

Quatre-Bras and Waterloo Revisited.

A Belgian and Dutch History without Glory

148

[JEROEN VAN ZANTEN]

Napoleon had no doubt; the defeat at Waterloo was all Marshall Ney's fault, not his. After his second exile the fallen French Emperor did not like to talk much about the fatal campaign of 1815. But the days on St Helena were long and every so often he couldn't resist saying something about Waterloo. The four loyal officers who voluntarily followed him into exile then eagerly noted down his words for later inclusion in their official memoirs of the Emperor. To one of them, Baron Gaspard Gourgaud, Napoleon commented at the end of February 1817 that it would have been better if he 'had placed Soult instead of Ney on the left flank'. He then added immediately that he had never expected that Ney, who after all had pressed upon him the importance of Quatre-Bras, would neglect to take control of the crossroads.¹ However there was no point in speculating about what might have been. In his opinion Waterloo was a closed chapter. There was no such thing as *the* historical truth, he remarked: 'You will not find two accounts agreeing together in relating the same fact'.²

After the battle, Napoleon's adversary Wellington agreed. The truth about Waterloo would never be fully known, let alone the battle array and the orders that had led to victory. In a letter to the Irish politician and historian, John Croker, Wellington wrote:

*The history of a battle is not unlike the history of a ball. Some individuals may recollect all the little events of which the great result is the battle won or lost, but no individual can recollect the order in which, or the exact moment at which, they occurred, which makes all the difference as to their value or importance.*³

The lack of trust shown by both Napoleon and Wellington in historical writing is, to say the least, striking since neither of them missed any opportunity after 1815 to claim possession of the true account of Waterloo. In contrast to his defeat at Leipzig in October 1813, Napoleon succeeded in turning his defeat at Waterloo into victory. Through his defeat and exile on distant St Helena, the myths surrounding him grew ever greater. After his death in May 1821, in France and even Belgium and parts of Germany, he would become a martyr. By mid-19th century, the French no longer regarded Waterloo as a painful defeat but as a glorious and heroic highpoint in their national history: Napoleon and his army had put up a wonderful fight and indeed had almost won.⁴ 'Waterloo!



Hat and Coat of Napoleon
© Musée de l'Armée, Paris

Waterloo! morne plaine!' [*Waterloo, dismal plain*], wrote Victor Hugo. Wellington used Waterloo primarily to enhance his political influence. Through his victory, he and the British troops had brought about peace. 'Waterloo did more than any other battle I know of towards the true object of all battles – the peace of the world'.⁵ In 1828 he became Prime Minister. Although he always denied it, and on occasion even demanded satisfaction when he was accused of it, the Duke made full use of Waterloo for political and personal advantage until his death.

By their denial of historical truth almost immediately after the battle, Napoleon and Wellington fired the starting pistol for a fresh struggle, a battle for the memory of Waterloo and even more importantly for the direction of European history. The Belgian historian Johan Op de Beeck rightly concludes in his recently published book on Waterloo that the Emperor and the Duke 'each in their own way' have made a satisfactory final assessment of Waterloo permanently impossible.⁶ After 19 June 1815, Waterloo would have losers other than those who lost the battle itself: the Prussians and especially the Dutch and the Belgians, 35,000 of whom had fought alongside the English.

A case of British chauvinism: Quatre-Bras

The contribution of these countries to Waterloo was and still is mainly played down in British historical writing. Important Belgian-Dutch officers such as Jean Baptiste Baron van Merlen, the Prince of Orange, Jean Victor de Constant Rebecque and Chrétien Henri Scheltens are often missing from English works. But the appropriation of Waterloo by the British is most obvious in the way 19th and 20th century English historians described the battle of Quatre-Bras.

