

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/43297> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Feddersen, Carl Fredrik

Title: Principled pragmatism : VOC Interaction with Makassar 1637-68, and the nature of company diplomacy

Issue Date: 2016-09-29

Principled Pragmatism - VOC Interaction with Makassar
1637-68,
and the Nature of Company Diplomacy

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 29 september 2016

klokke 10 uur

door

Carl Fredrik Feddersen

Geboren te Moss, Noorwegen

in 1952

Promotor:

Prof.dr. J.L. Blussé van Oud Alblas

Exam committee:

dr. Catia A.P. Antunes, Universiteit Leiden

Prof. dr. Michiel van Groesen, Universiteit Leiden

Prof. dr. Gerrit J. Knaap, Universiteit Utrecht

Prof. mr. Egbert Koops, Universiteit Leiden

dr. Carolien M. Stolte, Universiteit Leiden

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Acknowledgments.....	v
Summary, English.....	viii
Samenvatting.....	xiv
Chapter 1: Presenting My Case.....	1
Section 1: Chapter Introduction	1
Section 2: A brief chronology of VOC–Makassar interaction, 1603–68	4
Section 3: Approaches to VOC Diplomacy in the historiography: General overview	37
Section 4: Chronological overview of the historiography	44
Section 5: Positions on and propositions about law and treaty	59
Section 6: Summing up the historiography of VOC diplomacy	85
Chapter 2: Positions and Propositions Refined.....	89
Section 1: Brief historiography on seventeenth-century Company– Makassar interaction, with an emphasis on Andaya’s propositions ...	89
Section 2: Resink’s proposition on international law in Makassar and its implications for Andaya’s positions.....	117
Section 3: Two views on Makassarese dynamism.....	133
Section 4: The structure of the argument	145
Chapter 3: The model of overseas diplomacy in the Heeren XVII’s Generale Instructies and the advice on Makassar in the particular letters	159
Section 1: Chapter introduction	159
Section 2: The respective General Instructions 1609–50, and diplomacy’s role in them.....	165
Section 3: Commerce, diplomacy, and ideology	223

Section 4: Approaches to diplomacy in the entries on Makassar in the particular patriase letters to the High Government 1634–1669	232
Chapter 4: Culture and Treaty: Leonard Andaya’s model of conflicting treaty conceptions and the June 26, 1637 treaty between Sultan Alauddin and the Company.....	245
Section 1: Presentation of the June 26, 1637 treaty of peace between the Company and Makassar	247
Section 2: Perspective in South-Sulawesian thinking on diplomacy and treaty: Andaya’s positions and my counter-propositions.....	252
Section 3: The significance of communicative performance in the treaty negotiations	270
Section 4: Text, meaning, and nature of the June 26 treaty	305
Chapter 5: Policy Discussions and the 1655 Treaty with Makassar—A Matter of Trust and Belief.....	325
Section 1: Chapter introduction.....	325
Section 2: Conflicting assumptions of diplomatic performace 1650-1655.....	332
Section 3: The De Vlaming–Maetsuyker Controversy over When to End the War: the shared pragmatic mode of thinking about overseas diplomacy, and the assumptions in Maetsuyker’s “soft approach” ..	341
Section 4: Analysis of the 1655 treaty as a typical product of “soft diplomacy”	364
Chapter 6: The Pragmatic Dynamics of the Batavian Diplomatic Mode—Shifts and Fluctuations in the High Government’s Approach towards Makassar as Presented in the <i>Generale Missiven</i> , 1656–61.....	381
Section 1: Introduction to the chapter topic	381
Section 2: The missive of December 4, 1656—blaming Van der Beeck	389
Section 3: The missive of December 17, 1657—full explication of an offensive policy towards Makassar	394
Section 4: The missive of December 14, 1658.....	412
Section 5: The December 16, 1659 missive: Reporting on Negotiations with Low Expectations.....	421

