Johnston was an antiquary and political theorist who evolved into a supporter of James two years prior to the invasion, focusing in his works on Tory-inspired themes of divine royal right, succession and obedience. He wrote multiple tracts commissioned by the king himself when support for his rule started to falter, defending him against anti-Catholic opposition.\textsuperscript{281} After the revolution he fell on hard times. When William was crowned king, Johnston penned the inflammatory pamphlet in anguish, and it has been used by many historians to exemplify the Jacobite propaganda and the arguments it contained in the early years of William’s reign (see image 10).


A Dutchman and religion

Religion was a supranational identity that crossed borders; it had connected England with the United Provinces ever since the Reformation. It is no surprise, then, that the Prince of Orange focused in his propaganda on the shared Protestant bond between the two countries and the adverse Catholic beliefs of James.\(^{282}\) Opponents used many pages to discuss religion, in order to prove it held no place at all in William’s motivation to invade England. Pamphleteers’ focus on Dutch ungodliness was one example of these efforts. The downplaying of popery as a threat to England was another, which happened across a wide range of pamphlets. The author of The Dutch design anatomized highly doubted England needed to be saved from Catholicism by the Dutch:

‘Let not fear of Popery, or Massacres affright you out of your Senses, Reason, Religion and Duty; Can a handful of Men of that Persuasion be able to alter our Religion contrary to the bent of the whole body of the Nation?’\(^{283}\)

Englishmen were running ‘headlong into a Slavery to the Dutch’, solely because they swallowed the propaganda that inflated the popish threat. Another author wrote to his Dutch correspondent that he and his Hollanders: ‘blow up our People by their Aversion to Popery against the Liberty that should secure us both against That and You’. Pamphleteers complained with ‘what a grumbling and grunting were our Stomachs vext with, so that we were so Heart-Sick of Popery, that nothing but a Dutch Doctor could Cure us’.\(^{284}\)

Instead, Hollandophobic pamphleteers argued that the only popish threat that England was under, was brought by the Dutch themselves. Not James, but William of Orange was a popish crony! He had struck up a friendship with the old persecutors of Protestants, such as the king of Spain, the Holy Roman Emperor and the Pope. William promised them toleration of Catholics after he had conquered England, with the help of an army filled with popish soldiers.\(^{285}\) The character of a Williamite sketched a satirical description of an average follower of the Prince of Orange. He lacked wits and believed to be haunted by the ghost of popery. Hypocritically enough, he told ‘more Romantick Lyes than ever stood on Popish
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Legend’. He derived his name from a rigid Presbyterian, meaning he was no friend of the Anglican Church at all.\textsuperscript{286} Pamphleteers had to be careful when downplaying the Catholic threat, because they could be accused of defending popery, which would be fatal for any argument trying to appeal to a large English audience. The author of \textit{Englands crisis, or, the world well mended} specifically assured his readership that he was no papist himself. Another pamphleteer trusted his audience and ‘was sure you know I am no Papist’. The writer of \textit{The Dutch design anatomized} referred to himself as ‘a True Member of the Church of England’, being afraid he would be called a papist – which was of course precisely what happened in a critical pamphlet responding to his arguments.\textsuperscript{287}

Most pamphlets targeted moderate Anglicans in their argumentation, stating it was both their moral and legal duty to assist their rightful king. They also argued that the Catholic James was less of a threat to the Church of England than the Presbyterian William would be. \textit{The Dutch design anatomized} wrote: ‘we know neither the Dutch, nor any of the Confederates allow the Exercise of Episcopal Government’ – referring to the practice of the Anglican Church to use bishops in its organization. The Dutch were ‘as much Enemies to Episcopacy as to Monarchy it self.’\textsuperscript{288} \textit{The dear bargain} argued the Anglican Church was in danger of the Presbyterian party and dissenters, not papists.\textsuperscript{289} Dissenters were less likely to be addressed, but it was tried occasionally. Pamphlets argued non-conformist Protestants had little to gain by William’s accession, since James had already given them liberty of conscience and the Dutch would only revert this policy for personal gain.\textsuperscript{290} Religious toleration was by the late seventeenth century seen as the origin of Dutch commercial success. The Dutch, a pamphlet wrote, were ‘so small a People, in so little, and so ill a Country’, and yet they had used toleration to become ‘Masters of so great a part of the Traffick of the World.’\textsuperscript{291} James had propagated liberty of conscience to emulate the Dutch prosperity. Hollandophobic writers claimed the Dutch had invaded England to revert the policy, so that the Dutch Republic would maintain its wealth, leaving England impoverished.