In the early morning of 16 June 1815, two days before Waterloo, there was a fierce encounter at these crossroads between German, Belgian and Dutch troops under the command of the Prince of Orange and a superior French force led by Marshall Ney. Through a courageous tactical intervention by Belgian and Dutch troops, the Prince of Orange's officers were able to prevent Ney from taking the strategically important crossroads and so delayed the advance of the French towards Brussels. Initially, Wellington had overlooked the importance of Quatre-Bras and on the evening of 15 June had unsuspectingly attended a gala ball in Brussels given by the Duke and Duchess of Richmond. During the gala dinner preceding the ball he was informed of the French troop movements and only then did he realise that the loss of the crossroads would prevent the Anglo-Belgian-Dutch army from linking up with the Prussians, thereby enabling Napoleon to reach Brussels practically unhindered. Luckily for the Duke, the Dutch Chief of Staff Jean Victor Baron de Constant Rebecque and General Hendrik George de Perponcher-Sedlnitsky, acting against Wellington's orders, had sent extra troops to Quatre-Bras and instructed the 2nd Battalion Light Infantry under Major Von Normann and the regiment of Colonel Bernhard van Saksen-Weimar⁷ to guard the crossroads.

Had this not happened Wellington would never have been victorious. In 1817, Napoleon stated that the Battle of Waterloo was lost not on the 18th of June but on the 16th at Quatre-Bras:

'To sum up, I had banked on a victory. Defeating the enemy was the key to my whole campaign. Everything depended on a great victory that would throw the enemy back behind the Rhine, and without the heroic decision of the Prince of Orange, who with a handful of men dared to take up a position at Quatre-Bras, I would have caught the British army by surprise. On that day, the Prince showed that he had a sharp insight into and a clear understanding of warfare. He deserves all the credit for this campaign. Without him the British army would have been destroyed before it could have struck a blow.'⁸

Napoleon recalled that on that very day he had successfully started off by defeating the Prussians at Ligny⁹, but because of Ney's failure, the entire campaign failed. If the Dutch, Belgian and British troops had been overrun at Quatre-Bras, Wellington would have been unable to take up a position at Waterloo and the Prussians would never have arrived in time to give him support.

Wellington's casual attitude and his decision to leave Quatre-Bras unguarded while he attended the Richmond ball have taken on a mythical status in English historiography.¹⁰ To go dancing on the eve of battle! A more stirring symbol of chivalry and manliness can hardly be imagined. Wellington's charm, his calm and imperturbable manner, made him the embodiment of 'Britishness' and, like Nelson, an 'essential English hero'. Thomas Hardy referred to the ball in

his three part drama *The Dynasts* as a 'memorable gathering'.¹¹ William Thackeray described the festivities at the Richmond residence as historic:

'There never was, since the days of Darius, such a brilliant train of camp-followers as hung round the train of the Duke of Wellington's army in the Low Countries, in 1815; and led it dancing and feasting, as it were, up to the very brink of battle. A certain ball which a noble duchess gave at Brussels on the 15th of June in the above-named year is historical.'¹²

Wellington's biographer, Elizabeth Longford, concluded that the ball was the highpoint of the Duke's 'psychological warfare'.¹³ According to her, it was a conscious decision to grace the ball with his and his officers' presence, despite the French threat, to give everyone the impression that they had everything under control. However, whether Wellington deliberately employed this somewhat roundabout style of psychological warfare is doubtful. After all, the French could not have known that the Duke had been invited to the ball and the general public was only vaguely aware of Napoleon's rapid advance. Many other explanations have been given in the British histories, but it does appear that on 15th June Wellington miscalculated the speed of the French advance and had every reason to be grateful for Constant's and Perponcher's military insight.¹⁴

However, matters went beyond simply glossing over Wellington's actions on 15 and 16 June 1815. In the mid-1840s the English historian William Siborne, in his *History of the War in France and Belgium*, claimed that many Belgian-Dutch troops deserted at Quatre-Bras and that the Prince of Orange on several



occasions had been slow to give the order to form squares in response to the attacks of French cuirassiers on the Bossu Woods, leading to an unnecessarily high death toll among the allied troops.¹⁵ William's inexperience was apparently also a factor at Waterloo. According to Siborne the Prince sent Colonel Christian Friedrich Wilhelm von Ompteda to his death by ordering him to storm the farmstead of La Haie Sainte after the French had captured it. But judging by the evidence that can be found, these accusations do not hold water. At Quatre-Bras it was not William but Major Lindsay of the 69th Infantry Regiment who failed to give the command to form squares.¹⁶ And in the case of the unfortunate Von Ompteda the order to storm La Haie Sainte was given by Von Alten. It was when Von Ompteda raised objections to the order that William reminded him of his duty to obey orders.¹⁷

