

The *Plooierijen*

**A comparative historical analysis of political revolts in the
early eighteenth-century Dutch Republic**

By Arjan Pomp

G.J.T. Pomp

0026255

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Maarten Prak

Comparative History Master Thesis

Utrecht University

July 2010

In memoriam

Maria Geertruida Kok-Vos

Acknowledgements

First, I want to thank Maarten Prak for his help and guidance through the process of writing this thesis. I would also like to thank him for making the entire Comparative History program a great experience. I want to give special thanks to Katie Simanzik and Lotte van der Vleuten for their helpful comments. Finally, I want to thank my parents and sisters for their unconditional support.

Arjan Pomp

July 27th, 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
1 Utrecht	15
1.1 The Foldings of Amersfoort	15
2 Gelderland	29
2.1 Internal factors	29
2.1.1 The Foldings in Nijmegen	29
2.1.2 The Foldings in Arnhem	36
2.1.3 The Foldings in Zutphen	43
2.2 External factors	53
2.3 The end of the Foldings in Gelderland	58
3 Overijssel	66
3.1 The Foldings of Deventer	66
3.2 The Foldings of Steenwijk	74
Conclusion	88
Bibliography	92

Introduction

The Dutch Republic is generally known for its relatively wealthy and stable society during its two centuries of existence. Especially during the Golden Age, historians like C. Busken Huet, P.L. Muller and P.J. Blok saw the Dutch society as a harmonious and peaceful time.¹ Still, the Dutch Republic went through several periods of political crisis. At times of national crisis within the Republic, public revolts were not uncommon to break out in the Dutch Republic. The friction between States-minded and Orange-minded groups was one of the causes from which political crises could emerge. This was especially the case during the crisis of 1618 (*de bestandstwisten*), the crisis of 1650 when William II organized a *coup d'état*, the crisis of 1672 when the Dutch Republic was under attack from France and England, the crisis of 1702 when William III died, the crisis of 1747 when the French army invaded the Republic again, and the Patriots of the 1780s.² The crisis of 1672 is one of the most severe crises in the Dutch Republic. It entered the history books as *Het Rampjaar* (The Year of Disaster).

Besides these crises, the Dutch Republic experienced a number of other social revolts during its two centuries of existence. Historian Rudolf Dekker showed that there have been a lot more crises in the Dutch Republic than the consensus was until then. In his book *Holland in beroering; Oproeren in de 17de en 18de eeuw*, Dekker discussed the revolts that took place in Holland during the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Dekker discusses food revolts, tax revolts, religious revolts and political revolts. He limited himself to the revolts in the province of Holland, because this was the most important and most densely populated area of the Dutch Republic.³

Historian D.J. Roorda wrote a major study on the Year of Disaster. In his book, *Partij en Factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties*, Roorda discusses the revolts that took place in the towns of Holland and Zeeland in 1672. According to Roorda, the friction between Orange and States-minded parties was not what dominated political culture in the towns, but factions of regents.⁴ The sociologist's definition of a political party is a political entity that wants to bind large groups based on common ideological background. A faction on the other hand, is a group of local, in Holland and Zeeland particularly urban, rulers. These groups are generally of a more selfish nature. According to Roorda, modern

¹ R. Dekker, *Holland in beroering; oproeren in de 17^{de} en 18^{de} eeuw* (Baarn 1982) 8.

² D.J. Roorda, *Partij en Factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties* (Groningen 1978) 3.

³ Dekker, *Holland in beroering* 9.

⁴ Roorda, *Partij en Factie*, 3.

political parties did not exist in the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century. The broad public experienced only a modest political awareness and focused particularly on the interests of the province and the town they lived in. In times of crisis, burghers were drawn into the conflict through the different factions.⁵

Whereas in the past scholars did not pay much attention to revolts in the Dutch Republic, later scholars like Dekker and Roorda concentrated mostly on the revolts that took place in Holland and Zeeland. However, also in other provinces several revolts have taken place over the years. This thesis will discuss one of these revolts, The *Plooierijen*.

The *Plooierijen* were a struggle between the *Nieuwe Plooi* and the *Oude Plooi*.⁶ Originally, the word *Plooierij* (from now on Folding) was a term used to describe the difference between two parties. The *Oude Plooi* (Old Fold) represented the Orange-minded party, whereas the *Nieuwe Plooi* (New Fold) represented the States-minded party.⁷ In 1674, William III had subjected the provinces of Gelderland, Overijssel and Utrecht to a government regulation. The government regulation gave William the sole power to appoint persons to important offices in the province. This meant that William also had a free hand in the formation of the local government in these provinces. William received the power to exclude or appoint regents in the town government. Self-evident, in case a town had a *Gezwoeren Gemeente* (Sworn Community), a college of burgher representatives (community members), he could appoint or dismiss burghers from this college and could decide to decrease or even end the influence of this college in the town. William's changes differed from town to town. Especially in the early years, William appointed regents to the magistracy in the towns of Gelderland and Overijssel that he could trust. This had everything to do with the ongoing Franco-Dutch War (1672-1679), in which the Eastern provinces remained vulnerable for attacks.

The conflict was a more than just a conflict between two political parties. Burghers saw an opportunity to get more influence in the appointment of the magistracy and used the death of the *Stadhouder* (Stadtholder) to fight for their democratic rights. The Foldings took place in the provinces of Gelderland, Overijssel and Utrecht after the death of Stadtholder William III in 1702. The political revolts started in 1702 in Nijmegen and lasted in that town for fifteen years. In 1703, the Foldings spread over to many towns in the provinces of Gelderland, Overijssel and Utrecht. The revolts were a direct result of the termination of the government regulation. In the end, the Foldings were not very

⁵ Roorda, *Partij en Factie*, 3.

⁶ H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, D. Ormrod, W.F. Wertheim, 'Early 18th Century Uprisings in the Low Countries: Prelude to the Democratic Revolution' *History Workshop* 15 (1983) 96.

⁷ A. Brants, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen* (proefschrift Leiden, 1874) ii.

successful. In the towns where the Foldings lasted only a few months, the troubles were also very soon forgotten. In the towns where the New Fold was in control for a few years, the institutional changes that they had made disappeared after a while.

In this thesis, I will make a comparison of the Foldings that took place in the towns of the provinces of Gelderland, Overijssel and Utrecht. I will discuss the political revolts of six towns. The revolts in Arnhem, Nijmegen and Zutphen in the province of Gelderland, the revolts in Deventer and Steenwijk in the province of Overijssel, and the revolts that took place in Amersfoort in the province of Utrecht. I will make a comparative analysis of the duration of the conflict. The main question of this thesis is: Why was the New Fold in some towns shorter than a year in control of the government, while in other towns the New Fold could hold power for more than a year?

Historiography

Nineteenth century historian A. Brants wrote his dissertation on the Foldings in 1874. The dissertation discussed the movement in Nijmegen and the *kwartier* (district) of Nijmegen. According to Brants, the Foldings were a conflict between regents left out by William III, the New Fold, and regents who wanted to continue their positions in the magistracy after the death of the Stadtholder, the Old Fold. Brants mostly discussed the Foldings as a conflict between the States-minded and the Orange-minded groups.⁸ In 1908, historian S.P. Haak wrote a paper on the Foldings and made special reference to the Veluwe district and especially the revolts that took place in Arnhem. Haak took the role of the burghers in the conflict more into account than Brants had done in his dissertation.⁹

In 1973, historian A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink reversed the theory that the Foldings were a faction conflict between regents and regents left out by William III. According to her, the core of the Foldings lay in the democratic demands of the burghers to get more influence in the appointment and policy of the local government.¹⁰ In her dissertation, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink discussed the Foldings in the entire province of Gelderland. In 1977, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink wrote a book in which she only discussed the Foldings in the County of Zutphen district. According to her, the

⁸ Brants, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen* (proefschrift Leiden, 1874) i-viii.

⁹ S.P. Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe' *Bijdragen en mededeelingen / Gelre, Vereniging tot beoefening van Geldersche geschiedenis, oudheidkunde en recht* XI (1908).

¹⁰ A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland 1672-1795* (Proefschrift Nijmegen, 1973) 39.

democratic element of the Foldings was the most visible in revolts of the district of Zutphen.¹¹

There is not much literature on the Foldings in the towns of Utrecht and Overijssel. In 1950, historian J. Hovy wrote his thesis on the government changes that took place after the death of William III in Amersfoort.¹² In this thesis, Hovy discussed the revolts that took place in 1703 in Amersfoort. He looked at both the faction conflict as the involvement of the burghers in the conflict. In 1976, historian W.F. Wertheim and Wertheim-Gijse Weenink discussed the Foldings in the province of Overijssel and Utrecht.¹³ My discussion of the Foldings in Amersfoort is largely based on the thesis of Hovy, but emphasizes the democratic elements of the conflict.

Sources used

The comparative method generally relies on secondary literature and avoids trips to the archives. However, to make a good comparison, secondary literature has to be available. There is extensive literature of the Foldings in Gelderland. This is not the case for the Foldings in Utrecht and Overijssel. Because I was sometimes depended on only one source, I have done primary research in the town archives of Amersfoort, Deventer, Steenwijk and Zutphen to verify the literature. I have looked at magistracy books, town memorials, commission books, town chronicles and unpublished work.¹⁴ I have to compliment the research done by J. Hovy, A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink and W.F. Wertheim for their extensive and detailed description of the events that took place in Amersfoort, Deventer, Steenwijk and Zutphen. The trips to the archives were certainly informative, however, most of the time I found the same information that was already recorded by one of these historians. Next to my trips to the archives, I have used primary sources from the Knuttel catalogue.¹⁵ The Knuttel catalogue is an extensive database of Early Modern Pamphlets. The Pamphlets were a useful addition to the secondary literature.

Method

This thesis is relevant, because a comparative analysis on the duration of the conflict has never been

¹¹ A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen, de Plooierijen van 1703 tot 1705* (1977 Zutphen).

¹² J. Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, Amersfoort 1950).

¹³ W.F. Wertheim, A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij: Onrust in Sticht en Oversticht 1703-1706* (Amsterdam 1976).

¹⁴ For example, the thesis of historian Johannes Hovy has not been published, but can be found in the town archive of Amersfoort. Archief Eemland (AE), Inv. No. 2115.

¹⁵ W.P.C. Knuttel, *Catalogus van de pamfletten verzameling, 1649-1750 Dutch Pamphlets* (Den Haag 1985).

made. The studies that have discussed the Foldings mainly focused at the type of the conflict. Was it a conflict of burghers fighting for more democracy, or was it a conflict between regent factions? However, the studies do not answer the question if, for example, a strong burgher movement would have kept the New Fold in power, or that a combination of different factors is determining for the duration of the Foldings.

The method that I will use to find which factors had a causal relation with the duration of the Foldings will be the comparative method. Why is the comparative method the right method for this research? The comparative historical method is derived from comparative social science. Charles Ragin's book, *the comparative method; moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*, is the manual for applying comparative methods to historical processes.¹⁶

There are advantages to the comparative method, but there are also critics of the method. According to James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, the goal of comparative history is to ask questions and formulate puzzles on specific cases that have enough similarities to be comparable to each other. The basic strategy is to focus on important puzzles that can be applied to specific historical cases.¹⁷ The similarity in the cases that I am comparing lays in the fact that all towns were subjected to the government regulation.

The complexity of treating every single event as a whole is, that one can always come up with new variables that may have affected the outcome. Some scholars are skeptical to use sociological methods to explain why historical events have happened. They claim that sociological methods are very abstract and give a simplistic explanation of events, whereas, according to such historians, every event should be discussed by its own uniqueness. Especially German historicism excludes the possibility of a comparative knowledge of other cultures and suggests that each culture is ultimately isolated from all others.¹⁸ Historians write narratives about single events e.g. the French Revolution or the Russian Revolution. Comparative historical scientists on the other hand turn the question around and ask themselves why revolutions occurred here and not somewhere else.¹⁹ In this study, why do some revolts last longer than others do? One of the other criticisms comes from culturally

¹⁶ C.C. Ragin, *The comparative method; Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1987).

¹⁷ J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer, 'Comparative historical analyses; achievements and agendas', in: J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative historical analyses in the social sciences* (Cambridge 2003) 8-9.

¹⁸ H. Mah, 'German historical thought in the age of Herder, Kant, and Hegel' in: L. Kramer, S. Maza (eds.), *A companion to Western Historical thought* (Malden, Oxford 2008) 149.

¹⁹ E. Amenta, 'What we know about the development of social policy; comparative and historical research in comparative and historical perspective', in: J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative historical analyses in the social sciences* (Cambridge 2003) 97.

oriented scholars. According to Theda Skocpol, culturally oriented scholars believe that interpretation rather than causal generalization should be the goal of contextually sensitive scholarship on human affairs.²⁰

The comparative method can be applied in many different ways. In the first place, there is the case-oriented approach. A case-oriented approach is usually both historically interpretive and causally analytical. It can be best used for qualitative comparison with only a few cases. The case-oriented approach tries to piece evidence together in a way that keeps the historical chronology intact. The case-oriented approach tries to limit its historical generalizations that affect the unique context of a historical event.²¹

Next to the case-oriented methods, there is the variable-oriented method. This method is often used for quantitative comparison where large sets of data are compared. Where evidence is more important in the case-oriented approach, the variable-oriented approach is much more theory based. It is less concerned with understanding and interpreting specific historical outcomes. The variable-oriented approach is much more concerned in testing variables across countries and societies to test them against theories.²²

The case-oriented and variable-oriented methods are complementary to each other. The case-oriented method is best suited for comparing identical patterns in a small set of cases. The variable-oriented approach is best suited to look at possible connections between connections of social structures, formed as variables, over the widest possible population of observations.²³ The main weakness of the case-oriented method is that its strategy tends to lean to particularizing. It bases its theory on only one or two cases. The main weakness of the variable-oriented method is that it leans to very abstract and even hollow generalizations. The case-oriented method cannot work with a large number of cases, whereas the variable-oriented method is handicapped by its complex, conjunctural causal arguments.²⁴

With the Boolean method, we can use the best of both methods. The integration of the two methods allows the researcher to ask questions that are relevant to many cases that is not in contradiction with the complexity of the social causation or the variety of empirical social phenomena. Boolean algebra is different from other nominal methods because it allows the analyst to discuss several different combinations of variables as causes for an outcome. Multiple causal

²⁰ T. Skocpol, 'Doubly engaged social science; The promise of comparative historical analyses', in: J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative historical analyses in the social sciences* (Cambridge 2003) 414.

²¹ Ragin, *The comparative method*, 35.

²² *Ibid.*, 53.

²³ *Ibid.*, 69.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

combinations are possible to produce the same outcome. Ragin calls this multiple conjunctural causation.²⁵

There are two conditions or states in Boolean algebra; true (present) and false (absent). This is represented in binary data where 1 is present and 0 is absent. This procedure may result in the loss of some data. However, this loss of data is normally limited. In most cases, causes and outcomes are already nominal scale measures. To apply the Boolean algebra you have to make a truth matrix. Once the data is recoded into nominal-scale variables and presented in binary form, it is necessary to divide the data into their different combination of values. Each row produces an outcome and has to be either 1 or 0. In the case of this particular research, the outcome is either 1, the transfer of power lasted longer than a year, or 0, the revolts lasted shorter than a year. Each combination of causes produces either a revolt that took place longer than a year or a revolt that lasted shorter than a year. This is indicated in an equation, for example. $Z = aBc$ or $Z = ABc$. The uppercase letters indicate the variables that were present at the time of the conflict, and the lowercase letters indicate the absent variables.²⁶

After we have discussed all cases, the rows will be placed in a truth matrix. We use the truth matrix to minimize the equation to find the necessary causal combination for an outcome. If two outcomes only differ in one variable, than that variable can be considered irrelevant for the outcome. In the case of the above equation, the outcome Z differs only in A. In that case, variable A can be either present or absent for the outcome still to occur and is irrelevant for the equation. The outcome Z will occur in combination of Bc.²⁷

Theory

In my assessment for this paper, it is necessary to give a definition of what a revolt actually is and why people start to revolt. In his book, *Holland in beroering, oproeren in de 17de en 18de eeuw*, Dekker classifies revolts in terms of their motives. In this way, he singles out the motive and treats this as the main cause for the revolt. Dekker made a distinction between food revolts, tax revolts, religious revolts and political revolts.²⁸ According to this scheme, the Foldings were political revolts. However, how can I determine which factors were determining the outcome? To find out which

²⁵ Ragin, *The comparative method*, 84-85.

²⁶ Ibid., 86-89.

²⁷ Ibid., 93.

²⁸ Dekker, *Holland in beroering*, 22.

factors determined the outcome, I will look at several theories of political and social scientist to find out which factors are necessary for my own comparison.

After the death of William III, an unstable political situation emerged in several towns that were subjected to the government regulation. Several groups claimed the right to past privileges and positions they once held in their respective towns. The burghers wanted more influence in the election of the magistracies, and in certain towns, conflicts emerged between regent factions within the towns. The political scientist Charles Tilly would call this a revolutionary situation. According to Tilly, a revolution has two components; a revolutionary situation and a revolutionary outcome.²⁹ This does not mean that every revolutionary situation leads to an actual revolution. The idea of a revolutionary situation came from Leon Trotsky's concept of dual power and entails multiple sovereignty.³⁰ A revolutionary outcome occurs with the transfer of the state power from those who held it before the start of the multi sovereignty to a new ruling coalition.³¹ Tilly defines a full revolutionary sequence when the new rulers hold on to the power for at least a month. However, few revolutionary situations have revolutionary outcomes. According to Tilly, in many cases, the old holders of power ultimately triumph over their challengers. The holders of the power often worked together with some claimants to keep the rest in check.³²

In Ted Gurr's *Why Men Rebel*, Gurr uses a basic model for the conditions leading to political violence. He incorporates both psychological and societal variables. Gurr proposes some general answers to three basic questions that lead to disorder in a society.

What are the psychological and social sources of the potential for collective violence? What determines the extent to which that potential is focused? And what societal conditions affect the magnitude and form, and hence the consequences, of violence?³³

According to Gurr, the potential for collective violence varies strongly with the intensity and scope of relative deprivation among members of a collectivity. 'Relative deprivation' is defined as; 'actors perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities'.³⁴ Value expectations are the goods and conditions of life to which people believe they are rightfully entitled

²⁹ C. Tilly, *European Revolutions, 1492-1992* (Oxford 1993) 10.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., 14-15.

³³ T. R. Gurr, *Why men rebel* (New Jersey 1970) 7-8.

³⁴ Ibid., 24.

to. The value capabilities are the goods and conditions which persons think they are capable of getting and keeping. People come to action when they lack those goods and conditions during their current situation and think they can get it and keep it.³⁵

In Theda Skocpol's *States and social revolutions*, Skocpol defines social revolutions as a rapid, basic transformation of a society's state and class structure.³⁶ She thinks that social revolutions should be analyzed from a structural perspective with special attention to the international context and developments at home and abroad that affect the breakdown of the state. Social revolutions are set apart from other sorts of conflicts and transformative processes above all by the combination of two situations that coincidentally occur at the same time: the situation of societal structural change with class upheaval and the situation of political with social transformation. There are many cases where one of the two situations occur, however, social revolutions identifies a complex object of explanation, of which there are relatively few historical instances.³⁷

According to Skocpol, a social revolution of a state leads to actual change of state and class structure.³⁸ Social revolutions emerged from political crises and peasant insurrections. The variables that Skocpol uses to explain political crises are; the shape the monarchy or dominant Class is in, the shape of the agrarian economy and the type of international pressure a country faces. The variables for peasant insurrections are the shape of the agrarian class structure and the shape of local politics.³⁹

I will use these theories to define factors for my own comparison. The theory of Tilly is very useful, because he defined the difference between a revolutionary outcome and a revolutionary situation. Tilly already speaks of a revolutionary sequence when the transfer of power lasted for more than a month. In that case, every case that I will discuss would have had a revolutionary sequence. For the cases that I am discussing, it is better to speak of a revolutionary sequence when transfer of power would last until after a new election. We will see that in the weeks before and during the election, the conflict intensified where the New Fold was still in control of the town. Only if the New Fold could maintain power until after a new election, I will treat the case as a positive outcome where a revolutionary sequence has occurred.

³⁵ T. R. Gurr, *Why men rebel*, 24.

³⁶ T. Skocpol, *States and social revolutions a comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China* (New York 1979) 4.

³⁷ Skocpol, *States and social revolutions*, 4-5.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 155-157.

The theory of Gurr is useful, because the variables that he uses can be applied to tell us what the state of mind was of the group that claimed to be the rightful rulers of a town. If the recollections of past privileges and rights were very strong, this would probably strengthen the claim of the New Fold that they were the rightful rulers of the town. How did this affect the internal stability in the town, and how would this have affected the outcome?

The theory of Skocpol may not be the best theory to apply to the revolts that I am comparing. Skocpol looks more at revolutions of complete societies, whereas I concentrate on political revolts within a town. Still, her theory of social revolutions is helpful in defining factors for my own comparison. The revolts that I am comparing emerged from a political crisis. The political crisis created a legitimacy problem in the towns that were subjected to the government regulation. Next to that, Skocpol looks at peasant insurrection and the shape of the agrarian economy. In my cases, I look at the role of the burghers in the conflict and the economic and social condition of the town. I will use these variables as internal factors for my comparison. Skocpol also looks at the type of international pressure a country faces. I will apply this factor as external factors on the duration of the conflict. First, the Dutch Republic was fighting the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1713) at the time of the Foldings. The second external factor is the role of the States General and the Provincial States in the conflict.

Factors

It is the goal of this thesis to find out why the transfer of power in the one town only lasted shorter than a year and in the other town the transfer of power lasted more than a year. The outcome is either 1: the Foldings lasted longer than one year or 0: the Foldings lasted shorter than a year. The factors that will determine the outcome and how they are measured will be as follows.

The internal factors will determine the stability in the towns during the first year of the conflict.

- A. Political instability in 1702:** The Foldings broke out in 1703. By discussing this factor, I will look at the stability of the government in 1702. Different aspects influenced this factor. First, I will look at the role of William III and his government regulation. Next, I will look at the institutions prior to the government regulation. How fresh were the memories of burghers of past privileges? An unstable situation will score a 1, whereas a stable situation will score a 0.

- B. Regent conflict:** How did the regents contribute to the instability within the town during the conflict? Did regents ally with the burgher movement to improve their position in the town? The factor scores a 1 if there was a regent struggle. The factor scores a 0 if there was not a regent struggle.
- C. Burgher movement:** How strong was the burgher movement? A strong burgher movement was able to force its will on the government without turning the government into chaos. Problems could emerge when the burgher movement was divided internally. If there was a stable burgher movement, the factor scores a 1. If the burgher movement split up in the first year after they took control, the factor will be 0.
- D. Economic and social instability:** This factor will score a 1 if the situation contributed to the instability in the town. For example, where there tax revolts or complaints about poverty from burghers. The factor will score a 0 when the economic and social situation was not an issue. When there is no direct data to the local economic and social situation, the factor will score unknown.

The external factors

- E. Provincial States:** What was the stability of the political situation in the province? Was the Provincial States able to end the conflict? The factor will be 1 if the provincial States was able to end the conflict, and the factor will be 0, when the provincial States was not able to end the conflict.
- F. States General:** What was the role of the States General in the conflict? The factor will be 1 if the States General or another Province was successful in ending the conflict in the first year. The factor will be 0, when the States General or another Province could not end the conflict in the first year.
- G. Strategic location:** Was the geographic position of the town a factor in the duration of the conflict? This factor scores a 1 if the strategic position of the town was an advantage. The factor scores a 0 if the strategic position was a disadvantage for the towns.

1. Utrecht

In this chapter, the Foldings of Amersfoort in the province of Utrecht will be discussed. The choice for Amersfoort was not very difficult. Amersfoort was one of the two towns in which troubles emerged after the death of the Stadtholder in 1702. Rhenen was the other town in which troubles emerged. I have chosen not to bring Rhenen into the comparison. The town Rhenen was too small to make it a fair comparison with the larger towns of this thesis. However, for an accurate discussion of the Foldings in Amersfoort, I will refer to the troubles in Rhenen at some point.

1.1 The Foldings of Amersfoort

After the death of William III, there was uncertainty in the magistracy of Amersfoort on how to proceed with the upcoming election of 1703. In 1702, the magistracy of Amersfoort installed a commission that had to investigate the election procedure of 1703. Two members of this commission, Jacob Morray and Willem Teekman, got in a conflict on the way the election had to proceed in 1703. A disagreement between the two regents led the Teekman faction filing a request with six other magistracy members with the States of Utrecht and the magistracy of Amersfoort against the election procedure proposed by Morray. This conflict spilled over to the burghers of Amersfoort who got involved in the conflict in April 1703. Two prominent burghers, Richard Saab and Pieter van Houten, were the leaders of the burgher movement.