This religious discourse resembled republican efforts in the 1650s to deconstruct the closeness and similarities of faith between England and the United Provinces. Both religious contexts posed similar problems for Hollandophobic pamphleteers; they needed to foment
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hostility between Englishmen and Dutchmen – who were united in faith – in order to bring about political change. In 1652 Commonwealth writers tried to gain support for war, despite the fact that both countries were Calvinist republics. In 1688 Jacobite propagandists needed to gain popular support for James, while the English shared more beliefs with the Dutch than they did with their own monarch. The tactics were the same; denying the Dutch any religious beliefs and reducing all other motives to the stereotypical character trait of avarice.

A plot for the ruin of England

The Glorious Revolution was not undertaken for the sake of religion. Instead, pamphleteers interpreted the intervention as a continuation of traditional Dutch designs; the acquisition of all the trade in the world.292 This interpretation began with reaffirming the fundamental opposition between the United Provinces and England as rivals in commerce. ‘I need not tell my Country-men, that our Interest is grounded upon Trade,’ the Whig pamphlet The Englishman’s complaint vented, ‘and that whatever lessens that, lessens us; and that, that Country that rivals us in that point, is our Enemy by Interest’.293 Shared interests made it impossible to join in a close alliance. A pamphlet complaining about both sides in the revolution explained as follows:

‘Dutch Men must be Dutch Men in business; They are made with a contrary Byas to England, and always move with advantage to Holland, that has quite an other Interest then ours; for both seek the same thing for differing ends.’294

With Dutchmen in power, the government would have no choice but to promote Dutch interests. Throughout history, authors wrote, the Dutch had proven they were England’s greatest enemies. ‘they have treated us thus, whilst we had the Sword in our Hands,’ Englands crisis concluded when looking back on the century of Anglo-Dutch frictions, ‘What think you must we expect from them if we deliver it up?’295 The Dutch invasions had happened contrary to England’s interests, making the subsequent government worse than the royalists’ greatest devils in history; even ‘the very blackest of Parliaments, and Oliver Cromwel himself’ – vile as they were – had ‘that due regard to the interest of England, in point of Trade, that they
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undertook a War against the Dutch’, forcing them to favourable terms.\textsuperscript{296} Allowing the Dutch to be in control of the government was something unfathomable for supporters of James, yet it had happened nonetheless. There could be only one explanation for this.

Anti-Williamite pamphleteers continuously explained the Glorious Revolution in terms of a secret Dutch plot to enslave England: ‘a Plot is laid for the ruine of England’.\textsuperscript{297} This covert design formed the main narrative in pamphlets’ arguments, relying on eighty years of Hollandophobic expressions in literature and people’s minds, often slumbering, sometimes erupting, but always present as a familiar and recognizable stereotype that could be exploited for political ends. \textit{The Dutch design anatomized} wrote about the invasion:

‘not Religion was the design, but the subduing us to the Dutch, and by the Conjunction of our strength under their Command, to make themselves Masters of the Sea and Traffic’.\textsuperscript{298}

Johnston, too, repeated the argument of ‘the general Design of weakening the Nation’ to condemn the Dutch. He lamented that the kind and foolish English ‘not only expose our weakness to them, but give them up our Trade, and pay them too for their enslaving us’. This would make the English prisoners on their own island. The final goal of the plot was that of ‘utterly disabling the strength of our Nation, and bringing us to depend intirely on Strangers’ – more specifically the Dutch.\textsuperscript{299} The Dutch abused this vassalage after William’s accession to force the English into a conflict with France. The Nine Years’ War was seen as a Dutch war, fought for Dutch interests, using English resources.\textsuperscript{300} It was displayed in print as proof of the Dutch efforts to weaken England by depleting it of manpower and supplies: ‘the Dutch, dull as they are, have out-witted the English; and by a trick drawn us into a War, to defend them against France’.\textsuperscript{301}

\textit{Foreigners flooding the country}

Part of the Jacobite efforts to lessen popular support for William was to incite hatred against the Dutch by pointing at the influence they had gained, to the detriment of England.

\textsuperscript{296} Johnston, \textit{The dear bargain}, 5.
\textsuperscript{297} Savile, \textit{A letter from a nobleman in London}, 6.
\textsuperscript{298} Anon, \textit{The Dutch design anatomized}, 18.
\textsuperscript{299} Johnston, \textit{The dear bargain}, 4, 5, 10, 22.
\textsuperscript{300} Coombs, \textit{The Conduct of the Dutch}, 17.
\textsuperscript{301} Savile, \textit{A letter from a nobleman in London}, 1.
Whenever it was opportune, pamphleteers called in the Dutch. They were able to subdue the English, printed works stated, because of the great number of foreigners residing in England, deciding governmental policies. Criticism was directed against the large number of foreign troops that flooded the country and against the perceived Dutch cabal of councillors around William III.