Section 6: The December 16, 1660 missive.....	427
Section 7: The Missiven of January 26 and December 22, 1661: The grand strategy in a novel design.....	441
Chapter Conclusion.....	446
Chapter 7: Learning to contract, 1: From contractual regulations of interaction towards construction of a relational regime 1637–1660.....	447
Section 1: Chapter introduction	447
Section 2: A recapitulation of the 1637 and 1655 treaties as “soft” treaties	451
Section 3: The switch to contractual constructivism: The dual nature of the 1660 Treaty	455
Section 4: Textual analysis of the August 1660 treaty.....	457
Chapter 8: Learning to Make Treaties, Two Treaties of Political Hegemony, 1667-68.....	483
Section 1: Chapter introduction	483
Section 2: The outer islands treaties January–June 1667: Articulation of bonds of vassalage	486
Section 3: Company hegemony in the November 18, 1667 treaty with Makassar	494
Section 4: Restructuring the political geography of South Sulawesi by treaty.....	508
Section 5: The 1668 treaty with Tello: Paternalism as the cement of loyalty.....	520
Chapter conclusion.....	524
Chapter 9: The Pragmatic, Empirical Model of Overseas Diplomacy in Cornelis Speelman’s <i>Notitie</i>	527
Section 1: Chapter introduction	527
Section 2: Cornelis Speelman, a brief diplomatic-military biography	530
Section 3: Analysis, the <i>Notitie</i>	555

On the Notitie as a source for Speelman’s thinking about overseas diplomacy	555
On diplomacy’s role in upholding the Company’s hegemony in general	566
The importance of acquiring precise information on local conditions as the general foundation of the Company’s diplomatic performance ..	570
Considerations with respect to the foe: Karaeng Karunrung	573
Three aspects of keeping the alliance with Arung Palakka.....	592
Section 4: The personal prowess argument.....	617
Chapter conclusion	619
Thesis Conclusion	621
Bibliography	635
INDEX	643

Acknowledgments

- This thesis has a long history, beginning with my approaches to Professor Leonard Blussé in the spring of 1996. For a number of reasons—some of them having to do with health—some of them with teaching commitments—it has taken me over fifteen years to complete the work. Over these years, four institutions have made this possible. First, I would like to thank the Research Council of Norway for awarding me a Doctoral grant for the years 1997 – 2000. Second, I would like to thank the Department of History of Leiden University and the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) at the University of Leiden, at which a grant enabled me to stay as a guest researcher from 1997-98.

Returning to Norway, my ability to work was hampered by health problems for a number of years. This situation was relieved by the University of Agder's willingness to lighten my teaching load, and this meant that I finally was able to finish the thesis. I would like to thank the University of Agder for that and in particular the Dean at the Faculty of Letters at that time, Ole Letnes.

Professor Leonard Blussé, who is something of an institution all by himself, has guided me through this work with a mix of scholarly suggestions and friendly scolding. He possesses a unique ability to never miss an opportunity for presenting anecdotal digressions, where the digressions, paradoxically, were always to the point. If it were not for Professor Blussé, there would have been no thesis. And, had there been no Blussé, it would not have been half the fun writing it.

Many of the people that I met during my year in Leiden have become good friends; and more than they probably know, they have been a great support. So a big thank you and a smile and goes to Martha Chaiklin, Cynthia Vialle, Paul A. Van Dyke, Lincoln Paine corrected my English draft and Olaf Peters in addition to innumerable other friendly gestures kindly translated the English summary into Dutch.

At the beginning of this venture, and over the years, I have contacted a lot of people for advice. I have never met a person in this field who has not been forthcoming and helpful. All deserve my thanks, but I would like to mention two in particular, Professor Jurrien van Goor of Utrecht University, who perhaps without knowing it, helped me pursue the matter, and Professor John E. Wills Jr., who helped get the project back on the right track at a time when it might have crashed. I

have also over the years been in regular contact with Professor Peer Vries, and although we have not discussed my thesis in particular, our exchanges on global history have influenced my thinking about history.

A few words must also be said about Agder University and my colleagues there. I am grateful for having had the opportunity to discuss chapter-drafts with my colleagues at the History department. Special thanks go to Professor May-Brith Ohman Nielsen in this connection for her observant reading and to-the-point comments. Professor Ole Riis must also be included in this special list. I appreciated his merciless critical enthusiasm! Special thanks go to Professor Jonathan Baker, for his encouragements for over three decades.

Finally, I would like to thank my three daughters, Kate, Frida, and Birgitte Maaik, first for just being there, second for never asking why I kept on doing this and just accepted that finishing my thesis was a basic fact of our family life. And not only that; as the work finally started rapidly progressing, they actually showed enthusiasm for it!

Last but far, far from least: My thanks for supportive understanding go to my love, Ruth Wangberg.