



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Reframing the Diplomat: Ernst van der Beugel and the Cold War Atlantic Community

Bloemendal, N.A.

Citation

Bloemendal, N. A. (2017, September 6). *Reframing the Diplomat: Ernst van der Beugel and the Cold War Atlantic Community*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/54855>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/54855>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden




The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/54855> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Bloemendal, N.A.

Title: Reframing the diplomat: Ernst van der Beugel and the Cold War Atlantic Community

Issue Date: 2017-09-06



REFRAMING THE DIPLOMAT

Ernst van der Beugel and
the Cold War Atlantic Community

Albertine Bloemendal

Reframing the Diplomat:

Ernst van der Beugel and the Cold War Atlantic Community

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 woensdag 6 September 2017

klokke 15.00 uur

door

Nely Albertine Bloemendal

geboren te Amersfoort

in 1984

Promotor:

Prof. dr. G.P. Scott-Smith

Copromotor:

Prof. dr. A.E. Kersten

Promotiecommissie:

Dr. M.A. Ebben (Universiteit Leiden)

Prof. dr. D.A. Hellema (Universiteit Utrecht)

Prof. dr. L. Nuti (Università Degli Studi Roma Tre)

Prof. dr. M.L.L. Segers (Universiteit van Maastricht)

Prof. dr. H. te Velde (Universiteit Leiden)

Dr. T. de Vries (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)

Dankwoord

Dit proefschrift is tot stand gekomen met financiële steun van de Van den Berch van Heemstede Stichting, de Netherlands American Studies Association (NASA), de Eisenhower Foundation, het Roosevelt Study Center, het Leids Universiteits Fonds (LUF) en het Instituut voor Geschiedenis van de Universiteit Leiden.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Introduction	5
<i>Ernst van der Beugel, the Atlantic Elite and the Unofficial “Atlantic Community”</i>	7
<i>Towards a New Diplomatic History</i>	12
<i>Research Question</i>	14
<i>Sources</i>	17
<i>Structure</i>	18
Chapter 1: “The Great Mistake of the West”	21
<i>Youth and Student Years</i>	22
<i>The Worst Years: “The idea of war is growing more familiar to us every day”</i>	30
<i>The War Years</i>	36
<i>Conclusion</i>	40
Chapter 2: Present at the Creation	43
<i>The Marshall Plan</i>	43
<i>The Paris Conference</i>	47
<i>To Washington</i>	51
<i>The Washington Meetings</i>	53
<i>The Marshall Plan: a Joint Venture between the Public and the Private Sector</i>	56
<i>The Dutch Organization</i>	59
<i>Public Private Linkages in the Netherlands</i>	61
<i>Cooperation with the American Country Mission in The Hague</i>	63
<i>A comprehensive PR-campaign</i>	65
<i>The ERP: Developing Transatlantic Networks</i>	68
<i>Hirschfeld’s Heir</i>	71
<i>Conclusion</i>	74
Chapter 3: An Atlanticist European	77
<i>Historical Context: the Netherlands and the Road to Rome</i>	79
<i>Political and Military Integration</i>	81
<i>The Group of Ten</i>	82
<i>Diverging Paths: the European Defense Community and the Rise of the Gaullists</i>	85
<i>Atlanticist vs. Europeanists and the Straightjacket of Administrative</i>	91
<i>State Secretary: the Road to Rome</i>	98
<i>Hope and disillusionment: the Free Trade Area and Charles de Gaulle</i>	101
<i>Conclusion: an Atlanticist European</i>	107

Chapter 4: Unofficial Ambassador for an Atlantic Community 111

<i>Statesman without Office</i>	111
<i>KLM Connections</i>	114
<i>Transition and Continuity</i>	118
<i>The Unofficial Atlantic Community</i>	120
<i>The Bilderberg Meetings</i>	123
<i>Public Voice</i>	127
<i>A Transatlantic Mediator</i>	128
<i>Turbulence at KLM</i>	130
<i>Conclusion</i>	133

Chapter 5: The Gaullist Challenge 137

<i>Atlantic Crisis: A Nightmare Come True</i>	138
<i>Beyond 'facilitation': the run-up to the Bilderberg Meeting in Cannes</i>	142
<i>Cannes, 1963: "We now know what we are up against."</i>	147
<i>The MLF Conversion: from "patch-up" tool to instrument for Atlantic cohesion.</i>	150
<i>Transatlantic family quarrels: the lingering rivalry of Europeanists vs. Atlanticists</i>	152
<i>American Leadership: a Cri de Coeur</i>	155
<i>Reverberations of Williamsburg</i>	156
<i>MLF: the Battle Continues</i>	157
<i>European Political Union revisited: The Erhard Plan</i>	159
<i>Conclusion</i>	165

Chapter 6: Defense, Détente and the "Average Man" 169

<i>Détente and the Soviet threat</i>	170
<i>A Decline in Accepted and Acceptable American</i>	175
<i>The Atlantic Elite and the 'Average Man'</i>	176
<i>The Dutch Scene: Nieuw Links, the PvdA and the Vietnam Letter</i>	181
<i>The Dutch Defense Debate</i>	184
<i>A Friend in the White House</i>	186
<i>A small Intervention that Could Make All the Difference</i>	192
<i>The Biesheuvel Cabinet and the Committee of Civil and Military Experts</i>	195
<i>In Pursuit of a Domestic Climate Conducive to Close Transatlantic Relations</i>	199
<i>Conclusion</i>	204

Chapter 7: The Challenge of the Successor Generation 207

<i>A Very Serious Generation Problem</i>	208
<i>Consultancy: the Ford Foundation and the Successor Generation</i>	210
<i>Bilderberg and the pursuit of a 'continuous rejuvenation'</i>	216
<i>Bridging the Generation Gap: from Marienlyst to Woodstock</i>	220
<i>The Old Guard in Defense of the Capitalist System</i>	225
<i>Bilderberg and the Lockheed Scandal: an Existential Crisis</i>	228
<i>"The Smoothest Coup d'état in the history of the Atlantic Alliance"</i>	232
<i>"NATO-Professor"</i>	236
<i>Conclusion</i>	244

Conclusion: a Call for a New Diplomatic History	247
Appendix A: Directorships E.H. van der Beugel	255
Appendix B: Other positions E.H. van der Beugel	257
Sources & Bibliography	259
Dutch Summary	277
Curriculum Vitae	289

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has been quite some time in the making. In the process, I have become indebted to many without whose support this document would not exist today.

First of all, I want to express my gratitude to my PhD supervisors Prof. dr. Giles Scott-Smith and Prof. dr. Albert Kersten, who have been with me on this journey from the very start and without whom I would not have been able to complete it. I'm profoundly grateful for their guidance, patience and encouragement. I would also like to thank the Van den Berch van Heemstede stichting for providing the financial basis that enabled the research for this dissertation.

This dissertation is based on extensive research in both public and private archives and has greatly benefitted from interviews with individuals who knew Ernst van der Beugel well. I would like to extend my gratitude to all those who were willing to share their time, memories and/or private archives. In particular, I would like to thank dr. Henry Kissinger; not just for his willingness to take the time to meet in New York to share his memories, but also for sending me his personal correspondence with Ernst van der Beugel. I am also indebted to Kees Admiraal for sharing material from his private archive as well as for his encouragement. Above all, I want to express my gratitude to Aukelien van Hoytema - Van der Beugel and Hans Heestermans. I will never forget their unlimited kindness and support, nor the conversations we had over delicious dinners – often prepared by Hans. The private archival material, memories and encouragement that Aukelien has shared over the years have been invaluable for this research and I am deeply grateful for the trust she invested in me.

This dissertation is also based on extensive archival research abroad, mostly in the United States, where I have greatly benefited from the assistance of staff members from the following archives: the Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, NY; the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum in Abilene, KS; the Harry S. Truman Presidential Library and Museum in Independence, MO; the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in Boston, MA; the Richard M. Nixon Presidential Library and Museum in Yorba Linda, CA; the Harvard University Archives in Cambridge, MA; the Rauner Special Collections Library of Dartmouth College in Hanover, NH; the Princeton University Library in Princeton, NJ; and the Cornell University Library in Ithaca, NY. Visiting these archives has been made possible through the financial support of the Eisenhower Foundation, the Netherlands American Studies Association (NASA) and the Leids Universiteits Fonds (LUF). I am also grateful to those who have sheltered me during my research trips: Melissa and Eric Baldwin, Amy and Randy Commans, Kathleen Fitzgerald, Emily and Eric Littman, Hanneke Keultjes, Tala Tavakoli and Yashar Deylamipour. Their friendship and hospitality are greatly appreciated.

There are also many individuals from the close-knit community of American Studies scholars in the Netherlands to whom I am greatly indebted. The staff, events and resources of the Roosevelt Studies Center in Middelburg have been of especially great value in the process

of writing this dissertation. In particular, I would like to thank Kees van Minnen, Hans Krabbendam, Dario Fazzi and Leontien Joosse for their ceaseless support. Without the encouragement of Kees van Minnen I probably would not have embarked on this research project in the first place. I have greatly benefited from the PhD seminars led – with contagious enthusiasm – by Hans Krabbendam as well as from the international PhD seminars and the feedback I received during these sessions from fellow PhD students. I am also thankful for the grant I received, which allowed me to spend three weeks in the lovely town of Middelburg to do research in the RSC archives.

It is Leiden University's Institute for History, however, that I have considered my academic home during the research project that led to this dissertation. They too have sheltered me in a way. I am grateful that I got to share my journey as an American Studies PhD student with Jorrit van den Berk, Laura Visser-Maessen, Sabrina Otterloo, Sara Polak and Mark de Vries with whom I could share both progress and challenges. Their feedback, friendship and encouragement are greatly appreciated. In addition, I would like to thank all my friends and colleagues at the Institute for History and Leiden University College who have supported me during this journey, in particular Anne Beckers, Laura Bertens, Eduard van de Bilt, Elisabeth Dieterman, Joris Gijsenbergh, Anne Heijer, Constant Hijzen, Peter Meel, Matthijs Olieman, Damian Pargas, Anne Petterson, Dirk Pfeiffer, Judith Pollmann, Aniek Smit, Diederik Smit, Bart van der Steen, Robert Stein, Anna Tijsseling, Adriaan van Veldhuizen, Rebecca Wensma, Hans Wilbrink and Ann Wilson.

I would also like to express my thanks to the members of my reading committee who have provided valuable feedback in the final stages: dr. Maurits Ebben, Prof. dr. Duco Hellema, Prof. dr. Leopoldo Nuti, Prof. dr. Mathieu Segers, Prof. dr. Henk te Velde and dr. Tity de Vries.

Last but not least, I am profoundly grateful for the love and support from my parents without whom none of this would have been possible and to my dear brother who never tires of challenging me. This dissertation certainly could not have been written without the love, support, encouragement and patience of my best friend and husband, Willem van Rooijen.

Albertine Bloemendal

Leiden, the Netherlands, 1 August 2017

Introduction

“Here and there one still finds traces of the idea that relations between states are exclusively the business of governments”, a Dutch newspaper editor wrote in the summer of 1961. The author considered this a rather archaic take on international relations. “Surely”, he proceeded, “in the middle of the twentieth century we must have reached the point where the private citizen can no longer be denied the right to make contact with others should he consider this useful, even at the international level.”¹ The editorial was part of a heated discussion in the Dutch press, which had been triggered by a speech delivered at the Dutch Chamber of Commerce in London by the Director General of KLM Dutch Royal Airlines: Ernst van der Beugel.²

Ernst van der Beugel (1918-2004) was a kind of modern Renaissance man who carved out a unique position for himself through a kaleidoscopic career that made him an influential figure not just in the Netherlands but internationally, in particular within the Cold War Atlantic Community. Born into a Jewish family during the final year of the First World War, Van der Beugel grew up in Amsterdam during the run-up to the Second World War. Instead of following in the footsteps of this father, an international investment banker with social-democratic leanings, Van der Beugel decided to pursue a career as a civil servant once the war had ended. As such, he came to play a central role in the implementation of the Marshall Plan in the Netherlands and in the international negotiations related to the European Recovery Program. In this context, Van der Beugel developed an impressive career at the cross-roads of international political, military and economic policy as the protégé of Hans Max Hirschfeld, the most powerful civil servant in the Netherlands at the time. In the process, he also developed a close emotional attachment to the United States as well as a diverse and expansive transatlantic social network bridging the public and private spheres in the Netherlands, Europe and across the Atlantic. Even so, it was above all a strong belief in *realpolitik* fed by his experiences of the run-up to the Second World War, in particular the Munich agreement of 1938 and the lessons concerning the importance of power relations that he took from these experiences and applied to the new Cold War context, that motivated van der Beugel’s Atlanticist inclinations - eventually turning him into one of the “founding fathers of Dutch Atlanticism.”³

Van der Beugel’s Marshall Plan years were followed by top positions in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – where he was one of the main policy advisors with regards to European and transatlantic policy of Foreign ministers Stikker, Beyen and Luns and Prime Minister

¹ “Particulier in Statenverkeer”, *De Rotterdammer*, July 21, 1961 (translation mine).

² Parts of this introduction also appeared in: Albertine Bloemendal, “Between Dinner Table and Formal Diplomacy: Ernst van der Beugel as an Unofficial Diplomat for an Atlantic Community”, *New Global Studies*, 8:1 (2014): 103-119.

³ Thomas Gijswijt, “De Trans-Atlantische elite en de Nederlandse Buitenlandse Politiek sinds 1945”, in *Bezinning op het Buitenland: Het Nederlandse buitenlands beleid in een onzekere wereld*, eds. Hellema et al. (Den Haag: Clingendael, 2011), 36 (translation mine).

Drees. He participated in the negotiations leading up to the Rome Treaty and served as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs responsible for European integration in the third Drees Cabinet (13 October 1956 - 22 December 1958). While this may all make for an interesting career in itself – which has been documented, for example, in Ralph Dingemans' 2008 portrait of Ernst van der Beugel⁴ – this dissertation argues that what makes Ernst van der Beugel a particularly interesting figure is in fact what happened *after* he left the Dutch government in 1959 to join KLM Dutch Royal Airlines.

While Van der Beugel's transition to the private sector may at first sight appear as a fundamental break with his career as a diplomat, reality proved to be more complex. The end of Ernst Van der Beugel's official career at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not mean the end of his role in transatlantic relations. Instead, his experience as a formal diplomat served as a kind of springboard to a more diffuse and free-form approach to transatlantic diplomacy as a private citizen – built on an intricate mosaic of activities in many different spheres including the worlds of government, politics, business, finance, military circles, academia, think tanks, philanthropic organizations and unofficial transnational elite networks, particularly within the Atlantic Community.

Whereas a great deal of his post-1959 transatlantic endeavors took place behind the scenes, Van der Beugel did not hesitate to use his public position either. To illustrate, in his speech at the Dutch chamber of commerce in London referred to at the beginning of this introduction, Van der Beugel had publicly beseeched the British to join the process of European integration in order to create a more healthy (read: 'more Atlanticist') balance of power in Europe by thwarting the Gaullist dream to dominate the continent, arguing that 'the Netherlands' would very much applaud this.⁵ In the process, he rather bluntly criticized Gaullist France and scolded the Germans. The incident drew quite some attention in the Dutch press and the debate that followed raised interesting questions, like: What was – or ought to be – the role of a private citizen in foreign affairs? Who was Van der Beugel to speak for 'the Netherlands'? Was he just a mouthpiece of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs? And, if not, who *did* he speak for and who or what *did* he represent? But also: What would be the consequences? How did this unofficial endeavor relate to formal diplomatic relations?⁶

These were very relevant questions, especially since over the course of the 20th century advances in communication and transportation had enabled private citizens to play an unprecedented role in the conduct of international relations, thus considerably changing the diplomatic playing field. As Joe Johnson and Maureen Berman already noted in their 1977 book *Unofficial Diplomats*: "private citizens can now to a degree never before true inform

⁴ Ralph Dingemans, "'De zon ging op en de wind was gunstig': Ernst Hans van der Beugel (1918-2004)", in *In dienst van Buitenlandse Zaken. Achttien Portretten van ambtenaren en diplomaten in de twintigste eeuw*, eds. Bert van der Zwan, Bob de Graaff en Duco Hellema (Amsterdam: Boom, 2008), 157-173.

⁵ See: "Openhartige rede drs. v.d. Beugel: Fransen willen Britten niet in de E.E.G.", *Telegraaf*, July 21, 1961; "Particulier in Statenverkeer", *Rotterdammer*, July 25, 1961; "KLM-directeur wekt Engeland op toe te treden tot E.E.G.", *De Tijd/Maasbode*, July 21, 1961; "KLM-president pleit in Londen voor Bonn", *De Waarheid*, July 21, 1961.

⁶ See: "Moedig", *De Gelderlander*, July 25, 1961; "Particulier in Statenverkeer", *Rotterdammer*, July 25, 1961; "Vrijmoedig commentaar", *De Tijd*, July 21, 1961; "Vlucht in de politiek", *Volkskrant*, July 21, 1961.

themselves on the foreign policies of their own and other governments, visit and entertain the leaders of foreign governments, suggest new policy positions or probe for changes in policy during those meetings, bring back feelers for policy changes, and then publicize the results of those meetings to large numbers of people in the news media.” As a result “an increasing proportion of international interaction bypasses, complements, or supplements traditional bilateral procedures.” Johnson and Berman dubbed the range of private international relations ‘unofficial diplomacy’, referring specifically to “individuals and groups who have contact with private citizens or government officials from other countries as well as with their own government.”⁷ These developments were also visible in Cold War transatlantic relations, leaving a considerable impact on the diplomatic playing field.

Ernst van der Beugel, the Atlantic Elite and the Unofficial “Atlantic Community”

The post-war period witnessed a great intensification in transatlantic cooperation, often illustrated by the Marshall Plan, the creation of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), and the establishment of NATO – developments which were accompanied with talk of a nascent ‘Atlantic Community’. The term ‘Atlantic Community’ was used frequently during the Cold War and meant different things to different people.⁸ During the 1950’s some Atlanticists even advocated the creation of a formal Atlantic Community that would politically and economically integrate the North Atlantic area. While organizations like NATO and associated institutions like the OECD and GATT played an important role in formalizing the post-war transatlantic relationship, a formal Atlantic Community never materialized. Atlanticism, however, was never restricted to these formal intergovernmental organizations.⁹

Rather, as a new generation of scholars has started to uncover, the post-war period witnessed the proliferation of many private individuals and groups promoting close

⁷ Maureen Berman and Joseph Johnson, *Unofficial Diplomats* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 3-5.

⁸ The phrase “Atlantic Community” was first coined in 1916 by the American philosopher journalist Walter Lippmann, but the view it reflected was rooted in 19th century ideas of shared cultural affinities and dreams of Anglo-Saxon confederation and the unity of the English speaking peoples. During and right after the Second World War, the initial Atlantic alliance of the United States and Britain broadened to include Western Europe and the popularization of an Atlantic Community became a joint transatlantic effort, considered crucial in the light of the emerging Cold War. See: Ronald Steel, “Walter Lippmann and the Invention of the Atlantic Community” in *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, eds. Aubourg, Scott-Smith and Bossuat (Paris: Soleb, 2008), 28-36; Lara C. Silver, “The Political Use of Metaphor in the Construction of the Atlantic Community” in *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, eds. Aubourg, Scott-Smith and Bossuat (Paris: Soleb, 2008) 60-73; Ronald Steel, “How Europe became Atlantic: Walter Lippmann and the New Geography of the Atlantic Community”, in *Defining the Atlantic Community: Culture, Intellectuals, and Politics in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, ed. Marco Mariano (New York: Routledge, 2010), 13-27; Interjeet Parmar, “Anglo-American Elites in the Interwar Years: Idealism and Power in the Intellectual Roots of Chatham House and the Council on Foreign Relations,” *International Relations*, 16:1 (2002), 53-75; Sebastiaan Reyn, “Atlantis Lost: The American Experience with De Gaulle, 1958-1969” (Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden University, 2007), 29, 107-192.

⁹ See: Geir Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945: From ‘Empire’ by Invitation to Transatlantic Drift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 77; David W. Ellwood, “From the Marshall Plan to Atlanticism: Communication Strategies and Geopolitical Narratives”, in *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, eds. Aubourg, Bossuat and Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2008), 54.

transatlantic cooperation, including the international Movement for Atlantic Union, which was represented through the Atlantic Union Committee, the Atlantic Citizen's Congress (ACC), and the Declaration of Atlantic Unity group (DAU) and pursued an Atlantic federation based on the ideas set out by the American journalist and Atlantic federalist Clarence Streit in his popular 1939 book "Union Now". Other prominent Atlanticist NGO's included the Atlantic Treaty Association (ATA), which counted fifteen national member groups; the NATO Parliamentarians conference, the American Council on NATO, the Congress of European-American Associates, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, the Bilderberg Meetings and the Atlantic Institute.¹⁰

While most of these private organizations tended to pursue their own agenda's many of them had close ties with formal diplomatic and foreign policy establishments. After all, as multiple scholars have pointed out, a crucial characteristic of Cold War transatlantic relations was the existence of a highly integrated Atlantic elite, which consisted not only of formal government representatives but also included bankers and businessmen, philanthropists, union leaders, journalists and academics, or in the words of Giles Scott-Smith: "the loose collection of policy intellectuals and influentials dedicated to maintaining close transatlantic relations from dinner table to diplomacy and everywhere in between."¹¹

Kenneth Weisbrode has pointed out that it was no "historical accident" that these private organizations and meeting places proliferated in the mid-1950s and 1960s. During this period diplomacy started to grow more accustomed to the presence of the mass media while bureaucracies became more complex, creating a need for "alternative, 'unofficial' purveyors of elite consensus and continuity." Weisbrode emphasizes that the role of these private organizations and meeting places was "something more subtle and powerful than their ostensible roles as policy talking shops and cheerleaders." Instead, "they were at once alternative spaces for policymaking and policy planning as well as important catalysts and incubators of political consensus among a diversifying and increasingly contentious bevy of leaders."¹² The networks, think tanks, foundations, exchange programs and other private organizations that linked this transatlantic elite were just as much part of the transatlantic fabric as NATO itself. As Thomas Gijswijt has demonstrated, "at times they even succeeded where NATO, to a certain degree failed; e.g. in building a consultation infrastructure that

¹⁰ On the unofficial dimension of Cold War transatlantic relations see: David Ellwood, "What Winning Stories Teach" in *Defining the Atlantic Community: Culture, Intellectuals, and Politics in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, ed. Marco Mariano (New York: Routledge, 2010); Valérie Aubourg, "Creating the Texture of the Atlantic Community", in *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, eds. Aubourg, Bossuat and Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2008), 390-415; Kenneth Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century: Four Centuries of Extraordinary Diplomats who Forged America's Vital Alliance with Europe* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2009), 165-170.

¹¹ Giles Scott-Smith, "Ghosts in the Machine? Ernst van der Beugel, the Transatlantic Elite, and the 'New' Diplomatic History" (Oratie, Leiden, 2009). On the Atlantic elite see also: Thomas Gijswijt, "Beyond NATO: Transatlantic Elite Networks and the Atlantic Alliance", in *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges Beyond Deterrence in the 1960s*, eds. A. Wenger et al. (London: Routledge, 2007), 50; Kees van der Pijl, *The Making of an Atlantic Ruling Class* (London: Verso, 1984); Geir Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945: From "Empire" by Invitation to Transatlantic Drift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 66.

¹² Kenneth Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century*, 168.

went beyond purely military and strategic issues.”¹³ Thus, in the absence of formal transatlantic political structures the unofficial dimension of transatlantic relations only gained in importance.

Furthermore, among the transatlantic elite – many of whom had worked together on projects such as the Marshall Plan or the creation of NATO followed by common ventures in pursuit of Atlantic unity and cooperation – a sense of shared values, experiences and interests developed (especially in the context of the Cold War), which created an almost tangible sense of Atlantic community; a sense of community which they in turn tried to spread and foster, either individually or through transnational Atlanticist networks and NGO’s.¹⁴ Throughout his career, Ernst van der Beugel moved as a spider through this intricate web of formal and informal transatlantic relations – first as an official government representative and from 1959 onwards through positions in almost all the different spheres represented among the Atlantic elite.

After close cooperation with the private sector during the Marshall Plan, Van der Beugel eventually entered the business world through KLM Dutch Royal airlines in 1959; first as vice-president and between June 1961 and January 1963 as its president. He also mingled with captains of industry on the boards of governors of a varied collection of European and American corporations, including Merck, Sharp & Dohme, the Xerox corporation, Estel, the Diebold Group, Petrofina and General Electric.¹⁵ Next to that, he occupied significant positions in the financial sector, for example on the supervisory boards of S.G. Warburg, Bank Mees & Hope and ABN.

In 1960 Van der Beugel consolidated his position among the Atlantic elite through his appointment as Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg meetings – one of the main informal meeting places of the unofficial Atlantic elite.¹⁶ He would occupy this position until 1980, serving in the words of Henry Kissinger as the ‘glue’ that kept the network together.¹⁷ In addition, he served on the boards of private international relations councils including the Ditchley Foundation, the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship, the Paris based Atlantic Institute and the Dutch Association for Foreign Affairs. What’s more, between 1973 and 1985 Van der Beugel served as the chairman of the prestigious London based International Institute for

¹³ Gijswijt, “Beyond NATO”, 50.

¹⁴ Ibid.; Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century*, 13, 72; Valérie Aubourg, “Problems of Transmission: The Atlantic Community and the Successor Generation as Seen by US Philanthropy, 1960s-1970s”, in *Atlantic, Euratlantic or Europe-America?*, eds. Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2011), 416-443.

¹⁵ For a complete list see appendix A: Directorships E.H. van der Beugel.

¹⁶ On the Bilderberg Meetings see: Thomas Gijswijt, “Uniting the West: the Bilderberg Group, the Cold War and European integration, 1952-1966” (PhD diss., Heidelberg University, 2007); Ingeborg Philipsen, *Diplomacy with Ambiguity: the Bilderberg Organization 1952-1977* (PhD diss., Københavns Universitet, 2009); Ian Richardson, Andrew Kakabadse and Nada Kakabadse, *Bilderberg People: Elite Power and Consensus in World Affairs* (London/New York: Routledge, 2011); Valérie Aubourg, “Organizing Atlanticism: The Bilderberg Group and the Atlantic Institute 1952-63,” in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, eds. Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003); Hugh Wilford, “The CIA, the British Left, and the Cold War: Calling the Tune?”, in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, eds. Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003), 225-261.

¹⁷ H.A. Kissinger, interview with the author, 4 January 2012.

Strategic Studies (IISS). Meanwhile, he also maintained close ties with the ‘Big Three’ American private philanthropic organizations: the Ford, Rockefeller and the Carnegie Foundations, which financed many of the Atlantic NGO’s and their unofficial transatlantic activities.¹⁸

After writing a dissertation on European integration as a concern of American foreign policy, Van der Beugel also entered academia in 1966 as professor of Western Cooperation after the Second World War at Leiden University. As such, he did not only share his knowledge within the university’s ivory towers but also came to manifest himself as a public intellectual who avidly contributed to the public debate on international affairs and who was regularly consulted as an expert on European and transatlantic relations by businessmen, journalists and government representatives alike. Through his activities in all these different spheres he developed an illustrious network that provided access to the likes of Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands.

While personal interests including social status, financial gain and a certain dose of vanity should not be disregarded, Van der Beugel was also driven by diplomatic goals, and in pursuit of these goals he continued to play a role on the transatlantic diplomatic playing field as a member of the Atlantic elite. Thus, Ernst van der Beugel is a good example of the kind of ‘unofficial diplomat’ described by Johnson (who himself served for many years as the U.S. Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings) and Berman. Even so the history of his private diplomatic endeavors – while recognized by some historians – has not been thoroughly studied and thus remains cloaked in mystery.¹⁹ He has been described as a “natural networker”, an “artist in the field of human relations”²⁰, and a “one man pressure group; someone who brings everyone in contact with everyone while functioning as the central linkman.” In his book on Dutch power structures, journalist Joris van den Berg also described Van der Beugel as a “master-plotter on the power map of the Netherlands” and applied the Dutch soccer term ‘*aangever*’ to illuminate his political role, referring to the soccer player who provides the crucial assist that enables a team member to score a goal.²¹ Another observer has compared Van der Beugel’s activities to the role of an 18th century French woman holding a *salon*.²² While these are telling descriptions, they only scratch the

¹⁸ On the role of foundations see: Interjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: the Ford, Carnegie, & Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); Volker R. Berghahn, “The Ford Foundation and the Forging of the Atlantic Community after World War II”, in *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, eds. Aubourg, Bossuat and Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2008) 92-112; Valérie Aubourg, “Problems of Transmission”, 416-443; Volker R. Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

¹⁹ Ernst van der Beugel does pop up in some studies involving post-1959 Dutch-American relations, see for example: Kim van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder Spanning: Nederlands-Amerikaanse Betrekkingen, 1969-1976* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011); Gijswijt, “De Transatlantische Elite”; Giles Scott-Smith and David Snyder, “‘A Test of Sentiments’: Civil Aviation, Alliance Politics, and the KLM Challenge in Dutch-American Relations”, *Diplomatic History* 37:5 (2013).

²⁰ C.L. Patijn to V. Halberstadt, 14 January 1998, file 1, C.L. Patijn Papers, National Archives the Hague (NAH) (translation mine).

²¹ Joris van den Berg, *De Anatomie van Nederland* (Amsterdam: de Bezige Bij, 1967), 172-174 (translation mine).

²² Jérôme Helderling, “Afscheid van een tijdperk”, *NRC Handelsblad*, October 14, 2004, p. 9 (translation mine).

surface of his activities and no in depth study on Van der Beugel's role in transatlantic affairs including both the official and unofficial realms of diplomacy has been done. A lack of appreciation for the unofficial realm and its actors is not only visible with regards to the historical treatment of Ernst van der Beugel. The historiography of Dutch diplomacy and diplomats generally lacks in depth studies of the unofficial realm of foreign policy and the informal activities of private diplomatic actors in it.²³ This is remarkable, especially since a small country like the Netherlands might actually be able to profit disproportionately from building strong personal relationships through informal networks and a leading role in unofficial circuits like the Bilderberg meetings, which – in the absence of considerable hard power – might enable them to punch somewhat 'above their weight' in the diplomatic arena.

Meanwhile, the changes in the diplomatic landscape described above, in particular the proliferation of non-state actors and the importance of the unofficial realm, are only increasing in relevance and are having serious implications for the ways in which diplomacy is to be carried out – also today. In its 2010 strategic report *Attached to the World: on the Anchoring and Strategy of Dutch Foreign Policy*, the Dutch Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) emphasized that the first step towards an effective Dutch foreign policy within the current international context is “to be aware and acknowledge that we live in a hybrid world (...) in which the worlds of state politics and non-state networks exist next to each other” and that this situation demands new approaches to foreign policy. While originally Dutch diplomacy was focused on ‘directing’, in the new hybrid world cooperation with non-state actors is crucial requiring a new emphasis on ‘facilitating’ and ‘connecting’. In the hybrid world of state and non-state actors, the authors would like to see the Netherlands at the center of significant networks arguing that “the more prominent its position in the network (a large number of contacts, the appreciation of other actors), the greater its capacity to acquire knowledge and services from other actors, to regulate the transmission of information and products within the network, and to determine agendas and frame debates.”²⁴

The wakeup call provided by the WRR report aimed at the foreign policy arena is also relevant to academia. While the diplomatic playing field has dramatically changed, especially with regards to “how and where diplomacy is done, as well as in who is seen to be engaging in diplomacy”, and despite developments in global and transnational history, many diplomatic historians – not just in the Netherlands – still look at diplomacy and diplomatic relations

²³ Some shorter pieces do focus on the unofficial dimension. See for example: Giles Scott-Smith, “A Dutch Dartmouth: Ernst van Eeghen's Private Campaign to Defuse the Euromissiles Crisis”, *New Global Studies* 8:1 (2014); Thomas Gijswijt, “The Bilderberg Group and Dutch-American Relations”, in *NL-USA: Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, eds. Krabbendam, van Minnen and Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom: 2009), 808-818; Gijswijt, “De Transatlantische Elite”. An example of a more in depth-study concerning a private citizen on the diplomatic playing field is: Wouter Meijer, *Ze zijn gék geworden in Den Haag: Willem Oltmans en de kwestie Nieuw Guinea* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009).

²⁴ Ben Knapen et al, *Attached to the world: On the Anchoring and Strategy of Dutch Foreign Policy* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011), 11.

through a classical Westphalian lens.²⁵ The result is a blind spot with regards to the unofficial realm of diplomatic relations, which in fact has become increasingly important over the course of the 20th century – and which was already present long before that.²⁶ As this dissertation will demonstrate, the hybrid world – consisting of an official and an unofficial realm – described in the WRR report already existed during the Cold War. That this required a different attitude towards diplomacy was something that Ernst van der Beugel already anticipated half a century ago. ‘Facilitating’ and ‘connecting’ were two of his key trademarks, although his activities also went beyond this. Nevertheless, diplomatic historians have been slow to adapt their state-based analytical frames to the changing diplomatic arena.²⁷ This is not to say that this state-centered historiography has not been of fundamental importance. Its authors are the ‘giants’ on whose metaphorical shoulders this research will stand. They have laid a critical foundation on which we can now build to expand our understanding of the diplomatic process by adding more in depth explorations of the unofficial sphere in an attempt to provide a more holistic understanding of diplomacy in a globalized world. Because, as Geoffrey Allen Pigman has argued, “if the idea of diplomacy is to remain useful, the profusion of types of actor and venue implies that our understanding of what diplomacy is and who does it needs to be broadened accordingly.”²⁸

Towards a New Diplomatic History

Important steps in this direction have recently been taken by historians leading the way towards a New Diplomatic History (NDH) that seeks to add new layers of investigation by focusing on the informal or unofficial realm of diplomacy.²⁹ This includes “reassessing the role and identities of those involved in the diplomatic realm, and how the distinctions between official state diplomats and non-state actors have become blurred” through “a

²⁵ Geoffrey Allan Pigman, *Contemporary Diplomacy: Representation and Communication in a Globalized World* (Cambridge: Polity, 2010), 22. On relevant developments in global and transnational history see: Akira Iriye, *Global and Transnational History: Past, Present and Future* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013).

²⁶ See: Keith Hamilton and Richard Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its evolution, theory and administration* (London/New York: Routledge, 2011), 229; Kenneth Weisbrode, *Old Diplomacy Revisited: A Study in the Modern History of Diplomatic Transformations* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 16-17; Important in this context is also the inherent social nature of the diplomatic profession, which admits no clear demarcation between private and official life (as Weisbrode for example also points out). For the role of the private realm in diplomacy in premodern history see: Maurits Ebben and Louis Sicking, “Nieuwe diplomatieke geschiedenis van de premoderne tijd: een inleiding”, *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, 127:4 (2014), 541-552.

²⁷ In the context of post-war transatlantic relations, see for example the following key textbooks: David Ryan, *The United States and Europe in the Twentieth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003); Jussi M. Hanhimäki, Benedikt Schopenborn and Barbara Zanchetta, *Transatlantic Relations Since 1945: an Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012); Geir Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945*. While Lundestad clearly recognizes the importance of unofficial elite networks and meeting places like the Bilderberg Meetings, his book does not fully integrate this dimension of the diplomatic process in his own study. The overall approach is state-centered and mostly focused on the outcomes of the diplomatic process.

²⁸ Pigman, *Contemporary Diplomacy*, 23.

²⁹ Giles Scott-Smith, “Private Diplomacy, Making the Citizen Visible”, *New Global Studies* 8:1 (2014), 2.

‘broadening’ and a ‘deepening’ of diplomatic studies: a widening of its field of interest, and a focusing of its attention on the individual, the particular and the ephemeral.”³⁰

While diplomatic history has acknowledged the informal activities of formal diplomats as well as the role of Track-Two diplomacy, which pays attention to informal efforts aimed at conflict resolution in tandem with formal negotiations, NDH scholars perceive the informal realm as worthy of investigation in its own right, allowing for the possibility of “a kind of Derridean rejection of the orthodox dualism that privileges the state over the non-state.”³¹ While NDH seeks to do away with the rigidity of the distinction between state and non-state actors, this does not mean that it deems the study of nation-states irrelevant or tries to supplant more traditional methods of international diplomatic scholarship. Instead, “it attempts to enrich this scholarship by an approach that is more transnational than international in that more attention is given to the role of individuals and non-governmental organizations in diplomatic practice who are often bypassed in the more orthodox study of diplomatic interaction and who cannot be bound by orthodox understandings of the ‘national interest’ or national identity” claiming that their stories need to be featured more prominently, as do historical analyses of their *modus operandi*.³²

Thus, New Diplomatic History calls for more in depth explorations and analyses of the process and machinery of diplomacy as opposed to a preoccupation with its outcomes. NDH scholars recognize “that where their subjects sit in and out of officialdom is important, but generally less important, than what they do and how and why they do it.”³³ Thus, as the very nature of diplomatic practice and the role (and the very notion) of the diplomat is being transformed in an ever-more dynamic global context, they “try to re-conceptualize the concept of ‘diplomacy’ and ‘the diplomat’ by questioning the traditional limitation of regarding them as no more than representatives of governments attending official meetings”. As a consequence, it touches upon the very identity and meaning of diplomacy itself and how it changed through the 20th century and attempts to sketch the broader playing field of ‘diplomacy’ that developed during this period. As Scott-Smith puts it: “Once the frame of ‘diplomacy’ is altered, so the kinds of actors who become visible change with it.”³⁴ So, who then is a diplomat within this new diplomatic framework? Kenneth Weisbrode, one of the trailblazers of NDH provides the following definition:

[T]he history of diplomats focuses on people who perform diplomatic roles, which means anyone who imparts to himself or herself the role of intermediary for reasons beyond his or her own individual interests. They need not serve or

³⁰ Kenneth Weisbrode, “The Task Ahead”, September 20, 2012, <http://newdiplomatichistory.org/the-task-ahead/>.

³¹ Scott-Smith, “Private Diplomacy”, 6; For an overview of recent scholarship on ‘Track Two Diplomacy, see: Peter Jones, *Track Two Diplomacy in Theory and Practice* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015).

³² Scott-Smith, “Private Diplomacy”, 2; Kenneth Weisbrode, “The New Diplomatic History: An Open Letter to the Membership of SHAFR”, December 2008, taken offline, but still accessible through the Internet Archive: <https://web.archive.org/web/20110820101715/http://www.shafr.org/passport/2008/december/Weisbrode.pdf>.

³³ Kenneth Weisbrode, “The Task Ahead”. See also: Pigman, *Contemporary Diplomacy*, 208.

³⁴ Scott-Smith, “Making the Citizen Visible”, 3.

represent states, although many do. They must, however, serve a set of interests, a cause or collective unit above and beyond themselves, and which in some way involves the crossing of borders and the inter-relationship of political entities.³⁵

It is this 'functional' or 'operational' definition of 'the diplomat' emphasizing not so much the position of a diplomatic actor in or out of officialdom, but rather the performance of a 'diplomatic role' that this study will build on. In doing so, it will, however, like Johnson and Berman did, still distinguish between 'formal' or 'official' diplomats on the one hand – referring to those individuals formally representing a nation state, and 'unofficial' or 'informal' diplomats on the other hand, who may also be referred to as 'private' or 'independent' diplomats, 'diplomatic entrepreneurs' or 'diplomats without portfolio'.³⁶ When Ernst van der Beugel exchanged the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the private sector, he became one of these unofficial diplomats, operating specifically in the context of Cold War transatlantic diplomacy.

Research Question

While traditional approaches to diplomatic history have prevented an in depth study of Ernst van der Beugel's transatlantic role through both official and unofficial diplomatic networks, this dissertation will contribute to this new brand of scholarship by answering the following research question: *How does New Diplomatic History offer a different appreciation of Ernst van der Beugel's role in transatlantic diplomacy compared to traditional state-centered diplomatic narratives?* In order to answer this research question, this dissertation will analyze Ernst van der Beugel's role in Cold War transatlantic affairs with a focus on the continuation of his diplomatic role as a private citizen, guided by the following subquestions: What did Van der Beugel's 'diplomatic role' entail – what was his *modus operandi* – and what enabled the continuation of this role in transatlantic diplomacy as a private citizen? What motivated Ernst van der Beugel's transatlantic activities and what was the set of interests, the cause or collective unit above and beyond himself that Ernst van der Beugel represented as a private diplomat?³⁷ But also: how did Van der Beugel perceive his own post-1959 role in transatlantic relations and how did his unofficial transatlantic activities relate to formal diplomacy?

To properly assess Ernst van der Beugel's 'diplomatic role' as a private citizen three case studies have been selected based on the three perceived challenges to the Atlantic Community that preoccupied Ernst van der Beugel the most: the Gaullist challenge during the 1960s, the problem of maintaining transatlantic strength in a time of détente, the breakdown of the Cold War consensus and the democratization of foreign policy during the late 1960's

³⁵ Weisbrode, "The Task Ahead".

³⁶ See: Giles Scott-Smith ed., "Who is a Diplomat? Diplomatic and Policy Entrepreneurs in the Global Age", *New Global Studies* 8:1 (2014); Linda Fritzingier, *Diplomat without Portfolio: Valentine Chirol, His Life and 'The Times'* (London/New York: Tauris, 2006); Carne Ross, *Independent Diplomat: Dispatches from an Unaccountable Elite* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007).

³⁷ Weisbrode, "The Task Ahead".

and the early 1970s, and the long-term challenge of transmitting the Atlanticist mindset to the next generation that had not lived through the same formative experiences as the generation that had been 'present at the creation' of the Atlantic Community. Together these case studies give an overview of the nature, diversity and scope of Ernst van der Beugel's unofficial diplomatic endeavors. In line with NDH the focus will be on the process and machinery of diplomacy rather than on its outcomes in the more traditional forms of treaties or policy papers. The diplomatic goals pursued by Ernst van der Beugel and his peers tended to be more subtle and fundamental, often not so much focused on immediate decisions, but rather on such things as creating a favorable atmosphere for transatlantic cooperation by fostering close personal relationships, mutual understanding and an 'Atlantic mindset', thus strengthening the social and intellectual fabric of the Atlantic Community and laying the groundwork for the realization of more concrete and short term goals.

A re-appreciation of Van der Beugel's role in transatlantic affairs focusing on the continuation of his 'diplomatic role' as a private citizen through the lens of New Diplomatic History also requires a re-evaluation of the pre-1959 period, including the development of his views and network during his career with the Dutch government. After all, while it tends to be obvious what an official diplomat ought to represent, namely his or her nation state – while executing the policy set out by the nation's leadership – this is not necessarily as obvious in the case of private actors. As independent agents they can set out their own course, based on their own convictions. Hence, in order to understand an unofficial diplomat's position on the diplomatic playing field it becomes more important to explore the personal convictions and motivations of these private actors in the diplomatic arena. In addition, if Van der Beugel's role in the diplomatic process was not solely determined by his official ties to a nation-state, this also begs the question: what other factors enabled him to continue to play a role in transatlantic diplomacy once these formal ties to the nation state had been severed? A reassessment of Van der Beugel's pre-1959 career in the light of his later role as a private actor will also help to answer this question.

While Ernst van der Beugel clearly plays a central role in this narrative, this study intends to move beyond the individual and to approach Van der Beugel's multifaceted career as a window upon the world in which he operated, offering valuable insights about the Cold War transatlantic elite and the informal dimensions of transatlantic diplomacy. By following an individual like Ernst van der Beugel through his activities within this transatlantic web we can gain a better understanding of how it functioned; about the ways in which the Atlanticist elite tried to foster, manage, and sustain a Cold War Atlantic Community and how these transnational elite-networks enabled a private individual like Ernst van der Beugel to function as an unofficial diplomat in pursuit of transatlantic unity based on common values and interests as well as a common threat.³⁸

³⁸ While there was no official "Atlantic Community", Ernst van der Beugel and many other members of the Atlantic elite in particular did perceive themselves as part of an Atlantic Community. Thus, like Aubourg and Scott-Smith, I will approach the 'Atlantic Community' concept based on the following assumptions: "that the Atlantic Community, as a

Why such a perspective is crucial to gain a better understanding of the role of the unofficial dimension in Cold War transatlantic diplomacy may become clear by looking at a study from a state-centered perspective that nevertheless acknowledges Ernst van der Beugel's unofficial role in the transatlantic diplomatic process, namely Kim van der Wijngaart's excellent book on Dutch-American relations during the 1970's "Bondgenootschap onder Spanning". Van der Wijngaart does a terrific job of incorporating Ernst van der Beugel's unofficial role within a state-centered framework. But, by looking at Van der Beugel from this perspective, his activities may come across as an incidental guest role on the diplomatic stage by one individual who once belonged to the diplomatic establishment. When we flip the perspective, however, as this dissertation attempts to do, it becomes clear that Ernst van der Beugel's activities were not just incidents, but part of a continuous and concerted effort by members of the unofficial transatlantic elite to partake in the multidimensional management of the transatlantic relationship; that these individuals were not playing an incidental guest role on the transatlantic stage, but were part of the diplomatic troupe, of the very social fabric of transatlantic diplomacy – and that they did not need to work in tandem with nation-states to contribute to and partake in the transatlantic diplomatic process. These unofficial actors do not necessarily execute tasks given to them by nation states, but often follow their own diplomatic agendas, based on their own initiative – at times in cooperation with a nation state, but also independently. These things only become clear when we change the perspective, when we approach the diplomatic process not from the perspective of the state, but through the eyes of the unofficial diplomat. This is what this dissertation intends to do.

While many studies on the Atlantic Community have focused on American conceptions of the transatlantic relationship often linked to the construction of an unofficial American 'empire', this dissertation will offer insight into the perspective and agency of a European Atlanticist in his attempts to foster and defend Atlantic unity under strong American leadership, thus further complicating more simplistic conceptions of Europeans passively undergoing American hegemony without playing an active part in the process themselves in pursuit of their own perceived national and transnational interests.³⁹ Thus, as Ernst van der

regional notion, was a product of the representations and imagination of individuals and groups in the sense of Benedict Anderson's 'imagined communities', and of the communication and discursive strategies of particular actors; that it was rooted in and produced by specific political contexts and expressed a distinctive political representation of the world; and that it performed a legitimizing function for institutions, political movements, and asymmetric power relations operating within the transatlantic relationship." Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith, "The Transatlantic Imaginary: Constructing the Atlantic Community during the early Cold War", in *European Community, Atlantic Community?* eds. Aubourg, Bossuat and Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2008), 14. Next to approaching the 'Atlantic Community' as 'imagined community', I will describe the constellation of formal and informal transatlantic organizations and networks described in this introduction as the embodiment of an "unofficial Atlantic Community".

³⁹ See: Geir Lundestad, "Empire by Invitation? The United States and Western Europe 1945-1952", *Journal of Peace Research* 23:3 (1988), 262-277. Geir Lundestad was one of the first historians to complicate this image in the late 1980s. As Mary Nolan put it: "America was hegemonic, but Western Europe consented; it was, to borrow Geir Lundestad's phrase, 'an empire by invitation,' or perhaps more accurately, by invitations from national elites that were accepted by the population with varying degrees of enthusiasm." Mary Nolan, *The Transatlantic Century: Europe and America, 1890-2010* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 205. Nevertheless, discussions of

Beugel guides us through both the public and the private spheres of half a century of transatlantic relations we can gain access to the unofficial dimensions of the Atlantic Community from a European perspective; to a world that still remains for a great part veiled in obscurity, but which was nevertheless an integral part of post-war transatlantic diplomacy.

Sources

Once the importance of the private and unofficial realm within the diplomatic process is recognized, it also becomes crucial to expand archival research beyond the formal government archives. Consequently, while the traditional sources of diplomatic history derived from government archives including formal diplomatic correspondence, telephone conversation transcripts and internal notes of Foreign Ministries as well as other government agencies have certainly not been neglected, the majority of primary sources analyzed for this dissertation have been derived from private archives – including privately owned documents, which have not been officially released to the public at large from the personal collections of Ernst van der Beugel, Henry Kissinger and David Rockefeller.

In addition to an analysis of relevant literature and archives, this study has also made use of oral history sources. Ernst van der Beugel himself participated in multiple oral history projects, including three interviews kept by the Truman Library concerning the Marshall Plan.⁴⁰ By far the most important oral history project that has been used for this research, however, is the result of an extensive series of interviews with Ernst van der Beugel set up by Albert Kersten in the early 1990s, which resulted in over a thousand pages of material on Van der Beugel's life and career.

The use of oral history always involves risks.⁴¹ Consequently, the author has tried to build her argumentation as much as possible on written primary sources. In chapter one, however, the use of oral history is relatively heavy due to a lack of alternative sources concerning Van der Beugel's childhood and upbringing. What is most important about this period, however, is Ernst van der Beugel's memory of this period, which allows us to understand how he interpreted these experiences, and how his interpretation of these experiences impacted his views. That is exactly what the oral history captures.

transatlantic relations still remain quite one-dimensional and the role, agency and initiative of Europeans in Cold War transatlantic relations remains understudied.

⁴⁰ In 1964 van der Beugel participated in an oral history project by Philip C. Brooks and in 1970 he participated in another oral history project for the Truman Library conducted by Theodore A. Wilson.

⁴¹ It is important to be aware of the fact that oral history never presents a direct gateway to the past, making it more prone to factual errors. For starters, oral history depends on the memory of individuals, which tends to be flawed as people forget things or generate false memories. Interviewees may also have their own reasons and interests to present the story in a distorted way on purpose. In addition, oral history does not only depend on the interpretation of actual events, but it is also the result of a specific interaction between interviewer and interviewee at a specific moment in time, which may also color the answers that are generated. For a more comprehensive discussion on the challenges and complexities uniquely related to doing oral history research see: Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, eds., *The Oral History Reader* (New York and London: Routledge, 1998); Lynn Abrahams, *Oral History Theory* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

In addition, the author has conducted interviews with a selection of individuals who knew Ernst van der Beugel well, including former diplomat and Secretary of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community Max Kohnstamm, former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, former Dutch Prime Minister Piet de Jong, former Dutch CHU politician and Minister of Development Assistance Berend Jan Udink, former Dutch Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Ben Knapen, the Dutch journalist and political commentator Jérôme Heldring, former KLM President Sergio Orlandini, the former Dutch diplomat Rob van Schaik and the Dutch historian Professor Henk Wesseling as well as Ernst van der Beugel's daughter Aukelien van Hoytema – van der Beugel and his second wife, Nelletje van der Beugel-Schas who, prior to their marriage, served as a secretary for the Bilderberg Meetings. While there are some references to these interviews in the chapters that follow, they have mainly been used as a source of background information for the author.

Structure

This dissertation consists of seven chapters, which are more or less chronologically structured, even though the last three chapters, containing the three case studies, have a somewhat more thematic character.

The first chapter introduces the reader to Ernst van der Beugel and the milieu in which he grew up. It deals with Van der Beugel's childhood, his student years during the 1930's and his survival as a Jewish youngster during the Second World War. A key element in this chapter is Van der Beugel's experience of the run-up to the Second World War – including the Munich agreement, an event Van der Beugel himself referred to as 'the great mistake of the West'. These events made a huge impact on Van der Beugel and his later approach to foreign policy as was the case for many members of his generation.

The Second chapter, "Present at the Creation", focuses on the beginning of Van der Beugel's career for the Dutch government, his first trip to the United States and his role in the Marshall Plan. By doing so, this chapter covers a decisive formative period not only in the career of Ernst van der Beugel and the development of his Atlanticist sympathies, but in the development of a transatlantic mindset and social fabric in a more general sense by demonstrating how the Marshall Plan – in which the American and European governments closely cooperated with business and industry, labor unions, defense circles and a diverse collection of other 'experts' – served as a catalyst for public-private cooperation in the United States, in Europe and on a transatlantic level. Close cooperation during the Marshall Plan years produced many transatlantic relationships that would form the nucleus of a transatlantic social network tied together by shared experiences, hopes, fears and goals. In this unique context on the crossroads of the public and private spheres at the cutting edge of international strategic and economic policy, Ernst van der Beugel developed into a key player

and expert with access to a complex web of public and private networks woven across the Atlantic during the post-war reconstruction of Europe.

While the second chapter emphasizes the post-war Marshall Plan *context* in which Ernst van der Beugel was active and the public-private structures and social networks that developed during this period, the third chapter focuses more specifically on the development of Ernst van der Beugel's political *ideas*, in particular with regards to the process of European integration and the transatlantic relationship. It covers the entire period of Van der Beugel's career with the Dutch government both as a civil servant and as State Secretary by focusing on the debates that unfolded during this period, his experience in the negotiations that led to the Rome Treaty and his effort to include England in the process of European integration – an effort that he would not abandon even after leaving formal diplomacy. It was also in this context that Van der Beugel as an official government representative was directly confronted with the power exercised by unofficial actors behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy, leaving a lasting impression on him. By the time he left the Dutch government his Atlanticist ideas had mostly crystalized – as had his fear for Gaullist challenges to an Atlantic oriented Europe.

Chapter four describes Van der Beugel's transition from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the private sector as he joined KLM Dutch Royal Airlines. It emphasizes the continuity of Van der Beugel's transatlantic activities as a private citizen and attempts to identify some of the key factors that motivated and enabled this transition. It also introduces the three case studies that make up the remaining chapters, each of which focuses on another perceived challenge to the Atlantic Community and the ways in which Ernst van der Beugel endeavored to counter these challenges through his private diplomatic endeavors. Thus, chapter 5 focuses on the Gaullist challenge during the 1960s, chapter 6 deals with the problem of maintaining transatlantic strength in a time of détente and the democratization of foreign policy during the 1970s, while chapter 7 deals with the more long-term challenge of the 'successor generation'. Together these chapters will shed light on the nature of Van der Beugel's unofficial transatlantic activities, on the ideas behind these activities and the relationship between these private endeavors and formal transatlantic diplomacy.

1. “The Great Mistake of the West”

“Those who have not experienced the 1930’s, during which my student generation witnessed the horrifying consequences of the lack of will-power and strength in the West, which brought the Second World War upon us, who have never experienced the simplicity of purpose of the Second World War, nor the joy of recovery and integration of the Western world, will approach the fundamental problems of international politics differently.”¹

A key component of New Diplomatic History is not just to reassess the role, but also the identity of ‘the diplomat’, for example by examining the development of the cultural, political and social contexts of those involved in the diplomatic realm and the networks to which they belong. It also means we need to take the private life – including the milieu and significant formative experiences – of these actors into account. As the above cited quotation demonstrates, Ernst van der Beugel clearly perceived his experience of the 1930s, followed by the Second World War, the liberation of Europe and Western cooperation as key formative experiences that profoundly influenced his post-war approach to international relations. Moreover, he seems to suggest that these experiences left a deep impact not just on him personally, but on an entire generation. This idea will largely be confirmed throughout the following chapters, as allusions to these experiences will resurface over and over again. It will furthermore become clear that the shared memory of these key moments in transatlantic history had a transnational appeal and left marks in the diplomatic arena as well. These shared experiences not only helped to foster strong transatlantic bonds among the generation that shared them, but also created a significant divide between this generation and the generation that followed; a generation whose formative years were not marked by world war, liberation, reconstruction and Western cooperation, but rather by the Vietnam War and Watergate, causing a very different appreciation of the transatlantic relationship and the values it embodied. This had clear repercussions for transatlantic diplomacy as it caused the challenge of the “successor generation”, which will be described in more detail in chapter 7.

Since these memories play such a fundamental role throughout the narrative that follows – both on a personal level in understanding what made Ernst van der Beugel ‘tick’ as a diplomat as well as in the development of the Atlantic elite and transatlantic diplomacy more generally – it is useful to take a closer look at the nature of these experiences, which will also help to gain a better understanding of the environment in which Ernst van der Beugel came of age and the foundations of his social network. While this chapter will mainly focus on the 1930’s and the war years, the following chapter will concentrate on the period of reconstruction and the development of post-war Western cooperation.

¹ Ernst van der Beugel, “Leiding VS in Atlantische wereld is onmisbaar”, *Het Parool*, August 23, 1968 (translation mine).

Youth and Student Years

The First World War still raged through Europe when Ernst van der Beugel was born on February 2, 1918 as the second child of Theodor Max van der Beugel and Sophia van Praag. Theodor van der Beugel was a self-made man. While born the son of a hairdresser, costume specialist and make-up artist who worked behind the scenes of Dutch theater, he had become a rising star on the firmament of the international banking world. As the daughter of the deputy director of a large textile wholesaler, Sophia van Praag was not born into the upper class either. They got married in the summer of 1913 and their first child, a daughter they named Ina, was born in December 1914. Born roughly three years later, Ernst would be the last addition to the family.

As a reorganizer of bankrupt businesses, Theodor Max van der Beugel had made it to senior partner of Labouchère & Co – one of the most eminent banking houses in Amsterdam which he had established together with Henri Labouchère. In practice, Van der Beugel ran the place, while Henri Labouchère, a real ‘country gentleman’, contributed the illustrious name. Theodor van der Beugel travelled an awful lot and had an exceptional cosmopolitan orientation for his time.² His network of friends and colleagues was tightly woven into the cobweb of transatlantic financial structures. He closely cooperated with the Warburg bank in London, Lazard in Paris and Chase in New York and was widely acknowledged as a member of the international *haute finance*.

While the Great War left its marks on the Netherlands despite the country’s official neutrality, Ernst’s childhood battles had more to do with his social background.³ He spent his elementary school days at the Hagendoornschool, an upper class private school where he had a “horrible” time. Except for his friend Ynso Scholten, the later minister of Justice, he did not have many close friends.⁴ Because his father had made an enormous jump on the socio-economic ladder Ernst was regarded as *nouveau riche*. Children’s parties at the school were extremely selective and as a result of his modest roots Ernst did not fit in. To make matters worse, his parents divorced in 1926. While they did so in a very civilized way – without fighting – this was still a deed that was very uncommon during those days. Ernst was the only child in his class with divorced parents.⁵

Theodor van der Beugel remarried immediately after the separation, while Ernst stayed behind in the family house in Amsterdam with his mother until his mother remarried four years later. Even so, Ernst’s father was never really out of the picture. He made sure that Sophia and the children could keep the same standard of living as before the divorce and he remained deeply involved in the upbringing of Ernst and his sister Ina. In the process, he bent over backwards to stay in close touch no matter where he was. He would travel long distances just to be able to spend his Sunday afternoon with his children and assisted them

² EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, file 61-66, Ernst van der Beugel Papers (hereafter “EvdB”), NAH, p.3.

³ On the complexities of Dutch ‘neutrality’ in practice during the First World War see: Wim Klinkert, Samuël Kruizinga and Paul Moeyes, *Nederland Neutraal: De Eerste Wereldoorlog 1914-1918* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2014).

⁴ Ibid., p. 24.

⁵ Ibid., p. 2.

with arithmetic problems over the telephone from Paris.⁶ Throughout his life, Theodor van der Beugel would remain a dominant presence in the life of his son who greatly admired him.⁷

With four Jewish grandparents, Ernst van der Beugel was of full Jewish descent, but his parents were not religious practitioners. “As far as anything of our Jewish identity trickled through in our upbringing, it was on the Day of Atonement – Jom Kippur: then we did not go to school, but stayed at home,” Ina van der Beugel recalled. “If we don’t do this’, our mother said, ‘it may cause people to think that we are ashamed of being Jewish.’ But she never got to explain to us, what *Jom Kippur* actually meant. Those things I had to look up later on in the book of rabbi Soetendorp.”⁸ Even so, the Van der Beugels were not free of certain Jewish atavisms. With few exceptions the families of both of Ernst’s parents exclusively tended to marry ethnic Jews and Friday nights remained special – not so much in a religious sense, but usually people did come over for dinner.⁹

While anti-Semitism was not yet as venomous during those days as it would become later on, during Ernst’s childhood Amsterdam was not particularly free of “emotional and social discrimination” against its Jewish population either. Many social and recreational clubs, like rowing club *De Hoop* and tennis club *Festina* did not accept Jewish members. The same was true for an association of Amsterdam’s economic and cultural elite called *De Groote Club*. For Theodor van der Beugel, however, they were willing to make an exception. A man of his stature was welcome to join the Club despite his Jewish background. Theodor, however, refused. “If I cannot come in through the front door, I will not enter through the back door either,” he proclaimed. Ernst regarded his father as a remarkable man with “a very pronounced sense of justice and injustice.” He was emotionally sensitive, highly principled and he possessed a strong sense of discipline. He was not the sort of man who took the easy way out.¹⁰

During the summer, Theodor van der Beugel took his children to Austria for the *Salzburger Festspiele* with its magnificent operas, plays and concerts. They also spent numerous holidays in Chenonceaux, France, where Theodor owned a second house about two hundred meters from the grand castle to which the little town in the Loire Valley owed its renown. When they visited the *Château de Chenonceau* and Ernst or his sister mentioned how incredible it was that the building had been constructed in 1521 and how pretty it was, Theodor would remark: “very pretty indeed – if you stood on the right side.” He knew from experience that wealth was not something one could take for granted and rarely missed an opportunity to point this out to his children. Every now and then he also took Ernst and Ina to one of Amsterdam’s poorest neighborhoods. Once there, he would address them from a

⁶ Ina van der Beugel, “Zeer persoonlijke herinneringen van Ina van der Beugel”, (private, 1990-1992), Private collection Aukelien van Hoytema-van der Beugel (hereafter “AHB”), p. 10. Ina van der Beugel recalls that her father would travel for thirty six hours by train for a meeting in Budapest just to be able to spend a Sunday afternoon with his children.

⁷ See for example: EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 4,6.

⁸ Ina van der Beugel, “Zeer persoonlijke herinneringen”, p. 47 (translation mine).

⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 15-16, 153.

¹⁰ EvdB/Kesten Oral History Interview, pp. 7-8, 10, 22, 911 (translation mine).

sagging sidewalk, saying “look, there are also children living in these circumstances”, recalled Ina van der Beugel. “We had no idea, though, what ‘these circumstances’ entailed exactly. We just really preferred going to the Tuschinski Theater instead.”¹¹

Ernst’s father was not a typical banker. Despite the enormous jump he had made on the socio-economic ladder, he consistently voted for the Social Democratic Labor Party (SDAP) – something that “simply did not happen within Amsterdam’s *haute finance* circles.”¹² He also read the socialist newspaper *Het Volk*, which had a clear emphasis on social justice.¹³ He was emotionally interested in the matters of his time and gave money to causes he supported like the *Amsterdamsche Kunstkring voor Allen*, which tried to make the enjoyment of art possible for lower middle class and working class people by organizing concerts, lectures and exhibits with entrance fees depending on a person’s ability to pay – a typical SDAP form of cultural policy. According to Ernst van der Beugel, these things made his father unique, but also lonely at times. While Theodor van der Beugel “strongly believed in accepting the consequences of one’s ideals,” Ernst observed that, at the same time, “you could not imagine somebody whose lifestyle differed so much from the lifestyle of the average social democrat.”¹⁴ The complex relationship between Theodor’s social-democratic ideals and his luxurious lifestyle might best be illustrated by the following recollections of Ernst’s sister Ina:

Years later, I realized that our car was a Cadillac. I simply thought that a car was a car and saw hardly any difference. In those days it was very common to have a driver. Practically everyone who owned a car also had a chauffeur who drove the vehicle, separated from the company by a glass window. Because of my father's socialist ideals that window was almost constantly turned down. The idea that it must have been quite painful for the driver that, as a result, the more confidential conversations always started with: “Turn up that window again,” apparently did not occur to him. Our driver was the only one in Amsterdam with a fixed day off in the week – an arrangement for which father was criticized by his colleagues. “What would be next if even drivers got a regular day off?”, they asked with exasperation. Drivers had enough days off when their employer stayed abroad. My father believed, however, that the first assertion was based on the right of the employee while the second assertion was based on the whim of the employer. But, the fact that drivers – including ours – spent entire evenings waiting just in case ‘Mr. van der Beugel’ needed him, did not occur to him. In fact, he tended to refer

¹¹ Ina van der Beugel, “Zeer persoonlijke herinneringen”, pp. 17-18; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 911 (translation mine).

¹² EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p.6 (translation mine).

¹³ Anjo G. Harryvan and Jan van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm: Leven en werk van een Europeaan* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 2008), 38. With the help of *Het Volk* journalist Piet Bakker, Ina van der Beugel, Ernst’s three-year-older sister, even started her career as a journalist at this newspaper.

¹⁴ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 7, 10; Ina van der Beugel, “Zeer persoonlijk herinneringen”, p. 18 (translation mine).

with great regularity to that fixed day off by saying: "oh yes, it is your day off...that is annoying..."¹⁵

Ernst van der Beugel seemed destined to follow in the footsteps of his father. As he put it: "If there was a plan, the plan was that I would study economics and join Labouchère." With this prospect in mind Theodor sent him to the *Openbare Handelsschool* (OHS), which was the customary school for future economics students at the time. As opposed to his elementary school days, Van der Beugel had an excellent time at the OHS. It was a completely new environment, which lacked the pretentiousness of the Hagendoornschool which stifled social interaction. Here the young Ernst was not an outcast, but totally included in the company of his fellow students. To Ernst van der Beugel, who was undoubtedly a very social type, this made a huge difference. "I do not think that the desire to fit in is unusual, but in my case it is obviously a very distinctive characteristic," he once remarked. "During my entire life, I have enjoyed the interaction with people. I'm not somebody who is easily self-contained."¹⁶

Advisors of Theodor van der Beugel had recommended that his son study economics at the University of Amsterdam, where he enrolled in the fall of 1935.¹⁷ The alternative was the Netherlands School of Commerce in Rotterdam, which was founded through private initiative with broad support from the Rotterdam business community. As opposed to Amsterdam, the Rotterdam school was not a university and focused more on the practical aspects of preparing students for a job in the business community than on academic development. By integrating the commerce faculty into the university in 1922, Amsterdam had chosen for a more academic approach.¹⁸ Theodor van der Beugel's advisors had recommended sending Ernst to Amsterdam not so much because they thought the economics education was better compared to Rotterdam, but because they perceived it as a great advantage to study at a university. In addition, sociology professor Willem Bongers – a prominent social-democrat and the father of Frank Bongers, one of Ernst's best friends at the OHS – had specifically recommended that Ernst join an elite student club called the *Amsterdamse Studenten Corps* (ASC).

The Amsterdam student population at the time consisted of a select group of approximately 2500 students.¹⁹ Tuition was high, scholarships barely existed and it was natural that parents paid for their children's education. With a little over 300 members, the ASC represented a relatively small portion of the total student community. While the ASC regarded itself as the embodiment of all students, its elitist character and high membership fees alienated many. About 60% of all students did not belong to any social club at all. At the

¹⁵ Ina van der Beugel, "Zeer persoonlijke herinneringen", p 11 (translation mine).

¹⁶ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 28, 32-33 (translation mine).

¹⁷ Ibid., 37-38 (translation mine).

¹⁸ Willem F.V. Vanthoor, "Zeventig jaar Economische Faculteit binnen de Universiteit van Amsterdam 1922-192," in *Samenleving en economie in de twintigste eeuw*, eds. Martinus M.G. Fase and Ids van der Zijpp (Leiden: Stenfert Kroese, 1992), 7.

¹⁹ Peter Jan Knechtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998), 26. To be more precise: in the academic year 1937-1938 a total of 2473 students were registered at the University of Amsterdam.

same time, the pillarization of Dutch society on the basis of worldviews and the emancipation of women had led to the emergence of new student associations. These new clubs drew mostly members from the middle class and attracted many students whose families had no history with the club. Since many of the professors had been ASC members themselves, the bond between the university and this club was still much closer than between the university and the other student associations.²⁰

Thus, the ASC was *primus inter pares* among Amsterdam's student associations and it was not entirely self-evident that Ernst van der Beugel would become a member of this select group. Just like the university itself, student club life was *terra incognita* for the Van der Beugels. The core of the ASC consisted of a rich variety of debating societies – twelve in total – each with its own traditions and identity. Ernst was eventually invited – one had to be invited – to join *Breero*, which he regarded as “one of the most colorful and sophisticated debating societies in Amsterdam.” According to the biographers of Max Kohnstamm, a four year older member of Breero who would become an intimate and lifelong friend of Ernst, “Van der Beugel was originally a bit of an outsider at Breero. At the ‘blooming’, the traditional recruiting session for the club, it was not beyond question whether Ernst should be invited as a member.” Or, as Ernst van der Beugel put it: “I sure did not owe my membership to my personal background.”²¹

Indeed, as a first-generation student, Ernst had to find his own way into the well-established club, where most other members followed in the footsteps of their fathers. Max Kohnstamm's father had been an ASC member and his oldest brother, Dolph, even was a member of Breero, but the Van der Beugels did not have any history in the ASC. In addition, most of Ernst's fellow students had received a classical high school education at the Vossius or Barlaeus gymnasium or the Amsterdam Lyceum, while Ernst had gone to the OHS, like his father before him. Theodor van der Beugel knew that the OHS was an excellent school, with outstanding teaching with regard to economics and political science as well as foreign languages, but since he did not have any university experience himself he “did not have the antennae”, according to his son, “to recognize that there were other elements” that mattered as well. Looking back, Van der Beugel praised the quality of the *Openbare Handelsschool*, but thought it was a “terrible pity” that he had not received a classical high school education like most of his university friends, including his elementary school buddy Ynso Scholten. Their high schools had better prepared them for a university education and they still had a choice of what to study once they entered the university. After finishing the OHS, economics was the only option while Van der Beugel's preference would probably have gone out to studying history like Max Kohnstamm.²²

When Ernst enrolled, the Amsterdam department of economic sciences counted approximately 250 students – almost one fourth of the economics students in the

²⁰ Ibid., 19, 33; Albert Kersten, *Luns: een politieke biografie* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2010), 35.

²¹ Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 37; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 41-42 (translation mine).

²² EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 28-29.

Netherlands.²³ The main faculty consisted of professors Nico Frijda and Theo Limperg, responsible for respectively political economy and business economics – the program’s two core mandatory subjects.²⁴ Other courses belonging to the economics program were civil and commercial law, economic history, geography, and statistics.²⁵ The renowned social historian Nico Posthumus, “without doubt an impressive man,” taught economic history at the department. “It was a real academic community”, Ernst recalled, “which was still small.” For Van der Beugel, one of the great benefits of studying at a university was the fact that he was not restricted to studying economic subjects. Instead, he took the opportunity to enroll in other courses like philosophy and sociology, and – above all – he was preoccupied with the ASC.²⁶ Club life was very intense, as Van der Beugel recalled:

In the club you saw each other more or less every day. You ate together and you went for a drink with each other every day. As a freshman you had to turn up for drinks at 6 PM, and twice a week we had beer at 11. If you did not appear they phoned you up. Friday night was a special evening. First the club went for a drink in the Carlton-corner, close to the Mint, then we ate together in the Poort van Cleef (now called Port van Cleve), then we went to Tuschinski’s, then back to the Carlton-corner and finally to the club bar.²⁷

At first, Max Kohnstamm frequently had to push Van der Beugel to come along for drinking sessions at the club. Soon, though, a strong bond developed between the two and Ernst became well known for his songs, jokes, party performances and knowledge of classical music.²⁸ “In Breero we quickly realized that he was extremely gifted and funny”, Kohnstamm recalled. “He was a great lover of classical music and possessed an enormous music collection. During those days, students could go to concerts almost for free. Often, we went to his home to listen to the music we were going to hear in the music theater, before we went to the actual performance.”²⁹ Joseph Luns, the future minister of Foreign Affairs and Secretary General of NATO, was another older ASC member. Luns recalled “many happy evenings spent with Ernst in and outside the club” and remembered Van der Beugel as a “very young student” who was “considered one of the brilliant young men of his generation. (...) Witty, highly intelligent, with a swift and original turn of mind and interested in more

²³ Vanthoor, “Zeventig jaar Economische Faculteit”, 10, 36; Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, 48.

²⁴ Vanthoor, “Zeventig jaar Economische Faculteit”, 8; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 54.

²⁵ H. Frijda and Th. Limperg Jr., “Aan de leden van de Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen, 27 april, 1939, Annex Notulen Vergadering II Mei, 1939”, file 1968, Archief van het Amsterdams Studenten Corps (ASC), Stadsarchief Amsterdam.

²⁶ Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, 58; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 38, 55 (translation mine).

²⁷ Harryvan and Van der Harst, Max Kohnstamm, 39-40. Translation by Ian L. Fraser, *A European’s life and work*, <https://www.parlement.com/9353202/d/kohnstamm.pdd> PDF e-book, p.24, accessed: August 4, 2016.

²⁸ Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 38.

²⁹ Max Kohnstamm, interview with the author, 27 January 2010 (translation mine).

problems than usual for young men, he became rapidly one of the popular students of his year.”³⁰

Looking back at his student years, Ernst van der Beugel concluded that the ASC had been of great importance to him. In 1965, he even wrote an article in the Labor Party's magazine *Socialisme en Democratie* completely devoted to the importance of these clubs. Since Dutch universities tend to be solely focused on transmitting academic knowledge, Van der Beugel regarded social clubs such as the ASC indispensable in the general education of university students. According to him, they focused on those elements that he considered essential to the full cultivation of students' personalities while preparing them for key positions in society:

In the club, being 'smart' does not equal a special recommendation if it does not come with a personality that is real. I am not aware of any other environment in which the instinct for true personality is so well cultivated as in the club. Next to all unforgettable pleasure (and there's nothing wrong with having some fun) the true quality of the club for me, above all, is the instinct for what is 'real' and the scorn for what is not. In this, the 'clubs' are rightfully tough, and through this process they contribute to the cultivation of an elite.³¹

Van der Beugel was convinced that the ASC had helped him to grow in his interaction with people. In addition, while his father's social network should not be forgotten, Van der Beugel regarded his student years, "without doubt", as the place where his own network began. People he got to know during this period, like Max Kohnstamm, Joseph Luns, Pieter Blaisse, Emile van Lennep, Hans de Koster, Antonie Knoppers and Jaap Kymmell, would cross his path again throughout his later career. Many of these friends would find each other again in The Hague, where the contribution of former Amsterdam students was relatively large after the Second World War.³²

³⁰ Joseph Luns, contribution in: "Book on Ernst", The Bilderberg Meetings, April 1980, Series 6, box 27, file 1, Shepard Stone Papers, Rauner Special Collections Library, Dartmouth College (hereafter: RSCL).

³¹ E.H. van der Beugel, "De Corpora," *Socialisme & Democratie*, 22 (1965), 232 (translation mine); See also: EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 41,48.

³² EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 39-40,51-52, 61, 565; E.H. van der Beugel, "Speech for the Netherlands-America Foundation, New York, November 15, 1990", box 96, file 8, George W. Ball Papers, Princeton University Library (PUL); Albert Kersten and Ralph Dingemans, Interview with Jaap Kymmell, 8 July 1998, accessed: August 4, 2016, <http://www.eui.eu/HAEU/OralHistory/pdf/INT661.pdf>. Joseph Luns would pursue a career as a diplomat and as a politician for the Dutch Catholic Party. Between 1952 and 1971 Luns served as Minister of Foreign Affairs after which he was appointed as the Secretary General of NATO. Partly due to his insistence, Ernst van der Beugel served as his Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs from January 8, 1957 until December 22, 1958; Pieter Blaisse would become a top civil servant at the Ministry of Economic Affairs. As such he would be instrumental in giving Van der Beugel a job as deputy director at the Planning department of the Ministry of Economic Affairs in 1945. Between 1952 and 1967 Blaisse was a member of the Second Chamber for the Dutch Catholic Party, the KVP; Emile van Lennep served as the Treasurer General at the Dutch Ministry of Finance between 1951 and 1969 after which he was appointed as the Secretary General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a position he held until October 1984; Hans de Koster served as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1967 until 1971. Between 1971 and 1973 he served as Minister of Defence, after which he joined the Second Chamber of the Dutch parliament as a member of the liberal VVD Party. As Minister of Defense, De Koster appointed Ernst van der Beugel to the Van Rijckevorsel Committee, an advisory committee on Dutch defense; Antonie Knoppers was a professor of Pharmacology at the

Ernst developed an “exceptionally close bond” with Max Kohnstamm. Van der Beugel: “We have had some wonderful years at the university. He was brilliant - absolutely brilliant - with a special ability, which he has always maintained, to formulate problems and to express emotions. He also had a very strong bond with my father.” According to Ernst, his father possessed an enormous empathy for youth, which “made that many of my friends, belonging to my generation, my university friends, had a relationship with my father in which I was not involved. For many of my friends my father was an extraordinary important person.”³³ The fact that Max Kohnstamm only spoke about Theodor van der Beugel at the dinner organized to celebrate that Ernst had received his master’s degree, illustrates this point.

Ernst also frequently visited the Kohnstamm family in their grand wooden house on the Dutch countryside in Ermelo. The Kohnstamm home was characterized by a very intellectual atmosphere with a fervent debating culture. Max’s father, professor Philip Kohnstamm, was a physicist, pedagogue and philosopher who acquired fame as the founding father of scientific pedagogy and didactics in the Netherlands. He also displayed a great interest in theology. He was married to Anne Kessler, the daughter of a former president of the Royal Dutch Oil Company which later became Royal Dutch/Shell. While *Royal Dutch* was not as successful yet when her father was in charge, her mother unexpectedly became very wealthy when her enormous pile of previously worthless stocks turned into gold after the spectacular revival of the oil company in the early 20th century. Although the Kohnstamms generally lived soberly, their living environment was the milieu of the bourgeoisie and all its privileges. All year round the hospitable Kohnstamm home was frequented by guests from different signature; from the renowned physicist Albert Einstein to poor children from Amsterdam who came to recuperate on the country side. With two sons in Breero the Kohnstamm home also served as an important meeting point for the debating society.³⁴

Professor Kohnstamm was formally affiliated with a progressive-liberal political party called the *Vrijzinnig-Democratische Bond* (the Liberal-Democratic Federation), but in practice his social and political engagement tended to reflect the mindset of the Social Democratic Labor Party. He was of Jewish descent, but had embraced Christianity in 1917 when he was 42 years old, after which he had become a member of the Barthian wing of the Dutch Reformed Church.³⁵ While Ernst came from a very different background, the Kohnstamms and Van der Beugels could relate to each other’s social-democratic engagement as well as their concerns about the rise of national-socialism.

Free University of Amsterdam before he joined Merck and Co. in 1952. He held various positions in the International Division of Merck Sharp and Dohme. In 1971 he became President and Chief Operating Officer of Merck. Ernst van der Beugel became a member of the Supervisory Board of Merck, Sharp & Dohme in 1967. Jaap Kymmell would become one of Van der Beugel’s closest advisors at the Directorate-General for the Economic and Military Aid Program at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He had received his PhD in Amsterdam in 1950 and between 1955 and 1973 he also worked as Professor of International Economic Relations at the Dutch School of Economics in Rotterdam. In this capacity he would also serve as Ernst van der Beugel’s PhD dissertation advisor.

³³ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 7, 384 (translation mine).

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 179, 384; Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 19.

³⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, 20,26.

The Worst Years: “The idea of war is growing more familiar to us every day”

Since his high school years at the OHS during the early 1930's, when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, Ernst habitually discussed politics with his father. Both men had the impression that things were going badly wrong in Europe. They closely followed developments in Germany compelled by more than sheer political interest. As a fully Jewish family the Van der Beugels were very much aware of the existential threat posed by National Socialism in the 1930's. This awareness was reinforced by the refugee problem, which brought large flows of Jewish immigrants from Austria and Germany to the Netherlands. Ernst van der Beugel experienced this development from up close since his father's second wife worked for the Dutch committee that tried to accommodate Jewish refugees to the Netherlands in the 1930's.³⁶

The Kohnstamms shared these concerns. Professor Kohnstamm had been born in Bonn, Germany, where many of his family members still lived. Through his German contacts, he was very well-informed about developments in his mother country. As a philosopher he acknowledged the dangers of National Socialism early on and published books on topics such as ‘the psychology of anti-Semitism’ and ‘national socialism as a spiritual danger.’³⁷ He was also a member of the anti-fascist society *Eenheid door Democratie* (“Unity through Democracy”) and the *Committee of Vigilance* of anti-national-socialist intellectuals, which had been founded in 1936 and in which the University of Amsterdam was well represented. Ernst and Max did not shy away from expressing their resentment towards Hitler's Germany either – sometimes in rather curious ways. Max Kohnstamm's biographers relate that Ernst's father regularly visited sanatoriums in places like Marienbad in today's Czech Republic. When during the late 1930's Max and Ernst joined him on one of these trips, they stubbornly held back their urine until they passed the Czech border out of rebellion towards the political situation in Germany “so as not to fertilize the German soil.” In compensation they gleefully threw their cigarette butts out of the car windows onto the German *autobahn*.³⁸

Despite the looming danger, Ernst decided not to leave the Netherlands, even though he had the opportunity to do so. The main reason for this decision was the close bond he experienced with his friends. “I did not leave,” he explained, “because I had the feeling that I belonged to a group of friends who thought like I did and I did not want to leave them to receive some kind of special treatment.”³⁹

The Amsterdam student club was traditionally more politically engaged than other Dutch student clubs. Next to the common view, which regarded feasts and partying as the main objectives, there was a social democratic-leaning wing interested in issues like unemployment and the rise of fascism. As a “progressive, *avant la lettre* artistic and political

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 35, 62.

³⁷ Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 46; Philip A. Kohnstamm, *Psychologie van het anti-semitisme* (W. Ten Have: Amsterdam, 1934); Philip A. Kohnstamm, *Het nationaal-socialisme als geestelijk gevaar* (Van Gorcum: Assen, 1936).

³⁸ Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 38-39 (translation mine).

³⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p.62 (translation mine).

debating society,” Breero clearly belonged to the latter.⁴⁰ While Van der Beugel was not extremely excited about his economics courses at the university, he shared a great fascination for Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal with his friends from Breero. “We were deeply impressed by the dreadful situation of American society during the crisis and captivated by the ingenuity of the New Deal. It was the first time that Keynes was brought into practice. There were some individuals in Roosevelt’s *entourage* whose books we read in which a new way of handling things was discussed.” In the Netherlands, it was not easy to get one’s hands on this American reading material during the 1930’s. American literature was not yet part of the economics courses at the University of Amsterdam. Instead, Ernst’s textbooks were predominantly German and French with a little bit of Keynes in English. Fortunately Ernst’s father, who shared his son’s interest in the New Deal and who regularly visited the United States for business, was able to help out in providing literature from the U.S. Whereas the New Deal was fresh and exciting, the European climate with its traditional austerity measures was significantly less inspiring. While the United States were rising up out of the Great Depression, Ernst and his friends had the feeling that things were reaching a deadlock in Europe. Overshadowing all the parties and pleasures of student life, there was always “the dark cloud of the 1930’s.”⁴¹

In 1936, Max Kohnstamm was selected from a group of approximately sixty students as rector of the ASC senate. Club leadership rotated between the two dominant factions in the ASC: the ‘reds’ and the ‘whites.’ “White” stood for ‘conservative’; a group that was linked to the Catholic debating society Hera, which took rituals and symbolism very seriously. Max belonged to the ‘red’ wing, which was less formalistic, although it also followed the club’s ‘mores’. Breero, in particular, was also “very outspoken in its resistance against national-socialism.” Kohnstamm succeeded the ‘white’ Joseph Luns who had succeeded the ‘red’ Henk Bonger jr. - one of Professor Willem Bonger’s sons.⁴² In his inaugural speech, Kohnstamm stressed the importance of community and described the character of the dark clouds which hung ominously on the European horizon:

Our social future is very uncertain. The idea of war is growing more familiar to us every day. As we await the day when we shall become involved in it with our own lives, we can follow the madness in South America, in Africa and in Spain. We have grown as familiar with race hatred and crisis as with food and drink. Every newspaper we open seems to bear witness to this craziness. It has permeated even our bookshelves, we see it in paintings and we hear it in music. Science, in which previous generations of students had a trust that seems to us childish, is leaving us completely in the lurch in the face of the threatening chaos. In a society that has lost all style, the rise of the hordes is threatening even the bulwarks of culture we had thought impregnable. In the middle of all this, are we perhaps to stand among

⁴⁰ Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, p 36; Kersten, *Luns*, 35; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 911.

⁴¹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 43, 165, 174, 179, 165 (translation mine).

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12, 911; Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 42 (translation mine).

the group of cynical onlookers, recruited from every rank and class? Then where so many are talking we might as well maintain a decent silence. But that is not what our place is!⁴³

In 1937, with Max Kohnstamm in the lead, the ASC lustrum celebrations were used as a manifestation against national-socialism. Next to speeches by students and professors and a concert with lyrics written by the Dutch anti-fascist poet Albert Verwey, the ASC staged the play 'Liluli' by Romain Rolland in the famous Amsterdam theater *Circus Carré*. The subtle social critique of this production, which Rolland wrote primarily as a response to the 'infatuation of public opinion' during the First World War, did not go unnoticed. The eminent Dutch modernist author, publicist and devout anti-fascist Menno ter Braak wrote an extensive article about the play in the Dutch newspaper *Het Vaderland* saying it "exceeded all other lustrum plays he had ever seen in importance."⁴⁴ Despite the efforts of Kohnstamm and the ASC Senate to add a more serious tone to the lustrum celebrations, the group that really took note was probably rather small. As the Dutch historian of Amsterdam student life, Peter Jan Knegtmans remarked: "To his young audience, [Kohnstamm's] serious words probably sounded like rumbling in the distance on a beautiful summer day. On the outside, the most distinctive characteristics of the club were still its formal pomposity, its condescension of the common man and its explicit and often noisy presence at any more or less official or festive ceremony of the Amsterdam elite."⁴⁵

In 1938, Ernst van der Beugel was chosen as secretary of the ASC senate, causing his father to hesitatingly ask him whether this was really a good idea. "In those days it was sensible not to expose yourself too much as a Jew, he believed", recalled Ernst's sister Ina. "We thought that was ridiculous. We lived in the Netherlands. 'If that is what you are thinking', I remember myself saying, 'you should leave for Israel right away'. That was not what we were thinking. My brother joined the senate, and as far as I know, it gave him nothing but joy."⁴⁶

In March 1938, Ernst van der Beugel and his friends listened with tears in their eyes to the radio when the news came in that Germany had annexed Austria. They had read *Mein Kampf* and were well informed about Hitler's political ideas, which they regarded as utterly despicable. Books like *Die Revolution des Nihilismus* by the ex-Nazi Herman Rauschning, and *Edda en Thora* by the Dutch protestant theologian Heiko Miscotte served as important sources on the attitude of the West for Ernst and his friends.⁴⁷ They talked about the

⁴³ Harryvan and van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 43. Translation by Ian L. Fraser, *A European's life and work*, 27.

⁴⁴ Menno ter Braak, "Het lustrumspel 'Liluli': Romain Rolland's idealistische critiek op den publieke opinie en den oorlog", *Het Vaderland*, 26 June, 1937 (translation mine); EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 42, 59; Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, 16-19.

⁴⁵ Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, 18-19 (translation mine).

⁴⁶ Ina van der Beugel, "Zeer Persoonlijke Herinneringen", 32 (translation mine).

⁴⁷ See: EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 276. Rauschning had renounced Nazi party membership in 1934. In his 1938 book *Die Revolution des Nihilismus* (translated in English as *The Revolution of Nihilism – Warning to the West*) he wrote that the National Socialism that came to power in 1933 was no longer a nationalist but a nihilistic revolutionary movement destroying all values and traditions. Miscotte strongly opposed national socialism and

attitudes of France and England and the consequences of their actions for the Netherlands. After the Munich agreement between Hitler and Chamberlain was signed in September 1938, the event was discussed at length within Breero. The conclusion was that this had been a huge mistake. “We thought it was an abomination,” Van der Beugel recalled afterwards. After the annexation of Austria and the occupation of the Rhineland he regarded this as the next step towards war. They had assumed that at some point the English and French would stop Hitler. Instead, the European countries believed that they could make deals with Hitler – to appease him. “We were convinced that in principle you could never make a deal with Hitler”, said Van der Beugel. The failure of France and England to prevent Hitler from executing his catastrophic plans was the great disillusion. Van der Beugel: “The way in which [the French and the English] behaved after 1933 was not only morally gutless, but it was also incredibly foolish, because it directly affected their own interests.” Van der Beugel’s worst fears seemed to materialize. He worried that Hitler would go on and invade the Netherlands, eventually establishing the control of national socialism over the entire European continent.⁴⁸

Kohnstamm and Van der Beugel were not just shocked by what happened in Munich, but also by the Dutch response. “We witnessed this as the absolute catastrophe, while in 98% of the world and in 99% of the Netherlands flags were hung out” to celebrate that peace had been maintained.⁴⁹ Van der Beugel experienced an intense sense of loneliness during this period.

This has without any doubt greatly influenced my political thinking after the war, that despite the incredible pleasure of those student years, with regards to the world I experienced the 1930’s as the worst years – partly because of the loneliness. Not some kind of personal loneliness, but the loneliness of the West; the small minority that was completely appalled by what happened in Munich in 1938. Almost nobody in the Netherlands was appalled. You could barely see the houses because of all the flags indicating celebration.⁵⁰

What stung Van der Beugel’s little band of friends especially “was the lack of acknowledgement of the demonic dimension of national socialism. This we experienced as the worst of all. And the group who understood this, who saw through this, was extremely small.” The loneliness described by Van der Beugel was instigated by a feeling of “we are right and nobody sees it. The masses don’t see it and neither do our political leaders.” Instead, Van der Beugel recalled, “we were confronted with all that empty talk of the Netherlands being the Jeanne D’Arc of the world.” Van der Beugel particularly detested the attitude of the Dutch government which was characterized by the “arrogance of neutralism, the idea that whatever

fascism in his work and was part of a Barthian resistance group from the Dutch Reformed church in the south of Amsterdam to which Ernst van der Beugel’s father in law also belonged.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 62, 65, 70 (translation mine).

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 129 (translation mine).