The author of *The Dutch design anatomized* worried about the consequences of a possible Dutch intervention. The army that the Prince of Orange would bring with him during his invasion, would consist of Dutch, German and Swedish troops: ‘a medley of Nations of different Laws and Customs; but such as all will agree to make a ravage and spoyl of our Country’. Surely these foreign mercenaries would plunder, rape and steal their way across the country. By embracing foreigners, he predicted, the English people ‘may undergo the like miseries the Britains did under the Saxons, the Saxons under the Normans, and the Germans under the Swedes.’ Pamphlets attacking William’s army relied on general expressions of xenophobia, instead of specific Hollandophobia. This is not strange if we consider that the army landing on the fifth of November at Torbay was a mixture of European nationalities. Once the Glorious Revolution was concluded, we see more references to Dutch wrongdoings.

In 1689 Johnston still wrote in *The dear bargain* of foreign soldiers ravaging the country ‘under the Slavery of the Lord Dutch and Lord Danes’. Apart from the conduct of foreign troops, Johnston was also concerned with the fate of the English soldiers, who were distrusted by the new king. Army commanders had espoused ‘the Dutch Interest’, putting off ‘the charitable Nature of true English’, meaning soldiers were treated poorly. They were slighted and, worst of all, they were dispersed over Britain, Holland and the West-Indies, to keep them powerless. Englishmen who were sent into Holland to fight for the Dutch were doomed above all. For every Dutch soldier who died, a hundred of Englishmen fell:

‘From the scarcity, and the change of Dyet; from English Beef, Mutton, and Veal, with wholsom Beverage, and an open Air; to feed upon Herbs and Roots; drink a muddy Beer, and suck in a foggy Air; the Soldiers were starved into Diseases, and being in an unhospitable land (…) were suffered to die like English Dogs, as they were usually stiled’.
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Even the Dutch air was poisonous to the liberty-loving Englishmen. Clearer proof of the fact that they did not belong in that boggy country could not be imagined. A popular target of critique was the Dutch Blue Guard, the personal guard of William. It was a sore sight for citizens of London to see the Dutch soldiers protecting the royal palaces, where once their own English elite force had stood sentry. *The Belgick Boor* rhymed that William:

‘brings his nasty Croaking Crew
Unto his Father’s Gate,
Dismist his own, makes them his Guard,
O dismal Turn of Fate!’

Under pressure from parliament, the Blue Guard was recalled back to the United Provinces in 1699, under a loud applause of English spectators.

At the level of government, no other foreigners were condemned; all that Hollandophobic pamphleteers could see were Dutch advisors, buzzing around a Dutch king. ‘we know the Dutch are spread, like Locusts, over the whole Kingdom’, Nathaniel Johnston wrote. He witnessed that ‘The important and essential Consults and Resolutions are all managed by a few foreigners, in a secret Cabal of Dutch Men’. The ‘Dutch Councils’ were unconcerned about the fate of England and solely governed to enrich the United Provinces. The author of *Englands crisis* complained about William:

‘it is this eager desire of our Prosperity, that makes him dive under Water, out of the sight of the English Nobility, to a Dutch Cabal at Hampton-Court; and we can see his desirable Face no more, unless it be to pass Acts to empty our Coffers, to Saint Rebels, or destroy our Church’.

The Dutch councillor who was personally ridiculed was William Bentinck, the Prince of Orange’s closest confidant. The Dutchman was made Earl of Portland in 1689, joining the House of Lords as a result. The attacks on him increased in number and volatility as
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William’s reign continued and Bentinck’s perceived influence became more noticeable. Yet the Dutch courtier was already visible to pamphleteers directly after William was crowned king. Johnston mentioned: ‘Min Heer Benting, who upon the matter now rules over us.’ Another author opposed Bentinck’s inclusion in the king’s privy council, for reasons that he was:

‘a Forraigner, and Unnarutalized, and such a Superiour Favorite, (...) to disgust the English Nobility and Gentry. (...) I hear he does as he is bid, as other Favorites use to do; but Englishmen naturally don’t love Gavestons.’

