

Constitutional Reforms in the Batavian Republic

¹Marwa Habib Hasan, ²Prof.Dr.Naeem kareem Al-Shuwaili

Thi-Qar University, Department of History, Iraq

Corresponding Author E-mail: marwah.h.hassan@utq.edu.iq

Abstract:

This study indicates that the relationship between France and the Batavian Republic was not based on equal independence, but rather on political and military dependency. The republic was established under French intervention in 1795 within the framework of what were known as the "Sister Republics." France worked to steer the Batavian political system by supporting its allied powers and interfering in the drafting of the constitution to ensure that domestic policies aligned with its strategic interests. It also exerted continuous pressure in the military and economic spheres, which limited the republic's political independence. Although the Batavian people adopted the principles of the French Revolution, their implementation remained constrained by French hegemony, making the Batavian experience an example of a state with modern institutions but limited sovereignty in practice.

Introduction:

The Batavian Republic can be understood historically as a dual case between the experiences of national reform from within on the one hand, and on the other hand, it represents a transitional entity subordinate to the French revolutionary imperial project. In essence, it is a modernization project that France invested in within its revolutionary and then imperial expansionist system. Therefore, the republic was a sister republic under French protection and influence. Hence, the emergence of the alleged sister republics was to expand French strategic influence instead of granting them the right to true self-determination.

First: The First National Assembly 1796-1797

Following the French occupation of the Low Countries Netherlands in 1795, the government of the United Seven Provinces Republic fell.¹ The Batavian Republic was declared. The Batavian Republic, with the support of France, elected the first Batavian National Assembly in late 1795 and early 1796. Adult males participated in the elections, and the number of members of the Batavian National Assembly in those elections was 126 deputies.² The new members issued a statement on December 31, 1795 Document No. 1 following their victory, in which they declared their acceptance of responsibility and their good intentions towards their people as an elected national representative body.³ On February 16, 1796, the National Assembly proclaimed the principles of human rights and civil rights for the Dutch people, and definitively abolished state offices, knighthoods, hereditary monarchies, and the position of Grand Master. Grand Pensionary⁴ For the states of Holland and West Friesland, there were committed councils and bodies, meaning they were in charge of running the state, while some of them, such as city councils, were retained. These councils represented the city elites and merchants after the bodies of the old regime were removed and replaced by revolutionary Batavian elements. The provincial councils, which represented the feudal system, remained temporarily with their powers weakened.⁵

It appears from the reform issued by the members of the Batavian National Assembly that it was greatly influenced by the revolutionary ideas brought about by the French Revolution, and that the influence of the French is evident on the new thought that the members believed in, which was to move towards a republican system and away from the system of the ruling minority in the Dutch Low Countries.

Therefore, on March 1, 1796, the first official session of the Batavian National Assembly was held, presided over by Peter Paulus. Pieter Paulus⁶ It is a deliberative process that lasts for two weeks, then it is granted to another member who only manages the sessions without

real executive powers, in order to prevent tyranny and the monopolization of power and decisions, with the aim of achieving equality.⁷

Those elections were attended by adult men who believed in the Batavian national spirit, rejected hereditary autocracy, and supported the new republican government. The elections were held in two forms: the constituent assemblies were elected, and every 15,000 voters gathered in thirty assemblies for those aged twenty and above to participate in the elections.⁸

The first National Assembly included many new figures who had never held any administrative position before, and it also allowed religious freedom for Catholics and Mennonites. Mennonites⁹ They held public office, and 27% of the members were Catholic. It was noteworthy that two priests and seven ministers won seats in the first National Assembly, and some of them, like Reverend Bernardus Bosch, played a role in public service. Bernardus Bosch¹⁰

Reverend E. Van Hamelsveld IJ. van Hamelsveld¹¹ an important role¹² Naturally, many former Nationalist officials, who had been forced to leave the field in 1787 with the arrival of the Prussians, returned to the Low Countries. Many Nationalists fled to France and settled there in exile. They successfully lobbied for a French military campaign against the governor, and one of the prominent figures who returned to the National Assembly was Cort Lambertius VanCourt Lambertus van Beyma¹³ Bima and Johan Falkner Johan Valckenaer¹⁴ However, the most important nationalist was the widely respected Regent of Rotterdam, Peter Paulus I. More than half of the members¹⁵ had an academic education, and about 80% of them studied law, most of them¹⁶ 40% having pursued that course in Leiden. Leiden¹⁵