The discrediting of the Belgian-Dutch troops and the Prince of Orange as a commander by Siborne and British historians up to the present day has been inspired by British chauvinism.¹⁸ 'Slender Billy' was portrayed as a 'meagre', 'weak' and 'inexperienced' commander, who was incapable of commanding troops without Wellington's support. Siborne, and British historians after him, seem to have forgotten that a large number of the Belgian-Dutch troops were experienced and decorated soldiers who had served under Napoleon or had fought on the side of the allied powers during the first Coalition wars. The number of Belgian and Dutch casualties at Quatre-Bras and Waterloo says enough about their share of the fighting. At Waterloo the Belgian-Dutch army lost 3,000 officers and men out of a total of 17,000, i.e. one in six. At Quatre-Bras the losses were even higher. Here the Belgian-Dutch contingent lost more than a quarter of its men.¹⁹

The Lion's Mound, Waterloo, indicating the spot where the Prince of Orange was wounded.

© Michiel Hendryckx



Like the input of the Belgian and Dutch troops, the actions of the Prince of Orange in the 1815 campaign need no apology. However, some differentiation would not be out of place. William was certainly rather impetuous and, in the words of the military historian François de Bas, as a commanding officer showed evidence of a certain recklessness, 'une certaine témérité' in his ideas.²⁰ However, he was no fool in military matters. Soldiers and officers respected him as an officer and not just because of his title. In Portugal and Spain, where he fought with Wellington between 1811 and 1813 in an extremely dirty guerrilla war, he had, in spite of his youth, proved himself able to take independent command of troops and earn respect by example, something which few European princes could have done at that time.²¹ The claim of Siborne and many English historians after him that William only held out at Quatre-Bras and Waterloo because of Wellington's guidance is disproved by the sources. The Duke himself stated on 19 June 1815 that the Prince was directing the troop movements so well that it was unnecessary to send him any orders.²²

English criticism of the performance of the Belgian-Dutch troops at Quatre-Bras and later on at Waterloo is closely connected with the development of Great Britain after 1815. The victory over Napoleon marked the beginning of a period of British ascendancy which was to last until the death of Queen Victoria, in 1901. In addition to Trafalgar Square, London got a Waterloo Bridge in 1817, a Waterloo Road in 1823 and Waterloo Station in 1848. Britain's newly acquired status as a Great Power was attributed to national heroes such as Nelson, Wellington, Uxbridge, Picton and others. Wellington, as the personification of *Britishness*, had saved Europe from tyranny.²³ The Prince of Orange, Blücher, Bülow and Gneisenau had no place in this picture. Their role was downgraded or even suppressed, as in the case of the Dutch General Chassé, whose courageous move against the French guards at the end of the battle is often not mentioned at all by British historians.²⁴

The Belgian-Dutch Waterloo myth

Until about 1830 the Dutch and the Belgians shared the same history of Waterloo, and national historians, writers, poets and painters made huge efforts to make the battle their own. Catholic, South-Netherlandish poets, such as the Antwerp-born Jan Antoon Pauwels, presented the victory as a deliverance, as an end to French domination. Belgian officers who had fought courageously at Quatre-Bras and Waterloo were lauded as heroes. General Jean Baptiste Baron van Merlen, for instance, who died at Waterloo, received from the poet Adriaan Jozef Stips a stirring epitaph: 'Citizens of Antwerp! Sprinkle your tears upon this holy ground where now lie the heroic deeds of your fellow townsman'. ['Antwerpenaer! Besproey deez' heylig' aerd met traenen. Waer 't heldenryk in rust, van uwen stadgenoot'].²⁵ In particular, Dutch poets sang the praises of the Prince of Orange and emphasised in their rhymes the close historical ties between the house of Orange and the protestant Northern Netherlands.