Bentinck was not only seen to form the core of the Dutch faction around William, pamphleteers also considered him to be the personification of all the grievances Englishmen possessed against the Dutch in general. In their pamphlets they made use of a discourse of anti-favouritism. This had formed into an English tradition in history, going back as far as the despised favourite of Edward II, Gaveston. Many of the accusations laid at Bentinck’s feet were classical anti-favourite in nature – such as self-enrichment, an unhealthy influence over governmental policies and an unnatural close relationship with the sovereign. These charges were universal, and not specifically geared towards Dutchmen. When Bentinck became a symbol of opposition to Dutchness within the English nation, his image was thus not only shaped by a narrow Hollandophobia. This did not contradict the anti-Dutch discourse. Far from it; the fact that Bentinck was Dutch made the accusations of self-interest and self-aggrandizement all the more credible.

**Dutch William**

Lastly, we see pamphleteers mercilessly attacking the architect of the Glorious Revolution, William himself, for his unnatural ambition, immoral behaviour and his Dutchness. During the intervention and subsequent reign of William, Hollandophobic authors focused for the first time in the seventeenth century on the personal vices of an individual, apart from the mild references to Dutch naval commanders we witnessed in the 1660s. Here we can discern a
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glimmer of one of the traditional themes of the Spanish Black Legend, which had a century prior to 1688 furiously attacked Philip of Spain and his immoral conduct.\textsuperscript{315}

Pamphleteers argued the Dutch had invaded England for reasons of state, but William had led the intervention solely for self-aggrandizement.\textsuperscript{316} The *Dutch design anatomized* explained he: ‘had that particular one of gratifying an Ambition, to have himself numbered among Crowned Heads’.\textsuperscript{317} His sole design was to usurp the crown from his own father-in-law. This tyrannical ambition made William treacherous, barbarous and showed him for the violator of justice and honour that he was.\textsuperscript{318} His immoral behaviour could not be better described by discussing all the laws of government, nature and human decency he had broken while acquiring his absolute power. ‘It is unnatural for a Son to Rebel against a Father, and pretend to seize upon his Estate before he is Dead’, the author of *News from Sherburn-castle* judged. He was appalled at the sight of so many rebellions England had to endure: ‘One of the Nephew, and This of the Son. Good God!’\textsuperscript{319} The Glorious Revolution was ‘so unchristian, un-natural and Treacherous Invasion’, that no good government could sprout from it.\textsuperscript{320} Or, as Nathaniel Johnston summarized:

‘a Government raised by Parricide and Usurpation, entred into by Violation of his own Declaration, supported by the Overthrow of all our Laws Sacred and Civil, and the Perjury of the Nation.’\textsuperscript{321}

William’s nationality did nothing to alleviate his wretched character. He was depicted as ‘a Dutch King, such an one as he is’.\textsuperscript{322} As a foreign prince and Dutchman he should have nothing to do with the English government. Johnston was inspired by the stereotypical Dutch characteristics of avarice and ungodliness when describing the new king of England:
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‘He hath, if any ever had, two Faces under one Hood; and though he hath a double Conscience, (…) yet he hath but one Principle, That Gain is great Godliness; and one Dutch Soul, Interest, to become all things to all Men, to gain all to himself.’

By 1690 he had already proven to be a Dutch ‘Task-Master’, letting his foreigners lord over the English, while solely concerned with his home country. This showed ‘some Body’s heart is as Foreign as his Birth’. Thus, Englishmen were wrong to expect that William would counter ‘the Malignity of the Dutch Humor’ of the foreigners he had brought with him, since he had invaded England to ‘serve a Covetousness Natural to the Dutch, and an Ambition and Revenge as Natural to Himself’. William was a Dutch king, inflicted with the same despicable characteristics as his fellow Dutchmen.

**Defining Hollandophobia in 1688**

Hollandophobic sentiment slumbered in these tractates, building on seventeenth century stereotypes and commonplaces, to provide arguments with both strength and credibility. This focus on political arguments that condemned the outcome of the revolution was less direct than traditional anti-Dutch tropes and insults, but it reveals the antipathy felt towards the Dutch all the same. Historical research showed that the factual influence of Dutchmen in post-1688 England was rather limited. William was careful not to promote too many countrymen to court positions, government offices and the English peerage. Still, in anti-Williamite propaganda the Glorious Revolution was depicted as a subjugation of England to a Dutch cabal of sinister schemers. This indicated that the perceived influence of foreigners in the English government was a highly persuasive argument that struck a chord with the English audience. People recognized that foreign influence over their country, be it real or imagined, was not a good thing, especially when concerning the Dutch; in both history and in print they had showed themselves to be immoral enemies.