At 12%, the number of graduates in Harderwijk was almost as large as the number who studied in Groningen¹³ . Political parties had not yet been formed, and each member determined their voting orientation according to the nature of the issue at hand. However, some parliamentarians united into blocs from which two groups emerged: the Republicans and the Moderates. The Republicans were democrats who called for expanding civil liberties, separating church and state, and supported a unitary state along with the joint regulation of financial affairs. The Moderates, or Commonwealthians,¹⁶

They were partly in favor of maintaining the federal structure Federalists and partly in favor of a unified Moderate government. The majority came from the outer provinces Overell. Official Guelders were less inclined towards democracy, and included prominent political figures: Federalists: Jacob Abraham de Mist, Herman Hendrik Vitringa, Jacob Kantelaar, Pieter Leonard van de Kastele, Jan Berend Bicker, Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninck, Jacob Hahn; and Republicans: Pieter Vreede, Hendrik Miedema, and Bernard Bosch. The task of the first National Assembly, representing the people of the Netherlands, was to draft a constitution for the Batavian Republic. For this purpose, a committee of twenty-one members was formed. The members of the National Assembly who had won their seats were replaced by elected deputies. Only adult men who were not soldiers and did not live under exemption were allowed to vote. Potential voters had to register, and in order to vote, they had to sign a declaration against the aristocracy and against state ownership.¹⁷ .

Local revolutions, along with French military intervention, contributed to consolidating the new political system in all regions of the republic, leading to the demise of the old regime. The radical extremist current initially focused on reorganizing the institutions of power, particularly at the municipal level. However, this focus soon changed immediately after the convening of the National Assembly at the beginning of March 1796. This became a fundamental turning point, leading to an escalation of political activism and intensified efforts to formulate a new course for national policy, primarily represented in the preparation of a new constitution. However, this course quickly brought back to the forefront the existing dispute between the radical and moderate currents within the National Assembly, especially due to its inability to reach a formula that would create consensus and harmony between the national, international, and local authorities.¹⁸ .

At the same time, revolutionary movements at the local level began to face resistance from conservatives, which led to a state of political deadlock. The radical press launched a fierce attack against the aristocrats as well as against those they called separatists who opposed the projects of reorganizing the state. However, the revolutions that had broken out earlier in Amsterdam during November 1795 and April 1796, which demanded the expansion of the hall of popular participation and the purging of institutions of supporters of the previous Orange movement, did not achieve their goals and remained without decisive results.¹⁹

In line with what has been mentioned, in the province of Friesland, the moderates held power at both the regional and local levels and faced frequent popular protests sparked by worsening economic conditions that burdened the lower classes, leading some protests to turn violent, as happened in the village of Kullum. The rural Colom incident in early 1797 and the accompanying flight of a number of officials²⁰.

Growing frustration at the failure to achieve democratic demands contributed to the widening scope of popular discontent, as extremist administrators saw these disturbances as nothing more than mob riots, while rumors spread about British interference and foreign support for the counter-revolution.²¹

During 1796, extremists within the National Assembly called for the adoption of strict measures to confront what they described as the counter-revolution, either by tightening internal security or by seeking external French support. At the same time, they faced an appeal to neighborhood councils to pressure the National Assembly and push it to take coordinated and decisive measures and respond to the demands of the majority, even going so far as to issue a special appeal to suppress the disorder. Against this backdrop, one should consider the initiative put forward to reorganize the National Assembly, which came on December 21, 1796, when the General Assembly in Leiden sent a letter to a large number of neighborhood councils and revolutionary societies throughout the country.²²

The letter contained a call for the election of delegates to a meeting scheduled to be held on the 18th or 19th of January of the following year, on the second anniversary of the revolution, in the old building of the Leiden Civic Militia. The aim of this gathering was "to form a single assembly of representatives where the people can unite their voice, so that growth and prosperity may be promoted and established throughout the country."²³

The declaration was signed by three Democrats from Leiden, namely H. Bonaker, H. Bonnaker, Willem C. Harnisch, and WH Trapp.²⁴ This was the first time that the radicals had held a meeting of revolutionary clubs across municipal or regional boundaries.²⁵