Incidentally, William I used Waterloo shamelessly to enhance his own legitimacy, just as his forebears had done during the Dutch Revolt. He saw the battle as the moment when the United Kingdom of the Netherlands came into being and declared June 18 to be a national holiday. 'Promises have been backed



Jan Willem Pieneman, *The Battle of Waterloo*, 1824, oil on canvas, 567 x 823 x 1822.7 cm.
The Duke of Wellington hears that the Prussians are on the way. The Prince of Orange,
later King William II, lies wounded on a stretcher. © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam



up by deeds', he declared in his address from the throne in September 1815. He ordered innumerable prints which celebrated the heroic deeds of his son and the Dutch-Belgian troops during the campaign against Napoleon.²⁶ Medallions were struck and painting and poetry competitions were held, all to the greater glory of the nation. The wife of the writer Willem Bilderdijk, Katharina Wilhelmina Schweickhardt, summarised the feelings of the nation poetically:²⁷

How William battled for his people as did William's forebears
 How Batavians and Belgians brought down tyranny
 And how their illustrious swords caused the French to fall.

[Hoe WILLEM voor zijn volk als WILLEMS afkomst streedt.
 Hoe *Batavier en Belg* den dwingland nedervelden.
 En hoe hun roemrijk staal zijn Gaulers vallen deed!]

A pyramid with a bronze lion was placed on the spot where the prince was wounded.²⁸ The battlefield became a tourist attraction drawing visitors from all over Europe. In the summer of 1816, a year after the battle, a panorama of the battlefield was built on the Leidseplein in Amsterdam for Dutchmen unable to make the journey to Waterloo. Its initiator, the publisher and bookseller Evert Maaskamp, proudly announced that the panorama had been assembled from genuine sources and that the noble Prince had inspected it in person before it was opened to the public.²⁹ A reviewer from the literary journal *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* who visited the opening in 1816 compared it with the London panorama of Burnet and Barker that had opened shortly before in Leicester Square. The English, according to his commentary in the *Letteroefeningen*, had appropriated Waterloo for themselves and the London panorama reeked of historical falsehood:

To me it is incomprehensible how anyone could dare to present such a thing to the English people, how one could so disgrace the uprightness of the English character. [...] Waterloo has become the pinnacle of English inspiration; everything that is a reminder of that victory is dear to the heart of the nation.³⁰

Except for 'the person of the Prince of Orange' not a single Dutch commander was represented on the London panorama, according to the reviewer. The Amsterdam panorama was much more faithful to nature and to the truth. 'In it one can see what the Dutch paintbrush is capable of; in it one can see that the Dutch school has remained true to its traditional character.' In accuracy and charm, the Dutch artists stood head and shoulders above the English.

In 1846, two years after the appearance of Siborne's work, the Dutch Lieutenant-General Willem Jan Knoop published a 'rebuttal' of 'the imputations against the Dutch army'. Knoop took great care to refute all of Siborne's charges.³¹ His view of Siborne was unflattering. In his opinion, all the British accounts of Waterloo compromised themselves by 'a spirit of jealousy and national envy'. Historians like Siborne, he emphasised, 'attempted to enhance England's fame' at the expense of 'the honour of other nations'.³² This was a serious accusation. It was not long before the 'Siborne affair' was being discussed in newspapers and journals, not least because Prince William, now King, had given his approval to Knoop's 'Rebuttal'.³³ Like Siborne, Knoop had allowed national sentiment to sway him. In the summer of 1846 there were even rumours



Frederika Louisa Wilhelmina of Prussia, first Queen of the Netherlands, '...ran immediately to her suffering son'.

© Atlas Van Stolk, Rotterdam

that he and Siborne intended to fight a duel. But in the end the affair was no more than a storm in a teacup.

A Belgian and Dutch nuance?