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 62 (translation mine).

was going to happen, the Netherlands would stay out of it. Nothing was going to harm them. No, they were a shining example.”⁵¹

The image Van der Beugel sketches here is, of course, a rather black and white caricature of the Netherlands and Dutch neutrality during the run-up to the Second World War.⁵² Even so, it is important to be aware of the fact that this was how Ernst van der Beugel memorized these events as these memories informed his thinking later on. For the rest of his life Van der Beugel would remember these experiences as a grandiose failure in the history of Western leadership. “The great mistake of the West,” he said, “can be found in the 1930’s. It was not that they did not bomb Auschwitz. It was too late by then. The West is to blame for the 1930’s (...) for non-intervention after the re-militarization of the Rhineland, for neglecting to intervene in Austria, for non-intervention in Abyssinia and for the idea that you could make deals with Hitler.”⁵³ Their hope was now vested on the arsenal of democracy still standing on the other side of the Atlantic. As Van der Beugel would later recall: “already in this situation, although at that moment still unnoticed, the instinct was already present, that the only ones who could help us out of trouble were the Americans. It was a very strong instinct (...) that the Americans were in the reserve and that they had the ability to stop this absolute downfall. I remember that my father greatly influenced this.”⁵⁴

Theodor van der Beugel was not the only transatlantic traveler who infused Ernst with stories about the New World. Shortly after the Munich catastrophe, Max Kohnstamm embarked on a nine-month journey through the United States. His trip was enabled by a scholarship of the World Council of Churches, which was established only shortly before. In the U.S., Kohnstamm bought a second-hand car for 150 dollars and went on a road trip to study the labor and industrial relations of the New Deal while sharing his experiences through an intensive correspondence with family and friends back home.⁵⁵

During his journey, Kohnstamm beheld from up close the profound scars that the Great Depression had cut in American society and was deeply impressed by the grinding poverty he witnessed in the South. He was particularly upset about the extreme poverty and racial discrimination to which the African-American population was exposed in these states. At times his indignation almost dripped from the pages of his letters. At the same time, he was also captivated by the social revolution that the United States had gone through since Franklin Delano Roosevelt had come to power in 1933. Here he witnessed the social-democratic ideal of the ‘socially engineered society’ as preached by the SDAP in practice. Among Americans, the feeling prevailed that they were going to improve the world, that they could do this and that the government could play a positive role in the social life of its

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 67,72.

⁵² For a more nuanced understanding of Dutch society during this period see: Gerke Teitler, ed. *Tussen Crisis en Oorlog: maatschappij en krijgsmacht in de jaren '30* (Dieren: De Betaafse Leeuw, 1984).

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 62-64 (translation mine).

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 72, 129 (translation mine).

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 156. A selection of Max Kohnstamm’s letters has been published in: Max Kohnstamm, *Nog is er geen oorlog – Briefwisseling tussen Max en Philip Kohnstamm, 1938-1939* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001).

citizens. “The new society, if anywhere, will be built here,” Kohnstamm proclaimed, thus further instigating the fascination with the New Deal among his friends back home.⁵⁶

For a Dutch student to visit America in those days was an extraordinary rare event. In fact, it was so exceptional that Kohnstamm’s entire debating society escorted him on two open carriages to the train station to send him off.⁵⁷ Ernst closely followed Max’s adventures and observations from the other side of the Atlantic. Kohnstamm, in turn, also frequently wrote about the menacing threat of war in Europe in his letters. He shared Van der Beugel’s indignation concerning the Dutch attitude after the Italian attack on Albania in April 1939 and informed the home front about the political climate in the United States, including his expectations with regards to America’s response if war would in fact break out. “In the case of war, American hatred towards England will be insignificant,” Kohnstamm wrote on 26 February, 1939 from a YMCA in Tennessee that was so dirty that he wrote his letters wearing gloves and took his showers with his clothes still on. “I increasingly have the feeling that America will join after approximately four months, at the very least through active weapon supply.”⁵⁸

Two months later the idea was born that Ernst would also travel to America to accompany Max during the summer months on a trip to California. Kohnstamm’s mother, who heard of this plan from Ernst on the phone, responded disappointed – not so much because this meant that Max would not come home for the summer, but because she was afraid the trip would lapse into ‘sightseeing’, which was clearly not supposed to be the objective of the journey. “I think it would be better,” Max’s father wrote in response, “if you could get in touch with individuals who can help facilitate Western cooperation, which seems to become a more urgent necessity with every week that passes (because, it is of course utterly unlikely that Hitler will live up to his assertion that he will henceforth only serve peace).”⁵⁹

While Max was in the United States, his father read the book *Union Now: a Proposal for an Atlantic Federal Union of the Free* (1939) by the Atlanticist New York Times journalist Clarence K. Streit, which left the professor quite impressed. Professor Kohnstamm recommended Max to read the book and encouraged him to meet with Streit, arguing that “it is a man who knows something and who dares to think in the right direction and from good principle.” Streit’s book would eventually mark the beginning of an Atlanticist movement that grew in popularity after the Second World War. Whether Max actually met with Streit during his trip does not become clear from his (published) letters, but the book certainly left a deep impression on him. In fact, it would plant the seeds for his ideas on a European federation after the Second World War.⁶⁰ What does become clear, however, is that Kohnstamm

⁵⁶ Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 51 (translation mine).

⁵⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 165.

⁵⁸ Max Kohnstamm, *Nog is er geen oorlog*, 47 (translation mine).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 61 (translation mine).

⁶⁰ Jérôme Heldring, interview with the author, 1 December 2010. Jérôme Heldring maintained a lively correspondence with Streit, especially during the 1960s. In 1965 Streit met with Ernst van der Beugel in an attempt to

eventually recommended Van der Beugel not to join him on his trip to the West Coast – “mainly,” he wrote, “because I have the feeling that one should undergo the immense experience called ‘America’ not in the company of a friend, but by oneself.”⁶¹

A journey to the United States was also part of the education Theodor van der Beugel had in mind for his son. Ernst’s sister Ina had studied journalism in London after which she had lived for two years in New York during the late 1930’s. She had her own section in the Dutch daily newspaper *Het Handelsblad* called “Under the Skyscraper” in which she shared her impressions of American society with her Dutch readers. According to Ernst, his father was “*avant la lettre* very much focused on the United States” and through their upbringing he had given his children the impression that the United States “was the country where *it* really happened.” This idea had only been confirmed by the experiences of Max Kohnstamm. While an internship with a befriended banker on America’s East Coast might have been the obvious choice – considering the career path Theodor van der Beugel envisioned for his son – this was not what he had in mind. Instead, he planned to send Ernst for postgraduate studies to an American university. First, however, Ernst needed to finish his studies in the Netherlands. Unfortunately, by the time he graduated it was 1941 – the war had come in between.⁶²

The War Years

While Ernst van der Beugel entered the ASC senate dressed in civilian dress in 1938, he wore a military uniform by the time the next senate transfer came around a year later. On August 1939 the (still neutral) Netherlands had started its general mobilization. A week later, when England and France declared war to Germany, a quarter of a million Dutch soldiers – professionals, reservists and draftees – were called to active duty. The University of Amsterdam had to do without 20% of its male students. Ernst had also been called upon. As a student he had been exempt of the regular draft, but now the situation had become too serious for further delay of military training and Ernst was sent to the Dutch military academy in Breda.⁶³

On May 10, 1940, Germany attacked the Netherlands. Five days later, the Dutch surrendered. With the Nazi occupation soon came the repression of the Jewish population. At the University of Amsterdam a *numerus clausus* for Jewish students was introduced. In September 1940, only 213 Jewish students, including Ernst van der Beugel, were allowed to continue their studies. Applications of first year students of Jewish descent were not accepted and the selection of Jewish students that could continue their studies had to face many restrictions. They were not allowed in libraries, reading rooms or museums and each

recruit him as a spokesperson for his movement of Atlantic federalists. Van der Beugel, however, found Streit’s ideas too idealistic (and referred to his movement as the ‘Clarence Streit boy scouts’). Instead, he became an advocate of a more realist stream of Atlanticism. See: “Netherlands, 1945, 1955-1967”, box 28, Clarence Streit Papers, U.S. Library of Congress.

⁶¹ Max Kohnstamm, *Nog is er geen oorlog*, 59-60, 62, 64 (translation mine).

⁶² EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 38, 166 (translation mine).

⁶³ Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, 73; Aukelien van Hoytema, interview with the author.

month that screw was tightened more and more with little things, Van der Beugel recalled: “not allowed in the tram, not in the train, not allowed to sit on benches, not allowed into the movie theater, and so forth.”⁶⁴

On 26 November 1940 Ernst van der Beugel married Miekje van Bruggen, who studied medicine in Amsterdam and did not share Ernst’s Jewish background. They had met as students and “probably would not have married at such a young age if the circumstances had been normal.” He was 22, she 21. In consultation with Miekje’s father, they decided to get married on that day because they had read in the newspaper that because of Ernst’s Jewish background, this would soon be prohibited. The wedding ceremony took place in the Willem de Zwijger Church in Amsterdam and was led by Ernst’s father in law, the Dutch reformed reverend van Bruggen. During the service news came in from the University of Leiden where Professor Rudolph Cleveringa had just delivered his famous speech in which he protested against the resignation – forced by the German occupation authorities – of his mentor and colleague professor Eduard Maurits Meijers as well as other Jewish professors. According to Van der Beugel, the ceremony subsequently “turned into a massive demonstration with hundreds of people – mostly students and acquaintances of his in laws – and ended with the singing of the patriotic [student song] *Io Vivat* in the church.”⁶⁵

Van der Beugel was able to finish his studies just before Jewish students and professors were completely excluded from the university. It was customary for economics students at the time to write their doctoral thesis based on an internship at a company of their choice. Despite the relatively more academic approach to economics at the University of Amsterdam, real academic doctoral theses about general economic problems were still extremely rare. Ernst’s father had arranged an internship for his son at Wilton-Feijenoord, a Dutch shipbuilding and repair company, where Theodor served as a member of the advisory board. Based on this internship, which Ernst was able to finish before the war broke out, he wrote his thesis about problems in the shipbuilding industry. He was able to take his exam in political economics before professor Frijda was forced to stop his work at the university because of his Jewishness in November 1940. Van der Beugel eventually graduated on July 10, 1941. On the 28th of October 1941 the ASC senate, by now under the leadership of Ynso Scholten, dissolved itself as a response to the Nazi demand to ban Jews from the club.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Ibid., 131; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 78 (translation mine).

⁶⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 79-80. *Io Vivat* is a student song, which was often sung loudly by groups at fraternity gatherings, but the song was also considered appropriate for use at quiet, patriotic civil celebrations and memorial services, containing phrases like “Hooray, long live the good health of our people. May those who hate us perish. May our friends always prosper”. See: “Broadside Ballads - 6. Io, Vivat”, Meertens Institute, accessed: August 6, 2016, http://www.geheugenvannederland.nl/?en/collecties/straatliederen/6._io,_vivat

⁶⁶ “Doctoraal Examen Ernst Hans van der Beugel”, file 394: Registers van kandidaatsexamens afgenomen door de Faculteit der Handelswetenschappen en vanaf 1936 de Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen, met indexen 1923-1964, Archief van de Universiteit van Amsterdam: Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen en Econometrie, Stadsarchief Amsterdam; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 56, 60; Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*, 86, 132; A.C.A.M. Bots, “Frijda, Herman (1887-1944)”, Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland, 12 October 2013, accessed on August 5, 2016, URL:<http://www.historici.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn2/frijda>

After his graduation Ernst van der Beugel started to do research for a PhD dissertation he planned to write about the New Deal based on literature he had already collected on the subject before the war. In addition, he assisted his father in law, who was the chairman of the Dutch Reformed congregation in Amsterdam and a leader of the resistance movement within the church. Van der Beugel became part of this group, which focused mainly on the distribution of food coupons and false identification cards for individuals who were in hiding. Three or four times a week he walked for 70 minutes to the “Nieuwe Kerk” (“New Church”) to help with the administration of the baptized Jews.⁶⁷

In January 1942, some close friends of Ernst van der Beugel, among whom were Max Kohnstamm and Ynso Scholten, were arrested and sent to detention camp Amersfoort. The arrest was a retribution for an attack on a house of the national-socialist student front in Amsterdam earlier that month. They were released three months later on Hitler’s birthday – wrecked, broken and utterly famished. “This was our first experience with a concentration camp,”⁶⁸ Van der Beugel recalled. Meanwhile, Ernst and Miekje lived on and off in their own home, where they had a hiding place for Ernst. They also spent some time in hiding at different addresses, mostly at acquaintances of the Kohnstamms.⁶⁹

One early morning in 1943 Ernst and Miekje were at their own house when somebody knocked on their door. The visitors turned out to be two SS officers who had just completed a series of arrests in a resistance movement to which Ernst was connected. In the process they had come across his name. Since Van der Beugel had not anticipated anything unusual, he had not retreated to his hiding place and was apprehended right away. At that moment Miekje was eight months pregnant of their first child. With both his Jewishness and the charges of illegal activities testifying against him, Ernst said his goodbyes after which he left the house convinced that he would return never again.⁷⁰

He was brought to the SS *Zentralstelle für Jüdische Strafsachen* where he had to walk up stairs whose steps were covered with human bodies as a means of intimidation. Once confronted with the SS-officer who was in charge of his file Van der Beugel realized that denial was nonsensical. Instead, he decided that his only chance of survival was to resort to a more unorthodox tactic. After the SS-officer asked Van der Beugel about his father in law being a reverend and disclosed that he was an elder in the *Evangelische Kirche* himself, Van der Beugel had found his strategy and appealed to the SS-er’s conscience by questioning and attacking the compatibility of the officer’s ecclesiastical role with national-socialism. When the conversation was over, however, the effort seemed to have been in vain as the officer told Van der Beugel that he would be locked up to expect deportation to camp Westerbork first thing in the morning.

⁶⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, pp. 86, 91, 175.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p.75; Harryvan and Van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 65, 71 (translation mine).

⁶⁹ They spent some time in hiding with the Heyning family in Beverwijk and with Ms. Fokker a sister of Max Kohnstamm’s mother. See: EvdB/Kersten Oral history, p 76.

⁷⁰ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 84.

“That night at 4 o’clock,” Van der Beugel recalled, “that same officer entered my prison cell and said: “*Raus!*” He opened the doors of my cell and the entrance to the building downstairs and put me on the street.”⁷¹ Despite the fact that he had to walk the streets of Amsterdam in the middle of the night with a Jewish star stitched to his clothes, which was strictly forbidden, Van der Beugel was able to return home safely. It would not be the last time that he jumped through the eye of the needle while escaping deportation. As a result of his marriage with a non-Jewish woman Van der Beugel had winded up in a rather exceptional position. During the first years of the war, the mixed-marriage stamp in his passport had excluded him from the dire fate of most other Dutch Jews, the majority of whom had been deported to concentration camps by 1943. While almost all other exemptions were withdrawn as time passed, most mixed-married Jews continued to receive special treatment.⁷² In the fall of 1943, though, the law seemed to change to the detriment of Ernst van der Beugel as mixed married Jewish men without children would be excluded from requests for exemptions from 12 September onwards. Again, Ernst van der Beugel was able to escape deportation just in time when on 11 September, 1943 – just one day before the new law would become effective – his first daughter was born. Hence, Van der Beugel would contribute the fact that he had survived the war to the ‘mixed-marriage stamp’ in his passport and to the birth of his first daughter, Aukelien.⁷³

The start of the war had taken away the piercing feeling of loneliness that had overtaken Van der Beugel in the years leading up to it, “because,” he explained, “those who had seen it coming and those who had not came together at that very moment. At once, there was one common enemy.” In contrast to the loneliness of the run up to the war, Van der Beugel had experienced a “most incredible intensity of social and intellectual contact” during the war itself. He ran from one discussion group to the next to talk about the situation at hand as well as the future of the post-war world – an experience he would later describe as a “feast of human and intellectual contact.” The war simplified all discussions. “There was only one issue: how to win the war and what will happen afterwards?” Van der Beugel recalled. “Never again did I have such an intense contact with people.” Inspired by these lively conversations, and convinced that the realization of the anticipated future – the rebuilding of the country – would begin in The Hague, the war had put Ernst van der Beugel on a new track that led towards civil service. Consequently, just a couple of days after the liberation of the Netherlands he took an old rusty bicycle with wooden wheels and pedaled to The Hague.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 85 (translation mine).

⁷² For a detailed history of mixed married Jews under the German occupation in the Netherlands see: Coen Stuldreher, *De Legale Rest: Gemengd getrouwde joden onder de Duitse bezetting* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2007).

⁷³ Stuldreher, *De Legale Rest*, 293; EvdB/Kersten Oral History, 83.

⁷⁴ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, pp.74, 85, 108 (translation mine).

Conclusion

The international nature of his father's work and social network made Ernst van der Beugel aware of a broader international context from early childhood on and endowed him with a broad, cosmopolitan perspective and an interest in foreign affairs. From an early age onwards, Van der Beugel exhibited a special interest in the United States, a fascination that was inspired by his father's regular visits to the country, his sister's stories as a New York journalist and Max Kohnstamm's travels as a student. It also expressed itself in his fascination, shared by his college friends and nourished through American books provided by his father, for Roosevelt's New Deal policies.

The importance of personal relationships, of social bonds that blur the lines between the diplomat's personal and professional life stressed by New Diplomatic History is also relevant in this context. After all, the foundations of Ernst van der Beugel's social network and status are also rooted in the period described in this chapter. His father's status as a member of the international *haute finance* provided access to an extensive transnational social network and student club life further introduced a young Van der Beugel to Dutch elite circles. During his student years Ernst van der Beugel also started to weave his own social network. The personal bonds that he developed during this period with individuals like Max Kohnstamm, Pieter Blaisse, Emile van Lennep, Hans de Koster, Antonie Knoppers, Jaap Kymmell, Ynso Scholten and Joseph Luns would not just be of personal but also of professional significance during his later career.⁷⁵

Furthermore, Van der Beugel's approach to international relations would forever be informed by his experience of an existential threat, appeasement, war and liberation. The existential threat Ernst van der Beugel experienced as a Jewish man under the Nazi regime was real and immediate. Once the war was over the fear of suppression by authoritarian rule again seemed to linger just around the corner in the context of the Cold War. His memory of the experience of the loneliness of belonging to a small group that acknowledged the threat of the demonic character of national socialism amidst the joy of the masses about appeasement at Munich, the celebration of a neutrality drenched in idealism and characterized by a moral superiority that looked down upon power politics, may very likely have strengthened Van der Beugel in his own convictions when also during the Cold War his ideas were not always in sync with what was popular among the public at large. He would forever be disgusted by idealistic rhetoric that depicted the Netherlands as the "Jeanne D'Arc of the world" while presenting neutrality and weakness as morally superior to taking a strong position against authoritarian power. In Van der Beugel's mind, the American role in the liberation of Europe would stand in stark contrast with the "the great mistake of the West": the failure of the European countries to stop Hitler in the 1930s. The lessons he took from these experiences – that power relations were fundamental; that a dangerous enemy should be confronted from a position of strength and that weakness, neutrality and appeasement in

⁷⁵ See footnote 32 of this chapter.

the face of such an opponent were never acceptable – would be essential to the way in which he would approach international relations and defense policy for the rest of his life. It also demonstrated the importance of close transatlantic bonds with a powerful ally that shared the central values of Western civilization. Thus, these experiences will be key to understanding Van der Beugel's diplomatic goals and motivations as a private diplomat later on. What is more, the role of the Americans in the liberation of Europe also planted the seeds of a deep-felt gratitude towards the United States and of an emotional bond, which – as the next chapter will demonstrate – would only grow stronger as a result of the American role in the reconstruction of Europe.

2. “Present at the Creation”

The war years were followed by an intensive period of reconstruction during which Ernst van der Beugel embarked on a successful career as a civil servant in The Hague, which enabled him to witness the creation of post-war Western cooperation from up close. His involvement in the Marshall Plan from the summer of 1947 onwards set him on the transatlantic track that would characterize the rest of his career. The Marshall Plan years were not just important for the development of Ernst van der Beugel’s personal career and vision of the United States, but also played a crucial role in the development of transatlantic relations more generally. While the Marshall Plan has been extensively covered by historians, its role in the development of an unofficial Atlantic Community has not received the attention it deserves.¹

As this chapter will demonstrate, this period is particularly interesting from the perspective of New Diplomatic History. By including the private dimension of transatlantic relations in our analysis it becomes clear how the European Recovery Program (ERP) came to serve as an important catalyst of post-war public-private cooperation, which facilitated the development of a tightly integrated informal transatlantic elite network of which Ernst van der Beugel became a significant member. The unofficial networks that developed during this period also helped to facilitate the continuation of Ernst van der Beugel’s transatlantic activities after he formally left the Dutch government in 1959. Consequently, this chapter will provide a closer look not just at Ernst van der Beugel’s role in the Marshall Plan, but will also pay attention to the way in which the European Recovery Program was structured to gain a better understanding of a crucial period in the formation of the post-war Atlantic elite, the development of Ernst van der Beugel’s extensive and diverse transatlantic social network and the arena in which he received his main professional education, which prepared him for a life as a middle man between the public and the private spheres on the crossroads of Cold War international economic and security policy.

The Marshall Plan

During the extremely hot summer of 1947, Ernst van der Beugel – by now a promising young civil servant at the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs – was enjoying a vacation at his father’s villa in France when he received a phone call from the Dutch minister of Economic Affairs, Gerardus Huysmans. Shortly before, on June 5, 1947 the American Secretary of State George

¹ For a discussion of the historiography on the Marshall Plan see: Alessandra Bitumi, “Rethinking the Historiography of Transatlantic Relations in the Cold War: the United States, Europe and the process of European Integration” in *Reinstating Europe in American History in a Global Context* (Turin: Otto, 2015), 79-81. Thomas Gijswijt and Valerie Aubourg do mention the role of the Marshall Plan in fostering post-war transatlantic elite relations, but they do not work this out in much detail. See: Thomas Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 35-36; Valerie Aubourg, “The Bilderberg Group: Promoting European Governance Inside an Atlantic Community of Values” in *Transnational Networks in Regional Integration: Governing Europe, 1945-83*, eds. Wolfram Kaiser, Brigitte Leucht and Michael Gehler (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 46.

Marshall had delivered a speech at Harvard University in which he announced that the United States was willing to offer an extensive aid program to war wrecked Europe on the condition that the European countries would work closely together. The European nations were not supposed to respond individually to the American offer, but were asked to draft a joint aid proposal. After talks with the Soviet Union broke down, the British Secretary of State Ernest Bevin and his French colleague Georges Bidault issued a joint communiqué on July 4, 1947 inviting twenty-two European nations, including the Netherlands, to participate in a conference in Paris to formulate a European reply to the American offer.

Minister Huysmans's phone call related directly to this invitation. He inquired whether Van der Beugel was familiar with Marshall's speech and subsequently appointed the young civil servant as secretary to Hans Max Hirschfeld, one of the most internationally experienced and authoritative Dutch civil servants of his time, who had been chosen as the leader of the Dutch delegation to the Paris conference. Van der Beugel would frequently recall this event saying that he had never met Hirschfeld before and was told to look for a "stout man with glasses" who would be waiting for him in the bar of the Royal Monceau hotel in Paris.² While this makes for a good story, correspondence from spring 1947 suggests otherwise. In a letter to Piet Sanders in April 1947, Van der Beugel wrote the following:

I find Hirschfeld good. He has no character and no heart but he is damned realistic and absolutely not dogmatic. I happen to have spoken with him rather often lately and I appreciate him. Of course, not good in essence, but I prefer dealing with these kinds of very capable, realist chaps of a certain caliber than with the Posthuma's and the Verzyls.³

Ernst van der Beugel was not only familiar with Hirschfeld, but also with the precarious economic situation of the European countries and of the Netherlands in particular. He had started his career in June 1945 as the director of the Dutch bureau for the navigation of the Rhine at the Ministry of Transport – a job he had acquired through Flip Idenburg, Max Kohnstamm's brother in law, who served as director of the Central Bureau of Statistics. The issue of restoring the navigation on the Rhine River, which connects the Low Countries with the German hinterland, was a matter of vital economic interest to the Netherlands, but except for the location of the Rhine – which Van der Beugel said he could recall "with some intellectual strain"⁴ – Ernst did not know "anything" about these matters. Even so, a week later he was in charge of the Rhine bureau – a job that familiarized him with the Rotterdam chamber of commerce, the 'Rhine barons' and Dutch shipping interests. It also gave him the opportunity to travel to places like Belgium, England and Germany. Traveling to Brussels and

² See, for example: Philip C. Brooks, Truman Library Oral History Interview with E. H. van der Beugel (hereafter TLOHI – Brooks), The Hague, June 1, 1964, www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/beugel.htm; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, file 61-66, EvdB, NAH, p 127; "Amerikanen waren ongehoord vrijgevig: Prof. Van der Beugel (79) herinnert zich 'gevecht' om Marshall dollars", *De Telegraaf*, 24 May, 1997 (translation mine).

³ Ernst van der Beugel to Piet Sanders, n.d. [mid April 1947], file 2, Piet Sanders Papers, NAH, (translation mine).

⁴ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 110 (translation mine).

London was a real treat during this period due to the availability of numerous products of which war-torn Holland had been stripped bare during the war. Consequently, the delegation members spent a substantial period of time on quests through the streets of these cities to buy the shoes, bras and panty hoses that made up the shopping lists from family and friends back home.⁵

These were great times for ambitious young men like Ernst van der Beugel. The Dutch government departments in The Hague offered ample opportunities to young academics who wanted to contribute to rebuilding the country after the war.⁶ After Van der Beugel had worked for some months as the director of the Dutch bureau for the navigation of the Rhine, his old college friend Pieter Blaisse offered him a job as deputy director at the Planning department of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, which Ernst accepted. Before he could start at his new job on November 12, 1945 Van der Beugel had to undergo a 'psycho-technical examination'. The subsequent research report concluded that:

Mr. van der Beugel is a perfectly reliable worker; independent, conscientious, persistent and with a great ability to focus. He is balanced, equipped with good understanding and common sense and he is very critical. His strong criticism helps him to discover errors in the reasoning of others and in forming a correct judgment, but inhibits him in his work, partly because of a lack of self-confidence, which, by the way, does not show in his outer appearance. His easy interaction with others, his strong will and other capabilities make Mr. van der Beugel someone who has the talent to lead.⁷

The Planning department was part of the General Directorate of Trade and Industry, which distributed the available foreign currencies to Dutch businesses. This was done through direct contact with the companies involved. If a business was in need of dollars, this was where they went. To Van der Beugel this was "an extremely fascinating educational experience. It was sheer reconstruction work. Here, the Philipses and Unilevers came to bargain for money with memorandums arguing for their needs."⁸ Soon, Van der Beugel was appointed to two other jobs in addition to his position at Planning. Pieter Kuin, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Economic Affairs requested him to become his executive assistant and shortly afterwards Van der Beugel was also appointed as secretary of the Council on Economic Affairs, the most important subcommittee of the Dutch Council of Ministers.⁹ The president of the National Bank (Holtrop) and the director of the Central Planning Bureau

⁵ Ibid., p. 111.

⁶ Ralph Dingemans, "'De zon ging op en de wind was gunstig': Ernst Hans van der Beugel", in *In Dienst van Buitenlandse Zaken*, eds. Bert van der Zwan, Bob de Graaff and Duco Hellema (Amsterdam: Boom, 2008), 157.

⁷ Psychologisch rapport betreffende den heer Drs. Ernst Hans van der Beugel, 9 November 1945, file 35, EvdB papers, NAH (translation mine).

⁸ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 116 (translation mine).

⁹ The Council for Economic Affairs was a committee of the Council of Ministers in which next to the prime-minister, the ministers of Economic Affairs, Social Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Finance, Transport and Water, Agriculture and Overseas Territories were seated. See: Meindert Fennema and John Rhijsburger, *Hans Max Hirschfeld: Man van het Grote Geld* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 2007), 159.

(Tinbergen), who officially were not considered to be members, were also invited to attend the Economic Council meetings. It is most likely that this is also where Van der Beugel first met Hirschfeld. All in all, these events parachuted the young civil servant right into the center of Dutch post-war recovery affairs. During the Economic Council meetings, everything that concerned Dutch financial, economic and social policy was discussed. Here, Ernst van der Beugel experienced the cardinal problem of 1947, namely the dollar shortage which made it impossible to finance the necessary imports, firsthand.¹⁰

Like many other European countries, the Netherlands reached a state of crisis during the spring of 1947 due to an increasing shortage on the balance of payments. American products, which were indispensable for the economic recovery of the country, required too much of the national monetary reserves. "Looking back at that period, one can hardly realize how dominating and all absorbing the dollar problem was for the great majority of European countries," recalled Van der Beugel. There was a palpable feeling of panic in Europe. "More and more as week succeeds week the whole of European life is being overshadowed by the great dollar shortage. The margin between recovery and collapse throughout Western Europe is dependent at this moment upon massive imports from the U.S."¹¹, *The Economist* reported in May 1947.

In this context, the Dutch government had to make a tough decision: either they drastically decreased the number of imports, which would have serious consequences for the population's consumption level and cause a severe backlash to the process of economic recovery, or they would roughly maintain their level of imports, which would lead to such a speedy exhaustion of monetary reserves that the Netherlands would be heading for bankruptcy. They did not know that help was on the way, but even so there was a vague sense of hope in the air inspired by the feeling that 'something' would happen in Washington. "It's very difficult to trace why this feeling existed" Van der Beugel told Philips C. Brooks during an oral history interview for the Truman Library in 1964:

I think it started in a more concrete way after the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine, so after March – the period between March and June – there was a feeling that the Americans were moving into Europe. I remember very well, because I was a secretary to the Cabinet, that the Dutch Cabinet had to decide whether it should go on with its dollar imports with the terrible risk of spending practically the last dollars and hoping that something would happen, or simply to stop the thing. And then the Cabinet decided to go on, which was a very risky decision but they went on with the dollar import, because everybody had the feeling that something would happen.¹²

¹⁰ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 126.

¹¹ Ernst van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership: European Integration as a Concern of American Foreign Policy* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1966), 56.

¹² TLOHI – Brooks.

Thus, through his work at the Council of Economic Affairs, Ernst van der Beugel was not only familiar with the issues at hand, but he had also become acquainted with the gentlemen in charge. Consequently, he was seen a logical addition to the Dutch delegation at the Paris Conference.¹³

The Paris Conference

Between July 12 and September 22, sixteen European nations gathered in Paris under British leadership to convey a European response to Marshall's aid proposal. When Van der Beugel arrived in the city he found Hirschfeld behind a glass of cognac in Hôtel Royal Monceau. The two men got along right away and would spend many long days together in Paris.¹⁴ "Hirschfeld enjoyed the good life", Van der Beugel recalled. "Because I knew the city well, I also served as *Maître de Plaisir*. I had to go out for dinner with him every night [...] and then I wanted to go back to the hotel because it was hot and we had to work damn hard. But he was strong as a horse, so we had elaborate dinners and afterwards we went to a night club."¹⁵

On Saturday, July 12 at 11 A.M. the conference on European Economic Cooperation commenced in a most congenial atmosphere. During the first days the ministers of the sixteen nations gathered in a grand ornate dining hall on the Quai d'Orsay, which resembled, in the words of Van der Beugel, "an almost sad reminder to the 19th century splendor of France."¹⁶ Between July 12 and July 15 the ministers set up the machinery and drafted the guidelines for the conference, after which they handed the work over to their respective delegations. These delegations were in turn all represented in a newly established steering committee, which they referred to as the Committee for European Economic Cooperation (CEEC). Next to the CEEC the ministers had set up a series of technical committees focusing on the major areas of Europe's economy that needed to be restored: Food and Agriculture, Iron and Steel, Fuel and Power and, finally, Transport. The daily management of the conference was transferred to an executive committee under the leadership of Sir Oliver Franks, a distinguished diplomat and professor of philosophy at Oxford University, who also served as the chair of the CEEC. Next to the United Kingdom, the Executive Committee consisted of representatives from France, Italy, Norway and the Benelux. Hoping to strengthen their position among the bigger powers, the Netherlands had joined forces with Belgium and Luxemburg and Hirschfeld represented the Benelux in the Executive Committee, thus enabling the Dutchman to become one of the central players of the Paris Conference.¹⁷

¹³ Walter H. Salzmann, *Herstel, wederopbouw en Europese samenwerking: D.P. Spierenburg en de buitenlandse economische betrekkingen van Nederland 1945-1952* (Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers, 1999), 112.

¹⁴ Teus Lebbing and Niklaas Hoekstra, "Atlanticus pur sang: Interview met Ernst van der Beugel," *Atlantisch Perspectief* 4:5 (1997), 20; NAH/Kersten Oral History, p, 127.

¹⁵ Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 166 (translation mine).

¹⁶ E.H. van der Beugel, "Zestien Landen werkten te Parijs aan toekomst van Europa" *Het Parool*, 9 October, 1947 (translation mine).

¹⁷ See, for example: Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 176: 'Hij was de architect geworden van het Europese Herstelprogramma.' The Dutch delegation to the Paris conference consisted of the Dutch minister of foreign affairs C.W.G.H van Boetzelaer, H.M. Hirschfeld, D.P. Spierenburg (deputy director of Foreign Economic Relations), A.W.L.T

As Hirschfeld's secretary it was one of Van der Beugel's responsibilities to prepare telegrams for the Economic Council of the Dutch Cabinet in The Hague. He usually wrote the reports at noon while Hirschfeld took a nap at the hotel. After the telegram was ready, Van der Beugel shoved the draft underneath Hirschfeld's hotel room door after which he knocked three times. When Hirschfeld, in turn, responded by knocking on his side of the door Van der Beugel knew he had Hirschfeld's approval and the telegram was ready to be sent to The Hague.¹⁸

The negotiations were long and complex. Whereas the conference had started in a most agreeable spirit of community and solidarity, interactions became tenser as time proceeded. While the conditions throughout Europe became more desperate every passing day, the spirit of European cooperation that the Americans had requested slowly vaporized and many of the conferees lapsed back into old habits bringing the different national interests back to the forefront. Next to the much desired dollar aid, the Netherlands had a great interest in the revival of the German economy and the restoration of trade with the German hinterland to which its economy was closely linked. The French, on the other hand, desired to dismantle the German industry and wanted their own economy to become the driving force behind Europe's recovery. In order to guarantee their national security the French wanted to make sure that Germany would never rise to its former strength again, thus causing a major clash between Hirschfeld and the French representative Hervé Alphand. It would certainly not be the last clash between the Dutch and the French that Van der Beugel would witness in the process of post-war reconstruction.

The Americans had initially kept their distance to enable the Europeans to forge their own recovery plan, but on July 31 William Clayton, the American Undersecretary of State whom the New York Times dubbed the "American ambassador to Europe,"¹⁹ paid an official visit to the Paris conference. During the meeting Clayton stressed that the European recovery plan should not offer some kind of partial or temporal solution, but ought to be a comprehensive proposal that would help Europe all the way back on its feet again. He also emphasized the fundamental importance of a conference report that would be palatable to a skeptical American Congress, since they would have to approve the plan.

Without clear directions or direct leadership from the Americans at the conference, the participating countries all composed their own shopping lists. "Everybody cheated like hell in Paris,"²⁰ Van der Beugel recalled. The first estimates on August 20 exceeded all expectations and Clayton knew it was time to step in. The total shortage calculated by the Europeans for

van Starckenborgh Stachouwer (the Dutch ambassador in Paris) and F.A.G. Keesing (President of the Dutch Bank and financial advisor of the Dutch minister of Finance, Piet Lieftinck).

¹⁸ Pien van der Hoeven, *Hoed af voor Marshall: de Marshall-hulp aan Nederland 1947-1952* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 1997), 55; Dingemans, "De zon ging op", p 160; Salzmans, *Herstel, wederopbouw en Europese samenwerking*, 112.

¹⁹ Greg M. Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure: The Marshall Plan and the Reconstruction of Post-War Europe*, (London: Free Press, 2007), 100.

²⁰ TLOHI – Brooks; Pierre van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp: een perspectief voor Nederland, 1947-1953* (Houten: De Haan/Unieboek, 1987), 67.

the period 1948-1952 amounted to \$28 billion, an amount that the Americans regarded as utterly unacceptable.

On 30 August, Clayton met again with the Executive Committee. In the course of a three-hour meeting he explained in plain language that the conference was not meeting American expectations. To enhance the prospects of the European request Clayton finally provided some basic guidelines. Next to lowering the total amount of the aid request, the participating countries had to come up with a plan that emphasized production (especially of coal and food) which would make it possible for Western Europe to attain economic independence or self-sustainability within a four year timespan during which aid requirements should decrease each successive year. In addition, the Europeans had to work toward internal financial and monetary stabilization and were strongly encouraged to liberalize trade. Last, but definitely not least, Clayton made it clear that the Americans wanted the Europeans to create a permanent multilateral organization to promote European cooperation.²¹

The Europeans had not made much progress with attempts at a permanent cooperative effort. On August 28, two days before the Executive Committee's meeting with Clayton, Hirschfeld had written in a report to The Hague that "So far no detailed discussion has yet taken place at the Paris conference about the question whether a more permanent organization for European economic cooperation should emerge from the Marshall-plan consultations."²² In addition, Marshall's Harvard speech allusions to European cooperation had been very vague. The Dutch delegation felt very strongly that the ideas about European cooperation in the United States "were very outspoken, but not concrete at all."²³ As it became clear that the original conference deadline of September 1 could not be met, it was decided to apply the American recommendations after which the Paris report would be the basis for further detailed consultations with the American administration. On the occasion of the Paris conference, Ernst van der Beugel wrote two articles for the Dutch daily newspaper *Het Parool*, in which he described the major developments and emphasized the importance of American pressure on European cooperation. "Maybe", he wrote at the end of his second article, "the American understanding of the problems accompanying European cooperation is too simple; maybe they are not sensitive enough to the great traditional and historically grown differences between the European countries. But", he continued, now in bold print, "in essence their standpoint is correct, namely that from an economic perspective this impoverished continent will only have something to offer if a maximum degree of cooperation can be achieved."²⁴

²¹ H.M. Hirschfeld, 31 August 1947, "Bespreking op de Amerikaanse ambassade met de Amerikaanse Undersecretary of State W. Clayton, 30 August, 1947", file 20, EvdB Papers, NAH; Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure*, 108-109; Salzmann, *Herstel, wederopbouw en Europese samenwerking*, 117-118.

²² Telegram Hirschfeld, Paris, 28 August, 1947, "Bespreking van de heer Clayton met de heer Spaak", file 20, EvdB Papers, NAH (translation mine).

²³ TLOHI – Brooks.

²⁴ E.H. van der Beugel, "Zestien Landen werkten te Parijs aan toekomst van Europa", *Het Parool*, 21 October, 1947 (translation mine).

In later years, Van der Beugel would come to perceive the 1947 Paris conference as “the mother conference of the structure of the West.”²⁵ In his 1965 dissertation *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, he stressed how the collecting of data for a common purpose was an unprecedented peacetime exercise that was of great importance for the further development of Europe. “The affinity between these men, who worked in Paris day and night during the summer of 1947, formed an indispensable element for future cooperation.” This certainly applied to Van der Beugel himself, who developed many friendships in Paris, some of which would last a lifetime. Among the friends who belonged to this latter group were the Belgian Count Jean-Charles Snoy et d’Oppuers, the Frenchman Robert Marjolin and the Englishman Eric Roll, Lord Roll of Ipsden.²⁶ Van der Beugel had close contact with many members of the other delegations, which enabled him to collect valuable information for the Dutch. In the process he impressed not only Hirschfeld but also Hirschfeld’s deputy, Dick Spierenburg. Both men were convinced that Van der Beugel’s career prospects looked very bright.²⁷

After the Conference on European Economic Cooperation was formally concluded with the signing of the conference report on September 22, the next step was to get the plan through the United States Congress. In order to facilitate this process the Truman administration invited Sir Oliver Franks and a small delegation of European representatives from the CEEC (including Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel) to Washington where they were to provide assistance for the defense of the aid program in Congress.²⁸ This first trip to the United States would leave a deep impression on Ernst van der Beugel, as recorded in an extensive series of letters to his family and friends back home.

²⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 130 (translation mine).

²⁶ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 71-72. See also: Theodore A. Wilson, Truman Library Oral History Interview with Ernst van der Beugel, The Hague, June 17, 1970. (hereafter: TLOHI – Wilson), <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/beugeleh.htm>. Wilson: “Several persons with whom I’ve talked have suggested that the experience encouraged the growth of internationalism, an internationalist attitude. This is certainly borne out by your statements. Van der Beugel: “There is no question about that, and certainly from what happened in Paris. I mean, after all these years – it was practically 25 years ago – I still have a very close friendship with many of my first colleagues from 1947 in Paris.” Count Jean-Charles Snoy et d’Oppuers was a top civil servant and diplomat who would also play a key role in the negotiations concerning European integration. He was also one of the signatories of the Rome Treaties. After a stint in the private sector, he also served as politician for the Belgian Christian Democratic party. Snoy would also serve a member of the Steering Committee of the Bilderberg Meetings. The English economist Sir Eric Roll served as a professor of Economics and Commerce before he was recruited as a civil servant during the Second World War, after which he came to play a key role in the Marshall Plan and in Britain’s unsuccessful entry into the European Economic Community in the early 1960s, after which he left civil service for the private sector where he became a director of the Bank of England and chairman of the merchant bankers SG Warburg, where Ernst van der Beugel became a director in 1964. From 1964 onwards, Roll also became intimately involved with the Bilderberg Meetings. He did not only serve on the Steering Committee but would also serve as Chairman of the Meetings between 1986 and 1989.

²⁷ Salzmann, *Herstel, wederopbouw en Europese samenwerking*, 112: “Spierenburg en Hirschfeld zeiden dan ook tegen elkaar: ‘die jongeman zal het nog ver brengen.’”

²⁸ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 86.

To Washington

From the moment Van der Beugel boarded the Queen Mary, he felt 'lost' in the outrageous magnitude and luxury on the Cunard Line ship.

It is the most refined luxury hotel in Europe times fourteen. It is impossible to describe...It is just too much, very nice, but part of times gone by. This cannot exist anymore...We had a simple lunch with *hors d'oeuvre*, lobster, chateaubriand, omelet, soufflé, fruit and coffee...All day long you can get cake, toast, tea, coffee, cocktail appetizers, liquor and cigarettes.²⁹

In order to facilitate informal contact, the British Foreign Office had arranged that the European delegation would cross the Atlantic together with a group of American members of Congress led by the Republican Representative Christian Herter. This so-called 'Herter Committee' consisted of 19 congressmen with diverse backgrounds, including a young representative from California named Richard Nixon.³⁰ They had toured the European continent "to see for themselves what was happening and to assess the merits and needs of aiding Europe."³¹ Herter, himself a committed internationalist, was already convinced that the European countries were in need of a comprehensive aid program. He hoped that, once faced with the devastation on the continent, his congressional fellow travelers would come to share this view. The committee's members visited every country in Europe, except for Russia, Yugoslavia and Albania.³² Van der Beugel mixed with the congressmen, "but you should not exaggerate this contact with these Congress people," he warned his readers back home. "They all say, 'I'm so glad to meet you Mr. van der Beugel' and pat you on your shoulder and five minutes later they have forgotten your face, your name, your country and your existence."³³ The committee members were especially interested in Hirschfeld, who had made a good impression on them previously in Amsterdam.³⁴

Together with Sir Oliver Franks, Hirschfeld spent one afternoon with the Herter Committee to provide an account of the Paris conference.³⁵ Contacts between the European delegation and the American congressmen remained rather superficial in character and did not yield the hoped for results.³⁶ A complicating factor was that the Europeans had been invited to Washington not to speak with members of Congress, but to help the Truman administration defend their aid program in Congress. As a result, "a certain degree of caution

²⁹ Ernst van der Beugel to Miekje van der Beugel, "Eerste brief, overgeschreven door Miekje van der Beugel", file 'Correspondentie met Vader' (hereafter 'CmV'), AHB (translation mine).

³⁰ "List of Passengers. R.M.S. 'Queen Mary' October 4th, 1947", box 2, Herter Committee (PPS206), Congressional Collection, Nixon Presidential Library (NPL).

³¹ Greg M. Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure*, 115.

³² Harry B. Price, *The Marshall Plan and its Meaning* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955), 51-55.

³³ "Eerste brief, overgeschreven door Miekje van der Beugel voor de familie", CmV (translation mine).

³⁴ Ernst van der Beugel aan Miekje van der Beugel, "Tweede brief, overgeschreven door Miekje van der Beugel voor de familie", CmV. The only names mentioned were Republican congressman John C. Kunkel of Pennsylvania, and Allen Dulles, the diplomat, banker, lawyer and future leader of the CIA.

³⁵ Code-Bericht BZ, 11 October 1947, Hirschfeld to Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, file 20, EvdB.

³⁶ TLOHI – Brooks, p 26.

in the interaction with the Congress people was commanded” and the Europeans were not able to get a good impression of the general mood among the congressmen. “They are most kind, very interested, and very impressed by the situation in Europe, but whether the man with whom one drinks a whisky will in fact give a passionate plea for aid to Europe in Congress or whether he will reveal himself as the most fierce isolationist, one cannot say,”³⁷ Van der Beugel concluded.

The Queen Mary arrived in New York on Thursday, October 9. In order to experience his first encounter with the United States as fully as possible Van der Beugel got up at 7 AM. Around 9.30 AM the coast of Long Island appeared followed a bit later by the New Jersey coastline on the other side. Shortly after, immigration officers came aboard accompanied by two representatives of the British embassy in Washington who guided the passengers smoothly through customs. On arrival, Van der Beugel took a good look at the “unforgettable sight of New York.”³⁸

It was a bit hazy and when you sail between Brooklyn and Staten Island, all of a sudden you see the statue of liberty and then on your right something beautiful slowly emerges like a large mountain from the mist and that is the skyline of downtown Manhattan. Unbelievably magnificent and beautiful, not just because of what you see, but also because of what it makes you think of...You’ve seen the sight a hundred times in movies and you become aware of that especially when you sail closely past it. But that rising from the mist is truly one of the sights of the world. I will never forget it, that first time.³⁹

At the Cunard Line arrival hall, Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel were welcomed by Connie Patijn, another young Dutch official with whom Van der Beugel developed a close friendship, which, while not free from rivalry, would last a lifetime.⁴⁰ The British had reserved seats for the Paris delegation in the Congressional, the train from New York to Washington DC, but before they boarded Patijn took Van der Beugel and Hirschfeld for a ride through New York that ended on the roof of the Rockefeller building with its fabulous view of the city. “First impression: Fantastic! Much of it was exactly as I imagined it to be. Many things even more magnificent”, Van der Beugel wrote in a letter to his father that evening. “I did not think in the categories ‘beautiful’ and ‘ugly,’ because I was too astounded.” They had ice cream on the roof of the Rockefeller building after which “as in a dream” they drove through Fifth Avenue, back to Pennsylvania Station.⁴¹

During his first day in the U.S. it struck Van der Beugel how “the energy of the people” was “not being sucked away by a problem that simply does not exist here...it is completely

³⁷ Ernst van der Beugel to Dick Spierenburg, 17 October, 1947. file 828, NAH, Ministerie van Economische Zaken: Directoraat-Generaal voor de Buitenlandse Economische Betrekkingen (translation mine).

³⁸ Letter EvdB, “Donderdagavond 11 uur”, 9 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

³⁹ Letter EvdB, 9 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁴⁰ See: EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 236, 306.

⁴¹ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, 9 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

obvious that everything is available in every quantity and with incredible service and luxury. That is something we marvel at, but they do not.”⁴² When he finally got back to his hotel room around eleven o’clock that evening, Van der Beugel was ready to collapse. Even so, he wrote a letter to his family back home, which would be the first in a series of almost daily reports of his experiences in the United States. “I am extremely impressed by everything,” he wrote at the end of his first letter. “Tomorrow morning we will meet at 9.30 with the delegations for our first discussion...Nobody knows what to expect.”⁴³

The Washington Meetings

The next morning the entire group of CEEC Europeans met in the War Manpower building of the U.S. State Department. During the first day at their Washington headquarters they were briefed about the proceedings in the U.S. capital thus far. Consultation committees set up by the Truman administration had already started their discussions with the European technical experts earlier that week. Some questions required sending additional questionnaires to the sixteen countries of the Paris conference. During the meetings, which had taken place in a most agreeable atmosphere, the Americans were well informed and not uncritical: the general impression was that the requests of the Paris report were still too high.⁴⁴ The State Department, represented by Under Secretary of State Robert Lovett and his deputy Charles Bonesteel, coordinated the consultations with the European group.

During the weekend Van der Beugel was able to unwind a bit. At the Wardman Park Hotel Ernst tried to catch up with reading the reports of the consultations. He marveled at the beauty of the red and golden glow of the Indian summer from his balcony. On Sunday, Louis Soutendijk, the financial officer at the Dutch embassy, gave Van der Beugel a tour of Washington followed by a cocktail party in Baltimore.⁴⁵ “Life in the U.S. is truly breathtaking”, Van der Beugel wrote to his father. “I feel a bit like the sour aunt who really wants to say something unkind, but I’m unable to do so.”⁴⁶

The next day at 5 p.m. the Europeans were welcomed by Will Clayton, Robert Lovett, Charles Bonesteel and Marshall’s chief economic adviser Paul H. Nitze. The “friendly” and “pleasant” Clayton disappointed Van der Beugel, but he was deeply impressed by the strength and expertise of Robert Lovett, whom he described – just like Bonesteel and Nitze – as “a man of the very best caliber.”⁴⁷

Lovett was sympathetic to the Paris report, but also made it very clear that it would be a complicated task to get the aid request through Congress. The Republicans had a majority in

⁴² Ibid. (translation mine).

⁴³ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, 9 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁴⁴ “Eerste vergadering van de vertegenwoordigers van de Parijse conferentie voor de besprekingen in Washington, gehouden op 10 October 1947”, file 20, EvdB.

⁴⁵ “Louis Soutendijk, “Dutch Economist and Diplomat, 83,” *New York Times*, 29 December, 1993.

⁴⁶ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, 10 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁴⁷ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, “Maandagavond”, 13 October, 1947, CmV (translation mine).

both the Senate and the House of Representatives and they were reluctant to cooperate.⁴⁸ Next to that, there would be elections the following year and there was a considerable amount of lobbying going on. The Truman administration would need all the help it could get from the European delegation to back up their case. Lovett's message was simple: "You cannot charm this Congress and there is only one way to handle this and that is to give them facts and facts and facts. That is why you are here now. That is why your technical experts are getting milked; not because we are curious or critical. It is because in the end we will have to stand before congress to be questioned and we will need your help to stand strong." This was an "excellent and realistic approach,"⁴⁹ according to Van der Beugel. As he said later: "We were, as a matter of fact, mobilized by the Executive to help in getting the thing through Congress, which was a fascinating experience."⁵⁰

Soon a certain routine started to develop. Each day, Van der Beugel had to get up at 7.30 to make it to his first meeting with the Dutch members of the Paris delegation at 8.30 A.M., directly followed by a meeting of the entire European group at 9.30. A.M.⁵¹ Together with Eric Berthoud, Robert Marjolin and Guido Colonna di Paliano, Van der Beugel had been appointed to a newly established coordination committee of the European delegation.⁵² While the technical consultations continued, the rest of the delegation had to deal with general policy issues. Every day the American interdepartmental commission would provide the coordinating group with lists of questions, the answers being required by the chief delegates in their discussions with the U.S. Steering Committee in the afternoon.

The first consultations between Europeans and Americans were devoted to an exploration of policy problems that arose from the Paris report. The discussions for the first week were divided into four main themes: 1) the general production program, 2) financial policy, 3) commercial policy and 4) European organization. During the subsequent week they hoped to "explore the balance-of-payments problem and to turn toward the general course of future action with respect to the program as a whole."⁵³ Next to the formal diplomatic telegrams, Van der Beugel also wrote some "highly confidential" informal reports to among others Dick Spierenburg, Eelco van Kleffens, Pieter Blaisse and Max Weisglas who had requested Van der Beugel to keep them informed.⁵⁴

By the end of the first week the European-American consultations had not made as much progress as hoped. They had dealt with the general production program and were half

⁴⁸ Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure*, 50-53.

⁴⁹ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, "Maandagavond", 13 October, 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁵⁰ TLOHI - Brooks, p 4.

⁵¹ Next to van der Beugel and Hirschfeld there were also three Dutch technical experts in Washington: Boerma (agriculture), Kouwenaar (timber) and Groen (oil).

⁵² Letter E.H. van der Beugel, "Maandagavond", 13 October, 1947, CmV.

⁵³ "Tentative Program for Conferences with CEEC Delegates", October 14, 1947, file 20, EvdB.

⁵⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Dick Spierenburg, 17 October 1947, file 828, Ministerie van Economische Zaken: Directoraat-Generaal voor de Buitenlandse Economische Betrekkingen, NAH (translation mine). Spierenburg served as the Director-General of Foreign Economic Relations at the Ministry of Economic Affairs; Eelco van Kleffens, who had served as Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs during the Second World War, served as the Dutch Ambassador in Washington at the time; Max Weisglas was the chief of the press division at the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

way through financial policy. The Americans, Van der Beugel noted, “are friendly and almost embarrassed that they ask us so many questions. We are well prepared and they are enthusiastic about that, but it would all be much easier if they would expose themselves a bit more and if they would state more clearly what they expect and how they truly think about things. At the moment we cannot discern any of this.”⁵⁵ The Truman administration simply did not know yet what it wanted itself. Even so, Van der Beugel by now regarded “the chances of a realization of the entire Paris Report in its original form as virtually naught.”⁵⁶

On October 24, Lovett and George Kennan met with the chief delegates to answer some basic questions on how the U.S. assistance would function. As usual, Hirschfeld also smuggled Ernst van der Beugel into this meeting. The Americans explained there was no chance whatsoever that Congress would vote for the full four-year plan in one go. The highest attainable result was the approval of the general idea combined with a yearly appropriation, for which they had \$6.5 billion in mind, but nothing was guaranteed. “It is barely impossible to imagine how nervous the administration is about this Congress,” Van der Beugel noted. The aid would certainly not be given in dollars and the best the Europeans could hope for would be a mixture of dollars and goods. It would also be very hard to get the idea through Congress that a part of those dollars could be used for spending in other Western Hemisphere countries. One had to take into account, however, that “Lovett is an extremely cautious man”, Van der Beugel noted “who is scared to death for Congress and who does not want to make the Europeans too optimistic.” Lovett had shared with the delegates that he had just had lunch with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee who had given him the advice to “put on an asbestos suit” during the hearings on Capitol Hill while leaving him with the friendly warning that “everything I tell you in Congress, Bill, is not personally meant.”⁵⁷ On November 4, a last meeting with the European delegation took place at the State department. During the meeting, Lovett tried to take away some of the European concerns. Even so, an “informal indication of present thinking on certain of these points” was all Lovett could offer.⁵⁸

In the end, the Europeans “left Washington with many open questions as to how the Administration’s program would be presented to Congress, what the amount to be requested would be, which conditions were to be attached, and how Congress would react.” Nevertheless, the exercise had already been “most fruitful and constructive” Van der Beugel would recall, because it had “brought a group of Europeans, who were going to play a major role in further European developments, into the closest contact with their American opposite numbers and with the huge problems facing the American administration in its relations to Congress.” The Paris delegation went back to Europe “firmly convinced of the reality of the words of Under Secretary Lovett, in their last meeting with him, where he said that the real

⁵⁵ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, “Zaterdagavond”, 18 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁵⁶ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, “Dinsdagavond”, 21 October 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁵⁷ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, “Zaterdagmorgen”, 25 October, 1947, CmV (translation mine).

⁵⁸ Letter E.H. van der Beugel, “Woensdagmiddag”, 29 October, 1947. CmV (translation mine).

contribution of Europe could only be to abandon national beliefs and traditions in a joint approach to the recovery program.”⁵⁹ Their fate was now in the hands of the United States Congress.

The Marshall Plan: a Joint Venture between the Public and the Private Sector

On April 3, 1948 President Harry Truman signed the Economic Cooperation Act. The Marshall Plan had made it through Congress. To Ernst van der Beugel, who came to play a central role in the implementation of the Marshall Plan in the Netherlands, a “new diplomatic adventure” unfolded.⁶⁰

In its original proposal to Congress, the Truman administration had anticipated an organizational structure in which the coordination of the aid program would be in the hands of the State Department.⁶¹ During his January 8, 1948 Senate testimony, secretary Marshall had mentioned the need for ERP organization and its Administrator to be flexible, but he believed it should nevertheless “be fitted into the existing machinery of Government.” It would be “unfortunate” he declared, “to create an entirely new agency of foreign policy for this Government.”⁶²

In contrast, critics – including Arthur Vandenberg and Christian Herter’s Select Congressional Committee on Foreign Aid – preferred an approach that stressed the primacy of private management.⁶³ Advocates of a corporate organization claimed that such an approach would “relieve the State Department of operational responsibilities for which it lacked experience and personnel”, that it would ensure “a large measure of operational flexibility, attract competent managerial talent from the private sector, and make possible a bipartisan administration of the recovery program. All of these advantages in turn would guarantee a businesslike operation and appease those in Congress who were hostile to the State Department.”⁶⁴

Such a corporate approach also received support from the private sector. Leaders from academic circles, the major trade unions and from organizations like the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the Business Advisory Council (BAC), the Committee for Economic Development (CED), and the National Planning Association (NPA) published briefs on behalf of

⁵⁹ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 97.

⁶⁰ Harry B. Price, “Interview with Dr. van der Beugel, 21 November 1952 in The Hague,” Oral History Interview File, November 21-November 30, 1952, Papers of Harry B. Price, Harry Truman Presidential Library (hereafter TLOHI – Price).

⁶¹ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 20-21.

⁶² Qtd in: Nicolaus Mills, *Winning the Peace: The Marshall Plan & America’s Coming of Age as a Superpower* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2008), 165.

⁶³ Michael J. Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 105-106. The Herter Committee, whose report van der Beugel would later refer to as the “most generous formulation of policy which I have ever seen,” (see TLOHI- Brooks) specifically called for “an independent government corporation with a single administrator, a policy council and a bipartisan board of directors” (see Hogan, 101).

⁶⁴ Hogan, *Marshall Plan*, 102.

the program, testified before congressional committees and/or served on the Harriman Committee or on the Committee for the Marshall Plan to aid European Recovery. Like Herter and Vandenberg, they favored “corporative collaboration between private economic groups, including organized business and labor, and between these groups and government authorities in framing public policies.” The result was “something like a coordinated campaign mounted by an interlocking directorate of public and private figures.”⁶⁵

The post-WWII American foreign policy establishment consisted of a large network of influentials “connecting Wall Street, Washington, worthy foundations, and proper clubs.”⁶⁶ Since a “growing group of cultural and economic elites centered in the Northern and Eastern coastal regions of the United States” dominated the network, it was often referred to as the ‘East Coast Establishment’.⁶⁷ Private elite organizations such as the New York based council on Foreign Relations and the Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie foundations served as its vanguard institutions.⁶⁸ The latter ‘big three’ foundations “represented a strategic element of the East Coast foreign policy establishment and the core of the latter’s mindset, institutions, and activities, manifested by active leadership in organizations like the Council on Foreign Relations and the Foreign Policy Association.”⁶⁹ Close ties between these private networks and the formal foreign policy establishment were enhanced by how individuals “frequently switched between public and private service.”⁷⁰

“However shady its outlines,” the ‘East Coast Establishment’ shared many assumptions. “The values they embodied were nurtured in prep schools, at college clubs, in the boardrooms of Wall Street, and at dinner parties in Washington.”⁷¹ They were internationalists with a cultural affinity toward Europe and the Atlantic world and belonged to a generation of Americans that had lived through the Great Depression, World War II, and the beginning of the Cold War. The lessons they took away from these experiences led to a common belief in the importance of remaining engaged in international affairs, especially in Europe. They were convinced that America’s security and economic well-being were irrevocably linked to events abroad.⁷² They understood public service as a lofty calling and

⁶⁵ Ibid., 97-99.

⁶⁶ Isaacson and Thomas, *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1986), 29. The term ‘foreign policy establishment’ describes members of organizations, such as the groups mentioned here, who were actively interested in foreign affairs. The term is related to Adler/Bobrow’s ‘influentials’ and Almond’s ‘foreign policy elite’. See: Kenneth P. Adler and Davis Bobrow, “Interests and Influence in Foreign Affairs,” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 20:1 (1956): 89-101; Gabriel A. Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (New York: Praeger, 1950).

⁶⁷ Busby and Montan, “Without Heirs: Assessing the Decline of Establishment Internationalism in U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Perspectives on Politics* 6:3 (2008), 454.

⁶⁸ Isaacson and Thomas, *Wise Men*, 29.

⁶⁹ Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, & Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 2.

⁷⁰ Busby and Montan, “Without Heirs”, 454.

⁷¹ Isaacson and Thomas, *Wise Men*, 29.

⁷² Busby and Montan, “Without Heirs”, 454.

shared an aversion to partisan politics. Among them, “ideological fervor was frowned upon” whereas “pragmatism, realpolitik, moderation, and consensus were prized.”⁷³

It was in this spirit that on December 30, 1947 Senator Arthur Vandenberg solicited the advice of the private Brookings Institution on behalf of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. “It would be helpful to have an objective study by an independent research agency of the highest standard,” he wrote to the Institution’s president Harold G. Moulton. Less than four weeks later the Brookings Institution delivered a 20-page report containing specific recommendations for the structure, focus, and operating procedures of the Marshall Plan.⁷⁴

Considering the “magnitude and special character of the task to be performed”, involving “economic and business responsibilities the State Department was not equipped to assume”⁷⁵, the Brookings report stated that “a new and separate agency should be created in the executive branch of the Government to serve as the focal point of the administration of the program.” This agency was to be headed by a single administrator to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The report also encouraged the administrator to “set up special advisory bodies and to consult with representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and with other private citizens.”⁷⁶ In addition, it recommended exempting the agency from federal regulations, such as existing limitations on salaries, to make it easier to recruit talented individuals from the private sector. Similar recommendations had come from the Harriman Committee, the National Planning Association and the Committee for Economic Development. Eventually, they found their way into the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, thus formalizing “the pattern of public-private collaboration that had already taken shape around the ERP.”⁷⁷

The result was a new and independent agency called the “Economic Cooperation Administration” (ECA) to coordinate the European Recovery Program. The leadership of this organization would be entrusted to “an eminent American with an outstanding business background with Cabinet-level status.”⁷⁸ Senator Vandenberg argued that, since the post required “particularly persuasive economic credentials unrelated to diplomacy” it was “the overriding Congressional desire that the ERP Administrator come from the outside business world (...) and not via the State Department.”⁷⁹ On Vandenberg’s instigation, President

⁷³ Isaacson and Thomas, *Wise Men*, 29. Parmar challenges this “apparent independence” of the East Coast Establishment, claiming that “the “Big 3” foundations (Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie) have been “intensely political and ideological and are steeped in market, corporate and state institutions – that they are part of the power elite of the United States.” See: Parmar, *Foundations*, 2-5.

⁷⁴ Ron Nesson and Fred Dews, August 24, 2016, “Brooking’s Role in the Marshall Plan”, accessed on August 29, 2016, <http://www.brookings.edu/about/history/marshallplan>.

⁷⁵ Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 107.

⁷⁶ The Brookings Institution, “Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate on the Administration of United States Aid for a European Recovery Program, January 22, 1948.” <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/About/Content/marshallplan/19480122cmterepreport.pdf>

⁷⁷ Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 107.

⁷⁸ Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure*, 165.

⁷⁹ Quoted in: Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 108.

Truman appointed Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation (and a Republican), who had also served as one of the industry representatives on the Harriman Committee.

As soon as the Economic Cooperation Act was signed into law, the American organizations involved in the implementation of the Marshall Plan started to weave extensive webs of corporative collaboration by linking up with the private sector on many levels. They teamed up with leading commercial banks to arrange credit facilities and organized conferences with industry and farm groups to prepare programs for the shipment of goods to Europe. The Commerce and Agriculture departments, with their already well-established connections in the private sector, facilitated much of the early consultations. The ECA established its own Public Advisory Board, to which Paul Hoffman appointed representatives of business, labor, and agriculture.

Knowing that the ECA was a temporary venture, Hoffman recruited many of ECA's staff members from business circles, universities and law firms.⁸⁰ "In screening, our idea was that the choices must reflect America," Hoffman explained, "including government, business, labor, agriculture, education, etc."⁸¹ While a number of important positions were occupied by professional diplomats and career public servants, individuals with corporate backgrounds similar to Hoffman's were far more typical of the agency's leadership.⁸²

While the ensuing "networks of corporative collaboration" started on the American side where the "ECA became a hub in an elaborate system of public-private power sharing", the Americans also tried "to build a transnational alliance behind the ERP," by equipping "participating countries with American production skills, fashion American patterns of labor-management teamwork, and, in these and other ways, maximiz[ing] the chances for economic integration and social peace on the Continent."⁸³ This also applied to the Netherlands, which was soon woven into the growing transatlantic web of public-private linkages.

The Dutch Organization

Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel had started their own preparations for the implementation of the European Recovery Program in the Netherlands as soon as they got back from the United States. Hirschfeld believed there were so many sides to the ERP that its implementation did

⁸⁰ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 22. Hoffman took a leave of absence to spend a two-year term (1948–50) as director of the Economic Cooperation Administration, administering the Marshall Plan aid program to Europe following World War II. From 1950 to 1953, he also served as the president of the Ford Foundation.

⁸¹ Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure*, 182.

⁸² Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 139–140: It is also noteworthy that many of these business leaders had served as civil servants before and belonged to at least one prestigious private association like the Council on Foreign Relations, the Committee for Economic Development or the Business Advisory Council, which frequently advised public officials and served as important recruiting pools for government jobs.

⁸³ Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 136.

not fit within any one of the existing departments.⁸⁴ Like the Brookings Institution in the United States, he argued that the ERP was a unique venture, which needed to be approached in an innovative way. Consequently, he maintained that the proper coordination of the program demanded the leadership of a single government commissioner, assisted by an independent agency that could guarantee a unity of policy in The Hague, Paris and Washington.⁸⁵

On January 14, 1948 the Council for Economic Affairs of the Dutch Cabinet appointed Hirschfeld as Government Commissioner for the European Recovery Program, which made him responsible for the entire administrative coordination of the Marshall Plan in the Netherlands. While Hirschfeld wanted the existing government departments to keep their specific competences,⁸⁶ he also proposed to establish “a small, yet competent bureau”⁸⁷ to coordinate the implementation of the European Recovery Program in the Netherlands. Hirschfeld appointed Ernst van der Beugel – “who in fact had already been carrying out the envisioned activities since the beginning of the Paris conference” – as its director.⁸⁸

Due to the ERP’s interministerial character and in order to guarantee its flexibility, Hirschfeld believed that the envisioned agency should function directly under the Council of Economic Affairs of the Dutch Cabinet, as he did himself.⁸⁹ While this was a rather unusual arrangement, the Council approved.⁹⁰ According to Ernst van der Beugel, this distinct set-up was also influenced by the American example.⁹¹ It gave the Bureau of the Government Commissioner for the ERP the freedom and flexibility Hirschfeld desired, bypassing the often stiff and sluggish bureaucracy.

Meanwhile, on March 15 the Foreign Ministers of the European Marshall Plan countries reconvened in Paris to establish a working party for a treaty on European economic co-operation. Ernst van der Beugel was one of the Dutch representatives in the European team that prepared the way for the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) on April 16, 1948.⁹² This was finally the European response to the American demand for a permanent European organization. Once the OEEC was established, the American Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman left his cabinet post to represent the ECA in Europe as permanent U.S Special Representative at the OEEC. In late April he set up the Office of the

⁸⁴ Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 181.

⁸⁵ H.M. Hirschfeld to Dr. J.H.M. van den Brink, 17 February 1948, file 22946, Dossier 072: diverse stukken van dr. Hirschfeld, Archief Buitenlandse Zaken, Code-archief 45-54 (hereafter “MinBuza 45-54”).

⁸⁶ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 140; Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 182.

⁸⁷ “Nationale Organisatie in Verband met Europees Herstel Programma”, file 3261, Archief van het Nederlands Gezantschap in de Verenigde Staten van Amerika (2.05.75), NAH (translation mine).

⁸⁸ “Hirschfeld aan de Leden van de R.E.A. Nederlandse Organisatie voor het E.R.P.”, file 22946, dossier 072; diverse stukken van dr. Hirschfeld, regeringscommissaris in Algemene Dienst; privé correspondentie waaronder dankbetuigingen, 1947 nov- 1948 mrt., MinBuza 45-54 (translation mine).

⁸⁹ Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 181.

⁹⁰ See for example: Ine Megens, *American Aid to NATO Allies in the 1950's: the Dutch Case* (Groningen: Thesis publishers, 1994), 71.

⁹¹ TLOHI-Brooks. See also: TLOHI – Price.

⁹² E.H van der Beugel to Blaisse, 28 January 1948, “De Nederlandse Delegatie voor het European Recovery Program”, file 21: Stukken bijeengebracht onder de rubriek ‘Marshall-plan en O.E.E.C.’ – 1948-I, EvdB, NAH.

Special Representative (OSR) in Hotel de Talleyrand in Paris. William C. Foster, the former president of Pressed and Welded Steel Products and former Undersecretary of Commerce, became his deputy. As his chief aide and counsel he appointed the prominent Harvard Law professor Milton Katz, who would succeed Harriman in 1950.

During May and June – when it became clear how the Americans would organize their side of the aid program – Van der Beugel set-up the executive office of the Government Commissioner for the ERP in some former residential apartments at the Smidswater in The Hague, not far from the American embassy. He recruited a group of young staff members from universities and the existing bureaucracy including Paul Antoine Zoetmulder, who became his deputy. Soon the Smidswater staff was in charge of the coordination of Dutch Marshall Plan policy, including the distribution of the aid assigned to the Netherlands, and served as the Dutch counterpart of the American assistance agencies. To fulfill these tasks, Van der Beugel and his bureau stayed in close touch with all the groups involved, including the Dutch mission at the OEEC in Paris, the Dutch embassy in Washington DC, the ECA in Washington and the ECA country mission in The Hague. Hirschfeld required that all Marshall Plan interaction between the Dutch and the Americans would take place through either him or this bureau.⁹³ Any violation of this rule would threaten the unity of policy, he warned, and would allow the Americans to play the different government departments against each other, thus turning the local ECA Mission Chief into the *de facto* coordinator of recovery affairs in the Netherlands.⁹⁴

To coordinate the work of the different government departments an Inter-Departmental Commission for the European Recovery Program was established with Hirschfeld as chair and Dick Spierenburg as his deputy. Since the Americans had decided to supply the aid primarily through the regular trade channels, the implementation of the Marshall Plan also required close cooperation with representatives from business and industry as well as the labor unions on the receiving end in the Netherlands.

Public Private Linkages in the Netherlands

From the start, Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel had maintained “very intensive contact with business circles and the labor unions about their participation in the Dutch organization.”⁹⁵ Hirschfeld, who possessed close ties to the business community planned to involve Dutch business and industry in a way in which they could be made equally responsible for meeting Dutch obligations towards the United States.⁹⁶

⁹³ Rob Reinalda, “The Development of a Postwar International Economy”, in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, eds. Hans Krabbendam, Giles Scott-Smith, Kees van Minnen (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 750.

⁹⁴ “De Regeringscommissaris aan Prof. Dr. J.R.M. van den Brink, Betreft: Contact met ECA-Missie in Den Haag, 26 augustus, 1948”, file 23171, MinBuza 45-54, NAH; “Nationale Organisatie in Verband met Europees Herstel Programma”, file 3261, Archief van het Nederlands Gezantschap in de Verenigde Staten van Amerika, NAH.

⁹⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to Th. Max van der Beugel, The Hague, 25-1-1948, CmV (translation mine).

⁹⁶ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 157.

After the major Dutch unions and employers' organizations had expressed their mutual support for the European Recovery Program in the spring of 1948, Hirschfeld arranged a meeting with their representatives to establish a joint information center for the Marshall Plan. Such a center could both provide information for the business community and publicity for the government. The social partners showed interest in this plan and in early March they established the *Informatiecentrum Bedrijfsleven Plan-Marshall* (Business Information Center for the Marshall Plan). During the opening ceremony it was declared that the information center was founded on the understanding that the private sector was responsible for the production requirements, including boosting productivity.⁹⁷ In addition, "to establish good contact with highly qualified representatives of Trade, Science, Industry, Agriculture and Trade Unions,"⁹⁸ Hirschfeld composed a Business Advisory Council for the European Recovery Program, which convened for the first time on May 28, 1948.⁹⁹ It started out with 16 members from the private sector including four union representatives, three bankers, two industrialists, two agriculture representatives, one trade representative and one representative each for agriculture, shipping, trade and academia. The only labor union not represented was the *Eenheidsvakcentrale* (EVC), which was linked to the Dutch Communist Party, a fierce critic of the Marshall Plan.¹⁰⁰ By meeting regularly and staying up to date on all developments concerning the ERP, Hirschfeld was not only able to obtain the current point of view of leading figures in business and industry, it also enabled him to make them feel like they had a stake in the success of the policies.¹⁰¹

The establishment of an Advisory Council for the ERP was actually very much in tune with what the Americans, who composed their Public Advisory Board for the ERP around the same time, had in mind. In fact, soon after Hirschfeld had established his Advisory Council, the Americans started to encourage the aid receiving countries to do exactly that – thus exporting the corporate mindset via the Marshall Plan across the Atlantic. In the Netherlands, however, this approach was already practiced before the Americans began to push for it.¹⁰²

The Business Information Center and the Advisory Council were certainly not the only channels for interaction with leaders from business and industry. Since the Marshall Plan Bureau was in charge of the distribution of the aid in the Netherlands, business leaders were eager to bring their needs to the attention of the Director of the Marshall Plan bureau. In fact,

⁹⁷ Ibid., 157.

⁹⁸ Bureau van de Regeringscommissaris voor het EHP to Loyd V. Steere, Counselor for Economic Affairs at the American Embassy, August 6, 1948, file 23171, MinBuza 45-54, NAH (translation mine).

⁹⁹ Ir. St. Van Schaik to H.M. Hirschfeld, 9 June, 1948, file 23057, Dossier 111: Raad van Advies, MinBuza 45-54, NAH.

¹⁰⁰ Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 207.

¹⁰¹ "Aan de leden van de Raad van Advies voor het EHP", 14 juni 1948, file 23057: Raad van Advies; rapportage, 1948-1949 juni, MinBuza 45-54, NAH; "Function of National Advisory Council for ERP Problems", June 21, 1948, box 2, RG 469: Records of U.S. Foreign Assistance Agencies, 1948-1961/Mission to the Netherlands/Office of the Director Subject Files (Central Files) 1948-53, Administration Misc. – Agreements, NARA; Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 157.

¹⁰² See also: Memorandum from E.C. Wilkinson to the U.S. Ambassador, The Hague, June 21, 1948, box 2, Folder 850, RG 469, Records of U.S. Foreign Assistance Agencies, 1948-1961, Mission to the Netherlands. Office of the Director Subject Files (Central Files) 1948-53, USNA; Administration Misc. – Agreements, box 2, Folder 850, "Administrative (misc): Netherlands National Advisory Council for ERP, USNA.

according to Ernst van der Beugel they were “queuing in front of the Smidswater to talk about their interests.” As Van der Beugel put it: “We can make things very complicated with regards to the Marshall Plan, but in the end the whole thing basically came down to who would get the dollars.”¹⁰³ Eventually, many of Van der Beugel’s connections with business leaders, which started with professional interaction, developed into something more personal. “We were friends, we visited each other at home,”¹⁰⁴ Van der Beugel explained in an oral history interview. This also happened with many of his diplomatic counterparts, not least the Americans who moved to Western Europe during the summer of 1948 to work in the ERP apparatus.

Cooperation with the American Country Mission in The Hague

On June 29, 1948 the Netherlands and the United States signed a bilateral treaty which, among other things, included obligations to increase productivity, to stabilize the local currency and exchange rates, cooperate with other countries to reduce trade barriers, bring out quarterly reports concerning the scope and use of received aid, and to provide the Americans with all information related to the implementation of the aid program.¹⁰⁵ To ensure that each country operated in accordance with the Economic Cooperation Act and that the terms of the bilateral agreement were met, the Americans established Country Missions in addition to the embassies in the aid receiving countries. “Broadly speaking, the chiefs of the special ECA missions are responsible for representing the Administrator and the Special Representative in Europe in all relations with the participating governments”, an American memorandum explained. “The country mission chief works closely with government officials and private agencies responsible for preparation and execution of the recovery program in the country to which he is assigned.”¹⁰⁶ Van der Beugel’s Marshall Plan Bureau was accountable to them. In practice, Van der Beugel noticed, this construction made the Country Missions “co-responsible for almost every aspect of the economic, monetary, and social policies of the receiving countries.”¹⁰⁷

The relationship between the Dutch Marshall Plan Bureau and the American ERP country mission was “totally different from our relations to traditional diplomatic representatives,” Van der Beugel noted. “It was not merely a mediating, listening and reporting function. On the contrary, the Americans found themselves right in the middle of

¹⁰³ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 229-230, 277 (translation mine).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 277 (translation mine).

¹⁰⁵ Persdienst Ministerie van Economische Zaken, *Het Marshall Plan: Handleiding tot het Europese Herstel Programma* (The Hague: Stichting Economische Publicaties, 1948), 119-147.

¹⁰⁶ “Organization and Function of ECA Country Missions.” box 1. File Administration (misc) – 12011 – ORG and Function of Country Missions, RG 469. Records of U.S. Foreign Assistance Agencies, 1948-1961. Mission to the Netherlands. Office of the Director Subject Files (Central Files) 1948-53, USNA.

¹⁰⁷ Ernst van der Beugel, “An Act without Peer: The Marshall Plan in Dutch-American Relations”, in *A Bilateral Bicentennial*, eds. Schulte Nordholt and Swieringa (Amsterdam: Meulenhof, 1982), 75.

policy making, in spheres which infringed on national sovereignty.”¹⁰⁸ This “newer diplomacy”¹⁰⁹ as Van der Beugel called it, required a special kind of diplomat: “individuals who possessed not only first-rate diplomatic qualities but at the same time an extensive knowledge of economics; individuals who combined wisdom and tactfulness with sufficient toughness and the ability to negotiate. They were the outposts of the new role of the United States in the world.”¹¹⁰

While this situation offered many opportunities for friction, Van der Beugel was impressed by the “enviable American flexibility which facilitated the smooth flow of personnel from industry, universities, media, and trade unions to government posts and vice versa. Very few top functions were manned by what one could call the ‘professional civil servant’.”¹¹¹ Many were still young, like Van der Beugel and his staff, and had decided to dedicate a part of their lives to helping to rebuild Europe. The fact that the Marshall Plan stirred the public imagination in the United States probably did not hurt in the recruiting process. “Their advantage was that the whole administration was brand new. They practically made their own rules.”¹¹² Even so, Van der Beugel was very impressed by the great reluctance with which they exercised their authority.¹¹³ “They could have behaved as pro-consuls, but they did not (...). The fundamental principle of the Marshall Plan was something far beyond this. It was a joint attempt, a joint venture.”¹¹⁴ This experience not only further fostered Van der Beugel’s admiration and respect for the United States, but also served as a catalyst for strong social bonds between the Dutch involved in this ‘joint venture’ and their American colleagues.

“Although it is my impression that the Netherlands government is adept in supporting its own interests, all Government officers with whom I have come in personal contact (and that is an extensive list) have been extremely friendly and cooperative,”¹¹⁵ ECA Mission Chief Alan Valentine wrote to Hoffman after his first month in the Netherlands. In fact, Theodor van der Beugel, who lived in New York much of the time, developed his own personal relationship with Alan Valentine. The two men wrote letters to each other and Valentine even helped Ernst’s father with valuable introductions to influentials in Washington DC, including individuals from President Truman’s Council of Economic Advisors, the Department of Commerce and the Brookings Institution.¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ TLOHI – Price.

¹¹⁰ Van der Beugel, “An Act without Peer”, 75.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 75-76.

¹¹² TLOHI – Wilson.

¹¹³ See for example: EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 139.

¹¹⁴ Van der Beugel, “An Act without Peer”, p 75.

¹¹⁵ Alan Valentine to Hoffman, The Hague, August 17, 1948, box 2, Folder 600: “Administrative (misc). Netherlands ERP Setup, RG 469, Records of U.S. Foreign Assistance Agencies, 1948-1961, Mission to the Netherlands, Office of the Director Subject Files (Central Files) 1948-53, Administration Misc. – Agreements, USNA.

¹¹⁶ See for example: Th. M. van der Beugel to Alan Valentine, March 30, 1949, CmV.

A comprehensive PR-campaign

The fact that Congress would annually re-evaluate economic progress meant that there was a great deal of pressure on the aid receiving countries to show encouraging results. Hirschfeld was well aware of this. From the very start he had tried to keep representatives of the media in the loop. He distributed press releases and on 3 January 1948 (when the ERP was still under consideration by Congress) he called a press conference with the Dutch ministers of foreign and economic affairs, Van Boetzelaer and Liefstinck, to update the Dutch media on the most recent developments and “impressed upon them that they should really pay enough attention to the Marshall-dollars.”¹¹⁷ Before the meeting, Hirschfeld had told van Boetzelaer the Dutch press should “especially give an impression of the Dutch reactions with regard to the Marshall Plan (...) it will be necessary to publish certain things in the Dutch press so that they can see in America that the Dutch public is interested in the Marshall Plan, and preferably that they have a positive view of the program.”¹¹⁸

During this press conference Hirschfeld stated that the Netherlands would “have to take on commitments and make sacrifices” and that they should be ready for anything. The Dutch communist newspaper *De Waarheid* reported that Hirschfeld “also acknowledged that there were some questions; some areas in which the terms of the Marshall Plan would come to stand in stark contrast with Dutch national interests, but he asked the journalists to keep these in the dark and to write as little as possible about them.”¹¹⁹ The *De Waarheid* reporter called Hirschfeld’s attempts to influence the Dutch media “Marshall demagogy” and warned readers that “officials have launched a campaign in all pro-American newspapers to make it appear as if a financial catastrophe is imminent if the American aid does not come.”¹²⁰ Two days later *De Waarheid* followed this claim up by pointing out that the Catholic newspaper *De Volkskrant* was already “singing the Marshall-song with major headlines” and warned that it was “making Marshall-propaganda by threatening that our entire monetary system will collapse if the dollars stay away.”¹²¹ Indeed, with the exception of the communist newspaper, the press conference seemed to achieve its purpose. As one account has it, “With a certain sense of shared responsibility for the economic future of the Netherlands all newspapers and magazines devoted articles and supplements to the forthcoming Marshall aid.”¹²² Once the Marshall Plan had made it through Congress, Hirschfeld believed another “informal press-conference” should be organized. This time “without the communist!”

An active publicity campaign was in fact one of the obligations of the bilateral treaty that was signed in June 1948 and was greatly encouraged by ERC Mission Chief Alan

¹¹⁷ “Toekomst van Nederland staat op het spel”, *De Waarheid*, 6 January, 1948 (translation mine).

¹¹⁸ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 113 (translation mine).

¹¹⁹ “Zonder Marshall geen toekomst”, *De Waarheid*, 3 January, 1948 (translation mine).

¹²⁰ “Marshall demagogie”, *De Waarheid*, 5 January, 1948. See also: “Zonder Marshall geen toekomst,” *De Waarheid*, 3 January, 1948 (translation mine).

¹²¹ “Marshall demagogie”, *De Waarheid*, 5 January, 1948 (translation mine).

¹²² Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 113 (translation mine).

Valentine.¹²³ In addition to press conferences and briefings the neatly designed quarterly reports that Van der Beugel's bureau provided were used to this end. Next to members of the government, labor unions, journalists, entrepreneurs and high officials, they were distributed to a diverse range of organizations, the media, libraries and others who had expressed interest in the recovery program.¹²⁴ Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel also cooperated closely with the Press Office of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, run by the young economist Max Weisglas. Weisglas and the Smidswater bureau also regularly consulted with the Information Office of the ECA mission in The Hague, which ran its own publicity program.¹²⁵

During the first year, however, the American approach to publicity differed from the Dutch, at times causing friction between the two. "I remember there was a certain irritation on our side about the excessive amount of publicity we had to generate,"¹²⁶ Van der Beugel would later recall. In the fall of 1948 the Americans told the Dutch that their publicity activities had so far been of a rather static character. The ECA Mission in The Hague desired a comprehensive "Public Relations" campaign, a concept whose meaning and application were still foreign in the Netherlands.¹²⁷ Even so, Hirschfeld asked Weisglas to set up such a campaign. Based on American PR-strategies acquired through the ECA Mission and through study trips to the United States, the Dutch were eventually able to create a more dynamic campaign.¹²⁸ They also intensified existing activities like welcoming ceremonies when ships with Marshall goods arrived, exhibitions describing the recovery program, essay contests with award ceremonies, the publication of explanatory brochures and speeches and press-conferences by individuals like Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel.

One large event that attracted a great deal of attention was the conference of the "Stichting van de Arbeid" on 13 January 1949. The entire program was devoted to Marshall aid and packed with eminent speakers, including ECA Mission Chief Alan Valentine, who opened the event with a distinguished audience including seven Dutch ministers, representatives of the socio-economic partners, senior civil servants, journalists, U.S. diplomats from the embassy and the ERC mission and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. In this "demonstration of friendship", as the *Volkskrant* newspaper described it, "the 'Stichting', representing the Dutch nation, desired to express its gratitude towards the American people and their government for the aid they provide through the Marshall Plan towards the recovery of Europe."¹²⁹ In addition to expressing gratitude, union leader Evert Kupers

¹²³ See, for example: M. Weisglas to H.M. Hirschfeld, "Onderhoud met de Heer Valentine, Hoofd van de ECA-Missie in Nederland", 4 August 1948, file 23171, MinBuza 45-54, NAH.

¹²⁴ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 120.

¹²⁵ Van der Hoeven, *Hoed af voor Marshall*, 101.

¹²⁶ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 144 (translation mine).

¹²⁷ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 117.

¹²⁸ Tity de Vries, "Een brede verspreiding van de berichtgeving is wenselijk", in *Van Strohalm tot Strategie: Het Marshall Plan in Perspectief*, eds. Griffiths et al. (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp, 1997), 41.

¹²⁹ "Demonstratie van Vriendschap", *Volkskrant*, 14 January, 1949 (translation mine).

explained during his opening address that “the goal of this congress is to make the Dutch people aware of what this ERP means for our country in the first place.”¹³⁰

The second speaker was Ernst van der Beugel, described by the *Volkskrant* as “the correct type of the correct civil servant”, who gave an “astute” overview of the history and development of the Marshall Plan: “a speech like a government communique, but better, clearer.”¹³¹ Addressing Dutch suspicion towards America’s motives, Van der Beugel warned that “it is just as naïve to claim that Marshall’s plan is born out of American export interests as it is to assume that the American people and their government were solely motivated by the idea of playing Santa Claus.”¹³² The plan was a “product of generous insight and prudent policy”¹³³ and had laid the foundations for a form of economic cooperation unknown in the history of Europe. However, he emphasized there was no room for complacency. For the realization of the European Recovery Program 1949 would be a critical year.¹³⁴

Over the course of the European Recovery Program, Hirschfeld and Van der Beugel tried to remove irritations and suspicion concerning American meddling in Europe by explaining the American position and by fostering a sense of trust in the American people. Eventually, the ECA’s Special Representative in Paris, Averell Harriman, would praise the Dutch publicity campaign, saying that the Dutch public was “the best informed of all concerning the Marshall Plan.”¹³⁵ It was also in this context that Ernst van der Beugel became directly acquainted with the importance of public opinion in the diplomatic process. The lessons he learned here would serve him well in the future, as a private citizen pursuing his own public diplomacy campaigns.

In the summer of 1949 the American banker Clarence E. Hunter succeeded Alan Valentine as ECA Mission Chief to the Netherlands. Hunter, who had served as vice-president of the New York Trust Company since 1928, was a member of the elite New York Metropolitan Club, established in 1891 by J.P. Morgan, and as treasurer of the Council on Foreign Relations he was a core member of America’s East Coast Establishment.¹³⁶ Hunter was no stranger to the Netherlands either. As vice-president of the New York Trust Company he had been in charge of foreign trade, a position that allowed him to travel abundantly. Before his appointment as ECA Mission Chief he had visited the Netherlands “about twenty times,”¹³⁷ developing close relations with Dutch financial circles.¹³⁸ After his appointment

¹³⁰ “Openingsrede van de heer E. Kupers” in *Het Economisch Herstel Programma: derde Congres van de Arbeid*, 1949, file 23056, MinBuza 1945-1954, NAH (translation mine).

¹³¹ Drs. Van der Beugel: “Slagen van Benelux voorbeeld”, [newspaper unknown], 14 January 1949, Scrapbook I, AHB; “Demonstratie van Vriendschap”, *Volkskrant* 14-1-1949 (translation mine).

¹³² “De Marshall-hulp en Benelux”, *De Nieuwe Courant*, 14 January, 1949 (translation mine).

¹³³ “Rede Drs. E.H. van der Beugel”, *Het Economisch Herstel Programma: derde Congres van de Arbeid*, 1949, file 23056, MinBuza 1945-1954, NAH (translation mine).

¹³⁴ “Dr. Valentine op Utrechts Marshall Plan Congres”, *Volkskrant*, 14 January, 1949.

¹³⁵ Van der Hoeven, *Hoed af voor Marshall*, 106 (translation mine).

¹³⁶ Michael Wala, *The Council on Foreign Relations and American Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 1994), 51 (footnote).

¹³⁷ Translation Interview with Mr. Hunter, *Volkskrant*, Reel 7 of 7, RG469, Agency for International Development – Mission to the Netherlands, RSC.

was made public, Adriaan Philipse, the trade council at the Dutch embassy in Washington D.C., wrote to Hirschfeld that “practically all Dutch bankers are writing us letters to inform us that he is one of their very best friends.”¹³⁹ Turning 65 also meant Hunter had reached the age limit for his position as vice-president of the New York Trust Company. This allowed him to stay in the Netherlands for the remainder of the European Recovery Program.