The Foldings in Amersfoort lasted approximately ten months. Wertheim and Wertheim-Gijse Weenink divided the revolts in Amersfoort into three phases. The first phase was from January 1703 until March 1703. During this phase, there was only a faction struggle in Amersfoort between the factions of Morray and Teekman. The second phase went from April 1703 until July 1703. In this phase, the burghers got involved in the conflict in Amersfoort. The final phase took place from August 1703 until the execution of Richard Saab and Pieter van Houten on October 3 1703.⁴⁰ The phases in which Wertheim and Wertheim-Gijse Weenink divided the revolts in Amersfoort give a good outline of the course of the events in Amersfoort. The tensions that led to the faction struggle could have been present in 1702 when both Teekman and Morray were seated in the commission that looked at the new election procedure. The different phases probably overlap.

⁴⁰ Wertheim, Wertheim- Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 21-44.

What were the political institutions in Amersfoort before 1702?

In the course of the fourteenth century, a city council emerged in Amersfoort that consisted of two burgomasters, twelve aldermen and twelve councilors. As in Utrecht, the council replaced the aldermen in all her legislative and governmental authority. The difference with Utrecht was that Amersfoort did not have strong guilds. The role that the guilds played in the elections of the magistracy in Utrecht, were in Amersfoort fulfilled by a corpus of 'Fifty' wealthy burghers.⁴¹ The qualified burghers were presented with lots to some of which iron cubes were attached. Those who drew these cubes were appointed elector (*keurman*). Historian Johannes Hovy doubts if one can speak of a limited democracy in this case. The magistracy chose the qualified burghers, and they were probably appointed for life. There were strict rules for burghers to be qualified. Burghers had to be financially independent and had to be full citizens of Amersfoort. The boundaries between an oligarchic and a democratic government were not very strict.⁴²

In 1544, Charles V had ended the influence of the burghers in Amersfoort in the town government. The transformation to secular authority in the province from the bishop to Charles V in 1528 led to a reduction of urban autonomy. The magistracy of Amersfoort was no longer chosen by electors from the college of 'Fifty'. Instead, the Stadtholder or the provincial Court appointed the magistracy by cooptation. Amersfoort was in 1579 forced to join the Union of Utrecht. Since then the Stadtholder appointed all the members of the magistracy.⁴³

During the First Stadtholderless Period (1650-1672), a cooptation system in the Vroedschap was introduced in the towns of Utrecht. This government body supplemented itself every year. After the French occupation of the province of Utrecht (1672-1674), this cooptation system ended with the appointment of William III. With the government regulation, William got far-reaching dominance in the appointment of the magistracy in the towns of Utrecht.⁴⁴ From now on William had the right to appoint the whole magistracy in the towns of Utrecht. The Stadtholder chose the burgomaster and aldermen from doubles (*dubbeltallen*) that were presented to him by the town government. He had the right to continue or dismiss whomever he wanted in the councils. Where necessary he replaced or supplemented government members with qualified burghers.⁴⁵

⁴¹ J. Hovy, *Het bestuur van de steden en dorpen in de provincie Utrecht tot 1795* (verslag van de lezing gehouden op 24 oktober 1960 te Amersfoort) 7.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 6-7.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

⁴⁴ Wertheim, Wertheim- Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 15-16.

⁴⁵ J. Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703. Een bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen in de provincie Utrecht', *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 15 (1960) 179.

The government regulation

With the help of Renswoude, the Amerongens and Dijkveld, William used his power to appoint or dismiss persons suited to his best interest. William III did not have unlimited power to alter government regulations in Utrecht. In practice, it is difficult to understand how the government regulation really worked.⁴⁶ The fact is that in Amersfoort the Stadtholder did use certain forces to influence town governments by appointing new magistracy members or dismissing others. During the first decade of the government regulation, William replaced several regents in the magistracy of Amersfoort. The persons that were appointed in the magistracy were normally confidants of William.⁴⁷ After 1685, there were little changes in the magistracy.⁴⁸

William did play a role in the appointment of the magistracy in Amersfoort and did make changes in this body several times during the first decade of the government regulation. In 1702, there were only six regent families left who were already in the magistracy in 1672. The Morryay faction was one of these families and had a majority in the magistracy of Amersfoort. However, the six protesting regents were all members of the magistracy during the three years prior to 1703. They all entered the magistracy during the rule of William III. There were no signs that the protest of the regents had anything to do with the government regulation. The protesting regents were not left out of the magistracy during the government regulation.⁴⁹ After the first decade of the government regulation, most regents adapted themselves to the wishes of the Stadtholder. They acknowledged that it was of no use to contradict his wishes.⁵⁰

The government regulation was abolished in Amersfoort on April 19 1702. At the same time, the constitution of the years between 1651 and 1674 was restored. After the death of the Stadtholder, the election of the magistracy happened according to the system of the First Stadtholderless Period. Amersfoort, Rhenen, Wijk bij Duurstede and Montfoort were all present during the decision that the constitution would fall back to system of the the Stadtholderless period. They all agreed to this. In Utrecht, the cooptation system was restored without problems. This was

⁴⁶ D.J. Roorda, 'Prins Willem III en het Utrechtse regeringsreglement', *Van Standen tot Staten 600 jaar Staten van Utrecht 1375-1975 Stichtse Historische Reeks 1* (Utrecht 1975) 122.

⁴⁷ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 190.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Roorda, 'Prins Willem III en het Utrechtse regeringsreglement.' 126.

not the case in the towns of Amersfoort and Rhenen. In these towns, problems emerged during the elections of 1703.⁵¹

Around 1700, it was more than 150 years since a form of a burgher democracy had existed in the towns of Utrecht. However, a special document gave the burghers of Amersfoort a clear recall of their past privileges. In 1693, a professor from Leiden, Antonius Matthaëus, produced the *Rerum Amorfortiarum scriptores duo inediti*. The magistracy of Amersfoort asked the professor to write this work to show the States of Utrecht her ancient independence. The document went back to old elections and resolutions. This document showed the presence of a burgher democracy in the form of community members and electors in the middle ages that was ended by Charles V in 1544. In this document, the burghers of Amersfoort could literally find their old democratic rights.⁵²

Economic and social situation

Amersfoort was one of the towns that did not experience substantial economic and social changes because of the flourishing growth in trade and industry in the Republic. Amersfoort was around 1700 still of a predominantly medieval character. Nonetheless, Amersfoort was of more than just regional importance.⁵³ Amersfoort developed around 1700 as an important part in the Amsterdam trade network. It functioned as the regional market place and profited from its favourable position along the Eem. The Eem provided an easy access to the Zuiderzee. Agrarian products from surrounding villages of the Eemland, and some villages from the province of Gelderland brought their products to the market in Amersfoort. Some of these products were carried to Holland.⁵⁴

Amersfoort had a modest industry. The industries that were important were the fustian industry, the silk company and the tobacco industry. The fustian industry stayed more or less a small retailer. Amersfoort could not attract large manufacturers in the area of the silk industry. The tobacco industry was the biggest industry in Amersfoort. The tobacco trade was almost free of government interference. The high wages in the tobacco industry drew a large number of immigrants to Amersfoort.⁵⁵

Amersfoort had suffered from a flood disaster in the province of Holland and Utrecht in April 1702. The sea dyke at Muiden broke because of the ongoing northern storm. Large parts of Holland

⁵¹ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 180,186.

⁵² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 15-17.

⁵³ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 180.

⁵⁴ R.N.J. Rommes, 'Werken in de stad', in: C. Dekker (ed.), *Geschiedenis van de provincie Utrecht deel 2 van 1528 tot 1780* (Utrecht 1997) 196.

⁵⁵ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 180-181.

and Utrecht flooded under water. This led to the drowning of many people and animals between Amersfoort and the Zuiderzee.⁵⁶

In 1703, the War of the Spanish Succession started. The war brought high war debts for the Republic. The provinces of Holland carried by far the most of these debts, however, just like in Holland the tax burden for all provinces were very high during the wars.⁵⁷ In February 1703, the burghers rebelled against the tax policy in Amersfoort. They rebelled mainly against the high taxes that had to be paid on the municipal excise taxes. Dissatisfaction about taxes was not a new phenomenon in the Republic. Especially the excise taxes were a big burden. The tax revolts of February 1703 were not something new in Amersfoort. Already in 1670 and 1675, high taxes on butter led to several uproars against the tax farmers of butter.⁵⁸ The tax revolt from February 1703 will be discussed later in this chapter.

First Phase faction struggle

Because of the uncertainty about the procedure of the election of January 1703, the sitting burgomaster, Marcus van Deurn, got the assignment from the magistracy of Amersfoort to form a commission to look at resolutions, retroacts and regulations from the First Stadtholderless period. The two main players in this commission were Willem Teekman and former burgomaster Jacob Morray.⁵⁹ The influential, however, not very popular Morray submitted in December of 1702 a report which showed that the new magistracy should be chosen out of a majority of votes from the sitting Magistracy. This system corresponded with the election procedure in Utrecht after the death of William III.⁶⁰

In the council meeting of January 8 1703, the rapport of Morray was approved by a majority of the magistracy. After the voting, the magistracy had drawn up a resolution for this decision. However, six of the twenty-six members voted against the rapport of Morray.⁶¹ This is where the problems started in Amersfoort. The six regents filed a protest against the resolution that was proposed by Morray. According to the six regents, the election procedure should have proceeded

⁵⁶ A. van Bommel, *Beschrijving der stad Amersfoort II* (Amersfoort 1760; 2^e druk Zaltbommel 1969) 976.

⁵⁷ R.J. Fruin, *Geschiedenis der staatsinstellingen in Nederland tot den val der Republiek*, H.T. Colenbrander (ed). (2^e druk; Den Haag 1922) 314-315.

⁵⁸ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 24-25.

⁵⁹ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 186.

⁶⁰ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 21.

⁶¹ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 186. The six regents who voted against the proposal of Morray were dr. Gijsbertus Crinius, Anthony Bloeylant, Joachim Berger, mr. Frederik Hendrik Teekman and mr. Willem van Steenberg.

according to the procedure of the First Stadtholderless Period. In this system, the magistracy would nominate electors (*keuzeheren*) who had to appoint the magistracy. The six regents called upon old privileges of Amersfoort.⁶²

There was not a big difference between the voting system proposed by Morray and the voting system of the six regents. In both cases, the magistracy would supplement itself by means of cooptation.⁶³ The six regents protested against the system of Morray, because they were afraid that with the system of Morray they could be excluded from the magistracy. The six regents were determined to keep their position in the magistracy.⁶⁴ The system that was proposed by Morray, was in favour of the interests of the ruling regents. By means of cooptation and contracts, the regents could enhance their power upon the magistracy. The system that the six regents had envisioned would make it more difficult for the regents to control the election of the magistracy by means of contracts.⁶⁵

On January 8, the six regents filed a request against the proposal of Morray by the magistracy of Amersfoort and two days later also by the States of Utrecht. The six regents requested preservation of the old privileges and status quo during the negotiations.⁶⁶ However, the magistracy of Amersfoort and the States of Utrecht paid no attention to the request of the six regents. On January 11, the election took place according to the system proposed by Morray. The six regents had left the Council chamber before the election was completed. The only thing that they had achieved was the promise that a commission would be installed to look again at the election procedure. In the following month, the struggle between the regents kept on going, yet, the struggle was overshadowed by a tax revolt.⁶⁷

The tax revolts of February 1703

In February 1703, just like in 1670 and 1675, the burghers targeted the butter tax farmers. On Friday, February 16 (market day in Amersfoort), the butter tax farmers were molested by a group of

⁶² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 21.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁶⁴ J. Wagenaar, *Vaderlandsche historie, vervattende de geschiedenissen der Vereenigde Nederlanden, inzonderheid die van Holland, van de vroegste tyden af XVII* (Amsterdam 1757) 144.

⁶⁵ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 22.

⁶⁶ Knuttel No. 14978, Requeste met soodanige verdere authentique documenten en stukken als by eenige heeren regenten der stad Amersfoort, tot maintainue en conservatie van der voorschreve Stads, en der selver Borgerye hare oude Privilegien, en Geregtigheden, Aan de Ed: Mog: Heeren Staten 's Lands van Utrecht, Op den 10 Januari deses Jaars 1703. zijn overgegeven. 1.

⁶⁷ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 22.

protesters. Because of this incident, the tax farmers could not proceed with the collection of the taxes. The States of Utrecht took this incident very seriously and consulted with the States General to send troops to Amersfoort. The government of Amersfoort decided to reinstall the militia after the incident, because it did not want strange troops on its soil to restore the order in Amersfoort. To keep the order in place, the militia had to settle the disturbances that took place in the streets and in the houses of burghers. The militia did not succeed in this task.⁶⁸

The States General sent an armed force to Amersfoort in February 1703. The troops arrived on February 21 in Amersfoort. However, just like the militia, the troops could not end the rebellion. It escalated in a clash between the soldiers and the burghers of Amersfoort. The burghers of Amersfoort threw bricks at the soldiers.⁶⁹

The tax revolt was not directly connected to the ongoing conflict between the regent factions. Still, it was clear that the magistracy of Amersfoort could not keep order in its own town, but it also did not want strange troops on its soil. Armed forces arrived in Amersfoort on February 21 and stayed until mid March. Amersfoort had restored the militia on February 19. In March, Amersfoort informed the States of Utrecht that the militia worked efficiently, and that it did not need the troops anymore for keeping order. After the magistracy of Amersfoort informed the States of Utrecht that it did not need the troops anymore, the States of Utrecht informed the States General that it could leave Amersfoort.⁷⁰ According to Hovy, the magistracy of Amersfoort only gave the impression to the States of Utrecht that order had been restored. It was clearly not comfortable with the States troops within its town walls, and wanted them to leave considering the precarious situation between the regent factions. Next to that, the States army was a burden for the burghers and cost a lot of money.⁷¹

Second phase: The burghers came into play

After the tax revolts, the States of Utrecht were not sure if the conflict between the regent factions was resolved. The States of Utrecht urged the regents to reach a compromise to resolve the differences that had emerged in January. The States of Utrecht threatened that they would act when

⁶⁸ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 25-27.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 24-28.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

no compromise would be reached. Behind the scenes, the States of Utrecht consulted with the States of Holland to send troops to Amersfoort when the disturbances continued.⁷²

The retreat of the troops gave the burghers of Amersfoort an opportunity to interfere with the elite conflict. At the start of April, Richard Saab and Pieter van Houten convened secret meetings.⁷³ Saab en Van Houten were both prominent burghers in Amersfoort, however, they were not part of the ruling families. On April 15, Saab en Van Houten asked their followers if they wanted to file a request to the magistracy in which they would state their demands, or if they would follow the example of Gelderland and dismiss the magistracy of Amersfoort without notice. The burghers decided to follow the example of Gelderland and dismissed the government without notice.⁷⁴

On April 16, Saab, Van Houten and five other committed burghers⁷⁵ appeared in front of the magistracy to dismiss them. When they entered the magistracy chamber, the magistracy asked the burghers to show their qualifications. The representatives of the burghers answered to this question: "Our orders exist partly from the burghers that met at the house of Saab and our qualification stands outside in front of the town hall." When the members of the magistracy pointed to the fact that there were only young boys and women on the square in front of the town hall, Van Houten took over and said: "All our people are standing on the corners of the streets." After a sign of van Houten, approximately six or seven hundred armed burghers entered the square of the town hall.⁷⁶ After a few hesitations and protests, the members of the magistracy stepped down. Morray was warned in advance of the plans of the burghers. He was not present during this event, and had fled the scene. According to Hovy, the armed burghers were the militia restored in February.⁷⁷

After the burghers had dismissed the magistracy, new election were scheduled to be held on April 17. The election of April 17 proceeded according to the way it was done before 1544. The elected government would keep their positions until 1704 when a new election was scheduled to take place. However, the election of April 17 was invalid because of the under qualification of some burghers of the 'Fifty'. On April 19, a new election took place. Half of the old magistracy was chosen in the new magistracy. The other half was supplemented with the members of the New Fold. The burghers Saab and van Houten were also chosen in the magistracy.⁷⁸

⁷² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 29-30.

⁷³ Van Bommel, *Beschrijving der stad Amersfoort II*, 980.

⁷⁴ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 196.

⁷⁵ Knuttel 14982, Sententien, de vijf gecommiteerden waren Gerrit Beefting, Dirck Ebbenhorst, Rutger Dibbitz, Johan Stomphius en Sibert van Straelfont.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 196.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 196-198.

One of the first goals of the new magistracy was to get legal recognition from the States of Utrecht. On April 18, the new government informed the States of Utrecht that they had reached a compromise. They informed the States of Utrecht that they would restore the government system to the system of 1651-1672. For now, the threat of an armed intervention from the States of Utrecht was gone. This system was what the six regents had envisioned in January 1703. From now on, the magistracy would appoint five electors. The electors choose the magistracy. This would mean that the election by a college of 'Fifty' was only a one-time event and would not be permanent. The States of Utrecht approved the new system.⁷⁹ According to Hovy, the events from 16-19 April showed a double character in the burgher movement and the two-sided role Van Houten had played in it. It seemed that the moderate wing wanted the election to be as legal as possible. This resulted in a split in the burgher movement, since the radical wing wanted to obtain as much influence in the town as possible.⁸⁰

The radical wing did not approve the new election procedure. The agreement was that the magistracy should be chosen by thirteen electors out of the college of 'Fifty'. Certain members of the New Fold were left out of the magistracy after the second election. Among them were Richard Saab and Dirk Ebbenhorst, but also Willem Teekman did not get a position in the magistracy. If they wanted to enter the magistracy, they could only do this through illegal ways. This resulted in the emerging of a new radical burgher movement. Dirk van Ebbenhorst played a leading role in the new burgher movement.⁸¹

On May 14, Van Ebbenhorst entered the magistracy with four demands. The first demand of the burghers was that the magistracy had to remove the new election procedure from the resolution of April 19. The second demand was that the sitting regents had to give up their positions so other burghers could take over these positions. The third demand was that the magistracy had to announce the burgher rights from the town hall and had to post it all over town. That way every burgher could read his rights and privileges. The last demand of the radical wing was that the position in the college of 'Fifty' would be for life. The college was reduced to twenty-four members, but had to be supplemented by the magistracy to fifty.⁸²

Between May 14 and July 16, several riots broke out in Amersfoort. The goal of these riots was to get the burghers of the radical wing on the magistracy. This had to happen at the expense of the Old Fold in the government. The magistracy of Amersfoort tried to take actions against the

⁷⁹ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 203-204.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 199

⁸¹ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 47-50.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 47-48.

rioters, but it had little to no success. The result was that between May 14 and July 16 every demand of the radical wing was granted. Three regents of the Old Fold, Assuerus Schut, Dirk van Ommeren and Bartholomeus Temminck boycotted the council. The regents were dismissed from their positions and replaced by Willem Teekman, Johan Kool and Richard Saab.⁸³

The States of Utrecht, afraid that the situation would spread to the rest of Utrecht, followed the events in Amersfoort closely. The States of Utrecht were determined to end the troubles in Amersfoort and were this time backed by the city of Utrecht. Utrecht was generally not keen on provincial interference in local towns, but this time they were also afraid that the troubles would spread further to the other towns in Utrecht. The troubles had already spread to Rhenen.⁸⁴

Hovy called the troubles in Rhenen a miniature of the Foldings in Amersfoort.⁸⁵ The troubles in Rhenen started a month later than in Amersfoort. This was probably because the election in Rhenen took place a month later than in Amersfoort, and next to that, the burghers in Rhenen did not have the availability of a document in which they could have literally found their privileges of the past. A difference with the troubles in Amersfoort was that the burghers of Rhenen addressed the economic and social situation in the town more than their democratic rights. The burghers of Rhenen made three demands. Firstly, they wanted to be exempted of paying taxes and tolls. Secondly, the burghers wanted to be present during the presentation of the town's finances. Finally, the burghers wanted the right to work the peat lands of Achterberg. It had to become common land again. The magistracy had given away parts of this land to private farmers.⁸⁶ Just like in Amersfoort, the troubles in Rhenen were not successful. The States of Utrecht ended the troubles in Rhenen in August 1703.

On July 4, The States of Utrecht installed a commission to mediate in the conflict in Amersfoort. The commission was formed by the two burgomasters of Utrecht, Both and Thiens, the two burgomasters of Amersfoort, Van Deurn and alderman Willem Teekman. On July 21, the commission approved a resolution. The resolution stated that the magistracy of Amersfoort had to be restored in the form it had before April 16. Furthermore, the government system of the period 1651-1672 would be restored in agreement to the system of the six regents. This meant that the magistracy would not be chosen out of a majority from the sitting magistracy. This decision was declared illegal. Everyone that obeyed this resolution within twenty-four hours was granted amnesty.⁸⁷

⁸³ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 205-206.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 207-208.

⁸⁵ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 79.

⁸⁶ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 24,33.

⁸⁷ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 207-208.

On July 24, the Court of Utrecht sent two process-servers to Amersfoort to publicly announce the resolution. The first attempt of the process-servers was not successful. They were sent away by Richard Saab because one of the burgomasters of Amersfoort was absent that day. A crowd in front of the town hall was backing Saab. Two days later, the Court of Utrecht tried to announce the resolution again. This time the militia of Amersfoort prevented the process-servers from announcing the resolution.⁸⁸ The *sententie* (affidavit) of Willem Teekman told that he played a role in the prevention of the announcement of the resolution. He would have instigated the militia against the process-servers.⁸⁹

Saab and Van Houten tried to smooth things over with the States of Utrecht by proposing to appoint a new commission. However, the States of Utrecht were done with the burghers of Amersfoort. The States of Utrecht proclaimed the resolution as done and submitted the case to the Attorney General. He had the right to intervene in Amersfoort, because criminals ruled the town. The burghers took a last attempt to play off the States General against the States of Utrecht. The New Fold in Amersfoort sent representatives to The Hague. However, their action had no success.⁹⁰

Third phase, the end of the Foldings

From July 23, the magistracy stopped functioning in Amersfoort. The burghers took up arms and occupied the town until August 7. The armed burghers arrested all regents who were still in Amersfoort. They also arrested Willem Teekman and the other five regents who had supported him at the beginning of the year. The burghers were afraid that Teekman would come to an agreement with the States of Utrecht and wanted to prevent him from communicating with them.⁹¹

After the burghers took on arms, the States of Utrecht decided that it was time to end the conflict by means of force. On August 3, a regiment of Walloon cavaliers arrived under the command of Waleff at the gates of Amersfoort. The armed burghers of Amersfoort kept the regiment of Waleff outside the town. Waleff responded by asking reinforcement and supplies from the States General.⁹² He did not enter the town until reinforcement troops arrived from Zwolle and The Hague. On August 4, Amersfoort was completely isolated. Waleff got a special assignment to prevent members of the New Fold from Gelderland to cross the border between Utrecht and Gelderland.⁹³

⁸⁸ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 208.

⁸⁹ Knuttel 14982, *Sententien, tot laste van Pieter van Houten ende Richard Saab, Midsgaders Willem Teeckman*.

⁹⁰ Hovy 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960) 209-210.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁹² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 42-43.

⁹³ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 67-68.

Some last mediation between van Houten, Wallef and Colonel Maurits van Nassau-Ouwerkerk produced no results. With the sight of 3000 soldiers outside the town walls, the burghers quickly lost courage. There was little resistance when on August 7 the army of Wallef entered Amersfoort. The army got the assignment to arrest Van Houten, Saab, Van Bommel and Dibbits. Furthermore, all burghers had to hand over their weapons.⁹⁴ Saab and Van Houten were transported to Utrecht on August 9. On August 16, Willem Teekman was arrested by the deputy Attorney General and was sent to Utrecht.⁹⁵ That same day, the States of Utrecht restored the old government in Amersfoort and reversed all decisions of the unlawful magistracy.⁹⁶

It took some time for the situation in Amersfoort to fully calm down. The soldiers were a burden for the burghers of Amersfoort. In addition, many burghers had fled across the provincial border to a neighbouring village Hoevelaken. The preacher of that village, N. de Bruyn, an active member of the New Fold in Gelderland, stimulated the burghers of Amersfoort to not give up their cause and keep on fighting to the end.⁹⁷

However, the States of Utrecht took measures to end all problems in Amersfoort once and for all. They sentenced Pieter van Houten and Richard Saab to death. Willem Teekman was banned for life from Amersfoort. The capitulation of van Houten and Saab had to function as an example to the burghers of Amersfoort. The sentence was carried out on October 3. On October 16, the States of Utrecht gave amnesty and forgiveness to all but fourteen burghers of Amersfoort.⁹⁸ However, most of these fourteen burghers were later signaled again in Amersfoort.⁹⁹

The States of Utrecht still suspected six regents for their role in the Foldings. They were all suspended from their offices in the magistracy. The suspensions were not harsh and ended in December 1703.¹⁰⁰ The Foldings ended with the amnesty and the sentences of Van Houten, Saab and Teekman. In the years after 1703, the Foldings were hardly mentioned. Only during time of the Patriots at the end of the century Van Houten and Saab were honoured as martyrs for the burgher freedom.¹⁰¹

The States of Utrecht ended the Foldings in Rhenen almost the same way as it had done in Amersfoort. The States sent two companies to Rhenen, however, the moment that the companies

⁹⁴ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 67-68.