Hollandophobia during 1688-1690 can best be described as a mostly inexplicit confirmation of earlier images, which alluded to stereotypical characteristics and notions without specific references to textual tropes. Therefore, there was little explicit copying from
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older Hollandophobic sources. Pamphleteers focused on the actuality of the political upheaval and not on specific anti-Dutch insults and how they were phrased. There did exist a great deal of Hollandophobia in the proposed arguments, with the Dutch at the heart of them as the root of all evil. Prior to the invasion, Hollandophobic pamphlets were semi-official in nature, instructed to counter Williamite propaganda. After the Glorious Revolution these became clandestine, with seemingly less organization, explicit patronage and means of production. The anti-Dutch agenda did not die with the rule of William III; throughout his reign he was attacked for being ambitious and immoral – but most of all for the train of Dutchmen and Dutch interests he had brought with him when becoming king of England.
Conclusion

The reign of William III forced England and the United Provinces into an alliance against a common foe, quite similar to a century before. Then, Queen Elizabeth had aided the Dutch in the struggle against the universal dominion of Spain, even though she had not been particularly fond of the rebels. A hundred years later, both countries joined forces against the expansionist France of Louis XIV. And it proved to be a successful union, even after William’s death in 1702, eventually managing to force the military giant to a halt. It proved not, however, to be a happy union, as one Williamite pamphleteer hopefully predicted in 1689.\textsuperscript{328} Hollandophobic sentiment did not disappear after the Anglo-Dutch rapprochement. The English looked grudgingly at the costs of lives and wealth caused by the Nine Years’ War and the following War of the Spanish Succession against France, criticizing the Dutch ally for every setback at home or abroad, as if the two countries were still at war with each other.\textsuperscript{329}

It was all the more ironic that the Hollandophobic English had finally achieved through the alliance what they had not been able to accomplish with three subsequent wars – curbing the Dutch and supplanting their prosperity. The wars with France impoverished and indebted the United Provinces, which strained under the pressure of full-scale war. England, on the other hand, profited from the Dutch alliance, emerging from the conflict as the dominant power in Europe. How deep the Dutch had sunk was revealed in the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War (1780-1784), which was decisively won by Great Britain. The war left the United Provinces in shambles. The once so feared high and mighty state had, at last, been reduced to a distressed state again, finally fulfilling the boasts made by seventeenth century English pamphleteers – even if a hundred years late.

Hollandophobia

The first aim of this thesis was to give a survey of the anti-Dutch discourse in England during the seventeenth century. The phenomenon of Hollandophobia consisted of a comprehensive collection of stereotypical character traits, textual tropes and topical accusations that, by now, should be familiar to us. The negative characterization of the Dutch revolved around six interconnected attributes. Ingratitude was one of the leading characteristics shaping Dutch immorality. The past of the Dutch Revolt and England’s part in it was always revisited by
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pamphleteers, making ungratefulness a quintessential part of the Dutch nature. This hostility towards England was explained by avarice. The Dutch were led by their unnaturally large covetousness for power and profit. Principles of religion and human decency were subservient to this insatiable lust for wealth, making the Dutch notoriously ungodly and treacherous. This was manifest in the lack of concerns over the wellbeing of Protestants in the world and the refusal to adhere to treaties. The Dutch were undeservedly proud, placing their own state above those of others. At the same time, they were notoriously low, boorish and drunk.

This characterization of the Dutch was depicted with the use of textual tropes – short references reducing attributes to commonplace idioms and insults. The Unites Provinces were described as ‘Hogan Mogan’ or as a false ‘Belgick lion’ to summarize Dutch pride. Its amphibious geography was ridiculed with references to its low situation and many bogs. The Dutch were depicted as frogs, who generally annoyed the nations around them with their croaking. Pamphleteers also described the Dutch as uncivil boars, unmannered and filthy. This boorish nature was exemplified with an unquenchable thirst for brandy, the sole source of Dutch courage. All the unnatural characteristics of the Dutch were captured in the trope of the Amboyna Massacre, haunting the United Provinces throughout the seventeenth century and beyond. Lastly, the Dutch were the target of derogatory name-calling, casting them as evil heathens, non-European foreigners and blabbering butter-boxes.