As with Valentine, Van der Beugel developed a very close relationship with Clarence Hunter. The men met very often, both professionally and socially. “I have always taken the position that I decline every invitation, except the ones from the Americans, but even with that restriction I cannot keep up”, Van der Beugel wrote to his father in the fall of 1949. “It will be absolutely wonderful to meet up with Hunter later, with whom I had dinner on Thursday, lunch on Friday and cocktails and dinner on Saturday. When I tell him ‘how very pleased I am’ to see him, he will probably think I am fooling him.”¹⁴⁰ In addition to the many formal meetings and social gatherings that are so emblematic to the diplomatic circuit, Van der Beugel organized regular informal get-togethers between Clarence Hunter and Dutch business representatives that became known as the ‘Hunter Club’. In contrast to the more formal Business Advisory Council established by Hirschfeld, there were no representatives from the trade unions present at these meetings.¹⁴¹

The ERP: Developing Transatlantic Networks

While Ernst van der Beugel’s primary responsibility was the coordination of the Marshall Plan in the Netherlands, he was constantly connected to the broader ERP constellation that reached from Washington to Paris and from Paris to every Western-European country involved in the recovery program. The European cooperation that the Americans had pressed for since the Plan’s announcement in June 1947 forced Ernst van der Beugel and his European colleagues to work closely together. In the process – beginning with the 1947 Paris Conference – a web of transnational linkages developed both in Europe and across the Atlantic.

On a European level, this process was stimulated by the fact that Van der Beugel and his European colleagues became part of a unique form of “European machinery” in the OEEC in which they came to feel “responsible for a joint venture.”¹⁴² As the Frenchman Robert Marjolin, the first Secretary General of the OEEC and a lifelong friend of Ernst van der Beugel, later recalled: “Never in my experience, before and after the Marshall Plan, have I known an international team moved by such an intense desire to accomplish a joint endeavor, the success of which represented at that time a matter of life and death for Europe and for each member country, and to see that it succeeded in conditions such that each participant might

¹³⁸ A.H. Philipse to Hirschfeld, 27 April 1949, file 23173, MinBuza 1945-1954, NAH.

¹³⁹ A.H. Philipse to Hirschfeld, 3 May 1949, file 23173, MinBuza 1945-1954, NAH (translation mine).

¹⁴⁰ Ernst van der Beugel to Th. M. van der Beugel, 2 November, 1949, CmV (translation mine).

¹⁴¹ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 161.

¹⁴² Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 72.

derive equal benefit. We were convinced that the different European countries were indissolubly linked in their destinies.”¹⁴³

This close cooperation not only contributed to a growing sense of internationalism and “additional loyalties to a broader entity than their own government”; it also laid the foundation for transnational relationships that went beyond formal interstate relations.¹⁴⁴ Van der Beugel explained the development of this social network as follows: “It starts with working together, but in the process another aspect kicks in, namely that you get to like each other personally; that you think the same about the same problems. But that isn’t even the most important part. The fact that a personal element of trust and affinity develops in the process – that is the most important.”¹⁴⁵ Among the Europeans with whom Van der Beugel developed a particularly close bond during this period were Count Jean-Charles Snoy et d’Oppuers from Belgium, Sir Eric Roll from England, Robert Marjolin from France, Prince Guido Colonna di Paliano from Italy, and the group around Adenauer in Germany consisting of Walter Hallstein, Ludwig Erhard, Alfred Müller-Armack, Heinrich von Brentano, Herbert Blankenhorn and Hilger van Scherpenberg.¹⁴⁶ “I had a very intimate relationship with these people,” Van der Beugel recalled. “If we ran into trouble, we telephoned each other, talked with each other. We also visited each other at home.”¹⁴⁷

While Van der Beugel claimed that nationality didn’t play an important role in this, he found that “this sort of contact was by far the most difficult with the French.”¹⁴⁸ In his experience, “the entire club that ruled France was totally focused on France. It was an extremely cohesive *grand école*-club whose members did not speak in very flattering terms about foreign countries.” The only exception, Van der Beugel argued, was Robert Marjolin whose wife was American and “who did not have any French complexes.” In contrast, Van der Beugel felt “very much at home” with the Germans from Adenauer’s *entourage*. “I have had

¹⁴³ Robert Marjolin, *Architect of European Unity: Memoirs 1911-1986* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1986), 195-196.

¹⁴⁴ See for example: TLOHI – Wilson.

¹⁴⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 227 (translation mine).

¹⁴⁶ For Snoy, Roll and Marjolin see chapter 2, footnote 25. Prince Guido Colonna di Paliano was the Secretary-General of the Italian delegation at the Marshall Plan negotiations after which he served as Secretary-General of the OEEC (1948-1956), followed by top positions at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs after which he served as the Italian ambassador to Norway until he was appointed as the deputy Secretary General of NATO (1962-1964). Between 1964 and 1970 Colonna served as a European Commissioner. Walter Hallstein was Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs. Between 1958 and 1967 he would serve as the first President of the Commission of the EEC. After a clash with French president Charles de Gaulle he retreated to German politics as a member of parliament. He also served as the President of the European Movement from 1968 to 1974. Ludwig Erhard served as the Minister of Economic Affairs between 1949 and 1963, a position he combined with his role as Vice Chancellor of Germany between 1957 and 1963. Between 17 October 1963 and 30 November 1966 Erhard served as the 28th Chancellor of Germany. From 1952 onwards Professor Alfred Müller Armack served under Erhard as chief of the policy department at the Ministry of Economic Affairs. Heinrich von Brentano was a Christian Democratic politician who would serve as Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1955 and 1961. Herbert Blankenhorn and Hilger van Scherpenberg were members of the German Foreign Service. Blankenhorn would serve as ambassador to Italy, France and the United Kingdom. Between 1958 and 1961 Hilger van Scherpenberg served as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, when Heinrich von Brentano was Minister of Foreign Affairs.

¹⁴⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.p. 149, 227-228 (translation mine).

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p.p. 227-228 (translation mine).

the great advantage that in my first important contacts with the Germans I dealt with decent honest people”, Van der Beugel recalled: “I trusted them completely.” His experience with the Germans had “very strongly influenced” his attitude towards Germany for the better.¹⁴⁹ The same could clearly not be said about the French. A similar positive development, however, did occur with the Americans. Indeed, Van der Beugel frequently emphasized how the role and attitude of the Americans involved in the Marshall Plan played an important role in his growing admiration towards the United States. “The bankers and the lawyers, who wanted to help in those countries they felt affiliated with, where they believed they came from,”¹⁵⁰ made a deep impression on him. He considered them “symptomatic for the inventiveness and flexibility of America’s foreign policy” and saw them as “the outposts of the new role of the United States in the World.”¹⁵¹

Indeed, while trans-European linkages were important, Van der Beugel emphasized that the social network that developed during this period was above all trans-Atlantic in character.¹⁵² It was fostered at the bilateral level in the relationships with the staff of the American embassies and the ECA country missions. It was nurtured through consultations at the OEEC, but also through more informal social gatherings like receptions, cocktails and dinners in Paris, The Hague and Washington, where he got to know the other ECA Mission Chiefs as well as Harriman’s successor as Special Representative, Milton Katz, with whom he would develop a lifelong relationship.¹⁵³ What is more, it was during this period that he became acquainted with the East Coast Establishment: “I worked with that group (...) I knew them all; that whole group that ruled America during that period: the Achesons, the Lovetts, the McCloys, you name them.”¹⁵⁴ He not only greatly admired these men, but also felt a strong affiliation with their objectives.

This unusually intense and constructive period in transatlantic history also generated a common bond of having been part of this ‘joint-venture’; of having worked in the same challenging circumstances, gone through the same experiences, and shared the same hopes, fears and aspirations. Even those who did not know each other personally during the days of the Marshall Plan, but who nevertheless shared similar experiences from this post-war period felt connected through its can-do spirit. Many of them would cross paths again later on – either in the process of European integration or through cooperation in NATO or some other, maybe more informal, trans-Atlantic venue. As Van der Beugel put it: “the moment people see that you went through these first years together, there is something very special, very special.”¹⁵⁵

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 151 (translation mine).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 130 (translation mine).

¹⁵¹ EvdB/Kersten Oral history, pp. 130, 140, 151, 227-228; Van der Beugel, “An Act Without Peer”, 75.

¹⁵² EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.p. 226-227.

¹⁵³ See for example: Van der Beugel to Th. M. Van der Beugel, 20 November, 1949, CmV; Marjolin, *Memoirs*, 195-196.

¹⁵⁴ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.927 (translation mine).

¹⁵⁵ TLOHI – Wilson.

The Marshall Plan thus generated a group of individuals from Europe and the United States tied together through personal bonds, shared experiences and common aspirations. These linkages would soon evolve into the foundation for an informal transatlantic social network that would “form an indispensable element for future cooperation.”¹⁵⁶

Hirschfeld’s Heir

While the European Recovery Program took up the greatest chunk of Hirschfeld’s time, this was far from his only responsibility. As government commissioner he was involved in practically all major post-war international issues the Netherlands was confronted with: the German question, Indonesia, the Benelux and the European Recovery Program. This unusual accumulation of responsibilities made Hirschfeld the most powerful civil servant of post-war The Hague.¹⁵⁷ It also meant that he had to delegate.

In May 1948, Hirschfeld had appointed Van der Beugel’s close friend Max Kohnstamm as his deputy with regards to German Affairs. Kohnstamm had worked as Queen Wilhelmina’s personal secretary since the end of the war, but she had decided to abdicate in 1948. Kohnstamm – who had just made a study trip with a church delegation to Germany, which had deeply impressed him – was up for a new challenge.¹⁵⁸ As his biographers have noted: “even Hirschfeld’s energy had its limits, which made him delegate the negotiations concerning Germany completely to his deputy Max Kohnstamm and the distribution of the Marshall aid to Ernst van der Beugel.”¹⁵⁹ Overall, however, Van der Beugel played a more prominent role than Kohnstamm, with his own administrative apparatus that grew extensively over the course of the Marshall Plan. It already counted four departments by 1950.¹⁶⁰ Two years later it employed around 50 people.¹⁶¹ Besides, as opposed to Van der Beugel who had become the grand bureaucrat’s protégé, Kohnstamm never developed a close relationship with Hirschfeld. He would later say that while they were both assistants of Hirschfeld, Van der Beugel could be compared to a “giant” while he was just a “dwarf” in the Smidswater constellation.¹⁶²

Ever since Van der Beugel had been assigned to Hirschfeld during the 1947 Paris conference the two men had gotten along exceptionally well. Hirschfeld, who was over twenty years older than Van der Beugel, was not married. His life revolved around his work

¹⁵⁶ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 72.

¹⁵⁷ Willem Wansink, “De Groep van Tien: PvdA Ambtenaren en buitenlands beleid 1947-1952”, file 7, Archief C.L. Patijn 1940-1998, NAH. According to Fennema & Rhijnsburger even the “Most powerful civil servant the Netherlands has ever known” (*Hirschfeld*, 317).

¹⁵⁸ See: Harryvan & van der Harst, *Kohnstamm*, 110.

¹⁵⁹ Fennema and Rhijnsburger, *Hirschfeld*, 209 (translation mine).

¹⁶⁰ The Economic-Statistic department, the Programming and Procedure department, the ECA Technical Assistance and General Affairs department and an Archive and Documentation department.

¹⁶¹ Wansink, “Groep van Tien”, 59.

¹⁶² See: *Ibid.*, 114 (translation mine).

and he regarded Ernst van der Beugel as his protégé.¹⁶³ Hirschfeld biographer, Arie van der Zwan noted that

Ernst van der Beugel is probably the only one for whom, later in life, Hirschfeld has taken down his armor; to whom he also dared to reveal some of his weaker sides. That was during a period in his life, following the Second World War and its aftermath, during which the need for personal support became too powerful for him. The 'surrogate-father-son-relationship' – the term comes from Van der Beugel – which developed between them, must have meant a lot to Hirschfeld.¹⁶⁴

Ernst van der Beugel, in turn, also greatly admired the “grand man of the Dutch bureaucracy.”¹⁶⁵ “I am living *im Schatten der Titanen*” he wrote to his father in a 1948 letter describing his growing admiration for Hirschfeld.¹⁶⁶ While Hirschfeld was not a conceptual thinker, he was a superb manager with a vast amount of experience who knew the civil service like no other.¹⁶⁷ At the same time he was a first-class economist who tried to find “an equilibrium between the wisdom of the statesmen and the knowledge of the experts.”¹⁶⁸ He taught Van der Beugel the ropes of international politics and introduced him to an extensive network of contacts in political, financial and economic circles.¹⁶⁹ At his right hand Ernst van der Beugel’s career at the Smidswater truly took off.

Meanwhile, Van der Beugel had also become a prominent presence within the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. When in 1950 Hirschfeld left The Hague for eight months to serve as the first High Commissioner of the Netherlands to its former colony Indonesia, the *grand commis* was dearly missed. While Dick Spierenburg – Hirschfeld’s deputy from the Ministry of Economic Affairs – replaced him as Government Commissioner, the Dutch Marshall Plan organization was gravitating increasingly towards the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.¹⁷⁰

After war broke out in Korea in 1950, the Americans started to shift their emphasis from economic to military aid, thus adding a whole new sphere to Van der Beugel’s field of work. Startled by the loss of their nuclear monopoly after the Soviet Union had successfully tested an atomic bomb in August 1949, the Americans developed a new National Security Strategy (NSC-68), which emphasized the strategic importance of Western Europe for both the US and its allies. In fact, “the plan was so framed that the United States and Europe would jointly start with the build-up of their conventional forces, supplemented and assisted by nuclear and thermonuclear weaponry of American produce.”¹⁷¹ In addition, the ratification of the

¹⁶³ Arie van der Zwan, *H.M. Hirschfeld: In de ban van de macht* (Meulenhoff: Amsterdam, 2004), 308.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 308 (translation mine).

¹⁶⁵ TLOHI – Wilson.

¹⁶⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to Th. M. Van der Beugel, The Hague, 25 January, 1948, CmV (translation mine).

¹⁶⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.128.

¹⁶⁸ TLOHI – Price.

¹⁶⁹ Wansink, “Groep van Tien”, 62.

¹⁷⁰ Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 156.

¹⁷¹ Jan der Harst, *The Atlantic Priority: Dutch Defence at the Time of the European Defence Community* (Florence: European Press Academic Publishing, 2008), 42.

North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, enabled the European countries to request military aid from the United States. To facilitate the distribution of this aid, the Americans created the Mutual Defense Assistance Program (MDAP), which started in January 1950. That same month, the Netherlands signed a bilateral agreement with the United States in which the distribution of military aid was regulated next to the economic aid.

In response, the Dutch government appointed Hirschfeld as Government Commissioner for the Economic and Military Aid Program. During the first years of the European Recovery Plan it had been strictly forbidden to use the Marshall aid for military purposes. After the start of the Korean War, however, the American Congress began to underline the interconnectedness between the military and the economic aid programs by advocating that the ECA should also take the defense efforts of the aid receiving countries into account during the allocation of the Marshall aid. The underlying idea was that what had happened to Korea could also happen to Europe. The 1951 Mutual Defense Assistance Act eventually formalized the merger of economic and military aid through the Mutual Security Agency (MSA), functional from January 1952. In 1951 Van der Beugel's Marshall Plan Bureau merged with the Bureau for the Military Aid Program. Since the economic aid under the Marshall Plan would formally come to an end in July 1952, it was decided that MSA would take care of pending cases until July 1953, after which the Foreign Operations Agency (FOA) would take over this responsibility. MSA and FOA would still grant aid to Western Europe, but only in connection with military purposes.¹⁷²

The Dutch context was also changing. During the late 1940s, the Dutch minister of Foreign Affairs Dirk Stikker had ordered a reorganization of his department under the leadership of his chief of Political Affairs Han Boon. Boon tried to use this to strengthen the position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding its influence over the European Recovery Program. In the fall of 1949, Boon asked Van der Beugel to become the first chief of the newly designed Western Hemisphere division next to his Marshall Plan activities. "Since the relation of the Netherlands with the Western Hemisphere and in particular with the United States was determined for a large part by the Marshall Plan,"¹⁷³ and since the Ministry already involved Van der Beugel and his bureau in "all matters concerning the United States,"¹⁷⁴ this appeared like a logical step. While he emphasized that his work for the Marshall Plan would remain his chief priority, Van der Beugel – who was very eager to join the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – happily accepted.¹⁷⁵ As a result of the growing emphasis on matters relating to security policy following the start of the Korean War, the Marshall Plan

¹⁷² Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 25, 26, 233, 235.

¹⁷³ E.H. van der Beugel to Ingen-Housz, 24 January 1950, file 22948, MinBuZa 1945-1954, NAH (translation mine).

¹⁷⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Prof. Dr. J.R.M. v.d. Brink, 19 January 1950, file 22948, MinBuZa 1945-1954, NAH (translation mine).

¹⁷⁵ Van der Beugel to Th. M. van der Beugel, 20 November, 1949, CmV. "Daarbij komt dan nog, dat een verdere vermeerdering van of verhoging in het Marshallwerk het nieuwe werk op Buitenlandse Zaken heel moeilijk zou maken en dat wil ik perse doorzetten, juist nu. Men rekent daar op B.Z. vast op en de Ambassade hier heeft mij op alle mogelijke wijzen laten weten, dat zij dat ook zeer op prijs stellen. Ik wil dus naar de kant van B.Z. Keep the line open."

Bureau had started to lean more in the direction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well.¹⁷⁶ Consequently, when Hans Max Hirschfeld left the Dutch government in October 1952, his independent Government Commissariat was dissolved. In its place a new Directorate General was established within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to be headed by the 34-year-old Ernst van der Beugel – making him, as the *Volkskrant* put it, “Hirschfeld’s first heir.”¹⁷⁷

As Director General for the Economic and Military Aid Program Van der Beugel also became increasingly involved in matters concerning Dutch defense policy. His responsibilities entailed the general administrative coordination of the American aid programs in the Netherlands and the coordination of all communication with the involved American institutions, the administrative coordination of the Dutch position in the OEEC, as well as the economic, military-economic and financial affairs in NATO and the European Defense Community. Last but not least Van der Beugel was responsible for the implementation of related policies designed by the Commission for Economic Affairs and the Defense Council of the Dutch cabinet.¹⁷⁸ The execution of these tasks required close cooperation with the Ministry of Defense, all the more so because the Ministry of Defense did not have the bureaucratic capacity to deal with the American aid program.¹⁷⁹ “I have often said that in those years I was just as much Director-General of Defense as Director-General of Foreign Affairs”¹⁸⁰ Van der Beugel asserted. With the exception of purely military-organizational affairs, which he had to discuss with the Chiefs of Staff, the Dutch defense minister Cees Staf involved Van der Beugel in practically everything that had an international character, including the Dutch position in NATO, the yearly exams, and the entire chunk of military aid.¹⁸¹

Conclusion

The Marshall Plan marks a decisive period in Ernst van der Beugel’s career. It drew him right into the center of Cold War transatlantic diplomacy and familiarized him with international politics, the processes of European integration, America’s political system and its foreign policy establishment. It was here – under Hirschfeld’s wings – that Ernst van der Beugel received his main professional education, which prepared him for a life as an informal transatlantic mediator at the crossroads of Cold War transatlantic diplomacy, economic and security policy.

The implementation of the Economic Assistance Act of 1948 also helped to forge many new linkages inside the Netherlands, among the Europeans and across the Atlantic. When we

¹⁷⁶ See: Van der Eng, *De Marshall-Hulp*, 156.

¹⁷⁷ “Drs. E.H. van der Beugel wordt Hirschfeld’s eerste erfgenaam”, *Volkskrant*, 25 September 1952 (translation mine).

¹⁷⁸ Gids van het departement van Buitenlandse Zaken en de Buitenlandse Dienst (1953), 19. quoted in: “Inventaris van het code-archief van het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 1945-1945,” p.83. accessed, 29 August, 2016, <http://www.gahetna.nl/collectie/archief/pdf/NL-HaNA_2.05.117.ead.pdf>

¹⁷⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, file 62, p.p. 58-159.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 159 (translation mine).

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

apply the perspective of New Diplomatic History to look beyond the role of nation states in this context, it becomes clear that the corporatist organizational structure that the Americans chose to apply to the European Recovery Program served as a strong catalyst for public-private cooperation supported by an infrastructure of informal cooperation and consultation that would outlast the Marshall plan itself. Meanwhile, American pressure on European cooperation led to the creation of a permanent European organization in the form of the OEEC, which brought a group of European officials together in a unique cooperative setting. In addition, the close cooperation with the Americans, represented in Europe by the Office of the Special Representative in Paris and through the country missions and embassies in all the participating countries, forged many new and special bonds across the public and private sectors, thus paving the way for future cooperation.

As director of the Dutch Marshall Plan bureau that was responsible for the coordination of the American economic and military aid programs in the Netherlands, Ernst van der Beugel was positioned at the very center of Dutch, European and transatlantic Marshall Plan activity. As a result of the multidisciplinary character of the Marshall Plan this position not only demanded close cooperation with the relevant government departments, but also with representatives from business, labor, industry, military and financial circles and the press. In this process Van der Beugel became the ultimate middle-man navigating between the public and the private, the national, the European and the transatlantic, between foreign security and economic policy. Through his coordination of, interaction with, and mediation between the different groups involved in the Marshall Plan – both private and governmental, Dutch, European and American – Van der Beugel was able to develop an extensive and diverse social network which would prove to be a valuable asset throughout his career on the diplomatic playing field, both as an official and as an unofficial actor. As the next chapter will demonstrate, this period also played a crucial role in the development of Van der Beugel's political views on Cold War international relations.

3. An Atlanticist European

While the previous chapter emphasized the post-war Marshall Plan *context* in which Ernst van der Beugel was active and the public-private linkages that developed during these years, this chapter will focus more specifically on the evolution of Van der Beugel's *ideas* during his career at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in particular with regards to the process of European integration and its relationship to transatlantic relations. It was during this period that the ideas that would drive him as an unofficial diplomat crystallized. At times they would also clash with formal government policy.

Whereas official representatives of the nation state are expected to execute the formal policy line set out by the government, as this chapter will also demonstrate, private actors have more freedom to act upon their personal convictions. As a consequence, in the absence of a clear policy line set out by a nation state these personal convictions can offer crucial insight into what unofficial diplomats pursue and represent. Consequently, by focusing on the development of Ernst van der Beugel's ideas during this period, we can also gain a better understanding of his role and position as an unofficial actor on the diplomatic playing field later on. At the same time, the personal convictions of official actors in the diplomatic realm do not necessarily square with formal policy. When we assess the private convictions of government representatives in relation to official policy a certain tension may reveal itself that provides insight into an important difference between official government representatives and private diplomats who are not bound by the same restrictions. As this chapter will demonstrate, this also applied to Ernst van der Beugel *and* Max Kohnstamm during the years in which they served as official government representatives. Eventually, both men threw off the yoke of formal administrative discipline by entering the transatlantic political-diplomatic arena in a private capacity.

As demonstrated by the previous chapters, Ernst van der Beugel came of age through his experiences of the 1930's, the Second World War and the reconstruction of Western Europe, all of which helped to determine his attitude towards international relations and the transatlantic relationship in particular. In addition, his participation in the Marshall Plan created a strong identification with the post-war period and the Americans with whom he worked closely together.¹ "We experienced for the first time that a large country showed leadership in extremely critical circumstances," Van der Beugel would recall decades later. This leadership and determination stood in stark contrast with the attitude of the major European countries. The appeasement at Munich in 1938 in particular had left a deep mark on Ernst van der Beugel, which would never really fade. One of the most basic lessons he took away from these experiences was that power relations were fundamental and, consequently,

¹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, file 61-66, EvdB, NAH, p.167: "Dat is heel sterk beïnvloed door het Marshallplan. En daardoor het heel regelmatige contact met de Amerikanen, met die fantastische generatie van, laat ik zeggen, Truman, Acheson."

“that an expansionistic totalitarian regime should be confronted from a position of strength.”²

Central to the security of Western-Europe was also the question of Germany.³ Since its unification in the 19th century, this country had severely rocked the European power balance; it had played a central role in two devastating world wars and it was now divided between the rivaling powers of East and West. How could Germany be peacefully bound to the West? What kind of structure could safely contain Germany *and* safeguard the balance of power in Europe at the same time? To Van der Beugel, the Second World War had demonstrated that the only way to safeguard the European power balance was to include the United States in this framework. When the European countries had failed, the United States stood up as the backup country that could restore the power equilibrium. Now, with a new threat rising in the East, war-wrecked Europe depended totally on the American military guarantee. “The idea that we were dealing with an existential threat was an indisputable fact to me”, Van der Beugel maintained, “as was the idea that that threat could only be confronted with a total commitment of the United States in Europe” as well as “that NATO, with everything it encompassed, including its defense structure, was the best organization for this. And anything that threatened this (...) I opposed.”⁴ The idea that Europe’s security in the context of the Cold War depended completely on the security guarantee of America’s nuclear umbrella would be fundamental to Van der Beugel’s vision of transatlantic relations and the development of his attitude towards European integration for the remainder of the Cold War. This conviction also determined the development of his attitude towards the process of European integration.

As a result of the direct link between the Marshall Plan and the American demand for European cooperation, combined with the institutional structures that consequently developed within the Dutch government apparatus, Ernst van der Beugel came to play a central role in Dutch policy circles concerned with European integration. During the 1950’s in particular a march of events unrolled that would be fundamental for the evolution of Van der Beugel’s views concerning European integration and its relationship to Atlantic cooperation. What is more, as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Ernst van der Beugel also found himself confronted with the power of private actors in transatlantic relations – a highly relevant experience in the context of New Diplomatic History which left a deep and lasting impression on him. After all, New Diplomatic History seeks to broaden its framework of analysis not just by recognizing the diplomatic roles of unofficial actors, but also by including the private ideas, activities and networks of formal government representatives in this broader context. When we do so, it becomes clear that the official and unofficial spheres of transatlantic diplomacy do not exist in isolation from each other, but are intimately connected.

² EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 128, 166 (translation mine).

³ See for instance: “De Amerikaanse invloed op de Europese samenwerking”, *Rotterdammer*, 29 June, 1959.

⁴ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 275 (translation mine).

Historical Context: the Netherlands and the Road to Rome

In the Netherlands, the acceptance of Marshall aid was part of a radical redefinition of Dutch foreign policy. The war and the German occupation had brought an end to the Dutch policy of neutrality. Between 1948 and 1952 a new vision on the position of the Netherlands in the world unfolded, characterized by an Atlanticist orientation in the security realm, based on a broad acceptance (though not on every point) of American hegemony, which was formalized by the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949. NATO would serve as the corner stone of Dutch security policy throughout the Cold War.⁵ At the same time, as a logical consequence of the Dutch economy's heavy dependency on foreign trade, the Netherlands also moved towards an increasing participation in the process of continental European integration.⁶ Next to the general trade liberalization through the OEEC, the economic rehabilitation of Germany and its integration in Western Europe were of the utmost importance to the Dutch.

Dirk Stikker, who served as Minister of Foreign Affairs between August 1948 and September 1952, was a passionate advocate of this approach.⁷ As one of the first ministers of Foreign Affairs with a clear interest in economic affairs, he became a key promotor of the liberalization of European trade and finance.⁸ Pressed by the United States to move the process of European integration forward, France had proposed the creation of a customs union together with Italy and the Benelux countries. The Dutch were very hesitant towards this continental initiative due to economic motives including fear of French protectionism. They preferred close cooperation with the United Kingdom, since the English shared Dutch views on free trade, the value of an open community and close cooperation with the United States. What's more, due to their economic dependence on the German hinterland, the Dutch strongly favored the integration of Germany in the new economic framework. By the end of 1950 the French walked away from the Fritalux discussions. As opposed to The Hague, Paris did not want to involve the United Kingdom, nor their German archenemy.⁹ Despite the lack of progress in the OEEC, Stikker believed this organization still offered the best vehicle for his aims. Consequently, he set up a team of experts including Ernst van der Beugel and Max Kohnstamm to work out a 'Plan of Action' along these lines that became known as the 'Stikker Plan'. The resulting blueprint proposed a sectoral liberalization of trade in the OEEC zone combined with the establishment of a European integration fund to enable member states

⁵ Duco Hellema, *Nederland in de Wereld: de buitenlandse politiek van Nederland* (Houten: Spectrum, 2010), 149-151.

⁶ Philip Everts, "Inleiding, traditie en verandering", In *Nederland in een veranderende Wereld: de toekomst van het buitenlands beleid*, ed. P.R. Baehr (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1991), 14.

⁷ Jan Bank, "Overall een ondernemer: Dirk Uipko Stikker (1948-1952)" in *De Nederlandse ministers van Buitenlandse Zaken in de twintigste eeuw*, in *viijde jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek*, eds. Duco Hellema, Bert Zeeman and Bert van der Zwan (Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers, 1990), 193.

⁸ Anjo Harryvan and Jan van der Harst, "Een sneeuwveld in 1942: Vraaggesprek met drs. M. Kohnstamm", in *Voor Nederland en Europa: Politici en ambtenaren over het Nederlandse Europabeleid en de Europese integratie, 1945-1975*, eds. Harryvan et al. (Amsterdam: Boom, 2001), 88.

⁹ See: Régine Perron, *The Stability of Europe: The Common Market: Towards European Integration of Industrial and Financial Markets? 1958-1968* (Paris: PU Paris-Sorbonne, 2004), 64; Anjo G. Harryvan, *In Pursuit of Influence: The Netherlands' European Policy during the Formative Years of the European Union, 1952-1973* (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2009), 37; Willem Wansink, "De Groep van Tien: PvdA Ambtenaren en buitenlands beleid 1947-1952", file 7, Archief C.L. Patijn 1940-1998, NAH, p 72; EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, p. 132.

modernize industries faced with negative consequences from the proposed liberalization.¹⁰ In May 1950, however, the Stikker Plan was overtaken by the more ambitious Schuman Plan.

This plan, designed by Jean Monnet and presented by the French Minister of Foreign Affairs Robert Schuman, called for the establishment of a European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) that would place the French and German production of coal and steel under a common High Authority.¹¹ It was this supranational element, the fact that the organization would *not* be intergovernmental in character like the OEEC – and as had been usual in multilateral organizations up till that moment – that made the Schuman plan revolutionary.¹² Other Western-European countries, including the Netherlands, were also invited to participate, but whereas the Schuman Plan was received with great enthusiasm in the United States, it was not met with overall enthusiasm in the Netherlands.¹³ While Schuman had consulted Adenauer and the Americans – who had endorsed the plan – the Dutch had not been informed before its formal presentation at the press conference on May 9. To the Dutch, economic integration took primacy over political integration. While the Schuman Plan was economic in character, its purpose was clearly political.

Thus, the Netherlands had to come to grips with a new European reality and the Dutch cabinet was strongly divided on the issue. Sceptics like Prime Minister Drees and Finance Minister Lief tinck initially opposed the plan, while the Ministers of Economic Affairs and Agriculture, van den Brink and Mansholt, eagerly supported it. Foreign Minister Stikker took a middle position.¹⁴ In April 1950 he had declared in a speech in Rome that “if we truly want to develop our European cooperation, we will need to voluntarily give up some of our precious sovereignty, thereby accepting the possibility that on matters of common interest, decisions will be reached with less unanimity.”¹⁵ Even so, the proposed supranational character of the High Authority was a bridge too far for him. In his memoirs Stikker explained that he doubted whether the system of the High Authority would be the best possible construction, because he was afraid it would put off the British Labor government. In addition, Stikker believed the community should focus on more sectors than coal and steel and he still hoped for an organization – more like the OEEC – that would attract more countries.¹⁶ Even so, he

¹⁰ A more complete summary of the Stikker Plan can be found in: Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, *Jaarboek van het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken 1949-50*, The Hague, 1950, pp. 36-38.

¹¹ Jean Monnet was a French political economist who served as an economic intermediary between France and her allies during World War I, after which he was appointed as the deputy Secretary General of the League of Nations. During the Second World War he was sent to the U.S. by the British Government to negotiate arms supplies for the British and the Free French and in 1944 he was asked to work out plans for France’s post-war economic recovery. Monnet was a passionate advocate of European integration and would become one of the main founding fathers of European integration. For an in depth study on Monnet see: François Duchêne, *Jean Monnet: The First Statesman of Interdependence* (New York: Norton & Company, 1994).

¹² See: Mathieu Segers, *Reis naar het continent: Nederland en de Europese integratie - 1950 tot heden* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 2013), 71-72.

¹³ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 214.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 79-80.

¹⁵ Quoted in: Stikker, *Memoires*, 164 (translation mine).

¹⁶ Stikker, *Memoires*, 164. (translation mine).

came to the conclusion that the plan needed to be seen as a 'necessary evil'.¹⁷ The opportunity to bind West Germany to Western Europe combined with American pressure to accept the plan prevailed. On April 18, 1951, the Netherlands somewhat reluctantly signed the treaty that would bind it to the 'little Europe' of the new European Coal and Steel Community consisting of France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries.

Political and Military Integration

1950 not only brought forth the Schuman Plan, but also the Korean War, which set in motion a whole series of new defense initiatives in the West. Korea consolidated the idea among many in Western Europe and in the United States that the Soviet Union was indeed a totalitarian regime with expansionistic ambitions, which created the feeling of "an acute threat."¹⁸ Van der Beugel, interpreted the Korean War "as the beginning of truly expansionist Soviet politics, which went beyond the domination of Eastern Europe", more precisely as "the beginning of a planned Soviet expansion to the West."¹⁹ The likelihood of a hot war in Western Europe was something Van der Beugel also discussed in correspondence with his father who lived in New York at the time.²⁰ In response to the Korean War, NATO was transformed into an operative military organization with an American commander and American troops stationed in Europe. Furthermore, the emphasis of American post-war reconstruction aid to Europe shifted from the economic to the military sphere, as mentioned in the preceding chapter.

The consolidation of the Cold War and the desire for a strong European defense also raised the question of West-German rearmament.²¹ In September 1950, only five years after the end of the Second World War, the American Secretary of State Dean Acheson suggested to grant Western-Germany NATO membership in order to rearm the country within an Atlantic framework. A month later, French premier René Pleven proposed a plan, again designed by Jean Monnet, to create a supranational European army as part of a European Defense Community (EDC) in which West-German military units could be integrated without having to form a national army.²² An additional French-Italian proposal furthermore called for the establishment of a European Political Community (EPC) designed to integrate the ECSC and the EDG within the framework of a supranational democratically organized political authority. Stikker opposed this proposal and advised the Dutch to reject it. He feared that it would relegate the Dutch priority of economic cooperation to a back burner. He also argued

¹⁷ Segers, *Reis naar het Continent*, 80 (translation mine).

¹⁸ Hellema, *Nederland in de Wereld*, 147 (translation mine).

¹⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.274-275 (translation mine).

²⁰ See for example: Th.M. van der Beugel to E.H. van der Beugel, March 1, 1951, box "Correspondentie met Vader" (hereafter 'CmV'), AHB.

²¹ See: EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 155; Stanley R. Sloan, *NATO, The European Union, and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), 19; Hellema, *Nederland in de Wereld*, 147.

²² Duchêne, *Jean Monnet*, 11-12, 226-235.

that as long as the EDC had not yet truly materialized, there did not yet exist a “community of values”, which he considered necessary as a proper foundation for a political community.²³

In September 1952, however, a new administration took office in the Netherlands. While Willem Drees remained prime minister, Dirk Stikker was replaced by two ministers of Foreign Affairs: Johan Willem Beyen and Joseph Luns. Both men were old acquaintances of Ernst van der Beugel.²⁴

Although many expected a mere continuation of Stikker’s policy under Beyen, who was given the European integration portfolio, the changing of the guard at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs heralded a major policy shift with respect to its European policy. As it turned out, Beyen did not oppose the idea of political integration as long as it went hand in hand with economic integration. Under the dictum ‘no political integration without economic integration’ Beyen proposed the creation of a ‘tariff community’, which should be understood as a first step towards a general Common Market, as a minimum requirement for Dutch participation in a European Political Community.²⁵ In doing so, Beyen also abandoned Stikker’s sectoral approach. The realization of this plan, however, depended on the prior ratification of the EDC Treaty. Consequently, when in 1954 the Pleven plan was torpedoed by the Gaullists in the French Assemblée the establishment of a European Political Community linked to a Common Market seemed to be little more than a distant dream. Even so, an unexpected breakthrough was reached at the Messina Conference in June 1955, which eventually paved the way for the Rome Treaties, which would establish both EUROTOM and the Common Market.

The Group of Ten

During the early 1950s Van der Beugel enthusiastically embraced the idea of European integration as envisioned by the Schuman Plan. He did not only engage professionally in related debates through his work as a civil servant, but also tried to influence European policy as a civilian, active in the political arena. In 1951 he even joined a group of like-minded friends in pushing for a more thorough and pro-active European policy within the Dutch Labor Party, the *Partij van de Arbeid* (PvdA). He had joined the PvdA right after the party was established in 1946 as the result of a merger of three existing parties in which the social democrats soon got the upper hand. To Van der Beugel, whose father had been sympathetic to the social democratic cause, joining this new social-democratic party seemed like a logical step.²⁶

²³ See: Marcel Ermers and John Kragt, “Tussen tradities en tractaten: Minister Beyen en de Europese integratie 1952-1956” (Unpublished MA-Thesis, History Department of the University of Nijmegen, August 1988) p. 24.

²⁴ Beyen was a friend of van der Beugel’s father, and Luns was a friend from his student club (see chapter 1). EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 355: “Ik ken Beyen uit mijn jeugd, want hij was één van de intieme vrienden van mijn vader (...) Beyen heeft bijvoorbeeld ook op de begrafenis van mijn vader nog gesproken.”

²⁵ Ibid., p 41.

²⁶ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, pp. 263-264.

One of the PvdA's key domestic goals was the attempt to break with the Dutch tradition of pillarization: the division of Dutch society along religious or ideological lines with each group having its own newspapers, broadcasting organizations, sports clubs, trade unions, schools and political parties – a desire referred to as the *doorbraak* (breakthrough) in Dutch. By the early 1950s, however, a sense of discontent started to kick in among Van der Beugel and some of his social-democratic friends about the accomplishments of the *doorbraak*. What's more, they were deeply disappointed by the PvdA's international agenda, in particular its reticent stance towards the process of European integration. To their dismay the two most Eurosceptic ministers of the Cabinet – Prime Minister Drees and Finance Minister Liefstinck – were both members of the Labor Party. In the fall of 1951 a group of young social democrats, including Ernst van der Beugel and Max Kohnstamm, decided to list their grievances in a letter to the party leadership. With elections coming up in the summer of 1952, they hoped to awaken the party from its complacent slumber. The first 'formal' meeting of the Group of Ten, as they came to be known, took place in the fall of 1951.

Next to Van der Beugel and Kohnstamm, the Group of Ten counted two more colleagues from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Conny Patijn and Jan Meijer, both worked at the International Organizations department. They regularly met with other young social democrats, most of whom worked for the government, at informal lunch get-togethers and in discussion groups where they talked about politics and current affairs.²⁷ Some of the group's members also met at the home of the devout pro-European PvdA minister of Agriculture, Sicco Mansholt. Jaap van der Lee, the Director of International Organizations at the Ministry of Agriculture, organized these meetings. He joined the Group of Ten together with Ivo Samkalden, who also worked at the Ministry of Agriculture. They were part of the young vanguard of the Dutch Labor party, "bound together by their shared aggravation about the myopic regionalism that dominated the foreign policy of the PvdA. They were the internationalists of the PvdA, as opposed to their predominantly nationally oriented fellow party members."²⁸ Once they decided to turn their frustration into a force for change within the Labor Party, they invited three more experienced party members to join their quest in an attempt to give it more weight: Peter Koets, the Editor in Chief of the social-democratic newspaper *Het Parool*, Director-General of the Statistics department of the Central Bureau for Statistics (CBS) Flip Idenburg and the eminent economist and director of the CBS, Jan Tinbergen – who, like Ernst van der Beugel, had also been involved in the development of the Stikker Plan.²⁹

Aided by Van der Beugel and Kohnstamm, Conny Patijn drafted the first letter to the party leadership, which focused predominantly on the topic of European integration. Eventually two more topics which the Group desired to see on the PvdA's party program for

²⁷ Ibid., p. 264; Wansink, "De Groep van Tien", p. 48.

²⁸ Wansink, "De groep van Tien", p.10.

²⁹ Dr. Ph. Idenburg also happened to be Max Kohnstamm's cousin. He had helped van der Beugel to get his first job in The Hague right after the war.

the upcoming elections were added: Dutch policy towards Indonesia/New Guinea and the Dutch broadcasting system. With regards to European integration, the group called for an active political and military integration policy. They specified four elements in particular, which they considered 'important' for determining the right policy: 1) the relationship with the United States; 2) the German problem; 3) the role of England in the process of European integration and 4) the possibility of an Atlantic federation. It is worthwhile to take a closer look at these policy recommendations, because they serve as the starting point for the evolution of Ernst van der Beugel's views concerning these issues, which would eventually develop into a more cautious position as he began to perceive a potentially dangerous tension between certain forms of European integration and its relationship to the broader transatlantic framework.

Firstly, with regards to the transatlantic relationship, the authors specifically believed that, despite their deep respect and gratitude for America's post-war leadership, the European countries should be able to influence American politics. "In order to exercise influence on the most vital decisions Europe must be so closely integrated that it is able to speak with one voice," they wrote. "This does not mean, however, that we cherish the illusion that Europe could function as a third block which could be neutral in the battle between the greatest powers. No neutrality is possible as long as the Soviet Union continues its current course." European cooperation had to take place within an Atlantic framework as an equal talking partner in order to co-determine the course to be taken. "A common European military and foreign policy, managed from one point and speaking with one voice is the only thing that can guarantee a decisive influence on decisive moments in Washington," they concluded.

Secondly, they argued that the magnitude of the German problem and the fact that it could only be solved on a supra-German level made it necessary to give far-reaching powers to European institutions and a form of cooperation "far beyond a military treaty relationship." In addition, they stated that it would be a mistake to wait for England to join a federal European project because England would "never want to go far enough in the direction of such radical solutions as will be necessary on the European continent. In the decisive years that lay in front of us, no leadership is to be expected from England." Last but not least, they argued that "it is clear that the Atlantic Treaty shall not develop into an Atlantic federation any time soon. This fact combined with the English position forces the conclusion that European countries should seek the solution to their problems in the formation of a European federation as part of and in cooperation with the Atlantic Community." A fast process of European continental integration did not eliminate the possibility for an Atlantic federation, they emphasized, but could actually function as a stepping-stone towards it.³⁰ Consequently, Atlantic ambitions should not be a reason to slow down European federalism. This explicit attention to the concept of an Atlantic federation can be explained by the popularity of

³⁰ "Aan het Partijbestuur van de Partij van de Arbeid", 11 October 1951, file 7 ("Documenten met betrekking tot de Groep van Tien"), C.L. Patijn Papers (hereafter CLP), NAH.

Clarence Streit's 1939 book "Union Now: a Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic", which had greatly influenced Max Kohnstamm's ideas.³¹

The letter's authors met on four occasions with the party leadership to discuss their grievances. Van der Beugel, Kohnstamm, Tinbergen and Van der Lee were assigned to discuss the issue of European integration in a meeting with the party leadership – including Prime Minister Drees – on November 7.³² During the meeting, they once more made their case for a speedy federalist form of integration including a European army. The latter seemed like the only major sticking point, but Kohnstamm disagreed, arguing that the Ten also displayed a far greater appreciation for continental integration than the party leadership. Fellow party member Jacques de Kadt, for example, had voiced great pessimism concerning the feasibility of continental European integration, which he considered impossible due to the great differences between the European countries. "Let us, the socialist movement, seek our strength in being champions for the Atlantic defense; that is hard enough already," he argued. Despite these exchanges the letter's authors were not able to convince the party leadership of their views and "severe differences of opinion" persisted.³³ Even so, as Robin de Bruin has pointed out, "a side effect of the intervention by the Group of Ten was that its members had been able to place themselves in the spotlight." By 1956 five of them, including Ernst van der Beugel, had been taken up in the PvdA's committee on foreign affairs.³⁴

Diverging Paths: the European Defense Community and the Rise of the Gaullists

While Van der Beugel initially subscribed to the points put forward by the Group of Ten, his position on some of the letter's key tenets shifted as the process of European integration started to gain a more concrete form in the international political-diplomatic arena. As the process unfolded his attitude changed particularly on the plausibility of a European army, on the importance of English participation and with regards to the idea that Europe should integrate into a continental political federation enabling it to speak with one voice so as to confront the United States as an 'equal partner'. Lastly, considering the international political context, in particular the rising influence of the Gaullists in France, he also came to disagree with the desire of a fast paced integration process if this meant speedy progression into a direction he perceived to be perilous for the primacy of the Atlantic Community.

³¹ "Van grote invloed op mijn denken was het boek van Clarence Streit, Union Now, dat ik gedurende dat jaar in Amerika had leren kennen." Anjo Harryvan and Jan van der Harst, "Een sneeuwveld in 1942 – Vraaggesprek met drs. M. Kohnstamm" in *Voor Nederland en Europa: Politici en ambtenaren over het Nederlandse Europabeleid en de Europese integratie, 1945-1975*, eds. Harryvan et al. (Amsterdam/Meppel: Boom, 2001), 83; See: Clarence K. Streit, *Union Now: a Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic* (New York: Harper Bros., 1939).

³² E.H. van der Beugel to C.L. Patijn, 1 November 1951, file 7, CLP.

³³ "Notulen van de vergadering van het Partijbestuur, gehouden op Woensdag 7 November 1951", inv. no. 22 (9): Notulen P.B. Vergaderingen 1951/1952, archive of the PvdA (hereafter "PvdA"), International Institute for Social History (translation mine). See also: Wendy Asbeek Brusse, "The Dutch Socialist Party", in *Socialist Parties and the Question of Europe in the 1950s*, ed. Richard Griffiths (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 120-122.

³⁴ Robin de Bruin, *Elastisch Europa: De integratie van Europa en de Nederlandse politiek, 1947-1968* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Wereldbibliotheek, 2014), 137 (translation mine).

Indeed, the key to understanding Van der Beugel's growing skepticism towards the process of European integration as it unfolded can be found in the clash between his understanding of the fundamental primacy of the Atlantic relationship in the context of the Cold War and the growing influence of the Gaullists on French foreign policy. The latter worried him because he was afraid they might want to hijack the process of European integration for their own purposes of re-establishing French *grandeur* in Western Europe at the expense of American hegemony, thus fundamentally disturbing the power balance on which he believed Western security in the context of the Cold War depended. So, whereas Van der Beugel agreed with many of the key principles undergirding European integration, he did not believe that the political circumstances in Europe allowed for their realization in a way that would serve the Dutch national interest, which he understood to be interwoven with the American security guarantee institutionalized through NATO and dependent on American hegemony in Western Europe.

The first cracks in Van der Beugel's faith in the process of European integration as it unfolded became visible in the context of the European Defense Community. Van der Beugel had considered the Pleven Plan as a bridge too far from the start, but – as he had already explained during one of the meetings with the PvdA leadership – because the Americans had embraced it and pressed the six ECSC countries to move ahead along those lines he went along for pragmatic reasons.³⁵ In the process, he reminded his audience that the European countries could only make sure that the U.S. Congress would continue its “generous policy” towards Western Europe through the way in which they chose to proceed on the path of European integration. “A large part of what takes place in the military arena is no longer a matter of national sovereignty, but is decided by what the Americans want from us,” Van der Beugel maintained. He conceded that he shared some of the party leadership's practical objections against the EDC, “but,” he added, “what alternative do we have?”³⁶

The better alternative, from Van der Beugel's perspective, was in fact NATO. Like many in the Dutch foreign policy establishment, Van der Beugel feared that the EDC “would boil down to the establishment of a European pillar within or even outside NATO, hence undermining American leadership, weakening the Western alliance, and consequently jeopardizing Dutch national security.”³⁷ Van der Beugel would often remark, however, that what was desirable needed to be distinguished from what was possible and while he believed military integration through NATO was desirable, current circumstances did not allow the Netherlands to pursue this path. Already at this stage, he was in fact *plus américain que les Américains*.

³⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 20 February 1952, file 35, Ernst van der Beugel Papers (hereafter ‘EvdB’), NAH (translation mine).

³⁶ “Notulen van de vergadering van het Partijbestuur”, 7 November 1951, box 22, file 9, PvdA archive (hereafter ‘PvdA’) (translation mine).

³⁷ Jan van der Harst, “Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political Integration”, in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, ed. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 643.

Despite his reservations, Ernst van der Beugel did not openly speak out against the EDC. In order to make sure that the Americans would not turn away from Europe he went along with the policy in an attempt to make the best of the existing situation. Privately, however, he expressed serious doubts concerning its feasibility. In a personal letter to Herman van Roijen, the Dutch ambassador in Washington DC, Van der Beugel confided in February 1952 that he blamed the Americans for creating the impression that Europe would not be defensible without a German army, which he regarded as “one of the most serious mistakes since 1945.” The defensibility of Europe did “not depend on ten or twelve German divisions, but solely on whether one will be covered by the American military.”³⁸ He blamed the Americans for being insensitive to the German question, but also for ignoring how profoundly the fear for German rearmament was still alive in France.

To make matters worse, the political situation in France became only less favorable. In January 1954, the Netherlands was the first country to ratify the EDC treaty. Of course, Foreign minister Beyen’s attempt to pursue a Common Market by making concrete steps into this direction a condition for a European Political Community (EPC) depended on the prior establishment of the European Defense Community. At the same time, however, Dutch ratification of the EDC treaty was also meant as a gesture of goodwill, not least towards the United States where officials became increasingly worried that Dutch insistence on its economic goals in the EPC would become an extra reason for the French to reject the European Defense Community.³⁹

In January 1953, the newly elected Eisenhower administration had brought a new perspective on the EDC to the White House. President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles perceived the EDC not just as a military solution to realize a German defense contribution. Instead, as Marc Trachtenberg has pointed out “The real point of the EDC (...) was to weld France and Germany together as the core of a strong European federation that could stand up to Russia on its own, and thus make it possible for American forces to withdraw from Europe in the near future.”⁴⁰ According to Van der Beugel, “for the United States, the political, military and economic unification of Western Europe had become an end in itself and was no longer a means.”⁴¹

The Eisenhower administration’s pressure on the European countries to ratify the EDC was relentless. White House pressure was added to the already zealous pressure for European integration from Capitol Hill, which had been a fact of transatlantic political life since the conception of the Marshall Plan. That the U.S. Congress had also embraced the EDC project as a step in the right direction was once more underlined in the Spring of 1952 when U.S. legislators had “made further aid to the European NATO powers dependent upon

³⁸ Ibid. (translation mine).

³⁹ See: W.H. Weenink, *Bankier van de wereld, bouwer van Europa: Johan Willem Beyen 1897-1976* (Amsterdam: Prometheus, 2005), 338.

⁴⁰ Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 121-122.

⁴¹ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 292.

‘concrete measures for political federation, military integration and economic unification in Europe.’”⁴² According to Van der Beugel, now “every act of American diplomacy towards the European countries was inspired and dominated by the issue of the ratification of the EDC.”⁴³ In December 1953 American pressure reached a climax when Secretary of State Dulles declared that if the European countries would fail to ratify the EDC treaty, “this would compel an agonizing reappraisal of basic United States policy,”⁴⁴ which might include a withdrawal of United States forces from the European continent. Obviously, this was a nightmare scenario from Van der Beugel’s point of view, who regarded this “brusque” threat and “unprecedented bluntness in the intercourse between allied nations” as proof that for the United States “the issue was now presented in terms of the broadest political ideology and had elements of an almost theological dispute.”⁴⁵

While American pressure increased, the situation in France only worsened. The French Assemblée was permeated by a pervasive sense of uncertainty concerning the ratification of the EDC treaty. This situation was aggravated by the unstable political situation in Paris, which culminated in a political crisis that brought the radical Pierre Mendès France to power after the French military defeat at Dien Bien Phu in May 1954.⁴⁶ While the new government was divided on the EDC Treaty, French General Charles de Gaulle denounced the entire EDC project on April 7, urging the French to become independent both from the United States and the Soviet Union.⁴⁷ This view greatly alarmed Ernst van der Beugel who was convinced that the fate of Western civilization and Europe in particular depended on the closest possible bond between Europe and the United States and that a disintegration of the nascent Atlantic Community would only play into the hands of the Soviet Communists.⁴⁸

The rising influence of the Gaullists in France had already led to the reluctant acceptance – under severe American pressure – of five interpretive protocols to the EDC Treaty in June 1953. After deliberately delaying the ratification process, Mendès France put forward a new series of proposals regarding the EDC in August 1954, which according to Van der Beugel “would have emptied the Treaty of its basic political meaning, because every trace of supranationalism was to be either deleted or delayed.” The Dutch also regarded the French proposals as discriminatory towards Germany. They were not the only ones who thought

⁴² Klaus Schwabe, “United States and European Integration, 1947-1957”, in *Western Europe and Germany: The Beginnings of European Integration, 1945-1960*, ed. Clemens Wurm (Oxford: Berg, 1995), 118-119.

⁴³ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 291.

⁴⁴ Quoted in: Brian R. Duchin, “The ‘Agonizing Reappraisal’: Eisenhower, Dulles, and the European Defense Community,” *Diplomatic History* 16:2 (1992), 201-202.

⁴⁵ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 292-294.

⁴⁶ Weenink, *Bankier van de wereld*, 338-339.

⁴⁷ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 295.

⁴⁸ See for example: “Drs. Van der Beugel over Europese integratie”, *Handelsblad*, 22 November 1956; “De verhouding van Nederland tot Amerika,” *Prov. Zeeuwse Krant*, 9 April 1954: “De wereld is nu eenmaal in twee kampen verdeeld en er is geen discussie rond de vraag in welk kamp wij staan. Maar dan is het ook duidelijk dat met de Amerikaanse economische en militaire steun onze existentie samenhangt, dat onze beschaving ervan afhangt”; “De Amerikaanse invloed op de Europese Samenwerking”, *Rotterdammer*, 29 juni 1956: “Onze nationale en persoonlijke existentie is ten nauwste betrokken bij een goede verhouding tussen Europa en Amerika en bij een voortzetting van de Amerikaanse buitenlandse politiek ten aanzien van de Europese samenwerking.”

Mendès France had crossed a line. Despite continuous American pressure his proposals crashed on “a solid front of refusal” of the other Five. Eventually, the EDC treaty died a certain death during a vote in the French Assemblée on August 30, 1954. Formally this was not a vote on the treaty itself, but – as Van der Beugel was keen to point out – on a Gaullist resolution eliminating the treaty from the Assemblée’s agenda. Van der Beugel also liked to underline that in their rejection of the EDC treaty the Gaullists found themselves on the same side as the communists in the French Assemblée.⁴⁹

Thus, Ernst van der Beugel’s worries concerning the EDC had materialized. Just weeks before its rejection he had asked the American ambassador to the Netherlands, Doc Matthews, with whom he had a very close relationship, whether the Americans were thinking about alternatives to the EDC. Matthews replied that he was very sorry, but that he had received instructions from the State Department prohibiting him to talk about any alternative. “That is how committed the Americans were to EDC!”, Van der Beugel would recall.⁵⁰

In the end, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles called the French rejection a “tragedy” and issued a bitterly worded statement, but the ‘agonizing reappraisal’ was not put into effect. As an alternative to integrate the Germans into the Western defense structures, the old Brussels Treaty was dusted off and expanded to include Germany and Italy after which it was linked to NATO. In May 1955, after all signatories had ratified the new Brussels Treaty, the Federal Republic of Germany was eventually accepted into NATO. In his dissertation, published in 1966, Van der Beugel’s reflections on the American role during this episode were not exactly flattering:

The dogmatic character of this policy, the refusal to consider alternatives, the confusion between means and ends and the unprecedented pressure to obtain a specific solution for a problem over which the United States had no ultimate control, led to a situation in which the strain on the Western alliance was increased instead of mitigated. In these kinds of circumstances, the leader of the alliance should have more maturity and wisdom, should act less dogmatically and should not commit its power and prestige to a case, of which the success was so much in doubt.⁵¹

With the failure of the European Defense Community, Beyen’s dream of a Common Market linked to a European Political Community also burst into pieces. From the Dutch perspective, the moving train of European integration that Beyen had jumped onto in the fall of 1952 had been derailed by a French act of sabotage. Beyen was furious. Ernst van der Beugel had never experienced seeing a minister in office so distraught. Beyen just could not fathom what had happened. “At that moment he could have killed Mendès-France with his bare hands,”⁵² Van

⁴⁹ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 296-297.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 269.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 299.

⁵² E.H. van der Beugel to G.J. van Heuven Goedhart, 29 November 1954, file 35, EvdB (translation mine).

der Beugel recalled. The EDC episode also left a significant dent in Van der Beugel's already bruised confidence concerning the sincerity of the European and Atlantic intentions of the French and the Gaullists in particular. In November 1954, a few months after the French Assemblée had killed the EDC, Van der Beugel expressed his worries concerning a renewed French nationalism under Mendès-France, driven by the desire to position Europe as a third, neutral power between the United States and the Soviet Union:

In my opinion, Mendès-France is a personalization of a very activist (that is new about it) French nationalism. The entire setting, design and methodology are brutally nationalistic. While on a positive note, it has a very large intelligence and activism combined with a non-conservative attitude towards certain problems, it remains essentially sharply nationalistic with (...) fascist tendencies. It is also completely opportunistic and that explains the group of Gaullists and third-way-sympathizers surrounding him that I happen to know, who find each other in their activism and in particular through the reinforcement of a possible neutrality in this world.⁵³

The death of the EDC delivered a heavy blow to the process of continental European integration and heralded a period of great pessimism. The possibility of progress along economic and supranational lines – as the Dutch desired – looked particularly dim. “This French nationalism has not torpedoed the EDC based on a fear for the Germans, but based on a fear for the supranational development”⁵⁴ Van der Beugel concluded. During the months following the failure of the EDC Van der Beugel stressed the need for a supranational approach to continental European integration both internally as well as in speeches to different audiences throughout the Netherlands.

While he was devastated by the failure of the EDC, Beyen's enthusiasm for European integration along supranational economic lines only grew stronger. At the same time, the minister shared Van der Beugel's worries about the French nationalistic approach that had come to the fore under Mendès-France and called for a pause. As long as Mendès-France would be in charge, every truly supranational initiative would be rejected, he believed. Consequently, the Dutch would have to wait for a better political climate while resisting French “blackmail” in pursuit of “pseudo integration.”⁵⁵ Van der Beugel agreed: “There are two forms of cooperation possible in the West”, he wrote in a letter to his friend Gerrit Jan van Heuven Goedhart, who served as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. “On the one hand the intergovernmental cooperation like in NATO, OEEC, etc. which is a kind of cooperation we should not underestimate, but which – in the end – can never reach the fundamental solution and on the other hand the supranational solution in which the English will not participate, to which the French are currently opposed and which will also fail to

⁵³ Ibid. (translation mine).

⁵⁴ Ibid. (translation mine).

⁵⁵ Weenink, *Bankier van de wereld*, p. 343 (translation mine).

attract the Germans in a couple of years. In between there is a zone of hodgepodge, which – without any doubt – will be pursued by Mendès-France. In that zone it will be attempted to confuse both forms of cooperation, with the main purpose of undermining any form of truly supranational cooperation and to replace it with something that carries the disadvantages of both in it.”⁵⁶

Atlanticist vs. Europeanists and the Straightjacket of Administrative Discipline

It was also in the context of the European Defense Community that a clear difference in priorities between Europeanists and Atlanticists became visible within the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As it turned out, Van der Beugel’s growing cautiousness towards European integration as it unfolded was not shared by some of his closest friends at the department. Already in February 1952, Van der Beugel noticed “a sharp dividing line” cutting through the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs based on “a very profound disagreement on this issue” and feared that the issue had become as divisive as the decolonization of Indonesia had been during the late 1940s. “Facing those who are deeply worried about surrendering large tracts of sovereignty to the group of six Schuman countries are those who consider a fast – and I would almost say virtually unconditional – blending into the larger continental European unity as the only solution for both the German problem and the future of the European countries.” Van der Beugel considered this situation the hardest for those, including himself, “who seek to find a middle ground (...) in the end we are in our positions to defend, without reserve, Dutch interests – also when these Dutch interests clash with the political pressure towards the quickest and maximum amount of integration possible.”⁵⁷

Overall, the international situation had become so strained, Van der Beugel argued, that the best solution would be to insert “a pause for reflection.”⁵⁸ He had in fact been so charmed by an article in *The Economist* that proposed such a pause that he had suggested to Conny Patijn to give a copy to Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs Dirk Stikker. The ensuing correspondence reflects the schism that had developed within the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Patijn disagreed completely with the article and found it above all representative of a Britain out of touch with the rest of Europe. He also questioned Van der Beugel’s motives: “Is your sympathy for this article not based on the fact that it gives you some good arguments for your position that *nothing should happen* and thus, that it works towards *stalling* European integration-along-lines-you-do-not-want?”⁵⁹, he wondered. For Van der Beugel this was an affront: “I have great difficulties with the dogmatism of European integration as professed by you,” he replied. “When I have objections against (...) Karl Barth or against the new church

⁵⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to G.J. van Heuven Goedhart, 29 November 1954, file 35, EvdB (translation mine). For an in depth study on Gerrit Jan van Heuven Goedhart, see: Jeroen Corduwener, *Riemen om de kin! Biografie van mr.dr. Gerrit Jan van Heuven Goedhart* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2011).

⁵⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to Herman van Roijen, 20 February 1952, file 35, EvdB (translation mine).

⁵⁸ “A Pause in Germany”, *The Economist*, February 16, 1952, p. 379.

⁵⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to C.L. Patijn, 22 February 1952, file 5, EvdB (translation mine).

order or against Christian education, I do not wish to be confronted constantly with the question whether I believe in the resurrection of the dead.”⁶⁰

Van der Beugel’s letters did not only demonstrate a growing distrust towards French politics, but also revealed a clear sympathy towards the United Kingdom. This sympathy was primarily based on the idea that British participation in the process of European integration would “offer a guarantee for a closer transatlantic bond.”⁶¹ He also claimed to be sincere in his request for a pause. The EDC had thus far been only a paper plan, he argued. It had not been well enough thought through and – most importantly – it “did not fit the political realities of its time in Germany and France.” Instead, he felt that the emphasis should lie not on political and military integration, but on the economic and financial spheres:

I refuse to cheer blindly for a concept of continental European integration. After what has happened during the preceding six months less than ever so. With regards to this issue, the spirit is definitely not upon me, and that is the core of your accusation.⁶²

While Van der Beugel noted that it was above all “a matter of pace” that separated him from his Europeanist friends, on a more fundamental level it was his more realist outlook that clashed with the European idealism of some of his best friends. To Ernst van der Beugel, not European integration *an sich*, but the Dutch national interest – which for security reasons he regarded as directly tied to the closest possible transatlantic relationship – should be the main priority of Dutch foreign policy. European integration was thus only desirable to the extent in which it amplified the Dutch national interest by strengthening the Atlantic alliance in the face of Soviet communism. While at first European integration seemed to go hand in hand with close transatlantic relations, Van der Beugel now found himself separated from some of his most intimate friends, on the other side of a schism separating Europeans from Atlanticists.

At the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, the Atlanticists were in the majority. As Jérôme Heldring would later put it, a “regent tradition” lived on at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs that “manifested itself in a pragmatic, non-ideological policy, which, consequently, approached the ideology of European federalism with suspicion.”⁶³ Conny Patijn was in fact one of the few European exceptions to the Atlanticist rule. Max Kohnstamm was another exception.⁶⁴ They were two of the odd ones out at a department where realism reigned supreme and their passionate pro-European activism was not appreciated by the department’s leadership. From the spring of 1951 onwards, Max Kohnstamm had

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ E.H. van der Beugel, “Nederland in de naoorlogse Westelijke Samenwerking”, *Internationale Spectator* 49:3 (1995): 129 (translation mine).

⁶² E.H. van der Beugel to Patijn, 22 February 1952, file 5, EvdB.

⁶³ Jérôme Heldring, “De Nederlandse Buitenlandse Politiek na 1945”, in *Nederlands buitenlandse politiek: heden en verleden*, eds. E.H. van der Beugel et al. (Baarn: In Den Toren, 1978), 32 (translation mine).

⁶⁴ Others were Jan Meijer and Theo Bot. See EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.254.

experienced the feeling that he had reached a ‘dead end’ at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “*la voie de garage*,”⁶⁵ as he put it. The old guard at the department regarded him with suspicion, not just because of his strong federalist sympathies, but also as a result of his unconventional informal activities. Kohnstamm would, for example, frequently contact Europe-minded members of parliament with the intention to push the Dutch government through parliament into the direction of further integration.⁶⁶ This was simply ‘not done’ according to Secretary-General Han Boon who made sure that Kohnstamm got *kaltgestellt*.⁶⁷ In the summer of 1952 Kohnstamm left the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to join Jean Monnet as his secretary at the High Authority of the ECSC, a position in which Kohnstamm was “perfectly happy” according to Van der Beugel.⁶⁸ Kohnstamm’s diaries demonstrate, however, that the discrepancy between the European political goals he tried to pursue and the ‘technocratic element’ was even greater at the High Authority than at a ‘national ministry’. Thus, when Monnet left the High Authority in 1956, Kohnstamm gladly joined him to pursue their European ideals “as a free agent” behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy.⁶⁹ That same year Patijn exchanged his position at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for a seat in the Second Chamber of the Dutch parliament representing the PvdA.⁷⁰

While Kohnstamm struggled with the Atlanticist administrative discipline under Stikker, Ernst Van der Beugel’s personal convictions with regards to the process of European integration did not always square with the more ambitious European plans of minister Beyen. Even so, as a civil servant it was his task to defend and execute his minister’s policy. To illustrate, in March 1953 Dirk Stikker, who had accepted a post as Dutch ambassador to Britain after he had stepped down as Minister of Foreign Affairs, stated his growing concerns about the European policy of his successor in a letter to Beyen. He had the impression that the Netherlands was “leading the way in a federalist direction” with its ambitions vis-à-vis the *marché unique* of the six Schuman countries, a development he considered “dangerous”. He expressed great pessimism with regards to “the French, in other words ‘continental’ integration plans” and warned against the “weakness and hollowness” of the French. Stikker advised Beyen to seek cooperation with England instead. Last but not least, he also feared “the danger of deadlock with regards to the EDC”, based on his impression that France would not ratify the EDC treaty, at least not in a form which would be acceptable to the other partners – and without the EDC no political community or economic community would come

⁶⁵ Harryvan and van der Harst, *Voor Nederland en Europa*, 95 (translation mine).

⁶⁶ Anjo G. Harryvan and Jan van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm: Leven en werk van een Europeaan* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 2008), 133.

⁶⁷ Harryvan and van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 133; Harryvan and van der Harst, “‘Een sneeuwveld in 1942’”, 95.

⁶⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to C.L. Patijn, 1 November 1952, file 1, CLP.

⁶⁹ Mathieu Segers and Max Kohnstamm, *De Europese Dagboeken van Max Kohnstamm. Augustus 1953-September 1957* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2008) 11-13.

⁷⁰ See: Mathieu Segers and Max Kohnstamm, *De Europese dagboeken van Max Kohnstamm*, 58; Harryvan and van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm*, 133; Mathieu Segers and Max Kohnstamm, *Diep Spel: De Europese dagboeken van Max Kohnstamm, september 1957-februari 1963* (Amsterdam: Boom 2010), 86.

into existence. Consequently, Stikker advised Beyen to study alternative possibilities to involve Germany in the defense of Europe.

It should be no surprise that Ernst van der Beugel strongly sympathized with the worries expressed by Stikker. While Beyen was aware of this, or as Van der Beugel himself suggested, maybe exactly because he was aware of this, Beyen asked Van der Beugel to formulate his reply to Stikker, which Van der Beugel did.⁷¹ In the reply, Van der Beugel defended Beyen's policy with verve explaining that by signing the ECSC and EDC treaties the Dutch had reached a "point of no return."⁷² Beyen only made minimal editorial changes to the final version and even decided to distribute copies to the Dutch ambassadors in Washington, Brussels, Luxembourg, Paris and Bonn, arguing that this could be "useful as a clarification of the Dutch point of view regarding integration."⁷³ A more serious instance in which Van der Beugel's personal convictions clashed with Beyen's European policy concerned the relaunch of Beyen's plans for economic integration in 1955.

During spring 1955 the dark clouds that had gathered over the process of European integration since the Gaullists had torpedoed the EDC in the summer of 1954 seemed to be slowly drifting away from the firmament of little Europe. The fall of the Mendès-France administration on 6 February 1955 followed by the emergence of a new cabinet under the leadership of Edgar Faure ushered in a period that seemed to enable a "*Relance Européenne*". In the new French cabinet "the anti-European (i.e. anti-integration) Gaullist element was considerably weaker." Instead, with Antoine Pinay appointed as Minister of Foreign Affairs and Robert Schuman as Minister of Justice, the pro-European M.R.P. now held important posts, which contributed to "a new optimism characterized by a resurgence of pro-integration hopes and expectations."⁷⁴

Since September 1954, Jean Monnet – the godfather of the Schuman Plan and the EDC – had been working on a new blueprint to get the derailed process of European integration back on track. In the process, he closely cooperated with the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Paul Henri Spaak who notified his Benelux colleagues in March 1955 about their evolving ideas. Their plans were based on relaunching European integration through a supranational sectoral approach focused on expanding the supranational powers of the ECSC to the energy and transport sectors combined with the creation of a new, distinct High Authority for the production of atomic energy for civil purposes. While Beyen supported the supranational approach he was not happy with Monnet's sectoral methodology. Instead, he wanted to use the opportunity to revamp his own plan for horizontal economic integration on a supranational basis and to propose the creation of a Benelux initiative aimed at the creation

⁷¹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 352: "Die brief heb ik geschreven. Ik heb de brief van Beyen geschreven, hoewel ik het met Stikker eens was. Dat is altijd een voorbeeld voor mij geweest dat je je natuurlijk toch als ambtenaar aanpast aan je minister. (...) Tegen Stikker kon je zeggen, veel makkelijker dan tegen Beyen, 'nee, dat moet u niet doen. Dat zou erg onverstandig zijn.' Als Spierenburg en ik dat samen zeiden, dan luisterde hij heel goed."

⁷² J.W. Beyen to D.U. Stikker, 11 March 1953, file 57, EvdB (translation mine).

⁷³ Letter Beyen, "Europese Integratie", 20 March 1953, file 35, EvdB; Weenink, Bankier van de wereld, 332 (translation mine); Ermers and van der Kragt, "Tussen tradities en tractaten", p 54.

⁷⁴ Harryvan, *In Pursuit of Influence*, 81.

of a Western European Economic Union. If necessary, this initiative could be combined with Monnet's plans.⁷⁵

Ernst van der Beugel, however, did not share Beyen's optimism. In response to Beyen's intentions to resurrect his original plan Van der Beugel had asked his close advisor Jaap Kymmell to review the "original ideas of the Beyen Plan". The result of this exercise reminded Van der Beugel of how "correct" as well as "ambitious" this original plan had been. "At the relaunch of these plans, we cannot completely close our eyes to the central question whether they make a truly realistic chance in Europe today" he subsequently wrote to Beyen.⁷⁶ In fact, Van der Beugel was convinced that this question had to be answered negatively. He believed that on the short term the ideas voiced in the Beyen Plan would not only be unacceptable to France, but to all five partner countries. As he explained to Beyen:

I belong indeed to the pessimists who do not believe that a reduction of tariffs, combined with the idea of a fund and coupled to certain necessary harmonization measures belongs to the realm of reality. I have no concrete evidence to support this, but when we look at the Benelux and when we look further at the conversation concerning European integration that we have been conducting all the time, I believe that there is more reason for this pessimism than to hope for the possibility of realization.⁷⁷

Instead, Van der Beugel made clear that, considering the circumstances, he actually regarded Jean Monnet's proposal for an expansion of the ECSC as the only realistic option in the short term. While Van der Beugel underlined that he shared Beyen's general objections against the sectoral approach, he suggested to be careful with the assumption that supranational cooperation in certain sectors would probably never lead to general supranational cooperation, saying it "could very well turn out to be the only slow but realistic way." In contrast, he believed that in the foreseeable future Beyen's plan could only lead to "an excessively lengthy study."⁷⁸ Kymmell and Van der Beugel were not the only ones to draw this conclusion. The entire top leadership of the department of Foreign Affairs opposed Beyen's initiative, including the highest official Secretary General Tuyll van Serooskerken as well as the Director General for Political Affairs Eschauzier, but it was Van der Beugel who led the pack in their opposition.

Beyen, however, was not amused by Van der Beugel's initiative to submit his original plan to a critical internal examination, nor by the unsolicited advice that resulted from the review. A week later he responded in a very businesslike memorandum concluding that if things were up to Kymmell and Van der Beugel it would be certain that *nothing* would happen with regards to European integration. Beyen suspected them of rejecting continental

⁷⁵ Duchêne, *Jean Monnet*, 272-274.

⁷⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to J.W. Beyen, "Europese Economische Integratie", 5 April, 1955, file 18711, Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken Code-Archief 1955-1964 (hereafter "MinBuZa 1955-1964"), NAH (translation mine).

⁷⁷ Ibid. (translation mine).

⁷⁸ Ibid. (translation mine).

supranational integration in favor of intergovernmental integration within the framework of the OEEC, as Stikker had originally tried. This was also the suspicion of two devout Europeans at the department concerned with the matter, Director of Western Cooperation Theo Bot and the Chief of the Bureau for European Integration Charles Rutten, both of whom backed Beyen's plan and turned themselves against Van der Beugel's memorandum. Their direct superior, however, was Director General Eschauzier who agreed with Van der Beugel.⁷⁹ Beyen claimed not to have any illusions concerning the feasibility of his plan, but argued that "one should never stop fighting for the cause of European integration."⁸⁰ Van der Beugel emphasized that he and Beyen did not disagree about the desired form of integration, claiming that he too perceived supranational integration as the only possibility, but that he did not see "how the ultimate objective, *on which you and we do not differ of opinion*, can be achieved *on the short term*." According to Beyen it was "more than the methodology"; their differences involved their "basic attitudes and understanding."⁸¹

Ernst van der Beugel forwarded his correspondence with Beyen to Tjarda van Starkenborgh Stachouwer, the Dutch Ambassador to the North Atlantic Council and the OEEC in Paris "because it is necessary that one knows in Paris how the ideas are developing". After explicating his own stance once more, Van der Beugel concluded that "it is for Tuyll, Eschauzier and myself, who completely agree on this matter, rather annoying that our ideas encounter such great resistance from the Minister." Even so, he had explained to Beyen, that he considered it as the task of civil servants to express internally what was on their minds, but that Beyen would eventually be the one who determined the policy to which they would "direct themselves with good humor and energy."⁸² Thus, Van der Beugel once more experienced the limitations of his room for maneuver as a government official bound by the department's administrative discipline and directed himself to his minister's orders. In his memoirs, Beyen recalled how very fortunate he had been with the fact that, with regards to his European policy, his senior executives Van der Beugel and Eschauzier "exerted themselves with me for the goal I pursued – even though they were not all as convinced as I was."⁸³

⁷⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 387-388. In his memoirs Charles Rutten wrote: "Men was bij het DGEM [Directoraat Generaal voor Economisch en Militaire Aangelegenheden] een groot voorstander van de intergouvernementele vorm van samenwerking waarop de OEES was gebaseerd en had weinig vertrouwen in de methode-Monnet. Bij de actie van het DGEM tegen de plannen van Beyen werd echter ook dankbaar gebruikgemaakt van de hierboven vermelde bezorgdheid van velen over de politieke risico's die het voorstel van Beyen met zich zou kunnen meebrengen." Charles Rutten, *Aan de wieg van Europa en andere Buitenlandse Zaken: Herinneringen van een diplomaat* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2005), 34.

⁸⁰ Ermers en Kragt, "Tussen traditie en tractaten", p. 124 (translation mine).

⁸¹ Memorandum E.H. van der Beugel to J.W. Beyen, 12 April 1955, file 18701, MinBuZa 1955-1964 (emphasis by E.H. van der Beugel, translation mine).

⁸² Memorandum E.H. van der Beugel to Starkenborgh, 18 April 1955, inv. no. 19701, MinBuZa 1955-1964 (translation mine).

⁸³ Johan W. Beyen, *Het spel en de knikkers: een kroniek van vijftig jaren* (Rotterdam: Donker, 1968), 215 (translation mine).

Despite these differences of opinion, Ernst van der Beugel continued to play a key role in the coordination of Beyen's European policy, which despite Van der Beugel's pessimism, quickly reaped an unexpected but far reaching success.⁸⁴ At the Messina Conference in June 1955, the Benelux countries introduced a memorandum, which tied the plans of an atomic energy community to the idea of a Common Market. Against all expectations this move led to the establishment of a committee, which would work out the ideas put forward in the memorandum under the leadership of the Belgian minister of foreign affairs Paul-Henri Spaak.⁸⁵ As it turned out, the Messina Conference paved the way for the Treaties of Rome, which would establish EUROTOM and the Common Market. "We have all been mistaken", Van der Beugel exclaimed after the Messina Conference, "Who would have thought that the French would be willing to trade a customs union for the bomb?"⁸⁶ While Beyen's ideas became key tenets of the Rome treaties, and thus of the process of European integration, the 1956 Dutch elections prevented the foreign minister from personally overseeing the negotiations concerning these treaties.

After the elections of June 1956, the construction with two Dutch Ministers of Foreign Affairs was abandoned. Instead, it was decided that the Minister of Foreign Affairs would be assisted by a deputy. Next to serving as a general substitute to the Minister, this new Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs – also referred to as 'State Secretary of Foreign Affairs' – would specifically be charged with matters concerning European integration. After long negotiations about the cabinet formation, Joseph Luns was eventually appointed as the Minister of Foreign Affairs in October 1956. But, to the chagrin of Catholic Party leader Romme, he found no suitable candidate for the position of Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs within his own Catholic Party. Instead, Luns desired this position to be fulfilled by Ernst van der Beugel whom he had known since his student years and in whom he had great faith. In fact, Luns had already asked Van der Beugel to become his State Secretary at an earlier, rather premature stage but Van der Beugel had not shown any interest in this political position.⁸⁷ This time, however, both Joseph Luns and Prime-Minister Drees were committed to convince Van der Beugel to accept.

The PvdA faction in parliament was less enthusiastic. As faction leader Jaap Burger explained, "whether rightly so or not" Ernst van der Beugel had "acquired a reputation of being an inhibiting, if not an antagonistic factor with regard to European integration."⁸⁸ Consequently, due to Van der Beugel's alleged "anti-European predisposition" the party preferred a more outspoken European, like Conny Patijn or Jan Meijer. Drees had replied to similar accusations by telling Burger that at least Van der Beugel didn't give in to Burger's – by now pro-European – faction so easily. Burger was furious about this comment, which

⁸⁴ See: Ermers and Kragt, "Tussen traditie en tractaten", p. 147.

⁸⁵ See for example EvdB/Kersten Oral History, pp. 205-206: "Er zijn weinig conferenties geweest waar de verwachtingen zo laag waren en waar het resultaat zo positief is geweest als in Messina."

⁸⁶ Quoted in: Ermers and Kragt, "Tussen tradities en tractaten", p. 150 (translation mine).

⁸⁷ Albert Kersten, *Luns, een politieke biografie* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2010), 184.

⁸⁸ J.A.W. Burger to E.H. van der Beugel, 17 October 1956, file 2, EvdB.

obviously only served as grist to the mill of his objections and only strengthened the faction leader's suspicion towards Van der Beugel's European sympathies.⁸⁹

It soon turned out that the fact that Prime Minister Drees had nominated Van der Beugel for this position had been an important reason in itself for the faction to distrust Van der Beugel's stance on European integration. As a result of Drees' enthusiasm, Van der Beugel was regarded as a "Drees boy" and as a result party members who did not know him very well now projected the Prime Minister's views on European integration onto Ernst van der Beugel.⁹⁰ While they definitely shared a certain degree of skepticism towards the ongoing process of European integration and a mistrust of French designs, Drees's cynicism was of a more dogmatic nature than Van der Beugel's hesitancy, which was rather driven by a more detached pragmatic realism combined with a somewhat sentimental attachment to United States. With regard to the institutional debates raging in Europe, for example, Van der Beugel did not share Drees' aversion to supranationalism. Even so, Van der Beugel had clearly become part of a power struggle between Prime Minister Drees and faction leader Burger that was played out above his head.⁹¹

Faced with this lack of trust, Van der Beugel informed Luns and Drees that he could not accept their offer. Drees, however, was furious about the interference of his own party's faction leader and would not give up his fight. On November 22, the prime minister telephoned Van der Beugel with the announcement that the PvdA faction had withdrawn its objections. When Van der Beugel tried to explain that he needed some time to think about this rather unexpected turn of events, Drees became angry and told him that turning down the position was not an option.⁹² The prime minister had completely committed himself to the case and after his confrontation with Burger a rejection by Van der Beugel would be "politically unacceptable".⁹³ The next day Van der Beugel's appointment had already reached the press.⁹⁴

State Secretary: the Road to Rome

As State Secretary Ernst van der Beugel became responsible for matters of foreign affairs concerning European integration and transatlantic policy. In this capacity he oversaw Dutch policy in the run up to the Rome Treaties and conducted the negotiations concerning a British proposal to establish a Free Trade Area encompassing not just the six Common Market countries, but the entire OEEC. In the process, the distrust that Ernst van der Beugel had started to develop towards the European and Atlantic intentions of the Gaullists during the events surrounding the EDC fiasco would only grow stronger. What is more, he again felt

⁸⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 238.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 172.

⁹¹ "Bijlage 1 bij het Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", The Hague, October 1956, file 2, EvdB.

⁹² EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 235.

⁹³ "Bijlage 1 bij het Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", The Hague, October 1956, file 2, EvdB (translation mine).

⁹⁴ "Drs. E.H. van der Beugel wordt Staatssecretaris van Buitenlandse Zaken", *De Rotterdammer*, 23 November 1956.

restricted in his pursuit of what he perceived to be the Dutch national interest as a result of American insistence on a speedy integration process. As it turns out, this pressure – as well as a great deal of the pressure he came to face from within the Dutch parliament – could be traced back to the influence of non-state actors behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy including Jean Monnet and his dear friend Max Kohnstamm.

During the negotiations about the Common Market the Dutch once again found themselves at loggerheads with the French on basically all the issues they cared most about. Whereas the Dutch desired an open community with a low external customs tariff, the French aimed for the opposite. While the Dutch believed social harmonization should not be a condition for the implementation of the Common Market, the French believed it should. In addition, the Dutch had come to manifest themselves as staunch advocates of a supranational structure for the Common Market – partly to make sure that (especially French) political forces could be kept at bay while safeguarding the free market. In fact, the Dutch council of ministers had unanimously decided that the Dutch should withdraw itself from the Europe of the Six if too few responsibilities would be transferred to the supranational commission, since in that case the Europe of the six would not be that different from the more Atlantic oriented, but intergovernmental OEEC, as Van der Beugel had also argued in the past.⁹⁵

The recurrent difficulties with the French function as a key *leitmotif* in the diary that Ernst van der Beugel kept during his stint as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs. His notes clearly demonstrate his growing frustration and resentment towards the French, who allegedly acted “scandalous”⁹⁶ during the negotiations in the Spaak Committee. Van der Beugel constantly had the feeling that they were all being spoofed by the French “and the entire French-infiltrated secretariat.”⁹⁷ Already during his first month in office he felt the Dutch were getting increasingly isolated. As he became convinced that Spaak just wanted to push the treaties through, that the French aimed for this as well in order to secure their privileged position while Italy acted like “Europe’s prostitute”, Van der Beugel reported that the negotiations filled him with ever increasing concern, even keeping him awake at night.⁹⁸ Meanwhile on the home front the fourth Drees cabinet was divided between a group of deeply devoted European idealists, including Agriculture minister Sicco Mansholt, Justice minister Ivo Samkalden and the minister for Social Work Marga Klompé on the one hand, and more skeptical Europeans including Drees, Luns and Van der Beugel on the other hand. This could be a challenge in itself, but what complicated matters even more for Ernst van der Beugel was that most Europeans in the Dutch cabinet as well as in parliament had close ties to Jean Monnet and his recently established private pressure group for European integration, the *Action Committee for a United States of Europe*.

⁹⁵ Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 125-126. See for example: Memorandum 2019, E.H. van der Beugel to S and DGPZ, 5 October 1955, file 57, EvdB.

⁹⁶ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, file 1, EvdB, p. 30 (translation mine).

⁹⁷ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, p. 22 (translation mine).

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18. (translation mine).

After handing over the presidency of the High Authority in June, 1955 Jean Monnet had established a highly effective lobby-group to promote and revive the process of European integration after the failure of the EDC.⁹⁹ Through so-called “resolutions” leading parliamentarians and trade-unionists committed themselves to the goals of the Action Committee, making it an influential multinational lobby. With the exclusion of the extreme left and right, members from almost all political parties were connected to the Action Committee; enabling Jean Monnet to mobilize broad support for the process of European integration as he envisioned it.¹⁰⁰ Ernst van der Beugel was deeply impressed – as well as annoyed – by the power Monnet was able to assert as a private agent in the political-diplomatic arena, which at times severely limited the freedom of action he as a government representative had in executing Dutch European policy. “As soon as the Action Committee agreed on a certain issue or line of action, the governments were, in view of the composition of the Monnet group, confronted with a solid front, the attitude of which they were forced to take into account”, Van der Beugel recalled. “If for instance, the Netherlands Government took a position during the negotiations, which in the eyes of Monnet was detrimental to the outcome, the Dutch members of the group were mobilized to put pressure on the Netherlands Government to yield a point or to take action or initiatives which, by itself, it would not have undertaken. This, sometimes, severely limited the possibilities of negotiation for the governments and it often subjected them to a force which did not originate in the political life of their own countries.”¹⁰¹

This experience with Monnet also proved to be an important lesson to Van der Beugel on the power of informal transnational networks and private individuals to influence international policy and negotiations. It made him realize how “one individual from a foreign country can influence leading statesmen and officials of a very powerful and in many aspects decisive nation.” While it would be hard to measure his “great and permanent influence” exactly, Van der Beugel observed that “the history of American policy towards the process of European unification cannot (...) be explained without recognition of Monnet’s influence on the formulation of that policy.”¹⁰² Thus, Van der Beugel – inspired by his personal experience – himself also subscribed to one of the key tenets of New Diplomatic History, namely that one does not need to be formally employed by a government to be a significant, even dominant, player on the diplomatic playing field.

While Monnet had a superb European network, Van der Beugel was most impressed by the Frenchman’s strong bonds with influentials in Washington both within the Democratic and the Republican parties. These connections providing Monnet with access to the American decision-making establishment and enabled him to mobilize the American diplomatic machinery “to remove the many obstacles on the road to final and concrete results of the

⁹⁹ See: Duchêne, *Jean Monnet*, 284-308.

¹⁰⁰ Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 120; Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 315.

¹⁰¹ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 316.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 246-247.

negotiations, leading to the Treaties of Rome.” If Monnet believed a particular country caused the negotiations to run into difficulties he immediately alerted his American contacts who made sure that “the American diplomatic representative in that country approached the Foreign Ministry in order to communicate the opinion of the American government which, in practically all cases, coincided with Monnet’s point of view.”¹⁰³ Thus, Van der Beugel concluded, “Monnet and his Action Committee were unofficially supervising the negotiations.” What annoyed Van der Beugel most about this situation was the fact that “Monnet was so obsessed by the necessity of obtaining concrete results that he and his Committee tended to lend a willing ear to the most difficult partner in the negotiations – France. Thereby, it often lost its indispensable objectivity and sometimes, unwillingly, became an instrument of French demands and negotiating positions.”¹⁰⁴ At times this gave the more cautious Europeans in The Hague the feeling that they were seated “not in the Dutch, but in the French Cabinet.”¹⁰⁵ Van der Beugel deeply deplored that his more dogmatic colleagues, blinded by their passion for European integration, at times came to disregard the Dutch national interest in the process.

In the end, however, Van der Beugel was relieved when the negotiations were completed. “The treaties are not very pretty”, he wrote in his diary. “I’m very skeptical towards their implementation, but it is a political necessity, which, relatively speaking, has not ended badly for us.”¹⁰⁶ The result of these negotiations, as Van der Beugel saw it, was above all a very French treaty. By acting like the most difficult party at the negotiation table combined with the rush of the more *dévoué* Europeans like Spaak and Monnet’s Action Committee’s efforts via the European parliaments and the American diplomatic machinery to push the treaties through as fast as possible, the French had been able to leave a much greater mark on the treaty with regards to their institutional as well as their economic views than any other partner.¹⁰⁷ While the Rome treaties had been more French in character than Van der Beugel would have liked, he had great hopes that now these treaties had been signed, negotiations would follow about a British plan to connect the six countries of the newly established European Economic Community to the rest of the OEEC countries by means of an industrial Free Trade Area.

Hope and disillusionment: the Free Trade Area and Charles de Gaulle

Following the presentation of the ‘Spaak Report’ in the summer of 1956, the English – observing that the process of European integration that had suddenly been revamped in

¹⁰³ Ibid., 232. On Monnet’s relations with the Americans foreign policy establishment see: Clifford P. Hackett, *Monnet and the Americans: The Father of a United Europe and His U.S. Supporters* (Washington DC: Jean Monnet Council, 1995); Pascaline Winand, *Eisenhower, Kennedy and the United States of Europe* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993).

¹⁰⁴ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 316.

¹⁰⁵ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, p 30.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 32.

¹⁰⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 188.