Their initiatives were called the Meeting of Elected Representatives of Local Democracy Organs, indicating their representative and institutional nature. Their implicit proposal was that the people would unite their voice through this assembly. This meant that the National Assembly was not the true representative of the popular voice, and it challenged the founding claims of the Batavian state. Thus, it was in fact a revolutionary step. The government of the province of Holland discussed the call for a National Assembly on January 14, 1796, and took immediate action, without observing the usual forms of consultation with national and local authorities. The following morning, citizens of Leiden Trapp, Leleveld, Van Leil, Van Trecht, and Van Klaveren were arrested, and a commission of inquiry of the provincial government confirmed²⁶.

Two days later, regional authorities attempted to arrest two of the signatories of the Trapp Declaration, namely Bonaker and Harnish.²⁷ As soon as the mayor learned of the arrest, he called for an emergency meeting. Despite the differences in political orientations among those present, they condemned the actions of the regional authorities. Their statement did not focus on the revolutionary goals of the proposed assembly of local councils, but rather on condemning the violation of local authority by the regional government. They described the measures taken as an actual attack on the security of that community and a blatant criminal violation of the rights of all free citizens, as they were carried out without the prior

knowledge and consent of any member of the municipal government, minister, or any other person, in addition to the absence of the approval of the public interest committee or a competent judge. They considered this behavior a serious overreach of the council's powers, as it directly conflicted with legal rights that this municipality did not possess in the first place, but rather belonged to the people as a whole since ancient times.²⁸

The city council adopted a series of resolutions, which consisted of three main points: First, a pledge to do everything in its power to ensure the release of the five detained citizens. Second, a promise to provide full protection for H. Bonaker and J. C. Harnish. Third, an affirmation that the council would not allow the future arrest of any residents of that municipality unless the Leiden Public Interest Committee gave its prior approval. Finally, as part of a firm stance, the council began making military preparations in anticipation of possible further arrests, including preparing to send troops if necessary. These measures were supported by the popular body, which aimed to protect the city's exploitation against any external interference.²⁹

In this context, representatives of the General Assembly of Citizens attended the municipal council meeting where they presented a letter expressing their dissatisfaction with the violation of the rights of men and citizens, and requested decisive cooperation from their legitimate representatives to ensure the immediate return of the five detained citizens to their homes.³⁰

However, the reception for the representatives was not warm, reflecting the reluctance of most council members to adopt a hardline stance. These moves were seen as serving the radical current, and consequently, the letter was not referred to the official judicial authorities. Instead, a commission of inquiry was formed to examine the legality of the actions taken in the province, as well as the proposed National Assembly of Local Councils. The investigation did not last long; the following day, the commission, composed of moderates, presented Van Santin, van Santen and Wackersloot's recommendations, which reflected the position taken by the municipality.³¹

On the other hand, the efforts of Van Santen and Akersloot resulted in the release of the residents of Leiden, as the regional authorities responded to their demands quickly. In return, the regional government proposed banning the Association of Neighborhood Councils. Without going into lengthy discussions, the municipal government agreed to these two measures and sent a letter to the regional government, explaining the methods of the radicals. In this letter, its authors expressed their astonishment at undertaking such actions, which exceeded in severity and audacity even what the tyrants had done in the past. They reminded the citizens that every despotic regime can only continue by inflicting more victims, continuous violence, and permanent repression.³²

But despite the harsh language used by the regional authorities, the moderates in the municipal government benefited politically from the regional authorities' actions. Given the considerable support the extremists were able to garner among the city's residents, the moderates in Leiden lacked the power to suppress the National Assembly of Neighborhood Councils itself. Thanks to the actions of the regional authorities, the threatening extremist initiative was thwarted, while the municipal moderates were simultaneously able to present themselves as staunch defenders of civil liberties against "tyranny." They avoided a direct confrontation with the Leiden Citizens' Assembly and managed to steal the spotlight from the extremists by making the popular slogan "restoration of local autonomy" the only significant political demand.³³

Following the arrests, the events in Leiden became a matter of national importance. On January 16, 1796, the National Assembly heard its first report on the matter, and without delay, a commission was formed to assess the political consequences of the Leiden radicals' proposals. The inclusion of prominent figures like Van de Castelli illustrates this point. Van de Castelli, Schimmelpenninck, and van Lennep were in that committee to determine the weight

the National Assembly gave to this issue, and the following day, van Lennep presented his findings. These included an unequivocal condemnation of the planned assembly, "because such a meeting is already included in its name, and that it is a representative assembly, it is possible that it could create the most serious situations of confusion and conflict."³⁴.