Nowadays outbursts of pique like those of Knoop and Siborne are rare. Which is just as well since that kind of chauvinism is not very productive. Although ... nowadays anyone visiting the battlefield at Waterloo will hear and see nothing else but Napoleon and Wellington. A battle involving around 140,000 men has been reduced to a struggle between two historical figures. Waterloo has degenerated into an account of Wellington's victory over a brilliant Napoleon, a cockfight between two military geniuses.

Is it right that Belgian and Dutch heroes such as Baron Jean Baptiste van Merlen, the Prince of Orange, Jean Victor de Constant Rebecque and Chrétien Henri Scheltens are forgotten? Surely the historiography of Waterloo is in need of a Belgian-Dutch revision? The Germans had a good advocate in the person of the 19th century publicist Julius von Pflugk-Harttung, especially because the historian Peter Hofschröer made his work accessible to British historians in the 20th century. At the start of the 20th century a joint attempt was made in the Netherlands and Belgium to rescue Waterloo from the hands of British historians: between 1908 and 1909 the Belgian Major General Jacques de T'Serclaes de Wommersom and the Dutch Colonel François de Bas published the four volume *La campagne de 1815 aux Pays-Bas d'après les rapports officiels Néerlandais*. However, the work made little impact on British historians because it was written in French. This still remains a problem. The most recent Belgian and Dutch studies of Waterloo, by Luc de Vos, Nicolaas Vels Heijn and Johan Op de Beeck, are all written in Dutch.³⁴

At Waterloo-commemorations the opposite seems to happen. In 1965, the celebrations were strikingly international in Belgium and the Netherlands. In that year, while the English held an extravagant dinner in Whitehall at which the Queen, the Duke of Edinburgh, Prime Minister Harold Wilson and members of the English elite drank toasts to the British victory at Waterloo, in the Netherlands frantic efforts were being made to make the commemoration of the battle as European as possible. Members of the Commemoration Committee, who included Princess Beatrix, wanted to eliminate all martial nationalism and more or less forbade a re-enactment of the battle in the Goffert Stadium in Nijmegen.³⁵ In Belgium, Waterloo was an even more sensitive issue because the Flemish nationalists claimed ownership of the Waterloo Lion. The Royal Library of Belgium made every effort to stay neutral in this national conflict and organised an exhibition of stamps and prints of the battle.³⁶ The Belgian government went a step further. The politicians placed the battle in the context of European history and represented Waterloo as one in a long list of hostilities to have taken place on Belgian soil. Between 1914 and 1918 and 1940 and 1945 other states fought their wars here at the expense of the small, neutral state of Belgium. Perhaps that holds the answer to the question of how the British have got away with expropriating Waterloo unpunished for 200 years: small neutral countries like Belgium and the Netherlands simply do not have great and glorious histories.