Messina seemed to take off without them, thus leading to the creation of a rival continental European economic block – submitted a proposal in the OEEC to study the feasibility of an association between the six Common Market countries and the rest of the OEEC in the form of an industrial Free Trade Area. While Van der Beugel considered it of the utmost importance to create a close association with the UK and the other OEEC countries, he believed the UK would not get on board unless they would be confronted with a '*fait accompli*' in the form of the Rome Treaties. Meanwhile, he believed it was of great importance to follow the very 'promising' developments in UK closely and even to take these developments into consideration during the negotiations on the road to the Rome treaties.¹⁰⁸

During the fall of 1957, after the treaties of Rome had been signed, the feasibility of the British proposal for a Free Trade Area (FTA) in manufactured goods only (so excluding agriculture) was considered by a committee set up by the OEEC under the chairmanship of the British Paymaster General Reginald Maudling.¹⁰⁹ On August 29, 1957 Van der Beugel met Maudling for the first time during a visit in The Hague where the Englishman left an 'excellent' first impression on Van der Beugel for whom the FTA negotiations would be the first big multilateral negotiations that he had to lead himself. From the start of the discussions in October 1957, Van der Beugel had the impression that the Dutch and the Germans were on the same page concerning the feasibility of the English plans as both German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano and the German top diplomat Walter Hallstein, who in January 1958 became the first president of the European Commission, had been very positive. In the Dutch council of ministers, however, Van der Beugel encountered similar problems as he had done during the negotiations for the Rome treaties: this time characterized by strong resistance against the Free Trade Area that he traced back to Jean Monnet's Action Committee.¹¹⁰

What worried Van der Beugel even more, however, was the political crisis that unfolded in France as a result of the May 13 Algiers putsch, which had its origins in a demonstration in Algiers against the formation of Pierre Pflimlin's new government after Pflimlin had declared to be in favor of negotiations with the *Front de la Libération Nationale* (FLN) in the Algerian War. The coup was perpetrated by French civilians and military personnel trying to impose a policy change in favor of French Algeria and brought France on the brink of a civil war.¹¹¹ During a secret cabinet level meeting of the EEC on May 19, 1958, Maurice Faure sketched a deeply depressing image of the situation in France which ended with the remark that if the Christian Democratic prime minister Pierre Pflimlin would not succeed in uniting the France of Algiers with the France of Paris, General de Gaulle would move into power within ten days. "If de Gaulle comes to power in France, I envision the phantom image of an anti-NATO politics of

¹⁰⁸ See: Ernst van der Beugel to S. en DGPZ, 2 November 1956, "Engeland en de Zes" and E.H. van der Beugel to M, Memo 1987: "Mijn bezoek aan Londen van 6 t/m 8 november 1956", 10 November 1956, file 58, EvdB.

¹⁰⁹ David Gowland and Arthur Turner, eds., *Britain and European Integration 1945-1998: A Documentary History* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 83.

¹¹⁰ "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", p. 97.

¹¹¹ Henk Wesseling, *De man die nee zei: Charles de Gaulle, 1890-1970* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2012), 135-137; Miriam Camps, *Britain and European Community: 1955-1963* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), 171.

the French government combined with a soothing attitude towards the Six in order to use the Six an instrument of French power politics. An unacceptable situation”, Van der Beugel wrote in his diary. “I have the same feeling in my stomach as in ‘33. I believe it is going to be de Gaulle, but that means, that rebelling generals can send an, in this case rotten, but still democratic regime home. The situation is just as serious as it was in 1933.” During the days that followed Van der Beugel slept poorly and “thought of nothing but Paris.” He could not stand the people who believed de Gaulle would be a good solution. “It is better than a Popular Front” he concluded, “but it is the bankruptcy of much that is dear to us.”¹¹²

When a few weeks later de Gaulle did indeed come to power in France Van der Beugel was deeply concerned about the consequences this would have for the negotiations concerning the Free Trade Area – not without reason as would become clear later on.¹¹³ In July, Van der Beugel still had the feeling that the French understood how isolated they were in their rejection of the Free Trade Area, but it was all downhill from that moment on. Back home in the Netherlands, a conflict unfolded between Van der Beugel and Monnet adept Sicco Mansholt concerning the exclusion of agricultural policy in the British plans for a Free Trade Area, which created a rift within the Dutch government on the issue. In September, it became clear that the Germans – who Van der Beugel had considered as his main allies in the negotiations – had completely aligned themselves with the French position. Meanwhile, the Belgians were useless according to Van der Beugel and the Italians “sold themselves to the highest bidder.” As it turned out, not the French but the Dutch found themselves isolated in their enthusiasm for the FTA – a situation that filled Van der Beugel with grave concern.¹¹⁴ On 9 October, 1958 Max Kohnstamm reported in his diary that Van der Beugel was so somber about the negotiations that he no longer believed the FTA would be achievable.¹¹⁵ During a big press conference on 20 October 1958 Van der Beugel shared his concerns with the Dutch and international press. A week later he was again deeply dismayed by the French attitude. “The way in which they treated us, defies any description”, Van der Beugel wrote. “While the meetings took place in Paris, no French minister showed up.” The only positive element was that the Germans finally found out that they had been deceived by the French. “They exploded in the most literal sense of the word.” While this appeared to be all very ‘amusing’ Van der Beugel argued that amusement did not help the negotiations one step further. In fact, the situation was so grave that Van der Beugel suggested during a lunch with Stikker and Maudling that the only way the FTA could still be saved might be a meeting between De Gaulle, Adenauer and MacMillan. “This is not just about the Free Trade Area, but it is much more about the life of the Six themselves. Things cannot go on like this”, Van der Beugel

¹¹² “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, p.146.

¹¹³ Ibid., 147; Gowland and Turner, *Britain and European Integration*, 83: “Initial French hostility to the British proposal intensified following the collapse of the French Republic in May 1958 and the Gaullist return to power”.

¹¹⁴ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, p.169.

¹¹⁵ Segers and Kohnstamm, *Diep spel*, 99.

wrote in his diary. "We cannot form a community on the conditions of a country that preaches sheer protectionism."¹¹⁶

Ernst der Beugel spent most of November in the United States, where he complained about the impasse in the FTA negotiations as a result of the French attitude and beseeched the Americans to intervene. During a conversation with undersecretary of state Herter he argued "that the future of the OEEC depended on these negotiations and that the OEEC was after all their baby."¹¹⁷ In fact, the "political consequences of a split between the EEC and the rest of the OEEC countries" could be so great, he argued that it would "endanger much of the accomplishments of the postwar period, including NATO." At the same time, he "doubted that a restrictionist EEC could long survive."¹¹⁸ Van der Beugel also expressed concerns about the consequences of the negotiations for French-German relations, an issue the U.S. cared deeply about. While great progress had been made, he "feared that the French were pushing the Germans too hard". Since an inward-looking Common Market was contrary to German interests Van der Beugel was afraid that this would eventually backfire if the French forced German acquiescence in this respect, which might cause German industrial leaders to rebel "with potentially dangerous consequences to French-German relations." He told Herter that the Dutch government believed that "the most efficacious American role in the EEC-FTA problem might be found in an attempt to influence the Chancellor to take a fairly strong line with the French in respect to the need for a liberal oriented Common Market." He claimed to understand American "caution in respect to intervening in the current dispute – also considering the fact that the 'ghost of the EDC' could still be sensed in the Department's halls" but maintained that the "the friends of trade liberalism within the EEC were in rather desperate need of assistance."¹¹⁹ In the end, it would all be to no avail as the Americans did not intervene and Charles de Gaulle unilaterally rejected the Free Trade Area.

Shortly after Van der Beugel returned from the United States the fourth Drees cabinet collapsed after which Van der Beugel accepted a temporary position enabling him to continue his role in the failing negotiations concerning the relationship between the Common Market countries and the rest of the OEEC. After a clash between the French and the English on the 16th of December Van der Beugel concluded that the "breach is complete." Europe was heading towards months of serious crises with regard to the economic cooperation filled with more "sabotage" by the French. A "deeply depressing" situation, Van der Beugel observed. "Seldom I have seen the situation for our country with regards to European integration as somber as in these weeks."¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", pp. 178-179.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 189.

¹¹⁸ Memorandum of Conversation, November 21, 1958, Document 40, Foreign Relations of the United States (hereafter FRUS), 1958-1960. Volume VII, Part 1, Western European Integration and Security, Canada. Accessed 14 December, 2016, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v07p1/d40>

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", pp. 197, 206, 209.

Now that the formal negotiations had reached a deadlock, the unofficial Atlantic elite mobilized in an attempt to mediate the crisis that had emerged in the FTA negotiations in a more informal atmosphere. To this end, Ernst van der Beugel and other key individuals involved in the official negotiations were invited by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands – the spouse of Queen Juliana – to attend a special ad-hoc Bilderberg Meeting on “the present state of negotiations regarding the EEC and the Free Trade Area.”¹²¹ The meeting took place at “Hotel de Bilderberg” in Oosterbeek – the same venue as where the very first Bilderberg conference had been organized in a private attempt to mediate growing transatlantic tensions in 1954.¹²² For the purposes of the 1959 meeting, the hotel had been “entirely taken over for the meeting” from noon on Saturday January 17 until noon on Monday, January 19.¹²³

Ernst van der Beugel was positively impressed by the meeting, in particular by the high level of both the discussions and the participants.¹²⁴ In a report he prepared for Foreign Minister Luns, he described the debates as “very candid and more informal than is possible in official meetings.” As a result they also “had the advantage of making the positions even more clear than they had become during the last couple of months.”¹²⁵ The verbatim report of the meeting shows that Van der Beugel actively participated in the debates. He used the opportunity, for example, to bring up tensions within the group of six Common Market countries, a point he introduced by stressing that he was going to bring up “a rather delicate subject, which can be discussed in this group, and which cannot be discussed in more official gatherings.”¹²⁶ After the meeting Van der Beugel wrote in his diary that he had not only actively participated in the discussions, but also “introduced some controversial subjects – to the visible delight of the Prince”, whom he obviously had tried to impress.¹²⁷ On a personal level, the Bilderberg weekend also helped to intensify Van der Beugel’s contact with his

¹²¹ Participants: Giovanni Agnelli (Italy), Hubert Ansiaux (Belgium), Raymond Aron (France), George W. Ball (United States), Fritz Berg (Germany), Ernst van der Beugel (Netherlands), Muharrem Nuri Birgi (Turkey), Wlaler Boverly (Switzerland), Georges Brutelle (France), Louis Camu (Belgium), Hakon Christiansen (Denmark), Arthur H. Dean (United States), John H. Ferguson (United States), Hugh Gaitskell (United Kingdom), H.J. Heinz (United States), The Viscount Kilmauir (United Kingdom), J.O. Krag (Denmark), Giovanni F. Malagodi (Italy), T.H.E.H. Mathon (Netherlands), Reginald Maudling (United Kingdom), Alfred Mueller-Armack (Germany), George Nebolsine (United States), Bertil Ohlin (Sweden), Jacques Piette (France), Alberto Pirelli (Italy), Pietro Quaroni (Italy), Jean Rey (European Economic Community), Paul Rijckens (Netherlands), George Villiers (France) and Otto Wolff von Amerongen (Germany). Bilderberg Group, “List of Participants: Enlarged Steering Committee Meeting 17th-19th January 1959”, file 51, Collection “Bilderberg Conferenties: Secretariaat, 1952-2004” (hereafter “Bilderberg”), NAH.

¹²² The next chapter will go deeper into the Bilderberg Meetings.

¹²³ Bilderberg Group, “Enlarged Steering Committee Meeting, 17th, 18th and 19th January 1959”, file 51, Bilderberg.

¹²⁴ E.H. van der Beutel to J.H. Retinger, April 20 1959, file 53, Bilderberg; “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, 207.

¹²⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 19 January 1959, “no. 181”, file 2, EvdB: “De besprekingen gingen over de vrijhandelszone en het was een zeer openhartig en toch wel informeler gesprek dan in officiële zittingen mogelijk is (...) De debatten hadden het voordeel de posities nog eens duidelijker te maken dan ze ons in de laatste maanden al zijn gebleken.”

¹²⁶ “Verbatim Report of the Enlarged Steering Committee Meeting”, file 17, Bilderberg.

¹²⁷ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, 207-208: “Ik heb levendig meegedaan aan de discussie en heb een paar keer onder zichtbare vreugde van de Prins zware knuppels in het hoenderhok geworpen.”

German colleague Müller-Armack. They agreed to keep each other informed about any new developments in the future.¹²⁸

What is more, the open discussions at the Bilderberg meeting played a crucial role in the confirmation of Van der Beugel's already strong suspicions concerning French ambitions with regards to European integration under De Gaulle. The 'clearer' impressions with which Van der Beugel left the meeting filled him with the "the greatest possible concern." As he informed Luns afterwards, during the candid discussions at the Bilderberg meeting it had been confirmed that France "attached itself to the Europe of the Six, not because it wants integration, but because it wants to attain the leadership of this group. Villiers and Aron, who are both close to the government, have left absolutely no room for misunderstanding on this." While this idea was not new, Van der Beugel noted that it had received a new impetus with the election of De Gaulle. With regards to the situation in France, he furthermore observed that all "political life underneath de Gaulle has ceased to exist" arguing that France had become an "absolute monarchy, but without the mistresses." Considering the serious nature of this situation Van der Beugel hoped to meet up soon with Luns to discuss these problems personally arguing that a "Europe of the Six as an instrument of French domination would be completely unacceptable."¹²⁹ Thus, while Van der Beugel considered the Bilderberg discussions very useful and illuminating, with regards to the FTA negotiations they had above all confirmed beyond a doubt that "the French would not be prepared to accept a free trade zone, even if all their requirements were met."¹³⁰

A few days later Van der Beugel had a 'heart to heart' talk with European Commission president Hallstein at his home in The Hague during which Van der Beugel shared his gloomy thoughts as well as his criticism on the German's policy in the 'most explicit terms'. The talk revealed to Van der Beugel the depth of the differences in their thinking about Europe. "He is a supporter of the theory that the *marché commun* is and should be a precursor of the political integration of the Six. As a consequence of that position he does not want to endanger this process in any way. I do not believe in political integration with the France of de Gaulle and consequently my main priority is for the Six to operate as the driving force behind a deeper cooperation in a larger Europe."¹³¹ With the OEEC negotiations in a deadlock, Van der Beugel had started preparations for a new quest, this time focused on an attempt to enlarge the *marché commun*, starting with the U.K., but this too had been to no avail. After all the frustrations he had experienced with the French first during the negotiations about the European Defense Community, followed by the Rome Treaties and now the Free Trade Association, the arrival of Charles de Gaulle on the European scene was the real game changer for Van der Beugel's attitude towards the process of European integration. "All my instincts rise up against the treatment we need to put up with and against the life-threatening

¹²⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 19 January 1959, file 2, EvdB; "Summing up by E.H. van der Beugel", file 45, J.H. van Roijen Papers, NAH.

¹²⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 19 January 1959, "no. 181", file 2, EvdB.

¹³⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 19 January 1959, "no. 180", file 2, EvdB.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

instincts that are in the process of gaining the upper hand. We are becoming an instrument of French politics which is totally disastrous.” Rumors that de Gaulle wanted to retreat the French Mediterranean fleet from the NATO-command, an act Van der Beugel regarded as “an existential deterioration of Western policy”¹³² fed his worries even more. The experiences of these last months not only affected Van der Beugel’s views on European integration and transatlantic relations, but also deepened the rift in thinking between him and his Europeanist friends, including Max Kohnstamm. “Max remains a sweet and intimate friend”, Van der Beugel wrote in the spring of 1959, “the most difficult thing, however, is that gradually we have come to disagree very fundamentally about the European issue. He is the dreamy idealist, deeply impressed by Monnet, and during these last couple of months I have become deeply disillusioned and extremely skeptical towards the entire venture.”¹³³

As he was about to leave the Dutch government in May 1959, Van der Beugel shared his disappointment in and disillusionment with the process of European integration as it had unfolded in a couple of speeches that received a great deal of attention in the Dutch media, summing up his views on Dutch European and Atlantic policy as they had crystallized during his career in public service. The time for sweet idealistic dreams about European integration had ended, he declared. The expectations with which the Netherlands had entered the process of European integration had not materialized. First of all, they had expected that the EEC would be followed by a free trade zone, which never materialized – especially as a result of French resistance. Secondly, they had expected that German economic liberalism would function as a counterweight to French protectionism, but in reality political forces had rendered the expected balance impossible and a French-German axis had developed in ‘Little Europe’ instead. Thirdly, the Dutch had expected that the European Commission would also stand up for the interests of the little countries, but here too, everything revolved around the French-German axis. It was now time the Netherlands pursued its own interests, in this pursuit solidarity with the United States should be the main priority. It would be a big mistake, according to Van der Beugel, if the European countries would think that they could pursue their own plans, independently from the United States.¹³⁴

Conclusion: an Atlanticist European

As a result of the close links between the Marshall Plan and European integration, Ernst van der Beugel became closely involved in the process of European integration. While he had enthusiastically embraced the Schuman Plan in 1950, he became more skeptical as the integration process unfolded. In debates between Atlanticists and Europeanists, Van der

¹³² Ibid., 220-221.

¹³³ Ibid., 227.

¹³⁴ See for example: “Drs. Van der Beugel over de EEG: Tijd van dromen over ‘Europa’ is Voorbij”, *Vrije Volk*, 8 May, 1959.

Beugel clearly belonged to the Atlanticist camp. This did not mean, however, that he was anti-European integration.

When a journalist of the *Rotterdammer* newspaper informed the Belgian Prime Minister Paul Henri Spaak about the controversy surrounding Ernst van der Beugel's appointment as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs caused by his alleged anti-European attitude, Spaak acted surprised, saying that he considered such critical doubts incomprehensible and praised Van der Beugel as an "excellent European". Obviously, the standard of what makes an "excellent European" partly depends on the eyes of the beholder. In the eyes of fervent Europeanists like Max Kohnstamm, Conny Patijn, Charles Rutten or Theo Bot Van der Beugel's European faith was weighed and found wanting. While Ernst van der Beugel was not against European integration he lacked the ideological fervor of more fanatic Europeans. His approach, in contrast, reflected the more detached and pragmatic realism that prevailed at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but it would be a severe oversimplification to conclude from this that he was anti-European. The debates between Europeanists and Atlanticists did not revolve around the question "European integration or no European integration?" There was a basic consensus about the necessity of European integration in general. The disputes that arose mainly concerned the *form* and *purpose* of this integration.

Van der Beugel's hesitancy towards speedy European integration was determined by a different, more restrictive, understanding of what kinds of integration would be desirable. In contrast to the Europeanists, Van der Beugel did not perceive European integration as an *end* in and of itself, but as a *means* to enhance the Dutch national interest. On an economic level, this meant a form of European integration that limited protectionism and facilitated free trade in an open economic community – a desire that the Dutch shared with the United Kingdom and the United States, but which was rather unpopular in France. Overall, Van der Beugel took a rather pragmatic approach to the institutional debates about supranationalism vs. intergovernmentalism and sectoral vs. general integration dictated by his understanding of the Dutch national interest in light of the existing circumstances. If continental integration could not be realized on a supranational footing, Van der Beugel preferred a more Atlanticist approach, even if that meant that this had to happen in the intergovernmental context of the OEEC.

Of supreme importance in any discussion regarding the direction of European integration was the Dutch – and Atlantic – security interest. Ernst van der Beugel's understanding of the ideal Atlantic Community was rooted in a realist stream of Atlanticism, which regarded Atlantic unity under strong American leadership as essential for the security of the West in the context of the Cold War. Consequently, European integration was always meant to play an ancillary role. Since Van der Beugel believed that the security of the Netherlands, as well as the security of the entire European continent and Western civilization in general, depended completely on Atlantic unity under strong American leadership as institutionalized in NATO, he objected to any form of integration that could possibly loosen transatlantic ties. Hence, he declared that European integration "may never be seen as an

attempt to close itself off from the rest of the world, but only as an attempt to strengthen the European pillar of the Western alliance”, claiming that “our national and personal existence depends on it.”¹³⁵

From early on Van der Beugel suspected that the Gaullists wanted Europe to pursue a course more independent from the United States. A more independent Europe that might even be tempted to position itself as a third, neutral power between the Soviet Union on the one hand and the United States on the other, was one of his biggest fears. Such a disintegration of the nascent Atlantic Community would leave Western Europe weak and vulnerable and thus as an easy prey for expansionist Soviet power and influence. His experience of the failure of the European Defense Community, and in particular the role of a France that often successfully pursued interests that were diametrically opposed to those of the Netherlands by playing the ‘most difficult partner’ card greatly frustrated Van der Beugel and made him pessimistic about the direction and possibilities of continental European integration along lines that would be in the Dutch national – and Atlantic – interest as he perceived it. The subsequent rise of Charles de Gaulle to power, the death stroke he delivered to the negotiations about the Free Trade Area and especially his desire to create a Europe that would act more independently from the United States was the real game changer for Ernst van der Beugel, who regarded this as an utterly unacceptable development. The only integration Charles de Gaulle would allow would be detrimental to the Dutch national interest and to Atlantic security. In this context, he believed, stagnation was better than progress into what he considered as a perilous direction. Consequently, he left the Dutch government disappointed and disillusioned with how European integration was unfolding. As a private citizen, however, he would be free to express himself as the European Atlanticist he had become.

After all, this chapter has also demonstrated how in his official position Ernst van der Beugel – as any civil servant – had to execute the policy set out by his minister. While the Atlantic priority at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had taken root under the leadership of Dirk Stikker, his successor, Willem Beyen, pursued a more Europeanist path. In this context Van der Beugel’s Atlanticist priority sometimes clashed with his minister’s ideas, revealing a certain tension between the formal policy line and his personal convictions, as illustrated for example by the Stikker letter or Van der Beugel’s opposition to the *relance européenne*. Max Kohnstamm had experienced similar tensions as a Europeanist working at a predominantly Atlanticist Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1956 he had transferred to the private sector, where he could more purely pursue his own European ideals through Jean Monnet’s Action Committee.

As this chapter has demonstrated, when we adjust our frame of analysis just a little bit by adding a transnational layer to it, we gain a more holistic understanding of the diplomatic process. By also including the role of private individuals and organizations that

¹³⁵ “Europa’s integratie is geen streven naar de derde weg”, *Trouw*, 24 November 1956.

were active in the transatlantic diplomatic arena – such as Jean Monnet and his Action Committee and the Bilderberg Meetings – it becomes clear that formal diplomacy did not take place in a vacuum: there were more stakeholders involved in transatlantic diplomacy than just nation states. Their activities were closely connected and all of them were trying to contribute to the multidimensional management of the transatlantic relationship. As Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ernst van der Beugel witnessed from up close how powerful these private actors could be. In fact, as an official government representative he frequently felt restricted in his pursuit of what he believed to be the Dutch national interest as a result of Monnet's influence behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy. Domestically, Van der Beugel had to deal with Monnet's influence on members of the Dutch parliament who had close ties to his Action Committee for a United Europe, but even more important was Monnet's personal influence on the American foreign policy establishment. The American pressure on European countries with regards to a speedy European integration, which Van der Beugel often regarded as detrimental for the Atlantic relationship could often be traced back to the Frenchman's direct influence within the U.S. State department and diplomatic machinery.¹³⁶ At the same time, he also experienced how an unofficial venture like the Bilderberg Meetings could complement the formal transatlantic diplomatic infrastructure by offering a meeting place where the different transatlantic stakeholders could speak more freely and build relationships of trust in an informal atmosphere. Eventually, Van der Beugel himself came to subscribe to a key tenet of New Diplomatic History, arguing in his dissertation that "the history of American policy towards the process of European unification cannot (...) be explained without recognition of Monnet's influence on the formulation of that policy."¹³⁷ While he often disapproved of Monnet's influence because he believed the Europeanists, with their eagerness for a swift integration, indirectly played into the hands of the Gaullists, Van der Beugel would take the lessons concerning the informal means and unofficial channels used by Monnet to heart. After he had left the Dutch government himself, he took inspiration from Monnet convinced that at least part of his *modus operandi* could also be very well applied in the pursuit of Atlanticist goals.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ When we add a transnational layer to our analysis of the transatlantic diplomatic process this also further complicates more simplistic ideas of passive Europeans undergoing American hegemony as the ideas driving U.S. policy also have some more complex transnational roots that include European influences.

¹³⁷ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 246-247.

¹³⁸ See: E.H. van der Beugel to Shepard Stone and Joseph E. Slater, 13 June 1967, box ID#18975, Report#010874, IA-Joseph E. Slater, Ford Foundation Archive (hereafter "FFA"), Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).

4. Unofficial Ambassador for an Atlantic Community

In July 1959 Ernst van der Beugel officially left the Dutch government for a position in the private sector. Such a transfer might have heralded the final chapter of a more traditional account of diplomatic history that limits the study of diplomacy to the nation state and its formal representatives. Yet, from the perspective of New Diplomatic History with its emphasis on an individual's diplomatic *role* and contribution to the diplomatic process instead of his or her *position* in or outside of officialdom, such a transition does not necessarily have to mean the end of one's relevance to diplomatic history. To the contrary, as the following chapters will demonstrate: if we decide to keep following Ernst van der Beugel into the private sphere it becomes clear that his diplomatic role and his contribution to the diplomatic process did not end at all with his move out of officialdom, but continued in an unofficial capacity and through informal diplomatic channels. It is not so much his departure from officialdom but rather the continuation of his role in transatlantic diplomacy that is most striking. Consequently, while the next three chapters will primarily zoom in on what this diplomatic role entailed by focusing on three case studies concerning Van der Beugel's unofficial diplomatic efforts in the light of perceived challenges to the transatlantic relationship, this chapter will focus on his transition to the private sector and identify key factors that enabled the continuation of his role in transatlantic diplomacy after he formally left the Dutch government.¹

Statesman without Office

The fall of the fourth Drees cabinet on 11 December 1958 came as "quite a shock" to Ernst van der Beugel.² He handed in his notice of resignation together with the other PvdA Cabinet members and was unexpectedly forced to reconsider his future. "The following day I started to realize what it meant to be without a job and without an alternative", Van der Beugel wrote in his diary on December 12. "It is as if all the securities outside of the personal sphere suddenly fall away and thoughts about the future control the day."³ He experienced the following days as a crisis period in which he felt confronted with a "rather definitive choice"

¹ Parts of this chapter also appeared in: Albertine Bloemendal, "Between Dinner Table and Formal Diplomacy: Ernst van der Beugel as an Unofficial Diplomat for an Atlantic Community", *New Global Studies*, 8:1 (2014): 103-119.

² EvdB/Kersten Oral History Interview, file 61-66, EvdB, NAH, p. 252: "Het was natuurlijk volkomen onverwachts. En het was voor mij dus niet het einde van twee jaar staatssecretariaat, maar het was het einde van alles wat ik tot nu toe gedaan had vanaf 1945. Dat is 'quite a shock'."; Foreign Service Dispatch, "Views of Dr. Ernst H. van der Beugel, Former Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on Dutch Political Situation", 30 December, 1958, RG59, F482, Roll 6 ("Department of State Decimal File 1954-1959"), RSC: "Dr. Van der Beugel said that when the Cabinet decided to ask Finance Minister Hofstra to put the Parliament proposal for a two-year extension of certain temporary tax measures, it had no idea that it would be provoking a Cabinet crisis."

³ E.H. van der Beugel, "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", file 1, EvdB, p. 195 (translation mine).

which he had preferred to avoid for a long time to come.⁴ He did not worry much about losing his political position as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, but the prospect of leaving the department and the insecurity he experienced concerning his future fell heavy on him.

During the days and weeks that followed, Van der Beugel received several job offers. Rumors about an appointment as Government Commissioner for European Integration reached the Dutch embassy in Washington DC, but these were soon debunked by Van der Beugel. "I have come to the conclusion that I should not again occupy a position similar to the one I had before I became Deputy Foreign Minister, whether this would mean occupying the chair of Director General or becoming Government Commissioner", he explained to ambassador van Roijen. "One should only return to an old chair, when one is inwardly convinced that one will remain seated on it for a fairly long period, and I certainly lack that inward conviction. As a result I would consider it indecent to take upon me anything but a temporary position."⁵ Consequently, Van der Beugel informed Joseph Luns that he did not desire to return to his old position at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because he considered this to be "improper."⁶ Even so, the choice did not come easy and Van der Beugel told Luns he would very much appreciate a *periode transitoire*. This way, he would not have to break with his work at the department instantaneously – he was after all still immersed in the negotiations concerning the Free Trade Area – and it would offer him a basis from which he could decide what his next move would be. Thus, on Van der Beugel's request, Luns created an interim position for him as Special Advisor of the Minister of Foreign Affairs with the title of Ambassador in which he would "remain in his present office" and "continue to speak for Holland in negotiations over the Free Trade Area and other such European problems." He would start on January 1, 1959 "with it known that he may move to other fields of activity within the next year or two."⁷

While Van der Beugel was still figuring out what path to take he confided to ambassador van Roijen that he was certain about a few things he did *not* want to do. PvdA leader Jaap Burger had offered him a seat in the Second Chamber,⁸ but Van der Beugel had no desire to remain in the political spotlight. When he had just been appointed as Deputy Foreign Minister he had written in his diary that he was not "wired" to be a politician because he considered himself too vulnerable and too objective for this. His experience as Deputy Foreign Minister had only confirmed this. Hence, he did not want to return to a prominent political position – now less than ever, in fact, because he feared a radicalization within the PvdA. "Like you, I still

⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 23 December 1958, file 45, J.H. van Roijen Papers (hereafter "van Roijen Papers"), NAH (translation mine).

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", 196 (translation mine).

⁷ "Views of Dr. Ernst H. van der Beugel", 30 December, 1958, RG59, F482, Roll 6 (Department of State Decimal File 1954-1959), RSC; "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", 199.

⁸ "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", 202; "Views of Dr. Ernst H. van der Beugel", 30 December, 1958: "He had been offered a seat in the Second Chamber, and has refused it. He had been offered the job of 'Commissioner for Europe' in the Foreign Office – a position now not existing, but with proto-types in the Commissioner for Indonesia, Mr. Blom, and the unfulfilled Commissioner for Germany. He has refused that assignment as well, arguing that it would be improper for him to accept such an assignment with mental reservations over how long he would stay in it".

completely support the broad spiritual background of the Labor Party, but I cannot declare my solidarity to many points of practical politics,” he explained to van Roijen. Considering these circumstances, Van der Beugel believed it would be best to stay on as a member of the PvdA in an effort “to exert a moderating influence” on the party from behind the scenes.⁹

The alternative options he considered were a position in the Foreign Service and a switch to the private sector. Since no position in the Foreign Service was available in which Van der Beugel would feel both “happy and satisfied” and because he considered it “incorrect” to do something with his special training that others could do just as well or even better, the road ahead seemed to lead more and more into the direction of the private sector.¹⁰ Van Roijen was disappointed to hear this and, stressing his diplomatic value, disagreed with Van der Beugel’s argumentation against taking a job in the Foreign Service:

With regards to ‘the future’ I continue to think that it would be a great loss for our national interest if you would move to the corporate sector. I am convinced that sooner or later a post will open up in the Foreign Service in which you, as well as Miekje, shall find full satisfaction. As a man of the trade, I say this with some diffidence, but objectively I will have to conclude that at the moment there are few individuals in the Foreign Service who have shown to serve our country with as much dedication, but especially also with as much understanding and insight as you have.¹¹

Nevertheless, this was the direction Van der Beugel was gravitating towards. As a result of his experience during the Marshall Plan and the close cooperation with the private sector during that period combined with his father’s contacts in the financial and corporate world, Van der Beugel was well connected in private circles. Now that he could no longer turn to his father, who had passed away in 1953, one of the first people Ernst van der Beugel turned to for advice concerning his future was another important individual from his past: Hans Max Hirschfeld, with whom Van der Beugel had remained very close. Hirschfeld had already made the transfer to the private sector right after the completion of his work for the Marshall Plan in 1952. With him, Van der Beugel discussed possibilities for a future at the *Rotterdamsche Bank*, where Hirschfeld had started his career and where he was now a member of the Board of Supervisors, as well as the pros and cons of joining KLM Royal Dutch Airlines following a request by KLM president Aler to join the company as his possible successor.¹²

⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 23 december 1958, file 45, van Roijen Papers.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ J.H. van Roijen to E.H. van der Beugel, 6 January, 1959, file 45, van Roijen Papers (translation mine).

¹² Hirschfeld had collected no less than eighteen positions on prominent Supervisory Boards after he left the Dutch government; “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, 196; Meindert Fennema and John Rhijnsburger, *Hans Max Hirschfeld. Man van het grote geld* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2007), 317, 297-298.

KLM Connections

Ernst van der Beugel was no stranger to the KLM leadership. The Flying Dutchman had been a major recipient of American aid during the Marshall Plan years. In 1953, Van der Beugel had also been part of a committee appointed to study the Plesman Plan – a postwar proposal that focused on international cooperation in the execution and finance of grand infrastructural projects championed by aviation pioneer and legendary KLM-founder Albert Plesman. When Fons Aler replaced Plesman in 1954 Ernst van der Beugel sent him a personal note to congratulate him.¹³

During his career at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Van der Beugel had also become acquainted with Prince Bernhard von Lippe-Biesterfeld, the German-born spouse of Queen Juliana of the Netherlands. The prince, who had obtained his pilot license in England during the Second World War, was an avid aviation enthusiast and a member of the Board of Supervisors at KLM.¹⁴ After the war, Prince Bernhard had been appointed as Inspector-General of the Dutch armed forces and had established himself as a goodwill-ambassador of Dutch business interests abroad. When Van der Beugel still worked at the Marshall Plan Bureau, the prince would occasionally contact him to discuss informal meetings he had conducted with top officials in the United States and issues close to his heart, such as the off-shore possibilities for the Dutch ammunition industry in the U.S. or NATO plans for a collective production program for the aviation industry. Their relationship further intensified during Van der Beugel's stint as Deputy Foreign Minister when formalities made him a recurrent guest at Soestdijk Palace, the residence of the Dutch Queen and the prince consort.¹⁵ Even more important, however, was Van der Beugel's leadership of the Dutch delegation during the 1957 landing rights negotiations for KLM in the United States.

The acquisition of landing rights for KLM in the United States had been a recurring theme in Dutch-American relations since the Second World War, which caused a considerable amount of bilateral friction. KLM not only played a crucial role in the Dutch economy and in the post-war recovery of the Netherlands, but as the oldest airline in the world and carrier of the Dutch flag KLM was a vital source of pride for the Dutch – especially after the Netherlands had to let go of its lost empire in the East Indies.¹⁶

¹³ E.H. van der Beugel to I.A. Aler, 30 March 1954, EvdB, 35; EvdB/Kersten Oral History, 409.

¹⁴ Gerard Aalders, *Het Lockheed Schandaal* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2011), 140-144.

¹⁵ See for example: E.H. van der Beugel to T and M, 20 March 1956, file 5, EvdB; "Verslag bezoek aan Prins Bernhard", file 5, EvdB; EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.388: "Ik heb natuurlijk veel met hem te maken gehad in functie. Als staatssecretaris en vooral in die militaire zaak ook, zag je elkaar. Hij kwam toen ook wel bij me. Ik kwam natuurlijk bij de koningin in functie, maar ik kwam ook wel bij hem een borrel drinken in die tijd. Toen is de KLM gekomen, waar hij commissaris was en waar ik heel veel met hem te maken heb gehad."

¹⁶ Giles Scott-Smith and David J. Snyder, "A Test of Sentiments: Civil Aviation, Alliance Politics, and the KLM Challenge in Dutch-American Relations", *Diplomatic History* 37: 5 (2013): 921; Marc Dierikx, "'Een spel zonder kaarten': KLM-landingsrechten als nationaal belang, 1945-1957" in *Jaarboek Buitenlandse Zaken: Derde Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek*, ed. D.A. Hellema, C. Wiebes, B. Zeeman, (Den Haag: Sdu, 1997): 11-25; S.C. Labadie, "'Desert for dessert' De onderhandelingen tot het afsluiten van de luchtvaartovereenkomst van 3 april 1957 tussen Nederland en de Verenigde Staten van Amerika" (masters thesis, VU University Amsterdam, 2000): 20-25.

As one of the leading European airlines the 'Flying Dutchman' had wanted to expand its services in the United States after the war but the Americans were reluctant to grant them the necessary landing rights. Whereas the Dutch strongly favored freedom of the air, which offered the only way for such a small country to endure international competition, they soon found out that their American partners merely paid lip service to this idea. In practice the Americans pursued more protectionist policies based on bilateral agreements on a *quid pro quo* basis. With only one significant airport in the country, this left the Dutch with little to bargain with – except for their political loyalty as a faithful transatlantic ally in the Cold War. The U.S. State department was relatively sympathetic to Dutch landing rights requests as a means to reward a loyal Cold War ally with access to American airports, but they faced strong opposition from domestic airlines who saw KLM as a strong rival with whom they did not desire to compete on their home turf. The U.S. aviation industry was well organized and skillfully linked their own commercial interests to Cold War fears and security interests while lobbying Congress. After all, aviation was regarded as an industry that did not only have economic, but also military-strategic significance. As a result, in the absence of a real treaty the Dutch only received a series of temporary landing rights agreements during the first post-war decade. In the Netherlands, the American reluctance to successfully negotiate a real treaty was interpreted as unfriendly and unthankful behavior by the Americans towards one of its most loyal allies, hurting not only Dutch pride, but also the bilateral relationship.¹⁷

In the spring of 1956, with the expiration of the temporary permits in sight, the Dutch started to put pressure on the United States to resolve the landing rights dispute. The importance attached to this issue by the Dutch was underlined by the fact that Queen Juliana explicitly mentioned the matter in her annual speech to the Dutch parliament, beseeching the Americans to take the 'reasonable Dutch demands' into consideration. Prime minister Drees furthermore sent a personal letter to President Eisenhower to emphasize the importance of the matter and the Dutch cabinet postponed the ratification of a proposed Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between the Netherlands and the United States, which had been on the table since 1948, and in which Ernst van der Beugel had also invested much time during his days at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.¹⁸ The 'reasonable Dutch demands' mentioned by the Queen consisted of the replacement of the temporary arrangement by a standard civil air agreement and an expansion of KLM's service to the United States with three new flights: they wanted access to Los Angeles, Houston and a route including Amsterdam-New York-Curacao. The importance attached to these negotiations in the Netherlands did not go unnoticed in the United States. "Rarely have instruments of both the Cabinet and Parliament gone to such lengths in public to achieve what would seem to outsiders to be a fairly limited objective", a New York Times journalist observed shortly before

¹⁷ Labadie, "Desert for dessert": 25-30; Scott-Smith and Snyder, "A Test of Sentiments", 920-922.

¹⁸ "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", 25; "A Test of Sentiments", 922-930; "Memorandum to the President concerning U.S.-Netherlands Civil Aviation Negotiations, March 14, 1957, box 1, Chronological File – March 1957 (2), Christian A. Herter Papers, Eisenhower Presidential Library (EPL); "Troonrede 18 september 1956", last accessed 7 December, 2016. <http://www.troonredes.nl/troonrede-18-september-1956/>

the negotiations were finally reopened in the spring of 1957. What is more, “the importance the Netherlands attaches to the discussion” was also reflected, the journalist noted, “by the fact that her delegation will be led by the second man in the Foreign Ministry, Dr. E.H. van der Beugel, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs.”¹⁹

Ernst van der Beugel was not very eager about this appointment at first. The subject was not really his ‘thing’ and even though he “liked the opportunity to spend some time in the U.S.,” he believed that there was “little honor to be gained” with this task. “It will be difficult”, he wrote in his diary on 23 February, “and I don’t think we will get it.” Once he got involved, however, he became a passionate champion for KLM landing rights in the U.S. and very critical of the American attitude in this context.²⁰

The negotiations were indeed difficult as expected. They were also followed with an exceptional high degree of attention in the Dutch parliament and press, a fact about which Van der Beugel, who turned out to be a tough negotiator, frequently reminded his American counterparts. At some point, the Americans were willing to accept the demand for a civil air agreement including the expansion of landing rights for Houston and New York, but argued that they had to solve a conflict in Congress before they could discuss Los Angeles. This infuriated Van der Beugel, who in turn suggested breaking off the talks completely and told the American delegation that he considered any deal excluding the West Coast as “unjust, discriminatory and dishonorable”.²¹ In a letter, explaining this position to Foreign minister Luns, Van der Beugel argued that the West Coast was so essential that he would rather leave Washington “quarrelling” than without landing rights to Los Angeles. He regarded the exclusion of the West Coast – for which comparable European airlines like Lufthansa, BOAC and SAS had received landing rights – as extremely discriminatory and argued that it would severely impair KLM’s standing in the world by relegating it to being a “second rate” airline for the foreseeable future.²² Not just KLM’s future, but the Dutch national interest – not to mention Dutch pride – were at stake here. With the Dutch delegation threatening to walk out on the negotiations, President Eisenhower was informed and a crisis meeting was set up with the American Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in which Van der Beugel repeated his position, backed by both KLM and the Dutch cabinet.²³ In the end, however, he received instructions from the Dutch government to accept the deal offered to him by the Americans – without Los Angeles. They had decided that the far-reaching political consequences of a Dutch ‘no’ would be too grave.

While the American refusal to grant KLM access to the West Coast received a “sharply critical” response in the Netherlands, Van der Beugel’s efforts were very much appreciated –

¹⁹ Walter H. Waggoner, “Dutch put Hopes in U.S. Air Talks: Stake National Pride on Plea for Expanded Rights”, *New York Times*, 11 March, 1957, 46.

²⁰ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, 13.

²¹ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns and W. Drees, 27 March 1957, file 3, EvdB.

²² E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 22 March, 1957, file 3, EvdB; E.H. van der Beugel to J.Algera (Minister of Transportation), 26 March 1957, file 3, EvdB.

²³ Codebericht 3687, E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 29 March 1957, file 3, EvdB.

by the Dutch government and by the public at large as demonstrated by the massive coverage of the event in the Dutch media.²⁴ In the years that followed Van der Beugel regularly openly criticized the United States on this point. After all, the American position – which he found hypocritical and unfair – not only hurt the Dutch national interest, but also undermined the transatlantic relationship. To Van der Beugel’s frustration, the civil aviation dispute would remain a major source of friction in Dutch-American relations for at least two more decades. Van der Beugel’s role in this narrative would also continue, albeit in different capacities.

Ernst van der Beugel’s efforts on behalf of the Flying Dutchman in the United States were also greatly appreciated among the airline’s leadership. About a week before the fall of the Drees cabinet, KLM president Aler approached Van der Beugel to probe his interests in a career at KLM in the event that he might have to leave his position as Deputy Minister prematurely. Van der Beugel told him that if such a thing were to happen he would earnestly consider any serious proposal. This was not the first time that Van der Beugel was offered a job at KLM. Prior to the 1956 Cabinet forming negotiations – and thus prior to his negotiations on behalf of KLM in the United States – Van der Beugel had already been offered a directorship at KLM, which he had declined.²⁵ Since then circumstances had changed, however, and so had the job offer. As it turned out, the Flying Dutchman was experiencing some turbulence while entering the jet age resulting, among other things, from the acquisition of a series of new aircraft and the Board of Supervisors believed it would be good to blow some fresh air through the airline’s leadership. Moreover, in December 1958 KLM president Fons Aler announced that he had decided to step down as president once he would reach retirement age in May 1961. As a result, the KLM leadership was looking for a capable successor.²⁶

In the meantime, Ernst van der Beugel’s relationship to KLM had changed somewhat as well. While he had originally considered the landing rights matter a boring business, he had come to take a personal interest in the airline. In April 1958 he wrote a letter to Prime-Minister Drees in which he expressed “grave worries” about the direction KLM was taking – a move he explained to the Prime-Minister by saying that KLM had received “a special place” in his heart since the landing rights negotiations he had conducted for them in the United States.²⁷ His experience as a participant in these negotiations proved to be especially valuable now that the Board of Supervisors had come to the conclusion “that the increasingly complex world of international aviation required a new type of leadership in which patience, tact, diplomacy and familiarity with the field of international relations – traits through which neither Plesman nor Aler had distinguished themselves – would be a necessity.”²⁸ Thus, Van

²⁴ “Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris”, pp. 45,55; Christian Herter, “Memorandum for the President”, 17 February 1960, box 12, Eisenhower, Papers as President, 1953-61 (Ann Whitman File), Dulles-HerterSeries, EPL.

²⁵ “Views of Mr. Posthumus”, memorandum of conversation, February 5, 1959, RG59, F482, Roll 6: Department of State Decimal File 1954-1959, RSC.

²⁶ See: Marc Dierikx, *Blauw in de lucht: Koninklijke Luchtvaart Maatschappij 1919-1999* (Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers, 1999), 187.

²⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to W. Drees, 28 April 1958, file 35, EvdB (translation mine).

²⁸ Dierikx, *Blauw in de lucht*, 187 (translation mine).

der Beugel's diplomatic skills were regarded as an important asset, which should help him, in the words of Time Magazine, "to steer the world's fourth-largest international airline deftly through the financial perils of the jet age."²⁹

After some weeks of negotiations, during which he wanted to make sure that he would enter KLM not just as vice-president but as the certain successor of Aler, Van der Beugel decided to take the leap to the private sector and joined KLM.³⁰ While he mentioned on different occasions that he considered this a difficult decision, because it meant the end of fifteen years of work for the Dutch government which he had done with great enthusiasm and dedication and in which he had put "much of his heart"³¹, Van der Beugel mentioned repeatedly that, in contrast, his choice for KLM was a purely rational one:

It is a decision that I take with my mind and not with my heart. With my mind, because I do not want a political gamble, even though I am perfectly happy in my current position, even without the State Secretariat, but I am of the opinion that rationally this is the best moment to cut this line. If I say 'no' again, I will have become the man who has decided at the moment in which they wanted him to stay employed with the government. That is both for my career and for my finances too big a risk.³²

Transition and Continuity

Thus, on May 25, 1959 Ernst van der Beugel left the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs to join KLM Dutch Royal Airlines as its Vice-President.³³ While this transition to the private sector may at first sight appear as a fundamental break with his career as a diplomat, reality proved to be more complex. The end of Van der Beugel's official career at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs did, in fact, not mean the end of his involvement in transatlantic relations. Instead, his experience as a formal diplomat rather served as a kind of springboard to a more diffuse and free-from approach to transatlantic diplomacy.

During his career at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and through his work for the Marshall Plan, Ernst van der Beugel had developed an extensive social network that reached all over the Atlantic Community. Hence, he was very well connected, he had earned a good deal of trust and credibility, and he was seen by many as an authoritative expert in the field of European integration and transatlantic affairs whose consultation was sought after regularly. On December 2, 1959, for example – just a few months after he had left the Dutch government – Ernst van der Beugel was invited by the Council on Foreign Relations in New

²⁹ "The Netherlands: Crisis at KLM", *Time Magazine*, 11 January, 1963.

³⁰ This was eventually arranged through the mediation of van der Beugel's college friend Emile van Lennep, who was a member of the Board of Directors at KLM at the time. See: "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", p. 205; EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 309, 409; See also: E. van Lennep and E. Schoorl, *Emile van Lennep in de wereldeconomie. Herinneringen van een internationale Nederlander* (Leiden: Stenfort Kroese, 1991).

³¹ E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 23 December 1958, inv. no. 45, Van Roijen Papers, NAH (translation mine).

³² "Dagboek van een Staatssecretaris", p. 209.

³³ Dierikx, *Blauw in de lucht*, 187.

York to talk about “issues in the Common Market” at a private and off-the-record round table meeting in his honor attended by “a group of men widely experienced in United States foreign economic policy and the European economy.”³⁴ During the meeting, Van der Beugel voiced his worries about recent developments concerning the process of European integration. “While a look at the Common Market at this juncture may have given one the impression that it had been a success”, Van der Beugel expressed “serious apprehensions” and informed his audience about his “impression of failure” ensuing from the fact that the organization of the Common Market had resulted in a split in Europe between the ‘inner six’ Common Market countries and the ‘outer seven’ EFTA countries. Thus, he argued, “the Common Market rather runs counter to the movement of cohesion of Western countries – is a step away from it.”³⁵ Van der Beugel specifically shared his disapproval of America’s role in this development, criticizing its Common Market-focused policy at the expense of a broader Free Trade Area including Great Britain and beseeched the American foreign policy establishment to put pressure on the European countries of the “six” and the “seven” to come together and to pursue its “former policy aims of European cooperation in OEEC and NATO in favor of greater Western cohesion.”³⁶ On a more positive note, he also used the opportunity to express his admiration for the Council on Foreign Relations and his hopes “that Europeans will create a similar organization of statesman without office.”³⁷ Many more similar visits and exhortations would follow during the ensuing decades.

As mentioned in chapter two, the Council on Foreign Relations was one of the central meeting places of the unofficial foreign policy elite in the United States, often referred to as the ‘East Coast establishment’ with which Ernst van der Beugel had been closely associated since the Marshall Plan. Back home in the Netherlands, he also remained an eminent member of the informal Dutch foreign policy establishment and served as vice-chairman of one of its key organizations: the Netherlands Institute for Foreign Affairs.³⁸ In addition to that, Van der Beugel did not only stay closely involved in the Dutch Labor Party, trying to influence its course from behind the scenes, he also served as a member of multiple informal advisory committee’s consulting the Dutch government on issues involving foreign and security policy, including the informal advisory committee with members from the business community that Hirschfeld had set up during the Marshall Plan days, which Van der Beugel joined as a private member in 1965 and to which he was appointed chairman in 1978. He also served as a

³⁴ Council on Foreign Relations, “Round Table meeting in honor of Ernst H. van der Beugel”, Wednesday, December 2, 1959, box 453, file “Special Ad Hoc Meetings July 1959-June 1960”, Records of the Council on Foreign Relations, PUL.

³⁵ Ulf Sudeck, “Report of Round Table Meeting in Honor of Hon. Ernst H. van der Beugel”, December 21, 1959, box 453, file “Special Ad Hoc Meetings July 1959-June 1960”, Records of the Council on Foreign Relations, PUL.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid. On the role of the Council on Foreign Relations in the early Cold War see: Michael Wala, *The Council on Foreign Relations and American Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1994).

³⁸ See: P.R. Baehr, J.H. Leurdijk and Ph. P. Everts, *Elite en buitenlandse politiek in Nederland : een onderzoek naar de structuur, houdingen en opvattingen van de Nederlandse buitenlands - politieke elite* (Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij, 1978); A.G. Harryvan, J. van der Harst and S. van Voorst, *Voor Nederland en Europa: Politici en ambtenaren over het Nederlandse Europabeleid en de Europese integratie, 1945-1975* (Den Haag: Boom, 2001), 28; J.J.C. Voorhoeve, *Peace, profits and principle - a study of Dutch foreign policy* (Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1979), 85.

member of temporary advisory committees to consult the government on specific issues, such as the committee of civil and military experts (1971-1972) also known as the “Van Rijckevorsel Committee” and the advisory committee on the European Union (1974-1975) that become known as the “Spierenburg Committee”. In the meantime, Van der Beugel maintained close contact with his former colleagues at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in particular with the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns, who continued to serve as Foreign Minister until 1971 when he was appointed Secretary General of NATO – a position he would hold until 1984, offering Van der Beugel direct access to the highest echelons of NATO leadership. In addition, he also remained closely in touch with his international diplomatic and political acquaintances, thus ensuring access to formal decision-making establishments throughout the Atlantic Community.

Ernst van der Beugel’s extensive web of contacts, combined with the trust and credibility he had earned through the years, made him a well-informed and valuable source of information and offered a useful backchannel for informal communication. When he acquired intelligence he considered significant, he wrote reports comparable to the diplomatic dispatches he used to write while still a government official, which he distributed to whomever he deemed valuable. In September 1960, for example, he wrote a letter to Joseph Luns and the Secretary General of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs Baron Tuyl van Serooskerken, to inform them about a conversation he had had in London with the British Labor politician Denis Healey concerning changes in the British attitude toward the Common Market and the recent visit of the British Prime Minister MacMillan to German Chancellor Adenauer.³⁹ He also frequently briefed his American contacts about the latest developments in Europe and after visits to the US State Department he wrote “confidential memoranda” about conversations with American politicians and diplomats like George Ball, Bob Schaezel and Henry Owen which he distributed within his network including formal diplomats like the Dutch ambassador in Washington, Herman van Roijen, who remained a close friend of Ernst van der Beugel.⁴⁰

The Unofficial Atlantic Community

The continuation of Van der Beugel’s role in transatlantic diplomacy was also greatly facilitated by the existence of the unofficial transatlantic sphere mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation. A great part of the social fabric at the heart of the unofficial post-war Atlantic Community found its origins in the intense cooperation between Americans and Europeans during World War II, the Marshall Plan and the formation of NATO during which many high-level transatlantic friendships developed based on shared experiences and a deep sense of common purpose and destiny, which created an important foundation for

³⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to Mr. S.J. Baron Tuyl van Serooskerken, 15 September 1960, file 35, EvdB.

⁴⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 19 November 1964, file 45, van Roijen Papers. For an in depth study on Ambassador Herman van Roijen, see: Rimko van der Maar and Hans Meijer, *Herman van Roijen (1905-1991): een diplomaat van klasse* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2013).

future cooperation.⁴¹ As the Norwegian historian Geir Lundestad argues, “it was obvious that the many meetings in the various Atlantic organizations and the establishment of permanent bureaucratic structures for these organizations had to encourage the creation of transnational elites.”⁴²

One of the important characteristics of the highly integrated Atlantic elite that developed during the post-war decades was that it consisted not only of formal government representatives like diplomats and politicians but also included business men, lawyers, bankers, philanthropists, journalists and academics.⁴³ “The creation of such elites far from ended conflicts among the participating nations, but it must have made the chances of resolving conflicts somewhat greater. The effect was significantly heightened by the fact that many of these members of these transnational elites had worked together for as long as they had under the most challenging circumstances. Huge events such as the Second World War and/or the start of the Cold War had to bring the various personalities together, particularly since the outcomes of these events were perceived as favorable as they were.”⁴⁴ The Marshall Plan in particular served as a major catalyst of public-private cooperation within the emerging Atlantic Community facilitating the development of a diverse yet closely integrated Atlantic elite by bringing Americans with different backgrounds, but many of them belonging to the East Coast Establishment, in close contact with a diverse group of influentials from Western-European countries.

After the Marshall Plan ended, many remained active through the diverse constellation of private Atlantic organizations that offered an unofficial transatlantic substructure for European and American elites to maintain contact while working on common causes. After all, the development of the unofficial post-war Atlantic Community went hand in hand with processes of globalization that made it easier for private individuals and groups to play a role in international relations. Hence, this period saw the rise of many private groups and individuals with various Atlanticist genealogies promoting close transatlantic cooperation.⁴⁵ The assemblage of Atlantic NGO’s included, for example, the International Movement for Atlantic Union, the Congress of European-American Associations, the Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Declaration of Atlantic Unity organization, the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, the Bilderberg Meetings, the Atlantic-Brücke, Le Cercle, the International Institute for

⁴¹ See for example: Geir Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe Since 1945: From “Empire” by Invitation to Transatlantic Drift* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 13, 72; Thomas W. Gijswijt, “Beyond NATO: Transnational elite networks and the Atlantic alliance.” in *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges beyond deterrence in the 1960s*, ed. Andreas Wenger, Christian Nuenlist, and Anna Locher (London and New York: Routledge., 2007), 50.

⁴² Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe*, 72.

⁴³ Giles Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine? Ernst van der Beugel, the Transatlantic Elite, and the ‘New Diplomatic History.’” <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/19602/Oratie%20Scott-Smith.pdf?sequence=2>

⁴⁴ Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe*, 72.

⁴⁵ Valérie Aubourg, for example, has described three distinctive genealogies of some key Atlantic NGO’s that rose to the fore in the 1950s. See: Valérie Aubourg, “Creating the Texture of the Atlantic Community: The NATO Information Service, private Atlantic networks and the Atlantic Community in the 1950s,” in *European Community, Atlantic Community?* ed. Valérie Aubourg, Gérard Bosuat and Giles Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2008), 404-408.

Strategic Studies and the Atlantic Institute. Many of them served as unofficial meeting places for the Atlantic elite. Thus, they not only served as vehicles for Atlanticist inspired action and thinking, but also helped to sustain a closely-knit transatlantic elite network.⁴⁶ Harvard professor Charles Maier even writes about the emergence of an Atlantic elite with “semi-sacral status: Marshal, McCloy, Lovett, Spaak, Monnet, and other ‘wise men’ who exhorted to common effort and cooperation (...) transatlantic trips, common foreign policy forums, a network of clubby associations for talk and mutual self-regard created in effect a transnational ruling group.”⁴⁷ Thus, next to and at times overlapping the formal transatlantic structures, there existed an unofficial realm accommodating private individuals, networks and organizations all committed to fostering close transatlantic ties.

The official and unofficial realms of transatlantic diplomacy did not operate in isolation from each other, but were closely linked through unofficial transnational networks and converged at informal meeting places, which were all part of one and the same transatlantic diplomatic playing field. The unofficial Atlantic Community thus accommodated “a complex combination of private initiatives and official encouragement through which a shared experience in the war or the immediate after-war years was more important than distinctions between State and private groups.”⁴⁸ While the Atlantic NGO’s at times cooperated with nation states in pursuit of common goals we should not disregard the agency of these private ventures. As Valérie Aubourg’s research on Bilderberg and the Atlantic Institute has demonstrated:

[I]n neither case do we find a systematic organization of a Cold War waged by covert means through these two private institutions. We see rather a more nuanced picture of multiple initiatives, rooted in the same conception of culture as a crucial tool in transatlantic relations, people who often had a similar experience of the war, of the occupation in Germany or of the Marshall Plan. They were

⁴⁶ Joseph E. Johnson to American Participants in Bilderberg Meetings, 13 July 1962 (“Private Organizations Concerned with Atlantic and/or European Unity”), Business Correspondence, J. General Correspondence; Jul-Aug 1962, Christian A. Herter Papers, HCL; Kenneth Weisbrode, “The Political and Cultural Underpinnings of Atlanticism’s Crisis in the 1960s”, in *More Atlantic Crossings? European Voices in the Postwar Atlantic Community*, GHI Bulletin Supplement 10 eds. Jan Logemann and Mary Nolan (2014), 53; Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century*, 165-169; David Ellwood, “What Winning Stories Teach: The Marshall Plan and Atlanticism as Enduring Narratives,” in *Defining the Atlantic Community: Culture, Intellectuals, and Policies in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, ed. Marco Mariano (New York, Routledge, 2010), 119-123; Valérie Aubourg, “Organizing Atlanticism: the Bilderberg Group and the Atlantic Institute, 1952-1963,” in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, eds. Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (London, Frank Cass Publishers, 2003), 92-108.

⁴⁷ Charles Maier, “Empires or Nations? 1918, 1945, 1989”, in *Three Postwar Eras in Comparison: Western Europe 1918-1945-1989*, eds. Carl Levy and Mark Roseman (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 59-60; Qtd. in D.W. Ellwood, “From Marshall Plan to Atlanticism: Communication Strategies and Geopolitical Narratives,” in *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, ed. Valérie Aubourg, Gérard Bosuat and Giles Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2008), 53.

⁴⁸ Valérie Aubourg, “Organizing Atlanticism: The Bilderberg Group and the Atlantic Institute” in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, eds. Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003), 103.

convinced that close interaction of European and American elites was key to a stable, Atlantic region.⁴⁹

It was in the context of this unofficial realm at the heart of the Atlantic Community that Ernst van der Beugel was able to carve out a prominent role for himself after he left the Dutch government. A pivotal event that facilitated and fortified the continuation of his role in transatlantic diplomacy during this time of transition from officialdom to the private sphere was his appointment as Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings; one of the key Cold War meeting places between formal diplomats and politicians and the broader unofficial Atlantic elite and, according to Richardson, Kakabadse and Kakabadse, “the most prestigious of all informal transnational networks.”⁵⁰

The Bilderberg Meetings

The Bilderberg conferences came into being during a period of rising transatlantic tensions in the early 1950s. The main goal of the meetings, which were the brain child of the Polish champion of the European movement Joseph Retinger, was to maintain Atlantic unity through informal off the record conferences where European and American influentials could speak freely, ease policy differences and dispel misunderstandings.⁵¹ The Bilderberg Meetings were thus meant to facilitate the informal exchange of information, the establishment of relationships of trust among members of the Atlantic elite, and the strengthening of common values and beliefs, while also serving as a “safety valve for dissent and conflicting views within the pluralistic community of the West.”⁵² The meetings took three days, offering the attendees plenty of opportunities to bond, and thus to foster a very concrete sense of transatlantic community among the elite. Participants were seen as “Atlantic community leaders”, drawn from government and military circles, the worlds of business, law and finance, philanthropy, academia and the media, or in the words of the American honorary secretary general of the Bilderberg Meetings, Joseph E. Johnson, “a trans-national cross-section of people who are directly or indirectly influential in policy making and the leadership of public opinion.”⁵³

⁴⁹ Ibid., 102.

⁵⁰ Ian N. Richardson, Andrew P. Kakabadse, Nada K. Kakabadse, *Bilderberg People: Elite Power and Consensus in World Affairs*, (London: Routledge, 2011), very first page, [not numbered].

⁵¹ Giles Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine?”.

⁵² Thomas Gijswijt, “The Bilderberg Group and Dutch-American Relations” in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, eds. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 808.

⁵³ “Evaluation by Joseph E. Johnson” in: Ford Foundation Report, Bilderberg Meetings 1969-1971, Ford Foundation Grant File, Bilderberg, PA 56-341, Section 3: Reports, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC; “Background and purposes of the Bilderberg Meetings”, December 4, 1975, box 327, RG3, Bilderberg Meetings, Rockefeller Family Archive (permission by Peter Johnson): “the Bilderberg Meetings arose out of the complex problems and intricate relationships that emerged among the European and North American countries following World War II. A need was felt for a private, not-for-the-record forum where Atlantic community leaders – governmental, political, business, labour professional and academic – could exchange their views and explore ways for cooperation, agreement and resolution of problems of temporary concern. By means of a free and frank exchange of views, Bilderberg set out to lay the foundations for improving mutual understanding between Europeans and Americans on shared problems.”

As described in the previous chapter, Ernst van der Beugel attended his first Bilderberg meeting in January 1959, when he was still employed as special advisor to the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs. This meeting was not a normal Bilderberg Meeting, but a so-called “enlarged steering committee meeting”, a more *ad-hoc* get-together than the general conferences set up to discuss a specific crisis situation – in this case the deadlock in the FTA negotiations – with a select group of thirty one high-level participants.⁵⁴ That same year, Van der Beugel, who by now had left the Dutch government to join KLM as vice-president, was also invited to the ‘normal’ Bilderberg Meeting in Yesilkoy, Turkey on September 18-19.⁵⁵ What is more, Prince Bernhard had also invited him to the Steering Committee meeting that took place during that same weekend. It was at this meeting that Bilderberg founder Joseph Retinger announced to resign as Secretary General after which the prince proposed to appoint Ernst van der Beugel as Retinger’s successor. Despite the fact that Van der Beugel was rather new to Bilderberg this proposal was hailed with “unanimous approval” by the rest of the Steering Committee. Ernst van der Beugel accepted and it was decided that he would “officially assume his functions as Honorary Secretary General of the European Group on the first of January, 1960.”⁵⁶

According to the Danish historian Ingeborg Philipsen, the 1959-1960 change of was a “real turning point” for Bilderberg as a permanent organization. One of the key reasons for this was that Van der Beugel’s relationship with the Americans was “much more harmonious than Retinger’s had been.”⁵⁷ The beginning of the Bilderberg conferences had in fact been a bit rusty. The Americans had initially not been very keen to respond to Retinger’s initiative, partly because they simply did not trust him. During the Second World War, Retinger had cooperated with the British intelligence services and according to Thomas Gijswijt his “actions had aroused suspicions in Washington intelligence circles.” The prominent American Bilderberger Charles Douglas Jackson, an expert on psychological warfare who had served in the Office of Strategic Services during World War II, in fact suspected that he was a British secret agent. While they failed to establish a definite connection between Retinger and the British Secret Service, suspicions within the American group never really disappeared.⁵⁸

In December 1959, shortly after it had been decided that Ernst van der Beugel would succeed Retinger, the Secretary-General to be made a trip to New York where American Steering Committee member Jack Heinz – CEO of the Heinz food processing company – organized a dinner in his honor, giving Van der Beugel the “privilege to have much contact

⁵⁴ “Invitation Prince of the Netherlands”, Soestdijk Palace, December 1958, file 14, Bilderberg.

⁵⁵ “Bilderberg Group – Yesilkoy Conference 18-20 September: List of Participants”, file 14, Bilderberg.

⁵⁶ “Bilderberg Group, Steering Committee Meeting Çınar Hotel, Yesilkoy”, 17 September and 20 September, 1959, file 51, Bilderberg. See also: HRH Prince Bernhard, contribution to “Book on Ernst”, AHB: Ernst and I (...) soon became friends and by that I mean that we could ask each other for advice in all important issues in our work and in our private lives. So when Dr. Retinger died [sic], Ernst was quite obviously the first person I wanted to ask to become the Honorary Secretary General. I was very happy he accepted.

⁵⁷ Ingeborg Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity: The History of the Bilderberg Organisation 1952-1977” (PhD diss., Københavns Universitet, 2009), 110.

⁵⁸ Thomas W. Gijswijt, “Uniting the West: the Bilderberg Group, the Cold War and European integration, 1952– 1966” (Phd diss., Heidelberg University, 2007), 25.

with the members of the American group, individually as well as collectively.”⁵⁹ During this stay it turned out that the replacement of Retinger could not have happened soon enough. “They rejoice in the final termination of the operations of the London secretariat”, Van der Beugel wrote in a report to Prince Bernhard. Even so, it turned out that the Americans were still worried about the continuation of certain activities by Retinger’s assistant John Pomian, whose position had not been discussed at the Steering Committee meeting in Turkey.

Ernst van der Beugel and Prince Bernhard had decided that it would be best to move the Bilderberg secretariat from London to The Hague and to replace Pomian by the former Dutch diplomat Arnold Lamping, who had just ended his formal diplomatic career in May 1959 as the Dutch ambassador in Bonn.⁶⁰ This idea was “well received” by the Americans.⁶¹ How urgent the replacement matter actually from the perspective of the American Bilderbergers became especially clear when Pomian sent out the invitations for a meeting of the Advisory Committee to be held on the 30th of January 1960. After the American Steering Committee members found out that these invitations had still been sent out by Pomian, American Secretary General Joe Johnson sent an urgent telex to Van der Beugel saying that the Americans had understood Pomian would be out by the first of January. “We did not know of any plan to continue him for three months. I believe that if his status during that period is any more than a consultative one we will lose senior American co-chairman,”⁶² Johnson stated. The senior American co-chairman was the earlier mentioned C.D. Jackson. Van der Beugel, who wrote to Prince Bernhard that it struck him that the American group seemed to have developed “an allergy for anything that is in any way related to the old Secretariat”⁶³ immediately tried to take the American worries away by means of a telex with the following message:

Presume that our conversation yesterday dispelled any doubt about position Pomian. I repeat Pomian will stop function as from first of January when I, assisted by former ambassador Lamping will take over. Pomian will be at disposal for 3 months of Lamping to transfer secretariat and will not even have a consultative capacity. In other words the outside world will have no dealings whatsoever with Pomian after the first of January. This is an even more definite and clear solution than we agreed upon in Istanbul when only Retingers position was arranged and Pomians position was still open. Therefore I do not see any reason why these definite solutions as to Retinger and Pomians positions should not satisfy our American friends.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 9 December 1959, file 52, Bilderberg.

⁶⁰ W.J.M. Klaassen, 'Lamping, Arnold Theodoor (1893-1970)', in *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*. Accessed 12-11-2013: <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/bwn1880-2000/lemmata/bwn2/lamping>

⁶¹ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 9 December 1959, file 52, Bilderberg.

⁶² E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 21 December 1959, “Bijlage II: Kopie Telex van Mr. Johnson”, file 52, Bilderberg.

⁶³ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 21 December 1959, file 52, Bilderberg.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

Thus, Ernst van der Beugel's succession of Retinger established a new sense of trust between the American group and the Europeans within Bilderberg, which greatly strengthened the foundation of the venture. On a personal level, Van der Beugel's position in Bilderberg helped him to gather "transnational social capital"; it gave him a new kind of status as an unofficial ambassador for Atlantic unity and consolidated his position among the transatlantic elite.⁶⁵ As Secretary General, van der Beugel played a key role in selecting the participants and the topics of conversation during the meetings. Thus, he did not only serve as a facilitator of informal transatlantic contact but also helped to set the agenda of the unofficial transatlantic elite. For the next twenty years Ernst van der Beugel would serve as the driving force behind the Bilderberg Meetings, or as Henry Kissinger put it "I considered him for many years as sort of the glue that held the group together."⁶⁶

In her dissertation, Ingeborg Philipsen describes Bilderberg as a "diplomatic" initiative.⁶⁷ It is important to realize, however, that this was not just a label retrospectively attached to the venture by an academic. Those involved in the Bilderberg Meetings also perceived themselves as unofficial diplomats; as participants in and contributors to the transatlantic diplomatic process and likewise employed the language of diplomacy to describe their own activities. As John Pomian, explained to Van der Beugel during the transition of the Bilderberg secretariat from London to The Hague: "The principle activity of the [Bilderberg] Secretariat is of what might be called, a diplomatic nature. It involves keeping in touch with the members of the group, keeping abreast of political developments and in particular of the developments of ideas and with the people who are behind them."⁶⁸

Meanwhile, the European Secretariat referred to the members of the Steering Committee as "Bilderberg ambassadors" to their respective countries.⁶⁹ With regard to the Bilderberg Meetings, Ernst van der Beugel himself would speak of "our non-official international relations,"⁷⁰ whereas his successor as European Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings, Victor Halberstadt, also referred to Ernst van der Beugel as a "private diplomat".⁷¹

Ernst der Beugel's position in Bilderberg gave him a kind of unofficial diplomatic standing that transcended his role as an individual actor, while he did not represent a nation state, he did represent a valued institute on the transatlantic diplomatic playing field that offered a meeting place for the transatlantic elite committed to the transnational pursuit of Atlantic Community. The Bilderberg secretariat became Van der Beugel's unofficial Atlantic

⁶⁵ Valérie Aubourg, "The Bilderberg Group: Promoting European Governance inside an Atlantic Community of Values," in *Transnational networks in regional integration: Governing Europe 1945-83*, ed. Wolfram Kaiser, Brigitte Leucht and Michael Gehler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 49.

⁶⁶ Henry Kissinger, interview with the author, 4 January 2012.

⁶⁷ See for example: Ingeborg Philipsen, "Diplomacy with Ambiguity", 261.

⁶⁸ "Notes on the organization and activities of the Bilderberg Group Secretariat", file 53, Bilderberg.

⁶⁹ "Vergadering 10 november ten Paleize", file 62, Bilderberg.

⁷⁰ E.H. van der Beugel, "Victor de Raadsman Spreekuur van 8-24 uur", "Lezingen", AHB.

⁷¹ Victor Halberstadt, "Opmerkingen bij aanbieding Ernst H. van der Beugel Fellowship, 2 februari 1983", Scrapbook XVIII, AHB (translation mine): "het ontslaat je niet van de plicht in alle opzichten nog lang actief te blijven als Nederlands enige particuliere diplomaat."

headquarters and the meetings a key vehicle in his pursuit of transatlantic unity, as the following chapters will demonstrate in more detail.

Public Voice

In addition to his activities behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy, Ernst van der Beugel also did not shy away from publicly speaking his mind – something he often could not do while still a formal civil servant. To illustrate this, it is useful to take a closer look at a rather outspoken speech he delivered on July 1961 at the Dutch Chamber of Commerce in London. In the speech, he fiercely criticized Gaullist France as well as the attitude of the Germans and proclaimed in very strong terms that – in order to create a healthy balance of power in Europe and to thwart the Gaullist dream to dominate the continent – it was absolutely necessary that the English apply for membership of the Common Market. He presented this not merely as his personal opinion, but added that “the Netherlands” would very much applaud this.⁷² Present in the audience were many representatives of trade and industry, members of the Dutch and British press as well as the Dutch ambassador in London, the English ambassador to the Netherlands, the earlier mentioned Labor politician and Bilderberg Steering Committee member Denis Healey and the British Minister of Trade Reginald Maudling.⁷³ Maudling had represented Great Britain in the negotiations about the Free Trade Area and the Common Market and was also a close acquaintance of Van der Beugel through the Bilderberg Steering Committee. It was probably no coincidence that on the same day the British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan announced that he would soon make a formal statement concerning the British relationship to the Common Market.⁷⁴ A few weeks later the United Kingdom officially applied for membership of the Common Market.

The speech did not go unnoticed in the Netherlands. The initial news coverage of the speech was soon followed by a series of editorials in Dutch magazines and newspapers discussing the role of private individuals – and in particular Ernst van der Beugel – in international relations. How did they respond to this private diplomatic intervention? Some editorials called the speech brave, others disassociated themselves from it saying that when Van der Beugel spoke of “the Netherlands” he did not speak for them. Many feared that the Dutchman’s harsh words about France and Germany might have negative consequences for KLM’s relations in those countries, thus indirectly hurting the Dutch national interest.⁷⁵

⁷² See for example: “Openhartige rede drs. v.d. Beugel: Fransen willen Britten niet in de E.E.G”, *Telegraaf*, 21 July 1961; “Particulier in Statenverkeer”, *De Rotterdammer*, 25 July 1961; “KLM-president pleit in Londen voor Bonn”, *De Waarheid*, 21 July 1961; “Vrijmoedig Commentaar” *De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 21 July 1961.

⁷³ “Table Plan, The Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in the U.K.”, Luncheon 20 July 1961, Scrapbook VI, AHB;

“KLM-directeur wekt Engeland op toe te treden tot E.E.G.”, *De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 21 July 1961.

⁷⁴ “Frankrijk misbruikt Europese idealen voor eigen macht”, *Volkskrant*, 21 July 1961.

⁷⁵ “Moedig”, *De Gelderlander*. 25 July, 1961; “Vrijmoedig commentaar”, *De Tijd*, 21 July 1961; “Vlucht in de politiek”, *Volkskrant*, 21 July 1961.

According to the *Volkskrant* (a prominent Dutch daily newspaper) Van der Beugel had turned himself into the mouthpiece of his former employer: the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.⁷⁶

During his speech, Van der Beugel himself had pointed out that now that he was not attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs any more, he could finally speak freely – a great advantage of his newly acquired unofficial capacity. After all, as the preceding chapter also demonstrated, as a civil servant he had to conform to the formal position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and as a Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs he had to comply with the cabinet, but now, Van der Beugel argued, he was a free citizen.⁷⁷ Some found, however, that he had no business meddling in international relations as a private individual in the first place – an idea that was dismissed as archaic by an editor of the *Rotterdamsche Courant*: “Here and there one still finds traces of the opinion that relations between states are exclusively the business of governments”, he observed. “In the middle of the twentieth century, however, we must have reached the point where a private citizen can no longer be denied the right to make contact with others should he consider it useful, even at the international level.”⁷⁸ While there was no clear consensus on who or what Van der Beugel represented or what the repercussions of his actions would be, all the editorials took the speech very seriously. By doing so, they all seemed to agree that Ernst van der Beugel, even as a private citizen, was a serious actor in the diplomatic arena whose actions mattered.

Diplomats at the American embassy in The Hague seemed to agree with this and kept a close eye on Van der Beugel’s activities. They informed their colleagues in Washington when they found out that Van der Beugel planned to visit the United States and offered assistance in setting up meetings. They also reported on articles he wrote, speeches he delivered and meetings they had with him. In a 1964 diplomatic dispatch from the American embassy in The Hague he was described as: “Van der Beugel, who is well and favorably known to many American officials, holds no official position at the moment, but is at once a leading member of the Labor Party and influential in government circles.”⁷⁹

A Transatlantic Mediator

One of the Americans with whom Ernst van der Beugel developed a particularly close relationship was Henry Kissinger. They had first met in 1957 when Kissinger was a promising junior scholar at Harvard and Van der Beugel served as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs.⁸⁰ They got along right away. Over time their relationship developed into a very close friendship, which according to both men resembled a relationship between brothers.⁸¹ They kept an intensive correspondence, telephoned each other regularly and met often.

⁷⁶ “Vlucht in de politiek”.

⁷⁷ “Particulier in Statenverkeer”; “Ongepaste redevoering”, *De Telegraaf*, 29 July, 1961.

⁷⁸ “Particulier in Statenverkeer”.

⁷⁹ “European Unity and Atlantic Cooperation”, US Embassy The Hague, December 4, 1964, RG59, Reel 5, RSC.

⁸⁰ Henry A. Kissinger, contribution to the “Book on Ernst”, April 1980, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

⁸¹ Henry Kissinger, interview with the author, 4 January 2012; EvdB/Kersten Oral History, pp. 873-875.

Their relationship also proved to be useful for diplomatic purposes – especially after Van der Beugel had left the Dutch government. In May 1961, for example, Kissinger forwarded a letter from his friend outlining Dutch agitation about the ongoing Dutch-American landing rights dispute to President Kennedy’s National Security Advisor, Mc. George Bundy. This would certainly not be the last time that Van der Beugel appealed to Kissinger in the context of KLM’s landing rights negotiations. During the same period, soon after Prime-Minister Harold MacMillan’s announcement that Britain wanted to apply for membership of the Common Market, Van der Beugel again wrote a long letter to Kissinger; this time outlining his ideas concerning the importance of Britain’s inclusion in the Common Market with a strong emphasis on the significance of American pressure. “The US should persuade Britain not to try to arrange too much beforehand” he told Kissinger, “most of their problems can also be solved when being a full member – and they should try to convince the French that it is of the greatest political importance that the enlarged Community comes into being and starts working as soon as possible.”⁸² Henry Kissinger, in turn also called upon Ernst van der Beugel for aid when he ran into diplomatic difficulties with regard to Europe as will be demonstrated in chapter six of this dissertation.

According to Kissinger, Van der Beugel was still “taken very seriously” within the transatlantic diplomatic scene after he had left the Dutch government. Kissinger described the Dutchman as “a sort of mediator”, on the one hand “between America and Europe” but also “in inter-European disputes” – in particular “between conflicting points of view.”⁸³ These conflicting points of view came very clearly to the fore in 1963, when Charles de Gaulle vetoed British Membership of the EEC and dragged the Atlantic alliance into an existential crisis.⁸⁴ While this did not surprise Ernst van der Beugel, it did very much upset him. In fact, the Gaullist challenge to Atlantic cohesion was an important motivation for Ernst van der Beugel to remain active in transatlantic diplomacy – as were other threats to the Atlantic Community. He was certainly not the only Atlanticist who had left government service to be roused back into action as a private citizen to defend the Atlantic relationship that he had helped to build and maintain during the first post-war years. As Kenneth Weisbrode points out in his history of the US State Department’s Bureau of European Affairs:

De Gaulle, by rejecting British admission to the Common Market in 1963, signing a separate Franco-German treaty soon thereafter, and withdrawing from the unified NATO military command in 1966, seemed to confirm the worst suspicions of the Atlanticists about the risks of experimenting with alternative approaches. Into this breach, then, they came from their perches outside government to defend the

⁸¹ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 11 August 11 1961, Private Collection of Henry A. Kissinger – Selected Correspondence (HAK).

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Henry Kissinger, interview with the author, 4 January 2012.

⁸⁴ For a detailed analysis of Charles de Gaulle and the transatlantic relationship see Sebastian Reyn, “Atlantis Lost: The American Experience with De Gaulle, 1958-1969” (PhD diss., University of Leiden, 2007).

idea of Atlantic Community inherited from the late 1940s and to act as its self-appointed policy guardian.⁸⁵

About a year earlier, in the Spring of 1962, the American diplomat and Atlanticist Theodore Achilles, a close friend of Ernst van der Beugel, had even deliberately ended his thirty-year career at the U.S. State Department arguing that he could “contribute best toward the realization of these goals [such as expanding and deepening Atlantic Community] as a private citizen”.⁸⁶

Turbulence at KLM

1963 also happened to be the year in which Ernst van der Beugel left his post at KLM. While looking back decades later, Van der Beugel emphasized that his move to KLM had very much been motivated by the “glamor” and “sex appeal” of the job, a desire for status, security and “to maintain a prestigious position.”⁸⁷ The glamor wore off rapidly, however, when in January 1963 he resigned after which he was admitted to a hospital in The Hague suffering from what was officially described as ‘exhaustion’. As one clever editor at Time Magazine pointed out, however, “the fundamental causes of Van der Beugel’s departure had as much to do with KLM’s health as with his own.”⁸⁸

While it appeared on the outside that business was going well, the Dutch aviation historian Marc Dierikx points out that Van der Beugel had in fact entered a company that was preparing for hard times.⁸⁹ For a large part this was the result of developments that had taken place and decisions that had been made before Van der Beugel entered the picture, but things certainly did not improve once Van der Beugel took over and crisis kept on following upon crisis. Since KLM’s annual figures still remained positive, the seriousness of the situation initially remained concealed, but by 1961 – the year in which Van der Beugel succeeded Aler – the perilous condition of KLM became awfully clear. Overcapacity, wrong aircraft purchases and the very high investments associated with the purchase of DC-8 aircraft together with the loss of landing rights in Jakarta in December 1957 combined with the subsequent termination of KLM’s cooperation with Garuda airlines in Indonesia in January 1958, drew a trail of destruction through KLM’s finances. By 1961 the ensuing crisis was further exacerbated by the revaluation of the Dutch guilder that cost KLM about eleven million guilders. Around the same time, Schiphol airport introduced a new tax on aircraft fuel that disproportionately affected KLM. Meanwhile, KLM’s market share of the crucial transatlantic market dropped considerably since the Dutch, despite Van der Beugel’s efforts behind the scenes, were still

⁸⁵ Kenneth Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century: Four Generations of Extraordinary Diplomats Who Forged America's Vital Alliance With Europe* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2009), 163.

⁸⁶ Qtd. In: Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century*, 151-152. After he left the State Department Achilles became a director and Vice Chairman of the Atlantic Council of the United States and a governor of the Atlantic Institute.

⁸⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral history 426-427.

⁸⁸ “The Netherlands: Crisis at KLM”, *Time Magazine*, 11 January 1963.

⁸⁹ Dierikx, *Blauw in de lucht*, 187.

not able to reach agreement with the Americans on the desired expansion of landing rights in the United States. To make matters worse, two brand-new KLM airplanes crashed in the spring of 1961, which did not particularly help KLM's image. This event also took a high emotional toll from Ernst van der Beugel who tried to personally visit the families of each and every victim of these disastrous accidents.⁹⁰

Ernst van der Beugel personally took the lead in drafting a long turn strategic report to turn the tide at KLM. To survive, the airline had to shrink drastically, freeze its production for several years while its revenue should be increased considerably, Van der Beugel argued in his pessimistic report. The entire operation had to cost up to 1500 jobs.⁹¹ While it was clear that only radical reorganizations could solve the situation, the KLM leadership was divided. "Such financial turbulence made everyone fasten seat belts in KLM's executive suites," Time Magazine observed. "One group of entrenched, old-line KLM executives argued that despite the economic headwinds, the line should just continue to expand and even resume its service to Indonesia" while "a more moderate faction" sympathized with Ernst van der Beugel and "favored cutting back."⁹²

In the end, Van der Beugel was unable to unite his directors behind his plans. Instead of a drastic reorganization of the airline, they decided to patch things up by improving the financial results though an intensification of their marketing efforts combined with cost control. In practice, this meant that no fundamental changes were made. As a result, in December 1961 Van der Beugel was forced to turn to the Dutch government for financial assistance. The government, which held 71% of the airline's stocks,⁹³ came to KLM's aid but offered only a temporary solution that did not solve the structural problems that KLM had to deal with. Consequently, as "more and more knotty problems piled up on his desk" as more fundamental solutions appeared unattainable, Van der Beugel decided to call in outside support by asking the American management consulting firm McKinsey & Company for advice. The ensuing report was devastating for the KLM directors. They had provided inadequate leadership and barely had any hold of the line-organization of the company, according to the McKinsey report's verdict.⁹⁴ Ernst van der Beugel resigned.

Looking back on the affair, Van der Beugel acknowledged that he had failed and that he should have intervened far more radically.⁹⁵ More striking though, is the fact that according to Van der Beugel the root cause of his malfunctioning could in the end be reduced to a simple lack of interest and commitment:

I found that I was not sufficiently concentrated – not sufficiently committed. I actually considered it annoying. Apart from the question whether it was good or bad, I found it wearisome. I considered talking and thinking about aviation all day

⁹⁰ Ibid., 191.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² "The Netherlands: Crisis at KLM".

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Dierikx, *Blauw in de lucht*, 194.

⁹⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral history, p. 424

long annoying. And if your heart is not in it, you are not doing things well, obviously.⁹⁶

In contrast, as this chapter has illustrated, Van der Beugel's heart and interest above all still went out to the Atlantic cause and it was during his time at KLM that he discovered how the unofficial networks and channels at the heart of the Atlantic Community still allowed him to play a role on the transatlantic diplomatic playing field – a role in which he, as a private citizen, could speak more freely than as a government servant and in which he could devote his energy unambiguously to the causes he believed in. The close transatlantic relations that had been established during the post-war period had to be maintained, secured and defended – with passion. Consequently, after Ernst van der Beugel left KLM, he decided to pursue an even more diffuse existence in which he greatly expanded his unofficial activities in transatlantic relations.

First of all, he wrote a dissertation titled “From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership: European Integration as a Concern of American Foreign Policy”, which was published by Elsevier in 1966 with a foreword by Henry Kissinger. During that same year, Van der Beugel was appointed as “Professor of Western Cooperation after the Second World War” at Leiden University. He also regularly visited Harvard University as a guest lecturer. His academic position furthermore added to his status as an expert in the field of European integration and trans-Atlantic relations and as such he became an active contributor to public debates concerning European integration and trans-Atlantic relations. He published numerous articles in newspapers and magazines and delivered many speeches in both Europe and the United States. Furthermore, he became involved with exchange programs, think tanks and informal international relations councils like the Atlantic Institute in France, the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Ditchley Foundation in England and the Council on Foreign Relations in the United States as well as with powerful American foundations like the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which provided most of the funding for private Atlanticist organizations.⁹⁷ In addition, Van der Beugel started to collect an impressive list of directorships in the business sector and the financial world that came to serve as his main source of income, enabling him to travel abundantly and to keep up a lifestyle that facilitated the kind of private undertakings in pursuit of Atlantic cooperation that he was so passionate about.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 125. “Ik vond dat ik er onvoldoende op geconcentreerd was. Ik vond dat ik onvoldoende geëngageerd was. Ik vond het eigenlijk vervelend. Afgezien van de vraag of het goed of slecht ging, ik vond het vervelend. Ik vond de hele dag over luchtvaart praten, denken, lullen vervelend. En als je iets niet met je hart doet, doe je het dus ook niet goed.”

⁹⁷ For the role of American foundations in building transatlantic elite-networks see: Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); Volker R. Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Volker R. Berghahn, “The Ford Foundation and the Forging of the Atlantic Community after World War II” in *European Community, Atlantic Community?* ed. Valérie Aubourg, Gérard Bosuat and Giles Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb, 2009), 93-110.

⁹⁸ For a list of van der Beugel's directorships see “Annex A”.

When Van der Beugel had left the Dutch government he was approached to join the board of directors from several companies. When he left KLM the list grew fast – with positions not just in the Netherlands, but also abroad. This included a very prestigious directorship at the Warburg bank in London, where the renowned Siegfried Warburg had initially even asked Van der Beugel to become a partner; a proposition he eventually declined in favor of a more diverse and freestyle career that enabled him to stay more involved in transatlantic diplomacy. Van der Beugel would later remark that the connections he made through Bilderberg had also without any doubt helped in the acquisition of new positions. He questioned whether he would have gotten his directorships at Xerox in the United States, General Electric in England and Petrofina in Belgium without Bilderberg and he was certain that his chairmanship of the renowned International Institute for Strategic Studies in London was a direct result of his role in the Bilderberg Meetings.⁹⁹ He was careful, however, not to devote more than half of his time to his growing assortment of directorships that brought in most of the money. The other half of his time he wanted to devote to his ‘non-profit activities’, most of which were dedicated to fostering and maintaining close transatlantic relations.¹⁰⁰ While there is no reason to doubt Ernst van der Beugel’s sincerity in pursuit of close transatlantic relations, it is important to keep in mind that the participants of ventures like the Bilderberg Meetings were not always and not solely driven by motivations of a diplomatic nature, but that there were also other strong incentives such as personal status and prestige at play.¹⁰¹ At the same time, Van der Beugel’s personal status and prestige were also assets that enabled him to continue to play a role on the transatlantic diplomatic playing field even after he had left the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Conclusion

Ernst van der Beugel’s career switch to the private sector was a rational decision based on his desire to further his professional career in a way that enabled him to maintain his status and a sense of financial security. At KLM the initial sex appeal soon wore off, however, since his heart was not in it. Instead, he was still intellectually and emotionally attached to the process of transatlantic diplomacy, which had played a central role in his life since 1947. It was during his career at KLM that Van der Beugel carved out a place for himself among the unofficial Atlantic elite that enabled him to remain involved in the process of transatlantic relations in a private capacity. Despite the fact that he was not a formal diplomat anymore he was still taken seriously as a private actor on the diplomatic playing field. What is more, Ernst van der

⁹⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 707.

¹⁰⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to Peter Fleck, [date unknown], file 9, EvdB: “Ik moet erg oppassen dat het commissariaten-element dat steeds groeiende is (...) niet meer neemt dan 50% van mijn tijd. Ik wil de andere 50% van mijn tijd overhouden voor non-profit activiteiten.” For list of van der Beugel’s “non-profit” positions see appendix B “other positions”.

¹⁰¹ On Bilderberg and elite status, see: Ingeborg Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity”, 263: “this study shows that the motivation of the participants may have been less ideological in the sense that personal gains (...)The gains of the participants included elite status, networking, gathering of information, the possibility to have informal talks and occasionally to put forward new ideas and suggestions.”

Beugel and other non-state actors involved in Bilderberg, for example, also took their own role in transatlantic diplomacy seriously, describing themselves as “private diplomats” engaged in “non-official international relations.” The continuation of Van der Beugel’s diplomatic role in a private capacity makes him an interesting subject from the perspective of New Diplomatic History. While the following chapters will focus in more detail on what this role entailed and how his unofficial activities related to the formal diplomatic process in the context of three specific challenges to the transatlantic relationship, this chapter primarily focused on the period of transition from officialdom to the unofficial realm of transatlantic diplomacy so central to New Diplomatic History. In doing so, it demonstrated that an actor’s relevance to the diplomatic process and an actor’s role on the diplomatic playing field is determined by more factors than one’s official relationship to a nation-state.