⁹⁵ Van Bommel, *Beschrijving der stad Amersfoort II*, 987.

⁹⁶ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 212.

⁹⁷ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 43.

⁹⁸ Knuttel 14980, Publicatie: *De Staten van den Lande van Utrecht doen te weeten*.

⁹⁹ Hovy, 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703' (1960), 214.

¹⁰⁰ Hovy, *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie 1950) 74-75.

¹⁰¹ Hovy, *het bestuur van de steden en dorpen in de provincie Utrecht tot 1795*, 10.

arrived in Rhenen, most burghers of Rhenen had already surrendered and asked for amnesty.¹⁰² The amnesty arrangement for the burghers was the same as the amnesty for the burghers in Amersfoort. Three persons were not given amnesty in Rhenen.¹⁰³

Conclusion

The outcome of the Foldings in Amersfoort was that the New Fold was only for a few months in control over the local government. If I place the factors that were either present or absent in Amersfoort in a matrix, it looks as follows.

Table 1. Result matrix Utrecht

	Internal factors				External factors			
	Political instability in 1702	Regent conflict	Burgher movement	Economic and social instability	Provincial States	States General	Strategic location	Outcome
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Z
Amersfoort	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0

This case shows that absence of a stable burgher movement and the unfavourable position of Amersfoort near the border of Gelderland contributed to the negative outcome of the Foldings in Amersfoort. All other factors were present in Amersfoort. The actual transfer of power only lasted from April 19 to July 23. After that period, for a few days, there was no government at all in Amersfoort.

The internal situation was right after the death of William III already unstable in Amersfoort. The unstable situation was not a result of the government regulation and the policy of William III, but caused by a conflict between two regent factions. The mutual distaste for each other and the power vacuum left after the death of the Stadtholder only aggravated the unstable situation in Amersfoort.

¹⁰² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 44-45

¹⁰³ Knuttel 14980, Publicatie: De Staten van den Lande van Utrecht doen te weeten. The three persons that were not given amnesty were Johan Cupius, Joost Boonsayer and Cornelis Clerck.

The regent faction of Teekman was afraid that the already majority faction of Morray would get more dominant.

The tax revolts took place at an unfortunate time. The magistracy of Amersfoort had to restore the militia to calm down the rebellious burghers. Some well-off burghers used the chaos to make demands for a more democratic election procedure. With the help of the militia, the New Fold could dismiss the magistracy on April 16 and take control of the town government. The burgher movement was, however, not a unity. The movement split up in a radical and moderate wing after the second election of April 19, 1703. This aggravated the chaos in Amersfoort.

In Amersfoort, after the magistracy stopped functioning there was no longer a government in Amersfoort that could call upon Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht (1579) that interference in a domestic conflict was not allowed. The States of Utrecht and Utrecht believed they had the right to intervene in Amersfoort, because criminals ruled it. The States of Utrecht, who already kept a close eye on the situation since the tax revolts, did not want the Foldings to spread over to other towns of Utrecht. Amersfoort's geographic position near the border of Gelderland where the New Fold was in firm control was a big disadvantage for the town. Its position made the States of Utrecht extra cautious. With the help of the States General, an armed force ended the Foldings in Amersfoort.

2. Gelderland

For Gelderland, I will discuss the Foldings of Arnhem, Nijmegen and Zutphen. I have chosen to discuss the capital of each district in Gelderland, because these towns give a good representation of the Foldings in each district. The Foldings started in Nijmegen and spread all over the province. I will first give a short preface of the Foldings in each town. Next, I will analyze the events in each town by determining which factors were either present, absent or undefined. The chapter will first analyze the internal factors before and during the conflict. In this part, I will chronologically discuss the course of the Foldings for each town separately. In the second part, I will discuss the external factors in Gelderland. I will do this for the province as a whole, because these conditions applied to all towns in the same way. In the final part, I will discuss the ending of the Foldings and the meaning of it.

2.1 Internal factors

2.1.1 The Foldings in Nijmegen

After the death of William III, the Foldings first broke out in the Nijmegen district. The members of the nobility and the representatives of the towns understood that with the death without issue of William III, the power they lost under the government regulation of 1675 would return to them. On April 8, the States of Gelderland restored the government system to the system that existed before 1672. That system was a cooptation system in which the regents were appointed for life. The sitting magistracy in Nijmegen assumed that they could choose the burgomaster and aldermen during the election of 1703.¹⁰⁴ The magistracy thought that the burghers would accept this election procedure without major problems, because they had not received complaints from the community members during the time that the government regulation was in place.¹⁰⁵

It turned out to be a different story. Already in July 1702, an opposition emerged against the decision to restore the government system to the system before 1672. The burghers did not accept the decision to restore the old system of cooptation where the regents would be appointed for life. The burghers wanted their old privileges back and appealed to their right of a Sworn Community. The burghers wanted to control the finances of the town and regain the right to elect the magistracy for a

¹⁰⁴ I.A. Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', *Geldersche-Volksalmanak* 20 (Arnhem 1854) 5-6.

¹⁰⁵ Brants, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen*, 65-66.

period of three years. In 1702, the sitting magistracy managed to put a halt to the movement, but in 1703, the New Fold took control over the government in Nijmegen. The New Fold in Nijmegen kept control over the town until 1717. In 1717, the States of Gelderland ended the conflict and restored the cooptation system in Nijmegen in which the regents would be appointed for life in the magistracy.¹⁰⁶ The Foldings were not limited to Nijmegen alone. It was a broad movement over the whole Nijmegen district.

The political situation in Nijmegen before and around 1702

The burghers in Nijmegen have always had some sort of influence in the local government. Before 1590, every year eight men from the well-off burghers were chosen to be the representatives of the burghers. The burgher college received the title, Masters of St. Nicholas Guild (*Meesteren van St. Nikolaas Gilde*). Without the permission of the Eight, the magistracy was not allowed to undertake or decide anything of importance. In 1590, Masters of St. Nicholas Guild approved the replacement of the Eight by a college of thirty-two community members. Just like the Eight, the community members had far-reaching influence in the local government.¹⁰⁷

The community members of Nijmegen had the right to choose the magistracy of Nijmegen. They could appoint members to the magistracy from the nomination by the sitting magistracy, or they could nominate the candidates themselves. The power of the magistracy and the privileges of the community members were at times undermined by the Orange-Stadtholders. However, during the Stadtholderless period, the influence of the community members was partly restored.¹⁰⁸

During the Stadtholderless Period, the magistracy members were appointed for life. On May 1648, the magistracy and Sworn Community of Nijmegen agreed on the procedure on how to supplement the magistracy. The community members made their choice out of doubles that were selected by the council. Subsequently, the council chose two burgomasters for the upcoming year. After this, all twelve councilors, including the burgomasters, were appointed to aldermen. Eight years

¹⁰⁶ A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, 'Een kwarteeuw burgerverzet in de beide Nederlanden (1698-1719). Voorspel van de 'democratische revoluties', *Bijdragen en mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden* NHG 99 deel 1 (1984) 411.

¹⁰⁷ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 7- 8.

¹⁰⁸ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 36.

before William III installed the government regulation, the number of council members was set at twelve.¹⁰⁹

The government regulation

The moment the enemy had left Gelderland in 1674, William III received the power from the States General to install a provisional government in Gelderland. With the ongoing Franco-Dutch War (1672-1679), in which the Eastern province remained vulnerable to attacks, William chose to appoint provisional colleges of Deputy States in the three districts of Gelderland. These provisional Deputies had the assignment to oversee the finances and other affairs of the districts. They also were the temporal replacements of the *Hooge Regering* in Gelderland.¹¹⁰ William also installed an interim government in the towns of Gelderland. He had the ability to dismiss or appoint new regents through a deputy. The regents who were appointed, had to establish order in local finances and look after the ongoing affairs of the town until the moment William was able to go to Gelderland to announce the government regulation himself in 1675.¹¹¹

The representatives of William dismissed the magistracy of Nijmegen on June 11, 1674 and replaced them with eight provisional regents. The regents had to concern themselves in the first place with the finances of the town. The occupation of Nijmegen had taken its toll. For two years, the enemy financially wore out the burghers of Nijmegen. In 1675, William came to Nijmegen to appoint the new magistracy himself. He reappointed the eight regents of the provisional government and supplemented the magistracy with regents who had already been in the magistracy before 1673. He appointed two burgomasters for one year. The remaining members were appointed alderman. William also changed the legislative period of the appointment in the magistracy to three years instead of for life.¹¹²

The influence of the community members decreased significantly in Nijmegen with the government regulation of 1675. William reduced the college to only seven members, who had little to no influence left.¹¹³ On August 12, 1676, the community members filed a protest by the magistracy. They wanted the Sworn Community to be supplemented to thirty-two, because leaving

¹⁰⁹ A.J. Maris, 'Prins Willem III en het Provisionele Regeringsbestel in Gelderland en Zutphen van 1674', *Gelderland Vereeniging tot beoefening van Geldersche Geschiedenis, Oudheidkunde en Recht. Bijdragen en Mededelingen* LXXII (1981) 157.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 143-144

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 140-141.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 150, 157-158.

¹¹³ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 8.

the college incomplete was against the privileges of the community members. The representatives, however, were ordered not to interfere with the *Hooge regeering*. William dismissed the only member of the magistracy who supported the request.¹¹⁴

The death of William III

After the death of William III, a burgher movement emerged against the decision of the magistracy of Nijmegen to restore the election procedure to the system of the First Stadtholderless Period. The assumption that the burghers would simply accept this 'old' election procedure turned out to be wrong. Immediately after the death of William III, a burgher movement emerged in Nijmegen to fight against the proposal of the magistracy. The burghers were of the opinion that with the death of the Stadtholder, not only the government regulation ended, but also the consequences this government regulation brought with it. According to the burghers, the government got its power with the permission of the community. The common people were the rightful owners of the sovereignty of the government and had the right to choose the members of the magistracy and to dismiss the regents who were not qualified.¹¹⁵

After the death of William III, two of the seven remaining community members, Gijsbert van Urmont and Herman van Arnhem, repeatedly requested to supplement the college to thirty-two members. The sitting magistracy disputed the request. According to the sitting magistracy, if the college of community members were to be supplemented to thirty-two, the magistracy insisted that the supplements had to come from relatives of the sitting magistracy members. Gijsbert van Urmont and Herman van Arnhem would not accept this proposition because of nepotism.¹¹⁶

The denial of the magistracy to complete the college to thirty-two community members, only amplified the burgher movement in Nijmegen. Together with representatives Van Heuckelom and Francois van Romswinckel, a regent left out by William III, Van Urmont and Van Arnhem designed a plan to complete the college of community members to thirty-two. During the Rule of William III, Van Romswinckel was one of the first to fight against the policy of William III.¹¹⁷ Van Romswinckel was from the start one of the leaders of the burgher movement in Nijmegen.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 73.

¹¹⁵ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooielij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 6-7.

¹¹⁶ J.H. Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', *Geldersche-Volksalmanak* 64 (Arnhem 1898) 110-111.

¹¹⁷ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 84.

¹¹⁸ Knuttel No. 14842, Sententien |by den hove des furstendoms Gelderland [...] (1702) 12.

The well-off burghers came together to support the two community members. On June 1, they went to the Council house, where the magistracy was in session. The well-off burghers presented the magistracy doubles from which the community members had to be chosen to supplement the college to thirty-two. The burghers did not accept no for an answer and took a threatening stand. A crowd outside the council house supported the burghers inside. The magistracy had to make a choice to calm the crowd and decided to complete the college of community members to thirty-two from the doubles that were presented to them.¹¹⁹

The War of the Spanish Succession was the reason that the troubles in Nijmegen were put on hold. A common threat from outside the town resulted in a temporal joint operation of the burghers with the sitting magistracy against the approaching French army. Together with the count of Athlone, who was the commander of a States army of 20,000 men, a line of defense was made on the town walls of Nijmegen to fight off the French army of general Boufflers. This resulted in the retreat of the French army.¹²⁰

After the retreat of the French army, the burghers in Nijmegen continued their quest to get back their old rights. The burghers decided to dismiss the regents that were incompetent or guilty of nepotism. One of the burgomasters of Nijmegen, Dr. Roukens, heavily resisted the decision to dismiss certain regents. However, he had no chance to stop the New Fold. Six regents refused to resign their positions. Therefore, the New Fold decided to dismiss the whole magistracy on June 29. Twelve regents were immediately appointed. Three regents, among whom burgomasters Roukens and Reinders, refused to accept their appointment in the magistracy. Six members in the newly chosen magistracy came from the New Fold. Romswinckel and A. van Heerdt were appointed as burgomasters of Nijmegen.¹²¹

In July, the Court of Gelderland moved the *Landdag* (Diet) from Nijmegen to Arnhem because of the events that had just taken place in Nijmegen. The representatives from the districts of Zutphen and Arnhem met in Arnhem to discuss the recent events in Nijmegen. Roukens and Reynders could not accept what happened in Nijmegen and addressed the Diet in Arnhem.¹²²

The Court of Gelderland was of the opinion that the actions of the New Fold had to be reversed. The Court declared the actions of the New Fold unlawful. The participants of the *Diet* decided to litigate against the leaders of the New Fold, with the help of an armed force. On August 4, a strong force of armed cavaliers occupied the town. They announced the ruling of July 18 to be

¹¹⁹ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 9.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 10-12.

¹²¹ Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', 110-112.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 113.

illegal. The members of the New Fold fought against this announcement and said that it was in violation of the rights and privileges of the burghers. However, armed cavaliers were quartered in Nijmegen to keep the burghers under control and restore the peace.¹²³

The Court of Gelderland sent regulators (*momers*) to Nijmegen to prosecute the leaders of the New Fold.¹²⁴ On December 5, Frans van Romswinkel and Hendrik Singendonk were banned from the province for life.¹²⁵ They also had to pay a heavy fine. Other members of the New Fold were banned for several years.¹²⁶ On December 9, the court of Nijmegen announced that the members of the magistracy were appointed for life. Remarkably, there were no changes made in the recently appointed college of community members. The Court kept this college intact, and apparently acknowledged their rights.¹²⁷

Economic and social situation in Nijmegen around 1703

The economic and social situation was not good around 1703. The tax burden of the War of the Spanish Succession weighed heavily on every town in the Dutch Republic, but Nijmegen had not even fully recovered from the French occupation of the province between 1672 and 1674. After the French occupation, Nijmegen was completely impoverished. The French army left a trace of destruction and ravage across the town.¹²⁸ However, after the French army had left Gelderland, the economic activity started to increase in Nijmegen, because of the peace talks that took place in Nijmegen in 1676. The damages to houses were being restored and burghers were looking for accommodations for the representatives of the governments that were in Nijmegen.¹²⁹

However, after the peace talks had finished, the economic situation in Nijmegen did not continue to improve. After the death of the Stadtholder, the burghers had many complaints about the economic conditions in the towns. The burghers of Nijmegen accused the regents of being incompetent and corrupt. Several pamphlets around 1703 addressed the issue.¹³⁰ For example, a

¹²³ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 13-15.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 15. The members that were being prosecuted were Frans van Romswinkel, Hendrik Singendonk, Reinier Verschoor, William Vonk, Adriaan van Heerd, Jan Ingenool and Frans van der Linden.

¹²⁵ Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', 116.

¹²⁶ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 15-16.

¹²⁷ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 86.

¹²⁸ J. den Tex, *Onder vreemde heren De Republiek der Nederlanden 1672-1674* (Zutphen 1982) 77-90.

¹²⁹ J.H.J. Geurts, 'Tussen afhankelijkheid en zelfbestuur. Nijmegen gedurende de jaren 1591-1795', in: J. Kuys, H. Bots (eds.) *Nijmegen Geschiedenis van de oudste stad van Nederland Middeleeuwen en Nieuwe Tijd* deel 2 (Nijmegen 2005) 547.

¹³⁰ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 100.

pamphlet by the Meuse river traders stated complaints about taxes they had to pay between the years of 1682 and 1702. According to old privileges, they did not have to pay taxes.¹³¹ The bad social and economic conditions were an important reason for the burghers to get involved in the Foldings. By fighting for more influence in the government, they could use this influence to help create a more fair tax system. Historian Geurts went further and even thought that acquiring a better tax system was of more importance for the New Fold than acquiring democratic rights. According to him, the burghers only used democracy as an ideological tool to improve the social and economic situation in the town.¹³²

1703, the New Fold moves again

After the leaders of the New Fold were banned from the province, order seemed restored for a while. Everyone seemed to be returning to their normal life. However, it was just appearances that the New Fold accepted its defeat. The ban of Van Romswinkel and his supporters did not go down well with the burghers of Nijmegen.¹³³ The regulators had difficulty questioning witnesses. The magistracy, which now included members of the old magistracy as well as members of the New Fold, refused to work together. At the beginning of December 1702, the New Fold made a pact. This pact, *Onderlingh Verbant en Associatie*, between new regents, community members, guilds and burghers was a bad sign for the Old Fold. The New Fold just waited for the right moment to move again and change the resolution of August 4. This moment came around New Year with the upcoming election of January 3, 1703.¹³⁴

With the election of January 3, the burghers of Nijmegen saw an opportunity to fight for their rights again. The goal of the sitting magistracy was to reappoint itself through old custom by cooptation from the sitting magistracy. However, the members of the pact *Onderlingh Verbant en Associatie* demanded the resignation of the Old regents that got their positions back through the resolution of August 4. The New Fold also demanded that the verdicts of December 5 would be revoked.¹³⁵

The fact that William III had left the Republic with a war was fortunate for the New Fold in Nijmegen. One of the reasons the burghers and the regents of the New Fold could make new demands was the departure of the armed cavaliers who had occupied Nijmegen. The army left

¹³¹ Knuttel No. 15003, *Getuygschrift van eenige Maashandelaars [...]*, (1703).

¹³² Geurts, 'Tussen afhankelijkheid en zelfbestuur. Nijmegen gedurende de jaren 1591-1795', 553.

¹³³ Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', 116.

¹³⁴ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 86-87.

¹³⁵ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooielij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 19-20.

Nijmegen to fight on the battlefields of Limburg. The Old Fold had no longer the availability of the States Army.¹³⁶ The cavaliers who were left behind were not able to control the New Fold. The members of the Old Fold had to allow the whole magistracy that had been appointed on June 29 to be restored.¹³⁷ Two honourable guards awaited the return of Van Romswinckel. Throughout the whole town, burghers marched through the streets and carried banners with words such as *Pro Patria et Privilegiis*. However, it did not take long before the crowd started vandalizing the town. The victory of the New Fold was a humiliation for the Old Fold in Nijmegen.¹³⁸

On March 22, official amnesty was granted to the persons who had been banned in December. The amnesty was announced in an official publication.¹³⁹ The Old Fold was, without help from the States Army, unable to stop the New Fold, and was definitely unable to retake the power in Nijmegen after the States army had left the town. The Old Fold turned to the Diet and the States General for help. However, these were unable, or unwilling to help the Old Fold. For two years, the New Fold was relatively easily in control before new troubles started. I will discuss the role of the Diet and the States General during these two years in part 2.2 of this chapter.

Already in 1702, the New Fold had made up a list of grievances and complaints against the Old Fold. The old regents got the blame that they had dishonoured the rights and privileges of the free burghers in Nijmegen.¹⁴⁰ The reaction of the Old Fold was that the allegations were false.¹⁴¹ In 1704, the New Fold made up a new list of grievances. The main complaints were that the old regents had dishonoured the town laws and privileges, and that it had generally neglected Nijmegen. According to the New Fold, the policy of the old regents had left Nijmegen in a bad condition.¹⁴²

2.1.2 The Foldings in Arnhem

In Arnhem, the situation did not escalate immediately after the death of William III, as it had done in Nijmegen. In comparison to the situation in Nijmegen, the situation in Arnhem remained relatively peaceful in 1702. This would change quickly at the start of 1703 when the New Fold in Nijmegen

¹³⁶ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 48.

¹³⁷ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 87.

¹³⁸ Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', 117-118.

¹³⁹ Knuttel Nos., 14997-14999, Publicatie. Borgermeesteren, Schepenen en Raedt sampt Gemeensluyden der stadt Nymegen, (1703)

¹⁴⁰ Knuttel No. 14832, Grieven ende beswaren van de oude ende vrye borgerye der stad Nymegen (1702).

¹⁴¹ Knuttel No. 14849, Deductie van het voorstaen der privilegien, of privé-voordeelen in den Quartiere van Nimegen (1702).

¹⁴² Knuttel No. 15233, Generale en particuliere grieven en beswaren tot laste van d'ontsette regenten der vrye-rycks-stadt Nymegen (1704).

successfully took control of the town. The burghers of Arnhem followed the example of Nijmegen and dismissed the magistracy.

Just like in the Nijmegen district, the movement spread to the other towns of the Veluwe district. The New Fold of the Veluwe District had two goals. The first goal was to assure their democratic rights in their respective towns. Secondly, the New Fold took an attempted to decrease the influence of the gentry in the Veluwe District. Arnhem made a pact with the smaller towns of the district to support each other.¹⁴³

The Foldings lasted for five years in Arnhem. The New Fold took power in Arnhem in 1703. After the New Fold took control of the town, the movement spread to other towns of the Veluwe District. In the Veluwe District, the Nobility had a lot more influence than the nobility had in the other districts. The Nobility supported the Old Fold in the Veluwe. The New Fold and Old Fold fought for five years over the power in Arnhem. For two years, the district meetings were suspended and both parties tried to legitimize their rule over the town. The States General and the States of Holland tried to end the conflict, but they were not successful in doing so. In 1705, the Foldings radicalized in Arnhem. The Old Fold took a new attempt to seize the power in Arnhem. In 1707, the States General finally decided to end the conflict in the Veluwe District after the Wageningen expedition.

Political institutions in Arnhem and the government regulation

The first recollection of a chosen magistracy in Arnhem goes back to the Middle Ages. When Otto I gave Arnhem its first urban privileges in 1233, he declared that the magistracy of Arnhem had to be elected by the citizens, and not appointed by the Count. It is not clear if burghers had a role in the appointment of the magistracy. However, the members of the New Fold in Arnhem assumed they had.¹⁴⁴

The first time that it was legally established that the burghers of Arnhem had something to say in magistracy, was in a letter from Maximiliaan in 1487. Six masters of the guilds received a controlling function. In 1488, the magistracy of Arnhem gave the six masters of the guilds the same authority as the members of the masters of St. Nicholas Guild in Nijmegen. The magistracy of Arnhem had to inform the masters of the guilds about important town issues. The issues on which the masters of the guilds had to be consulted were war and peace, the marketing of rents and

¹⁴³ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 52.

¹⁴⁴ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 98.

products from the town, taxes, verdicts in which severe punishments were given, the appointment of offices, and the regulations for guilds and militia.¹⁴⁵

Around 1502, the Sworn Community replaced the masters of the guilds. The Sworn Community had more or less the same authorities as the masters of the guilds. In 1672, the Sworn Community consisted of forty-eight members. From the total college of community members, six had to come from the guilds. Before 1703, the community members never had the right to choose the magistracy in Arnhem.¹⁴⁶

With the government regulation, the community members lost all influence they had left in the town. The number of community members was set at forty-eight, but they never had any influence during the government regulation.¹⁴⁷ The representatives of William III, Van Wevelinchoven en Wierts, appointed a provisional government in Arnhem on June 5, 1674. This was the same day the same representatives of William installed the provisional Deputies for the Veluwe District. Alexander Bentinck was the only regent that was chosen in the provisional government of 1674. However, a year later when William appointed the new magistracy, only six regents were new. The other six regents were all in the magistracy before 1672.¹⁴⁸ William did not change many positions during his rule of Arnhem. Regents that joined forces with the burgher movement in 1703 did this probably to secure their position in the magistracy.