Several radical representatives opposed these proposals and protested the claim. Like Bernardus Bosch and the radicals in Leiden, they argued that a National Assembly directly elected by local councils might be a necessary means of exerting pressure from below on the primary National Assembly and preventing the country from reverting to federalism and aristocratic rule. Deputy Nohut van der Veen questioned this. Nahuys van der Veen argued that the situation would be disastrous for the people if they were not allowed to meet to discuss their most important interests. The leading radical in Friesland, C.L. van Beyma, declared that the National Assembly would need the support of the people, stating that without it, it lacked strength and courage. The moderate leader, Schmielbenick, echoed this sentiment, reiterating that the revolution was in safe hands with the elected representatives and that interference from below would only lead to chaos and confusion. He asserted that the time had come to demonstrate to the world the efforts being made to complete this revolution with all the energy of the republic, and that a constitution would be presented to the people based on the true principles of popular government through representation. However, he added that chaos and deception, however appealing they might appear, must be resolutely confronted. Schmielbenick further stated that failure to do so would lead to civil war. Pieter Vreede, one of the most prominent radicals in Leiden, responded with similar rigidity. Unlike many other radicals in the National Assembly, they did not even attempt to demonstrate that Leiden's proposal was within the existing legal framework, as long as the constitution... The new Batavi is unacceptable; the revolution is still ongoing, and as a result, it is the laws of the revolution, not the constitution that should judge the actions of citizens. Thus, Freddy indirectly compared the moderates in the National Assembly with the deposed Oranges. It was the lack of decisive action on the part of the National Assembly that forced ordinary citizens to seek their own ways to push the revolution forward.³⁵.

This was followed by confusion, with some military representatives demanding the hall be cleared, amidst loud protests from others. After this recess, the committee's report was put to a vote. A majority of 78 representatives voted in favor, 24 against, and 6 abstained. The following day, the French ambassador to the Republic of Batavia, Noël, wrote... Noble told Paris that the National Assembly had taken decisive action in an incident he considered "extremely important" ³⁶.

But the discussions also revealed the depth of the political divisions within the assembly. Despite the intensity of the debate, the conflict at this stage did not escalate beyond verbal confrontation. Although their actions garnered significant moral support, their practical actions remained entirely confined within the city limits. Letters of support were addressed to the Leiden municipal government and focused entirely on the issue of the violation of local autonomy. These letters conspicuously failed to mention the proposed National Assembly of Local Councils, which had been the cause of the political unrest.³⁷.

The first letter of support arrived on January 19, 1796, sent by the municipality of Delft. Delft ³⁸ The moderate party expressed, first and foremost, its satisfaction at thwarting the regional attack on the local judiciary, as the Zoetermeer municipality had sent Zoetermeer's message was similar, but more importantly, even the statements sent by local radical associations from other parts of the country to Leiden did not mention Trapp's proposal or those of other radicals.³⁹.

Second: The Constitutional Referendum of 1797

By 1797, the Dutch moderates began to feel that the fruits of victory were not in their favor, as a clear rise in the influence of the radical current emerged within national political life. In

July, Pieter Trapp, one of the most prominent supporters of the National Assembly, published an important pamphlet in which a group of radical representatives, including Freddy, Van Peyma, and Bosch, rejected the majority's proposal for the new constitution, especially regarding the adoption of an indirect system of electing representatives to the National Assembly. They considered that a government chosen directly by the people embodied the popular will in its true sense, while government based on representation might lead to the exclusion of the people from exercising their effective influence on power. This exclusion would push citizens to seek unconstitutional means to make their voices heard, which made resisting injustice, in their view, a legitimate right of the good citizen.⁴⁰