The endurance of Ernst van der Beugel’s role in transatlantic diplomacy was enabled by both personal and external factors that neatly tied into each other. On the personal level, one can discern a combination of assets that can be classified in categories of social, intellectual and financial capital, which were not only important in and of themselves, but which also amplified each other. First of all, with regards to social capital, Ernst van der Beugel possessed an extensive network that stretched all over the Atlantic Community. This network consisted of influentials from different spheres including journalists, academics, philanthropists, lawyers, captains of industry, labor leaders, civil servants and politicians. Due to his track record as an official diplomat, Van der Beugel was known and trusted as a professional. Above all, his experience as an official diplomat allowed him to maintain a certain insider-status in an otherwise relatively closed-off world. His professional experience, network, expertise and credibility thus offered him access to formal decision making establishments in different countries across the Atlantic, in particular in the Netherlands and in the United States. Secondly, but closely related to the first, through his career as a formal diplomat Van der Beugel had gained a great deal of knowledge and experience that gave him a high level of expertise, in particular with regards to the process of European integration and transatlantic foreign, security and economic policy. From 1966 onwards Van der Beugel’s position as Professor of Western Cooperation at Leiden University reinforced his status as an expert. In fact, this position even offered him the ability to create the illusion of objectivity through academic detachment. Meanwhile, his ever expanding social network and access to influentials across the Atlantic Community provided him with a great amount of valuable insider information, which in turn made him an interesting individual to connect with – an *interlocuteur valable* – which consecutively provided the potential to further expand his access. Last but not least, his expertise combined with his access to influentials on both sides of the Atlantic made him an attractive candidate for consultancy positions and directorships, both in the Netherlands and abroad, which subsequently enabled Van der Beugel to finance his private activities in pursuit of transatlantic relations.¹⁰²

¹⁰² EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 431.

In addition to these personal assets, the continuation of Van der Beugel's role in transatlantic diplomacy was facilitated by the existence of a closely-knit Atlantic elite, that Van der Beugel – through his personal experiences and in particular through his role in the Marshall Plan – had almost organically been woven into. The perpetuation of his role in transatlantic affairs as a private citizen was also facilitated by processes of globalization that made it easier for private individuals, in particular those belonging to the elite, to play a greater role in international and transnational relations in general. Within the North Atlantic area, these processes went hand in hand with the development of an unofficial Atlantic Community, which through a complex constellation of private organizations and initiatives next to and at times overlapping the formal structures of transatlantic diplomacy provided the infrastructure through which an unofficial transnational elite could operate – at times independently and at times in tandem with formal diplomacy – in pursuit of Atlantic unity in the context of the Cold War. Indeed, it was through his central position in one of the most prestigious of these organizations, namely the Bilderberg Meetings, that Ernst van der Beugel was able to consolidate a central position among the unofficial Atlantic elite through which he could remain a relevant and serious player – with direct access to the formal foreign policy establishments – on the transatlantic diplomatic playing field.

The continuation of his diplomatic role unintentionally seems to have received a symbolic twist by the fact that after he left KLM Ernst van der Beugel moved back into the very same building at the Smidswater in The Hague that had once served as the nerve center of the Marshall Plan bureau established by Hans Max Hirschfeld in 1948. It was this building, in which Van der Beugel had already housed the Bilderberg Secretariat in 1960, which from 1963 onwards became the unofficial headquarters from which he executed his informal transatlantic diplomacy in pursuit of Atlantic unity. As the remaining chapters will demonstrate, over the years Ernst van der Beugel would be roused into action by multiple perceived threats to the strength, cohesion and sustainability of the Atlantic Community that he had helped to build. Consequently, the following chapters will more specifically focus on Van der Beugel's unofficial activities in the context of three challenges to Atlantic unity: 1) the Gaullist challenge of the 1960's, 2) the challenge posed by détente, the democratization of foreign policy and the changing transatlantic landscape during the late 1960's and the early 1970's and 3) the challenge posed by the rise of a new generation that did not share the experiences of the Second World War, the reconstruction of Europe or the beginning of the Cold War.

5. The Gaullist Challenge

Ernst van der Beugel regarded Charles de Gaulle's dream of an independent continental *Europe des patries* under French leadership as one of his worst nightmares endangering the post-war transatlantic relationship that he perceived to be fundamental to the security of Western Europe. It did not only threaten the evolution of the transatlantic relationship into a full blown Atlantic Community, but he feared it would also make the transatlantic ties that had been carefully woven during the preceding decades come apart at the seams. This threat to Atlantic unity, which he already perceived during his years as a civil servant, became even more pertinent during the early 1960's and – as mentioned in the preceding chapter – served as an important motivation for the continuation of Van der Beugel's role in transatlantic diplomacy in a private capacity. While much has been written on the transatlantic tensions caused by Charles de Gaulle during the 1960s, little attention has been paid to the role of the unofficial Atlantic elite and private foreign relations councils like the Bilderberg Meetings in trying to mediate these tensions.¹

Since the continuation of his role in the diplomatic process is key to what makes Ernst van der Beugel an interesting subject from the perspective of New Diplomatic History, this chapter will concentrate in more detail on what this 'diplomatic role' entailed, specifically in the context of the perceived Gaullist challenge to Atlantic unity. What did Van der Beugel try to achieve and why and what *modus operandi* did he apply to these ends? Through which channels did he move and what diplomatic tools did he wield as a private citizen? While it is clear who or what a formal diplomat represents, namely his or her country and its perceived national interest, this is less obvious for actors whose ties to the nation state have been severed – if they ever existed at all. Consequently, this also raises the question 'who or what did Ernst van der Beugel represent as a private actor on the diplomatic playing field?'

These questions will be at the heart not just of this chapter, but central to all three remaining chapters, each one focusing on Van der Beugel's private activities in response to a specific perceived threat to Atlantic unity. In doing so, they will also allow us to reflect on how Ernst van der Beugel's unofficial activities and the networks through which he moved related to the formal diplomatic realm, enabling a more holistic understanding of transatlantic diplomacy. Thus, true to the calling of New Diplomatic History these chapters will offer a more in depth exploration and analysis of the *process* and *machinery* of transatlantic

¹An excellent exception is the dissertation by Thomas Gijswijt, who does pay attention to the way in which the Bilderberg Meetings tried to deal with the Gaullist challenge. This chapter will offer new insight into the way in which the Bilderberg Meetings were used to address this challenge by incorporating different archival material, including newly released documents from the official Bilderberg Archive that shine new light on the role of the Bilderberg Secretariat and their attempts to manage the tensions following Charles de Gaulle's 1963 press conference. In addition, it places these Bilderberg Meetings in a broader context of unofficial efforts to counter the Gaullist challenge. See: Gijswijt, "Uniting the West", 243-278. For an overview of scholarly works on the Gaullist challenge to the Atlantic Community see: Sebastian Reyn, "Atlantis Lost," 21.

diplomacy with a focus on Ernst van der Beugel and the unofficial realm from which he operated. In doing so, they will demonstrate that an individual's 'diplomatic role' can better be determined by *what* our subjects do and *how* and *why* they do this than by where they sit in or out of officialdom.

Atlantic Crisis: A Nightmare Come True

"My nightmare of three years has come true", Ernst van der Beugel wrote to Henry Kissinger after President Charles de Gaulle's renowned press conference of January 14, 1963 had plunged both the EEC and the Atlantic alliance into a severe crisis. "How I long to talk to you. From time to time I have the feeling that you and I at our first meeting in the Golf Club in Wassenaar were practically the only human beings who saw what was coming."²

While Ernst van der Beugel had been terribly worried about Charles de Gaulle's rise to power since the 1950's, things seemed to look quite promising for the Atlantic alliance around 1960. The Western world had made a transition through the Marshall Plan, OEEC, EEC and NATO from a loose group of competing and quarreling nation states into a structured system of cooperation and interdependence that, from Van der Beugel's perspective, served as the foundation of an evolving Atlantic Community in the context of the Cold War. In July 1961 Britain had applied for membership of the EEC and – following the signing of the American Trade Expansion Act, which, according to Van der Beugel was meant to usher in "a new chapter in the evolution of the Atlantic Community"³ – President Kennedy introduced the concept of an Atlantic Partnership as part of his Grand Design for Western Europe. To be more precise, after declaring that the U.S. did not regard a strong and united Europe as a rival but as a partner, president Kennedy declared on July 4, 1962 that:

We see in such a Europe a partner with whom we can deal on a basis of full equality in all the great and burdensome tasks of building and defending a community of free nations. It would be premature at this time to do more than indicate the high regard with which we view the formation of this partnership. The first order of business is for our European friends to go forward in forming the more perfect union which will someday make this partnership possible.⁴

While he was skeptical about the emphasis the American president put on the precondition of the European countries to first form a "more perfect union" and about the idea that this European union (which would have to include the United Kingdom) would – or even should – prepare the way for a partnership between trans-Atlantic *equals*, these developments did arouse a sense of hope even in Ernst van der Beugel. As he put it: "It looked as if the process

² E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, February 19, 1963, file 7, EvdB.

³ Qtd. in: Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership: European Integration as a Concern of American Foreign Policy* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1966), 371.

⁴ John F. Kennedy, "Fourth of July Address at Independence Hall", Philadelphia, July 4, 1962, accessed 5 December 2016, <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jfkindependencehall.htm>.

of European integration would receive a new and indispensable momentum by the joining of the U.K. and other European countries and that a true partnership between the U.S. and a unified Europe could be embarked upon as a crowning achievement of this process of structuring the Western World, which was started around 1947.”⁵ On January 14, 1963 these hopes were crushed by Charles de Gaulle in what Ernst van der Beugel would describe as “a frontal attack on the concept of the Atlantic Partnership as conceived by the Kennedy administration and understood in a great part of Europe.”⁶

In his press conference, Charles de Gaulle expressed his intention to veto British membership to the Common Market while he underlined the affinity which, according to him, existed between the six continental countries. Meanwhile, he painted a picture of Great Britain as both an unwanted outsider and a rival challenging the Gaullist vision of European integration. By doing so, he clearly suggested that the differences between the Anglo-Saxons and the six were of a fundamental nature. Central to de Gaulle’s rejection of Great Britain were Britain’s close ties to the United States. De Gaulle equated British membership of the Common Market to the entry of an American Trojan horse, claiming that the EEC “would seem like a colossal Atlantic Community under American dependence and direction, and that is not at all what France wanted to do and is doing, which is a strictly European construction.”⁷ In addition, he rejected the supranational approach to European integration while promoting the centrality of the nation-state in an *Europe des patries*. He furthermore underlined the protectionist character he desired in the economic field (in particular with regard to a common agricultural policy) and claimed the right for France to develop its own nuclear arsenal, thereby rejecting the American idea to create a transatlantic multilateral nuclear force arguing that for the French “integration in this field is something that is unimaginable.”⁸ To make matters worse, de Gaulle’s press conference was followed eight days later by the signing of the Elysée Treaty; a Franco-German treaty of friendship “aimed at establishing common policies in foreign affairs, defense, education, and youth matters through an extensive system of bilateral meetings.”⁹ Thus, as Van der Beugel had feared, Charles de Gaulle came to represent a severe political challenge to the concept of European integration within an Atlantic framework under American leadership, which he perceived as fundamental to the security of the West in the context of the Cold War.

⁵ E.H. van der Beugel, “Introduction Prof. E.H. van der Beugel at the Atlantic Symposium”, Greenwich, October 3, 1967, box “Lezingen E.H. van der Beugel” (hereafter “Lezingen”), private archive Aukelien van Hoytema-van der Beugel (hereafter AHB).

⁶ Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 376.

⁷ Qtd. in Geir Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945: From “Empire” by Invitation to Transatlantic Drift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 123.

⁸ Qtd. in: Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 378-379. See also: Sebastian Reyn, “Atlantis Lost: the American Experience with de Gaulle, 1958-1969” (PhD diss, Leiden University, 2007) p. 414-416; “The Multilateral Force Questions and Answers”, box 76, Arthur H. Dean Papers, Cornell University Library (CUL).

⁹ Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945*, 123.

Ernst van der Beugel had barely left KLM when Charles de Gaulle “dropped his bomb” on the hopes of those who desired a close-knit Atlantic partnership.¹⁰ While he was not surprised by this turn of events – after all he had warned against this for years – he was very upset about its consequences.¹¹ “I am terribly worried and after the first shock I see already in Europe that people still do not see the seriousness of what is happening,”¹² he told Kissinger. After the Franco-German Elysée treaty Van der Beugel also did not trust “the old man in Germany” anymore. Besides, he believed it was a “bad mark for Washington that they make the impression to be absolutely surprised by the events of the last months, and have not prepared any workable alternative.”¹³

As a response to these events and inspired by suspicions that the Elysée Treaty secretly incorporated nuclear ambitions, the Kennedy Administration had introduced a proposal within the NATO council in February to establish a multilateral nuclear force (MLF). The MLF-plan proposed the integration of a European nuclear force within NATO by producing a fleet of warships armed with Polaris ballistic missiles that were to be manned by mixed international crews under NATO command. Van der Beugel, who was not particularly thrilled by this idea, subsequently told Kissinger that he had the impression that the Americans were just trying “to patch things up” by means of the MLF project about which he had read a lot, but which nevertheless remained “completely unclear” to him. “Even if it would be clear”, Van der Beugel noted, “I do not think it would solve our problems.”¹⁴ Kissinger agreed that the multilateral force was not the answer: “I deplore General de Gaulle’s actions”, he replied. “On the other hand, a nuclear force in which the Germans will be the strongest single member does not send me exactly into simple transports of joy either.”¹⁵

So, what *should* be done? “I am deeply convinced that the Brussels’ process must be slowed down without throwing things away”, Van der Beugel told Kissinger in early March. “The only way the French will feel that they are deeply on the wrong track is to hurt them in their European plans and to a large extent Brussels is the place.”¹⁶ He hoped that the Dutch government would remain firm in its stand against de Gaulle as they had done in blocking the Gaullist attempt at creating a European Political Union by means of the Fouchet Plan in 1961-

10 E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, March 8, 1963, file 67, Collection “Bilderberg Conferenties: Secretariaat, 1952-2004” (hereafter “Bilderberg”), NAH.

11 Van der Beugel, *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership*, 376, 377. As van der Beugel put it in his dissertation: “For those who read and analyzed his [de Gaulle’s] writings and speeches, the veto to Britain’s entry not only could be expected but was an inevitable consequence of the Gaullist concept (...) The optimism of the United States and most European countries about the outcome of the negotiations between the Community in Brussels and the United Kingdom was unfounded. The contents of the press conference of January 1963, were not new. They were a strictly logical consequence of everything De Gaulle had written or said in the previous years.”

12 E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 19 February 1963, file 7, EvdB.

13 E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, March 4, 1963, file 7, EvdB.

14 Ibid.

15 H.A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, March 6, 1963, Correspondence from the private archive of dr. Henry A. Kissinger’ (hereafter “HAK”); H.A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, March 15, 1963, HAK.

16 E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 4 March 1963, file 7, EvdB..

1962.¹⁷ While slowing things down in Europe, Van der Beugel believed that – as Kissinger had proposed in his January 1963 *Foreign Affairs* article “Strains on the Alliance”¹⁸ – “we should give serious thought to the Atlantic Community idea” and that this “should be done in a different way as we proceed in Europe, by which I mean that politics must have priority over economics.”¹⁹

Meanwhile, the prominent Dutch political journalist and columnist Jérôme Heldring perceived a useful role for Ernst van der Beugel in countering the negative effects de Gaulle’s actions might have for the transatlantic relationship. In a column published on the 10th of February Heldring warned his readers about the risks of antagonizing the American Congress.²⁰ “A Congress that for whatever reason would turn not only anti-French, but anti-European would be able to block all the pretty Atlantic plans of the Administration”, he argued. Even worse, it might turn away from Europe altogether by driving the Americans back into isolationism. Since the U.S. Congress depended more directly on the favor of the American public it would be of fundamental importance for the survival of Atlantic cooperation not to create the impression among the American public that “the anti-American de Gaulle” represented general European sentiments. To achieve this, Heldring called for the deployment of the Dutch public diplomacy apparatus for “an intelligent campaign” to prevent any such identification of the other Western European countries with the person and policies of Charles de Gaulle in the eyes of the American public. More specifically he argued that:

Such a campaign should not only be executed by civil servants of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Not because we hold anything against them, but because as civil servants they are less free in their expressions and formulations than a private individual would be. For that reason, such a campaign should also include the deployment of private individuals who – and that goes without saying – share the vision of the government, but who are not bound to a specific text, cautiously composed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or its embassy in Washington.²¹

From Heldring’s perspective these private individuals should be exempted from their daily occupations for a certain period “to give lectures in the United States and to maintain other

¹⁷ For the Dutch and the Fouchet Plan see: Jan van der Harst, “Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political integration”, in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, ed. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009); 641-651; Mathieu Segers, “De Gaulle’s Race to the Bottom: The Netherlands, France and the Interwoven Problems of British EEC Membership and European Political Union, 1958-1963”, *Contemporary European History*, 19 (2010): 111-132.

¹⁸ Kissinger, Henry A. “Strains on the Alliance”, *Foreign Affairs*, 41:2 (1963): 261-285.

¹⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 4 March 1963, file 7, EvdB.

²⁰ This column was possibly a response to a column James Reston published in the New York Times on January 21, in which Reston argued that the United States would not be prepared to “defend a Europe which questions American good faith” and rejected Great Britain. Adenauer, Reston wrote, would have to choose between France and the United States. In a remarkable sign of US anger at de Gaulle, the State Department instructed its European embassies to make ‘urgent use’ of Reston’s column since it reflected the views of the White House.” See: Thomas Gijswijt, “Uniting the West: The Bilderberg Group, the Cold War and European Integration 1952-1977” (PhD diss., Heidelberg University, 2007), 265.

²¹ J.L. Heldring, *De Rotterdamer*, 10 February 1963 (translation mine).

kinds of contact with Americans.”²² For this job, Heldring had two individuals in particular in mind, both of whom were well versed in the issues concerned and, also not unimportant, able to speak “with ease and authority” on these matters: Ernst van der Beugel and his former colleague at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs professor Jaap Kymmell.²³ Heldring warned his readers that like most public diplomacy campaigns, the purpose would be *preventive* action, meaning that no one should expect any tangible results because prevention cannot be measured in retrospect, but this did not make the job any less valuable.²⁴ While nothing indicates that the Dutch government took up the task assigned to them by Heldring in response to the column, Ernst van der Beugel did not need government direction to see that as a private individual he still had a role to play in countering the Gaullist challenge to transatlantic relations. In fact, this role would not be restricted to the private efforts at public diplomacy described by Heldring either.

While he hoped that the Dutch government would remain firm in its stance against de Gaulle and that the Americans would come up with a workable alternative to the Gaullist challenge to Kennedy’s goal of an Atlantic Partnership, Van der Beugel also went to work through his own private activities. Two weeks after de Gaulle’s press conference, he paid a visit to Paris with Prince Bernhard in preparation of the forthcoming Bilderberg conference in March 1963, which coincidentally happened to be planned in France.²⁵ The trip also offered Van der Beugel a chance to take the temperature of the situation in the French capital, which exceeded his already existing worries. “The mess in Europe and in our Atlantic world is worse than even I – and you know how pessimistic I was – expected”, Van der Beugel wrote to the American Bilderberger, publisher of Life Magazine, and expert on psychological warfare C.D. Jackson upon his return. “How are we going to do the repair job?” From Van der Beugel’s perspective, much depended on the upcoming Bilderberg conference in Cannes.²⁶

Beyond ‘facilitation’: the run-up to the Bilderberg Meeting in Cannes

After having been admitted to a hospital in early January 1963 to recover from the exhaustion caused by his turbulent times at KLM, Ernst van der Beugel decided to take things somewhat easier by “going in the sabbatical business” for a while.²⁷ In the process, he decided to embark on writing a doctors thesis in the form of a book on European integration as a

²² Ibid.

²³ Jaap Kymmell worked under van der Beugel at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see chapter 3) and in 1963 he would become van der Beugel’s doctoral supervisor at the University of Rotterdam.

²⁴ J.L. Heldring, *De Rotterdammer*, 10 February 1963.

²⁵ During this trip van der Beugel had met with the French Bilderberg Steering Committee members Baumgartner and Nebolsine among others. He also met with Sali de Gorter of the Dutch embassy to discuss a press communique about the Bilderberg Conference which de Gorter would make sure to spread among French journalists in advance of the conference. “Vergadering ten kantore van de Heer Rijkens, 22 February 1963, file 55, Bilderberg.

²⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to C.D. Jackson, 29 January 1963, box 109, C.D. Jackson Papers, EPL.

²⁷ “Rust voor v.d. Beugel”, *Het Parool*, 5 January 1963; E.H. van der Beugel to C.D. Jackson, 25 April, 1963, box 109, C.D. Jackson Papers, EPL.

concern of American foreign policy – a decision that also gave him more time to focus on his private diplomatic activities.

After his resignation from KLM worries arose among the American Bilderbergers that Van der Beugel might also consider leaving his post at Bilderberg. They showed great relief when Prince Bernhard assured them that these worries were ungrounded.²⁸ In reality Van der Beugel would only start to invest more time in Bilderberg by taking up more of the ‘diplomatic work’ as described by John Pomian after Van der Beugel’s succession of Retinger. Next to the fact that he had more time on his hands, Van der Beugel believed that Bilderberg’s importance had only increased with the revitalized Gaullist challenge to Atlantic unity. “Precisely under the current political tensions a Bilderberg conference could lead to constructive results,” he believed, “because it could create an opportunity to reduce, in an atmosphere of trust, the contradictions that have developed in Atlantic relations – the very goal of Bilderberg.”²⁹ In a letter to Prince Bernhard, Van der Beugel underlined the high stakes of the Cannes conference, pointing out that next to opportunities there were also very serious risks involved:

There is no doubt that this will be one of the most complicated conferences that Your Royal Highness will have to chair in the context of Bilderberg. The situation is explosive; the subjects are explosive; the participants are explosive and, in addition, it has become clear from my conversations that nobody knows what should happen after the General’s intervention. Both the Americans and the English lack a policy; the Germans are floating more than ever and the state of the Alliance is, in my opinion more serious and more confused than has ever been the case since 1945. All of this makes the Bilderberg conference extremely important, because it is the first time that this kind of group comes together after De Gaulle dropped his bomb. However, if the conference is not steered into the right direction, it contains grave dangers (...). In fact, it would not be difficult, for example, to chase all the French on one big angry heap during the first half hour, but it will be difficult to have these days end with a somewhat positive impression.³⁰

To steer the conference in the ‘right’ direction, Van der Beugel considered it “necessary that this time the Prince would give a rather strong guidance as to the atmosphere and proceedings of the discussion.”³¹ During a meeting of the core group of the European secretariat, which referred to itself as the ‘small committee’ and whose members were all Dutch³², it was decided that Van der Beugel would write an introductory note for the Prince

²⁸ Joseph E. Johnson to HRH Prince Bernhard, 28 January 1963, box 76, file 2, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL; Prince Bernhard to Joseph E. Johnson, 19 January, 1963, box 76, file 2, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

²⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, February 5, 1963, file 67, Bilderberg, NAH (translation mine).

³⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 8 March 1963, file 67, Bilderberg (translation mine).

³¹ E.H. van der Beugel to Wilfrid S. Baumgartner and George Nebolsine, March 8, 1963, file 21, Bilderberg.

³² The European secretariat consisted next to van der Beugel of Secretary Arnold Lamping, Treasurer Paul Rijkens, A.E. van Braam Houckgeest (the personal secretary of Prince Bernhard) and two secretarial assistants.

to be presented at the beginning of the conference, which, after discussion in the small committee and approval by the Prince, would first be sent to all the members of the Steering Committee one week before the conference after which it would also be distributed to the other participants.³³

This introductory note, which started with some general remarks on Bilderberg stating that “What we have always tried to do is to analyze and to discuss problems of mutual concern and in our different jobs try to influence our friends outside Bilderberg with the aim of strengthening the Western Community and of fostering a better understanding not only between Europe and our North American friends but also inside Europe itself”, provided clear guidelines for the discussions in Cannes. While recognizing “that there are important disagreements within the Western Alliance”³⁴, the note warned the participants that they “should try to avoid being “too explosive” about some of the issues which have come so much into the open during recent months” and encouraged them “to analyze rather than to attack and finally to try to define what should happen from now on.”³⁵ In order to do this, a few specific points on which there seemed to be a wide divergence of opinion were introduced, including the following questions to guide the discussion:

- A. Will the growing strength of Europe tend to lead to a competition between Europe and the U.S. in the market of world power, or will it lead to an equal partnership in a single enterprise? What are the conditions for such a partnership? We should be more specific than we have been till now.
- B. Is the idea of a multilateral or multinational nuclear force a panacea for the troubles of the Alliance? What exactly does it mean? How is the problem of the ultimate political control of such a force to be solved? What is the relevance of this concept to the current general disarray of the alliance?
- C. How will economic relations between the Western countries be affected by the breakdown of the Brussels negotiations? Is the Trade Expansion Act a workable instrument after this breakdown? What chances are there after the Brussels breakdown for a more liberal trade pattern in the Western World and what can be done to avoid a further cleavage between the most important trading blocs?³⁶

³³ “Bespreking bij de Heer Rijkens”, March 8, 1963, file 55, Bilderberg; E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 13 March 1963, file 67, Bilderberg.

³⁴ Van der Beugel’s original version actually mentioned “a deep schism” within the Western alliance, but this was taken out because it was considered to be too pessimistic. See: “Bespreking bij de heer Rijkens”, 8 March 1963, file 55, Bilderberg.

³⁵ Bilderberg Secretariat, “Preliminary Note Bilderberg Conferences Cannes 1963”, file 67, Bilderberg.

³⁶ Ibid.

These questions – which focused on analyzing the troubles faced by the Atlantic Community and practical instruments to overcome them – would remain central to discussions in Bilderberg during the ensuing years. What is more, the Bilderberg Secretariat had also already put some thought into the desirable outcome. During a meeting at the office of Bilderberg treasurer and founding chairman of Unilever Paul Rijkens, the ‘small committee’ under leadership of Ernst van der Beugel laid down a very specific aim for the upcoming Bilderberg conference with regard to *point A* of the introductory paper, stating that the “goal” of the Cannes conference should be to formulate a “better definition” for the concept of Atlantic Partnership, which would “not include the danger of a third force.” The report of this meeting of the European Secretariat states explicitly that “the Prince should work towards this.”³⁷ Thus, while it is often argued by those involved in the meetings that the Bilderberg conferences simply offered a meeting place facilitating a free exchange of views, a close study of the reports of the meetings of the European secretariat’s ‘small committee’ show that the Dutch organizers in fact had more specific goals and consciously tried to steer the conferences into a very specific Atlanticist direction.

While the Kennedy administration’s concept of Atlantic partnership implicitly excluded the idea of an integrated Europe as a third force, Van der Beugel believed that the Americans had been too vague about the kind of integrated Europe they desired (namely an Atlantic oriented Europe), and, consequently, too indiscriminatory in their support for any form of European integration that moved the process of a closer union among the Western European countries forward. As he wrote to Kissinger, “European integration is not *persé* a contribution to the strength of the Western World. If we give priority to the cohesion of the Atlantic World, European integration is only a contribution to that cohesion on specific conditions which have till now not been fulfilled. My preliminary opinion is that the support of the United States Administration up until 1963 to the continental European integration has not been discriminatory enough.”³⁸

Thus, what was needed, from Van der Beugel’s perspective, was a clear rejection of the Gaullist conception of an integrated continental Europe as a third force. It was important to remind everybody involved that this conception was incompatible with the goal of Atlantic Partnership and that any movement into this direction would undermine the transatlantic relationship. In addition, a rejection of the Gaullist conception by the European participants would be important to reassure the Americans that de Gaulle – whose actions not surprisingly had caused resentment among the Americans – did not speak for all of Europe.³⁹ At the same time, while trying to isolate the French, it was important that the meeting should not

³⁷ See: “Vergadering ten kantore van de Heer Rijkens”, 27 February 1963, file 55, Bilderberg (translation mine): “Doel conferentie: betere definitie te geven voor 'equal partnership' wat niet mag insluiten het gevaar van een 3de macht. De Prins moet hier naar toe werken.”

³⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 5 September 1963, HAK. The EDC and the Fouchet Plan were examples of occasions in which the Americans had been ‘not discriminatory enough’.

³⁹ This, and in particular the effect on American public opinion, was also emphasized during the Cannes conference by an American participant. See: “Cannes Conference report.” Accessed December 5, 2016. <http://file.wikileaks.org/file/bilderberg-meetings-report-1963.pdf>.

estrangle or antagonize the French either – hence the warning to Prince Bernhard not to “chase them all on one big angry heap” and the cautious emphasis on not being “too explosive” and on “analyzing” instead of “attacking” in the introductory note.⁴⁰

The relationship with the French furthermore had to be treated with extra delicacy since several French participants had left the previous Bilderberg conference with a rather bad taste in their mouths. This was at least partly due to the fact that a New York Times column by James Reston that was critical of Charles de Gaulle had been a big hit at the 1962 Saltsjöbaden conference. In the column, Reston had drafted a fable in which various statesmen and countries were represented by animals – with Adenauer as an old fox, Macmillan as a lion, the United States as a buffalo and de Gaulle as a Giraffe (which was very proud and “taller than the Washington Monument, and he thought he could see farther than all the other animals”). As Thomas Gijswijt has pointed out, “the morale of the story was that if the giraffe and the old fox kept the lion out of the forest this might anger the buffalo that was responsible for defending the forest. Once the buffalo was gone and the old giraffe had died, the foxes took over. The bear in the East did not like this. Together with the tiger (China), the bear thereupon ate all the foxes and the giraffes.” The Bilderberg secretariat had distributed copies of this column to all conference participants and, at the conference “all the representatives referred to international personages by animal name rather than surname.” This whole episode had caused French participants to protest “against this insult to their Chief of State”. It probably did not help that the giraffe died of “a terrible sore throat.”⁴¹

This episode may also have contributed to the fact that President De Gaulle considered the 1962 conference in Saltsjöbaden to be “overly critical of France.”⁴² During the preparations for the upcoming Bilderberg Meeting, which was planned to take place in Cannes, the French government initially even insisted that the conference should avoid “acutely controversial issues.”⁴³ By doing so, they clearly demonstrated how seriously official government representatives took these unofficial meetings. In response, Van der Beugel prepped Prince Bernhard in November 1962 for a conversation with French “Bilderberg ambassador” Wilfrid Baumgartner by advising him to make it absolutely clear to the Frenchman that any request for topical restrictions meant to evade subjects sensitive to the French were in fact an “attack on the essence of Bilderberg.” The eventual conversation seemed to have its desired effect as Baumgartner afterwards convinced De Gaulle that the conference could only be hosted by the French if the government “refrained from trying to

⁴⁰ This caution in not angering the French might also have been influenced by events at the 1962 conference in Saltsjöbaden, Sweden, where a James Reston column which was critical of Charles de Gaulle had been a big hit. See: Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 263.

⁴¹ Ibid., 269.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Joseph E. Johnson, “Memorandum for the American Steering Committee”, 25 October 1962, box 76, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL; “Copie telegram van de Heer van der Beugel”, 11 October 1962, file 62, Bilderberg: “Baumgartner told me last night after consultations with Pompidou that meeting is all right provided that subject would be agreeable to French.” See also: Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 269.

influence the discussions” after which the General gave in and agreed to welcome the Bilderberg conference without any conditions.⁴⁴

After the events of January 1963, the Bilderberg secretariat considered it of fundamental importance to keep the French engaged in the transatlantic conversation. Especially during this time of crisis the channels of communication had to remain wide open to avoid transatlantic estrangement, both intellectual – with regard to policy – but also on a very personal human level. During the 1960’s, in the absence of a formal trans-Atlantic political structure, the Bilderberg conferences served as a vibrant forum for this very purpose.⁴⁵ The Bilderberg secretariat tried to manage the transatlantic relationship and its challenges as well as possible by keeping everybody engaged in the Atlantic conversation, offering a channel for venting frustrations and irritations, fostering mutual understanding and reconciling differences. Ernst van der Beugel regarded Bilderberg as an important tool for mediating trans-Atlantic tensions before they would escalate and blow up the alliance during a very explosive situation. The Atlantic alliance had to be guided, as well as possible, through these stormy weathers. To this end, first of all, everybody was to remain aboard. Secondly, the ship had to be steered towards the Atlantic.

Cannes, 1963: “We now know what we are up against.”

In retrospect, Ernst van der Beugel regarded the Bilderberg conference in Cannes as “an exceptionally good meeting as far as the level of the participants and the frankness of their statements” was concerned but also “gloomy as to what it brought to the surface about the future.”⁴⁶ His pessimistic impressions concerning the state of the alliance had once more been confirmed. The Americans had been “off balance” and had no alternative policy after the breakdown of Brussels. The Germans appeared more confused than ever and the British were in a very difficult position as a result of their domestic scene.⁴⁷

The political topic on the agenda was introduced by the preliminary note Van der Beugel had drafted for Prince Bernhard followed by a paper by the Italian ambassador to Great Britain, Pietro Quaroni with the rather vague title “The Balance of Power in the Light of Recent International Developments”. During a meeting of the Bilderberg Secretariat, Deputy Secretary-General Lamping had asked Van der Beugel whether he did not want to prepare a

⁴⁴ Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 269; E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 6 November 1962, file 62, Bilderberg (translation mine): “Zo scherp mogelijk gesteld, kan men zeggen, dat Baumgartner heeft aangeduid, dat er restricties zouden moeten worden geplaatst op de onderwerpen, die ter Bilderberg-conferentie in Frankrijk ter sprake zouden komen om Franse gevoeligheden te vermijden.”

⁴⁵ For a more elaborate study of how the Bilderberg Group reacted to the Gaullist challenge to both the Atlantic Alliance and an integrated Europe see chapter 5: Atlantic Partnership vs. l’Europe des Patries, 1958-1966, in: Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 229-292.

⁴⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, April 4, 1963, HAK; E.H. van der Beugel to S.G. Warburg, 11 April 1963, file 7, EvdB. From the American side participants included Undersecretary of State George W. Ball, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs of the Defense Department Paul H. Nitze, American ambassador to Germany McGhee and the State Department’s Director of Atlantic Policy Studies, Harold van B. Cleveland.

⁴⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to S.G. Warburg, 11 April 1963, file 7, EvdB.

speech for the conference himself, but Van der Beugel did not consider this necessary since his views were already reflected in Ambassador Quaroni's paper.⁴⁸ In his paper Quaroni emphasized the need "to remain loyal to NATO and to accept American superiority as a fact" – matters the conference participants "could generally adhere to", according to the conference report. Quaroni furthermore expressed bitter regret concerning the breakdown of the negotiations between the United Kingdom and the E.E.C. which he described as "a blow from which European integration might never recover."⁴⁹

In response to Quaroni's speech, Jacques Baumel, the Secretary-General of the French Gaullist party *Union pour la Nouvelle République*, very candidly shared Charles de Gaulle's perspective on Atlantic relations in an exposé that, to Van der Beugel's satisfaction, was "practically universally rejected"⁵⁰ by the participants of the Bilderberg conference. As van der Beugel confided to Henry Kissinger:

The French were absolutely impossible; the Gaullists stated their case and the others amongst whom Faure, former Prime Ministers and people like Fontaine and Baumgartner did not really dare to speak up. Since 1944 I never had the feeling that fascism was in a room where I was, but now I had. If after the Bilderberg meeting anybody would have any illusion about their attitude they must be nuts.⁵¹

The nuclear issue played an important role in Baumel's speech in which he "rejected the concept of a multilateral or multinational NATO nuclear force, and expressed the determination of the French government to continue with its policy of maintaining its own national nuclear deterrent." Baumel particularly stressed the Gaullist distrust of the American willingness to come to the aid of the European countries in all circumstances. While several Europeans, including some French participants, took issue with this statement, as with several others, there were also a few Europeans who appeared to share the Gaullist view. According to an American report for the Ford Foundation "this expression of doubt on the part of the Europeans aroused some bitter comments by Americans, who felt that our past performance gave no indication that we would not honor our pledge to defend Europe." In response, two Kennedy Administration officials defended the MLF, which was subsequently also supported by "several European speakers."⁵²

Deputy Secretary-General Arnold Lamping left the conference convinced that "the Gaullists had felt their isolation." He believed that the American statements, which had expressed "a deep-felt disappointment" concerning de Gaulle's recent actions, had left a deep impression on the participants. In addition, the French opposition to de Gaulle "seemed satisfied" since the meeting had provided them "the opportunity to voice their objections

⁴⁸ "Vergadering ten kantore van de heer Rijkens", 22 February 1963, file 55, Bilderberg.

⁴⁹ "Cannes Conference report."

⁵⁰ A.T. Lamping, "Rapport Conferentie Cannes", 3 July 1963, file 21, Bilderberg.

⁵¹ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 4 April 1963, Correspondence E.H. van der Beugel, HAK.

⁵² "Grant file Bilderberg 56-341", Reel 5473, FFA, RAC.

against the politics of their president at an international forum of a very high caliber”⁵³ – an opportunity which, according to Lamping, they received less and less. As his comment to Kissinger concerning the non-Gaullist French participants of the conference already indicated, Van der Beugel was not particularly satisfied as to the use they had made of this opportunity – a point he also stressed in a letter to Peter Fleck: “The French case was completely hopeless and the worst thing was how much the Gaullist thinking-terror influences people like Aron, Fontaine, Baumgartner, not to mention the former-premiers *who were present, but did not speak*.”⁵⁴

The official report of the conference⁵⁵, which was afterwards distributed among the participants, and which Van der Beugel also circulated within his own social network, deliberately paid a great deal of attention to the exposé of Jacques Baumel because the secretariat considered it very valuable that “for the first time a clear, complete overview had been given of the Atlantic politics of General de Gaulle.”⁵⁶ Indeed, according to a report by the Ford Foundation, “several participants expressed the opinion afterwards that this was the most forthright presentation of the Gaullist point of view ever put forth in any forum.”⁵⁷ The Secretariat’s report also gave ample attention to the isolation of the Gaullists at the conference. As secretary Lamping put it: “The ‘*Baumel seul*’ motif runs as the main thread through the entire report, which clearly reflects that the propositions brought forward by de Gaulle’s spokesperson were practically unanimously rejected.”⁵⁸ As the Ford Foundation report pointed out, however, there was also some support for some of Baumel’s arguments, which might suggest that the official report may have exaggerated the *Baumel seul motif* somewhat. Nevertheless, the American undersecretary of State George Ball left the conference “convinced that the majority of Europeans did not accept de Gaulle as their true spokesman,”⁵⁹ which suggests one of the key goals of the European Secretariat had been met. At the same time, the Bilderberg Conference had succeeded in not estranging or antagonizing the French. French participants had even expressed appreciation of “the way in which, and the atmosphere in which, they had been given the full opportunity to express the French views.” When deputy Secretary-General Lamping contacted Jacques Baumel afterwards to inquire about his experience of the Bilderberg meeting the Frenchman mentioned that he would gladly be present again during a subsequent conference “*si le Prince me ferait l'honneur de m'inviter à nouveau*.” “Not a bad result”, Lamping concluded.⁶⁰

⁵³ A.T. Lamping, “Afterthoughts after Cannes”, 11 July 1963, file 21, Bilderberg (translation mine).

⁵⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Peter Fleck, 1 May 1963, file 7, EvdB (translation mine, emphasis mine).

⁵⁵ “Cannes Conference report.”

⁵⁶ A.T. Lamping, “Rapport Conferentie Cannes”, 3 July 1963, file 21, Bilderberg (translation mine).

⁵⁷ “Grant file Bilderberg 56-341”, Reel 5473, FFA, RAC.

⁵⁸ A.T. Lamping, “Rapport Conferentie Cannes”, 3 July 1963, file 21, Bilderberg (translation mine).

⁵⁹ Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 276.

⁶⁰ A.T. Lamping, “Afterthoughts after Cannes”, 11 July 1963, file 21, Bilderberg, NAH (translation mine).

From the perspective of the Ford Foundation, a major private sponsor of the conferences, the Bilderberg Meeting in Cannes had provided a welcome addition to the formal diplomatic process. "For the first time since General de Gaulle's January pronouncement, the Bilderberg meeting provided a quiet and unpublicized opportunity for leading French figures to meet with other European and American members of the Bilderberg Group for serious and frank discussions of the Atlantic situation" where "contacts were re-established, and a free exchange of opinions took place that could not have occurred in an official gathering."⁶¹

"I think that Cannes was a great success for everybody involved. We now know what we are up against,"⁶² Van der Beugel told American Steering Committee member C.D. Jackson. "I completely agree that the recent Bilderberg was one of the best, if not absolutely the best we have ever had", Jackson replied. "To be sure, events played into your hands, but you and the Prince took extremely skillful advantage of them. I have a strong suspicion that the ripples from Cannes will have an effect on important American-European events for many months to come. I cannot conceive that Baumel did not report *un certain froid* to his boss, and conceivably this week's sudden cordiality may be a direct result."⁶³

The MLF Conversion: from "patch-up" tool to instrument for Atlantic cohesion.

Despite Ernst van der Beugel's satisfaction about the isolation of the Gaullists at the Cannes conference, he also perceived considerable room for improvement – in particular with regard to the American role and attitude. In Cannes, the Americans had appeared to be "off balance" and failed to put forward any alternative policy that could move Atlantic cooperation forward after the Brussels breakdown of January 1963. Consequently, while preparing the 1964 conference, which was to be held in Williamsburg Virginia, Van der Beugel focused his efforts on trying to make sure that the Americans would show more strength and initiative in the hope that some constructive movement in otherwise stagnant transatlantic relations would be attained. While he had initially been rather skeptical about the American plans for a multilateral atomic force, in the run-up to the Williamsburg conference Van der Beugel came to embrace the MLF as one of the most promising means to this end.

It appears that Ernst van der Beugel changed his mind about the MLF after a visit to the United States in the fall of 1963. After he spent four weeks at Harvard, where he was invited by Henry Kissinger to do research for his dissertation and to give some lectures, Van der Beugel exchanged Cambridge for Washington where he met with several key members of the American foreign policy establishment including National Security Advisor MacGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President Arthur Schlesinger Jr., former Secretaries of State Christian

⁶¹ "Request for Grant Action, General program of the Bilderberg Conference Group, Supplement No. 3", April 17, 1968, Ford Foundation Grant Files, Bilderberg 56-341, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

⁶² E.H. van der Beugel to C.D. Jackson, 3 April 1963, box 109, C.D. Jackson Papers, EPL.

⁶³ C.D. Jackson to E.H. van der Beugel, 10 April 1963, box 109, C.D. Jackson Papers, EPL.

Herter and Dean Acheson and Vice Chairman of the Atlantic Council Theodore Achilles.⁶⁴ At the State Department Van der Beugel met with Deputy Assistant Secretary for Atlantic Affairs Robert Schaetzel, Director of Atlantic Political and Economic Affairs Deane R. Hinton as well as with the Director of Policy Planning Walt Whitman Rostow and Henry Owen at the Policy Planning Council to discuss European-American relations and the upcoming Bilderberg Meeting about which they were “extremely well informed” according to Van der Beugel.⁶⁵ George Ball – who together with Schaetzel and Owen belonged to a group of the most avid promoters of the MLF who due to their “quasi-religious devotion”⁶⁶ to this policy were also known as ‘the theologians’ – had arranged the meetings at the State Department where his colleagues were eager to convert influential Europeans to their cause. They were convinced that European opinion on the proposal would to a large extent determine the American administration’s attitude towards the plan.⁶⁷ In March 1963 George Ball and Robert Bowie had already communicated to Max Kohnstamm that it would help if European support for the MLF would be voiced, because they did not want the MLF to be looked at as a Kennedy scheme. They regarded the Bilderberg Meetings as an important channel through which this could be accomplished.⁶⁸

The MLF campaign at the State department dovetailed nicely with Van der Beugel’s search for an American policy initiative that could create a new constructive dynamic in transatlantic relations. Van der Beugel would never really be thrilled about the MLF’s military-strategic virtues,⁶⁹ but he came to see great merit in its role as a political tool to cement a stronger transatlantic relationship, especially since he came to believe – like George Ball – that it could serve as one of the most concrete means to demonstrate opposition to Charles de Gaulle.⁷⁰ After all, the realization of a multilateral nuclear force in NATO would thwart the possibility that de Gaulle could create a French hegemony in Europe based on his *force de frappe*. “You convinced me about the multilateral force”, Van der Beugel wrote to Henry Owen after their meeting at the State department. “I immediately went to work on this point and I hope and expect that a positive attitude will be taken [at the upcoming Bilderberg

⁶⁴ Former U.S. Secretary of State Christian Herter served as a Trade Representative for both John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. He was an avid Atlanticist who was active in private organizations devoted to transatlantic relations such as the Atlantic Council and the Atlantic Institute.

⁶⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to G. W. Ball, 21 November 1963, box 96, folder 8, George W. Ball Papers, PUL; G.W. Ball to E.H. van der Beugel, 27 October 1963, file 7, EvdB, NAH.

⁶⁶ Andrew Priest, “George W. Ball, the Multilateral Force and the Transatlantic Alliance,” in *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America? The Atlantic Community and Europe 2*, ed. G. Scott-Smith and V. Aubourg (Paris: Soleb 2011) 172-191.

⁶⁷ Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 279.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 297, footnote 160.

⁶⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to Ivo Samkalden, 4 June 1964, file 7, EvdB. “Whether the MLF if strategically or militarily the best instrument is, in this context, irrelevant”.

⁷⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 16 January 1964, file 7, EvdB: “The way to demonstrate that we are opponents of de Gaulle’s policy is available in NATO and in eventually joining the multilateral force and is certainly not in joining a political set up which is his greatest desire.”; EvdB to I. Samkalden, 3 March 1964, file 7, EvdB: “De enige vruchtbare weg om te laten zien dat wij het niet met de Gaulle eens zijn, vooral begaan moet worden, door op concrete issues de wijzen, dat wij de Franse conceptie niet delen. Wij hebben in de NATO en daarbuiten gelegenheid genoeg om dat te doen. Het lid worden van de multilaterale kernmacht is één van de voorbeelden.”

Conference].”⁷¹ To this end, Owen and his colleagues at the State department had also done suggestions for possible participants for the Bilderberg Conference which Van der Beugel considered “extremely valuable.”⁷²

Ernst van der Beugel was not the only one who went to work on the MLF in preparation for the 1964 Bilderberg conference. Once the final guest list for the Bilderberg Meeting had been composed, the State department’s Office of the Special Assistant for the MLF contacted key American participants in March 1964 to provide them with information kits containing “general background information on the latest thinking about the aims, purposes, and possible form of the MLF” as it had emerged at the State Department.⁷³ Since they could only distribute unclassified material, the State department also arranged personal briefings on the MLF through which the department could better prepare American Bilderberg participants with regards to “such factors as attitudes of the key political elements and personalities in the various countries involved, general tactical considerations, and projected schedules for further steps.”⁷⁴

Transatlantic family quarrels: the lingering rivalry of Europeanists vs. Atlanticists

Shortly after Van der Beugel returned home in November 1963, President Kennedy was assassinated. Kennedy’s European policy, including the concept of an equal Atlantic partnership between the United States and an integrated Europe, also known as the ‘dumbbell’ idea, had been greatly influenced by the ideas of Jean Monnet. Central to this was the influential position of Monnet’s close friend and apprentice George Ball – “one of the strongest and most self-consciously ‘European’ personalities ever to set foot in Foggy Bottom” – who, as Undersecretary of State under both Kennedy and Johnson, dominated the State Department’s European policy.⁷⁵ While Van der Beugel and Ball were on good terms with each other and agreed on many things – including the political value of the MLF and the need to oppose Gaullism – their priorities with regard to the process of European integration and the development of an Atlantic Community were different. In fact, the struggle about the structure of the Atlantic relationship was not just a rivalry between third-force-Gaullists and those who recognized and welcomed the United States as a European power and desired to maintain close-transatlantic ties. There also still existed a clear rivalry *among* those who favored an Atlantic-oriented Europe, especially with regards to the role and shape of European integration in the broader Atlantic framework and the strategy that should be

⁷¹ E.H. van der Beugel to Henry D. Owen, 25 November 1963, file 7, EvdB.

⁷² Ibid.; E.H. van der Beugel to George W. Ball, 21 November 1963, box 96, folder 96, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

⁷³ Gerard C. Smith to Arthur H. Dean, 5 March 1964, box 76, file 2A, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁷⁴ Gerard C. Smith to Arthur H. Dean, March 5, 1964, box 76, file 2A “De Bilderberg Group/General”, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL. These personal briefings were arranged for Dean Acheson, Arthur Dean, Senator William Fulbright (Dem.), Representative Chet Holifield (Dem.), C.D. Jackson, Senator Henry Jackson (Dem.), Senator Jacob Javits (Rep.), John McCloy and Shepard Stone. See: Gijswijt, “Uniting the West”, 280.

⁷⁵ Kenneth Weisbrode, *The Atlantic Century: Four Generations of Extraordinary Diplomats who Forged America’s Vital Alliance With Europe* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2009) 157.

pursued with regard to Gaullist France. In essence, the debates between Europeanists and Atlanticists that first came to the fore in the 1950s had never really been resolved and even gained a new sense of urgency with the arrival of Charles de Gaulle on the transatlantic diplomatic scene. While Europeanists like Monnet, Kohnstamm and Ball shared the desire for an Atlantic oriented Europe with the Atlanticists, they were more open to collaboration with Charles de Gaulle in their attempts to move European integration forward in the direction of a European political union. As Jan van der Harst explains:

Monnet made the analysis that de Gaulle's ideas could help Europe advance toward a federation by passing through some kind of 'European confederation.' This might be needed as the interim stage of evolution toward the new Europe, since no adequate framework existed in which the Six could jointly tackle political questions. It might also convince the European citizens that unification was not solely geared toward economic prosperity but also had a political dimension. Monnet envisioned two methods to be at work simultaneously: the integration method and another method for political, educational, and defense questions. He saw great potential in letting these two evolve together.⁷⁶

In contrast, Atlanticists like Ernst van der Beugel – who were afraid that any European political union with France and without the United Kingdom would eventually lead to the development of a third force continental Europe under French hegemony – perceived this as a grave danger to the Atlantic Community. From Van der Beugel's perspective, de Gaulle's talk of a "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals" was nothing more than a civilized way of saying "Yankees go home." If put into practice, the result would be a power vacuum in Europe with only one power capable of filling it, namely the Soviet Union.⁷⁷ In 1967 Van der Beugel expressed his fears in the following words:

Those Gaullist objectives must eventually (and maybe sooner rather than later) lead to the neutralization of Europe, because the antagonism towards the Anglo-Saxon World grows bigger step by step. (...) In terms of power, this schism between the continent and the Anglo-Saxon world means the creation of a power vacuum in Europe. That vacuum can only and shall be filled by the Soviet Union and for this no military aggression is necessary. In that case, our children will live at best in Finland and in the worst scenario in Bulgaria. It is 1936.⁷⁸

While Monnet and his fellow Europeanists did not desire to sever Europe's transatlantic ties, Van der Beugel believed that by giving absolute priority to a swift realization of European

⁷⁶ Jan van der Harst, "Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political integration", in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, ed. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009) 648-649.

⁷⁷ E.H. van der Beugel, "Introduction Prof. E.H. van der Beugel at the Atlantic Symposium at Greenwich", October 3, 1967, box "Lezingen E.H. van der Beugel", AHB.

⁷⁸ E.H. van der Beugel. "Stuk voor Karel Polak, Kerstmist 1967", box "Lezingen E.H. van der Beugel", AHB.

integration they were willing to take too many risks by giving in to the French just to make sure the European project would keep moving.⁷⁹ Ernst van der Beugel, who regarded any concessions to de Gaulle as appeasement, believed that it was better to pause European political and military integration for the time being. Stagnation in the political-military field would not hurt the process of economic and monetary integration in Europe, he believed, while advancement would mean progress into an undesirable direction that would likely be detrimental to the Atlantic alliance to which he gave absolute priority. Fundamentally, it was the old discussion about ends and means all over again: was European integration to be regarded as an end in itself or was it mainly supposed to be a means to strengthen the Atlantic Community?

During the 1960s the struggle between Atlanticists and Europeanists took place on many different fronts; within informal foreign policy establishments as well as inside the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, among staffers of the U.S. State Department and between different government departments, but also in national and international political arenas, as well as in public debates through speeches and newspapers articles. Ernst van der Beugel was active on all these fronts where he became one of the key representatives of the realist Atlanticist school of thought while he simultaneously tried to harmonize and mediate the differences between the different groups, for example through the Bilderberg meetings, in an attempt to make sure this struggle between rivaling visions would not erode Atlantic unity. He also tried to use his access to the foreign policy establishments in Europe and the United States to convince its members of his Atlanticist perspective and priorities.

When Henry Kissinger asked Van der Beugel for a European perspective on the new Johnson Administration in January 1964, Van der Beugel vented his frustrations about the lingering influence of Monnet's school of thought at the State department, informing Kissinger that he was "most critical about the attitude of the American administration towards European unity." He especially resented the American attitude towards resurfacing discussions concerning a potential continental political arrangement between the six and the pressure the American Administration ("which is only and exclusively George Ball") put on European countries to give in to French demands in this context. "Why the hell should we have a new political set up when it is crystal clear that the six are in basic disagreement on foreign and military policy?"⁸⁰, Van der Beugel questioned. He considered it "outrageous" to enter any European political arrangement without the British. This was exactly what de Gaulle wanted so he could "formalize his ideas with the five on his bandwagon", Van der Beugel claimed. "Monnet and Ball think that a political set up would give the five the possibility to line up against De Gaulle's policy. This is a crazy idea which only could come up in the heads of those who have messed up already so many European things."⁸¹ Once again, Van der

⁷⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, 193.

⁸⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 16 January 1964, file 7, EvdB.

⁸¹ Ibid.

Beugel found himself in the ironic position of being '*plus américain que les Américains.*' As he put it:

The confusion of ends and means in Washington is again complete and for us it is a rather bitter thing to oppose De Gaulle because of the fact that his policy is basically anti-American and then see us under American pressure to do what De Gaulle so much desires. It would be the task and the duty of American foreign policy to put us under pressure not to go into a new political adventure; what we see, however, is the opposite. It becomes increasingly difficult to defend what we consider as an American interest against American policy itself.⁸²

American Leadership: a *Cri de Coeur*

While he complained about American pressure on European countries to move European integration forward, Van der Beugel believed the Americans should assert stronger leadership in favor of the Atlantic alliance and he used each and every opportunity he got to encourage this. Even in his letters to American officials expressing sympathy after the death of President Kennedy, Van der Beugel saw an opportunity to stress the issue of American leadership. In a letter to Henry Owen, Van der Beugel wrote that:

Never before in history people on this side of the ocean have had a similar experience. They simply feel that they have lost 'their' President. This is definitely not a feeling confined to a few internationally minded men but what is so touching about it is that this is the feeling of the average citizen. Our American friends might find some consolation in the fact that by instinct people in the Western World recognize that the man in the White house is their leader.⁸³

While the Europeans recognized American leadership according to Van der Beugel, he considered the Americans themselves too timid in asserting it. At the Bilderberg conference in Cannes Van der Beugel "could not escape the impression that the U.S. attitude was hesitant, vague and apologetic."⁸⁴ Besides, both George Ball and Paul Nitze had been "weak in their presentation."⁸⁵ Van der Beugel considered this lack of American leadership in the alliance as "an extremely frightening phenomenon, because if ever leadership were required, now would be the moment."⁸⁶ This had to be different at the next conference, which would be hosted by the Americans in the old colonial town of Williamsburg, Virginia. "Sixty rather important Europeans (at least they think that they are important) cross the Ocean to be in Williamsburg", Van der Beugel warned American Steering Committee member C.D. Jackson.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ E.H. van der Beugel to Henry Owen, 25 November 1963, file 7, EvdB.

⁸⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to C.D. Jackson, 2 March, 1964, file 7, EvdB.

⁸⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 4 April 1963, box 109, C.D. Jackson papers, EPL.

⁸⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to G.P. Fleck, 1 May, 1963, file 7, EvdB: "Mijn totale indruk is echter somber. De Amerikanen waren 'off balance' en hebben na de 14^e januari geen werkelijke politiek. Dat is een uiterst angstig verschijnsel, want als er ooit leiderschap gevraagd wordt, is het nu."

“They will meet a top U.S. delegation and even more than at a meeting in Europe the conference will be colored by the attitude of the American group.”⁸⁷

In March 1964, just weeks before the Bilderberg conference in Williamsburg, Van der Beugel sent a letter to C.D. Jackson concerning the desired attitude of the Americans at the upcoming conference. This unusually passionate epistle, which Ernst van der Beugel himself described as a *cri de coeur*, was one long plea for strong American leadership. Its opening remarks also give an interesting perspective on how Van der Beugel perceived his own role, motivation and aims in transatlantic affairs – not as a Dutchman, but as a transnational actor in pursuit of an Atlantic Community under American leadership:

I do not write to you as Secretary-General [of Bilderberg], even less as a Dutchman. I write because the only issue in the field of foreign relations, in which I am totally and emotionally involved is the issue of United States – European relations. I feel myself committed to do everything I can (although I know that I cannot do very much) to foster and defend the closest possible relations with, and friendship for the United States. I know that I have the reputation of being sometimes ‘*plus américain que les Américains*’ but I very much love that country of yours and I consider the world a livable place only if we recognize your undisputed leadership.⁸⁸

This undisputed leadership had not only been lacking in Cannes. During his most recent visit to Washington van der Beugel had also “experienced a lack of self-confidence” among the Americans which had “frightened” him. Many of Van der Beugel’s European friends who shared his views of the United States and who had crossed the Atlantic since shared this experience. “The highest people in Washington have an attitude which is as sympathetic from the purely personal and human point of view as it is ineffective and dangerous from the political angle. It is the kind of atmosphere in which they ask us: ‘Do you really think we made so many mistakes? What is wrong with our policy? Tell us what we should do.’” Van der Beugel stressed that this kind of attitude was to be avoided in Williamsburg. “It is much less harmful when Europeans disagree with the American point of view, than when they go away with the feeling that there is no self-confidence on your side and a vagueness and uncertainty which was too much apparent at Cannes and presently in Washington,” he argued.⁸⁹

Reverberations of Williamsburg

During the Bilderberg Meeting in Williamsburg the American delegation did indeed show “great strength and cohesion”⁹⁰ as Van der Beugel had hoped and encouraged. The same could be said about the five non-French members of the Common Market. After the

⁸⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to C.D. Jackson, 2 March 1964, file 7, EvdB.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to Henry Owen, 2 April 1964, file 7, EvdB.

conference Van der Beugel informed the Dutch ambassador in Rome that “It had become clear without any doubt that the problems which existed did not exist between Europe and the United States, but between the French and the rest.”⁹¹ The Gaullists had again done their “utmost to be uncompromising on every single point,”⁹² and Van der Beugel considered it heart-warming that after the French intervention, the Germans, the Belgians, the Dutch and the Italians had all distanced themselves from the “pernicious ideas of the Gaullists.”⁹³ The fact that all of this happened “in the presence of the top of the American Congress and the Administration was enough to make the trip to Williamsburg completely worth it,” according to Van der Beugel, who believed “that the congressional participants were convinced beyond any doubt about the positive attitude of the overwhelming majority of the Europeans towards the United States and NATO.”⁹⁴

The reverberations of the Bilderberg Meeting in Williamsburg also left their traces in formal diplomacy. Shortly after the conference, messages started to appear in the formal diplomatic correspondence from the American embassies in Brussels and The Hague listing options for action to be taken in response to “disquieting” ideas concerning the future of NATO voiced by one of the Gaullist participants of the Bilderberg conference. One of the diplomatic dispatches mentions that the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Paul-Henri Spaak and the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns were discussing the desirability of proposing at the North Atlantic Council “that basic review of NATO be undertaken to develop recommendation to strengthen it in the years ahead.”⁹⁵ Luns and Spaak both recognized that such a proposal might result in a major clash with the French but the alternative was to let the situation continue to drift with the French gradually eroding NATO away.⁹⁶ As a second response to counter the ideas voiced during the Bilderberg meeting Luns believed it was important to make very clear to the America’s, both North and South that de Gaulle “does not speak for Europe”. To emphasize this Luns “hoped to insert a reference in the Queen’s forthcoming speech in Mexico saying that not one voice speaks for Europe”⁹⁷ – an effort in which the Bilderberg meetings in Cannes and Williamsburg had played an expedient role.

MLF: the Battle Continues

Despite the efforts by the State Department the MLF “did not do too badly, but not well enough”⁹⁸ in Williamsburg according to Van der Beugel. In the spring of 1964, the State

⁹¹ E.H. van der Beugel to H.F.L.K. van Vredenburg, 24 April 1964, file 7, EvdB (translation mine).

⁹² E.H. van der Beugel to Henry Owen, 2 April 1964, file 7, EvdB.

⁹³ E.H. van der Beugel to H.F.L.K. van Vredenburg, 24 April 1964, file 7, EvdB (translation mine).

⁹⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Henry Owen, 2 April 1964, file 7, EvdB.

⁹⁵ Telegram from U.S. Embassy Brussels, 27 March 1964, Department of State Alpha Numerical File 1964–1966, reel 5, RSC.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Telegram from U.S. Embassy The Hague, Co 2559, 3 April 1964, Department of State Alpha Numerical File 1964–1966, reel 5, RSC.

⁹⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to Henry Owen, 2 April 1964, file 7, EvdB.

Department's MLF campaign was revitalized by a renewed commitment to the MLF by President Johnson. During discussions with his policy advisors – including George Ball, Walt Rostow and Henry Owen – concerning the MLF in April 1964, the president had declared that “if possible”, an agreement on the MLF should “be reached by the end of the year.”⁹⁹ With this new timetable in mind, the advocates of the MLF in the State Department stepped up their campaign to push the project ahead. They increased their determination to win souls in Congress, tried to foster favorable press coverage by organizing briefings for domestic and foreign media, and notified their European allies of America's strength of purpose concerning the project.¹⁰⁰ During a meeting with his NATO colleagues in the Netherlands in May, Secretary of State Dean Rusk declared that the American Administration regarded the MLF “as meeting real political and military needs, and we intend to go ahead.”¹⁰¹

Meanwhile, Ernst van der Beugel also continued to promote the MLF outside of Bilderberg, in particular in the Netherlands, where the Dutch government was still in the process of determining its definitive stance on the multilateral force.¹⁰² A 1964 diplomatic cable from the American embassy in The Hague mentions that the “leading” Dutch columnist G.B.J. Hiltermann, in discussing “the extremists’ struggle around MLF”, had pointed out that there existed no emotional Atlantic extremism comparable to the emotional national French extremism, but that instead there were strict formalists into which category doctrinaire Dutchmen fell. The cable subsequently quoted Hiltermann, saying that “in very moderate terms, Van der Beugel had made himself their spokesman.”¹⁰³

Ernst van der Beugel also took part in the discussions concerning the MLF in the Dutch Labor Party, which was also trying to determine its position on the transatlantic nuclear challenge.¹⁰⁴ Since the moment the Kennedy administration had proposed the MLF in the NATO Council in 1963, the PvdA had taken a rather negative stance towards the multilateral force. In early 1964, however, advocates of the proposal started to stir themselves, partly motivated by the fact that Jean Monnet and his Action Committee had embraced the MLF in February 1964, thus making the project appealing to both Europeanists and Atlanticists alike. The result was a party wide consultation in November 1964. While the pro- and con-MLF camps were not able to reach a consensus during this meeting, the pro-MLF group had gained quite some strength in the course of 1964 – a development that reflected a broader national trend in the Netherlands.¹⁰⁵ At the same time, partly as a result of the mounting Gaullist

⁹⁹ Qtd. In Reyn, “Atlantis Lost”, 476.

¹⁰⁰ See: Ibid., 478-479.

¹⁰¹ Qtd. In Reyn, “Atlantis Lost”, p 479.

¹⁰² Duco Hellema, *Nederland in de wereld: de buitenlandse politiek van Nederland* (Houten: Spectrum, 2010), 230-231.

¹⁰³ “European Unity and Atlantic Cooperation”, US Embassy The Hague, 4 December 1964, RG59, Records of the US Department of State, reel 5, RSC.

¹⁰⁴ See: E.H. van der Beugel to Ivo Samkalden, 4 June, 1964, file 7, EvdB, NAH.

¹⁰⁵ Frank Zuijdam, *Tussen wens en werkelijkheid: Het debat over vrede en veiligheid binnen de PvdA in de periode 1958-1977* (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2001), 113,116, 121.

opposition to the initiative, a reverse trend revealed itself in other European countries as well as in the United States.¹⁰⁶

While promoting the MLF in the Netherlands – behind the scenes as well as in the public debate surrounding this issue – Van der Beugel kept in close touch with Owen and Schaetzel at the State Department who were “most interested” in hearing from him about the developments in The Hague.¹⁰⁷ After British Prime Minister Harold Wilson called the MLF a “divisive force in Europe”¹⁰⁸ in his November 23 speech to parliament, Schaetzel contacted Van der Beugel to encourage him to convince Luns during one of their regular Sunday breakfasts to issue “a forthright statement of Dutch intentions” in favor of the MLF arguing that “given what appears to have been the retrogressive position established by Wilson it may be all the more necessary for constructive minded Dutch and Italians to rally to the cause.”¹⁰⁹ Van der Beugel, who replied from London, in turn informed Schaetzel about the atmosphere in England, advising the Americans to keep the conversation with the English going since he found the British “more positive than might seem from the Prime Minister’s speech.” It would just be very important “not to compromise the time limit,” he argued. Furthermore, Van der Beugel informed Schaetzel that no clear public statement was to be expected from the Dutch since such a statement would not be likely to lead to any positive result before the negotiations with the British. Instead, Van der Beugel suggested that the Dutch could play a constructive role by quietly talking to the Germans and the British behind the scenes. He also warned Schaetzel and Owen to be cautious about his own role in these affairs, saying that “the fact that I see my Dutch colleagues so frequently must be kept, as you will understand, as privately as possible because an eventual influence on them always diminishes when people know about our very frequent contacts.”¹¹⁰

European Political Union revisited: The Erhard Plan.

During his visit to the State Department in November 1964 Van der Beugel had started to notice a change in Washington in regard to its European policy: while there were still “remnants of the old policy”, his contacts at the State Department now seemed to fall more in line with some of his own ideas. After talks with George Ball, Bill Tyler, Bob Schaetzel and Henry Owen, he wrote a very upbeat “strictly confidential” memorandum, which he distributed within his network, among others to the Dutch ambassador in London, Herman van Roijen. “Slowly the State Department begins to realize that the cohesion of the Atlantic

¹⁰⁶ Ine Megens, “Ambitions and Ambivalence: Initiatives for a European Nuclear Force, 1957-67”, in *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America? The Atlantic Community and Europe*, ed. Giles Scott-Smith and Valérie Aubourg (Paris: Soleb 2011), 33; Reyn, “Atlantis Lost”, 488-497.

¹⁰⁷ J. Robert Schaetzel to E.H. van der Beugel, July 7, 1964, file 7, EvdB.

¹⁰⁸ “Telegram from the Under Secretary of State (Ball) to the Department of State”, FRUS 1964-1968, Volume XIII, Western Europe Region, document 54”, accessed December 5, 2016, <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-68v13/d54>.

¹⁰⁹ J. Robert Schaetzel to E.H. van der Beugel, 25 November 1964, file 35, EvdB.

¹¹⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to J. Robert Schaetzel, 2 December 1964, file 35, EvdB.

world and the interests of the United States are not by definition served in all circumstances by European unification now,"¹¹¹ he asserted. More specifically, he observed that the idea that the transatlantic relationship could "exclusively be based on a relation between the United States and a unified Europe" was starting to change. At the same time, Van der Beugel sensed "a new realization for the first time that [the creation of a European Political Union] could be highly dangerous."¹¹² The Americans now even showed great appreciation for the attitude of the Dutch government:

Our American friends now realize that previous pressures on the Dutch to go along with everything which has the appearance of European unification was a wrong policy. I explained to them how difficult it was from time to time for those on the continent who gave priority to the Atlantic concept and to close relations with the United States to see that in fighting this battle they were not supported by the diplomacy of the United States and, on the contrary, were left lonely in their efforts.¹¹³

Van der Beugel was keen to spread this message to his friends in the Netherlands, where the Dutch government was determining its position concerning plans of West-German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard to revamp talks between the six EEC countries concerning the creation of a European Political Union along intergovernmental lines. During the subsequent months Van der Beugel frequently voiced his opposition against this plan in public, pushing instead for stronger political and military cooperation within the Atlantic alliance, thus turning himself into a driving force behind the Dutch Atlanticist opposition against the plan Erhard.

The fact that Van der Beugel came to personify the Atlanticist opposition against a European Political Union within the Dutch policy debate is also reflected in official documents of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. To illustrate, in a November 1964 memorandum for Minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns, meant as a first attempt to determine the Dutch position with regard to the political aspects of the Plan Erhard, the question was posed whether the Dutch should focus on finding compromises or, whether, on behalf of the Atlantic relationship the Netherlands should pursue a stagnation policy for the time being. In this assessment, the government memorandum explicitly referred to the "stagnation policy" option as the "Van der Beugel proposition."¹¹⁴

Meanwhile, the American embassy in The Hague maintained in close touch with Van der Beugel and kept Washington informed of his activities. After Van der Beugel had published an article in *Le Monde Diplomatique* in November 1964 in which he explained the motivations

¹¹¹ Ambassador J.H. Van Roijen, now stationed in London, informed Ernst van der Beugel in reply to his memorandum that the Dutch minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns had noticed a similar change in George Ball's views. See: J.H. van Roijen to E.H. van der Beugel, 25 November, 1965, file 45, J.H. van Roijen Papers, NAH.

¹¹² E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 19 November 1964; memorandum, november 3, 1964, file 45, J.H. van Roijen Papers, NAH.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ D.M. Ringnalda, "Standpuntbepaling van BZ tegenover het politieke deel van het plan-Erhard), 24 November 1964, Accessed December 5, 2016, <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/watermarker/pdf/S01351>.

behind Dutch opposition to a political organization of the Six, the American embassy cabled a translation of his article to the State Department, saying that "Van der Beugel does in fact present the logic of the Dutch position although Foreign Minister Luns has said that the Dutch would not hold out alone for British accession or significant supra-nationality in the event that proposals such as those from Bonn, Rome and Brussels were to win support from all others in the Six including France." The American diplomat responsible for the cable did point out, however, that "Van der Beugel in private conversation goes somewhat further than the views expressed in his article."¹¹⁵

Despite the efforts on behalf of the MLF by the State Department's theologians and to Van der Beugel's great disappointment, President Johnson decided to shelve the multilateral force in December 1964. Van der Beugel's friends at the State Department had been effectively side-tracked. With the MLF "relegated to the transatlantic boulevard of broken dreams"¹¹⁶ and the Germans pushing for a rehabilitation of talks on a European political union, the optimism Van der Beugel had expressed in his Washington memorandum rapidly vaporized. "The situation in Europe is even more depressing than ever because of the lack of a strong American initiative which the MLF provided but which was taken away by the President", he wrote to Kissinger. "The Germans are rushing into the arms of de Gaulle and the friends of the U.S. in Europe who give priority to the Atlantic approach feel baffled and isolated."¹¹⁷ Even Kissinger, who had manifested himself as a fierce opponent to the MLF, seemed a little startled by its sudden demise. "I agree with your last paragraph on the situation in Europe", he told Van der Beugel: "I had always opposed the MLF because I had thought it put too much strain on the German political fabric for a dubious objective. But having gone this far, we should not have dropped matters so completely."¹¹⁸

Van der Beugel's worries augmented after Ludwig Erhard met with Charles de Gaulle at Rambouillet in January 1965, where de Gaulle expressed a willingness to re-open discussions about a European political union. With an even more concrete prospect of such talks on the horizon, Van der Beugel continued to voice his concerns. The Netherlands should reject even the invitation of an institutionalized consultation about such a political union, he insisted. By doing so the Dutch would not only be able to punch substantially above their weight, but be able to make a decisive difference like they had done during the negotiations about the Fouchet Plan.¹¹⁹ At the same time, Van der Beugel kept voicing the precondition of British participation to any European set-up in the Netherlands, as well as in Britain. "We in the Netherlands need Great Britain" he declared in a speech in London in February 1965.¹²⁰

¹¹⁵ "European Unity and Atlantic Cooperation", US Embassy The Hague, 4 December 1964, RG59, Records of the US Department of State, reel 5, RSC. "Foreign Minister Luns has said that the Dutch would not hold out alone for British accession or significant supra-nationality in the event that proposals such as those from Bonn, Rome and Brussels were to win support from all others in the Six including France".

¹¹⁶ Reyn, "Atlantis Lost", 463.

¹¹⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 14 January 1965, HAK.

¹¹⁸ H.A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, 19 January 1965, HAK.

¹¹⁹ E.H. van der Beugel, "Na de Conferentie in Rambouillet: Bezorgdheid om Europa", *Het Parool*, 3 February 1965.

¹²⁰ E.H. van der Beugel, "De politieke eenheid in Europa heden ten dage", box "Lezingen E.H. van der Beugel", AHB.

While the Atlanticist school of thought was still dominant at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the position of minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns was eroding during the course of the 1960s. Especially after 1963, foreign policy became more and more a matter of discussion within the Dutch cabinet and European policy in particular was increasingly approached as cabinet policy.¹²¹ According to Albert Kersten, the latter development was partly the result of the growing importance of European decision-making for the Dutch national policy, but it was also connected to the policies that Luns had pursued. While his actions in reply to the French veto of Great Britain were widely supported in the Netherlands, his opposition against a European political union had been less popular.¹²² In addition, the Dutch parliament, which tended to be more inclined towards the Monnet school of thought on European integration than the more Atlanticist Ministry of Foreign Affairs, increasingly demanded to have a say in the formulation of Dutch foreign policy – a situation that worried Ernst van der Beugel as well as some of his Atlanticist friends (not to mention Luns himself). While never wavering in his defense of NATO as the cornerstone of Dutch foreign policy, Luns did concede to drop the pre-condition of English participation, also known as the *prealable anglais*, during discussions in the Second Chamber in the fall of 1964 – a step back from the ideal course of action as envisioned by Ernst van der Beugel.¹²³

In order to fortify Luns' anti-Gaullist position in parliament, Ernst van der Beugel and some like-minded friends - including Jérôme Heldring, Theo Joekes, Willem Michiels van Kessenich, Jaap Kymmell and Berend Jan Udink – decided to compose an open letter in support of Luns' Atlanticist policies on the occasion of his 12,5 year anniversary as minister of Foreign Affairs.¹²⁴ The plan was in fact orchestrated in consultation with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which had indicated that it would “welcome” such a campaign.¹²⁵ Once the letter had been drafted Van der Beugel called upon his social network to get prominent individuals to sign the letter.¹²⁶ The result was a list with 38 signatures of prominent

¹²¹ Albert Kersten, *Luns: Een politieke biografie* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2010) 329,334.

¹²² Kersten, Luns, 332.

¹²³ Luns repeated this in the Dutch parliament in February 1965, saying that: “Indien de vijf andere landen het overleg van de Ministers van Buitenlandse Zaken over politieke samenwerking wensen te hervatten, zal de Regering dit gesprek niet uit de weg gaan. Op deelneming van Engeland zal zij in deze bespreking aandringen, maar zij zal het niet van te voren als het zogenaamde Engelse prealabel stellen.” ‘Handelingen Tweede Kamer 1964-1965, 2 februari 1965’, accessed December 5, 2016, <http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=sgd%3Ampg21%3A19641965%3A0000776>

¹²⁴ S. Haasnoot and H. Pach. “Veertig jaar geleden: Berend-Jan Udink over de weigering van De Gaulle om Engeland toe te laten tot de EEG,” *Historisch Nieuwsblad*, October, 2002, accessed December 5, 2016, <http://www.historischnieuwsblad.nl/nl/artikel/6024/veertig-jaar-geleden-berend-jan-udink-over-de-weigering-van-de-gaulle-om-engeland-toe-te-laten-tot-de-eeg.html>. Theo Joekes was a Dutch journalist and politician. Between 1963 and 1989 he was a member of the Second Chamber of the Dutch parliament for the liberal VVD party. Willem Michiels van Kessenich was the mayor of Maastricht and president of the Dutch division of Clarence Streit's “Atlantic Union” movement. Berend Jan Udink worked for the Dutch chamber of Commerce in Rotterdam before moving into politics as a member of the Christian Historical Union (CHU). Between 1967 and 1971 he served as the Dutch Minister of Development Cooperation and between 1971 and 1973 he served as Minister of Housing and Spatial Planning in addition to which he was appointed as Minister of Transport and Public works between 1972 and 1973.

¹²⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to A.W.L. Tjarda van Starkenborch Stachouwer, 22 January 1965, file 45, EvdB. “Het is mij bekend dat B.Z. een zodanige actie zou verwelkomen.”

¹²⁶ Jérôme Heldring, interview with the author, 1 December 2010. According to Jérôme Heldring “Ernst had a network that he could approach without any difficulty, maybe some did not even know what they signed up for”.

Dutchmen with very mixed political and professional backgrounds, including statesmen, union leaders, professors and justices, bankers and captains of industry, mayors and civil servants – all of whom acted in a “purely personal capacity.”¹²⁷ This emphasis on the private capacity of the signatories reveals the same tension as is at play at the Bilderberg meetings: while formally acting in an informal capacity these individuals are chosen to participate exactly because of the positions they hold in society and it was obviously exactly the status of their formal positions in society that contributed weight to the letter.

The presentation of the letter to minister Luns – which Van der Beugel described as a “very cheerful affair” – was crossed by the fall of the Marijnen administration on the very same day.¹²⁸ To make sure that the fall of the Dutch cabinet did not steal away the thunder of the 38, the publication of the letter was cunningly postponed until a few days later. Ernst van der Beugel personally delivered the open letter – under embargo – to the different newspaper offices with the request to give it ample attention.¹²⁹ In the end, the letter was not only published in numerous newspapers in the Netherlands, but also captured the attention of the media in France, Germany and England. The publication of the letter was soon followed by a flurry of editorials and opinion pieces discussing its contents. It was also discussed in the German Bundestag as well as in the U.S. House of Representatives, and while the French government did not formally respond to the letter, French press agency AFP reported that the letter had been received “coldly” in government circles.¹³⁰ Minister Luns responded with a public statement expressing his gratitude for the “valuable support” for his policies offered by these eminent Dutchmen. Indeed, as multiple commentators were keen to point out, the views expressed in the letter were so much in line with Luns’ own views that he could very well have written the letter himself.¹³¹

A few weeks after the publication of the letter, de Gaulle rejected Erhard’s plan to organize a conference for Foreign Ministers in Venice to discuss the potential re-launch of a European political union in May 1965.¹³² According to the chief diplomatic correspondent of the French newspaper *France Soir*, Maurice Delarue, the French rejection of this plan was a direct result of the open letter by the 38 prominent Dutchmen. Since the Dutch Atlanticist “manifesto” had been publicly approved by minister Luns the French government was of the

¹²⁷ “Open brief aan Zijne Excellentie de Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken”, 2 March 1965. See: Scrapbook “Open Brief aan Luns, Maart 1965”, AHB. The letter was signed, among others by: Jhr, dr. Fr. A.M. Alting von Geusau, Dr. W. Drees, Mr. C.L.W. de Gaay Fortman, Prof. dr. P. Geyl, Dr. L. de Jong, H.J. de Koster, Prof. Dr. J. Kymmell, MR. W. baron Michiels van Kessenich, Prof. Mr. C.H.F. Polak, Drs. J.W. de Pous, Prof, dr. J.E. de Quay, Dr. P. Rijkens, IR. C. Staf, Mr. M.P.L. Steenberghe, Prof. Dr. J. Tinbergen, Jhr, Mr. Tjarda van Starkenborch Stachouwer, Drs. B.J. Udink, Mr. G.E. van Walsum, Prof dr. J. Zijlstra.

¹²⁸ EvdB/Kersten Oral history, p.173

¹²⁹ J. van den Berg, *De anatomie van Nederland* (Amsterdam: de Bezige Bij, 1967), 201.

¹³⁰ “Open Brief aan Luns in Westduitse cabinet”, *De Waarheid*, 3 March, 1965; “Extension of Remarks of Hon. Paul Findley of Illinois in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, March 9, 1965, Congressional Record Vol. 111, no. 11.

¹³¹ See: Scrapbook “Open Brief aan Luns, Maart 1965”, AHB.

¹³² “Brief van 38 onverteerbaar voor De Gaulle”, *De Waarheid*, 31 maart, 1965; Jean-Marie Palayret, “De Gaulle Challenges the Community: France, the Empty Chair Crisis and the Luxembourg Compromise” in *Visions, Votes and Vetoes: The Empty Chair Crisis and the Luxembourg Compromise Forty Years On*, ed. Palayret, Wallace & Winand (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2006), 48.

opinion that a meeting under these circumstances would be “useless,”¹³³ according to Delarue. Officials in The Hague responded that if these assertions were true, Paris was just using the letter as an excuse to pass the responsibility of its own unconstructive role to The Hague. Meanwhile, Erhard’s attempts at revamping talks on political union were met with little enthusiasm in Paris and soon faded into the background.

Instead, 1965 would be the year of the empty-chair crisis: a six-month French boycott of decision-making in Brussels bred by disagreements about the Common Agricultural Policy, which were eventually resolved in January 1966 by means of the Luxembourg Compromise. It was also the year in which Charles de Gaulle got re-elected, officially for another 7 years. In March 1966 de Gaulle withdrew France from the military integration in NATO. All in all, this was a rather frustrating period for Atlanticists and Europeanists alike. At the 1965 Bilderberg meeting, which took place at Villa d’Este near lake Como in Italy just a few months before the empty chair crises started, Ernst van der Beugel had delivered a paper on the “State of the Alliance” in which he analyzed the breakdown of the initial post-war consensus on the transatlantic relationship into three schools of thought – the Gaullists, the (Monnet-inspired) Europeanists and the Atlanticists, after which he personally pleaded for an Atlanticist offensive by deepening and developing “military, economic and political integration, co-operation and consultation in the Alliance” while “limiting efforts in Europe to the economic field.”¹³⁴ He was still hopeful that maybe the MLF could still be revived in some form for this purpose. His Atlanticist plea, however, found little support among the Bilderberg participants. It did find its way to the American Secretary of State Dean Rusk, however, though probably not as Van der Beugel might have hoped. “There are many contradictory elements underlying the concept of European unity and the Atlantic partnership”, American ambassador to Germany George McGhee wrote to Rusk after the Bilderberg conference at Villa d’Este. “If we are to succeed in both, I believe we must not let one get ahead of another. Compromises must be affected all along the way. An uncompromising Atlanticist attitude which leaps over Europe altogether, such as that Van der Beugel proposed at the Bilderberg Meeting in Como last spring and which was turned down unanimously by the Europeans present, could I believe only end in our failure on both counts.”¹³⁵ McGhee was obviously not a supporter of Van der Beugel’s “uncompromising Atlanticist attitude” at Villa d’Este. While Van der Beugel’s ideas for an Atlanticist offensive did not receive much support, McGhee’s assertion that his ideas were *unanimously* rejected by the Europeans present at the Bilderberg conference seems too strong and is not reflected in the conference report of the meeting. Instead, this might be an exaggeration by the Ambassador who himself was a supporter of the Monnet-inspired European school of thought, which maintained that a united Europe should serve as

¹³³ “Volgens France Soir: “Brief van 38” oorzaak van weigerachtige houding Parijs”, *Het Parool*, 30 March 1965.

¹³⁴ “Bilderberg Meetings: Villa D’Este Conference 2-4 April 1965”, box 34, Personal Papers of Edwin Martin, KPL.

¹³⁵ “Letter from Ambassador to Germany (McGhee) to Secretary of State Rusk”, February 7, 1966, FRUS 1964-1968, Volume XIII, Western Europe Region, Document 121.” Accessed December 5, 2016, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-68v13/d129>.

a prerequisite for an equal partnership between Europe and the United States.¹³⁶ Even so, the Bilderberg participants at Villa d'Este did come to "the conclusion that little could be done as long as de Gaulle remained in power."¹³⁷

Ernst van der Beugel's Bilderberg analysis of the three schools of thought on transatlantic relations unexpectedly received a much wider audience just weeks later when columnist James Reston printed it – "against all rules" according to Prince Bernhard – as his own brainchild in the *New York Times*.¹³⁸ Van der Beugel, however, was preoccupied with bigger problems. The MLF, the key instrument to breathe new life into the Atlantic Community, was dead and would not be revived as Van der Beugel had hoped. From now on, the emphasis would be on maintaining the transatlantic relations that had been forged during the first postwar decade while weathering "the Gaullist driven storms" of the 1960s.¹³⁹

Conclusion

From the perspective of New Diplomatic History, Ernst van der Beugel remains a relevant subject of study even after he left the Dutch government because, as this chapter has demonstrated, he remained an integral part of the transatlantic diplomatic process. This chapter has attempted to answer the question what this role entailed specifically in the context of the perceived Gaullist threat to Atlantic unity by focusing on the diplomatic process and Van der Beugel's goals and *modus operandi* and how his activities related to formal diplomacy.

Ernst van der Beugel manifested himself on the diplomatic playing field as a transnational actor representing a realist stream of Atlanticism pursuing the closest possible transatlantic relations under strong American leadership based on the idea that the security of Western Europe totally depended on the U.S. military guarantee supported by its nuclear umbrella. While Charles de Gaulle posed a direct threat to this idea, Van der Beugel also regarded the Europeanists who followed Jean Monnet's school of thought as an indirect but still dangerous threat to Atlantic unity because they were willing to give in to Charles de Gaulle too easily from Van der Beugel's perspective. During the period described in this chapter the Monnet school of thought was still dominant within the U.S. State Department. Van der Beugel and the Europeanists found common ground, however, on the issue of the multilateral force, allowing them to join forces in the diplomatic arena.

In the absence of a formal transatlantic political structure beyond NATO, Ernst van der Beugel used the Bilderberg Meetings as an important vehicle in his attempts to manage,

¹³⁶ "Bilderberg Meetings: Villa D'Este Conference 2-4 April 1965", box 34, Personal Papers of Edwin Martin, KPL.

¹³⁷ Gijsswijt, "Uniting the West", 287.

¹³⁸ See: Prince Bernhard's contribution to "Book on Ernst", box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL; James Reston, "Challenge to Alliance: A View from Europe's Attitudes on the Future of NATO, *New York Times*, 12 April, 1965.

¹³⁹ Kenneth Weisbrode, "The State Department's Bureau of European Affairs in the 1970s", in *Atlantic, Euratlantic or Europe-America? Vol.2* Eds. Giles Scott-Smith and Valérie Aubourg (Paris: Soleb, 2011), 194.

mediate and strengthen the transatlantic relationship. After Charles de Gaulle's famous press-conference created a crisis in transatlantic relations he used the Cannes conference to relieve transatlantic tension by offering a forum where problems could be analyzed, frustrations vented and positions clarified in a way that was regarded as 'impossible' in a formal setting. By doing so, the Bilderberg Meetings were used to keep the channels of communication wide open in order to counter transatlantic estrangement both on a personal and on an intellectual level. In the process, the meetings filled a void that formal diplomacy was unable to fill.

Fearing that de Gaulle's fierce language against the U.S. might estrange the Americans from Europe and inspire Congress to retreat into isolationism, Van der Beugel more specifically used the Cannes conference to isolate the French by facilitating the creation of an unofficial front against the idea of a united Europe as a third force in order to demonstrate to the American foreign policy elite and Congressional representatives that de Gaulle did not speak for Europe. Instead of focusing his attention mostly on convincing the American public of this – as Jérôme Heldring had suggested – Van der Beugel helped to create an environment in which this message could effectively be brought across to the U.S. decision-making establishment directly. At the same time, he made sure to create an atmosphere in which the Bilderberg Meetings would not estrange or antagonize the French, but which allowed them to remain engaged in the transatlantic conversation.

These meetings were taken very seriously by representatives of the governments of participating countries, as illustrated not just by the high-ranking government officials that participated, but also, for example, by the French government's attempt to meddle in the proceedings of the Cannes conference. The insights that the Cannes meeting provided into the thinking of the Gaullists with regards to Europe in turn provoked Dutch diplomats to take formal action to distance them from the French policies in public, e.g. by suggesting to insert elements in the Queen's speech to be delivered on the American continent. State Department officials in turn regarded the Bilderberg Meetings as an important channel to foster elite support for policies like the MLF. Having been convinced of the value of the MLF as a common transatlantic project that could strengthen the Atlantic relationship while opposing de Gaulle, Van der Beugel happily cooperated with the facilitation of these efforts. Thus, these conferences reverberated in formal diplomacy and left their traces in official diplomatic correspondence demonstrating that the formal diplomatic establishment perceived these unofficial activities as valuable elements of the diplomatic process. In that sense, it is surprising that diplomatic historians have not demonstrated a similar interest in the unofficial realm of diplomacy.

Ernst van der Beugel did not only work through Bilderberg, although his role in the organization gave him a kind of unofficial diplomatic status. He personally maintained close contact with and had direct access to formal decision-making establishments on both sides of the Atlantic. Within these foreign policy establishments, his presence on the diplomatic playing field was not just recognized, but validated through close cooperation on issues of mutual interest. He played an active role in exchanging information on the atmosphere,

attitude and thinking with regards to specific international policy issues in different localities. He regularly informed individuals in his transatlantic network about the sentiments regarding specific policies in the United Kingdom, in the United States or on the European continent – a key element of the diplomatic practice. Sometimes he took the initiative himself, while at other times he was approached by government officials for consultation, thus indicating that his observations and contributions were valued and taken seriously by his *interlocuteurs*. He also served as a direct channel of communication between official government representatives, for example between U.S. State department officials and Dutch Foreign Minister Luns. Clearly, the private realm of transatlantic diplomacy, including the Bilderberg meetings, as well as Van der Beugel's individual unofficial activities did not function in isolation from formal diplomacy, but was neatly woven into the web of formal diplomatic structures; they fed and complimented each other.