The New Fold takes control

Right after the Diet of April 1702, the burghers of Arnhem were aware of the plans of the magistracy to restore the old election procedure. The magistracy wanted to restore the cooptation system in which the sitting regents would keep their positions. Already in July 1702, the community members came together and decided that they would unite against such a decision. The community members wanted to participate in the election of the magistracy and demanded access to the archives of Arnhem in which they could find their privileges and rights. Out of fear that the situation in Nijmegen would transfer to Arnhem, the magistracy gave permission to the community members and guilds of Arnhem to look at the old archives of the town. The magistracy thought that by allowing access to the old archives of the town, the community members would accept the old election procedure.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 98.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 99.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Maris, 'Prins Willem III en het Provisionele Regeringsbestel', 154, 160.

¹⁴⁹ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 51.

In the end, the burghers of Arnhem did not look at the documents in 1702. The burghers apparently trusted the Council of Arnhem to honour their rights. On January 8, 1703, the Council of Arnhem summoned the community members to the magistracy. Once again, the magistracy wanted to prevent the movement to spread to Arnhem, by maintaining a good relationship with the community members. The magistracy was worried about secret meetings of the community members. The Council did not want to deny the rights of the community members to look at the old documents and archives and allowed the burghers access to council protocols and commission books from 1651 to 1672.¹⁵⁰

The community members did not like the comments of the magistracy about the secret meetings. The relationship between the burghers and the magistracy worsened after the comments about the meetings. The magistracy had only allowed access to the council protocols and the commission books from 1651 to 1672. After the comments about the secret meetings, the community members wanted access to all documents without any limitation of years. The community members and the guilds kept secret meetings to write down the rights of the burghers. On January 16, the guilds of Arnhem announced their support for the actions of the community members.¹⁵¹

The distance between the Council, the community members and the guilds grew by the minute during the negotiations about the rights of the burghers. The burghers of Arnhem felt strengthened by the success of the movement in Nijmegen. The demands of the community members and the guilds became bigger than just the right to look at their privileges. The first action of the burghers was to purify their own college of community members. Their goal was to dismiss the unqualified members. Nepotism was the most common reason to be unqualified for the Sworn Community. Twenty-four of the forty-six community members were dismissed. On January 24, the remaining community members made doubles from which the magistracy had to supplement the college.¹⁵²

The magistracy of Arnhem became aware of rumours that the burghers also wanted to dismiss members of the magistracy with the upcoming election day of January 25.¹⁵³ The magistracy was concerned that the situation in Arnhem would escalate. In case the burghers decided to follow the example of Nijmegen to dismiss the magistracy, the magistracy contacted the count of Athlone

¹⁵⁰ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 88.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 89.

¹⁵² Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 245.

¹⁵³ Knuttel No. 15025, Missive van d'edele ende achtbaere magistraat der stad Arnhem aan de [...] Staaten Generaal [...] op den 7. february 1703 geschreven, over de veranderinge, die de gemeens-luyden [...] in de magistraat hebben vermogen te maacken (1703) 3-4.

and the duke of Wurtemberg to keep their troops available for the town to call upon. The request of the magistracy to keep troops available only aggravated the situation in Arnhem.¹⁵⁴ The magistracy had no intentions to change the election procedure. They were determined to hold on to the decision of April 2 1702 and continue their positions. On January 25, Election Day, the magistracy re-appointed itself.¹⁵⁵

However, the community members and the guilds of Arnhem had already made up their plan to dismiss the magistracy a day later. On January 26, the community members and the guilds presented the magistracy a written document. It stated that with the death of the Stadtholder, the right of the councilors to rule the town had expired. The burghers requested the magistracy to withdraw from further government's issues. The community members and the guilds appointed twelve new members. Six of the just dismissed magistracy were re-appointed. However, William Tulleken was the only old member who could be persuaded to take back his seat in the new magistracy. The other five members refused. On February 5, five other members were appointed in their place.¹⁵⁶

From now on, Arnhem would be ruled according to new democratic principles. The most important point of the democratic principles was the position of the community members. Two colleges, the Council and the Sworn Community, would rule the town. The community members, guilds and burghers had the right to dismiss the members of these colleges when one of these acted against the privileges of the burghers. The community members nominated the members for both colleges, upon which the magistracy appointed the members. The community members also nominated persons for other important functions like receiver (ontvanger) and supervisor (rentmeester). The receiver and supervisor controlled the financial expenditures and assets of the town.¹⁵⁷

Just like in Nijmegen, the New Fold of Arnhem was also of the opinion that the old government had abused its power over the years. The grievances against the Old rulers were written down in pamphlets. The pamphlets stated that the old regents had dishonoured the privileges of the burghers, had used their power for their own interest, and were guilty of nepotism and messing with the town's finances.¹⁵⁸ The Old regents kept denying these allegations. However, the detailed

¹⁵⁴ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 90.

¹⁵⁵ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 245-246.

¹⁵⁶ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 90-91.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 92-93.

¹⁵⁸ Knuttel No. 15043, Poincten, |staende tot verantwoordinge van de oude verlatene regenten der stadt Aernhem. See also Knuttel No. 15044, Sommier berigt, op seeker fameus libel, geintituleert, Poincten, staende tot verantwoordingh van de oude verlatene regenten der stadt Arnhem (1703).

complaints increased the credibility of the complaints made by the New Fold in Arnhem.¹⁵⁹ It all came down to two major objections of the New Fold in Arnhem. The regents were either unqualified, or they were bad rulers.¹⁶⁰

The Veluwe District

The new government in Arnhem took their oath on March 29, 1703.¹⁶¹ In the mean time, the burgher movement had spread to the other towns of the Veluwe district. The New Fold of Wageningen, Elburg, Hattum and Harderwijk followed the example of Arnhem and dismissed the magistracy in the months of March and April. Representatives of the New Fold of the Veluwe came together at the beginning of March. They agreed to support each other in their fight for their privileges. They agreed to fight together against influences of the Nobility and the Old Fold.¹⁶²

The district meetings soon became complicated, because the Nobility took the side of the Old Fold in the Veluwe district. The vote of the Nobility was equal to the vote of all towns in the Veluwe together. The Nobility represented the countryside in the Veluwe district. However, the power that the ambtsjonkers (gentry) had was far more unlimited than the power of the gentry in the other districts. The support of the Nobility for the Old Fold increased after the New Fold tried to undermine the privileged position of the gentry in the Veluwe district.¹⁶³

The New Fold sought an ally with the *geërfden* (untitled nobles) in the countryside. The untitled nobles were a new rural class of landowners who were not of noble birth. To join this class, the landowners had to pay a certain amount of money in direct taxes.¹⁶⁴ The power of the gentry was a disadvantage of the untitled nobles. The tax system was almost completely in the hands of the gentry, whereas in the districts of Nijmegen and Zutphen, the untitled nobles were involved in raising taxes. In those districts, the untitled nobles got a percentage from the raised taxes.¹⁶⁵ Throughout the seventeenth century, there were many tensions between the untitled nobles and the Gentry, especially about taxes. During the district meeting of April 30, 1703, the New Fold proposed changes to the way taxes were raised in favour of the untitled nobles.¹⁶⁶

¹⁵⁹ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 100.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 99-102.

¹⁶¹ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 52.

¹⁶² Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 93.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 111.

¹⁶⁴ S.W. Versteegen, *Gegoede ingezetenen Jonkers en Geërfden op de Veluwe tijdens Ancien Regime, Revolutie en Restauratie (1650-1830)* (Proefschrift, Amsterdam 1989) 68.

¹⁶⁵ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 115-116.

¹⁶⁶ Versteegen, *Gegoede ingezetenen*, 85-86.

The changes that the New Fold had proposed was the breaking point between the towns and the Nobility. During the district meeting of June 13, 1703, all but one member of the Nobility left the meeting. For one and a half year, there were no full district meetings in the Veluwe.¹⁶⁷ The Nobility decided to hold its own district meetings. The towns did not hold their own district meeting anymore.¹⁶⁸

Throughout 1703, the towns of the Veluwe tried to arrange a meeting with the Nobility, but the Nobility did not want to meet with the towns. The chaos made it difficult for the tax farmers to collect taxes in the Veluwe. The farmers gracefully made use of the disorganization by not paying taxes.¹⁶⁹ The reduced tax incomes were cause for additional problems. The whole province was years behind in its contribution payments to the Republic.¹⁷⁰ The Nobility hoped that the States General would decide to intervene in the Foldings when the government of the whole Province remained in chaos. The gentry consciously sabotaged the leasing of the taxes in order to keep chaos in the district.¹⁷¹

The situation between the Nobility and the towns threatened to escalate in 1704. The actions of the gentry to sabotage the tax collection caused tensions to raise very high in the Veluwe district. The receiver-general Van Deelen, the eldest member of the gentry, had closed his office and decided to cut off the tax farmers. The towns interpreted this as a way to disturb the tax collections. Other incidents also irritated the towns in the Veluwe District. A Sherriff of Nijkerk refused to measure the level of wine and beer. This made it impossible to determine the amount of wine and beer sold, which made it impossible to collect taxes. Arnhem sent a representative to arrest the Sherriff, but representative was arrested by Sherriff the instead. All these incidents made Arnhem decide to create a volunteer company under the command of W.A. Bouwens. The volunteer company was installed in August 1704 Bouwens had to arrest everyone who refused to do their jobs.¹⁷²

Bouwens took his job very serious and arrested at one point the wrong persons that caused the Count and his wife Doorwerth to be upset. On September 14, Bouwens wanted to arrest Sherriff Eslinger of Nijkerk, because he had refused to measure the level of wine and beer. However, the Count's wife had given the order to the Sherriff not to measure. The volunteer company also arrested a member of the Nobility, Coenraad van Wijnbergen. He apparently instigated farmers not

¹⁶⁷ Versteegen, *Gegoede ingezetenen*, 88-89.

¹⁶⁸ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 118.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 111.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 119.

¹⁷¹ Versteegen, *Gegoede ingezetenen*, 89.

¹⁷² Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 55.

to pay taxes. The Nobility responded by recruiting their own company. The towns forbade burghers to enlist, and complained to the States of Holland that the Nobility illegally recruited a company of their own.¹⁷³

The chaos was complete in the Veluwe district. The company of Bouwens arrested noblemen Van Arnhem, Roosendaal and Casijn van der Hell tot de Wildbaan in November 1704. After Bouwens had arrested the noblemen, the States of Holland decided that it was time to intervene in the Veluwe District. On December 4 1704, the States of Holland sent troops to Arnhem to end the conflict. The magistracy of Arnhem first objected to the arrival of the troops, but quickly gave in. The States of Holland ordered to release everyone that was arrested. The States of Holland promised to retreat the troops after the noblemen were released. On December 17, Arnhem carried out the conditions of the States of Holland.¹⁷⁴

The States of Holland had some understanding for the position of the towns. After all, they were natural adversaries of a Stadtholder regime. However, in the end, the States of Holland decided to end the conflict between the Nobility and the towns to make sure that contribution payments to the Republic would not get behind any further. The States of Holland sent representatives to Arnhem to mediate between the towns and Nobility. The Nobility and towns both gave in. The Nobility had to decrease their unlimited influence of the tax collections, whereas the towns had to end the prosecution of Van Deelen. The intervention of the States of Holland did not change anything within the towns. The New Fold held on to their positions in the magistracies.¹⁷⁵

2.1.3 The Foldings in Zutphen

The Foldings in the Zutphen district did not break out until February 1703. The sitting magistracy in Zutphen continued their work until the election of 1703. The consensus has long been that the election in Zutphen went quietly in 1703.¹⁷⁶ However, in 1977, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink contradicted this theory with new sources. In *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen de Plooierijen van 1703 tot 1705*, Wertheim-Gijse discussed the Schomaker collection and the manuscript of Reinier Schier and Lambert Verbeek. According to her, the image that the troubles in Zutphen were only of a superficial and passive character turned out to be false. Tadama and Wagenaar were probably not informed of the Schomaker collection and the manuscripts of Reinier Schier and Lambert Verbeek. The sources

¹⁷³ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 55-57

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 56-57

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 57.

¹⁷⁶ Wagenaar, *Vaderlandsche historie*, XVII, 143. R.W. Tadama, *Geschiedenis der stad Zutphen, van de vroegste tijden tot 1795* (Zutphen 1856; herdrukte editie Schiedam 1976) 262.

that Wertheim-Gijse Weenink later on used give an extensive description of the events that took place in Zutphen between 1703 and 1705.¹⁷⁷

The situation in Zutphen is clearly different from the situation in Arnhem and Nijmegen. In Zutphen the complete magistracy was reappointed in 1703. However, this did not mean that the burgher movement was not in control in Zutphen. The New Fold dominated the magistracy and the Sworn Community in 1703. The first year revolved around duration of the nomination in the magistracy. The companies and the guilds did not want this nomination to be for life but only for a period of three years. They had the power to dismiss both colleges at any time. After these two years, a more moderate wing took over in Zutphen. The conflict in Zutphen was however more than a political one. Zutphen was a former Hanseatic town and still an economic centre in the region.¹⁷⁸ The burghers in Zutphen used their dominance over the magistracy to improve their economic position in the region by breaking down the bridges across the Berkel. Next to that, the burgher movement also wanted to dismiss the *Heerlijkheid Voorst*.

Political institutions

According to the text of the *stadsrechtprivilege* of 1190, which is the oldest remaining document on the government system in Zutphen, the rule of the town was handed to twelve aldermen. Every year the election of the aldermen took place at *Petri ad Cathedram*, February 22. Aldermen were normally appointed for life.¹⁷⁹

The first signs of burgher influence came in 1412. Since that year, five or six representatives from the burghers (community members) were present during the presentation of the town budgets. The Government in Zutphen sporadically consulted the community members. The real power lay in the hands of the oligarchy of Zutphen. At the end of the fifteenth century, the influence of the community members and the guilds increased. The role of the burghers of Zutphen was similar to the situation in Arnhem. Since 1494, the magistracy of Zutphen had to consult the burghers in important decisions.¹⁸⁰ During the time of the Republic, the tasks of the community members in Zutphen

¹⁷⁷ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 8-10.

¹⁷⁸ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink et al., 'Early 18th Century Uprisings in the Low Countries', 103.

¹⁷⁹ R. van Schaik, 'Zutphens geschiedenis: van de Elfde tot het einde van de Zestiende eeuw', in: W.Th.M. Frijhoff, et al. (eds.), *Geschiedenis van Zutphen* (Zutphen 1989) 71.

¹⁸⁰ Schaik, 'Zutphens geschiedenis: van de Elfde tot het einde van de Zestiende eeuw', 74-80.

remained the supervision of the policies of the magistracy. The community members were chosen for three years by the guilds and the militia.¹⁸¹

On May 29, 1674, Van Wevelinckhoven and Wierts dismissed the magistracy in Zutphen and appointed provisional regents in their place. The representatives of William appointed seven new regents and reappointed Jacob Schimmelpenninck van der Oije tot Voorstonden who was already in the magistracy in 1673. On February 21, 1675, William appointed the new definite magistracy. Among them, several regents had already been in the magistracy before 1674. Others regent families returned to the magistracy offices in the following years.¹⁸² After the death of William III, no regents in Zutphen needed to claim their positions back in the magistracy.

The community members had already lost most of their influence in the magistracy after the death of William II. After 1650, the magistracy recruited through cooptation and not by nomination from the Sworn Community.¹⁸³ The government regulation primarily affected the community members in Zutphen. William III had the right to appoint the community members, but he left many positions open in the Sworn Community.¹⁸⁴ The burghers of Zutphen never had an influence on the election of the magistracy before 1703.¹⁸⁵

The guilds and companies take control

On February 5, with the election in sight, the magistracy of Zutphen summoned the seven remaining community members to the town hall. The community members who were still present in Zutphen asked for the old election procedures. They wanted to look at their rights and privileges. On February 7, the magistracy allowed the community members access to the archives. However, during that same time, a burgher movement emerged in Zutphen. On the initiative of two civic officers from the Beukerstraat company, Gerrit Bannink and Hendrik Coulman, several officers came together at the Frankensteeg in the lodging house of J. van Schoten. The guilds and the companies did not want to await the research of the community members. They decided to follow the example of Nijmegen and Arnhem to form a plan (*ontwerp-associatie*) to get back their old privileges.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸¹ W. Frijhoff, 'Zutphens Geschiedenis, 1591-1814', in: W.Th.M. Frijhoff, et. al. (eds.) *Geschiedenis van Zutphen* (Zutphen 1989) 103-104.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 103-104.

¹⁸³ Maris, 'Prins Willem III en het Provisionele Regeringsbestel', 159.

¹⁸⁴ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 14.

¹⁸⁵ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 57.

¹⁸⁶ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 13-14.

Between February 7 and February 22 (the day of the election), the friction between the regents and the burghers started to increase. The magistracy was worried about the intentions of the guilds and the civic officers, and summoned them to the magistracy on February 11. The magistracy wanted the burghers to state their intentions so that they could foresee potential problems with the upcoming election. The attempts to calm down the burghers had little effect. On February 15, representatives of the guilds and the companies decided to dismiss the sitting magistracy. The burgher movement also decided to dismiss the community members. The next action of the burghers was to appoint a new college of community members. The new college of community members consisted of four community members from the old college. The dismissed community members chose the other thirty-two community members from a selection of ninety-six candidates. The companies and the guilds nominated the ninety-six candidates.¹⁸⁷

On February 21, the college of community members had a meeting to discuss the upcoming election procedure. The new college of community members had made an instruction for the upcoming election. The whole point of the meeting was to find out for which duration the Aldermen and community members had to be appointed. The community members had to choose between one year, three years, six years or *ad vitam* (for life). A majority of eighteen members voted for *ad vitam*, seventeen members for three years and one member chose for the a period of six years. A problem arose with this outcome. The companies and the guilds were not happy with the choice for *ad vitam*. They disliked the fact that the community members had made the instruction (*design instruction*) for the upcoming election. The companies and the guilds were of the opinion that they were the ones who had to make this decision. To take control of the community members, the guilds and companies summoned the community members to come to the Grote Kerk at eight o'clock on the day of the election. The community members would be fined if they did not come.¹⁸⁸

The real problems started on the day of the election. To mislead the companies and the guilds, the community members decided to start the meeting that day already at half past seven instead of half past eight. The companies and guilds had informed the burghers of the plans of the community members. The burghers of Zutphen marched to the Grote Kerk and shouted: "no longer than three years". The moods were running very high in Zutphen on the day of the election. Some burghers even threatened to break the necks of the community members if the aldermen were elected for life.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 15-16.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 14-19.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 19.

Under the pressure of the burghers, the community members decided to vote again. The results were now that 27 had chosen for three years and only seven for *ad vitam*. The companies and the guilds had shown their power to the magistracy and the community members. The only difference with the other towns of Gelderland was that in Zutphen no members of the magistracy were dismissed. Gerrit Jurriën Schimmelpenninck was appointed to the magistracy in spite of the fact that he had voted *ad vitam*.¹⁹⁰ Schimmelpenninck was an aristocrat with some democratic ideas who did not want to oppose the New Fold after the voting had taken place. He decided that it was better to co-operate with the New Fold. This attitude gave him a position in the magistracy where he stayed for forty-nine years.¹⁹¹

The complete Sworn Community was dismissed. The guilds and companies chose a new college of community members. They chose fourteen new members among whom some radical activists. The guilds and the companies wanted to make both the college of community members and the magistracy completely dependent on them. On April 11 1703, the new college of community members was finally able to go to work.¹⁹²

Economic and social situation in Zutphen

Now that the New Fold had demonstrated that they both controlled the magistracy and the community members, the burghers used their power for municipal affairs.¹⁹³ The New Fold wanted to break down the bridges across the Berkel river to improve the economic position of Zutphen in the region. Next to that, the burghers wanted to abrogate the *Heerlijkheid Voorst*. William III had given this position to his friend Arnold Joost van Keppel. Van Keppel did not make himself popular with the burghers of Zutphen because of his authoritarian behaviour that caused many irritations among the burghers of Zutphen. After the death of William, the abrogation of the *Heerlijkheid Voorst* was one of the first demands of the burghers in Zutphen.¹⁹⁴

The dismantling of the bridges that connected Zutphen with surrounding towns led to tensions with those towns. Especially with Deventer and Lochem it almost came to an armed conflict. On April 27, under the leadership of five captains from the magistracy, the burghers marched to the bridges to break them down. The magistracy of Zutphen negotiated with the magistracy of Lochem about the conflict. It turned out that Zutphen had no legal grounds to break down the bridges.

¹⁹⁰ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 19-22

¹⁹¹ Frijhoff, 'Zutphens Geschiedenis, 1591-1814', 103.

¹⁹² Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 22-24.

¹⁹³ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink et al., 'Early 18th Century Uprisings in the Low Countries', 103.

¹⁹⁴ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 25-26.

Zutphen had to restore the bridges immediately. The negotiations between Zutphen and Lochem proceeded agreeably. On the other hand, the conflict with Deventer was more hostile. In the months of August and September, the towns confronted each other constantly with citations from the old books in which the privileges of the towns were chronicled.¹⁹⁵

The New Fold loses momentum

The relationship between the burghers within the movement was one of the reasons that weakened the movement in the summer of 1703. In principle, all burghers should have been equal according to the ideology of the New Fold. However, it appeared that some burghers were more equal than others. It all came down to who had most money. It seemed that the Foldings in Zutphen would come to a sudden end with the controversy within the burgher movement. However, an action of the magistracy at the end of 1703 led to a radicalization of the burgher movement instead.¹⁹⁶

Mid May 1703, the magistracy appointed four magistracy members to make together with the committed burghers and the community members an instruction for the election of 1704. The friction between the different groups had settled down in the summer of 1703. The writing of the instruction for the election of 1704 went peacefully. This changed around October. After the summer, the regents were no longer just compliant with the attitude of the burghers. On October 23, four representatives of the burghers appeared before the magistracy and requested the continuance of the town privileges. The magistracy refused the request and told the burghers that the dukes that had given the privileges were now dead. The ending of the Foldings in Amersfoort gave the regents of Zutphen the courage to stand up to the burghers. The execution of Richard Saab and Pieter van Houten gave the regents of Zutphen hope that they could also end the dominance of the New Fold in Zutphen. The burghers were surprised with the reaction of the regents and everybody left the town hall and just went their own way.¹⁹⁷

In the Zutphen district, the Old Fold was still in control since the New Fold of Zutphen had chosen not to dismiss the regents their town. The fact that the burghers of Zutphen did not dismiss the regents at the start of the year was, according to Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, a signal that the burghers refrained to get involved at the district's level.¹⁹⁸ On November 8, members of the Old Fold from the districts of the Veluwe and Nijmegen organized a Diet. The regents of Zutphen attended the

¹⁹⁵ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 27-36.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 36-38.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 37-38.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 38.

Diet. The outcome of the Diet was that the Old Fold declared that nothing would change and everything would return to the period before 1672. This was just a confirmation of the States resolution of April 8, 1702. The Zutphen district was completely in line with the outcome of the meeting of November 8. However, on December 20, the Zutphen district made an extra addition to the outcome of the Diet. It handed out an Amnesty Edict¹⁹⁹ in which the Zutphen district would forget and forgive everything that had happened during the troubles of 1703. It stated that the government system would not change and would turn back to the system before 1672, every dismissed regent had to get back its position and finally, everyone that illegally got his position had to resign.²⁰⁰

The burghers of Zutphen resented the actions of the regents. Had there been sign of cracks within the burgher movement in the summer of 1703, the Amnesty Edict only united the movement. The burghers felt that the Amnesty Edict had the intention to overthrow all the rights that the burghers had acquired during the course of 1703. The masters of the guilds and the elders of Zutphen heard rumours that the Amnesty Edict would be imposed on December 30. The Shopkeepers guild came together on December 29 and decided to protest against the Amnesty Edict and keep the *ontwerp-associatie* of February 7 intact. The Shopkeepers guild informed the other guilds of their decision. However, before the Shopkeepers guild could inform the other guilds, the magistracy forbade political meetings. The magistracy summoned the leaders of the Shopkeepers guild to the magistracy. One by one, the members of the Shopkeepers guild were called inside the meeting room of the magistracy. The magistracy urged them to stop causing troubles. Disobedience of the decision of the magistracy would be followed with punishment. For now, the magistracy succeeded to control the burghers of Zutphen.²⁰¹

Re-escalation of the Foldings in Zutphen

By the end of 1703, the magistracy had managed to control the burghers of Zutphen. However, it did not take long for the situation in Zutphen to fully escalate again and the burghers to re-take control over the regents of Zutphen. The election of 1704 was approaching, and encouraging messages reached Zutphen from outside. The New Fold in Nijmegen and Arnhem was still in control. The States General had attempted to end the troubles in Gelderland. However, the Old Fold did not leave a

¹⁹⁹ The text of the Amnesty Edict is included in the appendix of Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 167-168.