The events in Leiden and the disturbances in Amsterdam not only demonstrated the opposition of moderate municipal and regional governments to attempts to influence the course of the revolution through popular mobilization, but also revealed the structural inability of the radicals to penetrate national political life through grassroots action. When the Dutch regional government obstructed their initiatives, the radicals, both within and outside Leiden, were unable to garner more support than the moderate municipal governments. Conversely, the moderates successfully absorbed the popular response within the existing political framework of defending local self-government. As a result, during the summer of 1797, the radicals achieved their most significant political victory. By a majority of 108,761 votes to 27,955, the local assemblies rejected a proposal for a new constitution supported by the moderates in the National Assembly.⁴¹

But it remained difficult to interpret what this number of votes meant for the balance of power on the ground. The process that produced the new constitution was so confused and complicated that large numbers of moderates refused to endorse the draft. More importantly, while the rejection of the constitution blocked a resolution of the existing crisis in favor of the moderates, it did not end the impasse in the direction favored by the radicals. Time and again, the radicals' attempts to reform the state faltered because of their inability to mobilize a base of support beyond national and regional borders. By the summer of 1797, the popular movements and the radical faction in the National Assembly had grown weary. Meanwhile, the French were moving toward a more interventionist course toward the "sister republics." The coup that France had experienced on the 18th of Fructidor⁴² From the fifth year September 4, 1797⁴³ This has opened the door to further attempts to reduce France's influence.⁴⁴

The appointment of the new French ambassador, Charles François Delacroix, was a significant step. Charles-François Delacroix and the support of the military leader Herman Willem Daendels provided an opportunity for the radicals in the National Assembly to seize power. In important ways, the successful coup carried out by a select group of radicals on January 22, 1798, represented a decisive break between the democratic elements of Batavian radicalism on the one hand, and their focus on rationalizing and unifying the state from above on the other. After the coup, the local assemblies were purged of moderate supporters, but their role became no more than secondary in the process of reforming the state.⁴⁵

Its role was limited to implementing decisions made by the new directorate, and amid growing distrust of its popular base, the extremist regime, in which Peter Freddy played a leading role, succeeded in suppressing local uprisings and dismantling popular committees and revolutionary societies.⁴⁶

Conclusion

The Batavian Republic's experiment at that time represented a significant attempt to transition to a representative constitutional system, clearly influenced by the ideals of the French Revolution. Consequently, the reforms adopted by the First National Assembly abolished many aspects of the old regime and opened the door to broader participation in political life. However, this experiment faced considerable challenges, most notably the division between radical and moderate factions, as well as the influence of French

intervention in shaping its course. This was clearly reflected in the 1797 constitutional referendum, which revealed political instability and an inability to achieve broad national consensus. Therefore, the Batavian Republic's representative experiment, despite its importance, remained limited in its results, while simultaneously paving the way for a new phase of political transformation in Dutch history.

References:

(¹)The Seven United Provinces (Netherlands):It was a political union (confederation) that arose in the late 16th century as a result of the revolt of the northern provinces of the Low Countries against Spanish rule since 1572, led by William of Orange. This union comprised seven provinces: Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, Friesland, Overijssel, and Groningen. These provinces were characterized by broad internal autonomy, with joint cooperation in matters of defense and foreign policy. This culminated in the establishment of an independent republic by 1588, known as the Republic of the Seven United Provinces, which represented an early model of republican government in modern Europe.Look:

James D. Tracy, *The Founding of the Dutch Republic: War, Finance, and Politics in Holland, 1572–1588*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) p1-3.

(²)Berg, J.Th.J. & Vis, JJ This one comes next. *Parlementaire geschiedenis van Nederland, 1796-1946*, p. 49.

(³)https://www.parlement.com/id/vh8lnhrsd1rf/bataafse_parlementen_1798_1806.

(⁴)The oldest retiree (Grand Pensionary): He was the highest civil and political office in the United Seven Provinces Republic, and served as the official spokesman for the provinces of Holland and the overseer of their policies, representing the interests of the provinces – particularly the wealthy province of Holland – and defending the republican system, the authority of the Council of States (parliament), and the interests of the bourgeois and commercial class.Look:Jonathan Israel*The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 306.