Meanwhile, in the Netherlands Van der Beugel also actively tried to influence Dutch politics as a private citizen. He did so from behind the scenes, for example in his attempt to influence the policies of the Dutch Labor Party with regards to the MLF, but also in public like when he mobilized Dutch influentials into a pressure group by means of an open letter published in numerous newspapers in an attempt to fortify the Atlanticist position of Foreign Minister Luns vis-à-vis the Dutch parliament where Monnet's ideas found more support – an act that eventually also reverberated in formal diplomacy.

By 1966 new dangers started to manifest themselves on the Western horizon, which Van der Beugel regarded as even more acute threats to the Atlantic Community than the Gaullist challenge. While the years following the 1963 Brussels breakdown had demonstrated that there was a consensus among the great majority of Bilderberg participants about the fundamental value of transatlantic relations that had proven strong enough to resist de Gaulle's deviation from this consensus to "weather the Gaullist driven storms of the mid-1960s"¹⁴⁰, Van der Beugel started to ring the alarm in the Bilderberg Steering Committee in August 1966 stating that the basic assumptions of "practically every participant in the Bilderberg conferences" – like "the need for European integration", "the need for a maximum cohesion in the Atlantic world" and the "need for a strong defensive posture towards the Eastern Bloc" – were no longer shared by disturbingly large parts of the populations in the West. "I consider the Gaullist deviation as much less dangerous than the complete ignorance of and indifference to our basic assumptions in the minds and hearts of a substantial part of the population in our part of the world," he warned. Consequently, the following chapter will focus on Van der Beugel's private activities in response to this new challenge in the light of the changing transatlantic landscape during the second half of the 1960's and the early 1970s.

¹⁴⁰ Weisbrode, "The State Department's Bureau of European Affairs in the 1970s", 194.

6. Defense, Détente and the “Average Man”

This chapter will continue the analysis of Ernst van der Beugel’s diplomatic role and his *modus operandi* from the perspective of New Diplomatic History in the context of the challenge to a strong Atlantic defense posed by the coalescence of détente and the democratization of foreign affairs during the late 1960’s and early 1970s. While the previous chapter predominantly focused on Van der Beugel’s relations with the Atlantic elite and foreign policy establishments on both sides of the Atlantic, this chapter will pay more attention to Ernst van der Beugel’s private activities in the context of Atlantic public diplomacy and psychological warfare. While public diplomacy has traditionally been interpreted as “a state-based instrument used by foreign ministries and other government agencies to engage and persuade foreign publics for the purpose of influencing their governments”, scholars in international relations as well as in diplomatic and communication studies are increasingly studying the role of non-state actors in public diplomacy. As a result, “public diplomacy has come to mean an instrument used by states, associations of states, and some sub-state and non-state actors to understand cultures, attitudes, and behavior; build and manage relationships; and influence thoughts and mobilize actions to advance their interests and values.”¹

Moreover, in today’s “complex world of transnational relations” a more holistic understanding of public diplomacy also breaks down the rigid separation between outreach to domestic and foreign publics in creating a conducive context for more concrete diplomatic goals.² Melissen argues that public diplomacy can thus be seen as “a metaphor for the democratization of diplomacy” as it has not only brought diplomats to the forefront, “making them more visible than they have ever been”, but its development has also “been instrumental in opening up the traditionally closed domain of accredited practitioners.”³ When we apply this more inclusive frame to our analysis of Ernst van der Beugel’s transatlantic activities, it becomes clear that Van der Beugel, as a transnational actor, already engaged in this kind of unofficial public diplomacy during the 1960s and 1970s – indeed, during a key period in the democratization of foreign policy. At the same time, this chapter will demonstrate how these public diplomacy activities were part of a bigger continuous effort to contribute to the management of the transatlantic relationship through both public channels and diplomatic elite circuits.

¹ Bruce Gregory, “American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation”, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 6:3/4 (2011): 353.

² Jan Melissen, “Beyond the New Public Diplomacy”, *Clingendael Paper No. 3*, (The Hague: Netherlands Institute for International Relations ‘Clingendael’, 2011): 3, 19-20.

³ *Ibid*, 2.

Détente and the Soviet threat

Western cooperation, according to Ernst van der Beugel, was most of all a child of the Cold War conceived by the combined elements of the perceived Soviet threat and American hegemony, which he understood in terms of 'accepted' and 'acceptable' leadership. To a lesser extent he believed it was also born out of the post-war realization that certain problems – especially in the economic and security realms – could no longer be solved within the limited framework of the nation state.⁴ During the course of the 1960's Van der Beugel observed how all three of these elements became subject to erosion, thus creating new threats to Atlantic cohesion and consequently to the security of the West. As Van der Beugel put it in February 1968:

There is no field, whether political or economic or monetary in which things do not drift apart. Priorities in the U.S., by necessity of the circumstances have the tendency to change; Western Europe is in a complete mess; (...) and we talk about detente without knowing what detente is exactly about and what consequences we should draw from it. In other words, while the situation is screaming for a maximum cohesion of the West in practically every field, things have the tendency to fall apart.⁵

By 1966 Ernst van der Beugel had pretty much consolidated the set-up of his freestyle career in trans-Atlantic affairs. In January 1966 he defended his dissertation "From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership: European integration as a Concern of American Foreign Policy" at the Netherlands School of Economics in Rotterdam. The book was published by Elsevier with a foreword by his close friend and rising star Henry Kissinger. Subsequently, in October 1966 Van der Beugel was appointed as Professor of Post-War Western Cooperation at Leiden University – a position made possible by an endowment from the Leiden University Fund. While many of his other activities were more elusive to the public eye – as they took place behind the scenes in boardrooms and through back channels – Ernst van der Beugel's role as professor gave him a clear position and a renewed kind of status as an expert. In this new capacity, Van der Beugel started to play a more prominent role in the public debate. As Jérôme Heldring had already pointed out in his 1963 column suggesting Van der Beugel should take the task of private transatlantic public diplomacy upon himself, public opinion mattered a great deal in international relations. This observation only grew in relevance during the course of the 1960's when foreign policy increasingly became a subject of Dutch public debate. As had been the case with the Gaullist challenge, international relations could not be separated from domestic developments in public opinion and policy making, thus rousing Ernst van der Beugel into action on the domestic as well as on the international front.

⁴ See: "De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking - Voordracht gehouden op het Congres ter gelegenheid van het 100-jarig bestaan van de Hogere Krijgsschool op 19 november 1968", box "Lezingen EvdB", AHB; "Verslag van het Congres 'Afschrikking en Ontspanning'", *Internationale Spectator*, 23:1 (1969): 37.

⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to Dr. Fabio Luca Cavazza, 2 February 1968, file 7, EvdB.

Consequently, this chapter focuses on Ernst van der Beugel's analysis of the changing transatlantic landscape during the late 1960's and early 1970's and his subsequent efforts in pursuit of Atlantic cohesion with an emphasis on the legitimization of close Atlantic cooperation and a strong defense effort in the face of détente and the breakdown of the Cold War consensus.

While the first 10-15 years of the Atlantic alliance had been characterized by a sense of clarity undergirded by a basic consensus about the Soviet threat which led to a general recognition of the necessity to arm and defend the West, the alliance entered a twilight zone in the course of the 1960's as tensions in the relationship between East and West started to diminish and the consensus about the character of the Soviet threat broke down.⁶ The cautious rapprochement between East and West that began during the early 1960's started to gain a more concrete form towards the end of the decade as demonstrated by NATO's adoption of the Harmel Report in December 1967, which extended the organization's mission in response to the changing Cold War framework. Next to its original job "to maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity to deter aggression and other forms of pressure and to defend the territory of member countries if aggression should occur" NATO would now also "pursue the search for progress towards a more stable relationship in which underlying issues can be solved."⁷ Thus, as Geir Lundestad has pointed out, the report not only ratified the process of détente but also gave NATO an important role in the process.⁸ Half a year later, in July 1968, a Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed by the U.S. and the Soviet Union as well as some other nations. In 1969 détente entered a new phase. With Richard Nixon in the White House and Willy Brandt pursuing *Ostpolitik* in West-Germany, the process was further formalized and ushered into the 'era of negotiations'.⁹ Moreover, 1969 was also the year in which the Soviet Union realized its goal of reaching strategic parity with the United States, making it a "turning point in the history of the Cold War" according to Cold War historian John Lewis Gaddis.¹⁰

At the 1967 Bilderberg conference in Cambridge, England Foreign minister Joseph Luns had asked Ernst van der Beugel to serve as a Dutch rapporteur for the NATO study on the future of the alliance that eventually led to the Harmel report – a request Van der Beugel seriously considered. He was briefed on the subject by the Dutch Permanent NATO Representative Han Boon and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and discussed the option with the American Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Eugene V. Rostow and the U.S.

⁶ "Defensie-Inspanning Zinvol", De Reserve-officier (1967), file 47, EvdB, NAH; "Prof. Van der Beugel: Westen in periode van schemering", NRC, 12 August 1968.

⁷ Qtd. In: Geir Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945: From "Empire" by Invitation to Transatlantic Drift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 131.

⁸ Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945*, 131.

⁹ Duco Hellema, *Nederland en de jaren Zeventig* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2012), 120; Van der Beugel was not a fan of Ostpolitik. See: Van der Beugel/Kissinger TelCon 2-9-1971, Henry A. Kissinger Telephone Conversation Transcripts (TELCONS), Digital National Security Archive. "I disagree with him [(Healey)] on many things – he supports Ostpolitik now."

¹⁰ Qtd. In Hellema, *Nederland en de Jaren Zeventig*, 120.

Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council Harlan Cleveland. Both Americans supported Van der Beugel's appointment and were disappointed to find out shortly afterwards that the Dutchman had decided against accepting the position.¹¹ The reason was "purely a matter of time" Van der Beugel explained. He considered the study as very important, but his commitments for the next three months were such that he could not give it the absolute priority that it deserved.¹²

Ernst van der Beugel remained indeed very concerned about the future of NATO, which he avidly tried to support through his private efforts. During the second half of the 1960's, he carved out a place for himself as a public intellectual by sharing his increasingly disquieting observations of "disintegrating factors" within the Atlantic Community through a rich collection of speeches and articles. The evolving process of détente played a major role in these observations. To Van der Beugel's consternation, détente caused many in the West to think that the Soviet threat had diminished and that the Cold War was over. Many believed, according to Van der Beugel "that the interpretation of the external threat has either been wrong or that it has been outdated, that the existence of the two blocs stands in the way of a peaceful solution in the world and especially in Europe; that ideological differences are irrelevant for political relations; that, consequently, the dissolution of the two blocks would mean a positive contribution for the attainment of peace; that the dissolution of the blocks would mean that Western Europe should free itself from the hegemonic position of the United States and that maintaining and à fortiori strengthening NATO is a step back to an angry and irrelevant past." In fact, between this view and the other "extreme" point of view which stated "that nothing has changed and that what was relevant in 1947 is still as relevant today" Van der Beugel observed "tens of thousands of opinions and publications, which testify more or less to the dissatisfaction with the status quo."¹³

The consensus that once existed about the Soviet threat had clearly broken down and the great variety of interpretations of détente obfuscated the need for close transatlantic unity as well as the need for a robust Atlantic defense. Since Van der Beugel considered the "external threat as one of the most important impulses of the process of Western cooperation" it logically followed that "a change in the evaluation of that threat would imply a weakening" of this cooperation.¹⁴ This development greatly worried Ernst van der Beugel,

¹¹ E. H. van der Beugel to Eugene V. Rostow, 10 April 1967, file 7, EvdB; E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 10 april 1967, file 7, EvdB; Harlan Cleveland to E. H. van der Beugel, 17 April 1967, file 7, EvdB.

¹² E. H. van der Beugel to Eugene V. Rostow, 10 April 1967, file 7, EvdB: "I consider this study as very important which implies that people who take a responsibility upon them should do so in the certainty that they can give absolute priority not only in time but also in their minds. My commitments for the next three months are such that this priority-requirement could not be met."

¹³ Van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen in de Westelijke samenwerking" (translation mine).

¹⁴ See also: E.H. van der Beugel, "Stadium Generale 13 oktober 1967", box "Lezingen EvdB", AHB: "Wat de S.U. vraagt (Karlsbad Conferentie) is ontbinding van de NATO, verdwijnen van de V.S. en permanente discriminatie tegen West-Duitsland. Het stelt daar niets tegenover. See also: Van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen in de Westelijke samenwerking" (translation mine): "Het is duidelijk dat wij, voor zover wij aanvaarden dat de Westelijke samenwerking voor een belangrijk deel een functie is van de Koude Oorlog, wij hier te maken hebben met een

who did not believe that détente reflected any actual changes in the aims and motives of the Soviet Union. Instead, he belonged to the skeptics who, as Max Kohnstamm phrased it, doubted “whether anything has really changed except the girl’s make-up and our way of looking at her.”¹⁵

The enduring malicious objectives of the Soviet Union had been openly reaffirmed in the final communiqué of the April 1967 Conference of the communist Parties in Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia, Van der Beugel argued. These included the dismantling of NATO, the removal of the American presence from the European continent and the permanent discrimination against the Federal Republic of Germany.¹⁶ In addition to this line of conduct, which had not changed since 1945, he added the Russian desire to completely dominate the Soviet imperium and – when given the opportunity – to expand it.¹⁷ Developments like the non-proliferation treaty or agreements about nuclear testing were not in conflict with these objectives, but fitted perfectly within the narrow interpretation of détente as “the simple desire to avoid a nuclear conflict”, which also happened to be the definition Van der Beugel preferred to use.¹⁸ “Essentially, détente is not more and not less than the will of the superpowers to avoid a military confrontation”¹⁹, he maintained. While Van der Beugel hoped that the dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union on the above mentioned issues would continue, it should never obfuscate the underlying objectives of the Soviet Union, which remained unchanged: “What has not changed is that we still live in a world which is partly dominated by the rivalry of the two systems. East is East and West is West and in the foreseeable future the punishment for forgetting this will be severe.”²⁰

According to Ernst van der Beugel, the easing of East-West tensions was the result of the strength and cohesion that the West had shown after the Second World War. Now, the Atlantic alliance was in danger of becoming a victim of its own success.²¹ After all, a reduction in the strength and cohesion of the West in response to détente would destroy the very instruments that had brought about this change in the first place and would enable the Soviet Union to increase its influence and to bring the nations of Western Europe into a form of subordination through which it could strengthen its position vis-à-vis the only other relevant power in the world: the United States. This would not necessarily have to be a military

verschijnsel - het gebrek aan consensus over de Oost-West verhouding - dat het proces van Westelijke samenwerking verzwakt of althans de natuurlijke groei en evolutie daarvan vertraagt en bedreigt.”

¹⁵ “Max Kohnstamm’s Summary of Discussion Which Took Place at the Bilderberg Conference in Cambridge, England - April 2, 1967”, Box 76, file 4, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

¹⁶ Van der Beugel, “De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking” (translation mine).

¹⁷ “Speech Prof. Dr. van der Beugel at the dinner celebrating the 20th anniversary of the American Association of the Netherlands Hilton Hotel”, Amsterdam, 21 November 1974, box “Lezingen EvdB”, AHB: “The S.U. has an unbroken imperialistic tradition and it has a perfectly good conscience about being imperial”.

¹⁸ Van der Beugel, “De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking.”

¹⁹ “Changes in the Western World”, Speech by E.H. van der Beugel for the meeting of the *Conseil de Surveillance* of the *Société Financière Européenne* on October 22nd, 1974, Scrapbook XIV, AHB. p.19.

²⁰ Ibid; Van der Beugel, “De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking.”

²¹ E.H. van der Beugel, “Introduction at the Atlantic Symposium in Greenwich”, October 3, 1967, box “Lezingen EvdB”, AHB.

subordination according to Van der Beugel; it could just as well be political in nature leading to the 'finlandization' of Europe.²² Either way, it would be supported by an enormous military power, which was only increasing in strength.²³ The only thing that had kept the Soviet Union from extending its domination over Western Europe was that it had been kept in check by a strong opposing power. If that counter-power would diminish the communists would immediately make use of this situation since, as Van der Beugel perceived the situation through his realist spectacles, "The Russians are simply practicing a politics of immediately filling up any power vacuum [that might occur]."²⁴

While Ernst van der Beugel consistently stressed the importance of power relations and often described the Atlantic Community as a security community in his speeches and publications, he believed it was a mistake to disregard the importance of value systems and ideology in this context. Power politics void of ideological considerations were senseless, he claimed. Jérôme Heldring, with whom Van der Beugel usually found himself in agreement, did not share this conviction. In January 1968, this difference of view led to a rhetorical dispute between the two men that ended up on the pages of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*. "Why are you and I afraid of a power vacuum being filled up by the Soviet Union? Not just because of the strictly theoretical reason that every power should be kept in check by a countervailing power?" Van der Beugel asked Heldring while following up with his own answer to the question:

We are seriously concerned about such a development because the power vacuum in which we in Europe would live would be filled, not by a theoretical power but by the power of the Soviet Union, which advocates a form of society in which neither you nor I would wish to live, nor could live. To consider this as a secondary reason that ought to be subordinated by the pure theory that a power should be kept in check by a countervailing power is unrealistic and narrow-minded, and what will appeal more to you, factually incorrect.²⁵

Western Europe needed to cooperate closely with the United States because it belonged to the same community of values; a civilization that was being threatened by the power of the Soviet Union that desired to impose a system of values under which Van der Beugel did not desire to live.²⁶ "Individual freedom", Van der Beugel argued in multiple speeches, "is not a

²² Ernst van der Beugel often used this term coined by Richard Löwenthal, which was a popular term among the Dutch foreign policy elite at the time. See: A. van Staden, *Een trouwe bondgenoot: Nederland en het Atlantische bondgenootschap 1960-1971* (Baarn: In den Toren, 1974), 43.

²³ Van der Beugel, "Stadium Generale".

²⁴ "Defensie-Inspanning Zinvol": "Die vrede was er slechts doordat de USSR een sterke macht tegenover zich wist. Zou die macht verminderen, dan - en dit is mijn stellige overtuiging, zo benadrukte prof. Van der Beugel - zou de tegenpartij er ogenblikkelijk gebruik van maken. De Russen voeren nu eenmaal een politiek van het dadelijk opvullen van een machtsvacuüm" (translation mine).

²⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to Jérôme Heldring, 16 January 1968, file 7, EvdB (translation mine).

²⁶ E.H. van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking", "Verslag van het Congres 'Afschrikking en Ontspanning'", *Internationale Spectator*, 23:1 (1969): "Het gebruik van macht of het opbouwen van

marginal phenomenon. It is fundamental. A system that pursues individual freedom – and that is what happens in the countries of the Western system – often shows many weaknesses, flaws and shortcomings, but it demonstrates to be so clearly superior to a system that denies these freedoms that an obfuscation or even a denial of these differences must invoke the judgment of a lack of integrity.”²⁷ While Van der Beugel believed the threat of a full-out nuclear war had faded, he was convinced that the political threat of falling prey to the domination of a reprehensible political system had not faded a bit and was still to be feared – a conviction he tried to convey to whomever would listen. “I realize,” he acknowledged, “that this point of view is often classified as Cold War-orthodoxy carried by our trauma of the 1930’s and inspired by an outdated view of the power relations in the world or the intentions of those with respect to whom we have built up that strength. I do not want there to be any misunderstanding about the fact that I belong to that orthodoxy and that I would see a weakening of that strength or the creation of unclear situations as a calamity that would either bring the war closer or disturb the balance of power and at the very least it would expose us in Europe to the political pressure of the Soviet Union.”²⁸ Consequently, Van der Beugel argued that “European security is for the time being still bound to maintaining the structure, organization and power of the Western World.”²⁹ In this, Van der Beugel believed that American leadership and a continued American presence on the European continent played a central role. The American role and presence in Europe, however, had also become subject to erosion.

A Decline in Accepted and Acceptable American Leadership

American leadership in the Atlantic Community was a two way street according to Van der Beugel: not only should it be accepted by the receiving party (the Europeans), it also had to be embraced by the party exercising power (the Americans). During the course of the 1960’s, Van der Beugel observed how both European acceptance of American leadership and the American desire to assert leadership on the European continent were deteriorating. The Vietnam War played a key role in this process. “However one thinks about the American engagement in Vietnam – and in many of those thoughts I am often struck by the frightful lack of nuance in those judgments – one thing is certain, namely that Vietnam has sucked away both the material and mental sources of other objects of its foreign policy, and particularly from the process of Western cooperation,”³⁰ Van der Beugel observed. “Nobody can deny that the intense preoccupation with Europe by the United States has been substituted by its commitment to the war in Vietnam. I belong to those who support in

kracht in de Westelijke wereld van heden heeft onder meer tot doel het handhaven en verdedigen van een bepaalde maatschappijvorm. Spaak noemde het zelfs – en naar mijn mening terecht – een beschaving.”

²⁷ Van der Beugel, “Changes in the Western World”, 19.

²⁸ “Verslag van het Congres ‘Afschrikking en Ontspanning’”, 40 (translation mine).

²⁹ Van der Beugel, “Stadium Generale” (translation mine).

³⁰ Van der Beugel, “De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking” (translation mine).

general America's role in that area because I feel that the outcome of this struggle is as much in our interest as in that of our American friends. We all are committed to America's prestige because it is the position and prestige of the only relevant power in the free world of which we are a part."³¹ Van der Beugel acknowledged however that American prestige was also greatly undermined by the Vietnam War, which served as a key catalyst for criticism of the United States in Western Europe.³²

To make matters worse, the Vietnam War coincided with the manifestation of immense problems in American society itself, especially with regards to issues of race and poverty; "the discovery that an unbearable tension can develop between the blessings of the system and the neglect of gaping wounds"³³ as Van der Beugel put it, which further amplified a shift in American priorities away from Europe. "If we add to this a general fatigue with regards to carrying global responsibilities, an endangered balance of payments and an increasing estrangement of those groups who helped to design and carry out America's post-war politics, it is no wonder that [America's] hegemonic position (...) has been seriously weakened, not in terms of power, but in terms of accepted and acceptable leadership"³⁴, Van der Beugel concluded. Europeans were less eager to accept American leadership and Americans were less inclined to provide it. While the U.S. was struggling with domestic unrest, a balance of payments problem and the War in Vietnam, Western Europe had grown stronger economically and increasingly Americans started to wonder why Europeans could not pick up more of the burden of their own defense.³⁵

The Atlantic Elite and the 'Average Man'

Meanwhile, the Atlantic elite tried to come to grips with this shifting trans-Atlantic landscape. At the 1967 Bilderberg meeting in Cambridge, England the question was explored whether the basic concepts of Atlantic cooperation remained valid for the evolving world situation. "What should the Atlantic Alliance be – if there should be an Atlantic Alliance; in an era of détente – if there is any détente?" In these words Max Kohnstamm rephrased the central question in an attempt to sum up the conclusions of the debate following papers by the German journalist Theo Sommer and the renowned Harvard professor of international relations Stanley Hoffman. As it turned out, the participants of the conference had trouble getting beyond defining the "evolving world situation" in the first place. No agreement could

³¹ "Relations Between Europe and the United States", *Knickerbocker International*, April 1967.

³² Rimko van der Maar, *Welterusten Meneer de President: Nederland en de Vietnamoorlog 1965-1973* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2007) 203.

³³ Van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking" (translation mine).

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ See for example: J. Hoffenaar and B. Schoenmaker, *Met de blik naar het Oosten: de Koninklijke Landmacht 1945-1990* (The Hague: Historical Section of the Royal Netherlands Army, 1994), 257; A. van Staden, *Een Trouwe Bondgenoot: Nederland en het Atlantisch Bondgenootschap 1960-1971* (Baarn: In Den Toren, 1974), 164-166; Lundestad, *The United States and Western Europe since 1945*, 194-195. This request even translated into congressional resolutions to reduce the number of American troops in Europe, the most dramatic of which were the so-called Mansfield amendments, named after Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield, who repeatedly put such resolutions forward from 1966 onwards.

be reached about the nature of the context in which the Atlantic alliance was operating: "We differ as to how this détente should be defined and where it is leading to", Max Kohnstamm observed. There was disagreement about the objectives of the alliance and he perceived "a considerable amount of disagreement concerning our means" as well as about "the emphasis that should be placed on national action on the one hand and alliance action on the other in the use of military and political forces." There was also divergence of opinion on the non-proliferation treaty and about the exact nature of the Soviet threat.³⁶ As Lord Shawcross wrote to Ernst van der Beugel afterwards, the conference brought home "the force of some of the disharmonies and the differences of objective which exist in the Atlantic alliance" making it "all the more obvious how much we ought to work to overcome some of the differences which exist and to find a sensible *modus vivendi* for the future."³⁷

Ernst van der Beugel could not agree more. He was very worried about the fragmentation of views that also manifested itself at the conference and during the following decade the Bilderberg Meetings served as a central forum where the Atlantic elite tried to come to grips with the evolving world situation. The Ford Foundation also saw an important role for Bilderberg in this context; in a way as a private substitute to make up for the lack of attention given to Europe by the American government. In 1968, the foundation decided to approve a \$50,000 grant to cover Bilderberg expenses during the following three years stating that "given the present state of tension in European-American relations, contacts of this kind should be cultivated" especially in the context of "European concerns that U.S. Government policy is not giving sufficient attention to Europe (on account of our involvement in Asia)."³⁸

On Van der Beugel's instigation the debate on "the relations between the West and the Communist countries" was continued at the 1968 Bilderberg conference in Mont Tremblant, Canada.³⁹ This time, "in appraising the shortcomings and imperfections of the Atlantic Alliance, considerable attention was paid to the unsatisfactory state of public opinion vis-a-vis NATO." During the discussion "various speakers stressed the importance of taking action to win the support of the public for the Western alliance."⁴⁰ While the debate in Mont Tremblant had again exposed a division of views on the evolving Cold War context, a certain consensus about the fundamental importance of the Atlantic alliance could still be detected among Bilderberg participants. What worried Van der Beugel most was that this consensus no longer reflected general trends among the public at large: the Atlantic elite had run out of sync with the general public in the countries represented at the Bilderberg conferences. Consequently, in finding a sensible *modus vivendi* for the future trying to foster mutual understanding among the elite did no longer suffice.

³⁶ "Max Kohnstamm's Summary of Discussion".

³⁷ Lord Shawcross to Ernst H. van der Beugel, 5 May 1967, file 7, EvdB.

³⁸ "Grant Request No. ID-118, General Program of the Bilderberg Conference Group Supplement No.3", April 17, 1968, Grant Files, Bilderberg, 56-340, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

³⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to Steering Committee, 9 November, 1967, box 76, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁴⁰ Bilderberg Meetings Mont Tremblant Conference Booklet, 26-28 April 1968, Series 7, box 53:30, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

Already in August 1966, Ernst van der Beugel had rung the alarm bells within the Bilderberg Steering Committee concerning the “widening gap between the views (...) of the leading elites of our countries whose members still hold most of the vital posts in the Western world on the one hand, and, on the other, the great mass of people, and most especially the young”. In the past, Van der Beugel argued, “practically everybody in a position of influence in the Western World and practically every participant in the Bilderberg conferences agreed on a few basic assumptions” among which were the “need for a maximum of cohesion in the Atlantic world” and the “need for a strong defensive posture towards the Eastern Bloc”. Even more important, according to Van der Beugel, was the fact that “in agreeing to these basic assumptions the Bilderberg participants represented the main current of political thought in their respective countries”. Now that this was no longer the case, “the necessity for a strong and cohesive Atlantic world and for the strongest possible ties between the United States and Europe” was “in danger of becoming the credo of a very small group which is essentially the establishment of 1952 not that of 1966 and certainly not that of the seventies.”⁴¹

In this context, Van der Beugel was especially worried about “the complete ignorance of and indifference to our basic assumptions in the minds and hearts of such a substantial segment of the population in our part of the world,” which he considered to be very “dangerous”.⁴² After accepting an invitation as an “independent speaker” by NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) General Goodpaster, in May 1970 to give a critical speech on “the Preservation of an Effective Alliance in the 1970s” to the NATO leadership at SHAPEX, Van der Beugel identified this as the key challenge to the future of the alliance.⁴³ “The time is over that foreign and military policy was formulated and executed by a small elite”, he declared. “The average person in our countries is more than ever important in relation to NATO.” He did not even try to hide his elitist disdain of these developments as he admitted to “have a certain nostalgia” for the period when the elite did not have to pay attention to the masses stating that he was “not overly enthusiastic about all the political, military and strategic theories of protestant clergyman, marrying priests, new leftist sociologists, leaders of student movements, television commentators and even some members of parliament.” Even so, they were no longer to be ignored: “we must admit that they want to be more involved in the process of decision making in foreign policy and its military consequence than formerly,” he acknowledged. “Therefore the perspective of the average person of NATO becomes more important.”⁴⁴

The ensuing situation created a major challenge for the Atlantic alliance: while the Americans were demanding an increase in the European defense contribution – and rightly so according to Van der Beugel – public opinion seemed to be moving in the opposite

⁴¹ E.H. van der Beugel to the Members of the Steering Committee of Bilderberg, August 1966, file 7, EvdB.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ A.J. Goodpaster to E.H. van der Beugel, January 15, 1970, Scrapbook XI, AHB. SHAPEX is the annual SACEUR conference.

⁴⁴ E.H. van der Beugel, “NATO and the Average Man”, speech, May 14, 1970, file 47, EvdB.

direction.⁴⁵ Increasingly, raising the defense budget was going to be a hard sell in most European countries. According to Van der Beugel, it was particularly difficult to mobilize a consensus behind NATO because the average person, notwithstanding all available information, was “confused” about the organization. This confusion was a result of developments like détente, nuclear parity and the diminishing role of American leadership in Europe, but also of the subsequent change in NATO’s military strategy from the black and white simplicity of “massive retaliation” to the more complex strategy of “flexible response”, which was harder to explain to the general public. For more than a decade it had been “hammered” into the minds of European citizens that conventional forces were practically irrelevant for NATO, and now they “suddenly had to accept that conventional forces were not only meaningful but vital for the flexible response strategy and that there was no longer a nuclear superiority of the United States.”⁴⁶ This message had not come across yet and to change this Ernst van der Beugel emphasized the importance of making sure “that the thesis that substantial conventional forces are a condition *sine qua non* for stability and peace in this part of the world” be translated into the “language of the average man.” This was crucial Van der Beugel emphasized “because in our modern times we need the understanding and the consent of broad groups of average people to implement policies of this nature.” For a large part, this was a matter of ‘education’. Van der Beugel was very critical of the way in which the public had been informed, especially by the news media, but he believed that this could still be corrected. “There are fortunately even now on both sides of the Ocean majorities which, if properly informed, would still be in support of the basic political assumptions from which NATO was born”, he claimed. “But important and vocal groups have dropped out of the consensus.”⁴⁷ Consequently, he considered “bringing back, at least the serious fragment of those groups, to the view that Western cooperation is not a relic of a bygone era” as essential for the perseverance of the Atlantic Community.⁴⁸

An important segment of these groups consisted of a new generation that had grown up after the Second World War. Their falling out could partly be explained by the development of a generation gap – a challenge in itself that the next chapter will focus on in more detail. But, Van der Beugel argued, “this is not only a matter of generations – the so – called generation gap. The change is more profound. Increasingly no clear distinction can be drawn between domestic and foreign policy and when there are rather fundamental changes in our domestic political and social structures they must have a serious impact on the Western system and the foreign policy of the countries in the West. (...) I think that for the survival of the Western system – of our kind of society – it is essential that we will do everything to restore a certain

⁴⁵ For an in depth study on individuals and groups questioning the legitimacy of the armed forces and security and defense policy in the Netherlands during the Cold War see: Coreline Boot, *Het leger onder vuur: De Koninklijke Landmacht en haar critici 1945-1989* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2015).

⁴⁶ Van der Beugel, “NATO and the Average Man”.

⁴⁷ Ibid. (Emphasis mine).

⁴⁸ Van der Beugel, “De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking” (translation mine).

consensus about our relations with the Communist world.”⁴⁹ In the context of Atlantic security, Van der Beugel believed it was the task of the “very small well informed group of military personnel and diplomats” to convince the masses about the necessity of a strong defense contribution.⁵⁰ He believed this was first and foremost a task for the national governments.⁵¹ In the Netherlands, however, he found that the national government was not pro-active enough in this field. Consequently, it was in this perceived void that Ernst van der Beugel stepped forward.

In doing so, Van der Beugel certainly was not the only or the first private actor taking up a role in transatlantic public diplomacy. As Valérie Aubourg has pointed out, the development of NATO’s Information Service (NATIS) was intertwined with the organic grass-root development of Atlantic NGO’s, which led to a complementary role in transatlantic diplomacy. While NATO’s member governments had a clear perception of the importance of public opinion, NATIS had been faced with strong limitations from the start. Government representatives had no intention of giving up their national prerogatives in the field of information policy and NATO did not want to come across as aggressive. A too belligerent public diplomacy campaign was regarded as particularly counterproductive as it might actually start to reek of communist-like propaganda, damaging its credibility in the West.⁵² In contrast, private support from transatlantic civil society emphasized a view of the alliance as a “defensive cooperation between free, democratic states.” Most important, however, was the fact that NATO relied on private actors “as opinion framers to spread out its message much more efficiently than through official propaganda.”⁵³ Thus, from early on NATO outsourced part of its public diplomacy to private proxies as NATIS deliberately cooperated with non-state actors to spread a better understanding of NATO, its aims and necessity, thus including them “among recognized actors in transatlantic public diplomacy.”⁵⁴ As Aubourg put it: “governments and official institutions were of course essential [in promoting the Atlantic alliance], but so were middle-level elites – including public intellectuals, the media, and non-

⁴⁹ Van der Beugel, “Changes in the Western World”.

⁵⁰ “Prof. Van der Beugel: ‘Overtuig de massa van noodzaak sterke defensie’”, *Trouw*, 1 October, 1970, 4.

⁵¹ See: E.H. van der Beugel and M. Kohnstamm “Western Europe and America in the Seventies” (Paper for the Bilderberg Meeting in Knokke, 21-23 April 1972), Series 7-53:61, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL: “It nevertheless remains very important that NATO’s military role and its implications should be explained in a way understandable to the average citizen. This is not primarily a task for NATO, but for national governments – and here the record of performance is a bad one. This is a serious weakness because defence efforts are by definition not the most wildly acclaimed functions of government. In the long run no meaningful defence effort can be maintained without a broad basis of popular understanding.”

⁵² Valérie Aubourg, “Creating the Texture of the Atlantic community. The NATO Information Service, private Atlantic networks and the Atlantic Community in the 1950s,” in *European Community, Atlantic Community?* ed. Valérie Aubourg, Gerard Bossuat and Giles Scott-Smith (Paris: Soleb 2008), 392, 394, 407.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 408.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 410; A similar pattern can be seen in the context of NATO’s attitude towards psychological warfare in the 1960s. See for example: Giles Scott-Smith, “Not a NATO responsibility? Psychological warfare, the Berlin Crisis and the formation of Interdoc”, in *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges Beyond Deterrence in the 1960s*, eds. Anna Locher and Christian Nuenlist (London: Routledge, 2006), 31-49; Giles Scott-Smith, *Western anti-Communism and the Interdoc Network: Cold War Internationale* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).

governmental organizations for example – who captured the fleeting ideas about the Atlantic Community and acted as a transmission belt to the larger public.”⁵⁵

The Dutch Scene: Nieuw Links, the PvdA and the Vietnam Letter

Also in the Netherlands Van der Beugel's views were running out of vogue during the late 1960s as voices more critical of the status quo and especially of the *establishment* – to which Van der Beugel clearly belonged – were gaining strength and the broad post-war consensus underlying Dutch defense and security policy started to erode. The War in Vietnam (which was formally supported by the Dutch government), NATO, the arms race and the overall compliant attitude of the Dutch government towards the United States all became subject of social debate and criticism. “Current fashion”, Van der Beugel observed in 1967, “is characterized by long hair, short skirts and anti-Americanism.”⁵⁶

Cracks in the post-war foreign policy and security consensus also became visible within the Dutch Labor Party.⁵⁷ While the PvdA had traditionally been supportive of the Atlantic alliance, in 1966 a radical group of reformists that came to be known as *Nieuw Links* (New Left) came to the fore within the party. To Van der Beugel's chagrin, the rise of *Nieuw Links* led to a more vocal opposition to ‘Cold War dogmas’ accompanied, among other things, with pleas for a ‘critical NATO-membership’ and a decrease of the defense budget.⁵⁸ In an attempt to do away with the Cold War mentality, members of *Nieuw Links* wanted to replace the preoccupation with the East-West divide by more attention for the North-South divide and a greater role for the Netherlands in the Third World. Van der Beugel, who still regarded Europe as a key theatre in a military and ideological stand-off between East and West, regarded this as a dangerous development, arguing that the punishment of such a shift of attention would be “severe”.⁵⁹

In the spring of 1966 criticism regarding America's Vietnam policy appeared so popular that the PvdA party leadership was tempted to see it as a means to gain votes in its campaign for the provincial elections. Hence, on May 2, PvdA chair Sjeng Tans publicly delivered a critical letter on America's Vietnam policy to the U.S. ambassador to the Netherlands, William

⁵⁵ Aubourg, “Creating the Texture of the Atlantic community”, 391.

⁵⁶ “Defensie-Inspanning Zinvol” (translation mine): “De Verenigde Staten vormen nog steeds de enige krachtbron die relevant is voor onze verhoudingen. Dat is mijn eerlijke mening en door die te uiten - dat realiseer ik me - onttrek ik mij aan de mode. De huidige mode wordt namelijk gekarakteriseerd door lange haren, korte rokken en anti-Amerikanisme.”; “Prof. V.d. Beugel over Atlantische crisis”, *Utrechts Nieuwsblad*, 1 December 1966; For the Netherlands and the Vietnam War see: Rimko van der Maar, *Welterusten mijnheer de president* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2007).

⁵⁷ For an in depth study of the security policy debate within the PvdA during this period see: Frank Zuijdam, *Tussen wens en werkelijkheid: Het debat over vrede en veiligheid binnen de PvdA in de periode 1958-1977* (Amsterdam: Aksant, 2001).

⁵⁸ Frank Zuijdam, “Dutch Left-Wing Political Parties and NATO” in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, eds. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis van Minnen, Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 655; Zuijdam, *Tussen wens en werkelijkheid*, 193; Hellema, *Nederland en de Jaren Zeventig*, 66.

⁵⁹ See: Zuijdam, *Tussen wens en werkelijkheid*, 138, 148, 156-157; Van der Beugel, “De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking.”

Tyler. In the letter, which received a great deal of attention in the Dutch media, the PvdA leadership informed the American government that Dutch public opinion was growing increasingly disturbed by the enduring war in Vietnam and subsequently requested the Americans to stop their bombing campaign in Vietnam in order “to restore the shaken faith in the purposes of American politics.”⁶⁰

Ernst Van der Beugel strongly disagreed with this rather blunt and undiplomatic move by his own party. Together with three other prominent PvdA party members of the older generation – Frans Goedhart, Marinus van der Goes van Naters and Lou de Jong⁶¹ – he composed a critical response to the Vietnam letter which was published in two prominent Dutch Newspapers: *Het Parool* and *Het Vrije Volk*. In their response, the four critics accused the party leadership of defiling the international political-psychological climate and of playing into the hands of the communists by exercising “pacifist capitulation politics”. They furthermore warned the party leadership that it “should in no way cooperate with those who try to put pressure on America to ensure that the people in Vietnam will be left to their fate in their fight against the communists.” Instead, all the horrors of the Vietnam War should be seen as the responsibility of the instigators, “namely the communists in Hanoi, Peking and Moscow.”⁶² According to the writers, those who realized that resistance against communism “ought to be exercised with strength” were deeply disappointed and it was now up to the party leadership to do everything in its power to regain the trust of this group. During the course of 1967, however, it became increasingly clear that individuals like Ernst van der Beugel, represented a minority in the PvdA and the party leadership proved to be more interested in accommodating *Nieuw Links* than regaining the favor of the angry old guard.⁶³

In October 1966 Van der Beugel vented his remaining frustrations about the Vietnam letter in an opinion article in *Het Parool* and the PvdA journal *Socialisme en Democratie*. He now requested a clarification from the party leadership with regard to the letter on Vietnam and added the matter of the letter’s timing, namely weeks before the provincial elections, to his earlier voiced concerns while accusing the party leadership of jeopardizing Dutch relations with the Americans merely for the sake of domestic political purposes; in other words: to gain votes. Van der Beugel furthermore defended the United States as Holland’s greatest ally, reminding his readers of America’s benevolent role in and following the Second World War and as defender of the Free World in the Cold War. While this did not mean that the Dutch or the PvdA should accept America’s policy in Vietnam at face value, without any room for criticism, it did mean, Van der Beugel explained, that the way in which the United States

⁶⁰ Qtd. in: van der Maar, *Welterusten mijnheer de president*, 60 (translation mine).

⁶¹ Frans Goedhart served as a PvdA representative in the Second Chamber at the time. For an in depth study of Frans Goedhart see: Madelon de Keizer, *Frans Goedhart, een biografie. Journalist en Politicus, 1904-1990* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2012). Marinus van der Goes van Naters was a former SDAP and PvdA party leader (1945-1951) who served as a representative in both the Dutch (1937-1967) and the European (1958-1967) parliaments. Lou de Jong was a renowned Dutch historian specialized in the Second World War. For an in depth study on Lou de Jong see: Boudewijn Smits, *Lou de Jong, 1914-2005* (Boom: Amsterdam, 2014).

⁶² E.H. van der Beugel et al., “PvdA en Vietnam”, *Het Vrije Volk*, 16 June 1966, p. 9.

⁶³ Zuijdam, *Tussen Wens en werkelijkheid*, 178.

would solve this problem was an issue in which the Dutch people including PvdA members – as free people – were intimately involved. “However one thinks about the question whether Vietnam is the ideal place to commit so much American might and prestige, today we have to deal with the fact that this commitment is there and that an American defeat or humiliation is not tolerable – also not for us – because it would seriously impair the position of the only source of power in the Western World.” In the rest of the article, Van der Beugel went on to defend the American position and – again – suggested a communist plot. “Nowhere has the communist propaganda worked so effective and so subtle as in the case of the Vietnam-issue, not even in their attempts to systematically fuel fears of Germany”⁶⁴, he argued.

The PvdA’s international secretary Piet Dankert replied to Van der Beugel’s complaints on behalf of the party leadership in the same issue of *Socialisme en Democratie*. The party leadership’s letter to the American ambassador was not so much about the goals as it was about the methods of the Vietnam War, he explained. On the latter subject, however, Van der Beugel *et al* had been awfully silent. While arguing for an informed debate about a complex issue they had made themselves guilty of simplistic rhetoric that totally defied any such complexities, Dankert argued, while he, in turn, compared the style of the initial publication by the four critics of the Vietnam letter to the rhetoric used in communist propaganda. Dankert ended his piece by clarifying that the party leadership’s letter should first and foremost be understood as an expression of sympathy with those in the United States who strive towards a reasonable compromise that meets the need for order, rest and peace of great segments of the people of South-Vietnam.⁶⁵

In April 1967, Van der Beugel signed a petition of the *Reaktiecomité Vietnam*, a group of pro-America demonstrators set up by students from Rotterdam. In an effort to counter the anti-Vietnam War protesters, the group organized a demonstration during which they delivered a letter of support for America’s Vietnam policy to the American Ambassador and a petition of a similar nature to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Lou de Jong and Van der Goes van Naters were also among the signatories of the letter showing support for the Americans in Vietnam.⁶⁶ In November 1967, *Nieuw Links* won seven seats in the PvdA party council. After talks with the PvdA leadership in late 1967, in which they had shown no interest in countering the ‘anti-American’ forces unleashed within the party by *Nieuw Links*, Van der Beugel decided to terminate his PvdA membership in December 1967. He did so silently and never became a member of another political party again.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ E.H. van der Beugel, “De PvdA en Vietnam”, *Het Parool*, 15 October 1966, p.2.

⁶⁵ P. Dankert, “Vietnam, de brief van 2 mei en de links en rechts verontruste partijgenoten”, *Socialisme en Democratie* 23:10 (1966) 745-751.

⁶⁶ “Vluggesprek met prof. Dr. Ernst H. van der Beugel”, Scrapbook IX, AHB; “Demonstreren vóór VS in Vietnam,” *Nieuwe Leidsche Courant*, 12 april 1967, p.13.

⁶⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to W. Drees, 11 december 1967, file 7, EvdB; EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p 240.

The Dutch Defense Debate

During most of the 1960's, the Dutch defense contribution had decreased as a percentage of the Dutch GDP. While in 1962 the Netherlands dedicated 5,1 percent of its gross national income to its defense, this number had declined to 3,8 percent by 1970.⁶⁸ Van der Beugel not only believed that this budgetary trend had to be turned around in order to meet the NATO requirements, but was also convinced that the Dutch armed forces needed to be reformed so as to become more efficient. Both issues were highly controversial. In response to Van der Beugel's SHAPEX speech on 'NATO and the Average Man', professor Jaap Kymmell had written to him that "in essence, we can only arouse public interest in and appreciation for NATO and for the defense effort if we make the people afraid; afraid of the departure of the Americans and afraid of the dependence on the Russians. More information about the alliance, strategic conceptions, nuclear weapons, etc. essentially will not help."⁶⁹ While the Soviet threat and the dangers of an American retreat from the European continent were certainly central recurring themes in Van der Beugel's repertoire as a public intellectual, it was another Dutchman who, in the summer of 1970, succeeded to ignite a real national debate on the future of the Dutch defense by drawing upon some of the country's worst fears.

In June 1970, Lou de Jong, at the time the most renowned Dutch historian of the Second World War, delivered a speech titled "The Crisis of Our Defense" to an audience of former World War II political prisoners in the old Dutch city of Delft in which he drew direct parallels between the deplorable state of the Dutch military during the run-up to the Second World War and the current situation. History, de Jong argued, was repeating itself.⁷⁰ De Jong, who was one of the PvdA members who had joined Ernst van der Beugel in his protest against the party's Vietnam letter to the American ambassador, not only noticed a lack of public support for the Dutch armed forces, but also argued that the military itself was not trained nor equipped well enough to quickly repel a possible attack from the Warschaupact countries.⁷¹ With regards to the Dutch transatlantic commitments he also warned that:

⁶⁸ Theo de Jong, "Veertien Wijze mannen lichten defensie door", *Algemeen Dagblad*, 29 September 1971: "Vaststaat dat het percentage van het nationaal inkomen dat aan de defensie wordt besteed, de afgelopen jaren steeds verder gezakt is. In 1962 werd 5,1 procent aan de defensie uitgegeven: in 1963 4,8; 1965 4,3; 1966 4,1; 1967 4,2, 1968 4,0; 1969 3,9 en in 1970 3,8 procent. Dat niettemin het bedrag aan geld steeds stijgt, wordt verklaard door het feit dat het nationaal inkomen relatief snel groeit." For a more detailed description of the state of the Dutch defense during this period see: Jan Hoffenaar and Ben Schoenmaker, *Met de blik naar het Oosten*, 241-273.

⁶⁹ Prof. Dr. J. Kymmell to E.H. van der Beugel, 15 June 1970, file 9, EvdB: "in wezen kunnen wij de publieke belangstelling en waardering voor de NATO en voor de defensie alleen opwekken indien wij de mensen bang maken. Bang voor het vertrek van de Amerikanen en bang voor de afhankelijkheid van de Russen. Meer informatie over het bondgenootschap, strategische concepties, atoomwapens, etc. zullen in wezen niet helpen." Jaap Kymmell had served under Van der Beugel at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs before he became Van der Beugel's dissertation advisor in the early 1960's

⁷⁰ L. de Jong, "De crisis van onze defensie", *Militaire Spectator* 139 (1970), 402-407.

⁷¹ H.P.M. Kreemers, "De oorlog tussen de Generaals: Het conflict in de top van de Koninklijke Landmacht, 1971-1973", *Militaire Spectator* 176 (2007): 378-389.

A situation threatens to arise in which our Army (I will just have to limit myself to that now) because of a lack of means – through obsolete armaments, through worn-out vehicles, though insufficient training, is simply incapable of performing the defensive task which it has to carry out in the framework of the alliance.⁷²

As Jan Willem Honig has pointed out, de Jong's speech "for the first time effectively drew the attention of a wide audience to the fact that all was not well with Holland's defense." Thus, Honig argued, "it can be said that de Jong sparked off a national debate that was to drag on for several years. For the first time it seemed possible that forces outside the defense establishment would have a voice in defense reform."⁷³ The speech indeed received a great deal of attention in Dutch media. Responses varied from astonishment to disbelief. While Foreign Affairs minister Joseph Luns and Defense minister Willem den Toon welcomed the speech, Joop den Uyl, the faction leader of the PvdA of which Lou de Jong was still a member, responded annoyed, saying de Jong had been fooled by the military establishment.⁷⁴ This, in turn, inspired Ernst van der Beugel to write an angry letter in response to den Uyl in which he accused the PvdA leader of trying to appease "a completely impossible stream within the party", which would only lead to an "increasingly irresponsible radicalization of the party."⁷⁵ Den Uyl, in turn, replied by saying that he believed that de Jong's warning in fact undermined the defensibility of the West. He was convinced that the comparison with the 1930's was flawed and that the argumentation that raising the defense budget would solve the problem "played into the hands of the most conventional and conservative approach to the defense-problem." According to Den Uyl, the worst enemies of the West were those, who – as a result of repeatedly renewed escalations of violence – have come to identify the West with violence.⁷⁶

Lou de Jong had also sent a copy of his speech to Ernst van der Beugel, who was – not surprisingly – quite jubilant about it, and even called de Jong's fear mongering speech 'well-balanced': "I do not have to tell you how much I applaud the fact that you have spoken these words. It is a good, important and well-balanced narrative. I agree with everything in it and I am thankful that you, an individual who naturally receives much publicity, have delivered this speech at this congress,"⁷⁷ he wrote. De Jong in turn, believed that van der Beugel's SHAPEX speech should be published for a broader audience.⁷⁸ In the debate that unfolded, Ernst van der Beugel stepped forward as one of the main public proponents of a strong defense effort. He was not only active on the public front, but also used his connections behind the scenes to

⁷² De Jong, qtd in: J.W. Honig, *Defense Policy in the North Atlantic Alliance: The Case of the Netherlands* (Westport: Praeger, 1993), 90.

⁷³ Honig, *Defense Policy in the North Atlantic Alliance*, 90.

⁷⁴ H.P.M. Kreemers, "Hete Hangijzers: De aanschaf van Nederlandse Gevechtsvliegtuigen" (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2009), 105.

⁷⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M. den Uyl, 16 June 1970, file 9, EvdB.

⁷⁶ J.M. den Uyl to E.H. van der Beugel, 17 June 1970, file 9, EvdB.

⁷⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to L. de Jong, 15 June, 1970, file 9, EvdB.

⁷⁸ L. de Jong to EvdB, 19 June 1970, file 9, EvdB.

pursue his goal of a strong Atlantic defense. Since Richard Nixon's inauguration as President in January 1969, Ernst van der Beugel also had a very intimate friend in the White House.

A Friend in the White House

It was not a given that Henry Kissinger, who was a close friend and associate of Nelson Rockefeller, would end up in the Nixon White House. In the summer of 1968, after Nelson Rockefeller – “the only man who could have restored America's position abroad and unified the country” according to Kissinger – had been defeated by Nixon in his attempt to win the Republican nomination, Kissinger was not sure what to do. “The Nixon people have offered me a job, but I cannot hop from candidate to candidate”, he told Van der Beugel. “In any event”, he added, “I detest Nixon.”⁷⁹

Richard Nixon's appointment of Henry Kissinger as his National Security Advisor provided Ernst van der Beugel with a direct line to the White House. In the course of the 1960's the relationship between Van der Beugel and Kissinger had developed into a very intimate friendship that remained strong when Kissinger moved into the highest echelons of power, a reality to which their correspondence as well as the White House telephone conversation record testify.⁸⁰

While Kissinger and Van der Beugel had first met when Kissinger was still a little known up-and-coming Harvard intellectual and Van der Beugel served as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands, now the tables were more than turned. “From time to time it is difficult to realize that you and I still belong to the same human species and the only thing I can say is that I still feel very safe with you in the spot of chief political astronaut”, Van der Beugel wrote to Kissinger in the Spring of 1969. “At the same time even imagining that we can remain in the usual contact is absolute nonsense. That will come after you return to a less demanding life. Demanding it will always be.”⁸¹ Over the course of Kissinger's career at the White House, Van der Beugel was very touched and impressed by the fact that in reality little changed in their personal contact and that Kissinger “did not show any signs of a too strong influence by the power that he exercised.” Van der Beugel expressed a great appreciation for the exceptional loyalty Kissinger displayed in his friendship and the extraordinary desire for contact with old friends who had no direct interest in the work that he now exercised.⁸² While Van der Beugel probably meant to include himself in the category of those who had no direct interest in Kissinger's work, in practice this was not entirely the case. While these interests certainly did not serve as the foundation of their friendship, their relationship also proved to be a diplomatic asset. As it turned out, the character of diplomacy and the centrality of personal relationships in this line of work have a tendency to blur the lines

⁷⁹ Henry A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, 14 August 1968, HAK.

⁸⁰ See: Kissinger Telephone Conversation Transcripts, National Security Archive.

⁸¹ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 25 April 1969, file 8, EvdB.

⁸² E.H. van der Beugel to J.H. van Roijen, 26 July 1971, file 45, J.H. van Roijen archive, NAH (translation mine).

between the personal and the professional and the changing circumstances did not stop Kissinger and Van der Beugel from calling upon each other for assistance with international diplomatic or political situations.

Kissinger frequently solicited Van der Beugel's views on the evolving world situation and in particular on developments in Europe and valued his friend's judgement. "I have always gained confidence in crises of decision by asking myself how Ernst would respond to them", he wrote while looking back on their relationship in 1980.⁸³ In the fall of 1969, Kissinger asked Van der Beugel whether he knew if there was any particular reason why the Nixon White House did not have the same intimate contacts with the Monnet Committee as the previous administrations had had. Van der Beugel subsequently contacted Max Kohnstamm about this matter and instigated him to contact Kissinger, thus facilitating the re-establishment of contact between the White House and the Monnet Committee on Kissinger's request.⁸⁴

When in early 1969 Richard Nixon kicked off his presidency with a trip to Western Europe visiting Germany, France, England, Italy and Belgium, but not the Netherlands, he ran into some diplomatic trouble with the Dutch prompting Kissinger to call Van der Beugel for advice on how to respond. According to the telephone conversation transcript, Kissinger said Van der Beugel's "friend, the Foreign Minister is very agitated that we are going to Brussels and not to The Hague." Kissinger explained to Van der Beugel that they were going to Brussels because of the international organizations and that they would be happy to invite Foreign Minister Luns and Prime Minister de Jong to call on the President in Brussels but that they did not want to do this "if this creates bad feelings – beneath their dignity, etc." Van der Beugel told Kissinger he thought it was the right decision to visit the countries on the president's itinerary and that he believed that with regards to the idea to invite Luns to Brussels, the view of the American ambassador to The Hague Bill Tyler was important, adding that "if FM and PM go to Brussels it should be made clear that the meeting will take place in Brussels because of above reason but will not be distinct from other meeting."⁸⁵

It is unclear whether Van der Beugel contacted Luns about the matter, although it is likely they discussed it. Luns did not let himself be appeased and chose to interpret the matter "as a slight for a close and loyal ally" that came right after he had "risked considerable damage in the Netherlands by backing the U.S. effort in Vietnam."⁸⁶ In an attempt to make amends, President Nixon subsequently invited Luns and Prime Minister Piet de Jong to the

⁸³ See also: H.A. Kissinger in "Book on Ernst", 1980, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL. "I have always gained confidence in crises of decision by asking myself how Ernst would respond to them."

⁸⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Max Kohnstamm, 30 September 1969, file 8, EvdB; M. Kohnstamm to H.A. Kissinger, October 9, 1969, file 9, EvdB: Kohnstamm explained to Kissinger that "there is absolutely nothing which keeps us from our habitual visits to Washington but the feeling that we must clarify the position in Europe first" and that they had centered all their attention on "the British thing" in the meantime.

⁸⁵ Kissinger Van der Beugel/Kissinger TelCon, February 6, 1969, 9:40 A.M. "The Kissinger Telephone Conversations", Digital National Security Archive.

⁸⁶ Giles Scott-Smith and David J. Snyder, "'A Test of Sentiments': Civil Aviation, Alliance Politics and the KLM Challenge in Dutch-American Relations," *Diplomatic History* 37:5 (2013): 937.

White House, making them the first Western-European leaders to officially visit Nixon there.⁸⁷ Luns, however, was not yet satisfied. As Giles Scott-Smith has pointed out: "The message from The Hague was that the Dutchmen must return home after the meeting with some form of concrete policy concession."⁸⁸ Topping the Dutch wish list were a nuclear submarine and landing rights for KLM at Chicago's O'Hare airport. The possibility of negotiations about a Dutch nuclear submarine, however, proved soon unrealistic since this ran into strong opposition from the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Agency, thus bringing the focus back to KLM.

During the preceding decade Luns had raised the landing rights issue with the Americans at practically every single opportunity he got and it was probably at least partly due to his tenacity that in September 1968 a new round of informal talks on KLM landing rights had been initiated. Even so, these had not led to any concrete results. Luns was aware, however, that there was a strong "feeling of guilt" at the State Department concerning the strain on transatlantic relations as a result of Dutch dissatisfaction with the ongoing landing rights negotiations, which he had tried to use to the advantage of the Dutch.⁸⁹ After all, as Van der Beugel explained in a letter to Kissinger several years earlier there had been a "constant stream of assurances by top Administration people, that the thing would be settled. On numerous occasions Mr. Herter and Mr. Dillon and their staff have assured our Foreign Minister and other people from our government that it was much better not to bring the thing into the open because things were practically in the bag." In the end, however, the State Department had never been able to actually deliver. Consequently, there was a "definite feeling in the Netherlands Government that we have been treated badly."⁹⁰ It was this sense of guilt on the American side that Luns now used to tap into even further. As a result, a new window of opportunity was cracking open through which the friendship between Ernst van der Beugel and Henry Kissinger eventually "set the context in which a successful agreement could be reached."⁹¹

The issue of KLM-landing rights never really stopped to occupy Ernst van der Beugel. Next to the fact that he believed American policy was unfair to small countries like the Netherlands it greatly bothered him that this issue – which was of no great significance to the Americans who otherwise spent billions of dollars to "make themselves popular" – was creating an atmosphere of anti-Americanism in the Netherlands that "could not be described

⁸⁷ "Exchange of remarks between the President and Prime Minister de Jong and Foreign Minister Luns of the Netherlands", May 28, 1969, box 933, NSC Files, NPL.

⁸⁸ Giles Scott-Smith, "Ghosts in the Machine? Ernst van der Beugel, the Transatlantic elite, and the 'New' Diplomatic History," accessed December 5, 2016, <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19602>.

⁸⁹ Already in 1960 Luns wrote to Ernst van der Beugel "In Washington heb ik, zoals je inmiddels waarschijnlijk hebt gehoord, de KLM-zaak met klem bij Dillon e.a. voorgebracht en er is nog een kans dat ik de President te zien krijg. Of het veel zal helpen? Er is ontegenzeggelijk op het State Department een gevoel van schuld, doch, althans op dit moment, brengt ons dit niet verder." J.M.A.H. Luns to E.H. van der Beugel, 21 September 1960, file 297, J.M.A.H. Luns archive, NAH.

⁹⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, December 23, 1960, HAK.

⁹¹ Scott-Smith, "Ghosts in the Machine".

by any pen.”⁹² At different occasions he had tried to use his network to build sympathy for the Dutch case in the United States. In March 1960, for example, when the negotiations for landing rights in Los Angeles came to a deadlock for the second time, Van der Beugel wrote a long letter to George Ball, whom he had acquainted at his first Bilderberg Meeting in 1959, in which he described the history of Dutch-American landing rights negotiations and the Dutch role as a faithful ally to the United States from 1945 up to that moment as well as the way in which the matter was hurting transatlantic relations:

(...) the recent decision of the American Government makes it painfully clear to the people of Holland that all their efforts, also on behalf of the North Atlantic co-operation, are only measured against the geographical size of their country, which has little military or political influence. This lack of appreciation for the work and character of the Dutch nation, who rightly regard KLM as a major component of the national economy, has given rise to intense public resentment, disappointment and coolness towards the United States. Without exception the Dutch Press has criticized the attitude of the U.S. Government in biting editorials and derisive cartoons, wondering how it is possible that in the field of civil aviation the American point of view should be completely incompatible with the spirit of free enterprise and fair competition, so widely advocated by them!⁹³

George Ball, however, believed it would be “improper” to get involved in the controversy since his law firm served as the general counsel for Pan American World Airways and one of Ball’s partners at the law firm – Henry Friendly – was in fact the Vice President of Pan Am, one of KLMs biggest adversaries in its struggle for U.S. landing rights.⁹⁴ On the 5th of January 1961, roughly two weeks before he assumed office as Secretary of State, Van der Beugel also made sure to bring the matter to the attention of Dean Rusk.⁹⁵ In addition, as mentioned before, Van der Beugel also repeatedly vented his frustrations about the landing rights matter in his correspondence with Henry Kissinger.⁹⁶ In fact, he did not only make sure that Kissinger was well informed about the landing rights issue, but also acquainted him with the airline itself: “through Van der Beugel, Kissinger gradually became drawn into the world of KLM.”⁹⁷ To illustrate, when Van der Beugel was president of KLM, he organized a big annual KLM-dinner for “the great and the good” in the Netherlands to which he invited Henry Kissinger three years in a row as the guest speaker and made sure the table arrangements were as favorable for Kissinger as possible. In 1962, for example, Van der Beugel arranged that he got seated

⁹² E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 15 September 1960, file 297, J.M.A.H. Luns archive, NAH.

⁹³ E.H. van der Beugel to G.W. Ball, 28 March 1960, box 61, folder 17, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

⁹⁴ G.W. Ball to E.H. van der Beugel, 28 April 1960, box 96, folder 8, George W. Ball Papers, PUL. This was in fact the second time van der Beugel approached Ball about this issue. The first time was in 1959, after they had just met for the first time at the Bilderberg Meeting when Ball had already explained his law firm’s close ties with PanAm. See: G.W. Ball to E.H. van der Beugel, 28 July 1959, box 102, folder 5, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

⁹⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 23 December 1960, HAK.

⁹⁶ See for example: E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 28 March 1960, HAK; E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 23 December 1960, HAK; E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 3 August 1961, HAK.

⁹⁷ Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

next to Crown Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands.⁹⁸ Meanwhile, Van der Beugel ensured that Kissinger could cross the Atlantic comfortably with KLM, “all expenses paid”.⁹⁹ Next to the KLM-events, Van der Beugel organized meetings with the “top people dealing with military and foreign policy” in the Netherlands.¹⁰⁰ Kissinger, who was still an up and coming academic at the time, was very thankful for these occasions which enabled him to get acquainted with the Dutch elite.¹⁰¹

Thus, when in 1969 KLM landing rights negotiations again appeared on the radar, Kissinger was no stranger to this matter. As Scott-Smith and Snyder have demonstrated in their 2013 Diplomatic History article “‘A Test of Sentiments’: Civil Aviation, Alliance Politics, and the KLM Challenge in Dutch-American Relations”, he even took a personal interest in their progress by staying on top of the matter from start to finish, informing his colleagues at the State Department that he “would especially appreciate being informed should the negotiations run into difficulty.”¹⁰² What is more, based on the documentary record Scott-Smith and Snyder argue that Kissinger “was able to shift the way in which the issue would be treated.”¹⁰³ While in April 1969 it still appeared that the Americans would have to deny the Dutch their desired landing rights, by May 20 Helmut Sonnenfeldt reported to Kissinger that the State Department, while still internally divided, now recommended laying “the groundwork for a satisfactory negotiated outcome.”¹⁰⁴

What happened in between? Scott-Smith suggests that Kissinger personally laid the groundwork for a favorable outcome by making it possible for the President to intervene directly in the decision-making process of the landing rights negotiations. In fact, in early March it was reported that President Nixon was “supporting stronger State Department direction of international air transport activities...to permit a tighter application of foreign policy considerations.”¹⁰⁵ After all, due to its small territory and the fact that the Americans already had access to the few airports that existed in the Netherlands, the Dutch only had foreign policy considerations to bargain with. On May 23, Nixon was advised that, “considering long-standing support for U.S. objectives on Vietnam, nuclear proliferation, and trade and monetary policy, ‘this visit should build renewed Dutch confidence in the United States.’”¹⁰⁶ When Luns and de Jong subsequently visited the White House on May 27, the Dutchmen were able to reach an agreement with the Americans in principle “to settle their longstanding request for additional landing rights for KLM in Chicago”, with the “technical

⁹⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 14 June 1962, HAK.

⁹⁹ Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹⁰⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 14 May 1962, HAK.

¹⁰¹ H.A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, 26 May 1961, HAK; H.A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, 26 April 1961, HAK; Kissinger in interview with the author, 4 January 2012.

¹⁰² Qtd in: Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹⁰³ Scott-Smith and Snyder, “‘A Test of Sentiments’”, 939.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 937.

¹⁰⁵ Qtd. In Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹⁰⁶ Scott-Smith and Snyder, ‘A Test of Sentiments’, 937.

details” to be worked out in Washington in July.”¹⁰⁷ Afterwards, Van der Beugel wrote the following note to Kissinger, thanking him for his help in the process:

I can hardly tell you how excellently everything has worked. It has been a repair job of the highest order and the impact on American-Dutch relations could not be better. It will please you to know that both of them [Luns and de Jong] fully realized how very important the role has been which you have played in the arrangement and the substance of the visit. I repeat, it could not have been better.¹⁰⁸

To follow up on the White House meeting and to work out the further details of the deal, the American Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs Peter Flanigan subsequently visited the Netherlands for preparatory talks on the Chicago deal. In this context, Ernst van der Beugel again served as an “informal link-man” by contacting Secretary of State for Transportation M.J. Keyzer to make sure there were no remaining obstacles, something Kissinger greatly appreciated.¹⁰⁹ Van der Beugel made sure to also keep Luns in the loop during this process.¹¹⁰

In July, Kissinger asked Van der Beugel to meet with Peter Flanigan in the Netherlands who wanted to consult Van der Beugel in the context of an assignment he was given by President Nixon, namely to organize a study into American aviation politics as a foundation for possible reforms. During his meeting with Van der Beugel, Flanigan told the Dutchman that “Long before [Kissinger] had accepted his position in the White House, [Van der Beugel] had continuously reminded him that U.S. aviation policy created difficulties with other countries, which were unjustifiable if one considered these interests in the context of relations with these countries as a whole.”¹¹¹ Ernst van der Beugel, subsequently wrote a memorandum for Flanigan with his ideas on possible reforms. Before he did so, however, he secretly approached Deputy Minister of Transportation M.J. Keyzer and proposed to turn his memorandum into a “joint effort” through cooperation with the Ministry of Transportation and KLM.¹¹² He also consulted H.A. Wassenbergh and G. van der Wal of KLM, whose remarks he subsequently included in his final report to Flanigan.¹¹³

¹⁰⁷ “Memorandum for the President by Elliot L. Richardson”, 27 May 1969, box 933, NSC Files: VIP Visits, NPL; Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹⁰⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 5 June 1969, file 8, EvdB.

¹⁰⁹ H.A. Kissinger to E.H. van der Beugel, 21 July 1969, file 8, EvdB; Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹¹⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.A.H. Luns, 22 September 1969, file 8, EvdB, NAH.

¹¹¹ E.H. van der Beugel to G. van der Wal, 1 September, 1969, file 8, EvdB; Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹¹² E.H. van der Beugel to M.J. Keyzer, 8 August 1969, file 9, EvdB.

¹¹³ E.H. van der Beugel to P.M. Flanigan (Assistant tot the President), 19 September 1969, file 9, EvdB; E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Wassenbergh, 22 September 1969, file 9, EvdB: “Hartelijk dank voor de opmerkingen, die U hebt gemaakt naar aanleiding van mijn eerste concept. Ik heb ze vrijwel allemaal overgenomen en de brief is nu aan de heer Flanigan verzonden”; G. van der Wal to E.H. van der Beugel, 10 September 1969, file 9, EvdB, NAH: “Het spreekt natuurlijk vanzelf dat naar buiten nooit iets zal mogen blijken van enige medewerking van de KLM of van Dr. Wassenbergh.”

In the end, Scott-Smith concludes that while “the State Department’s advice to Nixon to take the opportunity to quell a major irritant in Dutch-American relations probably had more weight (...) there is no doubt that the Kissinger – Van der Beugel relation was a constant factor in the background.”¹¹⁴ Scott-Smith’s case study supports Van der Beugel’s own account of the matter in his oral history. When asked whether he had ever used his close friendship with Henry Kissinger to gain any results on policy matters, Van der Beugel answered by saying: “no, I don’t remember anymore...I have one example (...) KLM got Chicago because I arranged that through Henry.”¹¹⁵ As this chapter will demonstrate, however, this was not the only time.

A Small Intervention that Could Make All the Difference

While Ernst van der Beugel tried to be selective in appealing to Kissinger with “official” requests, they certainly did occur. In the fall of 1970, a situation developed in the Netherlands that compelled Van der Beugel to approach his friend in the White House. “This is the first time in all our conversations during your official tenure that I ask your attention for an ‘official’ issue”, Van der Beugel wrote to Kissinger. “I do it because I think that in this country of mine it is of vital importance.” The ‘official issue’ concerned the Dutch defense budget and the Dutch contribution to NATO, which had become highly controversial; not only due to the speech by Lou de Jong about which Van der Beugel also informed Kissinger, but with elections coming up in the Spring of 1971, the Dutch debate had gained an extra sense of urgency: the next cabinet would have to make some very important decisions. In fact, according to Van der Beugel the defense question would be “one of the most difficult and delicate issues with which this and the next government is faced.”¹¹⁶

Van der Beugel explained to Kissinger that he believed the Dutch defense budget should be increased during the next cabinet period in terms of expenditure, percentage of the budget and in terms of percentage of the G.N.P. “in order to correct grave deficiencies, especially in the effectiveness of the army. Only in this way our contribution to NATO can be valid and meaningful,” he argued. While historians like Kim van der Wijngaart have pointed out that the De Jong cabinet in fact already manifested itself as a loyal ally in NATO, also with regards to the defense contribution, Van der Beugel expected a little more.¹¹⁷ “With a few excellent exceptions” he explained to Kissinger, the current Dutch government is “hesitant at best.” In this context, a small intervention by Kissinger, he believed, could make all the difference.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Scott-Smith, “Ghosts in the Machine”.

¹¹⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 891: “De KLM heeft Chicago gekregen omdat ik dat via Henry heb gedaan.”

¹¹⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 14 September 1970, box 697, folder 1 of 3, NSC Files, Country Files – Europe, Netherlands, NPL.

¹¹⁷ Kim van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder spanning: Nederlands-Amerikaanse betrekkingen, 1969-1976* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011), 70.

¹¹⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 14 September 1970, box 697, folder 1 of 3, NSC Files, Country Files – Europe, Netherlands, NPL.

On November 13, 1970 NATO Secretary General Manlio Brosio and SACEUR General Andy Goodpaster were scheduled to visit the Dutch cabinet to discuss the military and political situation. "Without any doubt the Dutch military contribution will also be discussed", Van der Beugel wrote to Kissinger, but "the danger of these meetings is always that they take place in an atmosphere of smoothness and 'senatorial courtesy'". During the upcoming visit such routines were to be avoided according to Van der Beugel, who asked Kissinger to "give a signal to Andy Goodpaster" to make sure that "the tone of the NATO representatives should be tough and worried, not only about the general situation but also about the specific Dutch contribution." Van der Beugel believed that this "could just change the balance between those who want to do something and those who want to let things drift."¹¹⁹

Ernst van der Beugel's letter did not go to Kissinger directly, but was processed by Kissinger's close associate Helmut Sonnenfeldt. Ernst der Beugel was no stranger to Sonnenfeldt. Shortly after his appointment as National Security Advisor, Kissinger had invited Van der Beugel to the White House where he introduced him to his staff, including Sonnenfeldt who soon became a close acquaintance of Van der Beugel.¹²⁰ Sonnenfeldt informed Kissinger about the content of Van der Beugel's letter saying that he believed the Dutchman's suggestion to urge Brosio and Goodpaster to make their visit "more than a mere formality and really express their concern" was "very good."¹²¹ Kissinger, in turn, did as Van der Beugel had requested. He had been briefed on the speech by Lou de Jong and watched the developments that Van der Beugel had described with concern. "It is, unfortunately, not unique to your country", he wrote to Van der Beugel in reply, "but I agree that if it can somehow be arrested there it would also have a beneficial effect elsewhere."¹²²

What this episode illustrates, is that Ernst van der Beugel had access to key members of the American foreign policy decision-making establishment – also under the Nixon Administration – and that he was taken seriously. While the above mentioned 'intervention' fitted perfectly within America's foreign policy framework, it appears that Kissinger would not have taken this specific action if Van der Beugel had not requested it. It does remain questionable, however, whether the Dutch government really needed to be pressured into caring more for its defense – whether it was really as 'weak' and 'hesitant' as Van der Beugel made it appear. As the Dutch historian Kim van der Wijngaart has pointed out, the De Jong government was in fact already convinced of the importance of transatlantic burden sharing and a strong defense posture and did not really need any further stimulation.¹²³

What remained unclear, however, was how the *next* Dutch government would respond to the changing atmosphere in society, which was reflected in some political parties – like the

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to U.S. Ambassador J.W. Middendorf II, 19 August 1968, file 8, EvdB.

¹²¹ Memorandum from Helmut Sonnenfeldt to Mr. Kissinger, 23 September 1970, box 697, NSC Files, Country Files – Europe / Netherlands Vol I 1969-1971 to Netherlands Vol. II 1972 [628-7730-347-5300], NPL.

¹²² Dr. H.A. Kissinger to Prof. E.H. van der Beugel, 11 November 1970, box 697, NSC Files, Country Files – Europe / Netherlands Vol I 1969-1971 to Netherlands Vol. II 1972 [628-7730-347-5300] NPL.

¹²³ Van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder spanning*, 77.

PvdA – by a more critical stance towards defense spending. Hence, as Van der Beugel had already anticipated, the fate of the Dutch defense and the country's contribution to NATO would for a large part depend on the next government. It was in this context, with the election campaigns in full swing, that Ernst Van der Beugel urged Henry Kissinger in the spring of 1971 to receive the up-and-coming leader of the Dutch Catholic People's Party (KVP) Norbert Schmelzer – a likely candidate to succeed Joseph Luns as Minister of Foreign Affairs – in the White House. While Schmelzer – who was offered a trip to the United States by the American embassy in The Hague – was a supporter of NATO who recognized the need for a strong defense posture, the KVP was actually pressing for a reduction of Dutch brigades from six to four. Schmelzer personally did not agree with this decision, but a little pressure from the White House to fortify his position vis-à-vis his party probably would not do any harm.¹²⁴ “Norbert is a very nice man, very clever in domestic politics, but he is innocent and inexperienced in the field of foreign policy”, Van der Beugel told Kissinger. “His concept of the world is that of the youth congress of the Young Christian Democrats in Nancy.” The latter was not meant as a compliment.¹²⁵ While Van der Beugel was very fond of Schmelzer, he was also a bit “worried about the possibility that he gets Foreign Affairs” since Schmelzer was more European than Atlanticist in his orientation and he believed that a chat with Kissinger was “extremely important for Schmelzer's education.”¹²⁶ The American ambassador to The Hague, John William Middendorf II, also recommended Kissinger to receive the up-and-coming KVP politician.

This was not Ernst van der Beugel's first attempt to familiarize Schmelzer with the Western foreign policy establishment. He had also made sure that he got introduced to the Atlantic elite by inviting him to the 1969 Bilderberg Conference. In addition, Van der Beugel had already introduced Schmelzer to Kissinger during one of the renowned dinners at his own home in The Hague, where he brought many members of the Dutch establishment in contact with prominent Americans and Europeans.¹²⁷

Upon his return from the United States, Schmelzer was enthusiastic about his meeting with Kissinger and sent Ernst van der Beugel an elaborate report on his American trip.¹²⁸ During the trip he had been reminded of the importance of conventional forces in a time of nuclear parity and the problems the Nixon Administration faced in explaining to Congress why

¹²⁴ Memorandum from Helmut Sonnenfeldt to Henry Kissinger, 2 March 1971, box 697, NSC Files, Country Files – Europe / Netherlands Vol I 1969-1971 to Netherlands Vol. II 1972 [628-7730-347-5300], NPL.

¹²⁵ Jérôme Heldring, “Dezer Dagen”, no date (probably Summer 1971), in: Scrapbook XI, AHB: “Een aanhanger van die andere traditie in de Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek heeft eens van Schmelzer gezegd dat zijn horizon die is van ‘een deelnemer aan het christen-democratische jongerencongres te Aken’, en dat was niet aardig bedoeld.”

¹²⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 19 March 1971, file 9, EvdB.

¹²⁷ J. William Middendorf II to E.H. van der Beugel, 23 September 1969, file 8, EvdB: “I want to thank you once again for the lovely dinner this past Saturday evening. It was most enjoyable, informative and very helpful to Dutch-United States relations.” (This referred to a dinner which EvdB organized for Helmut Sonnenfeldt).

¹²⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to W.K.N. Schmelzer, 29 maart 1971, file 9, EvdB. Kissinger was a recurrent guest at these dinners as were many influentials from the worlds of politics, journalism, academia, business and industry as well as royals like the Dutch Queen and Prince Bernhard. In this way van der Beugel in a sense facilitated a smaller, more intimate version of Bilderberg, or as Jérôme Heldring liked to describe it: “a salon”.

the U.S. had to spend more and more on conventional forces while the feeling prevailed in Congress that the European allies did not increase their efforts. Defense Secretary Laird had expressed his appreciation for the NATO policy of Joseph Luns as well as for the initiatives that the Dutch Defense Minister den Toom had taken as chair of the Eurogroup in December 1970. Schmelzer had also been warned by the Defense Secretary that the importance of the Dutch contribution to NATO should not be underestimated, especially since he was convinced that a decrease of the scope or quality of the Dutch defense-effort would have an irrevocable snowball-effect in Europe which would seriously weaken the position of the American government vis-à-vis the American Congress.¹²⁹ He understood the necessity of defense reforms in the Netherlands, but made it very clear to the up-and-coming politician that he believed that a reduction of Dutch brigades, as proposed by some of Schmelzer's fellow Catholic Party members, would be very difficult to digest for the American Congress.

The Biesheuvel Cabinet and the Committee of Civil and Military Experts

In July 1971, Norbert Schmelzer was appointed as Minister of Foreign Affairs in the newly established center-right Biesheuvel cabinet as Joseph Luns left this post – “after 17 years of tsardom”¹³⁰ – to become Secretary General of NATO, a position he would hold until 1984.

As expected, the matter of the Dutch defense turned out to be one of the more difficult issues during the lengthy cabinet formation that followed the elections of April 28, 1971. In the run-up to the elections, Van der Beugel – who was also well connected to the transatlantic security community – had been closely in touch with some top individuals of the Dutch department of Defense. In preparation of the debate on the military budget scheduled in October 1969, Deputy Minister of Defense Haex had handed Van der Beugel a memorandum justifying the desired defense budget prepared for the debate concerning the defense budget in the Second Chamber, which was scheduled later that month. In response to the memo and in preparation of the upcoming political debate, Van der Beugel told Haex he completely agreed with the document, but that the focus was too much on a military escalation. Instead, in order to justify the proposed defense budget he advised Haex to pay more attention to the dangers of a disruption of the power equilibrium in Europe *also* when that would happen without military means. “When you concentrate the possibility of a disturbance of the power balance too much on the purely military balance in a discussion with so many individuals who lack expertise”, Van der Beugel cautioned, “you always risk that they will dismiss the matter by saying that there will come no war anyway.” Consequently, Van der Beugel advised Haex to also remind his audience of the risk of finlandization.¹³¹

In April 1971 Van der Beugel informed some of his friends about a “memorandum dealing with the Dutch defense effort” for the cabinet *formateur* which he had drafted on

¹²⁹ W.K.N. Schmelzer, “Verslag van een bezoek aan Washington en New York van 1 t/m 5 maart 1971”, file 9, EvdB.

¹³⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to W.K.N. Schmelzer, 16 May 1973, file 9, EvdB.

¹³¹ E.H. van der Beugel to J.C.E. Haex, 10 October 1969, file 8, EvdB.

“request”. While Van der Beugel did not specify on whose request he drafted the memo he did mention that he had reached agreement on the memorandum with Deputy Minister Haex. He furthermore sent a copy of the document to his friend Frans Goedhart writing that he had better “destroy the document after reading.”¹³² It is not completely clear what happened with Van der Beugel’s memorandum. What is clear, however is that during that same month Defense Minister den Toom brought forward a white paper to aid the Cabinet formation concerning the defense effort, which was very much in line with Van der Beugel’s ideas.¹³³

During the lengthy cabinet formation following the elections of April 28, 1971, Minister den Toom’s white paper on the future of the Dutch defense, which pleaded for reforms and underlined the necessity of increasing the defense budget, eventually inspired the creation of a committee of civil and military experts to be established on 28 September, 1971 with the specific task to examine the Dutch defense obligations with regards to NATO and the financial means necessary to fulfill these obligations in the future.¹³⁴ Ernst van der Beugel was mentioned in Dutch newspapers as a likely candidate to chair the committee as an ‘authoritative civilian expert’, but he showed no interest in this position arguing he did not have the time required to lead the pack of experts.¹³⁵ In the end he gladly joined the committee as one of the civilian experts while KVP politician Karel van Rijckevorsel was appointed as chair. The committee counted fourteen ‘wise men’ including five experts from the Ministry of Defense, one from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and five members that were appointed by the main political parties, namely Karel van Rijckevorsel (KVP), Laurens Jan Brinkhorst (D66), Peter Kooijmans (ARP), Henk Neuman (KVP) en Wiebe Wierda (PvdA). The other four ‘civilian experts’ were J.P. van den Bent (CHU-member), Has Beyen (VVD-member), Frans Goedhart (DS’70) and Ernst van der Beugel, who was not formally affiliated with any political party anymore, making him ‘independent’.¹³⁶

132 E.H. van der Beugel to Prof. Dr. C.J.F. Böttcher, 29 March 1971, file 9, EvdB: “We telefoneerden gisteren even over de nota over de Defensie, waarvan ik je de voorgeschiedenis vertelde. Ik stuur je even mijn ontwerp, dat nu ongewijzigd is geaccepteerd en dat natuurlijk wel alleen voor jouw strikt persoonlijke informatie is. Ik ben alleen benieuwd wat je ervan vindt, omdat jij ook kan beoordelen hoe de manier moet zijn, waarop je een kabinetsformateur over dit soort problemen benadert; E.H. van der Beugel to F.J. Goedhart, 1 April 1971, file 9, EvdB, NAH: “Ik doe je hierbij strikt vertrouwelijk, werkelijk alleen voor jouw ogen, een stuk toekomen, dat ik op verzoek heb gemaakt en dat moet dienen aan de nieuwe kabinetsformateur ter hand te worden gesteld, met betrekking tot de Nederlandse defensie-inspanning. Ik bel je eens op om over beide dingen te praten, maar ik zou je wel willen vragen dit stuk na lezing maar weer te vernietigen.”; E.H. van der Beugel to B.J. Udink, no date (around same time), file 9, EvdB: “Je herinnert je ons telefoongesprek over de voorbereiding van de kabinetsformateur met betrekking tot de defensie-inspanning. Ik vertelde je, dat Joop Haex en ik over de tekst overeenstemming hadden bereikt. Die tekst stuur ik je nu hierbij toe en wij moeten er binnenkort over praten, of je het ermee eens bent en wat er verder mee kan gebeuren”.

¹³³ Kreemers, “De oorlog tussen de Generaals”, 378-389, 379.

¹³⁴ Van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder spanning*, 110; J. Hoffenaar and B. Schoenmaker, *Met de blik naar het Oosten*, 268.

¹³⁵ “Defensie wordt doorgelicht”, *De Volkskrant*, 6 September 1971; “Kabinet Worstelt met instelling Defensie-groep”, *Volkskrant*, 18 September 1971.

¹³⁶ Theo de Jong, “Veertien Wijze mannen lichten defensie door”, *Algemeen Dagblad*, 29 September 1971.

In her annual speech to Parliament reflecting the Cabinet's policy – *de Troonrede* – Queen Juliana remarked in September 1971 that the Dutch government hoped that the work of the Van Rijckevorsel Committee would help to foster public support for the Dutch defense effort so that it would be “carried by the conviction of our people.” As Theo de Jong noted in the Dutch daily *Algemeen Dagblad* “With this sentence the queen touches upon the key problem, because a substantial part of the Dutch people, and consequently of the political parties, is not yet convinced of the fact that more money for the armed forces should be put on the table.”¹³⁷ In fact, several opposition parties – including the PvdA – pleaded for a significant reduction of the defense budget.¹³⁸ After the goal of fostering public support for the Dutch defense effort through the Van Rijckevorsel Committee was also highlighted by prime-minister Biesheuvel, a journalist at the Dutch (left-wing) weekly magazine *Vrij Nederland* observed that “clearly, the armed forces need to be ‘sold’ [to the public] with nice slogans.”¹³⁹

The deliberations of the Van Rijckevorsel Committee were followed closely by the American embassy in The Hague, where Ambassador J. William Middendorf II maintained close contact with Ernst van der Beugel. After all, decisions on Dutch defense in the NATO context were directly tied to domestic pressures in the United States to reduce the American military presence on the European continent. In November 1971 Ernst van der Beugel tried to put the ambassador's “mind at rest” by informing him that “the group was becoming more and more convinced that it had to take a hard line as regards defense and he predicted that a significant majority would favor this when the Committee submitted its report on March 1.” Van der Beugel admitted, however, that it was still necessary to convince certain members of the Committee leading him to believe “that a favorable consensus report was probable, but that a unanimous report was probably not possible.”¹⁴⁰ Middendorf sent a memorandum of this conversation to Henry Kissinger, who had already been informed by Van der Beugel himself, who – among others – also kept Secretary General Joseph Luns and General Goodpaster at NATO in the loop.¹⁴¹

In January 1972, while the Van Rijckevorsel Committee was in the middle of its proceedings, Prime Minister Biesheuvel paid a low-key visit to the White House. In advance, Van der Beugel had offered his services to Biesheuvel, telling him that he was available for a chat prior to the trip, if Biesheuvel desired. In addition, Van der Beugel offered Biesheuvel to arrange a meeting with Henry Kissinger for him. “Naturally, this shall be prepared through official channels, but should it be certain that you go, then I would consider it of great importance that you have a quiet hour to talk with Kissinger alone”, Van der Beugel wrote, adding that “that is difficult to arrange via the official channels and I would gladly help you

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ “Commissie buigt zich over begroting”, *NRC*, 12 Augustus, 1971.

¹³⁹ Hans Smits, “Doorlichtingscommissie moet defensie verkopen”, *Vrij Nederland*, 6 November 1971.

¹⁴⁰ “Memorandum of Conversation between Ernst H. van der Beugel and Ambassador J. William Middendorf II”, November 29, 1971.” White House Central File – Countries, box 54, Folder CO108 Netherlands, NPL.

¹⁴¹ E.H. van der Beugel to A.J. Goodpaster, March 23, 1972, file 9, EvdB.

with this.”¹⁴² In January, Van der Beugel subsequently encouraged Kissinger to meet with Biesheuvel, arguing that a chat “would be extremely helpful.”¹⁴³ Why was Van der Beugel so keen to arrange this? Well, as Van der Beugel informed Kissinger, Biesheuvel was “reasonable, but not too strong on defense matters” and Van der Beugel once again hoped to use his connection with Kissinger to put pressure on the Dutch government to increase its defense effort. He specifically provided Kissinger with the following suggestions:

I think that the line you should take, should be rather tough, making it clear that U.S. military posture in NATO is not only linked to reasonable defense effort of European allies, but also dependent on economic climate, which enables the President to maintain his present NATO policy.¹⁴⁴

This time, however, Kissinger did not follow up on Van der Beugel’s suggestion. In fact, as Kim van der Wijngaart has pointed out, the Americans did quite the opposite: they gave the Dutch prime minister a compliment. President Nixon himself explicitly expressed his appreciation for the continuing Dutch support for the unity and strength of Western cooperation as well as for the Dutch defense contribution. Compared to some other allies, the Dutch role in this field was actually perceived as exemplary by the Americans.¹⁴⁵

After fifty-five full days of meetings spread out over six months during which the Van Rijckevorsel Committee studied the Dutch defense situation and heard many experts, both foreign and domestic, the Committee presented its report to Prime Minister Biesheuvel on March 27, 1972. As Van der Beugel had predicted, the civil and military experts had not been able to come to a unanimous consensus on Dutch defense policy. Instead, their conclusions underlined the schism that had developed both in society and in the political arena as the Committee was split into a majority and a minority view – reflected in two separate reports.¹⁴⁶ The majority presented a report that was in line with the white paper that former Defense Minister den Toom prepared for the 1971 cabinet formation arguing for an increase of the level of defense spending from 3,945 percent of the national income in 1972 to an average of 4,25 percent between 1973 and 1977.¹⁴⁷ The minority recommended maintaining the defense budget on the existing level of 3,945 percent of the Dutch national income in 1972.¹⁴⁸ Considering the circumstances, Van der Beugel was quite satisfied with this outcome. As he wrote to General Goodpaster:

¹⁴² E.H. van der Beugel to B. Biesheuvel, 31 December 1971, file 9, EvdB.

¹⁴³ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, January 16, 1972, file 9, EvdB.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder spanning*, 119.

¹⁴⁶ Commissie van Civiele en Militaire Deskundigen, “De Toekomst van de Nederlandse Defensie, March 1972”, file 31, Commissie van Rijckevorsel archive, NAH.