²⁰⁰ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 58-59.

²⁰¹ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 39-40.

good impression, because it refused to send a delegation to The Hague before the States General made a decision on the illegality of the new regents. The New Fold now had the opportunity to make its own demands to the States General since they had already made the trip to The Hague. The New Fold in Zutphen closely followed the events in the other provinces. A triumph of the new regents in Zeeland inspired the burghers of Zutphen to continue their fight.²⁰²

Despite the ban on political meetings, around the beginning of February 1704, the Sworn Community was holding secret meetings. The burghers wanted to come to a solution and decided to hold a public meeting on February 12 in the house of the guilds. Community member Derk van Santebergen convened the meeting. With a majority of votes, the community members decided to work together with all the burghers of Zutphen and called a new meeting. The guilds, elders and the companies attended the new meeting. The magistracy tried to stop these meetings and summoned a few masters of the guilds to the magistracy. The magistracy reminded the masters of the guild that it was forbidden to hold political meetings. The magistracy had drawn up several resolutions to prohibit the political meetings. However, the resolutions of the magistracy were not made public before the meeting of February 14. The magistracy asked the burghers to postpone the meeting, so they could discuss the resolutions with the community members. The magistracy did not want to get into troubles with the burghers because of the upcoming election. The magistracy did not mention the punishments they would give to the leaders of the Shopkeepers guild if they continued to cause troubles.²⁰³

The content of the resolutions was as follows. First, the resolution stated that the position in the magistracy was no longer *ad vitam*. The burghers agreed to the terms that the burghers could nominate three persons from which a new alderman had to be chosen. The content of the second resolution was that the magistracy would recognize the current community members. In the third place, the magistracy would discuss important financial issues with representatives from the community members. The position of community member was from now on allowed to rotate between the burghers. However, these resolutions did not change the minds of the community members and the guilds. The leader of the Sworn Community, Coulman, led a meeting of the Sworn Community and the guilds. The burghers discussed the reason why they did not accept the resolutions of the magistracy. The burghers were dissatisfied with the Amnesty Edict and the ban on political meetings. According to them, this was a suppression of democratic rights.²⁰⁴

²⁰² Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 41-42.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 42-43.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 43-44.

Therefore, the community members, guilds, companies and elders decided to go on with their meeting on February 15 in the Grote Kerk. The magistracy tried to stop the meeting. They summoned all officers from the companies to the magistracy and tried to convince them to cancel the meeting. Three moderate members of the New Fold told the magistracy that the format of the current government system did not work nowadays. However, Gerrit Bannink, a lieutenant of the Beukerstraat Company, and a radical activist of the first hour, spoke out his mind pretty clearly. He told the magistracy that he might be willing to delay the meeting, but he could not guarantee that the common people would stay at home. The morning of the meeting, the magistracy called the elders and de masters of the guilds to the magistracy. However, the magistracy received no response. The meeting went on that day in the Grote Kerk and would proceed dramatically.²⁰⁵

The first question that was raised during the meeting was if the burghers wanted to hold on to the *ontwerp associatie* of February 1703, or that it wanted to accept the Amnesty Edict from December 30, 1703. The burghers unanimously chose to hold on to the *ontwerp associatie*. Next, the question was raised if the magistracy had behaved properly according to the agreements between the magistracy and the burghers during the election of 1703, or that the magistracy had taken improper actions and had to be dismissed. Again anonymously, the burghers chose to dismiss the magistracy. Derk van Santebergen was delegated to summon the magistracy to call a meeting around eleven o'clock. Subsequently, a representatives of the Sworn Community, guilds and companies went to the magistracy, while the people remained in the church until a new magistracy was chosen. The leader of the Sworn Community Hendrik Coulman took the floor and thanked the magistracy for their work, and dismissed them. The community members occupied the town hall.²⁰⁶

When the community members came back to the church everything that had happened was recorded. The election of a new magistracy was held in the afternoon. Eleven of the twelve magistracy members were re-elected which showed that the burghers were more interested in a democratic election procedure than to completely take over the power in the magistracy. Only Wolter Sloet did not receive enough votes. In his place, the leader of the Sworn Community Hendrik Coulman was chosen in the magistracy.²⁰⁷

On February 18, the burghers submitted a regulation, which consisted of eight points, to the magistracy. The content of the regulation was as follow. In the first place, the magistracy had to respect the election procedure and that the appointment would only be for a period of three years. Second, the burghers retained the right to make changes to the regulation. Third, the Amnesty Edict

²⁰⁵ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 43-44.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 44-46.

²⁰⁷ Frijhoff, 'Zutphens Geschiedenis, 1591-1814', 105.

of December 30, 1703 had to be destroyed. Fourth, the magistracy was allowed to go to the Diet meetings. Fifth, the position of *Heerlijkheid Voorst* had to be abolished. Sixth, the first three year period would start after the election of 1704. Seven, the burghers have the right to hold meetings and the ban on political meetings had to be lifted. Finally, the bridges over the Berkel had to be removed.²⁰⁸

The annulment of the Amnesty Edict and the duration of the appointment to the magistracy or the Sworn Community for a period of three years were the most important points for the burghers. The members of the magistracy first did not want to sign the regulation. However, signing the document was a requirement to be eligible for a position in the magistracy. On March 15, 1704, the magistracy gave in and accepted the regulation.²⁰⁹

For now, the burgher movement had reached its goal. However, around New Year 1705, the unity of the burgher movement started to show cracks again. The realization of the points took some time to accomplish. The realization of these points caused the burgher movement to split in 1705. The burghers of Zutphen were continuously in conflict with Lochem regarding the bridges across the Berkel. The burghers had broken down the bridges three times to improve their economic position in the region. However, the rebuilding of the bridges was very expensive. The support for the burgher movement started to decrease because of it.²¹⁰

The abolishment of the *Heerlijkheid Voorst* led to a conflict between Zutphen and the other districts. During the Diet of April 1705, that was held in Zutphen, the magistracy of Zutphen put pressure on the Nobility of the Zutphen district to abolish the *Heerlijkheid Voorst*. The Nobility constantly delayed the abolishment on which the magistracy of Zutphen decided to close the town gates until the Nobility gave in on May 6, 1704. This caused a lot of anger with the representatives of the other two districts who could not leave the town either. The other district decided not to meet with Zutphen again until their safety could be guaranteed.²¹¹ The incident led to a second period that the Diet did not convene. The Diet did not convene from May 1705 until March 1706.²¹²

The movement eventually split over the question if it would join the Association of magistracies. The towns would support each other in case the Old Fold tried to retake the power in a town. The smaller towns of the Zutphen district joined the Association that was led by Arnhem, but

²⁰⁸ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 46-47. The regulation can be found in: Regionaal Archief Zutphen (RAZ), *Memoriën- and resolutiënboek van de stad Zutphen* inv.nr. 25.

²⁰⁹ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 61-62.

²¹⁰ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 70-85.

²¹¹ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 69-70.

²¹² Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 110.

the magistracy of Zutphen had no interest in joining the Association.²¹³ In Zutphen, the moderate wing was in control of the town until 1717.²¹⁴ The regulation was in place for a period of thirteen years, before the States of Gelderland restored system in which the appointments to the government would be again for life.²¹⁵

2.2 External factors

Institutional chaos

It was in the best interest of the New Fold to prevent interference from outside the province. The New Fold was in control and the Old Fold was not able to retake the power by themselves.²¹⁶ Not long after the New Fold controlled the magistracies in their respective towns, the chaos spread to the Diet of Gelderland. Beside the conflict between the Old and New Fold, the districts got into a conflict over the appointment of military offices. The whole province became ungovernable and had to deal with back payments to the States General.

The Diet

On February 12 1703, an extraordinary meeting of the Diet was convened in Zutphen. The meeting of the Diet was doomed to fail. The Court of Anrhem had informed the Old Fold in the districts of Nijmegen and the Veluwe of the meeting. The result was that representatives of both groups showed up for the meeting. Immediately after the start of the Diet, the representatives of the Old and New Fold got into a conflict. Under the circumstances, it was not possible to take any decisions. The representatives of the Old Fold of Nijmegen and Arnhem deliberated with each other to look for a way to end the conflict. They agreed to ask the States General to mediate between the Old and New Fold in Gelderland. It was of no use to continue the current Diet. Both sides agreed to suspend the Diet until March 9, when a regular meeting of the Diet was scheduled to take place in Nijmegen.²¹⁷

The States General decided to send a delegation of three deputies to Nijmegen. The States General already had the intention to find out what the situation in Gelderland was, because they had to address the financial situation of the province. Gelderland was far behind in its payments to the

²¹³ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 70.

²¹⁴ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 84-85.

²¹⁵ Tadama, *Geschiedenis der stad Zutphen*, 264.

²¹⁶ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 78-79.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 102-104.

Republic. On March 9, the deputies arrived in Nijmegen to offer assistance in the conflict. The deputies offered to mediate between the Old and New Fold. For three weeks, the deputies tried to find a way to reach a compromise between the parties. However, The New Fold showed little willingness to talk with the deputies.²¹⁸

Before the New Fold of Nijmegen accepted to talk with the deputies, they demanded that the verdicts of the persons who were banned from Nijmegen, Tiel and Bommel in December 1702 were officially reversed. The Burgomasters of Nijmegen even told the deputies that they could not guarantee the safety of the members of the Diet when these verdicts were not reversed. On March 22, the verdicts were reversed. The deputies were now able to come to some kind of compromise in the Nijmegen district.²¹⁹ The compromise consisted of four points, which would later lead to a conflict between the districts. In the first place, the magistracy of Nijmegen would not step down. Secondly, seven arbitrators from the other provinces were to be appointed, to see if a compromise could be made between the New and Old Fold. Thirdly, the mediation could only take place as long as the arbitrators honoured the privileges of the towns. Finally, the magistracy, community members and guilds of Nijmegen received the right to use the arbitrators for complaints against the Old Fold.²²⁰ All points indicated that the New Fold had no intentions to come to any form of compromise, because it was unthinkable that the Old Fold would accept the agreement.

The New Fold of Arnhem had always been against any form of interference from the States General. The New Fold sent several letters to the States General to prevent them from having a meeting with the Old Fold. The New Fold defended the changes in the magistracy and called these a matter of a pure domestic nature in which the States General had no right to interfere. A potential delegation of the States General was of no use, because no serious troubles had taken place during the changes of the magistracy. Several attempts of the deputies to arrange a meeting with the New Fold failed. Eventually the representatives gave up and returned to The Hague.²²¹ It became clear that the New Fold did not accept any form of interference by the States General. According to them, the conflict was of a pure domestic nature and the magistracies called upon Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht.²²²

A Diet was scheduled on April 9, however, the Diet was rescheduled until July 10 in Nijmegen. The Diet of July 10 never took place, because the Nobility of the Veluwe and the Zutphen district refused to participate. Especially the representatives of the Zutphen district did not want to

²¹⁸ Brants, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen*, 137.

²¹⁹ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 105.

²²⁰ Brants, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen*, 137-138.

²²¹ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 104-105.

²²² Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 50.

appear. There were four reasons why neither the Veluwe District nor the Zutphen district wanted to come. The first reason was the fact that the burgomasters of Nijmegen could not guarantee the safety of the participants of the Diet of March 9. The representatives of Zutphen felt threatened by this remark. The representatives from Zutphen were not members of the New Fold of Zutphen, since the magistracy of Zutphen was not altered during the election of 1703. They could be seen as allies of the Old Fold.²²³

The second reason was a complaint made against the description of the compromise that had been reached between the deputies and the New Fold of Nijmegen on March 22. The representatives of Zutphen had problems with the second and fourth point of the compromise. The second point did not mention a compromise between the Old and New Fold. The New Fold did not want to recognize the Old Fold as an equal and did not want the States General to mediate, whereas the Old Fold wanted the States General to mediate. The fourth point against which the representatives of Zutphen protested, was because only the New Fold had the ability to make complaints. They thought that this was not fair. The representatives of Zutphen demanded these points to be rectified. The New Fold in Nijmegen was not willing to make changes in the compromise, and expressed on August 3 once more that they only wanted to make a compromise on the terms that were made on March 22.²²⁴

The third point to which the districts of the Veluwe and Zutphen protested, was the appointment of military offices. Zutphen wanted the rights of these appointments to rotate between the districts. This was the case before 1672. Nijmegen did not want to give up this arrangement, and wanted to appoint the officers by itself, because the troops were stationed in their district. This was against the wishes of the other two districts. The issue on the appointment of military ranks was settled only in 1724.²²⁵

The last point about which there was a conflict between the districts was the height of the quota that each district had to pay to the States General. The States General had a close interest in the district payments. The district payments were an issue since 1652 and would not be settled until 1720 after the Foldings had already ended.²²⁶

The disagreements may not directly be connected to the conflict between the Old and New Fold, but it contributed to the unstable situation in Gelderland. The Diet stopped functioning until December 1704. Members of the Nobility and the Old Fold convened occasionally during these two

²²³ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 110.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 107.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 108.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, 109-110.

years, but could not end the conflict. On November 8, 1703, some radical members of the Old Fold arranged a meeting in Zutphen. The Old Fold made up a resolution in which it stated that everything would return to the situation as it was before 1672. The members of the Old Fold acted as if nothing had happened in Nijmegen or Arnhem. The New Fold of Nijmegen and Arnhem were indifferent to the Amnesty Edict. The Old Fold had no chance that the New Fold would step down in these districts. However, in the Zutphen district, where few regents were dismissed, the Amnesty Edict had a negative consequence. The Amnesty Edict seemed to make end of the democratic rights of the New Fold in Zutphen. As we have seen, the burgher movement radicalized because of the Amnesty Edicts. In 1704, the Veluwe District tried to convene a meeting of the Diet, but this was again unsuccessful. It was clear that the New Fold did not accept any form of authority above itself.²²⁷

The States General

In 1703, the States General had little success in bringing the Old and New Fold together. The New Fold maintained that the affair was of a domestic nature in which the States General had no right to interfere, and called upon Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht. In a response to the States General on April 26, 1703, the New Fold of Arnhem stated that an arbitrator of the States General was of no use in a domestic affair.²²⁸ Next to that, the phrase *jus de non evocando*, the right not to be served, kept turning up in response to the States General attempts to appoint arbitrators on the conflict.²²⁹

There was another reason why the States General could not interfere openly in the conflict in Gelderland. The States General was not unanimous about ending the conflict in Gelderland. Traditionally, Groningen and Zeeland did not want the States General to have a lot of power in internal issues in the Republic. They agreed with the New Fold that the situation in Gelderland was of a domestic nature. It has to be said that Zeeland also had to deal with internal problems at that time. Interference with the situation in the eastern provinces could lead to interference of the States General with the situation in Zeeland.²³⁰ The province of Utrecht and Overijssel were also against an intervention of the States General in Gelderland, and only gave permission for the States General to mediate in the conflict.²³¹

²²⁷ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 109-110.

²²⁸ Knuttel No. 15229, [Brief van de stadsbesturen van Arnhem en de andere Veluwse steden aan de Staten Generaal betreffende de geschillen in Gelderland, gedateerd 26-04-1704] (1704).

²²⁹ Knuttel No. 15015 Copia. Missive |van de drie steden des Nymeeghschen quartier, Nymegen, Tiel en Bommel, aan de [...] Staten Generael (1703) 6.

²³⁰ Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', 122.

²³¹ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 121-122.

On May 29, the States General undertook a new attempt to end the conflict in Gelderland. The States General called representatives from the States of Gelderland to come to The Hague. Again, the New Fold in Gelderland refused to give audience to the request of the States General. This time the magistracy of Arnhem wrote a letter to the provinces of the Republic. Again, the New Fold appealed on the Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht. It stated again that mediation was not required because of the domestic nature of the conflict.²³²

On December 12, Nijmegen appealed onto the privilege *de non evocando* that Charles V had given to Nijmegen in 1549. For arbitrations, Nijmegen had the right to turn to the court of Aken instead of the court of Gelderland or the States General. Nijmegen did not acknowledge the Court of Gelderland or the States General as the higher authority above itself. The other provinces had always acknowledged the privileges, even after Nijmegen had signed the Union of Utrecht.²³³

In 1703, the States General repeatedly tried to end the conflict in Gelderland through mediation between the New and Old Fold. The States General even threatened with an intervention. However, Zeeland and Groningen would have never given permission for an intervention. On January 19 1704, the States General issued a statement saying that it was not their intention to send armed troops to Gelderland to end the conflict.²³⁴

At the start of 1704, the States General again tried to set up a meeting between the Old and New Fold of Gelderland. The States General invited representatives from both sides to come to The Hague. However, even to arrange a meeting between the two sides was very difficult. Neither side wanted to be regarded as equal. The Old Fold refused to appear to the meetings at the beginning of 1704. The Old Fold wanted the States General to acknowledge the Old Fold as the only legitimate authority.²³⁵ On the other side, the New Fold was of the opinion that they were the rightful rulers of the town. The New Fold accepted the request of the States General to come to The Hague. After the meetings of January 1704 ended, the New Fold protested against a rapport that was made by Van Essen, the representative of the States General who had chaired the meetings in January. The report addressed the issue of the election of the magistracy. However, the New Fold was of the opinion that this was not a matter for the States General.²³⁶

The next meetings took place in March. Van Ham replaced Van Essen, but it was still not possible to hold a complete meeting with all sides present. This time, the New Fold was unwilling to send a full delegation to The Hague. The New Fold of Zutphen did not send any representatives to

²³² Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 121.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 123.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 121.

²³⁵ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 41.

²³⁶ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 126.

The Hague. This was no surprise, since no members of the New Fold were represented in the Zutphen district. The representatives from the Veluwe District sent two members, but they were only interested in discussing the quota for the district payments. Nijmegen did not send any representatives. They were willing to talk about the compromise that they had offered in 1703, but otherwise, they saw no use in going to the meeting. Further meetings in the course of 1704 were very difficult to arrange. The deputies of the States General, who chaired the meetings, were associated to the financial department of the States General. The States General was more concerned with the payments that Gelderland had to make to the Republic instead of solving the conflict in the towns. The deputies could accomplish little on the political conflict since it seemed impossible to hold a meeting with all sides present.²³⁷

Holland saw a necessity in solving the conflict rather sooner than later. On June 12, 1704, Holland made a proposal to both sides to come to a righteous solution. Holland proposed to appoint arbitrators to investigate the nature of the conflict. The proposal was not very different from prior proposals made by the States General. Again, Zeeland was against such a proposal. New problems had broken out in Zeeland, and they wanted to prevent interference in their own domestic affairs. Groningen agreed with Zeeland on the matter. This was the same for the magistracy of Deventer, where the New Fold was also in control.²³⁸ The proposal of Holland had no results and the New Fold was able to maintain control over the towns.

2.3 The end of the Foldings in Gelderland

None of the attempts of either the province of Holland or the States General to end the conflict in Gelderland was successful. In Zutphen, the situation had calmed down in 1705. The election procedures were changed and the moderate wing of the New Fold was in control. There were no significant events until 1717. This was different for Arnhem and Nijmegen. For two years, the new government was in control in Arnhem and Nijmegen, before the situation re-escalated in 1705. In 1705, there were signs that the power of the New Fold was fading and a split in the movement was at hand.

²³⁷ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 126.127.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 127-129.

The end of the Foldings in Arnhem

In 1705, the New Fold of Arnhem broke up in a radical and moderate wing. The magistracy of Arnhem was divided over joining the Alliance of magistracies. The magistracies that joined the Alliance agreed to support each other if the Old Fold attempted a move to regain the power in a town. Arnhem was the only district capital that decided to join the Alliance. Nijmegen and Zutphen had no interest in joining the Alliance.²³⁹

The split of the New Fold in Arnhem resulted in a clash in June 1705. On the one hand, there were the radicals led by Bouwens and Swaen, and on the other hand the moderate wing led by Van Brienen. Van Brienen did not only want to prevent the magistracy of Arnhem to join the Alliance of magistracies, he also wanted to get rid of the Volunteer Company that was created in 1704. Instead of maintaining the Volunteer Company, Van Brienen restored the militia in Arnhem. Bouwens, a colonel of a Volunteer Company was decidedly against this decision. It came to a clash between the militia of Van Brienen and the Company of Bouwens. The Company of Bouwens won the fight. Van Brienen and his followers were prosecuted for their actions. The radicals were the victors of the fight. Valenus Swaen became the new burgomaster of Arnhem.²⁴⁰

Until 1707, the radicals were in control in Arnhem. There were no significant incidents in these years. In 1707, the tensions in the Veluwe District rose again over the question if Johan William Friso would be admitted in the Council of State. During the district meeting in Arnhem of 1707, the issue was discussed. Arnhem wanted every town to vote against Friso, however, the Wageningen magistracy was divided over this issue. Four of the seven regents who were present during the district meeting wanted to vote in favour of Friso.²⁴¹ The acts of the four regents led to anger reactions among the community members and pro Arnhem regents in Wageningen. To maintain the power in Wageningen, the four regents solved the problem by dismissing eleven community members. However, the dismissal did not solve the problem in Wageningen. Aalders, one of the dismissed community members, went to Arnhem to ask the magistracy of Arnhem for help. Arnhem, where the radicals were still in control, sent Bouwens and burgomaster Bassenn to Wageningen along with two Volunteer Companies to restore the power of the New Fold in Wageningen.²⁴²

When the Volunteer Companies arrived in Wageningen they entered the magistracy meeting and held the regents captive in their own town hall. The majority of the States were very annoyed

²³⁹ Haak, 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe', 146-147.

²⁴⁰ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 70-71.

²⁴¹ H.L. Driessen, 'De Plooierijen te Wageningen', *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen XLIV* (1941) 74-76.

²⁴² Jonckers Nieboer, 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', 132-134.

with the Wageningen expedition. From Holland, a garrison was sent to Wageningen to prevent further troubles. The New Fold had to surrender. The States of Gelderland decided to dismantle the Volunteer Companies themselves. The Diet sent representatives to The Hague to ask for more help from the States General. With the help of Holland, more troops were sent to Arnhem to end the power of the New Fold.²⁴³

The New Fold in Arnhem surrendered quickly after the troops arrived. Bouwens and Van Bassenn had already fled Gelderland. The Court of Gelderland started a process against the participants of the Wageningen expedition. On February 15 1708, heavy sentences were handed to the leaders of the Wageningen expedition Bouwens and Van Bassenn. Van Bassenn was banned for life from Gelderland. Bouwens was even sentenced to death.²⁴⁴

In a pamphlet,²⁴⁵ Bouwens and Van Bassenn defended their actions, and pleaded that the sentences would be reversed. According to them, the whole magistracy of Arnhem had approved the Wageningen expedition.²⁴⁶ The States of Gelderland did not allow Bouwens and Van Bassenn to defend themselves.²⁴⁷ In Arnhem, the moderate regents of the New Fold took their positions back in the magistracy.²⁴⁸

In a way, the New Fold of Arnhem had dug its own grave. The provinces and States General had respected for years the privileges and rights of Arnhem by treating the conflict as domestic. And now, the New Fold of Arnhem completely ignored the rights of Wageningen. Aalders had no legal authority to call for help. Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht states clearly that local rights and privileges would be respected, but if another town would violate these rights, it had the right to be protected.

‘Nevertheless each province and the individual cities, members and inhabitants thereof shall each retain undiminished its special and particular privileges, franchises, exemptions, rights, statutes, laudable and long practiced customs, usages and all its rights, and each shall not

²⁴³ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 76-77.

²⁴⁴ Knuttel No. 15704, Sententien |by den Hove des furstendoms Gelre, en graefschaps Zutphen [...] tegens [...] Wilh. Adriaen Bouwens [...] en Jan Aelders (1708) 4-5.

²⁴⁵ Knuttel No. 15705, Wettige verdediging, uytgegeven door Willem Adriaan Bouwensch, ende Derck Reynier van Bassenn [...] op den 15. february 1708. Uytgesproken (1708).

²⁴⁶ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 78.

²⁴⁷ Knuttel No. 15706, Placaat: Wy Raaden in naame van de Heeren Staaten des Furstendoms Gelre en Graafschaps Zutphen etc. (13 Dec. 1708).