(⁵)Jordan, Annie. *Amsterdam in revolution, 1795-1798. Un Jacobinisme batave*, (Working Papers European Studies Amsterdam no. 5, 2006), p. 23-30

(⁶Pieter Paulus (Axel, April 9, 1753 – The Hague, March 17, 1796) was a prominent Dutch jurist, tax lawyer, and politician. He is considered one of the leading thinkers of the Dutch national movement and one of the early founders of the idea of democracy and political unity in the Netherlands. Influenced by the ideals of the French Revolution, he strongly advocated for equality and human rights, earning the title "Apostle of Humanity" after the publication of his 1793 treatise, "In What Sense Can It Be Said That Men Are Equal? And What Are the Rights and Duties That Constitute This?", which is considered an early manifesto of equality and justice. Paulus participated in the events of the 1795 revolution as one of its main leaders and was elected president of the provisional representatives of the Dutch people. In the same year, he assumed the position of rector of Leiden University. In 1796, he was unanimously elected president of the first National Assembly of the Batavian Republic. However, a cold he contracted during the inauguration ceremony soon ended his life, and he was buried on March 24, 1796, in the Ter Navolging Cemetery in Scheveningen. See:

Gou, L. de (1985) *Biografische bijdragen over achttiende eeuwers. Fragmenten the jaarredes gehouden in the algemene vergadering van de 1799-1985*, pp. 143-69.

(⁷)Berg, J.Th.J. & Vis, JJ This one comes next. *Parlementaire geschiedenis van Nederland, 1796-1946*, p. 42.

(⁸)Ibid, p. 49.

(⁹)MennonitesMennonitesThey are a Protestant Christian group belonging to the religious Reformation movement of the sixteenth century, specifically to the Baptist movement.AnabaptistsThey are named after their Dutch leader.Menno SimonsThey were distinguished by their emphasis on adult baptism, rejection of violence (pacifism), and advocacy of a simple religious life based on moral commitment and relative separation from state affairs.He looks:

Cornelius J. Dyck, *An Introduction to Mennonite History* (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1993), p. 25.

(¹⁰Reverend Bernardus Bosch (Deventer, 4 September 1746 – 22 November 1803) was a Dutch minister, politician, and poet associated with the radical nationalist movement of the late 18th century. Bosch began his career as a preacher in several regions, including Spanbroek, Oudkarspil, Vollenhof, and Diemen, starting in 1782. He was known for his cultural activism, having founded a literary society in Amsterdam whose members were predominantly affiliated with the nationalist movement, while supporters of the House of Orange withdrew from it. He gained widespread fame after the publication of his poem "Eigenbat" (Private Bat), which attracted a large audience and led to a significant increase in church attendance. However, the events of the September 1787 uprising forced him to flee Amsterdam after his house was attacked, leading him into a nomadic life during which he relied on his writings for a living. Bosch published under the pseudonym Patavós, translated works from French, edited an edition of Vondel's writings, helped found the Society for the Public Benefit, and collaborated with Martinus Nieuwenhuizen on the ten-volume encyclopedic work "The Friend of Man" (1787–1798). Bosch entered politics after becoming mayor of Zaandam, and in December 1795 he was elected as a representative of the Batavian people in Amsterdam. He was also a member of the First and Second National Assemblies and the Constituent Assembly, and strongly advocated for the separation of church

and state. However, the June 1798 coups led by H. W. Dandels ousted him from office, and he was imprisoned in Huis ten Bosch along with a number of other radicals before being released as part of a general amnesty. Despite his prolific literary and political output, Bosch ended his life in abject poverty, spending his final years in a small house given to him by a benefactor. He died on November 22, 1803, and was buried in the New Church in The Hague under the auspices of the Masonic Lodge. See [link/reference].

Schama, Simon (1977). *Patriots and Liberators: Revolution in the Netherlands 1780–1830*. p122..

⁽¹¹⁾L.J. van Hamelsveld was a prominent Dutch theologian of the late 18th century. He began his career as a preacher in Dordrecht, Grootbroek, and Goos, before becoming known for his prolific intellectual output, including numerous theological works such as ambitious translations and rigorous defenses of the Old and New Testaments. He was appointed professor of theology at Utrecht University in 1784, but was dismissed in 1787 due to his sympathies with the Batavian nationalist movement. Alongside his academic and theological pursuits, van Hamelsveld was involved in post-Battaavi politics, being elected to the First National Assembly (1796) and the Second National Assembly (1797). His intellectual and theological disagreements with his colleague Jacobus Cantelaar made his role in parliament a contentious one. His career exemplifies the intersection of religious and political thought during the period of revolutionary upheaval in the Netherlands. See:

⁽¹²⁾Berg, J.Th.J. & Vis, JJ This one comes next. *Parlementaire geschiedenis van Nederland, 1796-1946*, p. 42.