¹⁴⁷ “Meerderheid commissie: ‘Defensiebudget moet verhoogd’”, *NRC*, 11 March 1972. “Zij volgen daarmee de conclusies van de nota die oud-minister den Toom van defensie vorig jaar voor de kabinetsformateur achterliet.”

¹⁴⁸ Kreemers, “Hete Hangijzers”, 115-116; Van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder spanning*, 111.

The majority of the Committee recommends a rather steep increase in defense expenditure for the first four years. Needless to say that I belong to the majority. The paradoxical situation exists that I don't consider the majority view as the main achievement of the Committee but rather that the majority pushed the minority to a point of view in which they propose the maintenance (fortunately not a reduction, which I expected them to do in the beginning of our deliberations) of our present effort.¹⁴⁹

The committee's chair Karel van Rijckevorsel had at the last moment sided with the minority, a decision that "was not received without irritation."¹⁵⁰ Consequently, in the flurry of media attention following the publication of the reports, Ernst van der Beugel emerged as a key spokesperson of the majority viewpoint. He gave interviews and wrote opinion articles, delivered speeches and appeared on national TV. In March 1972, for example, Ernst van der Beugel appeared in the popular current affairs program "Extra-Brandpunt" to comment on the Van Rijckevorsel report and to defend the majority viewpoint. Afterwards, Philip van Tijn of the Dutch social-democratic newspaper 'Het Vrije Volk' described the event as a lovely comeback of Ernst van der Beugel into the Dutch public debate through which "the smell of the Russian danger entered the living room."¹⁵¹

In Pursuit of a Domestic Climate Conducive to Close Transatlantic Relations

Overall, in his contribution to the public debate – through speeches and articles, lectures, interviews and commentary – Ernst van der Beugel consistently tried to counter the anti-American trends he perceived by trying to explain the American position to the Dutch as well as the necessity of a strong defense effort. These two issues were closely interrelated, not just in the Netherlands, but also in the United States where European anti-Americanism and the relatively meager European defense contributions were feeding Congressional pressures to decrease the amount of American conventional forces on the European continent.¹⁵² At the same time, Van der Beugel tried to foster understanding among the American foreign policy and defense establishment concerning the complications in bringing about an increase

¹⁴⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to A.J. Goodpaster, 23 March 1972, file 9, EvdB, NAH.

¹⁵⁰ "Defensie doorgelicht", *Haagse Post*, 29 March 1972.

¹⁵¹ Philip van Tijn, *Vrije Volk*, 28 maart 1972 (translation mine).

¹⁵² Scott Aiken, "European Security tied to U.S. Troops", *Cincinnati Enquirer*, No date but probably December 1972. Scrapbook XIII, AHB: In this context Ernst van der Beugel believed that "the West-Europeans should be accommodating to American needs and public opinion." This also included being more accommodating towards the Americans with regards to the economic negotiations which were creating transatlantic tension during the early 1970s. Within the framework of the Cold War van der Beugel believed economic negotiations should be approached in the light of the broader security context. The United States had been 'generous' to Europe in the early post-war era when it had accepted some economic discrimination for the purpose of building up a strong Europe. According to van der Beugel Europe should now be generous to the United States in economic matters "to help the [Nixon] Administration create the climate in which it can maintain a sizeable conventional armed force in Europe." In order to create this climate, the Western European countries' contribution to offset the cost of maintaining U.S. troops should be increased in order to create a situation in which the maintenance of American troops in Europe was "not a drain on the American balance of payments" (italics mine).

in the European defense budgets, thus trying to mediate international pressure and expectations on the one hand and domestic tensions on the other.¹⁵³ Van der Beugel believed that it was of fundamental importance to “create the climate” in which maintenance of a sizeable American force would be possible.¹⁵⁴ It was to such a climate – a public atmosphere conducive to close transatlantic relations and a strong defense – that he tried to contribute through his private efforts in the public domain, not just through his own publications, but also through his connections with journalists.

Ernst van der Beugel maintained contact with an extensive network of journalists throughout the Atlantic community.¹⁵⁵ Back home in the Netherlands, Van der Beugel was extremely annoyed by the negative views articulated by Dutch journalists about the United States and on defense matters.¹⁵⁶ The lack of an informed public opinion about matters of international relations and defense was, from Van der Beugel’s perspective, for a large part the result of ignorance and bad reporting on behalf of the Dutch press. This in turn, undermined the possibility of an informed public debate about these issues. Van der Beugel did not let these things go by without voicing his disapproval, for example through critical letters to journalists or their editors-in-chief when he believed they had gone out of line. He was not particularly mild in his criticism either.¹⁵⁷ To illustrate, in 1967 Van der Beugel ended his subscription of the Dutch daily newspaper *Algemeen Handelsblad* with a long letter to the editor-in-chief to whom he explained that his decision was “an act of protest” from his side directed towards “the daily menu of protest by some of your younger employees” and in particular aimed at the either “open, hidden or creeping anti-Americanism” in the newspaper that he considered not just “incorrect”, but “life threatening and cheap.”¹⁵⁸ A similar letter followed in 1970 to the editor-in-chief of the *Volkscrant*, arguing that the paper increasingly reflected “the forged, distorted, tendentious and deceitful reporting that is the beginning or the accompanying phenomenon of every form of terror.”¹⁵⁹

At the same time he was very supportive of journalists whose work he admired. He regularly sent personal notes to journalists to express his admiration in response to articles

¹⁵³ Van der Beugel, “NATO and the Average Man”.

¹⁵⁴ Aiken, “European Security tied to U.S. Troops”.

¹⁵⁵ Van der Beugel was for example well acquainted with the American political commentator Walter Lippmann and with New York Times journalists James “Scotty” Reston and Cyrus L. Sulzberger, Raymond Aron of *Le Figaro* and Theo Sommer from *Die Zeit*.

¹⁵⁶ See for example: “Prof. E.H. van der Beugel lucht zijn hart: ‘Nederlandse politiek verliest niveau’, *De Telegraaf*, 19 April 1972: “Velen bij de pers, radio en televisie (...) geven een oordeel dat verre van representatief is van wat er werkelijk leeft; een scheefgetrokken beeld van de publieke opinie. Bovendien is het niveau van meningsuiters eenvoudig onvoldoende; tot een werkelijke dialoog is men vaak niet in stand.”

¹⁵⁷ In 1966, Van der Beugel wrote a letter to W.G.N. de Keizer, the editor-in-chief of *Elsevier’s Weekblad* (an influential weekly magazine) in which he complained, among things, about some articles by the journalist Lunshof which he considered “not only bad, but completely unacceptable” accusing him of publishing ‘fundamental falsehoods.’ Keizer replied to van der Beugel that the ‘Lunshof problem’ would ‘undoubtedly’ be ‘solved’ in 1966.

¹⁵⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to C.A. Steketee, 12 April 1967, file 7, EvdB.

¹⁵⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to J.M.M. van der Pluym, 10 April 1970, file 9, EvdB: “...de vervalste, verdraaide, tendentieuze en leugenachtige berichtgeving, die het begin of het begeleidingsverschijnsel is van iedere vorm van terreur. Of die voorlichtingsterreur van rechts of van links komt, is voor mij onverschillig. Ik vind dat in alle omstandigheden onverdraaglijk.”

they had written or to provide encouragement. More important, though, was the fact that – as Jérôme Heldring also pointed out – Ernst van der Beugel could “open doors” by providing the necessary introductions for journalists who desired to meet with one of the *prima donna*’s in his extensive network.¹⁶⁰ Van der Beugel was eager to arrange access to prominent Americans for Dutch journalists whose judgement he trusted and of whom he expected satisfactory coverage of the United States. To illustrate, in 1968, he arranged a whole series of meetings with influential Americans for the renowned Dutch journalist G.B.J. Hiltermann, who had written to Van der Beugel that he did not intend to “rediscover America” nor to throw himself completely on “negroes and poverty” but that he instead intended to focus on some “preferably positive aspects of American society, which may be less well known, but still very much worth the effort.”¹⁶¹ Ernst van der Beugel was happy to help, providing introductions to a whole list of influentials including Henry Kissinger, Bill Moyers, Zbigniew Brzezinski, David Rockefeller, Richard Neustadt, Ted Sorensen, George Ball and Joe Johnson.¹⁶² In 1970 Van der Beugel arranged a meeting with Henry Kissinger for Jérôme Heldring, whom Kissinger (and his assistant Helmut Sonnenfeldt) had already met at dinners at Van der Beugel’s home, as well as at a Bilderberg Conference.¹⁶³ In the summer of 1973, Van der Beugel recommended Kissinger to give an interview to the foreign editor of Elsevier’s Magazine Gerry Philip Mok, whom he described as the one serious and responsible exception in the Dutch weekly press, which for the rest was “in the hands of the irresponsible left wing liberal establishment.”¹⁶⁴

Ernst van der Beugel also invited Dutch journalists whose work he appreciated to dinners at his home and to the Bilderberg Meetings, which enabled them to establish valuable contacts while enabling them to tap into the insider knowledge and ideas that proliferated among the Atlantic elite.¹⁶⁵ To illustrate, in 1971, Van der Beugel invited André Spoor, the editor-in-chief of *NRC Handelsblad*, to a Bilderberg meeting. When Spoor in May 1973 requested an interview with Henry Kissinger, the American embassy noted that Spoor had met Kissinger two years before at a Bilderberg conference. This comment was followed

¹⁶⁰ Jérôme Heldring, interview by the author.

¹⁶¹ G.B.J. Hiltermann to E.H. van der Beugel, 21 May 1968, file 8, EvdB.

¹⁶² E.H. van der Beugel to G.B.J. Hiltermann, 13 June 1968, file 8, EvdB.

¹⁶³ E.H. van der Beugel to David Young (Assistant to Dr. Henry Kissinger), 8 May 1970, file 9, EvdB: “He knows Henry because he has met him several times at my house and in Boston and I know that Henry has always been very much impressed by his intelligence and knowledge”; E.H. van der Beugel to H. Sonnenfeldt, 8 May 1970, file 9, EvdB: “I learned that my friend Jérôme Heldring, whom you have met at the dinner in my house, will spend three days in Washington notably May 25th, 26th and 27th. Jérôme Heldring is in my opinion beyond any shadow of a doubt the most intelligent and influential journalist in Holland. He is chief-editor of the “Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant” and has an absolutely first-class mind; Interview Jérôme Heldring.

¹⁶⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 13 August, 1973, file 10, EvdB.

¹⁶⁵ For a study of the relationship between Bilderberg and the Press see: Ingeborg Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity: the history of the Bilderberg Organization” (PhD diss., Copenhagen University, 2009) 220- 237: “part of the reason behind inviting journalists to attend the conferences was obviously also that they were in a good position to influence public opinion.” In this way, “journalists were not expected to act like passive observers; they were expected to take part in the foreign policy process.” (Philipsen, 227-228).

by the recommendation that “a background conversation with Spoor would be helpful, providing as it would for a sympathetic presentation of U.S. views in the Dutch press.”¹⁶⁶

Van der Beugel's own publications mostly appeared in Dutch newspapers as well as international foreign affairs magazines such as *Le Monde Diplomatique*, the Atlantic Quarterly and the Knickerbocker. In the Netherlands he had especially good contacts at *Het Parool* and *NRC Handelsblad* where he published the majority of his analyses and opinion articles for a general audience. His speeches usually received ample attention in the media. Journalists approached him for interviews and solicited his views as an expert on transatlantic relations and defense matters. His stint at the Van Rijckevorsel Committee followed by his appointment as chairman of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, which through its studies and publications tried to contribute to an informed public debate on defense matters, added to his renown as an authoritative expert on matters of international relations and defense. His undertakings did not go unnoticed by the American embassy in The Hague where successive ambassadors thanked Van der Beugel for his efforts. “I should like you to know how much I appreciate the time and effort that you give to creating a better understanding of American institutions and our role in the Western Alliance”, Ambassador Middendorf II wrote to Ernst van der Beugel on January 14, 1970. “We all feel greatly indebted to you.”¹⁶⁷

Thus, Ernst van der Beugel established a prominent position in the public debate. When in 1972 a journalist inquired during an interview whether he considered going back into politics, Van der Beugel answered he had no desire to do so whatsoever. “I consider my current combination of activities ideal”, he explained. “There is no other way in which I could make myself more useful for the public cause than by doing the work I do now: public speaking, teaching and/or publishing.”¹⁶⁸ In a similar vein he had already told his sister in 1970 that “When I would be offered the Embassy in Washington, I would not need ten seconds to decline clearly and friendly. Never again am I going to do something other than this.”¹⁶⁹

In the end, no major changes took place with regards to the Dutch defense policy during the Biesheuvel administrations, which were characterized by a high degree of continuity in this field.¹⁷⁰ However, as Van der Beugel had pointed out to Goodpaster – considering the negative trend in public opinion concerning defense spending – stability could be seen as a victory in itself as the feared spending cuts were held at bay. During the subsequent years,

¹⁶⁶ “Memorandum for Mr. Kissinger”, 7 May 1973, box 54, folder CO108 Netherlands 1/1/73, White House Central Files, Subject Files, Countries, NPL.

¹⁶⁷ J. William Middendorf, II (U.S. ambassador to the Netherlands) to E.H. van der Beugel, January 14, 1970, file 8, EvdB.

¹⁶⁸ “Prof. E.H. van der Beugel lucht zijn hart: “Nederlandse politiek verliest niveau” (translation mine): “De combinatie van werkzaamheden van nu vind ik ideaal ik (...) Ik kan me voor de publieke zaak niet nuttiger maken dan wanneer ik werk zoals ik nu doe: spreken, doceren en/of publiceren”

¹⁶⁹ EvdB to I. Brokmeijer-van der Beugel, 13 January 1970, file 8, EvdB: “Wanneer mij de Ambassade in Washington zou worden aangeboden, zou ik geen tien seconden nodig hebben om even vriendelijk als duidelijk neen te zeggen. Ik ga nooit meer iets anders doen dan dit.”

¹⁷⁰ Van der Wijngaart, *Bondgenootschap onder spanning*, 111-112.

however, when the Netherlands was governed by a relatively left-wing cabinet under the leadership of Joop den Uyl (PvdA), the defense contribution increasingly came under pressure. By 1976 Ernst van der Beugel wrote to Goedhart that “with regards to our advice in the Van Rijckevorsel committee, considering the current circumstances, I would wholeheartedly endorse the minority recommendations. At least we would have had something. One cannot be somber enough about the total paralysis of the West. To this paralysis, the Netherlands is contributing a more than proportional share.”¹⁷¹

In the meantime, Ernst van der Beugel remained active as an informal liaison between Kissinger’s White House and the American State Department on the one hand and the Dutch foreign policy establishment on the other hand. In September 1972, for example, he informed Biesheuvel, Schmelzer and Defense Minister De Koster about developments in Washington concerning potential reductions of American forces on the European continent. “In general”, Van der Beugel wrote, “one hears in the United States that it will only be a matter of time until a substantial amount of American forces will be pulled out of Europe and that this could either happen unilaterally or as a result of the Mutual Balanced Force Reductions” (M.B.F.R.). Even so, Van der Beugel informed his countrymen, this was not Henry Kissinger’s opinion. Instead, he reassured them that “supposing that this Administration will stay in power, any possible reduction would take place within the framework of the M.B.F.R.” He furthermore informed them that any potential American troop reduction would not exceed the 10-15%, adding that in the meantime Kissinger “hoped and expected” that the European defense effort would not be reduced warning that any substantial decrease of the European effort could jeopardize the plans of the Nixon administration in the most serious way.¹⁷² Schmelzer greatly appreciated this confidential report and told Van der Beugel that he would welcome any new information that Van der Beugel would be able to provide in the future.¹⁷³

Ernst van der Beugel continued these activities after 1973, when Max van der Stoep replaced Schmelzer as minister of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands and Henry Kissinger adopted a dual function as National Security Advisor and U.S. Secretary of State. Van der Beugel also served as a back channel between Kissinger and the NATO leadership, in particular Joseph Luns – who had been appointed as Secretary General of NATO in 1971 – and informed Kissinger about worries within NATO, for example concerning the American representation. In 1974, the Ernst van der Beugel – Kissinger backchannel was again instrumental in Dutch-American negotiations concerning the long desired landing rights for

¹⁷¹ E.H. van der Beugel to F.J. Goedhart, 16 January 1976, file 38, EvdB: “Voor wat betreft ons advies in de commissie van Rijckevorsel zou ik, gezien de gang van zaken nu, wholeheartedly de aanbevelingen van de minderheid onderschrijven. Dan hadden we tenminste iets. Men kan niet somber genoeg zijn over de totale paralyse van het Westen. Nederland levert aan die paralyse een meer dan evenredige bijdrage.”

¹⁷² E.H. van der Beugel to B.W. Biesheuvel, W.K.N. Schmelzer and H.J. de Koster, 27 September 1972, file 9, EvdB.

¹⁷³ W.K.N. Schmelzer to E.H. van der Beugel, 30 October 1972, file 9, EvdB, NAH. “Mijn welgemeende dank voor je brief van 27 september 1972 over je gesprek met Kissinger ten aanzien van de MBFR en een eventuele terugtrekking van Amerikaanse troepen. Intussen kreeg ik ook de beschikking over een samenvatting van het “Randall-rapport”, welke samenvatting ik je voor jouw informatie in fotokopie doe toekomen. Graag blijf ik mij aanbevolen houden voor informatie zoals je mij nu vertrouwelijk hebt willen verschaffen.”

Los Angeles. After Van der Beugel raised the issue with Kissinger, the latter assured Van der Beugel that he would “overrule our bureaucracy” in order to satisfy a key ally in Europe due to an “overwhelming desire to support the Dutch position.”¹⁷⁴

During the rest of the 1970’s as well as the 1980’s Ernst van der Beugel continued to play an active role in the public debate, partly as an Atlanticist Jeremiah – lamenting the state of the alliance while defying the “false prophets” of détente, the moralist politics of marrying priests and protestant clergymen, the new leftish sociologists and a new generation with its long hair, short skirts and anti-Americanism in the public square. Even so, during the course of the 1970s his clout started to fade. While still consulted as an *eminence grise*, the fossilization of Van der Beugel’s ideas increasingly turned him into a remnant of a different time and generation with different experiences, views and priorities while across the Atlantic the old East Coast Establishment, with which Van der Beugel had been intimately associated, was starting to unravel. “For two decades, the Establishment had held sway by sitting squarely astride the middle ground of ‘informed’ public opinion. But by the seventies, the center no longer held; Vietnam had shattered the post-World War II consensus.”¹⁷⁵

The times they were a changin’ and in the process the Atlantic Community was confronted with an additional challenge as the old Marshall Plan-era establishment had to make way for a new generation to whom the fundamental importance of close transatlantic ties was not as obvious as it had been to Ernst van der Beugel and many of his friends. In contrast to Van der Beugel’s generation, this generation had not lived through the horrors of the Second World War nor experienced the joy of liberation, the miracle of post-war reconstruction or the dawn of the Cold War. Instead, members of the successor generation spent their formative years during a period of détente combined with experiences like the Vietnam War followed by the Watergate Scandal. As they came of age – preparing themselves to move into positions of power throughout the West – one question became increasingly pertinent among the Atlantic elite: How could the values and aspirations of the post-war Atlanticist establishment be transferred to this new generation?

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated how the views of the Atlantic elite ran out of sync with the ideas and concerns of the ‘public at large’ – especially on the necessity of NATO and a strong Atlantic defense in the context of easing tensions between East and West. This happened during a period of democratization in foreign affairs during which the general public not only started to demonstrate a greater interest in foreign policy but also started to voice its concerns stronger and louder. In the process it demonstrated an awareness on Van der Beugel’s side that the Atlantic security community formalized through NATO in fact also

¹⁷⁴ Qtd. In: Scott-Smith and Snyder, “‘A Test of Sentiments’”, 943

¹⁷⁵ Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), 725.

depended on the Atlantic Community as an imagined community. While the sense of belonging to such a community was still alive on an elite level, he feared that it was unravelling among the public at large due to a combination of growing anti-Americanism and a diminishing awareness of the Soviet threat. Through a combination of private efforts focused on public diplomacy and psychological warfare Van der Beugel attempted to foster and strengthen this sense of community in the mind of the 'average man'. He did so by countering anti-Americanism with a more positive image of the United States as liberator, ally and protector while keeping the enemy image of the Soviet Union alive. Thus, while he did not expect the Soviet Union to start a hot war any time soon, he presented the communist enemy above all as a threat to the Atlantic Community as a community of values based on a shared civilization and shared interests.

While the democratization of foreign policy created new challenges for the Atlantic Community, it also increased the significance of public diplomacy, which in turn opened up new avenues for unofficial diplomats like Ernst van der Beugel to influence the transatlantic diplomatic process. While traditional state-centered approaches to diplomatic history tend to ignore the contribution of these unofficial actors to the diplomatic process, the perspective of New Diplomatic History makes it possible to demonstrate how Ernst van der Beugel as a private actor dissatisfied with official efforts at explaining NATO to the public at large, took it upon himself to contribute to this public diplomacy effort – and he was not the only one. The contributions of private actors, including many Atlantic NGOs, in public diplomacy and psychological warfare were recognized and encouraged by NATO officials who wanted to avoid suspicion of spreading communist-like propaganda. What is more, they believed that private actors could spread their messages more efficiently while granting more legitimacy to transatlantic public diplomacy efforts. In a similar vein, as a private individual, Van der Beugel could also be more aggressive in his psychological warfare through his efforts of keeping the enemy image alive.

From the second half of the 1960's onwards Van der Beugel put an increasing portion of his time and energy into private public diplomacy efforts – trying to create a conducive public climate for close transatlantic relations and a strong Atlantic defense. His positions as professor of transatlantic cooperation at Leiden University and chairman of the renowned International Institute for Strategic Studies in London provided him with extra status as an 'independent' expert in his field. Through speeches, publications and TV appearances – mostly in the Netherlands, but also abroad – he became a key voice in the public debate on transatlantic relations and defense. In the process, he tried to create a positive image of the United States by keeping the memory of America's role in the liberation and post-war recovery of the Netherlands alive in the face of the Vietnam War and growing anti-Americanism while emphasizing the importance of the Dutch and Atlantic defense while contributing to psychological warfare efforts by reminding his publics that the Soviet threat had not truly diminished.

Next to his own direct contribution to the public debate he also tried to influence the way in which Dutch journalists covered the United States, by offering access to American influentials to journalists whom he expected to write positively about the United States and by socializing them into the Atlantic elite by inviting them to Bilderberg Meetings or to dinners at his own home. While the greatest part of his public diplomacy efforts was focused on the Dutch public, these efforts were partly driven by the fear that the growing anti-American sentiments among European publics might alienate the Americans and threaten their willingness to stay committed to the safety of the European continent. He also tried to explain the Dutch position to the American elites directly.

While his public diplomacy efforts increased during this period, his role behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy did not diminish, as he remained well-connected to the formal diplomatic circuits, serving as an unofficial liaison between Washington, The Hague and NATO. In fact, as his close friend Henry Kissinger entered the Nixon White House first as National Security Adviser and later also as Secretary of State, his access to the official Foreign Policy Establishment in Washington was better than ever before. Both men also used this connection for diplomatic purposes. Kissinger contacted Van der Beugel for example when he wanted to reconnect White House bonds with Monnet's Action Committee for a United Europe through Kohnstamm or when the omission of the Netherlands on the itinerary of Nixon's 1969 European tour rubbed foreign minister Luns the wrong way. The two main 'official' issues about which Van der Beugel approached Kissinger repeatedly – the KLM-landing rights negotiations in the U.S. and the Dutch defense budget – don't just demonstrate that Ernst van der Beugel was taken seriously as an unofficial actor, but also show that he was not just an extension of the Dutch or the American government. He was very critical about American landing rights policy and helped the Dutch government to get U.S. landing rights, believing that resolving this issue was also in the interest of transatlantic cohesion. At the same time he did not mind to use his American connections to put pressure on the Dutch government via NATO and the White House to raise its defense budget. In the end all of these private efforts – in public and behind the scenes – worked in tandem towards the same diplomatic goal: fostering and maintaining close transatlantic ties within a strong Atlantic Community.

7. The Challenge of the Successor Generation

While the preceding chapter already introduced Van der Beugel's public diplomacy efforts in constructing a sense of Atlantic community by keeping the Atlantic mindset alive in a time of détente and the democratization of foreign policy, this chapter will continue this analysis with a more specific focus on the challenge of the successor generation. After all, diplomacy is not just about short term goals such as negotiating deals and crafting policies. On a more fundamental level, diplomacy is just as much about fostering and maintaining relationships; about ideas, values and identities, about creating an environment and a climate that enables the realization of more concrete and short term goals. Likewise, the challenge of the successor generation was not so much about how to shape European integration or how to legitimize a strong Atlantic defense. Instead it was concerned with the long-term challenge of fostering and maintaining the social fabric and mindset that served as the glue that kept the Atlantic Community together.

This shared mindset as well as the social fabric supporting the Atlantic alliance was both maintained and embodied by the Atlantic elite, composed of the constellation of state officials and private individuals and organizations working to foster and maintain close transatlantic ties and who were committed to transmitting this understanding to the public at large. Both this social fabric and the "Atlantic-mindedness" that united them were for a significant part rooted in formative experiences described in earlier chapters; experiences of appeasement and war, liberation and reconstruction, followed by integration and cooperation in the face of renewed fears of war and authoritarian repression – experiences shared by those who were present at the creation.¹ On the European continent these experiences had also influenced the development of a positive image of the United States as benevolent liberator, ally and protector. In the 1960s and 1970s, however, a new generation came of age that did not share these formative experiences so central to the genesis of the Atlantic Community. They had only known peace and grew up during a period of easing tensions between East and West. What is more, the European members of this generation did not associate the Americans with benevolent deeds of liberation and reconstruction, but rather saw the United States as belligerent and corrupt as a result of the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal. As an imagined community, however, the Atlantic Community – and the military alliance at the heart of this community – could only live on as long as the Atlantic mindset lived on in the next generation, as long as they too recognized the importance of transatlantic bonds and as long as the social fabric that had developed during war and reconstruction could be maintained. As this chapter will demonstrate, unofficial actors like Ernst van der Beugel and the Atlantic elite networks to which he belonged went

¹ Kenneth Weisbrode, "The Political and Cultural Underpinnings of Atlanticism's Crisis in the 1960s" in *More Atlantic Crossings? European Voices in the Postwar Atlantic Community*, *GHI Bulletin Supplement 10*, eds. Jan Logemann and Mary Nolan (2014), 52.

through great lengths to foster and maintain these long term bonds and to create social structures through which new and especially younger members could be engaged, socialized and play themselves an important role in transmitting this mindset within their own spheres of influence.

A Very Serious Generation Problem

During the 1960s Ernst van der Beugel's speeches and activities were characterized by a growing emphasis on the importance of engaging and educating new generations of Americans and Europeans in Atlantic affairs. "Those who have not experienced the 1930's, during which my student generation witnessed the horrifying consequences of the lack of will-power and strength in the West, which brought the Second World War upon us, who have never experienced the simplicity of purpose of the Second World War, nor the joy of recovery and integration of the Western world, will approach the fundamental problems of international politics in a different way,"² Van der Beugel observed in the summer of 1968 – a year that would be characterized by massive student protests, dissatisfaction and unrest throughout the West. "There is no doubt a very serious generation problem in the Western World," he acknowledged. "To escape it by calling it an irresponsible action of an irresponsible and tiny but violent minority does not meet the seriousness of the problem at all. Trying to link it to specific circumstances in specific countries does not lead to anything. The classrooms at the Sorbonne were overcrowded, but were they at Columbia? Where is the negro problem in Amsterdam, or the springer concern in Rome?"³

The fact that the post-war generation perceived "the necessity of Western cooperation" as an element of the very status quo many of them detested while associating it with the 'establishment' aroused strong feelings of antagonism against it, Van der Beugel observed.⁴ "The feeling that the Cold War and the leadership of that period belong to the established order and therefore should be changed is very strong indeed among the younger generation."⁵ In addition, many youths either principally opposed the use of power, or – and this category was much larger according to Van der Beugel – they manifested a curious blindness for the essential question of the purposes of the use of power. Consequently, they repeatedly contested the use of force or regarded it with suspicion, while isolating it from its ultimate purposes.⁶ "Maybe this is the case because many of those who direct themselves against the existing order; the rebels of today, at least those in Europe, have never experienced anything but peace, freedom and economic expansion", Van der Beugel

² E.H. van der Beugel, "Leiding VS in Atlantische wereld is onmisbaar", *Het Parool*, 23 August 1968 (translation mine).

³ E.H. van der Beugel, "A new Look at European-US Relations", *Knickerbocker International*, August 1968, file 47, EvdB.

⁴ E.H. van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen van de Westelijke samenwerking", speech, 19 November 1968, box "lezingen", AHB.

⁵ E.H. van der Beugel, "Where are we going?", speech, [date unknown, probably June 1968], file 47, EvdB.

⁶ These purposes included, according to van der Beugel, the protection of a way of life, a civilization that respected individual freedom. See: Van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen van de Westelijke samenwerking."

maintained. “They have – as for the young, completely beyond their control – never stood in the conflict where the central question was whether those values would disappear. They live and agitate by the grace of those very values which they themselves want to destroy or whose endangerment they do not recognize.” Van der Beugel acknowledged that Western society demands a certain degree of dissatisfaction with its own shortcomings, but as he perceived the situation at hand, the dissatisfaction driving the wish to improve was keeling over into a blind disapproval of Western society, which in turn led to a process of self-destruction in which essential accomplishments of the Atlantic Community were falling prey to unclear emotions.⁷

Ernst van der Beugel thus perceived the alienation of big clusters of young people from the principles of the process of Western cooperation and their identification of this cooperation with ‘the establishment’ and their rebellion against this establishment – of which he himself was obviously a prominent member – as “a serious disintegrating factor” in the Atlantic Community. Hence, he argued that bringing back the serious segments of these youths to the understanding that Western cooperation was not a remnant of a bygone era, was essential to the vitality and sustainability of the Atlantic alliance.⁸ As mentioned in the previous chapter, from 1965 onwards the Vietnam War was one of the prime catalysts of discontent – in particular among the younger generation. Even so, Van der Beugel warned in 1968 that “nobody should make himself the slightest illusion that after the Vietnam conflict will be solved this clash between the young and what they consider the established order will be terminated.”⁹ The generation problem was bigger than that and in order to ensure the long term survival of the Atlantic Community and all it stood for, Ernst van der Beugel considered it particularly important to socialize promising young leaders into the Atlantic elite; in fact into the very establishment that so many of them had come to detest.

These ideas did not develop in a vacuum, however, and Ernst van der Beugel was certainly not the only one contemplating the generational challenges to maintaining Atlantic cohesion. As historians like Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith have demonstrated, similar worries with regard to “the passing of the scene of the Marshall Plan architects and the values gap with their successors” developed within broader Atlanticist circles during the early 1960s.¹⁰ These concerns would reach their zenith during the early 1980s when the term ‘successor generation’ was coined “to describe the group that will replace the McCloy,

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ E.H. van der Beugel, “Where are we going?”, speech, [date unknown, probably June 1968], file 47, EvdB.

¹⁰ Valérie Aubourg, “Problems of Transmission: The Atlantic Community and the Successor Generation as Seen by US Philanthropy, 1960s-1970,” in *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America? The Atlantic Community and Europe*, eds. Giles Scott-Smith and Valérie Aubourg (Paris: Soleb 2011), 423; Giles Scott-Smith, “Maintaining Transatlantic Community: US Public Diplomacy, the Ford Foundation and the Successor Generation Concept in US Foreign Affairs, 1960s-1980s”, *Global Society* 28:1 (2014) 90-103;

Kissingers, Schmidts and others of the Founders Generation that created the Atlantic alliance.”¹¹

Consultancy: the Ford Foundation and the Successor Generation

In order to gain a better understanding of Ernst van der Beugel’s ideas in the context of the successor generation it is useful to take a closer look at some of his advisory work for the Ford Foundation,¹² one of the prime financial donors of the private Atlanticist organizations that together formed much of the informal infrastructure of the unofficial post-war Atlantic Community, which in turn facilitated many of Ernst van der Beugel’s private transatlantic activities.

As Inderjeet Parmar has shown, American philanthropic organizations and in particular the ‘Big three’ – the Rockefeller, Carnegie and Ford Foundations – have played a significant role in the forging of American foreign relations.¹³ While the Ford Foundation entered the international philanthropy scene relatively late in the early 1950s, it soon developed into the biggest philanthropic organization in the world. In 1951 Paul G. Hoffmann, who had just stepped down as the American director of the Marshall Plan’s European Cooperation Administration (ECA) became the Ford Foundation’s president. Together with some other prominent associates from the Marshall Plan days, including his ECA colleagues Milton Katz and Richard M. Bissell as well as former High Commissioner to Germany John J. McCloy and his Political Affairs Director Shepard Stone, Hoffmann set out to develop an international affairs program, which during the 1960s and early 1970s came to focus a great deal of its attention on fostering and promoting close transatlantic ties within an Atlantic Community.¹⁴

After President Kennedy introduced the idea of an Atlantic Partnership in 1962, the Ford Foundation decided to pursue the strengthening of this partnership as the core purpose of its International Affairs program. As one 1962 Ford Foundation report pointed out; “the primary objective of the International Affairs program is to identify key persons and institutions in the Atlantic area and assist them in developing the ideas and organizations required by the new challenges and opportunities.” In helping to “accelerate the development of the Atlantic partnership” through private activity, the report emphasized that “the Foundation would not

¹¹ Stephen F. Szabo, *The Successor Generation: International Perspectives of Postwar Europeans* (London: Buttersworths, 1983), 2; “Minutes Board of Directors”, 4 March 1981, box COR1, folder 25 “Atlantic Institute for International Affairs 1982 Feb-1988 Jan”, John J. McCloy Papers, Amherst College Archive: In the early 1980s many Atlantic NGO’s including the Atlantic Council of the United States and the Atlantic Institute increased their focus on the ‘successor generation’ by trying to transmit the NATO mindset to the next generation e.g. through education and young leader programs trying to improve America’s image among Europeans but also by “trying to stimulate American educators to pay more attention to the basic values of the West and the importance of defending them.”

¹² E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 8 July 1966, file 7, EvdB: “I just signed my agreement with the Ford Foundation which gives me twice a year a first class trip to the United States. I do not need much extra stimulation, but nevertheless it is a nice arrangement.

¹³ See: Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

¹⁴ Aubourg, “Problems of Transmission”, 419; Volker R. Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001) 143-177.

support activities that can be best carried on by governmental bodies. However, it would be considered appropriate to aid activities which would be suspect or impaired if national governments engaged in them.”¹⁵ In this context, the Ford Foundation provided funding for a whole series of Atlanticist organizations including the Bilderberg Meetings, the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Atlantic Institute. The latter was founded in Paris in 1961 with the purpose to “promote and develop a spirit of community among Atlantic peoples (...) the strengthening of (...) the social institutions of the Atlantic Community, the harmonization of the long range interests of the community”. The underlying goal was “to encourage the growth of a new generation of intellectuals and policy analysts working on Atlantic problems and thinking in Atlantic terms, as opposed to a national and restricted approach, therefore promoting harmonious and constructive Euro-American relations.”¹⁶

Aubourg argues that “one of the major difficulties was to create more than a few short-term projects and make this Atlantic outlook permanent.”¹⁷ In a similar vein, Giles Scott-Smith has pointed out that “the ‘belief system’ represented by the Atlantic Alliance needed to be embedded and maintained in transatlantic political culture. This awareness lay behind the efforts of many active in the public and private realms to ensure that NATO was seen as the central cornerstone of a wider and deeper social, cultural and economic Atlantic Community.”¹⁸ The generation gap posed a serious challenge to the preservation of this ‘belief system’. As J.E. Dougherty explained in his work on the psychological milieu of the Atlantic Community: “Among those who do not remember the [Second World War], or for whom it was but a dim childhood experience, the slogans of the more immediate postwar period – about the external military menace and the need for tightened community – no longer fit meaningfully into a cognitive framework that was conditioned primarily by economic boom and absence of conflict.”¹⁹ Thus, as Aubourg has demonstrated, in a search for long term approaches to maintain the ‘Atlantic mindset’ during the early 1960s the idea developed within the Ford Foundation that “the key to more durable results lay in transmitting this Atlantic perspective to the upcoming generation.”²⁰ In this context, the Ford Foundation for example justified its financial support for the University Institute headed by Max Kohnstamm in 1963 by arguing that it was a way to help “promising young scholars in developing an Atlantic approach to problems” through the identification of a set of common values and common interests, while trying to define a “community of purpose directed toward common policies and actions on issues of vital concern between Europe and the

¹⁵ “Ford Foundation - Activities to strengthen the Atlantic Partnership”, box 18, folder 182, Office Files-IA-Slater, Ford Foundation, RAC.

¹⁶ Qtd. in: Scott-Smith, “Maintaining Transatlantic Community”, 95.

¹⁷ Aubourg, “Problems of Transmission”, 422.

¹⁸ Scott-Smith, “Maintaining Transatlantic Community”, 90-91.

¹⁹ James E. Dougherty, “The Atlantic Community - The Psychological Milieu”, in *Atlantic Community in Crisis: A Redefinition of the Transatlantic Relationship*, eds. Walter Hahn and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr. (New York: Pergamon Press, 1979), 47.

²⁰ Aubourg, “Problems of Transmission”, 422.

United States.”²¹ Thus, while the term “successor generation” was not coined until the late 1970s, historians like Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith have demonstrated that the concept of a ‘successor generation’ was already clearly articulated by the Ford Foundation’s staff and consultants in the 1960s. One of these consultants was Ernst van der Beugel.

In 1966 Ernst van der Beugel was asked by the Ford Foundation to write a report on the future of the Atlantic Institute, which had not lived up to the foundation’s hopes and expectations during the first five years of its existence. This raised the question whether the institute was still worth Foundation support and if so, how should the institute be reorganized? Ernst van der Beugel, who was also involved with the Atlantic Institute as a member of its working party on the problem of Britain’s entry into Europe, was also critical about the way the Institute was functioning.²² Even so, in his consultant reports he argued that from the perspective of “everybody who thinks that the cohesion of the Western World is still one of our primary objectives” there was an “urgent need” for a good Atlantic Institute – especially as an instrument “to keep these thoughts alive and to transmit them to the ruling generation and especially to those who are going to govern in the public, private and academic sectors of life.” As Van der Beugel explained in more detail:

The generation who has lived through the thirties and still has the collapse of appeasement in its blood is approximately the same generation which has witnessed the ‘great acts’ of the 1948-1954 period in Atlantic relations. They are now between 50 and 75. Many of them are still in the leading establishment but they are practically fading out.

The younger generation in Europe is pragmatic and less committed to any concept. Vietnam and the disappearance of the probability of an overt Soviet aggression plus the birth of the welfare state in Europe puts, to say the least of it, their feelings for the necessity of strength in the Western World in a different perspective.

We – the older generation – have failed to transmit to them the message in which we believe. This message is that the Atlantic countries dispose of a unique reservoir of talent and resources. This reservoir can only be used if we live in a cooperating, organized and structured Western world.²³

There were a few “instruments available” according to Van der Beugel to address this problem, but they either did not function on a permanent basis – Bilderberg, for example – or they did not function “properly and imaginatively”. Consequently, Van der Beugel reasoned that the Atlantic Institute “should be the Center (and I also mean this in the physical sense) of

²¹ Ibid., 422.

²² E.H. van der Beugel to Joe Slater, 9 January 1967, box 27, folder 286, Office Files, IA – Slater, FFA, RAC.

²³ E.H. van der Beugel to S. Stone and J.E. Slater, September 1966, box ID#18170-Report#010747, Unpublished Staff and Consultant Reports, IA – Joseph E. Slater, FFA, RAC.

those who are concerned with Atlantic relations. To put it in an oversimplified way, it should be a Bilderberg on a day-to-day basis”.

In addition, Van der Beugel emphasized the value of visitor and exchange programs, maintaining that “there is no better investment in the cause of American-European relations than bringing Europeans closer to the American society, preferably by bringing them over here but also by American programs in Europe.”²⁴ He referred to the Columbia-Leyden Program of American Law as a good example of a program bringing Americans to Europe²⁵, but considered it of greater importance to create opportunities for Europeans to visit the United States arguing that “the real problem in American-European relations is primarily with Europeans and not with Americans.” In this context he believed that the Atlantic Institute should act as the selection place for programs intended to bring Europeans to the U.S. and, to a lesser degree, vice-versa, arguing that “in the political field one should concentrate on the intellectual left labor wing and the Catholic right wing. They should see America. In the academic and journalistic field, one should concentrate on people who might learn that the U.S. is concerned about the year 2000 and we in Europe are not.”²⁶ Obviously, Van der Beugel talked from experience when he mentioned that “there is no single field in which investment yields so much as in the field of showing Europeans what the U.S. is really like”, but whereas his generation of leaders had been brought in direct contact with Americans and American society through the Marshall Plan, similar formative experiences now had to be consciously created through Foreign Leader Programs, educational exchanges, and other trans-Atlantic meeting places. The Atlantic Institute, like the Bilderberg Meetings, should also concentrate on functioning as such a “meeting place”.

Van der Beugel also believed that the Atlanticists could learn from Jean Monnet’s Action Committee for a United Europe with regard to its ‘policy statement’ aspect, arguing that “the Atlantic Institute should from time to time (and not as an exclusive activity) issue policy statements on actual problems” which “through the composition of the board carry the weight of having a real political background.” To accomplish this, a “good Atlantic Institute should be carried by a representative board which consists of people who are responsible for the political decisions in their countries along the lines of what Monnet did in his Committee.” Last but not least, Van der Beugel recommended “a complete change in the Board of Governors in the sense that the establishment of 1950 should, to a great extent, be replaced by a younger generation.”²⁷

²⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Shepard Stone and Joseph E. Slater, June 13, 1967, box ID#18975, Report#010874, IA-Joseph E. Slater, FFA, RAC.

²⁵ On the connections between the Ford Foundation and the Leyden-Columbia Summer Program in American Law and The Hague Academy, as well as Ernst van der Beugel’s role in this, see: Giles Scott-Smith, “Expanding the Diffusion of US Jurisprudence: The Netherlands as a ‘beachhead’ for US Foundations in the 1960s”, in *American Foundations and the Coproduction of World Order in the Twentieth Century*, eds. Helke Rausch and John Krige (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 210-232.

²⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to Shepard Stone and Joseph E. Slater, June 13, 1967, box ID#18975, Report#010874, IA-Joseph E. Slater, FFA, RAC.

²⁷ Ibid.

Jim Huntley, a former U.S. Foreign Service officer and one of the founding fathers of the Atlantic Institute who had joined the Ford Foundation's International Program in 1965, responded with great enthusiasm to Van der Beugel's recommendations. "Van der Beugel sees the Institute as I saw it from the very beginning: the place where the vital interests of the Atlantic countries are thoroughly discussed and from which policy statements emanate. It should be largely a meeting place, a planning center, and a leadership development organization", he wrote to his Ford Foundation colleagues Joe Johnson and Shepard Stone. "In my opinion, Ernst van der Beugel is the man for Director General of the Atlantic Institute. (...) I really cannot think of anyone besides Ernst who is equal to the task, although if he were not willing, another person could probably be found after a thorough search."²⁸

Ernst van der Beugel, however, tried to convince his colleagues at the Ford Foundation to appoint Max Kohnstamm, who also worked as a consultant for Ford, to this position. Van der Beugel "strongly recommended" to Foundation officials that "we should do everything to bridge the gap between the 'Europeans' and the 'Atlanticists' which unfortunately exists." According to Van der Beugel "not many things have hurt the Atlantic movement in Europe so much as this feeling that you either were a European or an Atlanticist", arguing that this was "the reason that the real political appeal has been monopolized by the European movement."²⁹ To bridge this schism, Van der Beugel argued "a man should be appointed as Director who could personify the fact that there is not and should not be any antagonism between the two priorities of European unification and Atlantic cohesion." Max Kohnstamm was the ideal man for this job according to Van der Beugel.³⁰ This, however, was exactly what Huntley – who considered Kohnstamm as too Europeanist for his taste – was trying to prevent. He lamented the fact that the Atlantic Institute had originally "been launched on a course that would mainly support the Kennedy (but really Monnet-Ball) concept of Atlantic Partnership, not a broad transatlantic community of nations bound together in a complex web of intergovernmental institutions and less concrete but still very real habits of thought and heart built on a thousand or more years of common history."³¹ While Kohnstamm would mean a continuation on the Monnet-Ball course, Ernst van der Beugel would be better suited to steer the Institute into the latter direction. In the end Jack Tuthill, a highly regarded former U.S. career diplomat became the new Director General, while both Max Kohnstamm and Ernst van der Beugel joined the Institute's revised Board of Governors together with 14 other newly-elected governors – most of whom – like Van der Beugel's old Marshall Plan friend Robert Marjolin and his fellow Bilderberg Steering Committee member Otto Wolff von Amerongen – did certainly not belong to the younger generation. Other recommendations

²⁸ James R. Huntley to J.E. Slater, December 6, 1966, box 27, folder 187, IA/Slater, Ford Foundation, FFA, RAC.

²⁹ Van der Beugel to Stone and Slater, 13 June 1967, box ID#18975, Report#010874, Unpublished Reports, FFA, RAC.

³⁰ See for example: E.H. van der Beugel to George W. Ball and Siegmund Warburg, 6 September 1967, box 96, folder 8, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

³¹ James R. Huntley, *An Architect of Democracy: Building a Mosaic of Peace* (Washington DC: New Academic Publishing, 2006), 201.

made by Van der Beugel did come back, however, in the eventual grant request for the restructured Atlantic Institute, which argued that:

One of the prime requirements for such a center is the need to increase communication and understanding among the younger leaders in Europe and the United States. As suggested above, the opportunities for meeting and working together which were afforded emergent leaders in the immediate post-war era through the negotiations for new forms of international cooperation – the Marshall Plan, NATO, EEC, OECD and others – no longer exist in the same full measure. Established leaders at least have the Bilderberg meetings as a forum for an exchange of ideas but no similar opportunity is afforded to the younger generation, and it would be the aim of the Institute to work out a design for seminars which might ultimately result in something like a junior Bilderberg – without, however, detracting from the development of the specific meetings and workshops mentioned earlier in this section.”³²

Jim Huntley furthermore went on to extensively quote Van der Beugel’s ideas on the successor generation as a motivation to support an ambitious Young Leaders Program for the Atlantic Community through the Atlantic Institute.³³ The Ford Foundation was certainly not the only American foundation supporting these kinds of efforts, however. While skeptical towards the Atlantic Institute as a whole, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, for example, also supported the Atlantic Institute’s Young Leaders Program, which was “conceived as a means of renewing those post-war working relationships among exceptional individuals, which have served the Atlantic Community so well in the recent past.” Here too the initiative was propelled by the idea that “if the necessary channels of communication can be established, and these emerging leaders can get acquainted with each other and exchange ideas on common problems, they can establish that community of ideas and goals so necessary if the Western peoples are to resolve together the issues which confront them in the decades ahead.”³⁴

It is helpful to look at Van der Beugel’s recommendations for the Atlantic Institute because it provides insight into the way in which he believed private actors and institutions should contribute to fostering close transatlantic relations and the importance of socializing younger generations in this endeavor. Even so, Ernst van der Beugel’s role as a consultant on and governor of the Atlantic Institute was rather marginal compared to his role as a professor of Post-War Western Cooperation, a supporter of exchange and visitor programs and his leadership in the Bilderberg Meetings where he acted on these ideas by becoming one of the

³² “Request for a grant of \$160,000 to the Atlantic Institute for a five-year program of expanding activity in the field of studies and seminars for the promotion of Atlantic Unity”, Grant File 65-161, Reel 2757, FFA, RAC.

³³ “A Program for Development of Rising Young Leaders”, discussion Paper/Office of IA, December 7, 1966, box 18, folder 192, IA/Joseph E. Slater, FFA, RAC.

³⁴ “Young Leaders Program - Outline of a Study Project by the Atlantic Institute”, box 144, Atlantic Institute, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, RAC.

driving forces behind a constant effort to educate new generations and to rejuvenate the Atlantic elite.

Bilderberg and the pursuit of a ‘continuous rejuvenation’

Among those involved in the Bilderberg Meetings there was a certain understanding of Bilderberg as a vehicle to sustain the trans-Atlantic relationships and contacts that had originally developed during the Marshall Plan era by developing and maintaining the human infrastructure of an evolving Atlantic Community. As William P. Bundy³⁵, who succeeded Joseph E. Johnson as Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings for the United States explained in response to the question why Bilderberg was founded:

During the period of the Marshall Plan, many Americans in government and in certain sectors of private business were in close touch with all the European countries that were participating in the program. When the Marshall Plan came to a close in 1953 there was on the European side a very strong desire to maintain the kind of close contact with Americans in and out of government that had been established during that period. There was a concern that there would be a loosening of ties and perhaps a return to the kind of economic nationalism that had been such a terrible feature of the period between the First and Second World War. It was felt that we needed to maintain the strong cooperation that had developed in the field of defense and economics on both sides of the Atlantic. We needed a continuing forum where leaders on both sides of the ocean could come together – responsible people in many walks of life. That is my understanding how the conference came about and that is still the spirit in which it is conducted.³⁶

While this describes just one dimension of Bilderberg’s genesis it certainly was an important component and one in which Ernst van der Beugel played a central role.³⁷ As Bundy related while looking back on his relationship with Ernst van der Beugel, “It was largely through Ernst that I came to realize the high degree to which Bilderberg was built on the relations formed during the period of the Marshall Plan. He was a direct link to a vitally important segment of history, in which the Netherlands had played a special part from the outset. He knew everybody from that time and their successors, and it was a privilege to observe, and in time,

³⁵ William P. “Bill” Bundy was an American attorney and intelligence expert who worked as a CIA analyst in the 1950s until he joined president Eisenhower’s Commission on National Goals. He also served as an advisor on foreign affairs to presidents Kennedy and Johnson. During this period he became deeply involved in Vietnam War policy, first as deputy to Assistant Secretary of State for International Security Affairs Paul Nitze during the Kennedy years and later as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific affairs under Johnson. After the election of Richard Nixon, he moved on to academia. In 1969 he started teaching at MIT and in 1973 he moved on to Princeton University where he worked as a professor for the rest of his life. Between 1975 and 1980 he served as the American Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings.

³⁶ “Interview: with William P. Bundy”, *Freeman Digest*, November-December 1978, p. 41, Scrapbook XVI, AHB.

³⁷ See also Thomas Gijswijt, “The Bilderberg Group and Dutch-American Relations” in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, eds. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 908; Aubourg, “The Bilderberg Group and the Atlantic Institute”, 103.

share in those bonds.”³⁸ While a significant segment of the Bilderbergers shared a common history from the Marshall Plan days, which had helped to facilitate the creation of the organization during a time of growing transatlantic tension, the Bilderberg Meetings were not just meant to serve as an annual reunion of those good old days. Rather, as Van der Beugel pointed out, it was meant as an instrument to “*keep the relations good*” – in the future as well.³⁹ In this context, the need to involve “a larger number of ‘new faces’ as much as possible to be recruited from the younger generation” was recognized as early as 1961.⁴⁰ In December 1963, Ernst van der Beugel informed Prince Bernhard about the necessity of a reorganization of the Steering Committee, arguing that its current composition severely prevented “the much needed circulation of fresh, young blood” which “guarantees that Bilderberg remains a vital organism.”⁴¹ As Van der Beugel explained:

The problem is that we are too much inclined to invite people, who are *arrivé* either in the public or the private sector. It is obvious that the Bilderberg Conferences are only worthwhile when a significant part of the participants occupy important positions. On the other hand it is of great importance that we also get people, who are not yet *arrivé*, but of whom it is likely that they will become so in the future, or that they will have influence on important individuals.”⁴²

Even worse, the Steering Committee was stuck with quite some individuals who not even belonged to either one of the above-mentioned categories anymore. Instead, their main trait was that they once “had been *arrivé*”. The number of European members of the Steering Committee had also grown considerably over the years, which was problematic because all of its members were to be invited to every Bilderberg Meeting. As a result, they “blocked” a great amount of the available seats, sometimes even representing half of the total number of participants.⁴³ Meanwhile the Bilderberg leadership was slowly ageing.⁴⁴ Consequently, what was needed, according to Van der Beugel was a rejuvenation of the Steering Committee, which meant that some of Bilderberg’s European “ambassadors in the different countries” had to be replaced. This was obviously going to be a “delicate problem” that would be accompanied with some “difficult conversations”, but it could no longer be avoided.⁴⁵ The reorganization of Bilderberg’s leadership was subsequently discussed during the Steering Committee meeting at the 1964 Bilderberg Conference in Williamsburg, Virginia, where the

³⁸ William P. Bundy, contribution to “Book on Ernst”, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

³⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 737: “Van der Beugel: Meer: ‘om de contacten goed te houden’” (translation mine, emphasis mine).

⁴⁰ “Meeting of the Advisory Committee at the ‘Century Club’, New York”, 17 November 1961, file 61, Bilderberg.

⁴¹ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 16 December 1963, file 66, Bilderberg (translation mine).

⁴² E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 20 October 1963, file 66, Bilderberg.

⁴³ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard [no date, probably 1964 - before Williamsburg Conference], file 67A, Bilderberg, NAH; Ingeborg Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity: the history of the Bilderberg Organization, 1952-1977” (PhD diss., Copenhagen University, 2009), 103.

⁴⁴ “Het Steering Committee”, A.T. Lamping, 6 March 1964, file 68A, Bilderberg.

⁴⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to HRH Prince Bernhard, 20 October 1963, file 66, Bilderberg.

Steering Committee agreed that “this situation ran counter to the widely-felt and widely-expressed desire that the Bilderberg Meetings should undergo a strong and continuous rejuvenation process.”⁴⁶

The rejuvenation process that Van der Beugel initiated was also received with approval by the Ford Foundation’s Director of the International Affairs program Shepard Stone – himself a frequent Bilderberg participant – who asserted in a letter to Joe Johnson, the American Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings, that he was convinced that Van der Beugel’s suggested improvements were very much needed. When Stone travelled around Europe he found many “younger men who are now assuming larger responsibilities in parliaments, universities, and business” but who were not represented at Bilderberg. “Bilderberg does not include, in my opinion, a sufficient number of new faces, either European or American”, he argued. “As one looks back to Williamsburg, one might say that we should have had one of Goldwater’s young men on hand. This would not have been to my personal taste, but it might have been useful to all of us.”⁴⁷ It is not unlikely that Van der Beugel had in fact been informally instructed by Stone, who was a close friend of Van der Beugel, to put greater emphasis on the socialization of promising young leaders in Bilderberg as this would happen repeatedly during the years that followed.⁴⁸ In their June 1964 interim report to the Ford Foundation, the Bilderbergers made sure to underscore that “Both the Americans and the Europeans are conscious of the need to involve younger persons, and particularly future leaders, in the Bilderberg Meetings, and are making efforts to increase the number of such persons.”⁴⁹ This emphasis on the successor generation would from this moment on remain a constantly recurring element in Bilderberg’s reports to the Ford Foundation. Stone, in turn, tried to help the Secretaries-General in their scouting efforts by providing Johnson “on a confidential basis” with a list of young leaders composed by Ford’s International Affairs department for possible Bilderberg selections, while reassuring his Ford Foundation colleague Joseph E. Slater that they were “working actively on the new crop.”⁵⁰

While the overhaul of the Steering Committee was a first step towards this goal, its members still found it difficult to include the desired amount of younger participants – younger meaning in this case ‘under 45’.⁵¹ Consequently, in his August 1966 memorandum that warned against Bilderberg running out of sync with “the great mass of people and most especially the young” mentioned in the preceding chapter, Van der Beugel also pushed for a

⁴⁶ “Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting held at Williamsburg”, 20 and 22 March 1964, file 67A, Bilderberg.

⁴⁷ Shepard Stone to Joseph E. Johnson, 24 August 1964, Grant files, Bilderberg, PA56-341, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

⁴⁸ See for example: “American Friends of Bilderberg, 24 January 1968”, box 22, folder 12, George W. Ball Papers, PUL: “The second is the importance of continuing to get both new faces and young faces. In the latter connection, officials of the Ford Foundation, with whom we now have an application pending for a further grant for Bilderberg, have repeatedly stressed to me the importance they attach to Bilderberg’s not becoming a closed group and to the desirability of seeking out younger people who seem likely to play key roles in their countries in the near future.”

⁴⁹ “Interim Report to the Ford Foundation on Activities of the Bilderberg Meetings for the period 1 July 1963-15 June 1964”, Ford Foundation Grant File, Bilderberg, PA56-341, Section 3: Reports, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

⁵⁰ S. Stone to J.E. Slater, 17 December 1964, box 18, folder 193, IA/Joseph E. Slater, FFA, RAC.

⁵¹ Joe Johnson to Joseph E. Slater, 12 May 1965, box 18, folder 191, IA/Joseph E. Slater, FFA, RAC.

further rejuvenation of the Bilderberg meetings, this time with a prime focus on facilitating the integration of still younger members into the transatlantic establishment through its choice of subjects as well as its list of invitees. "It is a good thing", Van der Beugel maintained, "that Bilderberg is after all an 'establishment' group. It could not function otherwise. But it would be a pity if we should become increasingly an emeritus 'establishment' group of 1952. If this analysis should be correct (and I hope very much that it is not) then we should draw the consequences in the choice of our subjects and especially in the composition of the participants."⁵²

Ernst van der Beugel's August memorandum was extensively discussed during a Steering Committee meeting at Soestdijk Palace⁵³ in October 1966, where Van der Beugel explained that "in proposing to invite younger people with diverging opinions he did not mean the attendance of new participants with an entirely negative attitude towards basic assumptions of Bilderberg, but the people he had in mind should have constructive alternatives. Moreover, they should have the qualifications of 'coming men' and have a certain following. A percentage of 25 to 30 of this group on the total number of participants should be aimed at." According to the minutes of the meeting, "all members present agreed with Mr. van der Beugel's suggestions."⁵⁴ Even so, actually living up to these standards continued to prove a challenge for the Steering Committee.⁵⁵ At the Cambridge meeting in 1967, 25% of the American participants were under 45 years of age, but only four of them were under 40.⁵⁶ Ernst van der Beugel provided an example of the kind of younger individual with a "diverging" – but not *too* diverging – opinion he had in mind by inviting the 35 year old Dutch social-democrat Piet Dankert, with whom he had debated the PvdA's stance on the Vietnam War not long before, and who became the PvdA's spokesperson on Foreign Affairs and Defense the year after. Even so, it was not until the 1969 conference in Marienlyst, Denmark that "a conspicuously successful effort was made to include a larger proportion of younger people in each of the delegations."⁵⁷

⁵² E.H. van der Beugel to Members of the Steering Committee of Bilderberg, August 1966, file 7, EvdB.

⁵³ Soestdijk Palace was the residence of the Dutch Queen and Prince Bernhard in Baarn, the Netherlands.

⁵⁴ "Minutes of Steering Committee meeting at Soestdijk Palace on October 9, 1966", box 76, file 3, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁵⁵ See for example: "Final report to the Ford Foundation (...) 13 June 1963 - 1 May 1968", box 76, file 4, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL. "There has been marked success in getting new faces but some difficulty in getting as many younger people as we seek. This is partly because members of the steering committee on both sides of the Atlantic tend to think in terms of persons who have already 'arrived' and it is difficult for the administrators on both sides to counter this tendency. Also it has proved easier to identify promising younger persons among scholars and parliamentarians than among businessmen. The two Honorary Secretaries-General are constantly endeavoring to find more young people and hope to be more successful in 1969 than in 1968. In this connection we hope to benefit from the files of names of up-and-coming young people in the possession of the Ford Foundation."

⁵⁶ Joseph E. Johnson to Joseph E. Slater, 20 December 1967, Bilderberg Grant File, 56-341, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC; "Final report to the Ford Foundation (...) 13 June 1963 - 1 May 1968", box 76, file 4, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁵⁷ "Interim Report to the Ford Foundation Grant 56-341E", May 1968-August 1969. Ford Foundation Grant File, Bilderberg, PA56-341, Section 3: Reports, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

Bridging the Generation Gap: from Marienlyst to Woodstock

During his preparations for the Marienlyst conference, Ernst van der Beugel had emphasized that the rejuvenation process should be stepped up in “an effort to increase the participation of much younger people who are much nearer to the views of the student generation in vital matters of foreign policy and other relevant problems.” Out of 80 participants at least 20 should come from the age group between 25 and 40 and they should not only be chosen on the basis of their age, but also on the basis of their opinion about policy matters. To illustrate what he meant by this, Van der Beugel suggested that the Bilderberg ambassadors should “reach out for the [Eugene] McCarthy and younger Kennedy people in the United States and the analogue groups in Europe.”⁵⁸

Besides, the topics discussed at the conference departed from previous practice in that the agenda for the first time included a social issue: “Elements of Instability in Western Society.” The year before, a first attempt to use Bilderberg as a forum to come to grips with the challenges posed by the younger generation had been made by a last minute modification of the Conference programme when it was decided rather ad-hoc to set the Saturday evening aside for a discussion of the “student problem.” This discussion had been introduced through a twelve page statement on this topic by James A. Perkins of Cornell University, who had argued that students should be perceived as members of a new ‘pre-adult class’ that distinguished itself by its early freedom, late responsibility, and detachment from the adult world combined with high motives and a genuine idealism which had not been tempered by adult contact, as a result of which they had “not seen how idealism must be modified in life by experience.”⁵⁹ To counter the negative effects of this emerging new pre-adult class, Perkins stated that “We must put the ladders down for this group or else they are going to be at the mercy of their own ignorance and their own naïveté and continue to view the adult world as essentially hostile and unfriendly and one they want no part of.”⁶⁰ The formal addition of a related social issue to the agenda of the Marienlyst conference now indicated a more serious attempt to use the Bilderberg Meeting as a forum to come to grips with the challenges posed by the younger generation to Atlantic stability.

In response to Van der Beugel’s renewed call for younger participants, Canadian Steering Committee member Tony Griffin wrote to the European Secretary-General that he was “looking carefully into whom we might get in the category of a youngish man identified with the ‘New Left’ but who is not also on the periphery of lunacy.”⁶¹ In this context, he suggested to invite “not so much a member of youthful activism as their very prophet”, namely the media theorist Marshall McLuhan who had coined the famous phrase “the medium is the message”. While McLuhan was well beyond the age limit he was “renowned

⁵⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to Members of the Steering Committee, September 24, 1968, box 76, file 4, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁵⁹ “Remarks by dr. James A. Perkins”, 27 April 1968, box 22, Folder 12, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ T. Griffin to E.H. van der Beugel, 24 December 1968, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

as [a member of] the avant-garde” and “closely identified with the problems of instability” Griffin argued, and as such he was invited to the conference.

During the conference, Professor Daniel Bell of Columbia University and Professor Ralf Dahrendorf of Konstanz University in Germany delivered the papers on general elements of instability in Western society. Bell’s paper was meant to ignite a discussion on the sources of alienation among the young and the question to what extent this was a response to the Vietnam War, whereas the sheet with discussion points that came with Dahrendorf’s paper included questions like “what can we learn from student unrest – and how should we react to it?” and: “Are student unrest, the personalization of power, regionalism and hippiedom symptoms of the same ‘disease’ and is there any political action which can, and has to be taken in relation to it?”⁶² The second agenda item that was discussed – ‘Conflicting attitudes within the Western World toward relations with the USSR and the other Communist states of Eastern Europe in the light of recent events’ – “also took into account the attitudes and views of youth.”⁶³ For this item the paper was prepared by François Duchêne, van der Beugel’s colleague at the International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Looking back on the conference, Ernst van der Beugel was very pleased with the result. “It was a superb conference” he wrote to Kurt Birrenbach. “The experiment to mix 15 young and rather radical men with the older group proved to be a complete success.”⁶⁴ According to the 1969 interim report to the Ford Foundation Van der Beugel was not the only one who believed this was the case:

The combination of a high proportion of younger participants, representation of a wide range of views, and topics of unusual interest produced lively and often exciting discussions. Comments during and after the meetings indicated that veteran Bilderbergers viewed this as one of the most successful, in terms of the mutual education that is de *raison d’être* of Bilderberg. While perhaps few converts were made, there was unquestionably greater understanding of the issues, and, it is to be hoped, greater awareness of other points of view. Marienlyst Bilderberg helped bridge not only the Atlantic gap but the generation gap.⁶⁵

While planning the next conference Ernst van der Beugel felt “strongly about the necessity that we repeat the Marienlyst approach in inviting at least 25% young people with this kind of attitude apparent at our last conference.” It had not only been a useful experiment according to Van der Beugel, but – also important, since this was one of the main worries in the process

⁶² “The Bilderberg Conference: Daniel Bell Paper - Questions for Discussion”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁶³ “Interim Report to the Ford Foundation – Grant 56-341E, May 1968-August 1969”, Ford Foundation Grant File, Bilderberg, PA56-341, Section 3: Reports, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

⁶⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to Kurt Birrenbach, 13 May 1969, file 8, EvdB. See also: E.H. van der Beugel to H.A. Kissinger, 13 May 1969, file 8, EvdB.

⁶⁵ “Interim Report to the Ford Foundation – Grant 56-341E, May 1968-August 1969”, Ford Foundation Grant File, Bilderberg, PA56-341, Section 3: Reports, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC. See also: “Minutes Steering Committee Meeting 11 May 1969”, box 22, folder 13, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

of engaging younger participants – “it did not in the least hurt the cohesion of the group and the ‘ambiance’ of the discussion as some had feared.”⁶⁶ The latter analysis was not shared by everyone, however.

After a meeting of the American Steering Committee, lawyer, diplomat and veteran Bilderberger Arthur Dean⁶⁷ wrote a letter to the general Steering Committee in which he pointed out that while Ernst van der Beugel had “quite properly wished to lower the age of those who participate”, the experimental composition of the group in Marienlyst had – in contrast to what Van der Beugel claimed – actually impaired the atmosphere of the meeting as he experienced it. “Due to the number of sociologists and younger people from vocations and callings generally not previously invited”, he wrote, “the character of the interchanges was quick and brisk and some such as that of Professor McLuhan were both tiresome, repetitious and unproductive.”⁶⁸ It appears, however, that in the end not so much the young as the sociologists, and McLuhan in particular, received most of the blame for spoiling the atmosphere in Marienlyst. Years later an anonymous Bilderberger would tell a journalist of *The Times* that McLuhan had been invited to Bilderberg as a “daring move” in an attempt to be “*really* radical” adding that during the conference the Canadian prophet of the successor generation had “used so many four letter words that we had learnt our lesson.”⁶⁹ As Dean mentioned in his report of the general Steering Committee meeting at Soestdijk Palace on October 8, 1969, there “was unanimous agreement that he should not be invited to another Bilderberg meeting.” In addition, there was “extended discussion as to whether people holding high offices in government would come if you had a preponderance of young men of the sociological type.” While the Steering Committee did not reach a definite conclusion on this, Dean mentioned that there “seemed to be a general consensus that we should not again invite sociologists to a Bilderberg meeting.” It might be possible though, that this analysis mainly projected his own disagreements with sociologists, as already expressed in the discussion with the American Steering Committee and the remarks in his letter to the general Steering Committee. Even so, Dean added that there was also “a general feeling that we should continue to invite younger persons in the fields that we decided upon to discuss.”⁷⁰ The other Steering Committee members agreed, however, that it did not “seem advisable to

⁶⁶ E.H. van der Beugel to Members of the Steering Committee, September 17, 1969, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁶⁷ Arthur H. Dean had been on the Bilderberg Steering Committee since 1957. Dean served as a negotiator and advisor to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. He had helped to negotiate the Korean Armistice Agreement which ended the Korean War, was chief of the delegation to the talks that eventually produced a partial nuclear test ban treaty in 1963 and was credited with helping to persuade President Johnson in 1968 to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and to not seek re-election. See: Albin Kress, “Arthur H. Dean, Envoy to Korea Talks, Dies at 89”, *The New York Times*, December 1, 1987.

⁶⁸ Arthur H. Dean to Bilderberg Steering Committee, October 2, 1969, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁶⁹ “The Bilderberg Group: an exclusive club”, *The Times*, April 18, 1977, p. 9. See also: Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity”, 138.

⁷⁰ “Arthur H. Dean's notes on the meeting of the Steering Committee at Soestdijk Palace on Wednesday, October 8, 1969”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

invite still younger people (20 years old), as this would probably be harmful to the cohesion of the conference.”⁷¹

On Van der Beugel’s instigation the Steering Committee decided to repeat the experiment during the 1970 conference in Bad Ragaz, Switzerland – not only with regards to the invitees, but also with respect to the nature of the topics to be discussed.⁷² With one exception the general feeling within the Steering Committee was that the discussion about instability in Western Society had by no means been exhausted while its subject remained of prime importance. Therefore, van der Beugel suggested to continue the discussion; this time with a focus on one specific element of the general instability discussed in Marienlyst. Since “one place where the sources of instability present themselves in the most obvious way is the University” Van der Beugel suggested the “problems, function and future of the university in our society” as the first topic to be discussed at the following conference. The one person who was not so sure about continuing the Marienlyst discussion – the one exception mentioned above – was in fact the Swiss lawyer and diplomat Victor Umbricht, the host of the 1970 conference in Bad Ragaz. He believed it might be better to postpone a continuation of the discussion on instability until 1971 which would enable the Bilderbergers to gain “valuable additional experience as to how instability is developing and how it should be handled” so that they would be able to confront the issue with “more aloofness to present-day happenings.” While Van der Beugel fully recognized the validity of these arguments he explained that he was nevertheless still inclined to press for discussing the university problem in 1970. “I feel that especially the situation at our universities is a burning problem”, he wrote, “relevant to all of us whether we work in the field of politics, business, journalism or the academic world.”⁷³

The importance of the university was also recognized in the American Steering committee, but the exact approach was a matter of extensive discussion in which all the major traits of the successor generation problem passed the revue. Jack Heinz suggested to amend Van der Beugel’s topic to “the changing role of the university in relation to society”, emphasizing that he was not proposing a discussion of student disorders but of the significance of things like the popularity of Democratic presidential candidate and Vietnam war critic Eugene McCarthy among students, the suspension of university activity on 15 October 1969 to protest the war in Vietnam, and the confrontation between Columbia University and the blacks of Harlem. “Clearly”, he argued, “the university today is no longer the ivory tower institution of the past, and this is having far-reaching repercussions.” The

⁷¹ “Minutes, Steering Committee Meeting, May 11, 1969”, box 22, folder 13, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

⁷² “Minutes of the meeting of the Steering committee at Soestdijk, October 8, 1969”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL: “There was a general consensus that again 20-25% of the number of participants should be chosen not only from the age group of approximately 25-40 but also on the basis of their diverging views on basic issues of policy.”

⁷³ E.H. van der Beugel to Steering Committee, box 22, folder 13, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

American banker David Rockefeller⁷⁴, however, was skeptical “as to whether the topic was sufficiently ‘Atlantic’ in scope and suggested to adapt the subject to “the impact of student disorder on Atlantic unity.” George Ball subsequently felt that the topic was “interesting in the light of the fact that today’s graduate students, who will soon occupy positions of leadership, are a generation away from the War”, arguing that “their experiences and priorities are vastly different from those of the pre-war generation: they no longer find the confrontation with the USSR relevant and think that too much attention is given to it: they grew up with the bomb and are therefore used to it; they have a greater deal of contempt for the older generation. The young, moreover are in the vanguard of the opposition to Vietnam War since they are the ones whose lives are most immediately tested by it. It is the issue of the war that unites them most firmly against their parents’ generation.” American Secretary General Joe Johnsen eventually proposed that “one way of approaching this topic might be to recruit a ‘young person’ on each side of the ocean to write a paper dealing with the priorities on foreign affairs” which should be “representative of the views of a rather large cross-section of the post-war generation.” While this idea appealed to most American Steering Committee members, Arthur Dean interjected that proposing a discussion on dissent of the young would result in losing a good part of the membership of Bilderberg. According to him at most ten to twenty per cent of the young actually shared the views attributed to them by George Ball, and he believed that there was “no need to devote too much time to them.” The other American Steering Committee members disagreed, however. While it was probably true that no more than ten per cent of the young would “take to the barricades”, the economist, former World Bank director and Exxon Corporation executive Emilio Collado pointed out that “a vast majority of the young does hold priorities very different from ‘ours’.”⁷⁵ In the end, the Steering Committee decided to go ahead with the “Future function of the university in our society” as the first agenda item.⁷⁶

In this context, James A. Perkins, the American president of Cornell University delivered a paper on the ‘University and Society’ while Edgar Faure, who had just stepped down as France’s minister of Education in 1969 – a capacity in which he had pushed through major reforms of the French universities – delivered a paper on “Transformations in Society and the Replanning of Education”. The Bilderbergers also decided to follow up on Joe Johnson’s suggestion to ask two younger participants, both academics, to serve as ambassadors for their generation. To this end, the 30 year old Harvard political scientist Graham T. Allison delivered a paper on “‘Young Americans’ Attitudes towards Foreign Policy for the 1970s” while Van der Beugel asked the 35 year old German political scientist Karl Kaiser of the

⁷⁴ David Rockefeller, the youngest son of Standard Oil scion John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was chairman and chief executive of the Chase Manhattan Corporation.

⁷⁵ “Minutes of Meeting of US Bilderberg Steering Committee, 2 October 1969”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁷⁶ “Arthur H. Dean’s notes on the meeting of the Steering Committee at Soestdijk Palace on Wednesday, October 8, 1969”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

University of the Saarland as a representative for the European youngsters on “Priorities in Foreign Policy.”⁷⁷

The Old Guard in Defense of the Capitalist System

As a second agenda item for the Bad Ragaz conference, Van der Beugel had originally suggested to either take an important political or economic subject of current importance (...) or to “continue the discussion of the first day from a completely different angle e.g. “Problems, function and future of private enterprise in our society.”⁷⁸ This topic greatly appealed to the Americans, who were concerned about the image of private enterprise in the US – especially among the young. “Many young people are convinced that corporations earn huge profits which are spent on ‘riotous living’ of the directors,”⁷⁹ they observed. David Rockefeller had on multiple occasions publicly voiced his concerns on this topic. “Many of the attitudes expressed by the generation treading upon our heels are both uncongenial and deeply disturbing”, he had written in the Harvard Alumni Bulletin. “But they are realities, and angry denunciation will not cause them to vanish.” What might actually help to make them disappear, Rockefeller argued, was “for those of us who are over thirty to display in our professional lives precisely those qualities which our youthful critics say we lack – open mindedness, intellectual honesty and commitment to responsible social progress.” To foster among the young an appreciation of the importance of business and the profit motive, which many of them had come to despise, it was necessary to “demonstrate through action that the profit motive, properly employed, constitutes a powerful tool with which to achieve the goals that the best of our young people profess to want.” To this end, Rockefeller argued, “we must show beyond dispute that business can become the engine of progress in such areas as civil rights” as well as in fighting “poverty, urban decay, and pollution of the environment.”⁸⁰ This sentiment was also present during the Steering Committee meeting at Soestdijk Palace, where there was a general agreement between the Americans and the Europeans that they should “try to get younger people in order to convince them that private enterprise was not wholly bad, and also to try to convince them that turning everything up to the state was not the most appropriate solution.”⁸¹

⁷⁷ Karl Kaiser, “Priorities in Foreign Policy”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL; James A. Perkins, “The University and Society”, series 7, box 53:50, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL; Graham T. Allison, “Young Americans’ Attitudes towards Foreign Policy for the 1970s”, series 7, box 53:51, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL; Edgar Faure, “Transformations in Society and the Replanning of Education”, Series 7, box 53:49, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

⁷⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to Members of the Steering Committee, 17 September 1969, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁷⁹ “Minutes of Meeting of US Bilderberg Steering Committee, 2 October 1969”, box 77, folder 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁸⁰ “David Rockefeller, *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, May 23, 1968” - reprinted with permission from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin, accessed December 5, 2016, <https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1368&dat=19680523&id=THhQAAAAIBAJ&sjid=txEEAAAAIBAJ&pg=3052,4514943&hl=en>.

⁸¹ “Arthur H. Dean’s notes on the meeting of the Steering Committee at Soestdijk Palace on Wednesday, October 8, 1969”, box 77, file 5, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

While the topic of business and the young did not turn up on the official agenda of the 1970 Bad Ragaz conference, it was discussed at the conference. Even so, there was still a strong desire within the Steering Committee to go deeper into this topic afterwards. Within the American Steering Committee, Gabriel Hauge, Tony Griffin and Arthur Dean in particular expressed a strong desire to see an agenda item, which had continuity with the “discussion on the environmental-cultural situation” in Bad Ragaz. This time, however, they believed “thoughtful business leaders or industrial leaders should prepare the papers and lead the discussion” on this topic. “If there is, as there must be, positive and constructive thinking on these problems in the international business community let it be advanced at Bilderberg and let a few younger people listen, criticize, etc.”⁸²

Shepard Stone, the Ford Foundation’s Director of International Affairs, also again expressed his support for Bilderberg’s shift in focus, this time with regards to the content of the meetings. As he wrote to Ernst van der Beugel: “though foreign policy and economic problems undoubtedly have larger appeal to most of our members, you have been right, I believe, to emphasize in recent years youth, university and environmental questions which are influencing decisions on international relations.”⁸³ It was important not to lose this momentum now, he emphasized. In connection with this subject area, however, he believed it would be better not “to have young people or professors write the papers and tip off the discussion.” Instead, Stone proposed to ask two thoughtful businessmen, one European and one American, to write the papers and to open the discussion by explaining what established leaders, bankers, industrialists, lawyers and public officials are doing to meet the challenge of the environment and of social and intellectual change. “What is the response of administrators, industry, the law to the attitudes and criticisms of the young? What are they doing to achieve understanding of these problems, build bridges to the young who are their inevitable successors? What are they doing to expose the young to the complexity of problems, to work together in getting at new solutions where required or to fortify old and tested points where valid?”, Stone wondered. “To put this range of questions to thoughtful men of the David Rockefeller, Cy Vance, Otto Wolf type”, he believed, “might stimulate creative thinking among our older members and increase their interest.”⁸⁴ Young participants would ‘undoubtedly’ challenge and debate these presentations, Stone believed, but it might serve as “a method to maintain interest in problems to which we should continue to give our attention.” In other words, reversing the roles of the young and the scholars on the one hand and the business and government leaders on the other might have a stimulating effect on both sides at the next conference. It might also, Stone added, “help to stimulate European-American leaders to think through problems they have sometimes tried to avoid.”⁸⁵ The desired defense of private enterprise eventually happened at the 1971 conference in

⁸² Arthur H. Dean to Joseph E. Johnson, 29 September 1970, box 77, file 6, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁸³ S. Stone to E.H. van der Beugel and J. Johnson, 5 May 1970, box 77, file 6, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

Woodstock, Vermont where “The contribution of business in dealing with current problems of instability” was put on the agenda next to attempts to deal with détente and the “possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequences.” Thus, while Bilderberg had started out as an instrument to mediate transatlantic friction by building bridges among the Atlantic elite, it was now also perceived as a vehicle to bridge the generation gap as part of the broader effort to sustain Western cooperation and all its stood for – including the capitalist system as represented by private enterprise.

In a report to the Ford Foundation covering the 1969-1971 period, the Bilderbergers explained that “strenuous recruitment had led to a marked increase in the number of participants under forty.” Even so, there still remained some difficulty in getting as many younger people as they had sought, a situation the report attributed to the fact that many members in the Steering Committee – who were responsible for recruiting and suggesting participants – still had the tendency to “think in terms of persons who have already ‘arrived’.” This was especially problematic for the selection of participants from business and government since, as they argued “few people in business or government ‘arrive’ before 40”. In contrast, it had been “easier to identify outstanding young persons who are scholars and politicians than to find them in other walks of life.”⁸⁶ What is more, while the American Secretary General Joe Johnson believed that Bilderberg could help participants “to understand their fellows of different ages, experience, and points of view” he also recognized that there existed a certain tension between the old guard and the new generation at the Bilderberg meetings. “There are at Bilderberg as elsewhere dialogues of the deaf; the young may sometimes fail to press their points vigorously; there may be manifestations of an old school tie spirit among the veterans of the Marshall Plan and NATO; the generation now coming to or on the threshold of power may be impatient or scornful of the backward glance, the apparent nostalgia, of their seniors”, he explained. “Nevertheless”, he concluded his evaluation, “I know no other place in which European and North-American men – and as of 1972, women – of diverse nationalities, professions, ages, experiences, and interests can explore each other’s views and prejudices and establish contacts that may have significance and utility for the world of the ‘70s.”⁸⁷

As Joe Johnson pointed out, in 1972 the Steering Committee had for the first time also invited women to participate in the Bilderberg Meetings. Before 1972, some women had been present; most prominently the Dutch crown-princess Beatrix, the eldest daughter of Prince Bernhard and Queen Juliana, who was present at the Bilderberg meetings from 1962 onwards. Formally, though, she was not a participant but an “observer” during those first years.⁸⁸ In 1972, the Steering Committee departed from its habit of exclusively inviting male participants by inviting a first set of prominent women including Miriam Camps (whose work

⁸⁶ “Ford Foundation Report of Bilderberg Meetings 1969-1971” Ford Foundation Grant File, Bilderberg, PA56-341, Section 3: Reports, Reel 5464, FFA, RAC.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity”, 138.

Van der Beugel greatly admired), the Italian journalist Marion Dönhoff and the French journalist and politician Françoise Giroud, the Dutch economics professor Maria J. t Hooft, the British Labor politician Shirley Summerskill and Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands to fully participate as well. From correspondence between Ernst van der Beugel and Sydney Gruson of the New York Times it appears that Van der Beugel was in fact in favor of including women at an earlier stage, but that it was the chairman – Prince Bernhard – who had prevented this. As Van der Beugel told Gruson, who in 1971 suggested to include female participants: “I agree with your judgment (...) it takes, however, quite some time to break the very strong conviction of our Chairman of having women at the conference. It is a slow process but I know that in the end we will win.”⁸⁹ It seems that the Ford Foundation also played a role in pushing this change through. Nevertheless, as in the case with the young, introducing women into Bilderberg remained a “slow process” as Van der Beugel had warned. “The ‘lady-participants’ worked very well”, Van der Beugel remarked in June 1972, “It will, however, be difficult to keep up the level because in spite of ‘women’s lib’ the reservoir is not unlimited.”⁹⁰

The level of younger participants also fluctuated after the 1969-1971 experiments. Moreover, in 1972 the Steering Committee also discussed diversification by welcoming Japanese participants. They eventually decided against this, however, after which David Rockefeller set up the Trilateral Commission in 1973, which did include Japanese participants and became one of Bilderberg’s rival organizations.⁹¹ “Despite all the declarations of intentions to rejuvenate the membership of the organization”, Ingeborg Philipsen concluded in her dissertation on the Bilderberg meetings, “the SC members preferred to draw on their established network when choosing the participants, which meant that the average Bilderberg participant of the period was a white man in his sixties.”⁹² Eventually, it would take a severe crisis to create the opportunity for Ernst van der Beugel to push through a more fundamental rejuvenation of the Bilderberg Meetings.

Bilderberg and the Lockheed Scandal: an Existential Crisis

On February 7, 1976 news broke that during statements made during investigations of the Church Committee in the U.S. Senate it had been asserted that a “senior Netherlands official” had been involved in a huge bribery scandal concerning the American aerospace company Lockheed.⁹³ Rumor had it that this Dutchman was Bilderberg chairman Prince Bernhard. It would not take long before the Dutch Prime Minister, Joop den Uyl, put forward a statement

⁸⁹ E.H. van der Beugel to Sydney Gruson (The New York Times), 6 July 1971, file 9, EvdB.

⁹⁰ E.H. van der Beugel, “Note on Bilderberg”, 28 June, 1972.

⁹¹ On the Trilateral Commission see: Stephen Gill, *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Dino Knudsen, *The Trilateral Commission and Global Governance: Informal Elite Diplomacy* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

⁹² Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity”, 138.

⁹³ For an in-depth study on the Lockheed Scandal, see: Gerard Aalders, *Het Lockheed Schandaal* (Amsterdam: Boom, 2011).

confirming that Prince Bernhard – “the flying Dutchman of industry”⁹⁴ – was indeed the person referred to in the evidence and that the government had decided to conduct an investigation while underlining that this did not mean that Prince Bernhard “was guilty of any reprehensible act.” The Prince, in turn, stated that he “had never received or accepted any money from Lockheed and invited an investigation concerning the development that resulted into his being named in this affair.”⁹⁵

Ernst van der Beugel – who was internationally known as a close associate of Prince Bernhard – put his reputation at stake by defending the Prince in Dutch media. “I have been in close working relationship with His Royal Highness for twenty-five years. I am totally convinced that there is no beginning of truth in these rumors,” he declared on a Dutch TV newscast the day after the statements were made in the U.S. Senate.⁹⁶ Van der Beugel also reassured members of the Bilderberg Steering committee that there was nothing to worry about. “I should like to repeat what I told you on Sunday”, he wrote in a telegram to his American counterpart Joe Johnson, “I am totally and completely convinced that nothing irregular has happened and that even if P.B.’s name is mentioned in Lockheed’s files, this in no way proves anything.”⁹⁷ Nevertheless, Van der Beugel considered the case “a terrible headache”. The only way in which the issue could be solved, he believed, was when it would become clear to whom the money had in fact been paid. “I have good hope that the Dutch government will direct its activity to that purpose, because denials, arguing that the Prince was not involved, are not sufficient. The positive proof has to be delivered to show where the money did indeed end up. We keep our fingers crossed,” he wrote to his Dutch-American friend Peter Fleck.⁹⁸

The Bilderberg Steering Committee followed the developments closely as they unfolded. Just days after the news broke Arthur Dean called a meeting of the American Steering Committee together to discuss how to deal with the evolving situation. The upcoming Bilderberg conference was planned to take place in the Homestead near Hot Springs, Virginia and Dean feared that considering the circumstances “it may be difficult to get acceptances of the prominent personages in Europe who have been invited and of the U.S. officials who have been or are being invited. We may encounter difficulty in getting contributions from prospective American donors.”⁹⁹ On March 8, the Wall Street Journal reported that the 1976 Bilderberg Conference had in fact been cancelled after U.S. leaders invited to the conference

⁹⁴ Alden Hatch qtd. In: “A Slap for the Prince”, *Newsweek*, April 5, 1976.

⁹⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to Joe Johnson, February 9, 1967, telegram, forwarded to the members of the Steering Committee on February 9, 1967, Series 8, box 64: 50, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

⁹⁶ Joseph E. Johnson to Members of the Steering Committee, February 9, 1976, Series 8, box 64: 50, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

⁹⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to Joe Johnson, 9 February 1967, telegram, forwarded to the members of the Steering Committee on February 9, 1967, series 8, box 64: 50, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

⁹⁸ E.H. van der Beugel to Peter Fleck, 9 February 1976, file 38, EvdB (translation mine).

⁹⁹ Arthur H. Dean, Memorandum to U.S. Steering Committee, 10 February 1976, box 77, folder “1975-80, Bilderberg 1976 - Lockheed, Arthur H. Dean Papers, CUL.

had expressed doubts about accepting the invitation “in view of the official investigation in the Netherlands”, which was confirmed by the Bilderberg Secretariat in The Hague.¹⁰⁰

The Europeans, however, appeared less concerned about the allegations against the Prince. A number of them had in fact indicated to Shepard Stone, who agreed with them, that the Homestead conference ought to be held despite the circumstances and they complained that “the Americans were really pressuring the Prince to postpone or to give it up.”¹⁰¹ As Ernst van der Beugel explained in a letter to the European members of the Steering Committee, “there was ‘without any doubt a difference between the approach of most Europeans and most Americans involved.’ In the US, there was a greater sensibility about these matters in an ambiance which, according to [Van der] Beugel, had ‘all the characteristics of a ‘witch-hunt.’” Even so, Van der Beugel recognized that it would be better to “preserve Bilderberg and to not get our meeting involved in undesired and malicious publicity.”¹⁰² From Secretary General Joe Johnson’s correspondence, it appears that Van der Beugel was in fact quite irritated by the attitude of certain Americans in this context. After a visit to Prince Bernhard in March, Johnson told Stone that he had found the Prince “in very good spirits”, explaining that while he was “clearly annoyed at some of our American colleagues, he was much less bitter than Ernst who seemed to me to have gone a bit off the deep end.” Johnson had told Van der Beugel so, and “for once in our long association we had some rather sharp words.” More importantly, though, Johnson “came away from the palace more convinced than ever that P.B. [was] not guilty either in fact or in intent.” Instead, the American Secretary General was “very impressed by his attitude”, relating that the Prince “was most emphatic, incidentally, in his determination to keep Bilderberg going ‘until I die.’”¹⁰³ In the end, despite American pressure to postpone the Homestead meeting, the Steering Committee seems to have had enough confidence in its chairman to plan the next Steering Committee meeting at Soestdijk Palace in the fall – following the release of the report by the Dutch investigation committee. As Van der Beugel wrote to Canadian Steering Committee member Tony Griffin:

My guess about the report of the Commission of Inquiry is that the report will come out in the middle or at the end of August, but I must repeat that it is only a guess. As to the contents I remain completely confident. I therefore have every reason to believe that the October Meeting of the Steering Committee will take place as we have planned. I have no recent news from our American friends, but I am in close touch with them. I think that everything is completely under control.¹⁰⁴

The report was eventually released on 26 August, 1976 and “all hell broke loose” after it became clear that the Prince had in fact been found guilty of accepting a \$1.1 million bribe

¹⁰⁰ “Bilderberg Conference Led by Prince Benrhard Is Cancelled this Year”, Wall Street Journal, 8 March 1976.

¹⁰¹ Shepard Stone to Joseph M. Johnson, 26 March 1976, Series 8, box 64:50, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

¹⁰² Qtd in: Philipsen, “Diplomacy with Ambiguity”, 251.