²⁴⁸ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 81.

only do the others no damage, harm or vexation but shall help to maintain, strengthen, confirm and indeed protect the others in these by all proper and possible means.²⁴⁹

In the months prior to the election of 1705 in Nijmegen, both the Old and New Fold were looking anxiously to the upcoming election of January 2. The last appointment of the magistracy by William III in 1702 was for a period of three years. The Old Fold was still of the opinion that they were the rightful rulers of the town despite the fact that the New Fold was already in control of the town for two years. On December 31, 1704, the Old Fold tried to gain access to the town archives of Gelderland. However, the New Fold decided to deny the Old Fold that access.²⁵⁰

At the end of 1704, it was not yet the right time for the Old Fold to take on the New Fold. The discontent among the burghers with the new government started to increase in Nijmegen. Members of the Old Fold kept in touch with some of the burghers of Nijmegen after they were denied access to the archives. The Old Fold tried to bribe burghers to their side. In July 1705, the Old Fold planned an attack on the movement of 'July 31 1703'. The New Fold could prevent the attack in the first place. However, on August 7 the Old Fold attempted a new attack. This time a group of fifty to sixty armed persons entered the council house to force the six regents that were present that day to resign. Unfortunately for the Old Fold, two regents managed to escape before the Old Fold had entered the council house. This was a problem for the Old Fold, because now the New Fold could make a counterattack. The New Fold rang the alarm bells. The burghers stormed to the council house to overthrow the Old Fold. The New Fold won the battle. William Roukens, a leader of the Old Fold, was immediately decapitated in the yard of the council house. Five other members of the Old Fold were executed by hanging. They were exposed in the windows of the council house so that everybody could see them.²⁵¹

According to Nijhoff, the democratic victory of free election was not assured after the defeat of the Old Fold in 1705. The common people found out that in the end the New Fold only fought for the interests of the regents who had been left out in 1675, the community members and the guilds. The well-being of the common people was quickly forgotten.²⁵² After the Wageningen expedition in 1707, the States General was done with the whole situation in the towns of Gelderland. The New Fold of Nijmegen was able to hold on to the power a bit longer than the movement in Arnhem, but in 1708, the radical movement of Nijmegen also had to give in. Until 1717, the

²⁴⁹ M. Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century. The Golden Age* (translated by D. Webb, Cambridge 2005, third printing 2009) 167.

²⁵⁰ Nijhoff, 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', 21-23.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Ibid., 25-26.

moderate wing of the movement was in control. However, around 1717, the power of the New Fold had virtually disappeared.²⁵³

In 1717, the province of Gelderland made the decision that the election of the magistracy was again for life, and that the supplementation of the magistracy went back to old customs, where the magistracies were chosen by cooptation of the sitting magistracy. On October 21, 1717, the decision was announced in an Edict. The Edict meant an end to all democratic rights of the burghers in Gelderland.²⁵⁴

Conclusion

I have discussed three cases for the province of Gelderland. The outcome was that in all three towns the transfer of power lasted for more than a year. Still, there is a difference between on the one hand Arnhem and Nijmegen, and on the other hand Zutphen. If I place the factors in a matrix, it will look as follows.

Table 2. Result matrix Gelderland

	Internal factors				External factors			Outcome
	Political stability in 1702	Regent conflict	Burgher movement	Economic and social stability	Provincial States	States General	Strategic location	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Z
Zutphen	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Nijmegen	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
Arnhem	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1

²⁵³ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland*, 79.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 82-83.

There is one thing that immediately stands out. All towns have a positive outcome, but in Zutphen and Arnhem, the regent conflict has both scored a negative. Next to that, only in Zutphen was the political situation stable in 1702. All three towns have scored the same for the external factors.

Analyzing the internal factors

Nijmegen was the first town in which the Foldings started. After the death of the Stadtholder, the political situation in Nijmegen was unstable. A burgher movement and some regents joined forces to overthrow the magistracy. In 1702, the strategic position of Nijmegen was a disadvantage, because an army was stationed in the town that was waiting to be called to fight in the War of the Spanish Succession. At that time, the New Fold could not take control over the town. However, that same strategic position became an advantage for Nijmegen, because now no one could stop the New Fold from taking control over the government. The New Fold quickly dismissed the old regents and appointed a new magistracy.

After the New Fold had taken over the power in Nijmegen, I have shown that all internal factors were present in Nijmegen. The New Fold in Nijmegen was very powerful for four years. A stable burgher movement had a good co-operation with the regents that wanted their positions in the magistracy back after the death of William III. This resulted in a very strong and stable government in Nijmegen that could impose her will on a district level and even on a provincial level. Internally, the rule of the old regents that had left the town in a bad economic and social condition was a good motivation for the New Fold to make changes. The list of grievances made by the burghers was a good example of the discontent with the time that the old regents ruled Nijmegen. Another important result of the stable movement was that it could convince the States of Gelderland and the States General of its sovereignty. The movement was the rightful ruler of the town and the events were of a domestic nature in which intervention from outside was not allowed according to Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht.

After the death of the Stadtholder, the situation in Arnhem was not as inflammable as it was in Nijmegen, but still the burghers informed the magistracy that it wanted access to the archives to find out what their rights were. Just like in Nijmegen, the War of the Spanish Succession put the plans of the New Fold on hold in 1702. However, just like in Nijmegen, at the start of 1703, and with no army to protect the sitting magistracy, the movement could push through.

In Arnhem, there was no sign of a regent conflict after the death of the Stadtholder. After the burgher movement had dismissed the magistracy of Arnhem, five members who were re-appointed

by the burgher movement refused to take place in the magistracy. Only one regent accepted his nomination in the magistracy. However, just like in Nijmegen, the burgher movement worked well together with the new magistracy. The New Fold of Arnhem created a stable government that was able to convince the provincial States and States General of their sovereignty.

The current economic and social situation in Arnhem was also a reason for the burghers to get more influence in the government. Just like in Nijmegen, a list of grievances was made that stated that the old rulers had neglected the town. Another goal of the New Fold of Arnhem was to change the tax system of the Veluwe district. A pact was made between the New Fold of the Veluwe district to fight together against the power of the Nobility and the gentry. The conflict between the New Fold and the gentry led to instability in the Veluwe district, but the movement was able to keep the chaos outside of Arnhem. The province of Holland intervened in the conflict, but did nothing about the local governments.

The Folding of Zutphen were clearly different from the Foldings of Arnhem and Nijmegen. There was no political instability in 1702 after the death of William III, and there was no conflict between regent factions. However, the other two factors were clearly present during the two years that the New Fold was in control in Zutphen. The New Fold of Zutphen was not interested to get involved on a district and provincial level since it had not appointed members of the New Fold in the magistracy.

A strong burgher movement took control over the magistracy and Sworn Community in 1703. The burgher movement made clear that it did not want the appointment to be *ad vitam*, but for a maximum of three years. The burghers influenced the magistracy through the Sworn Community. The burghers did not replace persons in the magistracy. During the first half year that the New Fold was in control in Zutphen, it worked together with the magistracy to produce an instruction for the election. There seemed to be a stable government in Zutphen.

The economic and social factors were important in Zutphen. The burghers wanted to improve the economic position of Zutphen in the region by breaking down the bridges across the Berkel. The burghers also wanted to abolish the *Heerlijkheid Voorst*. The way these goals were pursued, resulted in some cracks in the burgher movement. It appeared that in reality not all burghers were equal. The cracks in the movement gave the magistracy members spirit to retake the control over the town. However, the burgher movement regrouped after the magistracy announced an Amnesty Edict. The burgher movement interpreted the Amnesty Edict as a threat to their democratic rights since the magistracy wanted to reverse all changes made in 1703. The burgher movement showed the magistracy who was in control in Zutphen, and dismissed the magistracy. However, just like in 1703, most members were reappointed.

Analyzing the external factors

Because the influence of the New Fold had penetrated on a district and even provincial level, it was impossible for the Diet to keep functioning. The Old Fold tried to convene a Diet, but could not make any legal decisions, because the vote of the town was in the hand of the magistracy, And since the New Fold in Nijmegen and Arnhem were in firm control, they would not vote for a solution to end the conflict if that was disadvantageous to the New Fold. The magistracy of Zutphen communicated with the Old Fold in the other districts, but the magistracy of Zutphen did not need help from the provincial States, since they had not lost their position in the magistracy. Whereas the local government was organized, the provincial government was in chaos for almost three years. And even after the moderate wings had taken control over the towns in Arnhem and Nijmegen in respectively 1707 and 1708, it took until 1717 before the States of Gelderland was able to end the conflict with a resolution that stated that the local government systems went back to the period before 1672.

The reason that the States General did not intervene had everything to do with the structure of the Dutch Republic. The States General was not allowed to intervene in domestic affairs without being asked. Especially Zeeland and Groningen were against an intervention of the States General. Mostly because they were afraid that the next time the States General would also intervene in their domestic affairs. The States General was allowed to mediate between the Old Fold and the New Fold, but the mediations resulted into nothing. Both sides were not willing to acknowledge each other and claimed that they were the rightful rulers of the town. Because of the War of the Spanish Succession, it seemed that the States General was more interested in the contribution payments to the Republic than in the political situation in the towns of Gelderland. Gelderland was far behind in its payments.

As long as the conflict was limited to the town alone and the group that was in power could call upon Article 1 of the Union of Utrecht, the States General had no means to intervene. However, the moment Arnhem interfered with the Foldings in Wageningen, it ignored the authority of the magistracy of Wageningen. This gave the States General and the province of Utrecht the opportunity to finally end the Foldings of Gelderland.

3. Overijssel

In this chapter, the Foldings of two towns in the province of Overijssel will be discussed. I have chosen to discuss the Foldings of Steenwijk and Deventer. Overijssel was the only province where the New Fold in one town held power for longer than a year, and in other towns, the New Fold was in control less than a year. In Deventer, one of the three enfranchised towns of Overijssel, the New Fold was longer than a year in control, whereas in Steenwijk, the New Fold could hold power for only a short period.

Steenwijk was one of the smaller towns of Overijssel. It still fits the comparison since William III treated the town as equal to the enfranchised towns under the government regulation. Steenwijk had the right to be present during the meetings of the Diet, but it is interesting to see how the position of Steenwijk influenced the outcome. Steenwijk had a more or less similar position in Overijssel as Amersfoort had in Utrecht. I have chosen not to bring Vollenhove into the comparison for the same reason I have given not to bring Rhenen into the comparison. The position of Deventer in Overijssel can be best compared with Arnhem, Nijmegen and Zutphen.

The Foldings of Deventer

Around the election of 1703, troubles emerged in Deventer. The troubles in Deventer were not so much a fight for more democracy. The burghers in the towns of Overijssel traditionally had a lot of influence in the towns' government through a college of community members, the Sworn Community. After the death of William III in 1702, burghers were not immediately involved in the conflict. The conflict started as an elite conflict. Persons left out of the Sworn Community and magistracy by William wanted those positions back after his death. The election procedure of the magistracy was not an issue. However, after the troubles started in Deventer, a burgher movement did want to get more influence the local government. The guilds turned out to be the driving force behind the success of the New Fold during the election of February 1703. The guilds demanded for every guild a position in the Sworn Community. After the election, the conflict in Deventer mostly became a faction struggle between the new magistracy and the dismissed regents during the election of 1703.

The Foldings were a success for the New Fold. The New Fold consisted of two groups in Deventer. In the first place, there was the Nilant faction whose power in the town had decreased under the rule of William III. After the death of the Stadtholder, the Nilant faction managed to get some of their positions back in the Magistracy. The second group was the guilds that wanted to

control the Sworn Community in Deventer. The guilds succeeded in their goal to take control over the Sworn Community. The Old Fold were the dismissed members of the magistracy and Sworn Community.

The Foldings in Deventer can be divided into three phases. The first phase is when the guilds and Nilant faction take control over the government in Deventer. This took place around the election of February 23, 1703. During this phase, the guilds fought to get influence in the Sworn Community. The actions of the Nilant faction resulted in a faction struggle. The second phase is when the Old Fold tried to get back their lost positions. This started around May 1703, when the excluded regents and some community members filed a request with the States of Overijssel. The situation calmed down after 1703. The final phase starts around the election of 1704. The Nilant faction was reelected in 1704. The faction struggle continued after 1704, however, the New Fold held on to their positions.

Political institutions in Deventer

In Deventer, the government consisted of two Burgomasters, ten aldermen and a council. The election of the community members, aldermen and council took place every year on St. Peter ad Cathedram, February 23. The Sworn Community was formed by the eight districts (*straten*) of Deventer. Eight community members from every district formed the Sworn Community.²⁵⁵ The government system of Deventer was the same as it was in Zwolle and Kampen, the other two enfranchised towns of Overijssel. There were two government bodies in these towns. The Sworn Community chose the magistracy. The aldermen and councilors ruled the town. The Sworn Community had to be consulted for important decisions.²⁵⁶ In 1591, the Sworn Community and magistracy were reduced to respectively forty-eight and sixteen members. The magistracy was formed by twelve aldermen and four councilors.²⁵⁷

The Sworn Community and the magistracy were in constant conflict. Both government bodies were interested to exercise power and undermine the power of the other. According to nineteenth century historian Theodorus Ruijs, the two government bodies canceled each other out. The main cause for this was the lack of clear laws and election procedures for these two bodies.²⁵⁸ The Sworn Community shared legislative power with the magistracy. It also had the right to make

²⁵⁵ Fruin, *geschiedenis der staatsinstellingen in Nederland tot den val der Republiek*, 95.

²⁵⁶ M. de Jong Hzn, *Joan Derk van der Capellen, Staatskundig levensbeeld uit de wordingstijd van de moderne democratie in Nederland* (Groningen, Den Haag 1922) 53.

²⁵⁷ T. Ruijs, *De Gezworene Gemeente in Overijssel en Gelderland. Naar aanleiding van art. 131 Gemeentewet. Historisch toegelicht.* (Dissertatie Universiteit Utrecht 1873) 38-39.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 36-38.

proposals. The Sworn Community convened four times a year. It consulted with the magistracy over many town issues; however, the most important issue by far was the financial policy. The executive and judicial power was in the hands of the magistracy. The magistracy was not allowed to make changes in the town's policies without the consent of the community members. Borrowing or expending money was a hot item, as was raising taxes.²⁵⁹

William III and the government regulation

In 1674, William III got the right to appoint or reject the nominated community members, aldermen and councilors in Deventer. William did acknowledge the autonomy of the towns of Overijssel to a certain degree. The consequence of the government regulation was that William had to approve the appointment of the magistracy and the Sworn Community. William got the right to reject persons he did not like.²⁶⁰

The Sworn Community of Deventer protested heavily against the government regulation. According to them, the regulation was in conflict with their own right to appoint the magistracy. The magistracy tried to convince the Sworn Community to subject to the regulation, just as all other towns were doing. The argument that the magistracy gave to the community members was that the newly appointed magistracy and community members had already accepted the decision of the government regulation. The community members were of the opinion that the decision was invalid. In 1677, twenty-two community members refused to get approval from the Stadtholder for the appointment of the magistracy. The protest of the community members had no effect and it only resulted in the dismissal of the twenty-two. William evicted them from the Sworn Community for life and appointed new members in their place.²⁶¹ According to Wertheim and Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, this created the climate that resulted in the Foldings in Deventer after the death of William III.²⁶²

William also excluded regents from the magistracy. Prior to the government regulation, the Nilant faction was one of the influential families in Deventer. The faction had a majority in the magistracy and was represented by several members in the Sworn Community. The Nilant faction did not protest against the policy of the Stadtholder during the government regulation, but it waited until after the death of William to try to regain their lost positions. The influence of the Nilant faction had decreased significantly since 1672. It lost its majority in the magistracy, however, this had not so

²⁵⁹ Ruijs, *De Gezworene Gemeente in Overijssel en Gelderland*, 34-41.

²⁶⁰ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 18.

²⁶¹ Knuttel No. 00414, *Missive van sijne hoogheit, de heere prince d'Orange.&c. Aen de heeren van de magistraet der stadt Deventer* See also Ruijs, *De Gezworene Gemeente in Overijssel en Gelderland*, 42-47.

²⁶² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 54.

much to do with the government regulation. The Nilant family fell from grace after it had handed over the town to the enemy in 1672 without a fight.²⁶³

The political situation around 1702

In 1702, there were issues on how to proceed after the death of the Stadtholder. Whereas in Utrecht and Gelderland the government system returned to that of the First Stadtholderless Period, in Overijssel the Nobility and the three enfranchised towns of Overijssel debated over the question if a new Stadtholder had to be elected. Because the Nobility and towns could not come to an agreement, the regulation of 1657 was restored. The regulation was put in place by the States of Holland to end a conflict in Overijssel that had started in 1654.

In 1654, the appointment of Haersolte as Governor (*Governor*) divided the States of Overijssel into two camps. On the one hand, there were the magistracy of Deventer and the Nobility of Twente who were against the Orange minded Haersolte as Governor. On the other hand, there were the remaining nobility and the magistracies of Kampen and Zwolle who were in favour of Haersolte as Governor. Johan de Witt intervened and nullified the appointment of Haersolte in 1657. De Witt installed a regulation that contained procedures for the ruling of Overijssel.²⁶⁴ However, the regulation did not discuss the position of the magistracy and community members. It took until 1705 before a new regulation was in place in Overijssel.²⁶⁵

With the upcoming election in February 1703, an opposition formed against the existing magistracy and Sworn Community. The Nilant faction was looking for a way to get back their lost power in the town.²⁶⁶ The community members who had been dismissed by William III were looking for a way to get back their positions in the Sworn Community. They were of the opinion that the Stadtholder did not have the right to dismiss them in 1677.²⁶⁷ A third party that played a role in the Foldings of Deventer were the guilds. The Nilant faction tried to get the guilds on its side. This

²⁶³ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 54.

²⁶⁴ A.J. Mensema, A.J. Gevers, 'De Staten als souverainen van Overijssel 1578-1795' in: E.D. Eijken, A.J. Mensema, A.J. Gevers et al. (eds.), *In alle Staten. Vierhonderd jaar provinciaal bestuur van Overijssel* (Zwolle 1978) 54-55.

²⁶⁵ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 18.

²⁶⁶ W.Th. Keune, 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van schepenen en raad en de Gezworen Gemeente van Deventer in 1703', *Verslagen en Mededelingen Vereeniging tot beoefening van Overijsselsch Regt en Geschiedenis* 81 (1966) 120.

²⁶⁷ Knuttel 15047, Remonstrantie aen de wel wijse [...] heeren burgemeesteren, schepenen en raad der stad Deventer.

strategy would prove to be unsuccessful, because the guilds later on showed that they had an agenda of their own.²⁶⁸

The excluded regents led by Lambert Nilant fought a faction struggle to get back the majority in the magistracy. The guilds wanted more influence in the composition of the Sworn Community.²⁶⁹ More influence in the Sworn Community meant more influence in the nomination of the magistracy. The Old Fold evidently did not want to give up their positions. According to them, they were the rightful rulers of the town.²⁷⁰

Economic and social situation in Deventer around 1703

There are no signs that the burghers of Deventer suffered excessively because of the high taxes that had to be paid for the War of the Spanish Succession. Deventer was a Hanseatic town. Its favourable position along the IJssel benefitted Deventer because of its position along the trade route between Holland and Germany. In 1703, Zutphen tried to improve its own position along this route at the cost of Deventer. The burghers of Zutphen broke down the Spitsholders Bridge to improve their economic position in the region. In the months of August and September, the emotions between the two towns increased. The magistracy of Deventer demanded that Zutphen would restore the bridge. Deventer threatened to block trade ships from Zutphen on the IJssel.²⁷¹ The blocking of ships from Zutphen would probably have a bigger economic impact on Zutphen than it would have had on Deventer. The destruction of the Spitsholders Bridge would have had a temporary disadvantage for Deventer, but the moment the bridge was restored, this disadvantage would disappear.

The start of the Foldings in Deventer

The troubles started in Deventer at the beginning of February 1703. The direct cause of the troubles was the events in the neighbouring districts of Zutphen and the Veluwe spilling over to Deventer.²⁷² In the council meeting of February 11, the sitting magistracy and Sworn Community refused to treat the petition of the community members. The Sworn Community wanted the magistracy to take stern measures against anyone who caused trouble. They insisted that the vacant positions in the Sworn

²⁶⁸ Keune, 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van Schepenen en Raad', 121.

²⁶⁹ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 55.

²⁷⁰ Keune, 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van Schepenen en Raad', 121.

²⁷¹ Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen*, 36.

²⁷² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 54

Community would be filled by means of cooptation. The community members who got their positions through the policy of William III were not willing to give these up.²⁷³

With the approach of the election on February 23, the unrest under the burghers started to increase. The magistracy started to analyze its position in the town and showed little willingness to act fiercely against the emerging unrest. Next to that, the guilds started to pursue their own interests, instead of following the petition of the community members or the Nilant faction. The guilds were looking for a way to get influence in the composition of the Sworn Community.²⁷⁴

The guilds and the Nilant faction came together on February 21 at the house of Nilant. They decided to dismiss the Sworn Community and the magistracy. On February 22, over a thousand people were present in the square in front of the town hall. Representatives from the New Fold entered the town hall, thanked the magistracy and the Sworn Community for their work, and dismissed them. The majority accepted their resignation. The majority of the dismissed regents also did not want to take actions against the emerging unrest before the election. The regents were probably sure that they would be reappointed. A small group resisted and had to be forced to leave the town hall.²⁷⁵

The day before the election, the intentions of the guilds would become clear. The guilds presented a list of representatives who would function the next day as electors. The guilds also demanded for every guild a seat in the Sworn Community. The bakers' guild even demanded two seats. The Nilant faction, who pretended to stand up for the interests of the burghers, protested against the demands of the guilds, as unheard and conflicting with the towns' rights. However, in the end the Nilant faction had to give in.²⁷⁶ The Nilant faction accepted the demands of the guilds with the restriction "*voor dese reyse*" to prevent further troubles. By giving in, the Nilant faction only saved their faces. The restriction was of no use in reality.²⁷⁷

During the night before the election, some members of the dismissed magistracy met in the house of Gisbert Cuper. Next to Cuper, also present were Arnold and Gerhard van Suchtelens, Antoni Brouwer and Georg and Rudolf Jordens. They agreed to offer the guilds their cooperation hoping that they would be reappointed in the magistracy. The election of the Sworn Community and the magistracy took place on February 23. The guilds took firm control of the Sworn Community during the election. The majority of the magistracy kept their positions. Only three of the sixteen members were not reappointed in the magistracy. The Nilant faction got its majority in the magistracy back

²⁷³ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 54-55.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 55.

²⁷⁵ Keune, 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van Schepenen en Raad', 125.

²⁷⁶ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 55.

²⁷⁷ Keune, 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van Schepenen en Raad', 125-126.

and increased from seven to nine members. The attempts by Arnold and Gerhard van Suchtelens and Antoni Brouwer to persuade the guilds to their side were unsuccessful. They were not appointed in the magistracy on February 23.²⁷⁸

It appeared that the victors aimed to consolidate their newly acquired positions, instead of continuing their fight for more democracy. On February 25, the magistracy ratified an Amnesty Edict that all events of the last weeks had to be forgiven and forgotten.²⁷⁹ The Edict did not immediately have the effect of calming down the situation in Deventer. There were some incidents after the election. Serious troubles occurred at the publican's guild. The magistracy was asked to settle the situation before it could escalate. The magistracy decided after deliberation with the Nobility and Towns to freeze the taxes on beer at a fixed price. There were also incidents that were directly connected to the appointment of the magistracy and the Sworn Community. Reverend Verhorst, a supporter of the Old Fold, preached in front of some magistracy members in favour of the Old Fold. The magistracy did not accept this and suspended the reverend. The Church council defended the reverend. He was allowed to preach again after he had swallowed his words. Tailor Gerrit Jacobs was not that lucky after he called the latest election unlawful. He was exiled from Deventer for his remarks.²⁸⁰

The States of Overijssel and the States General

The Old Fold did not accept their dismissals. Not long after the elections, the dismissed regents and community members were seeking help from the States of Overijssel and the States General. On May 18, the Diet of Overijssel received a request from the three dismissed magistracy members. They called their dismissal unlawful and wanted to be restored to their former offices.²⁸¹

The representatives from Deventer, Kampen and Zwolle discussed the request with their own governments. The outcome was not positive for the Old Fold of Deventer. The outcome was adopted in a resolution of the Diet. The resolution stated that the claim from the protesters that they were the rightful rulers of Deventer was false. In addition, the representatives of Deventer ruled that the protest was aimed at the quality of the aldermen and councilors of Deventer. For that reason, the

²⁷⁸ Keune, 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van Schepenen en Raad', 126

²⁷⁹ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 56. The Amnesty Edict can be found in: Atheneum-bibliotheek Deventer, Collection Dumbar, *Troubles in 1703 en 1704: Deventer, Nijmegen en Middelburg*. Inv. No. 53, 'dat al het gené daar omtrent,... sal zijn vergeten en vergeven'. See also Knuttel No. 15048, Publicatie. Schepenen ende Raad van Deventer

²⁸⁰ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 56-57.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 71. See also Collection Dumbar for the letter to the States of Overijssel. G. van Suchtelen, A. van Suchtelen and A. Brouwer signed the letter.