Topical accusations against the Dutch varied over time, but many of these political arguments for war shared the same fears of Dutch behaviour. The inhabitants of the United Provinces were accused of ingratitude when supporting enemies of the English state – whether they were royalist exiles or republican radicals. Commercial rivalry was always an important argument, wherein the Dutch, motivated by avarice, supplanted English trade and prosperity through unfair trading practices. Elaborating on this notion, pamphleteers claimed the Dutch were trying to acquire a universal dominion by taking over all trade in the world. The interplay between these general characteristics, textual tropes and topical arguments shaped Hollandophobia as a large and unified literary discourse. The arguments for war formed contemporary instances of the immoral Dutch nature, whereas the propagated character was used as the root explanation of all wrongdoings perpetrated by the Dutch. Textual tropes rehearsed condemnations of the Dutch in easily consumable literary devices, constituting the glue that strengthened Hollandophobic notions through force of repetition, holding the discourse in place.
Origins
The second aim was to shed some light upon the origins of these characteristics, tropes and commonplaces within the discourse of Hollandophobia. Whilst writing about the Anglo-Dutch conflicts of the second half of the seventeenth century, it became acutely clear that anti-Dutch notions existed long before this time. The stereotype of the drunken, boorish Dutchman, for instance, already existed on the London stage in the middle of the sixteenth century, whereas accusations of ungodliness and avarice were widely commented upon in travel journals at the turn of the seventeenth century. The images of senseless pride and croaking frogs seemed to have come somewhat later, during the initial commercial friction between the two countries. The charge of ingratitude was also first voiced in this period, but it really leapt to the forefront of peoples’ minds in 1652, the first year of actual war. The notion of Dutch cowardice most likely also originated relatively late in the century. In this thesis I have discerned a number of literary traditions, such as Elizabethan drama, travel accounts and climate theory, that inspired anti-Dutch pamphleteers. Even though not extensive, they are indicative of the historical origins of many of the elements of the discourse of Hollandophobia.

Another undeniable source of influence for the discourse of anti-Dutch writing in early modern England was the Spanish Black Legend, which has figured repeatedly in the narrative of this thesis. When reading Hispanophobic and Hollandophobic sources alongside each other, it is difficult not to see the likeness in tone, narrative and style. It is important to be aware of the many similarities between Hollandophobia and an older discourse of xenophobic stereotyping, since it reveals a lot about the influence and repetition taking place in national stereotypes in early modernity.

Since the focus of this thesis has been the seventeenth century, studying sources from that specific period of time, it is difficult to give a complete survey of the origins of Hollandophobic images. To accomplish this, more historical research is necessary, studying pamphlets and other literary sources from the sixteenth century, in relation to the emergence of the first independent and discernible Dutch state. Despite this lack of focus, we can observe that Hollandophobic images tend to be older than generally believed in historiography. A book chapter on the opposition against William III, for example, stated that the term ‘Hogan Mogan’ became a popular term of anti-Dutch abuse from the 1670s onwards, whereas it was already prevalent in the 1650s. The frog-symbolism was already used in the 1620s, long
before Meijer Drees recognized its popularity in 1665. These minor inaccuracies are mainly caused by a lack of focus on the development of Hollandophobic thought, with historians only observing single images that accidentally pass in their studies. This is not a bad thing for the research of academics who are not primarily concerned with the anti-Dutch stereotype, but it does impede our full understanding of Hollandophobia.

**Continuity and change**

Treating Hollandophobia as a historically changing phenomenon has been the most important contribution of this thesis for our understanding of national stereotyping in early modernity. It has set this thesis apart from previous academic works, such as those written by scholars such as Simon Schama, Steven Pincus and Marijke Meijer Drees – all useful studies in themselves, but limited in their analysis of anti-Dutch expressions in early modern print. By providing a chronological study on the development of the Hollandophobic discourse, we are able to reveal continuity and change in the way it was shaped and propagated. For example, the quantity of Hollandophobic pamphlets and its share in the total amount of printed sources in England varied over time. A first lesson we can draw from the EEBO database is that more sources discussed the Dutch – either positively or negatively – whenever they became topical as a result of war. This is visible when looking at the four spikes in Appendix 2, indicating an increased popularity of the Dutch in printed works, correlating to the four periods of Anglo-Dutch conflict. This conclusion is expected, but it is useful to have it corroborated by statistical evidence all the same.