NOTES

- 1 Gaspard Gourgaud, *Journal inédit de Ste-Hélène*, vol. I (Paris 1899), pp. 500-504. This contribution is largely based on: Jeroen van Zanten, *Willem II*, (Amsterdam 2013).
- 2 *Memoirs of the life, exile and conversations of the Emperor Napoleon by the Count de Las Cases*, volume IV (London 1836), pp. 179-180.
- 3 Wellington to John Croker, 8 August 1815. Quotation taken from: John Keegan, *The Face Of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme* (London 1976), p. 117.
- 4 *Jeremy Black, The Battle of Waterloo. A new history* (London 2010), pp. 199-200.
- 5 *Croker Papers, volume II* (London 1884), p. 235.
- 6 Johan Op de Beeck, *Waterloo. De laatste 100 dagen van Napoleon* (Antwerp 2013), pp.377. See also: Jean-Marc Largeaud, *Napeleon et Waterloo. La défaite glorieuse de 1815 à nos jours* (Paris 2006), passim.
- 7 H.M.F. Landolt. 'Z.K.H. Hertog Karel Bernhard van Saksen-Weimar-Eisenach', in: *Militaire Spectator* (1862), pp. 507-511.
- 8 Charles Tristan de Montholon, *Récits de la captivité de l'empereur Napoléon à Sainte-Hélène II* (Paris 1847),pp. 182-184.
- 9 Gaspard Gourgaud, *Journal inédit de Ste-Hélène*, tome I (Paris 1899), pp. 500-504.
- 10 P.W. Sinnema, *The Wake of Wellington: Englishness in 1852* (Athens 2006), passim.
- 11 Thomas Hardy, *The complete poetical works of Thomas Hardy, vol 5: The Dynasts. Part Three*. (Oxford 1995).
- 12 William Makepeace Thackeray, *Vanity Fair: a novel without a hero* (New York 1848), p. 136.
- 13 E. Longford, *Wellington. The Years of the Sword*, pp. 416-417. See also: Jeroen van Zanten, *Willem II*, (Amsterdam 2013), pp. 189-236.
- 14 For a good analysis of Wellington's position on 15 June 1815 see: Richard Holmes, *Wellington. The Iron Duke*, pp. 222-224. The leading military historian Jeremy Black sets Wellington's reaction in June 1815 against the background of his 'defensive tactics'. Cf. Jeremy Black, *The Battle of Waterloo. A new history* (London 2010).
- 15 For a negative judgement of William see William Siborne, *The Waterloo Campaign 1815* (Westminster 1900, originally published in 1844), pp 177-179. See too a work based on Siborne: George Hooper, *Waterloo, the downfall of the first Napoleon: a history of the campaign of 1815* (London 1862), pp.130-131. See further for criticism of William, P.J. de Bruine Ploos van Amstel, 'De Prins van Oranje bij Quatre-Bras', in: *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis, Land en Volkenkunde* 23 (1908), pp. 25-38. And also the novel by Georgette Heyer, *An Infamous Army* (London 1937), passim. See too Jac Weller, *Wellington at Waterloo* (Barnsley 2010), pp. 31-33 and 212. Weller wrongly makes William out to be a military nitwit who failed as a commander on several occasions at Quatre-Bras and Waterloo. Weller attributes success entirely to Wellington and the English. For criticism of Siborne see Malcolm Balen, *A Model Victory. Waterloo and the Battle for History* (London 2006).
- 16 Longford, Wellington. *The Years of the Sword*, p. 431 and Herbert Siborne (the son of William Siborne), *Waterloo Letters* (London 1983), pp. 336-338.
- 17 Barbero, *Waterloo. Het verhaal van de veldslag*, pp. 270-271.
- 18 For the background to Siborne's work and his influence on historical writing about Waterloo see David Hamilton-Williams, *Waterloo. New Perspectives*, pp. 11-30.
- 19 The number of casualties cannot be established exactly because no lists were drawn up immediately after 16 and 18 June. The figures and percentages cited here are therefore approximations and based on the figures given in F. de Bas and J. de T'Serclaes de Wommersom, *La Campagne de 1815 aux Pays-Bas III*, pp. 202-204; Wüppermann, *De vorming van het Nederlandsche leger na de omwenteling van 1813 en het aandeel van dat leger aan den veldtocht van 1815*, pp. 141-142 and W.G. de Bas, *Quatre-Bras en Waterloo*, p. 162.