States of Overijssel was not allowed to interfere. The case had to be handed over to the current magistracy of Deventer. The States of Overijssel acceded. Kampen and Zwolle offered to mediate, but Deventer rejected this. The New Fold achieved success by preventing interference from outside. It was a smart move of the New Fold to send representatives from Deventer to the Diet who were continued during the latest election. These regents were familiar faces in the Diet and could therefore prevent intervention from the States of Overijssel better than members of the New Fold.²⁸²

There was another reason for the New Fold to keep the case domestic. In May 1703, the States General had received a request from the nobility of Gelderland and the dismissed regents of Nijmegen to mediate in the conflict. The Provincial States had to judge on this request before the States General could take action. Kampen, Zwolle and the nobility were in favour of the States General to mediate in the conflict in Gelderland. However, Deventer fought hard against this resolution and called it a domestic case for Gelderland itself to decide. The Provincial States were in that case not allowed to rule on the subject with a majority of the votes. The States of Overijssel had already sent their answer to the States General, but the representatives of Deventer demanded that the States of Overijssel sent Lemker, a clerk, to The Hague to revoke the answer.²⁸³

The Deventer magistracy knew that the Old Fold would eventually follow the example of Gelderland to ask the States General for help. On July 16, the old regents sent a letter to the States General. The three dismissed members got the support from nine dismissed community members this time. To support the regents, the request was co-signed by the old community members.²⁸⁴ Van Suchtelen was hopeful that the States General would help the old regents in Deventer. He based his hope on the developments in Utrecht. It seemed as if the States of Utrecht, with the help of the States General, prepared to interfere in the troubles in Amersfoort. However, where in Amersfoort the States of Utrecht and the States General eventually did intervene, this would not happen in Deventer.²⁸⁵

In the following Diet, the request from the Old Fold to the States General was discussed. Again, the representatives from Deventer strongly insisted that the situation was of a domestic nature. They informed the Diet that there was no rebellion in the town as was claimed in the letter to the States General. Again, Lemker was sent to The Hague to explain the position of Deventer. Any

²⁸² Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 71.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 72.

²⁸⁴ Collection dumbar, *Troubles in 1703 en 1704: Deventer, Nijmegen en Middelburg*.

²⁸⁵ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 73-74.

interference from either the States of Overijssel or the States General with this domestic affair was in conflict with the rights and sovereignty of the town, the Deventer representatives argued.²⁸⁶

The end of the Foldings in Deventer

The States General and the States of Overijssel reconciled with the position of Deventer and did not take further actions. The magistracy of Deventer however, was not done with the persons who had sent the request to the States General. The magistracy of Deventer ruled that the Van Suchtelen brothers and their supporters were guilty of disturbing the peace in Deventer. The three regents got a fine of six hundred golden guilders and the old community members who had co-signed the request, got a fine of three hundred golden guilders each. In addition, the old regents and the old community members were dismissed from their subsidiary positions.²⁸⁷

In the end, only three regents were replaced in the magistracy of Deventer in 1703. To hold on to their position, they did everything they could to keep the States of Overijssel and the States General outside the town gates. In 1704, two new regents of the Nilant faction were chosen in the magistracy. The guilds increased their influence in the Sworn Community, but they did not go further in the fight for more democracy. Despite the increased influence of the guilds, the system of contracts and correspondence remained flourishing in Deventer. The appointment of certain offices was still negotiated between regent factions.²⁸⁸

The Foldings of Steenwijk

After the death of William III in 1702, the situation in Steenwijk remained peaceful. Just like in Deventer, the burghers of Steenwijk traditionally had a lot of influence through a college of community members. In Steenwijk, there were two such colleges, the Sworn Community and the *Mindere Meente* (Minor Community).

The troubles started in Steenwijk after the Sworn Community and Minor Community made a plan to strengthen their position in the town. The Sworn and Minor Community were supposed to represent the burghers in Steenwijk, but instead they were looking for more power. The Communities wanted their appointments to be for life, and they wanted to restore the election procedure to the way it was before the government regulation of 1675. The burghers of Steenwijk

²⁸⁶ F.Th. Holsboer, "'Troubelen" te Deventer 1703 II', *Salland* March 19, 1935.

²⁸⁷ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 73,74.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 107-108.

were not pleased with the actions of the community members. The burghers decided to dismiss the Sworn and Minor Community. After the burgher movement had dismissed both Communities, the burgher movement went on to seek more influence in the towns' government by forming a new Sworn and Minor Community and dismissing the magistracy. The States of Overijssel were not happy with the actions of the burghers in Steenwijk. The unrest in Steenwijk had already spread over to other small towns of Overijssel, and the States did not want the situation to escalate as it had done in Gelderland. The Diet appointed a commission to research the events that had just taking place in Steenwijk.

At the same time the Foldings were taking place in Steenwijk, its neighbouring town of Vollenhove also had to deal with a burgher movement. Vollenhove was a small town in Overijssel with even fewer rights than Steenwijk. Vollenhove did not have the right to be present during the meetings of the Diet and the election of the magistracy took place under the supervision of the States of Overijssel. Even during the government regulation, William left the appointment of the magistracies in the smaller towns to the Deputy States and did not pay much attention to it.²⁸⁹

Political institutions in Steenwijk

The magistracy in Steenwijk consisted of a college of aldermen and councilors. They were chosen for one year. Every two months, two of the aldermen held the position of burgomaster. Until 1597, there were four aldermen and four council members. After 1597, six persons were chosen in the magistracy for both the position of alderman and councilor. The two positions were no longer separately chosen. The election took place in January on a Sunday after St Paul's conversion.²⁹⁰

One day before the election, the magistracy summoned eight, and after 1597 twelve, burghers to the town hall. Six of them were appointed to the Sworn Community and six were appointed to the Minor Community. The members who were appointed to the Sworn Community were selected from the sitting Sworn and Minor Community. The Minor Community was appointed from the burghers. The community members from the sitting Sworn and Minor Community that were not re-appointed became regular burghers again. They were eligible to be appointed to the Minor Community the next year. The members of the Sworn Community took place in the town

²⁸⁹ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 18.

²⁹⁰ J.H.E. Meesters, *De Steenwijker Meenthe. Een bijdrage tot de Marke- en Stadsgeschiedenis* (Zwolle 1881) 43-44.

meetings with the magistracy. The Minor Community had no further function in the government, because there were no meetings that took place outside the magistracy.²⁹¹

The burghers drew lots. After the draw, six burghers remained and chose the magistracy for one year. The complete legislative power in Steenwijk remained in the hands of both the magistracy and the community members. After the election, the magistracy was required to choose eight qualified burghers for the position of community member or to re-appoint the old community members. The rule of the town was in the hands of the magistracy and the Sworn Community. The magistracy regularly summoned representatives from burghers to the council meetings for consultation in important affairs. The burghers were probably asked by the magistracy to satisfy the burghers in Steenwijk, when the magistracy and the Community had to make difficult decisions.²⁹²

William III and the government regulation

With the government regulation of 1675, William appointed the magistracy out of the nomination from the community members in Steenwijk. However, William still had the right to reject persons from that nomination that he did not like.²⁹³

The provisional government that was installed in 1674 after the occupation of the town by Munster still included one magistracy member, Jan Ram, from before 1672. The appointment of the magistracy in 1675 resulted in a completely new magistracy in Steenwijk. William appointed the entire nomination of the Sworn Community in 1675. The only time William did not adopt the nomination was in 1682. The impending French threat was probably the reason for William to appoint regents to the magistracy who were known for their loyalty to him. In 1682, Jan Dannenbergh and former burgomaster Johan Croeven replaced Frederik and Simon Ram in the magistracy. However, one year later, William did not reject the nomination of Frederik and Simon Ram to the magistracy. In 1688 and 1693, William again rejected the appointment of certain regents in the magistracy. In 1688, Berend Jan Boncke had to give up his seat to a member of the old regent family Ten Broecke. In 1693, William replaced Jan Dannenbergh with Jan Kiers van Loon.²⁹⁴

²⁹¹ Meesters, *De Steenwijker Meenthe*, 46.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, 43-47.

²⁹³ F. Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ’t geheel vergeten” De positie van Hasselt en Steenwijk binnen het bestuur van het Gewest Overijssel 1621-1795* (Kampen 2001) 128-129.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 126-127.

Political situation in Steenwijk around 1702

During the rule of William III, the Sworn and Minor Community kept some influence by nominating the magistracy members. Nevertheless, the Sworn and Minor Community were easily influenced, because the burgomaster appointed the members for these colleges every year. William got the power to reject persons he did not want in the magistracy, so in the end, the community members were indirectly influenced by William himself. The legislative period of the magistracy members increased during the rule of William from 3,3 years in the 1670s to 8,6 years in the 1690s. After the sudden death of the Stadtholder in 1702, the regents who had been certain of their positions the previous years, were not so anymore.²⁹⁵

There were other concerns besides the positions of regents and community members after the death of the Stadtholder. Not until 1657 was Steenwijk completely free in its appointment of the magistracy. As one of the smaller towns of Overijssel, the position of Steenwijk changed after 1657. The States of Overijssel always supervised the elections of the magistracy and the Communities in the smaller towns. The elections had to be ratified to be legal.²⁹⁶ Steenwijk fought together with Hasselt for a better position in Overijssel. Especially after the Twelve Years' Truce, when the war costs increased the tax burden, both towns complained by the States of Overijssel that they were unequally taxed in comparison to the three enfranchised towns. It took until 1657 and the mediation of Johan de Witt for the situation between Steenwijk and Hasselt, the States of Overijssel and the larger towns to be resolved. In the regulation of 1657, Hasselt and Steenwijk both got the privilege to appoint the magistracy without consent of the States of Overijssel. However, both towns still were not full members of the Diet and still had no vote in the Diet.²⁹⁷

After the death of the Stadtholder, the enfranchised towns of Overijssel and the Nobility restored the regulation of 1657, but this regulation did not mention the position of the colleges of community members and the magistracy in towns of Overijssel. This problem also affected Steenwijk where the appointment of the magistracy and community members remained unclear.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁵ Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ‘t geheel vergeten”*, 128-129.

²⁹⁶ Ruijs, *De Gezwoorene Gemeente in Overijssel en Gelderland*, 64.

²⁹⁷ Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ‘t geheel vergeten”*, 85-116.

²⁹⁸ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 18.

Economic and social situation in Steenwijk

Steenwijk had suffered a lot from the occupation by Munster troops (1672-1674). Demographically the town did not really diminish in inhabitants, but financially the town suffered a lot from the two years of occupation. After the occupation, the town's total economy recovered somewhat, but after 1700 the income of especially the middle class started to decrease.²⁹⁹

Steenwijk was not very wealthy. Around 1703, it probably still benefited somewhat from the recovery of the last quarter of the seventeenth century. The industries of Steenwijk only produced for the town, and were not a factor on the national market. The magistracy of Steenwijk did its best to help the poor where necessary. In November 1702, the sea dikes broke and large parts of Steenwijk were flooded. The magistracy of Steenwijk took measures to help farmers who had no financial means to pay their rent that year. No one who owned land that was flooded, had to pay rent that year. The magistracy took these actions, so no one would be ruined by the floods.³⁰⁰

The Sworn and Minor Community

Everything indicated that the election of 1703 would proceed normally. On January 27, the Burgomasters, aldermen and councilors appointed electors for the upcoming election. The electors drew lots on January 29. In addition, on February 22, the Burgomasters, aldermen and councilors appointed the officers for 1703.³⁰¹ The peaceful situation would change the moment the community members wanted to change the election procedures in Steenwijk.

On April 13, the Sworn and Minor Community of Steenwijk convened at the house of Herman Bent. The community members proposed to the magistracy some institutional changes in the upcoming election of 1704. The community members convened under the pretext to prevent disturbances to spread from Vollenhove to Steenwijk.³⁰² The proposal of the community members was to make the appointment to the Community for life and change the election procedure to the system as it had been before 1672. Before 1672, the community members were the ones who actually appointed the magistracy every year. Under the rule of William, they could only nominate the regents for the magistracy. It seemed that the proposed changes were not to give the burghers

²⁹⁹ Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ‘t geheel vergeten”*, 29-65.

³⁰⁰ *Kronijk van Steenwijk*, Gemeentearchief Steenwijk (GAS) f. 423-424.

³⁰¹ Memorialen, d.d.(1688-1724), Gemeentearchief Steenwijk (GAS) Inv No. 8 f. 111-112

³⁰² *Kronijk van Steenwijk*, GAS f. 424-425.

of Steenwijk more rights, but to strengthen the position of the community members themselves in the town.³⁰³

The proposed changes of the community members had the opposite effect on the burghers of Steenwijk. If the community members were to be appointed for life, it became much harder for other burghers to make their way into the Community. The day after the meeting of the community members, three representatives from the burghers insisted that both communities had to be dismissed.³⁰⁴ A large group gathered in front of the council house on April 14, 1703 and dismissed the Sworn and Minor Community. The community members were replaced with twelve new members. Former burgomaster Jan Kroeven got a place in the new Community. Other well-off persons appointed to the new Communities were Cornelis Dortman (he would become one of the leaders of the New Fold), Gerbrandt Boncke (he was the brother of Berend Jan Boncke who had been rejected by William III) and dr. Rijckman Ram (he was the son of the sitting burgomaster Frederik Ram).³⁰⁵ Next to the right of election and not just the nomination of the magistracy, the community members also demanded the right to be present during the presentation of the financial policy of the town.³⁰⁶ In Steenwijk, it seemed that some well-off burghers made use of the dissatisfaction among the common burghers and used their help to get in the Sworn and Minor Community. The conflict developed into an elite conflict. In the mean time, in the neighbouring town of Steenwijk, a burgher movement was also trying to get more influence in the local government.

The Foldings of Vollenhove

The conflict in Vollenhove started as a judicial conflict between de Sworn Community and the magistracy. The community members were unhappy with the towns' government system and wanted to get more influence in the appointment of the magistracy. Until 1703, a system of cooptation existed in Vollenhove.³⁰⁷

With the upcoming election in 1703, the community members saw an opportunity to change the old government system in Vollenhove. The community members referred to an old privilege they had received from Bishop Rudolf van Diepholt in 1450. According to this privilege, seven persons from the Sworn Community had the right to appoint the magistracy. The community members

³⁰³ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 61-62.

³⁰⁴ Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in 't geheel vergeten”*, 130. The three burghers were dr. Meindert Dortman, Jacobus Tuttel and Berend Stuijfsandt.

³⁰⁵ Ibid.

³⁰⁶ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 62-63.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 58.

formally filed a request with the States of Overijssel to honour this privilege. However, the States of Overijssel rejected the request, and ruled that the document of the Bishop was not authentic.³⁰⁸

The States of Overijssel did not leave it at a rejection, and issued a warning to the burghers of Vollenhove. The States of Overijssel forbade secret meetings or complots between the guilds, the burghers and the community members. Everyone who ignored the decision of the Diet would be severely punished. The States of Overijssel had every bit of intention to prevent the situation in Vollenhove from escalating. The warnings of the States had little effect. Shortly after the resolution of April 13, the situation escalated in Vollenhove. Timan Coops, a lawyer, would emerge as the leader of the community members in Vollenhove.³⁰⁹

The situation in Vollenhove deteriorated in the period between 13 and 19 April. The Diet of Overijssel met on April 17 to discuss the disturbances taking place in Vollenhove. During the Diet of April 17, it became clear that the burghers of Vollenhove did not obey the resolution of the States from April 13. The Governor of Vollenhove informed the States that many of the burghers misbehaved and were guilty of participating in several secret and forbidden meetings. Out of these meetings, the burghers started petitioning the magistracy for extensive influence on town issues. The most important rights the burghers demanded, were the right to be present during the announcement of financial policies of the town, and the right to appoint the magistracy themselves. The magistracy referred the burghers to the States of Overijssel.³¹⁰

The situation became problematic for the burghers when they decided to dismiss the sitting Community on April 19. With this action, they openly violated the respect and authority of the States of Overijssel. On April 19, the States of Overijssel sent a commission to settle the situation in Vollenhove. This commission had little success.³¹¹

On April 20, Timan Coops informed the burghers of Vollenhove of the outcome of the commission. He made up a document with representatives from the burghers and the guilds, and decided to push on with their intentions to hold new elections. Coops and the representatives from the burghers and guilds presented this document to the magistracy. After the meeting with the magistracy, the group informed the burghers on April 21 that the election of the magistracy would proceed the next day.³¹²

The burghers were aware of the threats from the States of Overijssel if they would proceed with their quest for old privileges. Out of precaution for possible sanctions from the States, the

³⁰⁸ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 58-59.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 59-60.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 63-66.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

³¹² *Ibid.*, 66.

burghers decided to get approval from the Governor, which was an old custom in Vollenhove. The Governor was not happy with the actions of the burghers. Dismissing the Sworn Community and the magistracy were criminal acts, according to Governor Van Rechteren. He summoned the burghers to reverse their actions and submit themselves to the States of Overijssel as their legal sovereign. If they would do that, he would help them sort out the conflict. The action of the Governor had a big impact on the burghers. On April 24, the burghers reversed their actions.³¹³

The Foldings in Vollenhove led to nothing and the troubles quickly ended.

Dr. Timan Coops discovered some new documents that mentioned the old rights of the burghers. He decided to continue his fight through legal channels. The magistracy attempted to get the troublemakers convicted by the States of Overijssel. However, at the same time Vollenhove endured heavy floods. The States got many requests for help and decided to concentrate on strengthening the dikes around Vollenhove instead of convicting political troublemakers.³¹⁴

The States of Overijssel

On April 17, the news that a large group of burghers in Steenwijk had dismissed the community members and replaced them with new community members had reached the Diet that was being held at the time. The *Governor* of the Vollenhove district, Van Rechteren, and the burgomaster of Kampen, Beeldsnyder-Steenbergen, got the assignment to investigate the actual situation in Steenwijk and report back to the Diet. The Governor and the burgomaster were told not to let the situation in Steenwijk escalate further. If necessary, the States of Overijssel would ask the States of Friesland to send troops to Steenwijk to help the Governor and Burgomaster with their investigation.³¹⁵

On April 19, the burgomaster and Governor reported to the States of Overijssel on the situation in Steenwijk. The States of Overijssel took a more cautious stance with Steenwijk than it had done with Vollenhove. Steenwijk had a larger role in the States of Overijssel than Vollenhove did. The States of Overijssel were also of the opinion that the dismissed Community had brought the problems on themselves. The States of Overijssel decided not to acknowledge the Sworn and Minor Community, old or new, in Steenwijk. Instead, the States of Overijssel decided to appoint a college of community members themselves. Furthermore, the States decided that the election of the magistracy had to continue according to the system before the government regulation. A

³¹³ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 68.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

³¹⁵ Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ‘t geheel vergeten”*, 130.

commission was appointed by the States of Overijssel to start an investigation on the developments in Steenwijk.³¹⁶

The situation escalates again

While in Vollenhove the States of Overijssel had successfully ended the Foldings, the situation in Steenwijk escalated again. The new Sworn Community and some burgher representatives held a meeting on April 22 on how to proceed. The burghers and the community members came to the conclusion that the best option was to dismiss the magistracy from its function, because it refused to give the burghers access to vital documents.³¹⁷ Steenwijk was in a better position to hold new elections than Vollenhove was. After the death of William III, the election procedure went back to the regulation of 1657. Steenwijk did not have to get permission from the States of Overijssel for the appointment of the magistracy. Another point, in which the burghers were very dissatisfied with the old magistracy, was that embezzlements had taken place in the financial issues of the orphanage. The magistracy, however, was of the opinion that the orphanage was not a town case, but a private matter.³¹⁸

At the time that the situation in Steenwijk escalated again, the Diet was in recess. The news of the new unrest in Steenwijk alarmed the provincial deputies. The deputies undertook actions by asking the States General and the States of Friesland to leave troops and cavaliers available in Zwolle and Kampen to intervene in Steenwijk. One of the reasons for the reinforcement was that Overijssel did not have the availability of soldiers because of the War of the Spanish Succession.³¹⁹

Between April 22 and May 8, the moment the Diet convened again, no interventions had taken place in Steenwijk. The States of Overijssel received a report from the commission that was sent out on April 19. The report mentioned the dismissal of the magistracy and other serious incidents that had taken place in Steenwijk. The response of the States was that the unlawful magistracy had to be dismissed. To strengthen their demands, the States of Overijssel decided to send three armed companies of cavaliers to Steenwijk. However, the aggressive attitude of the States did not work immediately. The newly appointed magistracy was not willing to allow companies inside the town walls.³²⁰

³¹⁶ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 63-64.

³¹⁷ Memorialen, GAS Inv. No. 8 f. 116.

³¹⁸ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 69-70.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 70.

³²⁰ Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ‘t geheel vergeten”*, 130.

The States of Overijssel were furious that Steenwijk kept the Frisian companies outside the gates. The States gave Steenwijk an ultimatum to either open the gates and let the companies restore public order in Steenwijk, or the States would order an armed intervention of the town. In that case, everyone that would resist would be treated as a rebel and captured.³²¹ The new magistracy did the rational thing in the face of a supreme force and opened the gates.³²²

Deventer apparently had no problems with the States of Overijssel interfering in the smaller towns of its own province. Apparently, Deventer did not see interference in these towns as a threat that the States of Overijssel or the States General would intervene with its own conflict.³²³

The consequences of the actions of the New Fold

After the States of Overijssel had ended the conflict, the situation remained unstable in Steenwijk. The companies that were sent already left the town on May 13. They were sent to the south to fight in the War of the Spanish Succession. However, new companies replaced the companies that had to leave. The States of Overijssel were not willing to leave the troubles unpunished in Steenwijk. The States kept troops available to send to Steenwijk and sent prosecuting counsel, Meier, to Steenwijk to investigate the events in Steenwijk. Meier had to find out which persons were guilty of the troubles in Steenwijk. On May 16, a number of activists were summoned to appear before the Diet. The statements of these persons were sent to Meier. Subsequently, two persons were arrested and sent to Kampen. The arrested persons were old burgomaster Croeven and Hans Veneman. On May 29, there were additional incidents in Steenwijk, which caused the States of Overijssel to send six companies from Deventer to bring the town to order.³²⁴

On June 2, the States of Overijssel were determined to definitely end the troubles in Steenwijk. The states of Overijssel received a letter from the burghers of Steenwijk in which they showed remorse for their actions and said they would from now on comply with the orders of the States. In the letter, the burghers also requested the release of burgomaster Croeven. However, there was still a situation that had to be dealt with. Since April 19, there was no official Sworn and Minor Community in Steenwijk. The Governor of Vollenhove and clerk Lemker got the assignment to

³²¹ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 76.

³²² Schmidt, *“Te laate genodigt of in ‘t geheel vergeten”*, 130-131.

³²³ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 74.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, 77-78.

form a new Community in Steenwijk. The States of Overijssel did not allow persons in the Communities that were accessories to the troubles.³²⁵

The burghers requested the States of Overijssel to respect and maintain the privileges from before 1672. However, the States of Overijssel had other plans with the smaller towns of Overijssel and reduced the privileges of the towns. In an Amnesty Edict published on June 3, the intentions of the States of Overijssel would become clear. The States would forgive and forget the recent troubles but the privileges of the burghers were reduced.³²⁶

The burghers of Steenwijk managed to achieve some goals through legal ways after the Edict of the States of Overijssel. Dortman, one of the members that was chosen in the community in April, negotiated with the Governor and Lemker over the appointment of the Community and the rights this Community would receive. On July 9, a new Community was appointed which included Dortman.³²⁷

Whereas in Amersfoort after the decapitation of Saab and van Houten the troubles were quickly forgotten, this was not the case in Steenwijk. In 1704, some burghers had written poems and songs about the troubles of 1703. The magistracy imposed a penalty on those who wrote these texts. Burghers were also not allowed to sing these songs. The offence carried a heavy fine. There were also some tensions between the magistracy and the church council in 1704 on the appointment of the minister. The States of Overijssel kept a close eye on the situation and mediated between the magistracy and the church council to come to a solution. In 1705, the tensions in Steenwijk were something of the past.³²⁸

Conclusion

I have discussed two cases for the province of Overijssel. The cases have a different outcome. In Steenwijk the transfer of power was for only a few months, whereas in Deventer, the transfer of power lasted longer than a year. If we place the factors for these two towns in a matrix, it will look as follows.