Another conclusion is that the quantity of Hollandophobic pamphlets is influenced by the popularity of anti-Dutch policies. Whenever support for war with the Dutch was high, more Hollandophobic sources were printed to capitalize upon the tide of xenophobic sentiment. This suggests the propagandistic value of Hollandophobia had its limits, since anti-Dutch pamphleteers did not try to sway popular opinion on a large scale, whenever the public was against them. During the First Anglo-Dutch War, twenty pamphlets, out of a large collection of sources mentioning the Dutch, could be called Hollandophobic in nature. Once peace was concluded, the popularity of Dutch topical pamphlets plummeted to an all-time low in the seventeenth century, indicating Hollandophobic sentiment quickly lost ground when no longer propagated as a justification for war. The Second Anglo-Dutch War sparked thirty-eight Hollandophobic pamphlets. These remained popular as the war progressed, only
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declining starkly after the disastrous raid on the Medway in 1667. They formed a relatively large portion of the total amount of printed works that have survived in the database of *EEBO*, nearly 1.5 per cent for the year 1665 (see Appendix 3). This does not sound like much, but we have to realize this includes *all* printed works that appeared in that year – pamphlets, sermons, treatises, speeches and books on every topic imaginable – together forming a total of 1368 unique sources. The Third Anglo-Dutch War was remarkably different in comparison. Twenty-eight anti-Dutch sources appeared, almost all in 1672, the initial year of the war. Hollandophobia was nearly absent one year later, forming a mere 0.25 per cent of all published sources, an indication of the growing opposition against yet another war with the Dutch. During the Glorious Revolution, Hollandophobic propaganda was both clandestine and frustrated by domestic division, preventing large-scale support. Only fifteen anti-Dutch sources appeared, forming a small percentage of the total amount of printed material, an indication of the growth of print in general – reducing the relative amount of Hollandophobic sources – and a preoccupation with larger concerns than only the Dutch alliance.

Similarly, the use of pamphlet type was influenced by the popularity of anti-Dutch policies, and by the period’s historical context in general. Hollandophobia functioned differently in accounts, political tractates, character pamphlets and poems, each pamphlet type having its own use for anti-Dutch images in its narrative – from being a narrative in itself, a political argument, a concrete example of sweeping generalizations or an easily consumable trope. In the Commonwealth’s conflict with the United Provinces the use of pamphlet types was relatively balanced. Political tractates were used to justify the unprecedented war, whereas character pamphlets re-casted the Dutch as evil enemies instead of close friends. Poems were intended to entertain, not to convince, so they were barely used in this period. During the Restoration regime’s war in 1665, poems were the dominant type used in Hollandophobic pamphlets. This indicated the familiarity with, and popularity of, war with the Dutch. Tropes propagated in these poems served to maintain existing anti-Dutch sentiment in English society, instead of creating it – made possible because the war was universally supported. The war of 1672 quickly became unpopular, causing a more balanced use of pamphlet types. Half of the Hollandophobic sources were still poems, but more attention was given to tractates and character pamphlets to persuade people of the necessity of war. The Glorious Revolution constituted a political crisis, caused by a divided nation. As a result political tractates were used most often, intended to influence the struggle of allegiance between William and the deposed James. Because Hollandophobic pamphlets were
clandestine during the Dutchman’s reign, increasing the risks for pamphleteers, very few entertaining works were written.

The Hollandophobic stereotype itself remained remarkably stable and recognizable in the seventeenth century. There were, however, a number of changes and nuances in the images propagated by pamphleteers, influenced by the self-changing historical context of the time. The central aim of pamphleteers during the First Anglo-Dutch War was to distance England from the Dutch for the first time on a large scale. The character trait of ingratitude became a centrepiece in Hollandophobia, used to recast the shared history of both countries. To deny the sameness of both people, the characteristics of avarice and ungodliness were emphasized, refuting the claim that the United Provinces formed a Protestant republic. In the 1660s the Hollandophobic character was already firmly in place, meaning it could be propagated in a different manner. Short textual tropes became the dominant form for transferring anti-Dutch sentiment. References like Hogan Mogan, boars, frogs, bogs and butter-boxes were all popular, at the expense of more substantial political arguments for war. The English self-image had changed alongside its political system. As a result, the Dutch were no longer seen as covert royalist, but as republican radicals. This became especially apparent in the Third Anglo-Dutch War, when Hollandophobic propaganda targeted the Dutch States Party. Pride and the haughty title ‘High and Mighty’ formed key elements to attack republicanism in the United Provinces and to increase support for the Prince of Orange. Dutch perfidy was a popular characteristic, used to justify another war with the Dutch after the signed peace of 1667. A renewed focus on arguments, such as the right of the flag, strengthened this justification. Pamphleteers during the Glorious Revolution placed arguments and larger themes squarely above literary tropes, a result of growing division within England itself. Dutch ungodliness was mercilessly attacked, because this would discredit the reasons of the invasion and reveal the Prince of Orange’s true motives. Dutch avarice put forward as the real reason why the Dutch had invaded England. Thus, the changing historical contexts during the latter half of the seventeenth century influenced both the quantity, the typology as well as the content of Hollandophobic pamphlets.