- 20 F. de Bas en J. de T'Serclaes de Wommersom, *La Campagne de 1815 aux Pays-Bas I*, p. 183.
- 21 For the Prince's Spanish and Portuguese experiences see Jeroen van Zanten, *Willem II*, pp. 97-150. Elizabeth Longford writes that English historians have been too hard on William. She argues in her biography of Wellington that it was 'a fault in the system' that William at twenty-two was given command of a regiment, but that the Prince himself was not to blame. In spite of this concession, Longford is consistently too negative about William's military achievements and experiences. Longford, *Wellington. The Years of the Sword*, p. 474.
- 22 Jeroen van Zanten, *Willem II*, pp. 189-236 and Bosscha, *Leven van Willem den Tweede*, p.344. See also E. Maaskamp, *De veldslag van het schoon verbond*, p. 36.
- 23 P.W. Sinnema, *The Wake of Wellington: Englishness in 1852 (Athens 2006)*, *passim*. See also L. Colley, *Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (London 1994), pp.327-328; R. Colls en Ph. Dodd, (ed), *Englishness: politics and culture 1880-1920* (London 1987) and Paul Langford, *Englishness identified: manners and character, 1650-1850* (Oxford 2001). For Waterloo en *Britishness* see Peter Kellner, 'What Britishness means to the British', in Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright (ed), *Britishness: perspectives on the Britishness question* (Oxford 2009), pp. 62-71, esp.p. 63.
- 24 Chassé to William, 4 July 1815, F. de Bas and J. de T'Serclaes de Wommersom, *La Campagne de 1815 aux Pays-Bas III*, pp. 354-357.
- 25 Janneke Weijermars, *Stiefbroeders. Zuid-Nederlandse letteren en de natievorming onder Willem I, 1814-1834* (Hilversum 2012), pp. 49-57.
- 26 Bergvelt, 'Koning Willem I als verzamelaar, opdrachtgever en weldoener van de Noordnederlandse Musea', in: Tamse en Witte, *Staats- en Natievorming in Willem I's Koninkrijk*, pp. 261-285, esp. pp. 263-268.
- 27 *Vaderlandsche uitboezemingen* (Leiden 1815), pp. 121-137, esp. 136-137 and *De dichtwerken van vrouwe Katharina Wilhelmina Bilderdijk. Deel 3.* (Haarlem 1860), p.132.
- 28 Guido Fonteyn, 'Waterloo: de Leeuw. Over de slag bij Waterloo die nog altijd aan de gang is', in Jan Bank, Marita Matthijssen (ed.), *Plaatsen van herinnering*, pp. 72-81; Philippe Raxhon, 'De Leeuw van Waterloo. Een trefpunt van verleden, heden en toekomst', in Jo Tollebeek (ed.), België. *Een parcours van herinnering. Plaatsen van geschiedenis en expansie* (Amsterdam 2008), pp. 179-189.
- 29 Cf. Eveline Koolhaas-Grosfeld, *De ontdekking van de Nederlander. In boeken en prenten rond 1800* (Zutphen 2010), pp. 299-301.
- 30 'Comparison between the London and the Amsterdam panorama of the Battle of Waterloo; in a letter to a friend. Amsterdam, 22 October 1816', in 'Mengelwerk', *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (Amsterdam 1816), pp. 671-682.
- 31 See for Knoop's 'nation-rousing historical writing': Remieg Aerts, *De letterheren. Liberale cultuur in de negentiende eeuw: het tijdschrift De Gids*. (Amsterdam 1997), pp. 257-258.
- 32 W.J. Knoop, *Beschouwingen over Siborne's Geschiedenis van den oorlog van 1815 in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden en wederlegging van de in dat werk voorkomende beschuldigingen tegen het Nederlandse leger* (Breda 1846), pp. 1-8.
- 33 See for example: *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (Amsterdam 1847), pp. 128-129 and E. Maaskamp, *De veldslag van het schoon verbond* (Amsterdam 1815), pp. 10-11.
- 34 Luc de Vos, *Het einde van Napoleon: Waterloo 1815* (Leuven 1999), Nicolaas Vels Heijn, *Waterloo. Glorie zonder helden* (Amsterdam 1990) and Johan Op de Beeck, *Waterloo. De laatste 100 dagen van Napoleon* (Antwerp, 2013).
- 35 Jasper Heinzen, 'A Negotiated Truce: The Battle of Waterloo in European Memory since the Second World War', *History & Memory*, 26, Number 1, (2014), pp. 39-74 and Martin Steegmans, 'Vergeten-glorie? De slag bij Waterloo in het collectievegeheugen van Nederland, 1815-1965' (Unpublished Master's thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2011).
- 36 Bibliothèque Albert I, *Waterloo 1815: Estampes, documents, dessins* (Brussels 1965).