³²⁵ Wertheim, Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij*, 78-80.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, 80-82.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*, 85-86.

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, 86-87.

Table 3. Result matrix Overijssel

	Internal factors				External factors			
	Political instability in 1702	Regent conflict	Burgher movement	Economic and social instability	Provincial States	States General	Strategic location	Outcome
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Z
Steenwijk	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Deventer	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1

As we take a first look at the matrix, the matrix shows that both towns only scored one factor the same, and that is the stability of the burgher movement.

Analyzing the internal factors

Deventer was the only enfranchised town of Overijssel that had to deal with the Foldings in 1703. The guilds and the Nilant faction joined forces to overthrow the sitting magistracy and Sworn Community. The New Fold had no economic and social reasons for taking over the control of the local government. Deventer, a Hanseatic town, benefitted from its strategic location along the IJsel.

Despite the economic and social stable situation in the town, the political situation was unstable in 1702. This had everything to do with the power vacuum left in Deventer after the death of William III. After the death of William III, the community members and the Nilant faction that were both victims of the policy of the Stadtholder, were anxiously awaiting the opportunity to retake their lost positions. This opportunity came during the election of 1703. However, it were not the dismissed community members who were the strong burgher movement, but the guilds that jumped in the power vacuum to control the local government in Deventer.

The guilds collaborated with the Nilant faction to take control of the town. The guilds ensured that the Nilant faction got a majority in the magistracy and for themselves, the guilds made sure they occupied enough positions in the Sworn Community to dominate this college. There was a stable government in Deventer after the New Fold had taken control that convincingly showed that

they were the sovereign in Deventer and not the dismissed community and magistracy members. Therefore, the New Fold of Deventer gave no reason for anyone to intervene in a domestic conflict.

Steenwijk was not an enfranchised town, but through the government regulation, Steenwijk was treated the same by William III as the enfranchised towns of Overijssel. William III had the last word in the appointment of the magistracy. However, throughout the duration of the government regulation only once William did not take over a nomination of the community members. Right after the death of the Stadtholder, there was no reason for anyone to feel disadvantaged. There were some uncertainties about the election procedure in 1703, but that was not yet an issue in 1702.

The economic and social situation was not good in Steenwijk, however, this factor was not used by the New Fold to get the support of the common burghers. The burghers were angry enough with the sitting community members who wanted to abuse their power for their own interests.

The stability in the town changed in 1703 when the Sworn and Minor Community took an attempt to increase their influence in the town by trying to get their nominations to be for life. The community members did this under the pretext that they wanted to prevent the troubles of Vollenhove to spread to Steenwijk. A strong burgher movement emerged after the actions of the community members. The burgher movement consisted of several well-off burghers that were seeking to get more influence in the local government. The movement demanded the right to choose the magistracy and to be present during the presentation of the financial policy of the town. The New Fold was a strong movement in Steenwijk.

Analyzing the external factors

The strategic location was in a way beneficial for Deventer, because the Foldings spread from the neighbouring province to Deventer. This was however no guarantee for the New Fold to be successful. Deventer did benefit from the fact that it was an enfranchised town. During the meetings of the Diet, Deventer could influence the actions of the States of Overijssel. For example, Deventer convinced the other members of the Diet that interference in the conflict in Gelderland by the States General was not allowed because of the domestic nature of that conflict. Deventer had a clerk sent to The Hague to change the answer of the States of Overijssel that it was not allowed to interfere in the conflict in Gelderland.

Furthermore, it was a smart move of the New Fold to send re-appointed members to the Diet. The regents were familiar faces on the Diet. The regents were able to convince the States of Overijssel of the domestic nature of the conflict. The Old Fold tried to get the States General involved

in the conflict, but this never had a chance to succeed. Besides the fact that the magistracy of Deventer would call upon Article 1 if the States General did decide to mediate in the conflict, the States General would never interfere on its own with even the States of Overijssel not willing to take actions against the New Fold in Deventer.

In the end, a strong New Fold and the fact that both the States of Overijssel and the States General did not interfere in the conflict in Deventer resulted in the transfer of power to the New Fold to last longer than a year.

The New Fold in Steenwijk never had a fighting chance to succeed in maintaining control over the local government. After the death of the Stadtholder, the government system in the province went back to the regulation of 1657. The regulation gave Steenwijk the right to appoint its own magistracy and to be present during the meetings of the Diet. However, it did not become a full member of the States of Overijssel. The fact that Steenwijk was not a full member was a strategic disadvantage for the town. Even Deventer, in which the New Fold was also in control, had no problems with interference in the conflict in the smaller towns of Overijssel.

It soon became clear that the States of Overijssel had no interests in respecting the sovereignty of the smaller towns of Overijssel. Vollenhove was the first smaller town of Overijssel that had to experience the authority of the States of Overijssel. The States of Overijssel did not want the Foldings to spread to other towns. The moment the New Fold of Steenwijk dismissed the magistracy in their town to take control, the States of Overijssel made sure there was an army present to stop the movement from progressing.

The New Fold in Steenwijk was just not able to keep the provincial States out of the conflict. On June 2, 1703, the New Fold of Steenwijk had to surrender to the overwhelming power of the Frisian companies. The Edict that the States of Overijssel announced a day later strongly reduced the rights and privileges of the burghers in the smaller towns of Overijssel. A strong burgher movement did not help the New Fold in Steenwijk to take control over the local government for an extensive period. The role that the States of Overijssel played in the conflict made it impossible for the movement to succeed.

Conclusion

In the previous chapters, I have found out which factors were either present or absent in the cases that I have discussed for this thesis. I have tried to restrain myself in this thesis from getting too much involved in the discussion of the character of the Foldings. I wanted to be as objective as possible to determine if a factor was either present or absent. This was at times difficult because of the fact that for a few cases I was dependent on the limited amount of available secondary literature. For example, in order to remain objective, I had to take into consideration the fact that Wertheim-Gijse Weenink had a democratic perspective. However, the democratic element did not necessarily implicate that the presence of a burgher movement would lead to the control of the local government for several years as we have seen for example in Amersfoort. The burgher movement was present in Amersfoort, but it could not keep stability in the local government.

If I place the cases that I have discussed in a matrix, it will look as follows.

Table 4. Result matrix of all cases compiled

	Internal factors				External factors			Outcome
	Political instability in 1702	Regent conflict	Burgher movement	Economic and social instability	Provincial States	States General	Strategic location	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Z
Amersfoort	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
Steenwijk	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Deventer	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Zutphen	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Nijmegen	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
Arnhem	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1

The next step is to bring this table into words. In what way did the presence or absence of each factor influence the outcome Z?

Analyzing the outcome

Looking at the cases that have a negative outcome, the cases have internal factor D, and external factors E, F and G in common. This would imply that these factors caused the transfer of power to last shorter than a year. Factors A, B and C are contradictory and therefore were not determining factors for the outcome z. Factor D was also present in three of the four cases that have a positive outcome. Therefore, factor D was not the determining factor for the duration of the transfer of power during the Foldings. A negative outcome comes down to the following equation. $z = E F g$.

Looking at the four cases that have a positive outcome, the matrix tells us that a positive outcome has the factors C, E, F and G in common. The combination of the factors A, B and D are contradictory in all cases, either positive or negative, and were therefore not determining for the duration of the transfer of power. Factor C, however, was also present in the negative outcome of Steenwijk. The factor is present in all positive outcomes. This implies that for a positive outcome to occur, factor C was necessary but not sufficient. A positive outcome only occurred in a combination of C with e, f and G. The outcome where the transfer of power was longer than a year comes down to the following equation. $Z = C e f G$.

What does this analysis mean for the actual conclusion of this thesis? The combination of an absence of an intervention by the provincial States and the States General with the presence of a stable burgher movement and strategic location was the reason that the New Fold was able to control the government for longer than a year in Arnhem, Deventer, Nijmegen and Zutphen.

Is it possible to simplify the whole event to a relative simple equation? One can argue that the presence of the War of the Spanish Succession had a much greater influence on the Foldings in Gelderland than it did on the Foldings in Utrecht or Overijssel. The reason that the army had left Gelderland to fight in Limburg surely gave the New Fold in Nijmegen the opportunity to take control. However, the argument can be approached from the other side too. The States General would benefit more from a stable political situation in Gelderland for the payments Gelderland had to make to the Republic. However, for the States General it was not possible to intervene, because interference in a domestic case was not allowed. In the early years of the Foldings, Zeeland and Groningen were strongly opposed to an interference of the States General.

Another problem arises with the simplification as I have done. The reason why the States of Overijssel did not intervene in Deventer is different from the situation of the inaction of the States of Gelderland. The score of '1' and '0' does not say much about the question why the provincial States did not intervene, only that it did not. However, we do see how the State of Overijssel did intervene

in Steenwijk. In Gelderland, the chaos spread from the towns to the State of Gelderland. The result was that the Diet in Gelderland stopped functioning, whereas the Diet of Overijssel kept functioning and intervened in the smaller towns of the Province.

The position Deventer took in Overijssel was the reason that the States of Overijssel and States General did not intervene. The rights of the smaller towns of Overijssel were not clear. Therefore, the States of Overijssel may have believed they had legal grounds to intervene in the smaller towns. In Gelderland, we saw that the moment Arnhem violated the sovereignty of the magistracy in Wageningen the States General intervened. When the magistracy of Amersfoort stopped functioning and there was no sovereignty anymore in the town. The States of Utrecht got the opportunity to prepare an intervention in Amersfoort. The chaos in Amersfoort brought as consequence that there was no authority left to advocate the domestic nature of the troubles. Furthermore, the strategic location of Amersfoort was disadvantageous for the town since the States of Utrecht was afraid that the movement would spread further into its province. The moment the States of Utrecht had a chance to intervene, it did.

The outcome of the equation also shows that in every positive outcome the factor burgher movement was present. In the introduction, I have explained that burgher movement would score '1' if the movement showed stability and the power to control the magistracy without turning the government into a chaos. This factor was also present in the case of Steenwijk where a group of well-off burghers took firm control over the Community. However, this shows that the presence of a strong and stable burgher movement alone was not sufficient to hold on to the power. It was a necessary factor for the transfer of power to be longer than a year, but only in combination with the absence of the factor provincial States and States General and presence of the factor strategic location, the outcome of the duration was positive.

Except for Deventer, I have shown that the factor economic and social condition was present everywhere during the Foldings. The list of grievances in the towns of Arnhem and Nijmegen, the way the burghers of Zutphen tried to improve its economic position in the region, the tax revolts in Amersfoort and the generally bad economic condition of Steenwijk are all examples of this factor playing a role during the Foldings. However, the analysis of this thesis has shown that this factor was not determining the duration of the Foldings.

Charles Tilly called the situation in Overijssel and Gelderland in 1702 revolutionary situations. He did not mention the situation in Amersfoort as a revolutionary situation. The reason for the revolutionary situation in these provinces was according to Tilly the displacement of Orangist

clients.³²⁹ However, I have shown that not in every town a faction conflict was present. In addition, the government regulation did not create political instability in every town in 1702. The Foldings were clearly more than just a faction struggle between regents. Next to that, the analysis of this thesis has shown that both factors cannot be considered determining factors when explaining the duration of the Foldings

Tilly also pointed out that there were few revolutionary outcomes in the Dutch Republic.³³⁰ According to Tilly, in many cases, the old holders of power ultimately triumph over their challengers. The holders of the power often worked together with some claimants to keep the rest in check.³³¹ This was also the case with the Foldings where in the end the old rulers retook control. In the short term, all movements in all towns were successful in taking control of the government. However, in the end, after the conflict ended in each town, all changes in the election procedure that the New Fold had fought for were either insignificant or even reversed.

What is the answer to the central question of this thesis; why was the New Fold in some towns shorter than a year in control of the government, while in other towns the New Fold could hold the power for more than a year?

In the towns where the New Fold was only a short time in control, the presence of the factors Provincial States and States General in combination with a poor strategic location, caused the transfer of power in Amersfoort and Steenwijk to last shorter than a year.

In the towns where the New Fold was in control for more than a year, the burgher movement was powerful enough to maintain a sovereign government. These towns also benefitted from their strategic positions in the province. The political structure and the broad movement in Gelderland caused the Diet of Gelderland to stop functioning. It was therefore not possible for the States of Gelderland to intervene. Deventer was successful in convincing the States of Overijssel of the domestic nature of the conflict. The political structure in the Dutch Republic was the reason that the States General was unable to intervene in Gelderland and Deventer. The other provinces simply did not allow the States General to intervene in domestic conflicts.

The absence of the factors Provincial States and States General in combination with the presence of a strong burgher movement and the strategic location of a town caused the transfer of power in Arnhem, Deventer, Nijmegen and Zutphen to last for more than a year.

³²⁹ C. Tilly, *European Revolutions, 1492-1992* (Oxford 1993) 74.

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, 78.

³³¹ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

Bibliography

Archives

Atheneum-bibliotheek Deventer Stadsarchief, Collection Dumbar, *Troubles in 1703 en 1704: Deventer, Nijmegen en Middelburg*. Inv. No. 53

Gemeentearchief Eemland, Inv. No. 2115. Hovy, J., *De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703* (Scriptie Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, Amersfoort 1950).

Gemeentearchief Steenwijk, *Kronijk van Steenwijk* s.a.

Gemeentearchief Steenwijk, Memorialen, d.d.(1688-1724), Inv. No. 8.

Regionaal Archief Zutphen (RAZ), *Memoriën- and resolutiënboek van de stad Zutphen* inv.nr. 25.

Sources

Knuttel, W.P.C., *Catalogus van de pamfletten verzameling, 1649-1750 Dutch Pamphlets* (Den Haag 1985).

Knuttel No. 00414, Missive van sijne hoogheit, de heere prince d'Orange.&c. Aen de heeren van de magistraet der stad Deventer.

Knuttel No. 14832, Grieven ende beswaren van de oude ende vrye borgerye der stad Nymegen.

Knuttel No. 14842, Sententien |by den hove des furstendoms Gelderland [...].

Knuttel No. 14849, Deductie van het voorstaen der privilegien, of privé-voordeelen in den Quartiere van Nimegen.

Knuttel No. 14978, Requeste met soodanige verdere authentique documenten en stukken als by eenige heeren regenten der stad Amersfoort, tot maintainue en conservatie van der voorschreve Stads, en der selver Borgerye hare oude Privilegien, en Geregtigheden, Aan de Ed: Mog: Heeren Staten 's Lands van Utrecht, Op den 10 Januari deses Jaars 1703. zijn overgegeven.

Knuttel No. 14980, Publicatie: De Staten van den Lande van Utrecht doen te weeten.

Knuttel No. 14982, Sententien, de vijf gecommiteerden waren Gerrit Beefting, Dirck Ebbenhorst, Rutger Dibbitz, Johan Stomphius en Sibert van Straelfont.

Knuttel Nos., 14997-14999, Publicatie. Borgermeesteren, Schepenen en Raedt sampt Gemeensluyden der stadt Nymegen.

Knuttel No. 15003, Getuygschrift van eenige Maashandelaars [...].

Knuttel No. 15015 Copia. Missive |van de drie steden des Nymeeghschen quartier, Nymegen, Tiel en Bommel, aan de [...] Staten Generael.

Knuttel No. 15025, Missive van d'edele ende achtbaere magistraat der stadt Arnhem aan de [...] Staaten Generaal [...] op den 7. february 1703 geschreven, over de veranderinge, die de gemeensluyden [...] in de magistraat hebben vermogen te maacken.

Knuttel No. 15043, Pointen, |staende tot verantwoordinge van de oude verlatene regenten der stadt Aernhem. See also Knuttel No. 15044, Sommier berigt, op seeker fameus libel, geintituleert, Pointen, staende tot verantwoordingh van de oude verlatene regenten der stadt Arnhem.

Knuttel No. 15047, Remonstrantie aen de wel wijse [...] heeren burgemeesteren, schepen en raad der stadt Deventer.

Knuttel No. 15048, Publicatie. Schepenen ende Raad van Deventer

Knuttel No. 15229, [Brief van de stadsbesturen van Arnhem en de andere Veluwe steden aan de Staten Generaal betreffende de geschillen in Gelderland, gedateerd 26-04-1704].

Knuttel No. 15233, Generale en particuliere grieven en beswaren tot laste van d'ontsette regenten der vrye-rycks-stadt Nymegen.

Knuttel No. 15704, Sententien |by den Hove des furstendoms Gelre, en graefschaps Zutphen [...] tegens [...] Wilh. Adriaen Bouwens [...] en Jan Aelders.

Knuttel No. 15705, Wettige verdediginge, uytgegeven door Willem Adriaan Bouwensch, ende Derck Reynier van Bassenn [...] op den 15. february 1708. Uytgesproken (1708).

Knuttel No. 15706, Placaat: Wy Raaden in naame van de Heeren Staaten des Furstendoms Gelre en Graafschaps Zutphen etc. (13 Dec. 1708).

Literature

Amenta, E., 'What we know about the development of social policy; comparative and historical research in comparative and historical perspective', in: J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative historical analyses in the social sciences* (Cambridge 2003) pp. 91-130.

Bemmel, A. van,, *Beschryving der stad Amersfoort II* (Amersfoort 1760; herdruk Zaltbommel 1969).

Brants, A., *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen* (proefschrift Leiden, 1874).

Dekker, R., *Holland in beroering; oproeren in de 17^{de} en 18^{de} eeuw* (Baarn 1982).

Driessen, H.L., 'De Plooierijen te Wageningen', *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen XLIV* (1941) pp. 65-76.

Frijhoff, W., 'Zutphens Geschiedenis, 1591-1814', in: W.Th.M. Frijhoff, et al. (eds.), *Geschiedenis van Zutphen* (Zutphen 1989) pp. 84-132.

Fruin, R.J., *Geschiedenis der staatsinstellingen in Nederland tot den val der Republiek*, Colenbrander, H.T., (ed.), (2^e druk; Den Haag 1922).

Geurts, J.H.J., 'Tussen afhankelijkheid en zelfbestuur. Nijmegen gedurende de jaren 1591-1795', in: J. Kuys, H. Bots (eds.), *Nijmegen Geschiedenis van de oudste stad van Nederland Middeleeuwen en Nieuwe Tijd* deel 2 (Nijmegen 2005) pp. 510-583.

Gurr, T.R., *Why men rebel* (New Jersey 1970).

Haak, S.P., 'De Plooierijen, in het bijzonder in het kwartier van Veluwe' *Bijdragen en mededeelingen / Gelre, Vereniging tot beoefening van Geldersche geschiedenis, oudheidkunde en recht* XI (1908).

Holsboer, F.Th., "'Troubelen" te Deventer 1703 II', *Salland* March 19, 1935.

Hovy, J., 'De regeringsverandering te Amersfoort in 1703. Een bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Plooierijen in de provincie Utrecht', *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, XV (1960) pp 177-216.

Hovy, J., *Het bestuur van de steden en dorpen in de provincie Utrecht tot 1795* (verslag van de lezing gehouden op 24 oktober 1960 te Amersfoort).

Jonckers Nieboer, J.H., 'De Geldersche onlusten in het begin der 18^{de} eeuw', *Geldersche Volksalmanak* 64 (Arnhem 1898) pp. 96-140.

Jong Hzn, M. de, *Joan Derk van der Capellen, Staatskundig levensbeeld uit de wordingstijd van de moderne democratie in Nederland* (Groningen, Den Haag 1922).

Keune, W.Th., 'Gebeurtenissen rondom de verkiezing van schepenen en raad en de Gezworen Gemeente van Deventer in 1703', *Verslagen en Mededelingen Vereeniging tot beoefening van Overijsselsch Regt en Geschiedenis* 81 (1966) pp.119-129.

Mah, H., 'German historical thought in the age of Herder, Kant, and Hegel' in: L. Kramer, S. Maza (eds.), *A companion to Western Historical thought* (Malden, Oxford 2008) pp. 143-165.

Mahoney, J., Rueschemeyer, D., 'Comparative historical analyses; achievements and agendas', in: J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative historical analyses in the social sciences* (Cambridge 2003) pp. 3-40.

Maris, A.J., 'Prins Willem III en het Provisionele Regeringsbestel in Gelderland en Zutphen van 1674', *Gelderland Vereeniging tot beoefening van Geldersche Geschiedenis, Oudheidkunde en Recht. Bijdragen en Mededelingen* LXXII (1981) pp. 140-174.

Meesters, J.H.E., *De Steenwijker meenthe Een bijdrage tot de Marke- en Stadsgeschiedenis* (Zwolle 1881).

Mensema, A.J., Gevers, A.J., 'De Staten als souverainen van Overijssel 1578-1795' in: E.D. Eijken, A.J. Mensema, A.J., Gevers et al. (eds.), *In alle Staten. Vierhonderd jaar provinciaal bestuur van Overijssel* (Zwolle 1978) pp. 31-76.

Nijhoff, I.A., 'De Geldersche plooiërij, bijzonder te Nijmegen', *Geldersche-Volksalmanak* 20 (Arnhem 1854) pp 1-26.

Prak, M., *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century The Golden Age* (translated by D. Webb, Cambridge 2005, third printing 2009).

Ragin, C.C., *The comparative method; Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1987).

Rommès, R.N.J., 'Werken in de stad', in: Dekker, C., (ed.), *Geschiedenis van de provincie Utrecht deel 2 van 1528 tot 1780* (Utrecht 1997) pp 195-211.

Roorda, D.J., *Partij en Factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties* (Groningen 1978).

Roorda, D.J., 'Prins Willem III en het Utrechtse regeringsreglement', *Van Standen tot Staten 600 jaar Staten van Utrecht 1375-1975 Stichtse Historische Reeks 1* (Utrecht 1975).

Ruijs, Th., *De gezworene Gemeente in Overijssel en Gelderland. Naar aanleiding van art. 131 Gemeentewet. Historisch toegelicht.* (Dissertatie Universiteit Utrecht 1873).

Schaik, R. van., 'Zutphens geschiedenis: van de Elfde tot het einde van de Zestiende eeuw', in: W.Th.M. Frijhoff, et al. (eds.), *Geschiedenis van Zutphen* (Zutphen 1989) pp. 48-83.

Schmidt, F., *"Te laate genodigt of in 't geheel vergeten" De positie van Hasselt en Steenwijk binnen het bestuur van het Gewest Overijssel 1621-1795* (Kampen 2001).

Skocpol, T., *States and social revolutions a comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China* (New York 1979).

Skocpol, T., 'Doubly engaged social science; The promise of comparative historical analyses', in: J. Mahoney, D. Rueschemeyer (eds.), *Comparative historical analyses in the social sciences* (Cambridge 2003) pp. 407-428.

Tadama, R.W., *Geschiedenis der stad Zutphen, van de vroegste tijden tot 1795* (Zutphen 1856; herdrukte editie Schiedam 1976).

Tex, J. den, *Onder vreemde heren De Republiek der Nederlanden 1672-1674* (Zutphen 1982).

Tilly, T., *European Revolutions, 1492-1992* (Oxford 1993).

Verstegen, S.W., *Gegoede ingezetenen Jonkers en Geërfden op de Veluwe tijdens Ancien Regime, Revolutie en Restauratie (1650-1830)* (Proefschrift, Amsterdam 1989).

Wagenaar, J., *Vaderlandsche historie, vervattende de geschiedenissen der Vereenigde Nederlanden, inzonderheid die van Holland, van de vroegste tyden af XVII* (Amsterdam 1756).

Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, A.H., *Democratische bewegingen in Gelderland 1672-1795* (Proefschrift Nijmegen, 1973).

A.H. Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, 'Een kwarteeuw burgerverzet in de beide Nederlanden (1698-1719). Voorspel van de 'democratische revoluties', *Bijdragen en mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden* NHG 99 deel 1 (1984) pp. 408-434.

Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, A.H., *Twee woelige jaren in Zutphen, de Plooierijen van 1703 tot 1705* (1977 Zutphen).

Wertheim-Gijse Weenink, H., Ormrod, D., Wertheim, W.F., 'Early 18th Century Uprisings in the Low Countries: Prelude to the Democratic Revolution' *History Workshop* 15 (1983).

Wertheim, W.F., Wertheim- Gijse Weenink, A.H., *Burgers in verzet tegen regenten-heerschappij: Onrust in Sticht en Oversticht 1703-1706* (Amsterdam 1976).