The discourse of Hollandophobia was also highly influenced by the actors who had created and shaped it in the first place. Government officials proposed criticism against the Dutch in a reserved manner, for diplomatic reasons. Commissioned semi-official propaganda, written by professional pamphleteers, repeated these anti-Dutch notions in volatile language. These images proliferated when further distributed by independent polemicists, motivated by a mixture of financial considerations, hopes of patronage and genuine concern about the ill-
natured Dutch. The corpus of pamphlets from the First Anglo-Dutch War was for example a collection of official treatises, commissioned propaganda, like Nedham’s, and independent works, such as those of Felltham and Osborne. Most of the poems in the 1660s were written anonymously. Other pamphlets were either written by young men, possibly in hopes of recognition and patronage, or known writers with close connections to the Restoration regime. Collaboration between government and pamphleteers was quite clear during the Third Anglo-Dutch War. Henry Stubbe was the government’s most prolific propagandists. Pamphlets written by other authors, such as De Britaine, followed the official line of argumentation meticulously. These sources were joined with a number of independent works. The government had both a stimulating and a facilitating role, being able to cause a surge of Hollandophobic print, for instance when commissioning works that defended its policies during the wars of 1652 and 1672. It was difficult to set up a Hollandophobic discourse without the support, or at least approval, from the top. The ousting of the anti-Dutch regime of James II in 1688 seriously damaged the possibility of pamphleteers to write and distribute Hollandophobic works. When the court of James I did not benefit from Hollandophobia in 1624, it actively repressed the expression of anti-Dutch sentiment in public print, as shown by the case of the Amboyna Massacre.

Throughout the seventeenth century, intertextuality gave cohesion to the discourse of Hollandophobia, allowing pamphleteers to benefit from the strength of repetition. This understandably contributed to the continuity of the phenomenon during the studied period. The rehearsal of old literary traditions and recent works of print by Hollandophobic pamphleteers meant a continuity of phrases, images, paragraphs and entire pamphlets, copied and reprinted in later periods. Hollandophobia changed continuously during the century as a result of changing contexts, regimes and interests, but it remained one recognizable discourse, and this was in no slight degree the result of pamphleteers’ tendencies to fall back to stereotypical images and narratives propagated in the years before. Therefore, it is vital to study intertextuality when trying to understand a literary discourse, and this is only possible with a chronological research over a lengthy period of time.

The three aims discussed in this thesis give us an increased understanding of the discourse of Hollandophobia and the construction of national stereotypes in early modernity. They tell us with which characteristics, tropes and arguments a national stereotype was constructed. They reveal how much the discourse was influenced by past literary traditions and other national stereotypes and how intertextuality provided the strength of repetition. This thesis has shown
the different ways in which a discourse could be propagated in print, and which actors were responsible for this. It also illustrated that a national stereotype could be influenced a great deal by the historical context of the specific period: the form of government, changing self-images, the position of political power of the propagators, the extent of popular support for xenophobic policies, previous examples of hostility, domestic political division, the existence of clear causes for war, the coordination between government officials, professional pamphleteers and opportunistic enthusiasts... They all determined the manner in which pamphleteers could effectively propagate the Hollandophobic stereotype, to sway public opinion. The Hollandophobia appearing in seventeenth century pamphlets was intentionally engineered, its shape consciously adapted to fit contemporary historical circumstances. However, propagated stereotypes could outlive their political viability (and relevance), slumbering through time whilst the political motivations behind them were long dead. Some of the elements of Hollandophobia have survived to this day in the English vocabulary and images of the Dutch – such as their secular, profit-minded and ill-mannered behaviour – though they have lost most of their negative connotations. Considering the remarks we have passed in this thesis, it is probably a good thing they have.
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Primary sources
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Appendix

Appendix 1: Number of sources from 1623-1700 mentioning ‘Amboyna’ in the database of EEBO. The four largest peaks in the figure correlate with the outbreak of the three Anglo-Dutch Wars of the seventeenth century and the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Note that the figure includes sources naming ‘Amboyna’ in a different context than the Amboyna Massacre of 1623 (e.g. geographical surveys of the East-Indies), explaining some of the peaks that fall outside the four periods.

Appendix 2: Number of sources from 1650-1700 mentioning ‘Dutch’ in the database of EEBO. The second line shows the percentage of these Dutch topical sources compared to all printed sources from that year. The four largest peaks in the figure correlate roughly with the three Anglo-Dutch Wars and the Glorious Revolution, especially when looking at the percentages.
Appendix 3: Number of Hollandophobic sources from the three Anglo-Dutch Wars of the seventeenth century and the Glorious Revolution in the database of EEBO. The line shows the percentage of Hollandophobic sources compared to all printed sources from that year.