⁽¹³⁾Court Lambertus van Beyma (Harlingen, 5 February 1753 – Dronreep, 7 September 1820) was a prominent Dutch politician and one of the leaders of the Frisian nationalist movement during the late 18th century. He was the son of Julius Mathis van Beyma and Vogel Helena van Burmania. Early in his career, he held administrative and legal positions, including newspaper secretary, notary, and auctioneer, before rising to prominence as a Frisian nationalist leader. He played a pivotal role in leading the nationalist uprising and subsequently spent time in exile in northern France after its failure.

Van Pema was elected to the first National Assembly in 1796, where he helped shape the constitutional phase of the Batavian Republic. After the return of political stability, he re-entered local politics, becoming a member of the Friesland Territorial States in 1817, and continued his involvement in public life until his death in 1820. Look

H. Spanninga (1987) *Beginning with others* CL van Beyma, p. 35.

⁽¹⁴⁾Johan Valckenaer (Franker, 12 January 1759 – Penbrooke, 25 January 1821) was a prominent Dutch jurist, nationalist, and diplomat whose name is associated with the nationalist and reformist movements of the late 18th century. He was educated at the Freslant Academy, where he emerged as an influential legal and political figure. With the outbreak of the Batavian Revolution in 1795, known as the Velvet Revolution, Valckenaer played a pivotal role in formulating reformist ideas that sought to establish a new political order based on the principles of equality and popular representation.

Alongside his political activism, Valkennier participated in diplomatic work, representing the Batavian Republic on several missions, and contributed to building bridges between different intellectual and political currents. His career clearly reflects the intersection of law and politics during the major transformations that the Netherlands underwent in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. He died in Penbroek in 1821, leaving behind a significant intellectual and political legacy in the history of the Dutch national movement. , F. Jos. van den Branden, JG Frederiks–rechtenstatus Auteursrecht onbekend *Biographisch woordenboek der Noord- in Zuidnederlandsche letterkunde*(1888-1891) www.dbnl.org

⁽¹⁵⁾Leiden city (LeidenRuisco is one of the historic cities of the Netherlands, located in the province of South Holland. It was one of the most prominent scientific and cultural centers of the Republic of the Seven United Provinces during the early modern period. It is famous for its role in the Dutch Revolution against Spanish rule, particularly during its siege in 1574, and became an important scientific center after the founding of the Dutch Empire. Leiden University Which is one of the oldest universities in Europe and a prominent center for scientific research and thought. Look: Jonathan Israel *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 157.

⁽¹⁶⁾The Commonwealthians of Batavia: They were the republican movement in the Netherlands during the late 18th century, particularly in period The Batavian Republic, who were influenced by English republican thought, called for the establishment of a political system based on national sovereignty, the abolition of aristocratic privileges, and the strengthening of the role of representative institutions, in opposition to the Oranian (monarchical) system. Look: Simon Schama *Patriots and Liberators: Revolution in the Netherlands 1780–1813* (New York: Knopf, 1977), p. 85.

⁽¹⁷⁾Berg, J.Th.J. & Vis, JJ This one comes next. *Parlementaire geschiedenis van Nederland, 1796-1946*, p. 42.

⁽¹⁸⁾Jordan, Annie. *Amsterdam in revolution, 1795-1798*. Un *Jacobinisme batave*, Working Papers European Studies Amsterdam no. 5, 2006, p23-30

⁽¹⁹⁾Kuiper, Jacques. *Een revolutie ontrafeld: Politiek in Friesland 1795-1798*. Franeker: Van Wijnen, 2002, p256.

⁽²⁰⁾Pepijn Brandon and Karwan Fatah-Blackb, “The supreme power over the people”: Local autonomy and radical democracy in the Batavian revolution (1795-1798), *ATLANTIC STUDIES*, VOL 13, 2016, p337.

⁽²¹⁾The integral text was read in the National Convention on 16 January 1797. *Dagverhaal*, Vol. IV486.

⁽²²⁾Blok, PJ *Geschiedenis eener Hollandsche stad*. Vol. IV. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1918. P49..

⁽²³⁾The integral text was read in the National Convention on 16 January 1797. *Dagverhaal*, Vol. IV486.

⁽²⁴⁾Ibid, 488.

⁽²⁵⁾Pepijn Brandon and Karwan Fatah-Blackb, “The supreme power over the people: Local autonomy and radical democracy in the Batavian revolution (1795-1798), *atlantic studies*, vol 13, 2016, p337.

⁽²⁶⁾**The committee clarified the following: One would have to be willfully blind to refuse to see that this message was intended to form an association that would very soon challenge this government; indeed, if it had been possible, it would have seized the power entrusted to it. people of the Netherlands) See more information: Rapport to the Personnel**

Commitment on the basis of his Provinciaal Comité enz. mitsgaders het request van PH Trap cs (The Hague 1797) 3; KB, Knuttel Catalog no. 2293

(²⁷) Advice from Advocaat Fiscaal in Procureur Generaal over Holland and Zeeland, in the PH Trap, G. van Klaveren Junior, J. van Trig, J. van Lil and W. van, *Jaarboeken der Bataafsche Republiek* X, 163-164.

(²⁸) *Notulen van de Municipaliteit*, Volume 1, 16 January 1797. GAL, SA II 501A, no. p552.

(²⁹) Pepijn Brandon and Karwan vol. 13, 2016, p. 337.)

(³⁰) Driessen, Felix, ed. *Leiden in den Franschen Tijd: Handschrift uit de jaren 1794-1813*. Leiden: lido, 1913, p21..

(³¹) LC Suttrop, pp. 181-183

(³²) Blok, P.J. *Geschiedenis eener Hollandsche stad*. Vol. IV. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1918. P49..

(³³) *Dagverhaal der handelingen van de Nationaale Vergadering representatieerende het volk van Nederland*. Vol. IV. The Hague: Swart en Comp, 1796, p513.

(³⁴) *Dagverhaal der handelingen van de Nationaale Vergadering representatieerende het volk van Nederland*. Vol. IV. The Hague: Swart en Comp, 1796, p513.

(³⁵) *Ibid*, pp. 517-522

(³⁶) Pepijn Brandon and Karwan Fatah -Blackb, "The supreme power over the people": Local autonomy and radical democracy in the Batavian revolution (1795-1798), *atiatic studies*, vol 13-.vol.13, 2016, p339.

(³⁷) *Ibid*, p. 383.

(³⁸) Delft Municipality (Delft Municipality is one of the historic municipalities in the province of South Holland in the Netherlands, and a city of significant urban and cultural importance in the history of the Dutch Republic. During the early modern period, Delft was renowned for its role in trade and industry, as well as being a center for the arts and architecture. It was also closely associated with the ruling House of Orange, whose members were buried in the Nieuwe Kerk (New Church). Today, it remains an important scientific and industrial center, home to Delft University.:Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 200–203.

(³⁹) (Pepijn Brandon and Karwan Fatah – Blackb 2016, p385..

(⁴⁰) *Ibid*, p. 383.

(⁴¹) Schamma, Simon. *Patriots and liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands, 1780-1813*. New York: Knopf, 1977, p269.

(⁴²) The Fructador Coup (18 Fructador Year V / 4 September 1797) was a political coup that took place during the Directory government in France, when the executive authority, with the support of the army, removed the royalist deputies from the legislative assemblies and canceled the results of the elections that showed the rise of the royalist movement, with the aim of protecting the republican system and preventing the return of the monarchy. Look: William Doyle *The Oxford History of the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 307..

(⁴³) Jordan, Annie. *La Révolution Batave: Entre la France et l'Amérique (1795-1806)*. Rennes: PUR, 2008, p758.

(⁴⁴) Schamma, Simon. *Patriots and liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands, 1780-1813*. New York: Knopf, 1977, p269.

(⁴⁵) Kubben, Raymond. *Regeneration and Hegemony: Franco-Batavian Relations in the Revolutionary Era, 1795-1803*. Leiden: Brill, 2011, p418-430.

(⁴⁶) *Ibid*, p41427.