¹⁰³ Joseph E. Johnson to Shepard Stone, 2 March 25, 1976, series 8, box 64:50, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

¹⁰⁴ E.H. van der Beugel to A.G.S. Griffing, file 39, EvdB.

from the Lockheed Corporation to ensure that the Dutch government would buy the American Lockheed F-104 Starfighter aircraft instead of the French Dassault Mirage 5.¹⁰⁵ The event plunged the Bilderberg Meetings into an existential crisis recovery from which was uncertain at best. It was this crisis, however, that offered Ernst van der Beugel a window of opportunity to push through the more fundamental rejuvenation of Bilderberg that he had pursued for years.

After the report of the Commission of Three was accepted by the Dutch government as well as by the Queen and the Prince and debated in Parliament, Ernst van der Beugel first of all met with Foreign Minister Max van der Stoel to discuss the Bilderberg Meetings. According to Van der Beugel's report to the Bilderberg Steering Committee he explained to Van der Stoel "that Bilderberg was a private organization but that [he] always had been in touch with the Dutch Government if matters of foreign policy arose which could have an effect on the constitutional position of H.R.H." This time, however, Van der Beugel explained "I came to see him because in the new circumstances I could neither fruitfully talk to my colleagues in the Steering Committee nor to H.R.H. without knowing the opinion of the Netherlands government." The two Dutchmen "agreed immediately that continuation of the chairmanship of Bilderberg by the Prince was out of the question." Subsequently, Van der Beugel discussed two other options, namely to liquidate Bilderberg at the end of the year or to continue without the Prince. Because he "felt that Bilderberg as an instrument and as a formula was unique in the transatlantic dialogue which was more necessary than ever", Van der Stoel expressed "a strong preference" for a continuation of the Bilderberg Meetings.¹⁰⁶ Next to that, he believed that it would be better if the Bilderberg Meetings would not be terminated as an "immediate consequence of the change in the position of the Prince." While the Prince had played an important role in the Meetings, Bilderberg had "substance on its own" and "liquidation now would create the impression that it had been a kind of private club of the Prince and would be retroactively depreciating," the Dutch foreign minister argued.¹⁰⁷

After consulting Max van der Stoel, Ernst van der Beugel started to solicit the opinion of the European members of the Steering Committee by telephone. He also consulted some former participants who were not members of the Steering Committee including the German economist and politician Helmut Schmidt, the British labor politician Denis Healey, the Dutch banker and former prime-minister Jelle Zijlstra and OECD Secretary General Emile van Lennep. Could Bilderberg survive this crisis? A great majority believed it was worth trying and

¹⁰⁵ E.H. van der Beugel to Dr. A. Polak Daniels, file 39, EvdB.

¹⁰⁶ This was certainly not the only time a Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs expressed appreciation for the role of the Bilderberg meetings in transatlantic diplomacy. In 1955, for example, when Queen Juliana had tried to put a halt to Prince Bernhard's involvement in the Bilderberg Meetings, the Dutch cabinet resisted this move, as Thoams Gijswijt has pointed out "in part because Beyen felt that the Bilderberg meetings served a valuable purpose" and "realized that the prince was a considerable international asset for the Netherlands" especially since the "Bilderberg connection opened even more doors for the prince than his royal title already did." Thomas Gijswijt, "The Bilderberg Group and Dutch American Relations" in *Four Centuries of Dutch American Relations*, eds. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 814.

¹⁰⁷ E.H. van der Beugel to the members of the Steering Committee, September 27, 1976, box 23, folder 3, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

expressed a preference for a continuation of the Bilderberg Meetings.¹⁰⁸ During that same week, Van der Beugel also visited the Prince, whose position as chairman of the Bilderberg Meetings had become untenable and Van der Beugel was the one who had to tell him that it was time to resign – a task which he experienced as “extremely unpleasant.”¹⁰⁹ While a few individuals like the Italian Giovanni Agnelli and the Frenchman Edmond de Rothschild thought it was ridiculous that anyone would need to step down due to such an affair, the overall consensus within the Steering Committee was that the prince had to go.¹¹⁰ The Americans with whom Ernst van der Beugel met in New York on the 17th of September, and David Rockefeller in particular, were unforgiving in their judgment and did not want to be associated in any way with the scandal that surrounded the Prince. While Van der Beugel agreed that Prince Bernhard had to resign, he was offended by the harshness of the response by some of the Americans who until then had been frequent guests at Soestdijk Palace. While Van der Beugel was personally disappointed in Bernhard and losing his chairmanship of the Bilderberg Meetings was a big blow to the Prince, both men maintained that the event did not damage their relationship.¹¹¹

“The Smoothest Coup d’état in the history of the Atlantic Alliance”

It was decided that the fall meeting of the Steering Committee, originally planned at Soestdijk Palace, would take place at the Savoy Hotel in London instead – under the chairmanship of Max Kohnstamm. With regards to the future of Bilderberg a special study group would be assembled. The big question was: should the Bilderberg Meetings continue and if so, in what form? As a memorandum from the American Steering Committee put it: “Events have produced an occasion to review and re-evaluate the Bilderberg meetings which had been running for 23 years with little change in format and organization.”¹¹² It was this forced re-evaluation that offered Ernst van der Beugel the opportunity to push through the more fundamental rejuvenation of Bilderberg that he had pursued for years.

At the October and January committee meetings the consensus was “that the need was as great as ever for an informal Atlantic Community forum such as Bilderberg.”¹¹³ The Working Party decided to leave the traditional format of the conferences unchanged. While

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral history, p. 719.

¹¹⁰ EvdB/Kersten Oral history, p. 718.

¹¹¹ HRH Prince Bernhard, contribution to “Book on Ernst, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL, p. 719-720: “Subsequent events have in no way changed our friendship.” Prince Bernhard had clearly betrayed Ernst van der Beugel’s trust in the process. The day before the news confirming the prince’s involvement in the Lockheed Scandal broke, Ernst van der Beugel had called Bernhard to ask whether there really wasn’t anything to worry about after which the prince had denied everything. According to Ernst van der Beugel’s daughter, Aukelien van Hoytema-van der Beugel, her father certainly felt hurt by this betrayal, but he could also deeply love people despite their faults, which she considered to be very characteristic of Ernst van der Beugel. Aukelien van Hoytema-van der Beugel, interview with the author.

¹¹² “American Steering Committee Members Discussions on Bilderberg”, October 4, 1976, box 23, Folder 3, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

¹¹³ “Minutes of the Meeting held by the Steering Committee at Torquay, England on April 22, 1977”, George box 23, Folder 5, W. Ball Papers, PUL.

opening up the Bilderberg Meetings to Japanese participants was once more considered, the members of the working party decided against this, arguing that “there was an established camaraderie in Bilderberg, a shared cultural tradition, which risked being lost in widening membership.” Furthermore, “it looked as if considerable difficulties between Europe and America lay ahead, and it was important to preserve a unique forum like Bilderberg, designed as it was to foster transatlantic understanding through personal contact.” In addition, by now the Trilateral Commission “already provided an excellent means for including the Japanese in discussions with the West.”¹¹⁴ To ensure frank and open discussion, the working party considered it essential to preserve the private character of the meetings, with no quotations or attributions allowed.

With regards to the organization and leadership of the conferences it was decided that a European chairman would be chosen for three years. While Van der Beugel had already before the Lockheed affair indicated that he wanted to retire as Secretary-General, “the consensus was that it would be difficult for Bilderberg to have to break in the same year with a new Chairman and a new European Secretary General, especially given the detailed administrative functions of the latter office.”¹¹⁵ This was all the more complicated since Joe Johnsen, who in 1975 had announced that he would leave the Bilderberg Meetings after the Homestead meeting, would already be replaced by Bill Bundy.¹¹⁶ Consequently, “at the urging of the other members of the Working Party, Ernst van der Beugel therefore agreed to carry on with his duties for an additional year, i.e. until after the 1978 conference – on condition that in the interim the Steering Committee would work hard at locating a suitable successor.”¹¹⁷ Meanwhile, it was decided that the members of the Steering Committee would rotate by arranging staggered terms of five years, with no member eligible for re-election until he had been off the Committee for at least one year. The Working Group furthermore asked Van der Beugel, Bundy and Griffin to get together as a sub-committee to decide about the composition of the Steering Committee and to draw lots for the rotation of its members. This rotation of Steering Committee members had as its object the “refreshing of the Committee from year to year, as new members took the place of retiring ones.”¹¹⁸

It was in this context that Ernst van der Beugel finally demanded that the Steering Committee would be thoroughly rejuvenated and that an operation would be set in motion to facilitate the smooth transfer of the Bilderberg Meetings from its ‘founding fathers’

¹¹⁴ “Minutes of the Bilderberg Working Party Meeting, London, January 22, 1977”, box 23, folder 3, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ “Minutes of the Meeting held by the Steering Committee at Soestdijk Palace on October 19, 1975”, box 23, folder 3, George W. Ball Papers, PUL. For William P. “Bill” Bundy see chapter 7, footnote 35.

¹¹⁷ “Minutes of the Bilderberg Working Party Meeting, London, January 22, 1977”, box 23, folder 3, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

¹¹⁸ “Minutes of the Meeting held by the Steering Committee at Torquay, England on April 22, 1977”, box 23, Folder 5, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

("Bilderberg One") to the next generation ("Bilderberg Two") by 1980.¹¹⁹ If Bilderberg was to continue, Van der Beugel maintained, we should "use the time left to us to create Bilderberg II in the sense that it would be carried in all aspects by the younger generation" – meaning an age group between +/- 30 and +/-50 years of age. More concretely, Van der Beugel explained, "That means a brand new Steering Committee with only Daniel Janssen, Thierry de Montbrial, Niels Norlund and Theo Sommer from the present Steering Committee with the addition of Chris Bertram, Victor Halberstadt, Andrew Knight, Leon Lambers and others from the European side and also a complete set of younger Americans."¹²⁰ To this end, Van der Beugel invited the above mentioned younger Europeans who were to be "instrumental in 'carrying' Bilderberg Two" to his house in The Hague to hear their opinions and to solicit their views on this endeavor. Meanwhile, Bill Bundy organized a parallel meeting on the other side of the ocean by inviting younger Americans including Harvard political scientist Graham Allison, Jack Bennett of Exxon, *Foreign Affairs* editor James Chase, Paul B. Finney of Fortune magazine, Charles Getchell of the Gray, Wendell & Clark law firm, lawyer, civil rights activist and president of the National Urban League Vernon Jordan, Winston Lord - who had just left the State Department to become the President of the Council on Foreign Relations, former president of CBS and founder of the private investment concern Tayler & Company Arthur Taylor; Labor leader Murray Finley of the Clothing Workers Union, Nicholas Katzenbach who had moved to IBM after having served under both president Kennedy and president Johnson, Georgetown professor and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Kissinger's closest counselor and associate at the NSC and the U.S. State department Helmut Sonnenfeldt, who now served as a visiting scholar at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, president of the Brookings Institution Bruce MacLaury and the automobile executive, professor of economics and frequent government adviser Marina von Neumann Whitman – all of whom had participated in past Bilderberg Meetings.¹²¹ Both groups expressed strong support for carrying on Bilderberg "on the grounds that Europeans and North Americans need more than ever to cooperate and understand each other's viewpoints, while at the same time there will continue to be the possibility of serious differences in outlook and policy on central

¹¹⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 682: "Toen ik wegging heb ik meteen geëist – dat kan ik wel zeggen, ik had het natuurlijk wel voor een groot deel te vertellen – dat het steering committee verjongd werd, toen Victor het van mij overnam. Want, zo heb ik het ook altijd gezegd: we kunnen in 1980 niet zitten met het establishment van 1960. Dus wij zijn, met een enkele uitzondering, het establishment van 1960 en jullie moeten nou maar kijken dat je het verjongd. Dat is ook gebeurd. Dat is volledige gebeurd."

¹²⁰ "Future of Bilderberg", 25 May 1978, Box 23, Folder 6, George W. Ball Papers, PUL. The Belgian businessman Daniel Janssen worked for the multinational biopharmaceutical company *Union Chimique Belge* (UCB). Thierry de Montbrial was responsible for the establishment of the Center of Analysis and Projection at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1973 where he also became the first Head Director of the Policy Planning Staff. Niels Norlund was a Danish journalist and foreign news editor for the *Berlingske Tidende*. The German journalist Theo Sommer served as editor in chief of the German newspaper *Die Zeit*. The German journalist Christoph Bertram served as the director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London at the time. The Dutch economist Victor Halberstadt already served as professor of Public Finance at Leiden University at the time. The English journalist Andrew Knight worked as an editor at *The Economist*.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*; W.P. Bundy to the "Tony Griffin Working Party" of the Steering Committee, October 12, 1978, box 23, Folder 6, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

economic and other issues.”¹²² Furthermore, it was decided that the transition from Bilderberg I to Bilderberg II should be completed during a “grand finale” at the Bilderberg Conference in the Federal Republic of Germany in 1980. Before that date, a new Steering Committee should have been constituted and a new top set of officers selected, ready to take over. “After that”, Van der Beugel and Bundy reported, “it is up to the youngsters.”¹²³

While some members of the Steering Committee felt that an effective transition to the successor generation could be made gradually without the rather dramatic contrast implied by the labels “Bilderberg I” and “Bilderberg II”, the great majority endorsed Van der Beugel’s operation as illustrated by an analogy to the motor car industry by the Italian industrialist and principal shareholder of Fiat Gianni Agnelli: “There were times, he said, when a ‘face lift’ would do, but at other times a whole new model was needed, and Bilderberg now found itself in the latter situation.”¹²⁴ Those members in the Steering Committee who had felt some hesitation at first also “expressed their agreement after having heard the various arguments” and there was “no doubt” that the “younger groups” convened by Van der Beugel and Bundy, which included younger members of the present Steering Committee, could “produce the nucleus around which a Bilderberg II [could] be constructed.”¹²⁵

The Dutchman Victor Halberstadt, a finance professor at Leiden University and Van der Beugel’s protégé, was chosen as the new Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings for Europe while it was decided that Paul B. Finney would succeed Bill Bundy on the American side. While the Younger Working Groups decided to keep the same overall structure, they did consider introducing some changes, including “slightly more austere meeting places than have sometimes been the case in the past”, cutting the overall size of the group from 100 to 75-80 participants and having one or more of the five conference sessions on a split-up basis by topic. As the Bilderberg Conferences were transferred to the next generation during the 1980 “grand finale” in Aachen, Victor Halberstadt described the event as “the smoothest coup d’état in the history of the Atlantic Alliance. But even more remarkable: it is a coup d’état staged by one of the principals in Bilderberg who carefully planned to be dethroned and on top of that acquired the support of his friends to do so.”¹²⁶

The transfer of Bilderberg I to Bilderberg II was a crowning achievement to Van der Beugel’s decades long efforts to ensure the long term survival of transatlantic bonds through the rejuvenation of the Bilderberg Meetings. It was also in this moment that his prior efforts, the many ‘face-lifts’ he had executed – e.g. by attracting younger participants – gained in relevance, since the connections he had nurtured during the preceding years had paved the

¹²² William P. Bundy, “Notes on the views of the European and American ‘Younger Groups’”, London, 3 November 1978, box 23, Folder 6, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

¹²³ E.H. van der Beugel and William P. Bundy to the Members of the Steering Committee, October 11, 1978, box 23, Folder 6, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

¹²⁴ “Minutes of the Meeting held by the Steering Committee at the Office of S.G. Warburg & Co. Ltd.”, 4 November 1978, box 23, folder 6, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ V. Halberstadt, 19 April 1980, contribution in “Book on Ernst”, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

way for this transition since they had helped to provide the human infrastructure that facilitated this transfer of Bilderberg to a new generation. Indeed, as the Turkish Bilderberg Steering Committee member Selahattin Beyazit pointed out, Ernst Van der Beugel had been “very much instrumental in creating an attachment to the concept of Bilderberg among its younger members.”¹²⁷ Consequently, to use Shepard Stone’s terminology: since Van der Beugel had been “actively working on the new crop” he could now harvest the results. As a consequence, the “Atlantic mindset”; the “belief system represented by the Atlantic alliance” could live on at least a little longer among this section of the transatlantic elite. “All I can say here and now,” Halberstadt said as he took over Bilderberg’s management, “is that I’ll try to succeed Ernst as Secretary-General in the fashion we all agree on: to spread the word from generation to generation so that peace and friendship will come much closer than they are today.”¹²⁸

“NATO-Professor”

While Bilderberg was “without doubt” an essential part of Ernst van der Beugel’s life, it was not his Bilderberg-work that he missed the most as he retired, but his professorship in Leiden which had offered him another prominent stage from which he could convey his ideas about and experience of post-war Atlantic cooperation to the next generation.¹²⁹

Ernst van der Beugel worked as professor of Western Cooperation after the Second World War at Leiden University from 1966 until 1984. It was an honorary position for which he received only 2.500 guilders a year, but which he thoroughly enjoyed.¹³⁰ “I found it extraordinary enjoyable to convey my opinion or my story or my analysis to younger people,” Van der Beugel recalled. “I enjoyed dealing with these young people, because (...) I could be helpful in their career choice.”¹³¹ Van der Beugel taught an elective course on Western Cooperation after the Second World War to students in the history and law departments. Attendance for this course grew from about a dozen students during the first year to 70-100 students in later years, including many future diplomats.¹³² One of these students was the later NATO Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, who studied in Leiden between 1967 and 1973. After he took Van der Beugel’s course he also graduated under Van der Beugel’s supervision with a thesis on the American Military Presence in Europe. “His classes were fascinating”, De Hoop Scheffer recalled. “He was a transatlanticist *pur sang*, but also the first man whom I met as a young student who was able to put his story on transatlantic affairs in a

¹²⁷ S. Beyazit, 18 March 1980, in: “Book on Ernst”, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

¹²⁸ V. Halberstadt, 19 April 1980, in: “Book on Ernst”, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL.

¹²⁹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p 730: “Maar het [Bilderberg] is zonder twijfel een zeer essentieel stuk van mijn leven geweest”.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 743, 745.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 744.

¹³² EvdB/Kersten Oral History, 744

geopolitical context. I found that quite unique. There is not a whole lot of attention for that aspect in the Netherlands; we don't really like that."¹³³

Ernst van der Beugel's emphasis on the geopolitical aspect as De Hoop Scheffer called it was in fact a very conscious effort by Van der Beugel to counter the Dutch preoccupation with more moralistic judicial approaches to foreign policy. Instead, Van der Beugel's teaching was characterized by a strong anti-ideological and anti-emotional tone, which was also present in his general contributions to the public debate in the Netherlands. Above all, he tried to convey the importance of power in foreign affairs over the importance of international law and judicial aspects.¹³⁴ After all, one of Van der Beugel's main worries about the next generation was that many youngsters questioned or even principally opposed the use of power while even more of them "manifested a curious blindness for the essential question of the purpose of the use of power" as a result of which they contested the necessity of a strong Atlantic defense which Van der Beugel considered a sheer necessity for Western security.¹³⁵ Ernst van der Beugel traced his own emphasis on the importance of power back to his memory of the appeasement at Munich in 1938 and tried to convey this experience and the lessons he took from this to a generation that had not lived through these experiences and tended to be at best skeptical towards the use of power.¹³⁶

Next to advocating a more realist political approach (as opposed to a moralist judicial approach), Van der Beugel tried to convey "the miracle of American foreign policy of 1945-1955,"¹³⁷ trying to keep the memory of America's positive post-war role in Europe alive in the face the fresher yet more sour memories of the Vietnam War. In this context, he did not hide the fact from his students that he detested the revisionist literature on America's role in post-war Europe, which he discarded as 'fables'.¹³⁸ "I have always tried to convey a very clear opinion", Van der Beugel explained. If students wanted to understand the origins of the Cold War, for example, he would tell them that entire libraries could be filled with the literature on the subject, but "I recommend you to read these three books."¹³⁹ Then you'll know what you

¹³³ Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, interview with the author, 4 February 2013 (translation mine).

¹³⁴ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 757: "Ik heb dus gepleit voor een meer politieke benadering van buitenlands politieke vraagstukken, maar dat moet ik dan aanvullen als, laat ik zeggen, tegenmove in wat in Leiden en in Nederland natuurlijk toch ook nog erg gebruikelijk is. Een politieke benadering betekent voor mij het zeer bewust maken van macht."

¹³⁵ Van der Beugel, "De huidige problemen van de Westelijke samenwerking".

¹³⁶ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 756: "ik vraag me af of ik zulke uitgesproken opvattingen zou hebben gehad zonder de ervaring van de dertiger jaren. Jullie kunnen je toch nauwelijks voorstellen, want om het nou heel stenografisch te zeggen, wat München heeft betekend. En als je dat ook weer op een hele eenvoudige manier wilt interpreteren, dan is het niet inzetten van macht in een situatie waarbij je veel erger zou kunnen voorkomen door het wel inzetten van macht."

¹³⁷ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 756.

¹³⁸ E.H. van der Beugel, "Ons Amerikabeeld: Boosdoener en/of Weldoener?" in *Te beginnen bij Nederland: Opstellen over oorlogen vrede*, ed. Van der Beugel et. al. (Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot, 1983), 21.

¹³⁹ Van der Beugel did not specify which three books, but the reading list in the syllabus for his course on "Western Cooperation after WWII" in 1973/1974 contained: B.H.M. Vlekke, *Tweespalt der wereldrijken, de tegenstelling tussen Oost en West in wezen en wording* (Haarlem: H.D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1953); Louis, J. Halle, *The Cold War as History* (London: Harper & Row, 1967); W. Lippmann, *The Cold War: A Study in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York/London: Harper, 1947); G.F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); But he

need to know” while adding that “this is my opinion and I believe I am right. If you want to acquaint yourselves with an opposing opinion, then this is the literature you should consult.”¹⁴⁰ This is also confirmed by his course syllabus and lecture notes of former students, as well as by the experience of Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, who remembered that Van der Beugel had a very clear opinion which he conveyed during his classes. “He was not a man who one could easily oppose. It was a different time, the 1960s and professors had an enormous amount of command and authority. He in particular. He took very clear positions. You could contest that, but you’d have to be very well-prepared. He was not somebody who said let’s listen carefully and then I will be prepared to adapt my opinion.”¹⁴¹

Despite the fact van der Beugel tried to convey a very clear opinion, which was not always very popular, he never became a direct target of student protests during the 1960s. The closest student protests ever came to directly affecting Ernst van der Beugel seems to have been campus unrest not in Leiden but at Harvard, where he was a frequent guest ever since Henry Kissinger had invited him to conduct research for his PhD dissertation at Harvard’s Center for International Affairs in 1963.¹⁴² He would also frequently visit this Ivy League university to give guest lectures. Moreover, in 1967 van der Beugel had been the driving force behind the establishment of an Erasmus Lectureship in Dutch Civilization at Harvard “designed to bring to Harvard visiting lecturers from Holland and other countries who are distinguished specialists in various aspects of economics, history, and the art of the Netherlands.”¹⁴³

The establishment of the lectureship was above all meant as an expression of Dutch gratitude and a “symbol of friendship” between the Netherlands and the United States

also assigned revisionist literature, including: G. Kolko, *The Politics of War: Allied Diplomacy and the World Crisis of 1943-45* (London: Wiesenfeld and Nicholson, 1969), followed by a list works criticizing this revisionism, for example in R.J. Maddox, *The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973); H.J. Morgenthau, “Historical Justice and the Cold War: The Politics of War, by Gabriel Kolko”, *The New York Review of Books* (July 10, 1969). In the same syllabus, Van der Beugel mentions that it is important to pay attention to the revisionists, after which he basically burns them down one by one arguing that in the end the only revisionist that could be taken seriously was Kolko. Syllabus, “Geschiedenis van de Westelijke Samenwerking”, private archive C.A. Admiraal, p. 7-11.

¹⁴⁰ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p.756.

¹⁴¹ Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, interview with the author, 4 February 2013 (translation mine): “Hij had zeker een duidelijke mening. Kwam naar voren tijdens de colleges, maar hij deed dat niet op een manier.... Het was niet een man die je makkelijk tegensprak. Het was een andere tijd, zestiger jaren. Een professor had een enorm gezag en autoriteit. Zeker hij. Hij had heldere standpunten, daar kon je tegenin gaan, maar dan moest je wel goed beslagen ten ijs komen. Het was niet iemand die zei van ‘laat ik nou eens uitgebreid gaan zitten luisteren en dan ben ik wel bereid m’n mening aan te passen.’”

¹⁴² In 1963 Harvard’s Center for International Affairs started to focus more on transatlantic relations. What is more, the Center “had a distinct advantage when it came to facilitating contacts with governmental actors who had played key roles in the management of transatlantic interactions. As Karl Kaiser, one of the key participants in this aspect of the Center’s research program put it: “In my own work on transatlantic relations, a few phone calls and I could interview Dean Acheson or Paul Nitze, and important members of the Senate. It was really wonderful.” See: David C. Atkinson, *In Theory and in Practice: Harvard’s Center for International Affairs 1958-1983* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 59-61. It appears that Ernst van der Beugel also made use of these contacts to arrange interviews within the American Foreign Policy establishment for his PhD dissertation, which also further acquainted him with these individuals.

¹⁴³ “Erasmus Lectureship on the civilization of the Netherlands”, HUC XXX, box 63, 23-E-1, Harvard University Archives, HCL.

commemorating Secretary Marshall's commencement speech twenty years earlier in which he announced the European Recovery Program. Through his extensive social network Ernst van der Beugel raised \$200,000, ninety percent of which was collected through contributions by private individuals, companies and organizations in the Netherlands and from the Dutch community in the United States.¹⁴⁴ Van der Beugel convinced the Dutch government to contribute the other 10 percent and to commit itself to finance travel and library expenses in the future.¹⁴⁵ During a ceremony on June 7, 1967, the Lectureship was formally presented to Harvard University by Prince Bernhard. In his speech, which may very well have been written by Ernst van der Beugel¹⁴⁶, he used the occasion to draw special attention to the challenges posed by a younger generation "prepared to test the solidity of the foundations that were laid in the post-war world, to X-ray the values we, their elders, used to cherish." In this context, it was crucial according to the Prince "to see to it that in spite of the changes that have taken place, some principles and objectives will survive this scrutiny".¹⁴⁷ The key principle he was referring to was the idea that Europe and the United States could not do without each other. The establishment of the Erasmus Lectureship was meant to strengthen this relationship and, as Prince Bernhard explained, to be taken as "a sign of urgency. The urgency to bring the peoples of our world closer together, not so much through improving their means of travel but particularly by extending their fields of communication."¹⁴⁸ If instigated by the Dutch government this would certainly have been labeled as an example of 'cultural diplomacy' by diplomatic historians. Orchestrated by a private individual, in the broader context of this research, it could as well be seen as an act of private cultural diplomacy. Ernst van der Beugel was subsequently appointed as the 1969 Erasmus lecturer and meant to give a series of lectures on "the Integration and Disintegration in Western Cooperation" and "American-European relations from the Dutch point of view". His lectures, which had been planned for the spring eventually had to be postponed to the fall due to student protests – unrelated to Van der Beugel's visit – during which Harvard's University Hall was seized and held for eighteen hours, when police were called in to remove the students, after which the university remained in a state of crisis, with a number of students in the College and other parts of the University going on strike.¹⁴⁹

In contrast, Leiden was not a hotbed of student protests. Even so, in a letter expressing his sympathy to his colleague H. Daudt of the University of Amsterdam – where student

¹⁴⁴ "The Netherlands to Present \$200,000 Chair to Harvard", *The New York Times*, June 2, 1967; "Leerstoel is symbool van vriendschap met de VS", *Nieuwe Haagse Courant*, 8 June 1967.

¹⁴⁵ "Address of HRH Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands", Harvard University, June 7, 1967, box 63, HUC XXX, 23-E-1, Harvard University Archive, HCL.

¹⁴⁶ It is not unlikely that this speech was actually written by Ernst van der Beugel, who during the late 1960's and early 1970s frequently wrote speeches for the Prince and the Harvard speech shares quite some similarities with regards to both style and content – including the same key quotes – with speeches delivered by Van der Beugel at the time. For more speeches written by Ernst van der Beugel for HRH Prince Bernhard see: "Lezingen E.H. van der Beugel", AHB.

¹⁴⁷ "Address of HRH Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands."

¹⁴⁸ Ibid. See Also: "Dutch Establish Post at Harvard", *The New York Times*, 11 July 1967.

¹⁴⁹ Verna C. Johnson (administrative assistant to Dean Ford at Harvard) to E.H. van der Beugel, 18 April 1969, file 9, EvdB.

unrest was much more intense – van der Beugel did mention that there were also signs of what he liked to call “the silent inquisition” at Leiden University. Van der Beugel himself attributed the fact that he had not fallen prey to this ‘inquisition’ himself to the fact that his course was an elective and that it was only chosen by students who did so deliberately because it appealed to them. Jaap de Hoop Scheffer recalled that there even was a small group of students – including himself – who were “deeply devoted” to the professor. The fact that Ernst van der Beugel could talk from personal experience and actually knew many of the key players of the history he taught gave a certain “sex appeal” to his course that some students thoroughly enjoyed.¹⁵⁰ He also frequently interrupted his course schedule to discuss current events in foreign affairs as they unfolded. Van der Beugel conceded that this might undermine the academic depth of the course, but he considered it more important that his students would be better equipped to make sense of what they read in the newspapers.¹⁵¹

Since the course was scheduled in the last year of their studies, combined with the fact that Van der Beugel also served as a thesis advisor, many students approached him for advice on their future. As a result of the fact that Van der Beugel also took his student’s oral exams at his home, it was a *va-et-vient* of boys and girls who wanted to discuss their work or desired advice on their future at the Van der Beugel home in The Hague. De Hoop Scheffer also extensively discussed his future with Professor Van der Beugel. After all, it was through his course that De Hoop Scheffer had become interested in peace and security studies.¹⁵² “I come from a family where foreign policy played no major role – it was not in my genes”, De Hoop Scheffer explained, but “he introduced me to that entire field of policy and made me accustomed to it and from that my entire career has unfolded.” When De Hoop Scheffer inquired Van der Beugel about a career at the Foreign Service the professor discussed the pros and cons with him. He told him that the foreign service was certainly a possibility, but also warned a young De Hoop Scheffer for the limitations of the job, telling him that he should realize that as a foreign servant he would be “his master’s voice” and that he should not have the illusion that he could independently act upon his own ideas – limitations Van der Beugel had experienced himself before he left the government, a move that allowed him to give a more independent twist to his transatlantic activities. He also warned his student that life in the Foreign Service could be hard on one’s partner. “He always remained an all-things-considered-man”, De Hoop Scheffer recalled. Once De Hoop Scheffer had determined what he wanted to do, Van der Beugel provided him with very concrete advice on how to pursue his ambition to become a diplomat. “He recommended me to pick international economic relations as an elective course – for which I am still thankful – and to write my thesis on a transatlantic subject”, De Hoop Scheffer recalled. “You could see that he did what he did with great pleasure and enthusiasm and by doing so he demonstrated ‘I take that generation

¹⁵⁰ Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, interview with the author, 4 February 2013 (translation mine).

¹⁵¹ Prof. A. van Staden, “T.g.v. het afscheid van Prof. van der Beugel”, 16 november 1984, Scrapbook #22, AHB.

¹⁵² “Former Secretary-General of NATO to be appointed professor,” accessed December 5, 2016, <http://www.news.leiden.edu/news/former-secretary-general-nato-appointed-professor.html#sthash.HCKxYnQW.dpuf>.

seriously and I try to educate them in my spirit.”¹⁵³ In his own acceptance speech as professor at Leiden University in 2010 De Hoop Scheffer would mention Ernst van der Beugel as his “great example and teacher.”¹⁵⁴

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer was far from the only Dutch diplomat to pass through van der Beugel’s class. According to van der Beugel, any Leiden student who had the ambition to join the Foreign Service followed his course.¹⁵⁵ Consequently, he greatly contributed to the education of future diplomats – not only in Leiden, but he was also closely involved in the formal education of future diplomats through his position as chairman of the “Leergang Buitenlandse Betrekkingen” of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where he helped to determine the content of the training course for new diplomats.¹⁵⁶ Ernst van der Beugel also used his network to provide introductions and recommendations for those students he considered to be promising, preferably with a positive attitude towards NATO.

Overall, the content of van der Beugel’s courses reflected his own views, personal experience and analyses as expressed in his other writings and speeches as well. There was a complete unity in his thinking that found expression through a diverse body of activities of which academia was just one component. During the late 1970s and early 1980s van der Beugel also agitated against the prevalent moral and ideological argumentation in the public debate which according to him fostered an anti-Americanism that found expression in concerns about human rights, cultural anti-Americanism and especially in the debate on nuclear weapons. The latter was especially clear in the protests ignited by the 1979 NATO decision to place American nuclear cruise missiles in Western Europe. With regard to all these elements on the “menu of anti-Americanism” van der Beugel came to America’s defense in the Dutch public debate for which he was somewhat scornfully given the label of “NATO-professor” by one journalist.¹⁵⁷ In 1983, he enthusiastically participated in an offensive against the peace movement through a book publication with “Essays on War and Peace.”¹⁵⁸ His own contribution to this book focused on the America-image in the minds of the Dutch and the generational transition from an image of the United States as benefactor – determined by the “great acts of the post-war period” as he himself had experienced them – to a malefactor – an image that emerged especially after the experiences of Vietnam and Watergate, two major formative experiences of the post-war generation, which had helped to foster a negative image of the United States, which was further fed by such things as concerns about human rights abuses and the deployment of nuclear weapons on Dutch soil during the

¹⁵³ Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, interview with the author, 4 February 2013 (translation mine).

¹⁵⁴ Prof. mr. Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, “Opkomst G20: Bedreiging voor Gevestigde Instiuties?” Accessed December 5, 2016, <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/19576/Oratie%20De%20Hoop%20Scheffer.pdf?sequence=1> (translation mine).

¹⁵⁵ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 746.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 749.

¹⁵⁷ Oral history, p 765.

¹⁵⁸ E.H. van der Beugel et al. *Te Beginnen bij Nederland: Opstellen over Oorlogen Vrede* (Amsterdam: Van Oorschot, 1983).

1970s and early 1980s. It was above all this image of America as “benefactor” that he tried to convey to the next generation as well as the public at large.

Ernst van der Beugel was convinced that the negative image of the United States was for a great part the result of a lack of proper knowledge of American society. In this regard he underlined the importance of bringing young people, but also other up-and-coming leaders who were bound to occupy influential positions in society, in touch with American society through exchange programs and visitor programs. He recommended students, friends and employees to spend time in the United States and was closely involved with such ventures the Columbia-Leyden exchange program and the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship – an international leader exchange program set-up by a group of businessmen in honor of president Eisenhower.¹⁵⁹ To illustrate, in 1980 Ernst van der Beugel and Victor Halberstadt discussed “the desirability” that the up-and-coming Dutch journalist Harry van Wijnen, who was a likely candidate to succeed Van der Beugel’s friend Herman Sandberg as editor in chief of the Dutch daily *Het Parool*, to “get a decent American experience.” Van der Beugel had asked Halberstadt to see if it would be possible to station him for some time at the Council of Foreign Relations or a similar institution. “Even if he does not succeed Herman”, Van der Beugel wrote to Halberstadt, “I think it will be of great importance.”¹⁶⁰

Overall, Van der Beugels efforts to create meaningful encounters with American society or with the Atlantic elite for up-and-coming leaders like Schmelzer, Dankert, Benthem van den Bergh and Harry van Wijnen were very much in line with NATO’s and the U.S. State Department’s public diplomacy efforts to “‘socialize’ and ‘familiarize’ up and coming leaders (...) with the United States as part of their political education” through such programs as the Fulbright Program and the State Department’s Foreign Leaders Program or the NATO leader program.¹⁶¹ In the process, “transatlantic social and intellectual bridges were build and strengthened in situations where ideological divides could easily widen out of control.”¹⁶² In his private efforts, Van der Beugel focused on similar target groups as these programs, which is also underlined by the fact that Schmelzer, Dankert and Van Wijnen had also been grantees of these government directed programs.¹⁶³ Ernst van der Beugel’s endeavors through Bilderberg – Bill Bundy even called Van der Beugel a “talent-scout” in this context¹⁶⁴ – and his involvement in exchange programs, supplemented by individual efforts through his social network, complemented and strengthened these more formal efforts, which Van der Beugel greatly valued. In fact, when during the 1960s the number of participants in the U.S.

¹⁵⁹ “History of EF”, accessed December 9, 2016, <https://www.efworld.org/about-us/history>.

¹⁶⁰ E.H. van der Beugel to V. Halberstadt, 24 March 1980, file 43, EvdB.

¹⁶¹ Giles Scott-Smith, *Networks of Empire: The U.S. State Department’s Foreign Leader Program in the Netherlands, France, and Britain, 1950-70* (Brussels: Peter Lang AG., 2008) 324.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 323.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 479, 481.

¹⁶⁴ Bill Bundy, contribution to “Book on Ernst”, box 27, Folder 1, Shepard Stone Papers, RSCL: “Ernst the talent scout. Established or rising reputations, who counts, who has ideas – has anyone in these twenty years known more of these in the Atlantic firmament at least? Or been more subtle in the diplomacy of snaring the right fish for the annual net?”

Government sponsored “Leader Grant Program”, which had “been extremely successful in the past in encouraging prominent visitors from the Netherlands to learn at first-hand about the people and institutions of the U.S., and to help transmit their motives, thoughts, aspirations and accomplishments to the Netherlands” had been reduced from 8 in 1960 to 1 in 1969, Van der Beugel was deeply concerned about the consequences. So was the American ambassador to The Hague Bill Tyler. Once Van der Beugel became aware of this, he encouraged the American ambassador to compose a memorandum describing the importance of such programs for Dutch-American relations and negative consequences of an American cut back “of U.S. Government support to exchanges of persons programs”, which he offered to personally forward to Henry Kissinger.¹⁶⁵ Both men considered the mentioned cuts “unacceptable”, especially – as the eventual memorandum also pointed out – during a time in which “American society is more than ever before under close scrutiny by the people of the Netherlands. Yet their curiosity for the most part can be satisfied only by the distortions that the superficial treatment of American events by modern mass communications presents to them.”¹⁶⁶

When Van der Beugel turned 65 in 1983 – retirement age in the Netherlands – his friends decided to arrange the perfect gift as a tribute to his efforts to foster and maintain the transatlantic relationship by establishing an Ernst van der Beugel fellowship at the Fletcher School of Law and diplomacy of Tufts University. This gift, which was meant to represent Van der Beugel’s influence behind the scenes, his Atlanticist principles and his “position on the impossible crossroads of academia, education, business, government, domestic and foreign affairs”, was awarded to Van der Beugel in the presence of a diverse group of politicians and former politicians as well as many prominent leaders from the worlds of business, finance, journalism, academia and the government.¹⁶⁷ The fellowship allowed for the annual selection of one Dutch individual, preferably between 20 and 40 years of age, to study for three months in the United States at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.¹⁶⁸ This gift was meant, Victor Halberstadt explained, to enable Ernst van der Beugel to “continue his activities as a private diplomat.”¹⁶⁹ The funds for the fellowship were raised from corporations and other private entities and individuals in the Netherlands. The board of the foundation responsible for the selection of students consisted of Ernst van der Beugel, Victor Halberstadt, Max van der Stoep and Jelle Zijlstra.¹⁷⁰ The first individual selected by the board was Ben Knapen, a

¹⁶⁵ William R. Tyler to E.H. van der Beugel, 17 January 1969, file 8, EvdB.

¹⁶⁶ William R. Tyler to E.H. van der Beugel, 30 January 30 1969, “Enclosure 1: Draft on Leader Grant Program”, file 8, EvdB.

¹⁶⁷ Victor Halberstadt, “Opmerkingen bij aanbieding Ernst H. van der Beugel Fellowship”, 2 February 1983, Scrapbook XVIII, AHB.

¹⁶⁸ G.M.V. van Aardenne, “Toespraak Z.E. Drs. G.M.V. van Aardenne, Minister van Economische Zaken”, Scrapbook XVIII, AHB.

¹⁶⁹ Halberstadt, “Opmerkingen”.

¹⁷⁰ “Ernst H. van der Beugel Fellowship Established”, Scrapbook XVIII, AHB.

promising young journalist whose work Van der Beugel admired.¹⁷¹ Eventually, Knapen would move on to become the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs in 2010.

While Van der Beugel gradually retired from more and more of his activities – sometimes voluntarily as in Bilderberg and sometimes reluctantly as was the case with his retirement from Leiden university – the Dutch minister of Economic Affairs remarked that this would probably not deter many from consulting the wisdom of the Atlantic *eminence grise* in the future as well “if only because you may very well be the last 'private' diplomat for whom few doors in the Western world remain closed,” the minister remarked.¹⁷² Ernst van der Beugel probably only welcomed this as he had always done, since as he mentioned in his farewell speech from Bilderberg: “I was , I am and I will always be committed to the central purpose of Bilderberg: Fostering better understanding between the U.S., Canada and its Western European Friends”, because, he once more explained: “the destiny of those relations determines all our destinies.”¹⁷³ Even so, it was now “up to the youngsters.”¹⁷⁴

Conclusion

From the early 1960s onwards, Ernst van der Beugel manifested himself as one of the driving forces behind a constant effort to educate new generations and to rejuvenate the Atlantic elite. While he continued his role in the public debate explaining and defending the U.S. to Dutch audiences and the Dutch and European position to American audiences, trying to foster a conducive climate for close transatlantic cooperation, this chapter has emphasized his concern with the education and socialization of potential future leaders within the Atlantic Community in an effort to foster and sustain both the mindset and social fabric at the heart of the transatlantic relationship. While these activities pursued a very clear diplomatic goal, they were carried out in an unofficial capacity and on the basis of private initiative, operating independently from nation-stations. As such, these efforts might not capture the attention of traditional diplomatic historians despite the fact that they were part of one and the same transatlantic diplomatic process. New Diplomatic History, however, allows us to see how Ernst van der Beugel as an unofficial diplomat contributed to the transatlantic diplomatic landscape through his attempts to address the challenge of the successor generation. He did so in different roles and through different channels, for example as a consultant for the Ford Foundation, as Secretary-General of the Bilderberg Meetings, as a board member of the Atlantic Institute, through his involvement in exchange programs and training programs for future diplomats as well as through his professorship at Leiden University.

Ernst van der Beugel's work as a consultant for the Ford Foundation, one of the key funders of the Atlantic NGOs, offers a glimpse into the world of private foundations which

¹⁷¹ Ben Knapen, interview with the author, 4 February 2013.

¹⁷² G.M.V. van Aardenne, “Toespraak Z.E. Drs. G.M.V. van Aardenne”.

¹⁷³ E.H. van der Beugel, “Mijn afscheid van Bilderberg op 19 april in Aken”, Scrapbook XVII, AHB.

¹⁷⁴ E.H. van der Beugel and William P. Bundy to the Members of the Steering Committee, 11 October 1978, box 23, folder 6, George W. Ball Papers, PUL.

pulled a great part of the strings within the unofficial Atlantic Community based on their own private policy agendas, informed by the ideas solicited from consultants such as Ernst van der Beugel. They pursued their own goals, by their own means, but it is important to realize that they maintained close ties to the formal foreign policy establishments in Europe and the United States. Like Ernst van der Beugel, many individuals involved in these foundations once served as formal government officials themselves. In that sense, they are a typical product of the revolving door between government employment, academia, think tanks, law and consultancy firms, the financial world and foundations that so much characterizes the East Coast Establishment. Of their own accord they chose to support formal diplomatic goals that they agreed with, such as helping to “accelerate the development of the Atlantic partnership” through private activity with a focus on “activities which would be suspect or impaired if national government’s engaged in them.”¹⁷⁵ As a consultant, Ernst van der Beugel helped to give direction to their private policy agenda, specifically emphasizing the need to address the challenge of successor generation, while also putting these ideas in practice through his direct role in private organizations pursuing these very goals.

In the absence of “the opportunities for meeting and working together which were afforded emergent leaders in the immediate post-war era through the negotiations for new forms of international cooperation – the Marshall Plan, NATO, EEC, OECD and others” , Van der Beugel attached great value to the creation of similar formative experiences through visitor and exchange programs, in particular those focused at brining young Europeans into close contact with American society.¹⁷⁶ To this end, he was closely involved in and an avid supporter of such programs, including the Columbia-Leyden exchange program and the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship and through individual efforts through his own social network, which he also used to help recently graduated students from Leiden to start their careers.

At Leiden University he furthermore used his professorship as an extra platform to educate the next generation on the importance of the transatlantic relationship for which he was labelled a ‘NATO-professor’. As such, he tried to keep the positive memory of the American role in the liberation, reconstruction and protection of Western Europe alive in the face of more recent memories of Vietnam and Watergate and a revisionist history that fed images of the U.S. as a belligerent, corrupt and imperialist nation. He also tried to explain the importance of power relations to a generation that had only known peace and grew up amidst the popularity of moralism and the spread of Hollanditus fed by the idealism of the Netherlands as a guiding country, as the Jeanne D’ Arc of the world – a spirit he remembered very well from the days of the run-up to the Second World War, and which he associated with his memories of appeasement at Munich, which he had so bemoaned and detested.

¹⁷⁵ “Activities to strengthen the Atlantic Partnership”, box 18, folder 182, Office Files - IA - Slater, FFA, RAC.

¹⁷⁶ “Request for a grant of \$160,000 to the Atlantic Institute (...) for the promotion of Atlantic Unity”, Grant File 65-161, Reel 2757, FFA, RAC.

As Secretary General Van der Beugel used the Bilderberg Meetings as an important instrument to engage and socialize promising young individuals from different fields into the Atlantic elite and to create a forum in which not only transatlantic tensions, but also generational friction could be mediated. Despite Van der Beugel's efforts, and despite the fact that there was a certain understanding among those involved in Bilderberg that the organization should serve as a vehicle to sustain the transatlantic relationships and contacts that had originally developed during the Marshall Plan era by developing and maintaining the human infrastructure of an evolving Atlantic Community, the rejuvenation of the Bilderberg Meetings was no easy task. Eventually it was pushed through the window of opportunity created by the existential crisis caused by the key role of Bilderberg chairman Prince Bernhard in the Lockheed scandal. This crisis, however, also demonstrated the value attached to Bilderberg in the context of transatlantic relations by those who had been involved in the meetings – including official government representatives and younger participants. Thus, Ernst van der Beugel manifested himself not just as a transatlantic mediator, but also as a mediator between generations.

Conclusion: a Call for a New Diplomatic History

By studying Ernst van der Beugel through the lens of New Diplomatic History this study has offered an alternative perspective to traditional state-centered narratives of diplomatic history by putting the unofficial diplomat front and center. In doing so, it has not disregarded the key role that nation states still play in diplomacy. Rather, it has attempted to broaden and deepen our understanding of the diplomatic process by including the unofficial realm of diplomacy in the analysis and through a focus on the goals, *modus operandi* and “diplomatic role” of a private individual in transatlantic relations.

To understand the continuation of Ernst van der Beugel’s role in transatlantic diplomacy as a private actor it was key to also reassess the period before he entered the diplomatic playing field as an unofficial diplomat. While it tends to be clear what a formal diplomat represents – namely his or her nation-state – this is not as obvious in the case of unofficial diplomats. As a result of their greater freedom to act upon their own ideas, the personal convictions that drive private actors become more important in attempts to understand their positions on the diplomatic playing field.

One of the key facets of what makes these private individuals diplomatic actors is the nature of the goals they pursue. The goals pursued by Ernst van der Beugel were clearly diplomatic in character, namely fostering and maintaining a tightly knit Atlantic Community. To understand what this meant and why he pursued these goals we had to go back to some key formative experiences that helped to shape his perspective on international relations. This included the experience of appeasement, war, liberation and reconstruction, which instilled in Van der Beugel an understanding of the fundamental primacy of power relations and a deep appreciation of the American role in these events. In the context of the Cold War this translated into the conviction that the security of Western Europe depended completely on the American security guarantee as formalized through NATO – and anything that threatened this, he opposed.¹ The development of Van der Beugel’s Atlanticism also provided insight into how and why he as a European came to be *plus américain que les américains* repeatedly inviting, encouraging and defending American hegemony on the European continent.

This Atlanticist perspective also determined his attitude towards European integration. Together with some of his closest friends he heartily welcomed the Schuman Plan, but he would never regard European integration as an end in itself, but always only as a means to strengthen the Atlantic Community in the context of the Cold War. Thus, his understanding of the role and preferred blueprints of European integration was tightly linked to his assessment of Cold War power relations. When he came to believe that the Gaullists rising to power in France intended to hijack the process of European integration for their own

¹ EvdB/Kersten Oral History, p. 275 (translation mine).

nationalistic desire to re-establish French grandeur at the expense of American hegemony in Western Europe, he opposed any form of integration that he believed would play into the hand of the Gaullists. This did not mean, however that he was anti-European. He was just convinced that the Atlantic priority trumped everything. Based on his understanding of power relations the primacy of the Atlantic security interest enveloped the Dutch national interest as well as the security of Western Europe as a whole.

While Van der Beugel's ideas crystallized while he was still employed by the Dutch government, from 1959 onwards he was able to carve out a place for himself as a private actor on the transatlantic diplomatic playing field trying to foster and maintain an Atlantic Community based on his realist stream of Atlanticism. The continuation of his diplomatic role in transatlantic relations was enabled by a combination of personal and external factors, which neatly tied into each other.

The personal factors depended for a great part on his experience and track record as a formal government representative and can be classified in terms of social, intellectual and financial capital all of which in turn amplified each other. The continuation of Van der Beugel's transatlantic activities was facilitated by *social capital* in the form of his extensive transatlantic network consisting of both government representatives and individuals from the private sector, which he had been able to build up during his work for the Marshall Plan and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The fact that he had been a diplomat himself, an insider in a world that is hard to penetrate from the outside, was also fundamental in that it provided him access to formal decision making establishments in Europe and the United States. His social status and track record as a formal diplomat furthermore made that he was seen as a credible professional who could be trusted, for example to serve as an unofficial backchannel between the American and Dutch foreign policy establishments. His appointment as Honorary Secretary General of the Bilderberg Meetings, one of the key meeting places for the official and unofficial Atlantic elites helped to consolidate his unofficial diplomatic position among the Atlantic elite providing him with an extra kind of transnational social capital. It also helped him to expand his network even more across all the spheres from which Bilderberg drew its participants. At the same time his role as a spider in the transatlantic webs connecting the official and unofficial realms also provided Van der Beugel with a great deal of valuable information that official diplomats were eager to hear, thus making him an *interlocuteur valable* in transatlantic diplomacy. This insider information, combined with the knowledge, experience and expertise derived from his career as an official diplomat in the field hence provided him with useful *intellectual capital*. His appointment as professor of Western Cooperation at Leiden University further amplified his status as an expert and even helped to create an illusion of objectivity and academic detachment. This combination of social and intellectual capital made Ernst van der Beugel also an interesting candidate for consultancy positions and directorships in the private sector, which in turn provided the financial basis enabling his unofficial activities in transatlantic diplomacy. These personal factors facilitating the continuation of Van der Beugel's diplomatic role coalesced with external factors of a more

structural nature, in particular the development of the post-war Atlantic elite and the rich constellation of policy forums, exchange programs, think tanks, and other private Atlantic organizations, initiatives and meeting places that provided the infrastructure of the unofficial realm of transatlantic diplomacy in which Ernst van der Beugel became very active.

Already during his days as a formal diplomat, Van der Beugel had been confronted with the fact that there were more stakeholders invested in transatlantic diplomacy than nation states alone. He had experienced this, for example, during the Marshall Plan, a transatlantic venture that served as a key catalyst for public-private cooperation which was instrumental not just in the development of the post-war Atlantic elite, but also in weaving Van der Beugel himself into this elite. Moreover, as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs he – as an official government representative – had even felt restricted in his own pursuit of the Dutch national interest by the influence exercised by Jean Monnet's private activities behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy. As a private agent Monnet was able to mobilize not just European legislators, but also the American diplomatic machinery in service of a speedy European integration process along the lines he had set out. After all, as the process of European integration took shape, different blueprints appeared with regards to the desired form that this integration should take and about how it should relate to the broader Atlantic framework.

During the 20th century processes of globalization in the fields of transportation and communication enabled advocates of these different visions from different nations, whether employed by a nation-state or not, to organize themselves in an unofficial capacity into a transnational force on the diplomatic playing field. The result was the development of transnational groups advocating different European and transatlantic perspectives, including Jean Monnet's brand of Atlantic partnership, Clarence Streit's Atlantic federalism, but also those who, like Van der Beugel, subscribed to a more realist stream of Atlanticism. These transnational groups disregarded state lines not just in the sense that their members had different nationalities (although the Gaullist vision was obviously a very French vision closely tied to a desire to elevate the French nation state), but also because their members consisted of both government officials and private individuals. What united them, however, was a shared vision of the transatlantic relationship. The debates about the shape of the transatlantic relationship were thus not only debates between nation states and their representatives. Instead they both transcended and pierced straight through the nation state – as illustrated by the debates at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where Van der Beugel's vision of European integration and the transatlantic relationship differed for example from the blueprints envisioned by Kohnstamm and Patijn, and where he also had to deal with the transnational influence exercised by Monnet. In this context, the Bilderberg Meetings filled up a void left open by the formal diplomatic machinery by offering a forum for the transnational mediation of rivaling blueprints of the transatlantic relationship, while its leadership tried to foster and maintain a basic consensus about the value of the Atlantic Community.

The Bilderberg meetings also served as an important instrument in Ernst van der Beugel's private efforts to manage, mediate and strengthen the transatlantic relationship. After Charles de Gaulle challenged the Atlantic Community in his famous 1963 press conference, for example, Van der Beugel used the Bilderberg Meetings as an instrument not just to mediate these different views, but also to contribute to the management of the transatlantic relationship. On the one hand Bilderberg offered a podium for a freer exchange of thoughts than formal diplomatic meetings, also allowing the Gaullists a podium to express their views. Thus Van der Beugel made sure to keep the French engaged in the transatlantic conversation. At the same time, however, fearing an American retreat into isolationism as a result of what might be perceived as anti-American Gaullist rhetoric, he used the Bilderberg Meetings to demonstrate to the American Foreign policy elite that de Gaulle did not speak for all of Europe – a message Foreign Secretary Luns, for example, also decided to transmit through formal diplomatic channels after taking note of Gaullist exposition at Bilderberg. During the subsequent Bilderberg conference in Williamsburg, Virginia Van der Beugel made sure that the meeting could be used by the U.S. State Department to foster elite support for the MLF. While Bilderberg could be useful in the context of processes concerning the creation of transatlantic policy, he also very consciously used the Bilderberg Meetings to socialize new, and preferably younger, members into the Atlantic elite in efforts to preserve the mindset and social fabric at the heart of the Atlantic Community for the long run.

Preserving the Atlantic mindset was crucial, because, as Van der Beugel understood, the Atlantic alliance could only exist and function properly as long as the Atlantic Community as a community of shared values and interests remained alive in the minds not just of the elite, but also in the mind of the 'average man' in the form of an imagined community. This became even more important in the context of the democratization of foreign policy. In this context, 'those in the know', to which Van der Beugel counted himself, had an obligation to explain and transmit the Atlantic mindset undergirding the Atlantic alliance to the public at large. To this end, Van der Beugel engaged in private efforts at transatlantic public diplomacy and psychological warfare by fighting European anti-Americanism while keeping the enemy image of the Soviet Union alive. He did so through his own massive contribution to the public debate in the form of speeches, publications and interviews, but also tried to foster a conducive atmosphere for close transatlantic relations behind the scenes, for example by socializing journalists into the Atlantic elite. He also arranged introductions to prominent Americans for journalists from whom he expected sympathetic reports on the United States while he kept these gates closed for more critical voices. In the meantime, he also tried to explain the Dutch and broader European position to the American foreign policy elite. After all, during this entire period, he also remained active through the more traditional diplomatic channels connecting the formal diplomatic establishments behind the scenes.

In fact, all these activities were part of one big concerted and continuous effort to foster and maintain an Atlantic Community, thus contributing to the multidimensional management of the Cold War transatlantic relationship by nation states and transnational actors, through

official and unofficial channels. As the preceding chapters have demonstrated, the official and unofficial spheres of transatlantic diplomacy did not exist in isolation from each other. Instead, they were intimately connected through social networks and meeting places where the official and unofficial elites mingled and interacted. At the same time, it is important to point out that many of the private Atlantic organizations, like the Bilderberg Meetings and the Atlantic Institute and many other Atlantic NGO's, were grass-root initiatives. They were not set up, instigated or orchestrated by nation states, although government representatives did acknowledge and at times encourage their roles in the diplomatic process. They happily cooperated when in pursuit of shared diplomatic goals. At times officials believed private diplomats and organizations could do things even more effectively than formal representatives of NATO or a nation states. As private actors they could speak more freely, for example, and come across as more credible in the context of public diplomacy and psychological warfare efforts, which when executed by a government representative might start to reek of propaganda. At the same time the Bilderberg meetings, for example, in turn offered a place where officials could also speak more freely and where relationships of trust as well as a consensus could be fostered between diverse transatlantic influentials that endured beyond changes in governments. Thus, at times the official and unofficial realms of transatlantic diplomacy neatly complemented each other. At other times they also challenged each other.

The same can be said of Ernst van der Beugel's relationship to the nation state as a private actor. As an unofficial diplomat he was not a mere extension of the Dutch government nor a puppet of the Americans. To the contrary, as he mentioned himself during his 1961 speech at the Chamber of Commerce in London, being a free agent was a liberating experience. It allowed him to speak his mind and pursue his own diplomatic goals more purely based on his own convictions, without having to follow 'his master's voice' as he had to when he was a government official. Thus, he cooperated for example with Dutch government officials in their struggle to gain American landing rights for KLM, but he also did not shy away from using his American connections to put pressure on the Dutch government, for example to raise the defense budget. He also gladly cooperated with the State Department's theologians in their efforts to foster transatlantic elite consensus concerning the multilateral force through Bilderberg. At the same time he did not shy away from criticizing the American role in the process of European integration or their lack of strong Atlanticist leadership. From Van der Beugel's perspective, these efforts did not only serve the Dutch or American national interest but above all a shared Atlantic interest. The landing rights issue, for example, fed anti-Americanism in the Netherlands. While in this specific case he believed these anti-American sentiments to be justified they were also detrimental to the cohesion of the Atlantic Community. Interesting in this context is also Henry Kissinger's remark that "he was equally comfortable in Europe as in the United States (...) we did not really look at Ernst van der

Beugel as a foreigner,”² suggesting that Van der Beugel was not seen as a national agent. While Kissinger and Van der Beugel did not share the same nationality they did share a deep appreciation for the Atlantic Community to which they both belonged. Thus, as a private actor tightly integrated in the web of formal and informal transatlantic structures Ernst van der Beugel manifested himself not as a national, but as an independent transnational actor, more specially as an unofficial ambassador for an Atlantic Community.

As the preceding chapters have demonstrated, Ernst van der Beugel as well as other non-state actors involved in the unofficial dimension of transatlantic relations were an integral part of the diplomatic process in which relationships are fostered and maintained, differences explained, tensions mediated and frustrations alleviated; where policy is shaped, consensus generated and ideas transmitted. In this context, Ernst van der Beugel as well as his Bilderberg companions also understood their own role to be ‘diplomatic’ in nature speaking of themselves in terms of “private diplomats” engaged in “unofficial international relations”.

Ernst van der Beugel was an independent diplomat who acted upon his own instigation and upon his own convictions – as did many other private actors that appear in this narrative. From a traditional state-centered perspective many of these unofficial activities would remain under the radar and only sporadically pop up when Ernst van der Beugel or another private actor entered the official diplomatic realm. Consequently, traditional state-centered approaches can only offer a very limited appreciation of Ernst van der Beugel’s diplomatic role, which cannot do justice to his contributions to the diplomatic process – nor to this diplomatic process itself. However, by reassessing his role through the lens of New Diplomatic History by putting the unofficial diplomat, instead of the nation state, front and central, combined with a focus on the diplomatic process and its machinery and the (un)official diplomat’s *modus operandi*, it becomes clear that his private diplomatic activities were not just sporadic incidents, but part of a continuous and concerted effort contributing to the multidimensional management of transatlantic diplomacy in which more stakeholders were involved than nation states alone. This could only be revealed, however, by changing the framework of diplomatic history on the basis of the idea that being a ‘diplomat’ does not depend on one’s official status as a government representative, but is rather determined by an actor’s role in the diplomatic process serving “a set of interests, a cause or collective unit above and beyond themselves, and which in some way involves the crossing of borders and the inter-relationship of political entities.”³ In doing so, this study did not only attempt to do better justice to Ernst van der Beugel’s role in and contributions to the diplomatic process. It also constitutes a call to reconsider the way in which we study diplomatic history and above all to pay more attention to the unofficial realm of diplomacy.

This does certainly not mean that diplomatic historians should disregard the nation state. Also in this study nation states still played a key role. They were however, not the only

² Henry A. Kissinger, interview with the author, 4 January 2012.

³ Weisbrode, “The Task Ahead”.

stakeholders in the diplomatic process that has been described. By looking at Cold War transatlantic diplomacy from the perspective of New Diplomatic History, it becomes clear that formal transatlantic diplomacy during this period did not take place in a vacuum, but was closely entangled with unofficial individuals, networks and ventures. To recognize these links also helps us understand formal diplomacy better. However, from the perspective of New Diplomatic History it is crucial to recognize that these unofficial actors were not only part of the diplomatic process when they were directly linked to a nation state, but also acted independently and on their own instigation. They had their own agency. Thus, while the distinction between state and non-state actors has proven to be a valuable distinction, as it indicates how these actors operate from different positions in different capacities, this should not lead to the idea that only those linked to nation states can be diplomatic agents. The fact that Ernst van der Beugel as a private agent was still such an integral part of transatlantic diplomacy demonstrates that a narrow focus on nation states and their representatives limits our understanding of the actual diplomatic process. Instead, we can do better justice to the diplomatic process if we identify “the diplomat” not so much on the basis of his or her relationship to the nation state, but by focusing on how actors relate to the diplomatic process by focusing on their diplomatic role: what they do and why and how they do this. Since both state and non-state actors were part of the same diplomatic process they deserve to be recognized as such. To this end, it is not only useful to add a transnational layer to our investigations of the diplomatic process, but also to speak of “unofficial” or “private diplomats” on the one hand and of “formal” or “official” diplomats on the other hand – both of them worthy subjects of study by diplomatic historians in their own right. Such an approach would not only offer a more holistic understanding of the diplomatic process, but also opens up new venues for further research.

By following Ernst van der Beugel behind the scenes of transatlantic diplomacy the preceding chapters have offered a window upon the broader unofficial dimension of the Atlantic Community. In doing so, they provided not more than a glimpse of the other individuals and organizations active in this realm, many of them requiring further exploration. While a group of historians has started to describe the role of organizations like the Bilderberg Meetings and the Atlantic Institute in transatlantic diplomacy, other Atlantic NGO’s like the London based International Institute for Strategic Studies, have barely received any attention. In addition, more studies analyzing the roles of private individuals or groups of individuals on the diplomatic playing field can provide more general insight not only into their diplomatic roles, but also into the factors that enabled these actors to play such a role. Ernst van der Beugel’s track record as a formal diplomat, for example, helped to facilitate his role as a private diplomat. Studies focusing on other individuals may identify other factors and qualities and may even demonstrate that also prior government experience is no prerequisite for a diplomatic role. A bigger reservoir of studies on 20th century unofficial diplomats may also enable the development of a greater body of theory on this topic with regards to the qualities and characteristics shared by private diplomatic actors during this period,

comparable to the work done by historians of New Diplomatic History focusing on the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period.⁴

Finally, the remarks by Victor Halberstadt and Minister van Aardenne describing Ernst van der Beugel as “the Netherlands’ only private diplomat” who “may very well be the last ‘private’ diplomat for whom few doors in the Western world remain closed”,⁵ seem to indicate that Van der Beugel belonged to a rare and almost extinct breed. The diversity, breadth and scope of spheres in which Ernst van der Beugel was active is indeed uncommon – at least in the Dutch context. In this sense, Ernst van der Beugel was especially a rather ‘un-Dutch’ phenomenon, as Ben Knapen has also pointed out; more representative of the American East Coast Establishment with its revolving door between public and private spheres.⁶ While there was only one Ernst van der Beugel, this dissertation has demonstrated that there were many more unofficial stakeholders involved in Cold War transatlantic diplomacy – and that processes of globalization have enabled them to proliferate in ever greater numbers. Their stories not only deserve to be told, but by including them in our narratives we will be able to do better justice to the complexity of the diplomatic process, particularly in a globalizing world.

⁴ The greater proliferation of studies focusing on private individuals participating in the diplomatic process during the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period has led to a greater body of theory about the characteristics of these individuals, for which researchers of those periods use the term ‘agents’. See for example: Marika Keblusek and Badeloch Vera Noldus, eds., *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014).

⁵ Victor Halberstadt, “Opmerkingen bij aanbidding Ernst H. van der Beugel Fellowship, 2 februari 1983”, Scrapbook XVIII, AHB; G.M.V. van Aardenne, “Toespraak Z.E. Drs. G.M.V. van Aardenne, Minister van Economische Zaken”, Scrapbook XVIII, AHB.

⁶ Ben Knapen, interview with the author, 4 February 2013; Ben Knapen, “Woord vooraf” in: “For Ernst Only” (Liber Amicorum), 1997, AHB; Busby and Montan, “Without Heirs: Assessing the Decline of Establishment Internationalism in U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Perspectives on Politics* 6:3 (2008), 454.

Appendix A – Directorships E.H. van der Beugel¹

1959 -	Algemene Bank Nederland N.V.
1977 -	Badger B.V.
1967 -	Berenschot N.V.
1969 -	Brill N.V. (Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1975 - 1980	Cincinnati Milacron, Ohio.
1965 -	Cincinnati Milacron, Vlaardingen.
1970 - 1973	Diebold Group International.
1967 -	D. Drukken & Zn. N.V. (Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1972 - 1983	Estel N.V. (since 1976 Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1972 - 1976	Eurometaal N.V.
1966 - 1970	FAS International Inc.
1974 -	Ferro B.V.
1979 -	Fina N.V. + Mafina (Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1972 - 1979	General Electric Company, London.
1955 - 1972	Geveke N.V.
1960 -	Hoogovens B.V. (since 1976 Chairman of the Supervisory Board)
1960 -	Kon. Hoogovens en Staalfabrieken N.V. (Since 1976 Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1973 -	Internatio Müller N.V.
1977-	Bank Brussel Lambert, Brussel.
1975 -	Bank Mees/Hope N.V. (Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1967 -	Merck, Sharp & Dome N.V. Netherlands.
1959 -	Nationale Nederlanden N.V. (since 1980 Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1978 -	Rank Xerox Limited, London.
1959 - 1972	Reineveld Machinefabriek N.V. (Since 1967 Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1976 -	Sigma Coatings B.V. Int. (Chairman of the Supervisory Board).
1971 -	VMF/Stork N.V.

¹ Ernst Hans van der Beugel, *Ernst Hans van der Beugel: 65 Jaar* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 10.

1964 - 1976	S.G. Warburg & Co. Ltd. London.
1975 -	S.G. Warburg & Co. International Holdings Ltd., London.
1973 -	Xerox Corporations U.S.A.
1963 - 1972	Zeeuwsche Confectie Fabrieken N.V. Middelburg.

Appendix B - Other Positions E.H. van der Beugel¹

1938 - 1939	Ab Actis Senaat Amsterdams Studenten Corps.
1965 - 1968	Adviescommissie uit het Bedrijfsleven voor het Department van Buitenlandse Zaken (Business Advisory Council of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, member).
1968 -	ANWB balanscommissie (member).
1975 - 1979	Atlantic Institute (governor).
1960 -	Van den Berch van Heemstede Stichting (foundation, member of the board).
1960 - 1980	Bilderberg Meetings (Honorary Secretary-General for Europe).
1975-	Carnegie Foundation (member of the board).
1965- 1968	Cie Economische Ontwikkeling Amsterdam (advisory committee, chairman).
1971 - 1972	Cie van Rijckevorsel (Government Advisory Council Civil and Military Experts, member).
1974-1975	Cie Spierenburg (Government Advisory Council European Union, member).
1978 -	Ditchley Foundation (member of the board).
1979 -	Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship (member of the board).
1959 -	Genootschap voor Internationale Zaken (member of the board).
1981 -	Geri M. Joseph Lectureship (executive committee).
1974 - 1981	Hugo de Groot Foundation (member of the selection committee).
1969 - 1973	International Institute for Strategic Studies, London (council member)
1973 – 1985	International Institute for Strategic Studies, London (chairman of the council).
1967 - 1976	Beheerscommissie Leergang Buitenlandse Betrekkingen (chairman).
1972 -	European Advisory Group of Merck & Co. Rahway U.S.A. (member)
1970 -	Nederlands Kanker Instituut (Dutch Cancer Institute, chairman)
1957 - 1972	Residentie Orkest (member of the board)

¹ Ernst Hans van der Beugel, *Ernst Hans van der Beugel: 65 Jaar* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 11.

1963 - 1967	Socialisme en Democratie (member of the editorial board)
1968 -	Volkenrechtelijk dispuut "Professor Mr. B. M. Telders" (honorary chairman).

Sources & Bibliography

Private Collections:

- C.A. Admiraal
- Aukelien van Hoytema-van der Beugel (AHB)
- Henry A. Kissinger (HAK)

Dutch Archives

National Archives The Hague (NAH)

- Archief van prof. dr. E.H. van der Beugel, 1946-1990.
- Archief van de Bilderberg Conferenties: Secretariaat 1952-2011.
- Archief van de Commissie Van Rijckevorsel, 1971-1972.
- Code-Archief Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken 1945-1954.
- Code-Archief Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken 1954-1964.
- Archief van het Ministerie van Economische Zaken: Directoraat-Generaal voor de Buitenlandse Economische Betrekkingen, 1945-1995.
- Archief van dr. J.M.A.H. Luns.
- Archief van het Nederlands Gezantschap in de Verenigde Staten, 1940-1954.
- Archief van C.L. Patijn, 1940-1999.
- Archief van dr. J.H. van Roijen, 1940-1989.
- Archief van prof. Mr. P. Sanders Papers .

International Institute for Social History (Amsterdam)

- Archief PvdA

Stadsarchief Amsterdam

- Archief van het Amsterdams Studenten Corps.
- Archief van de Universiteit van Amsterdam: Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen en Econometrie.

U.S. Archives:

Amherst College Archive

- John J. McCloy Papers

Cornell University Library (CUL)

- Arthur H. Dean Papers

Eisenhower Presidential Library (EPL)

- Christian A. Herter Papers
- C.D. Jackson Papers
- Eisenhower, Papers as President, 1953-61 (Ann Whitman File)

Harvard University Library (HCL)

- Harvard University Archive
- Christian A. Herter Papers

Kennedy Presidential Library (KPL)

- Personal Papers of Edwin Martin

Nixon Presidential Library (NPL)

- Congressional Collection
- NSC Files
- White House Central Files

Princeton University Library (PUL)

- George W. Ball papers
- Records of the Council on Foreign Relations

Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC)

- Ford Foundation Archive
- Rockefeller Brothers Fund
- Rockefeller Family Archive (permission by Peter Johnson)

Rauner Special Collections Library – Dartmouth College (RSCL)

- Shepard Stone Papers

Truman Presidential Library (TPL)

- Harry B. Price Papers

United States National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland (NARA)

- RG 469

U.S. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

- Clarence K. Streit Papers

Newspapers

- *Algemeen Dagblad*
- *Cincinnati Enquirer*
- *Haagse Post*
- *The Milwaukee Sentinel*
- *The New York Times*
- *De Nieuwe Courant*
- *Nieuwe Haagse Courant*
- *Nieuwe Leidsche Courant*
- *NRC / NRC Handelsblad*
- *Het Parool*
- *Prov. Zeeuwse Krant*
- *De Rotterdammer*
- *De Telegraaf*
- *De Tijd/De Maasbode*
- *Trouw*
- *Het Vaderland*
- *Volkskrant*
- *Vrije Volk*
- *De Waarheid*
- *The Wall Street Journal*

Popular Magazines

- *The Economist*
- *Knickerbocker International*
- *Newsweek*
- *Time Magazine*
- *Vrij Nederland*

Published sources

- Brookings Institution
- Delpher
- Digital National Security Archive (DNSA)
 - o The Kissinger Telephone Conersations
- European University Institute
 - o Historical Archives of the European Union – Oral History Collections.
- Parlement & Politiek
- Truman Presidential Library
 - o Philip C. Brooks, Truman Library Oral History Interview with E.H. van der Beugel, The Hague, June 1, 1964.
 - o Theodore A. Wilson, Truman Library Oral History Interview with Ernst van der Beugel, The Hague, June 17, 1970.
- Foreign Relations of the United States,
 - o 1964-1968, Volume XIII, Western Europe Region.
- Handelingen der Tweede Kamer
- Meertens Instituut
- Huygens ING Online Resources
 - o Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland
 - o “Nederland en de Europese Integratie”
- Roosevelt Study Center, Middelburg
 - o RG59
 - o RG469
- U.S. Congress - Congressional Records
- Wikileaks

Websites

Eisenhower Fellowships, "History of EF", accessed December 9, 2016,
<https://www.efworld.org/about-us/history>.

Kennedy, John F. "Fourth of July Address at Independence Hall", Philadelphia, July 4, 1962,
accessed 5 December 2016,
<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jfkIndependenceHall.htm>.

"Troonrede 18 september 1956", last accessed 7 December, 2016.
<http://www.troonredes.nl/troonrede-18-september-1956/>

Universiteit Leiden, "Former Secretary-General of NATO to be appointed professor," accessed
December 5, 2016, [http://www.news.leiden.edu/news/former-secretary-general-nato-](http://www.news.leiden.edu/news/former-secretary-general-nato-appointed-professor.html#sthash.HCKxYnQW.dpuf)
[appointed-professor.html#sthash.HCKxYnQW.dpuf](http://www.news.leiden.edu/news/former-secretary-general-nato-appointed-professor.html#sthash.HCKxYnQW.dpuf).

Weisbrode, Kenneth. "The New Diplomatic History: An Open Letter to the Membership of
SHAFR", December 2008, [taken offline, but still accessible through the Internet Archive],
accessed: 15 December, 2016,
[https://web.archive.org/web/20110820101715/http://www.shafr.org/passport/2008/decem-](https://web.archive.org/web/20110820101715/http://www.shafr.org/passport/2008/december/Weisbrode.pdf)
[ber/Weisbrode.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20110820101715/http://www.shafr.org/passport/2008/december/Weisbrode.pdf)

Oral History

Interviews conducted by the author:

- Nelletje van der Beugel-Schas, 16 March 2010.
- Jérôme Heldring, 1 December 2010.
- Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, 4 February 2013.
- Aukelien van Hoytema, 8 March 2010.
- Piet de Jong, 17 May 2011.
- Henry A. Kissinger, 4 January 2012.
- Ben Knapen, 4 February 2013.
- Max Kohnstamm, 10 February 2010.
- Sergio Orlandini, 12 May, 2011.

- Rob van Schaik 25 May, 2010, 6 December 2012.
- Henk Wesseling, 24 October, 2011.
- Berend Jan Udink, 16 May, 2011.
- C.T.C. Heyning, 19 May 2011.

Bibliography

Aalders, Gerard. *Het Lockheed Schandaal*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2011.

Abrahams, Lynn. *Oral History Theory*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Adler, Kenneth P. and Davis Bobrow. "Interests and Influence in Foreign Affairs." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 20:1 (1956): 89-101.

Almond, Gabriel A. *The American People and Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger, 1950.

Asbeek Brusse, Wendy. "The Dutch Socialist Party." In: *Socialist Parties and the Question of Europe in the 1950s*, edited by Richard Griffiths, 106-134. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Atkinson, David C. *In Theory and in Practice: Harvard's Center for International Affairs 1958-1983*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Aubourg, Valérie. "Creating the Texture of the Atlantic Community. The NATO Information Service, private Atlantic networks and the Atlantic Community in the 1950s." In *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg, Gerard Bossuat and Giles Scott-Smith, 390-415. Paris: Soleb, 2008.

Aubourg, Valérie. "Organizing Atlanticism: The Bilderberg Group and the Atlantic Institute 1952-63." In *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, edited by Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam, 92-108. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003.

Aubourg, Valérie. "Problems of Transmission: The Atlantic Community and the Successor Generation as Seen by US Philanthropy, 1960s-1970s." In *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith, 416-443. Paris: Soleb, 2011.

Aubourg, Valérie. "The Bilderberg Group: Promoting European Governance inside an Atlantic Community of Values." In *Transnational networks in regional integration: Governing Europe 1945-83*, edited by Wolfram Kaiser, Brigitte Leucht and Michael Gehler, 38-60. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

- Aubourg, Valérie and Giles Scott-Smith. "The Transatlantic Imaginary: Constructing the Atlantic Community during the early Cold War." In *European Community, Atlantic Community?* edited by Valérie Aubourg, Gerard Bossuat and Giles Scott-Smith, 8-27. Paris: Soleb, 2008.
- Baehr, P.R., J.H. Leurdijk and Ph. P. Everts. *Elite en buitenlandse politiek in Nederland: een onderzoek naar de structuur, houdingen en opvattingen van de Nederlandse buitenlands - politieke elite*. Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij, 1978.
- Bank, Jan. "Overall een ondernemer: Dirk Uipko Stikker (1948-1952)." In *De Nederlandse ministers van Buitenlandse Zaken in de twintigste eeuw: vijfde jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek*, edited by Duco Hellema, Bert Zeeman en Bert van der Zwan, 180-197. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers, 1990.
- Behrman, Greg M. *The Most Noble Adventure: The Marshall Plan and the Reconstruction of Post-War Europe*. London: Free Press, 2007.
- Berg, Joris van den. *De Anatomie van Nederland*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij de Bezige Bij, 1967.
- Berghahn, Volker R. *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Berghahn, Volker R. "The Ford Foundation and the Forging of the Atlantic Community after World War II." In *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg, Gerard Bossuat and Giles Scott-Smith, 92-112. Paris: Soleb, 2008.
- Berman, Maureen and Joseph Johnson. *Unofficial Diplomats*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- Beugel, E.H. van der. "De Corpora." *Socialisme & Democratie*, 22 (1965): 230-234.
- Beugel, E.H. van der. "De huidige problemen in de Westelijke Samenwerking." *Internationale Spectator*, 23:1 (1969): 5-21.
- Beugel, Ernst H. van der. "Ons Amerikabeeld: Boosdoener en/of Weldoener?" In: *Te beginnen bij Nederland: Opstellen over oorlogen vrede*, edited by Van der Beugel et. al. 11-45. Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot, 1983.
- Beugel, Ernst van der. *From Marshall Aid to Atlantic Partnership: European Integration as a Concern of American Foreign Policy*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1966.
- Beugel, Ernst van der. "An Act without Peer: The Marshall Plan in Dutch-American Relations." In *A Bilateral Bicentennial*, edited by J. W. Schulte Nordholt and Robert P. Swieringa, 66-79. Amsterdam: Meulenhof, 1982.

- Beugel, E.H. van der. "Nederland in de naoorlogse Westelijke Samenwerking", *Internationale Spectator*, 49:3 (1995): 126-132.
- Beyen, Johan W. *Het spel en de knikkers: een kroniek van vijftig jaren*. Rotterdam: Donker, 1968.
- Bitumi, Alessandra. "Rethinking the Historiography of Transatlantic Relations in the Cold War: the United States, Europe and the process of European Integration." In *Reinstating Europe in American History in a Global Context*. Edited by Maurizio Vaudagna, 71-95. Turin: Otto, 2015.
- Bloemendal, Albertine. "Between Dinner Table and Formal Diplomacy: Ernst van der Beugel as an Unofficial Diplomat for an Atlantic Community." *New Global Studies*, 8:1 (2014): 103-119.
- Boot, Coreline. *Het leger onder vuur: De Koninklijke Landmacht en haar critici 1945-1989*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2015.
- Bruin, Robin de. *Elastisch Europa: De integratie van Europa en de Nederlandse politiek, 1947-1968*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Wereldbibliotheek bv, 2014.
- Busby, Joshua W. and Jonathan Monten. "Without Heirs: Assessing the Decline of Establishment Internationalism in U.S. Foreign Policy." *Perspectives on Politics* 6:3 (2008): 451-472.
- Corduwener, Jeroen. *Riemen om de kin! Biografie van mr. Dr. Gerrit Jan van Heuven Goedhart*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2011.
- Camps, Miriam. *Britain and European Community: 1955-1963*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Dankert, P. "Vietnam, de brief van 2 mei en de links en rechts verontruste partijgenoten." *Socialisme en Democratie*, 23:10 (1966): 745-751.
- Dierikx, Marc. *Blauw in de lucht. Koninklijke Luchtvaart Maatschappij 1919-1999*. Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers, 1999.
- Dierikx, Marc. "'Een spel zonder kaarten': KLM-landingsrechten als nationaal belang, 1945-1957" In *Jaarboek Buitenlandse Zaken: Derde Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek*, edited by D.A. Hellema, C. Wiebes, B. Zeeman, 11-25. Den Haag: SDU, 1997.
- Dingemans, Ralph. "'De zon ging op en de wind was gunstig': Ernst Hans van der Beugel (1918-2004)" In *In Dienst van Buitenlandse Zaken*, edited by Bert van der Zwan, Bob de Graaff and Duco Hellema, 157-173. Amsterdam: Boom, 2008.

- Dougherty, James E. "The Atlantic Community - The Psychological Milieu." In *Atlantic Community in Crisis: A Redefinition of the Transatlantic Relationship*, edited by Walter Hahn and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., 30-52. New York: Pergamon Press, 1979.
- Duchêne, François. *Jean Monnet: The First Statesman of Interdependence*. New York: Norton & Company, 1994.
- Duchin, Brian R. "The 'Agonizing Reappraisal': Eisenhower, Dulles, and the European Defense Community." *Diplomatic History* 16:2 (1992): 201-222.
- Ebben, Maurits and Louis Sicking, "Nieuwe diplomatieke geschiedenis van de premoderne tijd: een inleiding", *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, 127:4 (2014): 541-552.
- Ellwood, David W. "From the Marshall Plan to Atlanticism: Communication Strategies and Geopolitical Narratives." In *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg, Gérard Bosuat and Giles Scott-Smith, 38-59. Paris: Soleb, 2008.
- Ellwood, David W. "What Winning Stories Teach: The Marshall Plan and Atlanticism as Enduring Narratives." In: *Defining the Atlantic Community: Culture, Intellectuals, and Politics in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, edited by Marco Mariano, 111-131. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Eng, Pierre van der. *De Marshall-Hulp: een perspectief voor Nederland, 1947-1953*. Houten: De Haan/Unieboek, 1987.
- Ermers Marcel and John Kragt, "Tussen tradities en tractaten: Minister Beyen en de Europese integratie 1952-1956." MA-Thesis, University of Nijmegen, 1988.
- Everts, Philip. "Inleiding, traditie en verandering." In *Nederland in een veranderende Wereld: de toekomst van het buitenlands beleid*, edited by P.R. Baehr, 1-19. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1991.
- Fennema, Meindert and John Rhijnsburger. *Hans Max Hirschfeld: Man van het Grote Geld*. Amsterdam: Bakker, 2007.
- Fritzinger, Linda. *Diplomat without Portfolio: Valentine Chirol, His Life and 'The Times'*. London/New York: Tauris, 2006.
- Gijswijt, Thomas. "Beyond NATO: Transatlantic Elite Networks and the Atlantic Alliance." In *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges Beyond Deterrence in the 1960s*, edited by Andreas Wenger, Anna Locher and Christian Nuenlist, 50-64. London: Routledge, 2007.

- Gijswijt, Thomas. "The Bilderberg Group and Dutch-American Relations." In *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, edited by Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith, 808-818. Amsterdam: Boom, 2009.
- Gijswijt, Thomas. "De Trans-Atlantische elite en de Nederlandse Buitenlandse Politiek sinds 1945." In *Bezinning op het Buitenland: Het Nederlandse buitenlands beleid in een onzekere wereld*, edited by Duco Hellema, Mathieu Segers and Jan Rood, 31-46. Den Haag: Clingendael, 2011.
- Gijswijt, Thomas. "Uniting the West: the Bilderberg Group, the Cold War and European integration, 1952-1966." PhD dissertation, Heidelberg University, 2007.
- Gowland, David and Arthur Turner, eds. *Britain and European Integration 1945-1998: A Documentary History*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Gregory, Bruce. "American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 6:3/4 (2011): 351-372.
- Haasnoot, S and H. Pach. "Veertig jaar geleden: Berend-Jan Udink over de weigering van De Gaulle om Engeland toe te laten tot de EEG," *Historisch Nieuwsblad* (October 2002), accessed December 5, 2016, <http://www.historischnieuwsblad.nl/nl/artikel/6024/veertig-jaar-geleden-berend-jan-udink-over-de-weigering-van-de-gaulle-om-engeland-toe-te-laten-tot-de-eeg.html>.
- Hackett, Clifford P. *Monnet and the Americans: The Father of a United Europe and His U.S. Supporters*. Washington DC: Jean Monnet Council, 1995.
- Hanhimäki, Jussi M., Benedikt Schopenborn and Barabara Zanchetta. *Transatlantic Relations Since 1945: an Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Halle, Louis, J. *The Cold War as History*. London: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Hamilton, Keith and Richard Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its evolution, theory and administration*. London/New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Harryvan, Anjo G. and Jan van der Harst, *Max Kohnstamm: Leven en werk van een Europeaan*. Utrecht: Spectrum, 2008.
- Harryvan, Anjo and John van der Harst. "'Een sneeuwveld in 1942': Vraaggesprek met drs. M. Kohnstamm." In *Voor Nederland en Europa: Politici en ambtenaren over het Nederlandse Europabeleid en de Europese integratie, 1945-1975*, edited by A. G. Harryvan, J. van der Harst and S. van Voorst. 81-119. Amsterdam: Boom, 2001.
- Harryvan, Anjo G. *In Pursuit of Influence: The Netherlands' European Policy during the Formative Years of the European Union, 1952-1973*. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2009.

- Harst, J. van der. "Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political integration." In *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, edited by Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith, 641-651. Amsterdam: Boom, 2009.
- Harst, Jan van der. *The Atlantic Priority: Dutch Defence at the Time of the European Defence Community*. Florence: European Press Academic Publishing, 2008.
- Heldring, Jérôme L. "De Nederlandse Buitenlandse Politiek na 1945." In *Nederlands buitenlandse politiek: heden en verleden*, edited by E.H. van der Beugel et al. 29-45. Baarn: In Den Toren, 1978.
- Hellema, Duco. *Nederland en de jaren Zeventig*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2012.
- Hellema, Duco. *Nederland in de wereld: de buitenlandse politiek van Nederland*. Houten: Spectrum, 2010.
- Hoeven, Pien van der. *Hoed af voor Marshall: de Marshall-hulp aan Nederland 1947-1952*. Amsterdam: Bakker, 1997.
- Hoffenaar, Jan, and Ben Schoenmaker. *Met de blik naar het Oosten: de Koninklijke Landmacht 1945-1990*. The Hague: Historical Section of the Royal Netherlands Army, 1994.
- Hogan, Michael J. *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Honig, J.W. *Defense Policy in the North Atlantic Alliance: The Case of the Netherlands*. Westport: Praeger, 1993.
- Hoop Scheffer, Prof. mr. Jaap, de. "Opkomst G20: Bedreiging voor Gevestigde Instituten?" Accessed December 5, 2016, <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/19576/Oratie%20De%20Hoop%20Scheffer.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Huntley, James R. *An Architect of Democracy: Building a Mosaic of Peace*. Washington DC: New Academic Publishing, 2006.
- Iriye, Akira. *Global and Transnational History: Past, Present and Future*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.
- Isaacson, Walter and Evan Thomas. *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1986.
- Jones, Peter. *Track Two Diplomacy in Theory and Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Jong, L. de. "De crisis van onze defensie", *Militaire Spectator* 139 (1970): 402-407.

- Keblusek, Marika and Badeloch Vera Noldus, eds. *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Keizer, Madelon de. *Frans Goedhart, een biografie. Journalist en Politicus, 1904-1990*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2012.
- Kennan, G.F. *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Kersten, Albert. *Luns: een politieke biografie*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2010.
- Kissinger, Henry A. "Strains on the Alliance." *Foreign Affairs*, 41:2 (1963): 261-285.
- Klinkert, Wim, Kruizinga, Samuël and Moeyes, Paul. *Nederland Neutraal: De Eerste Wereldoorlog 1914-1918*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2014.
- Knapen, Ben, Gera Arts, Yvonne Kleistra, Martijn Klem and Marijke Rem. *Attached to the world: On the Anchoring and Strategy of Dutch Foreign Policy*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011.
- Knegtmans, Peter Jan. *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998.
- Knudsen, Dino. *The Trilateral Commission and Global Governance: Informal Elite Diplomacy*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Kohnstamm, Max. *Nog is er geen oorlog – Briefwisseling tussen Max en Philip Kohnstamm, 1938-1939*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001.
- Kolko, G. *The Politics of War: Allied Diplomacy and the World Crisis of 1943-45*. London: Wiesenfeld and Nicholson, 1969.
- Kreemers, H.P.M. "De oorlog tussen de Generaals: Het conflict in de top van de Koninklijke Landmacht, 1971-1973." *Militaire Spectator* 176 (2007): 378-389.
- Kreemers, H.P.M. "Hete Hangijzers: De aanschaf van Nederlandse Gevechtsvliegtuigen." PhD dissertation, Leiden University, 2009.
- Labadie, S.C. "'Desert for dessert' De onderhandelingen tot het afsluiten van de luchtvaartovereenkomst van 3 april 1957 tussen Nederland en de Verenigde Staten van Amerika." MA-thesis, VU University Amsterdam, 2000.
- Lebbing, Teus and Niklaas Hoekstra. "Atlanticus pur sang: Interview met Ernst van der Beugel." *Atlantisch Perspectief* no. 4/5 (1997): 19-21.
- Lennep, E van and E. Schoorl. *Emile van Lennep in de wereldeconomie. Herinneringen van een internationale Nederlander*. Leiden: Stenfert Kroese, 1991.
- Lippmann, W. *The Cold War: A Study in U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York/London: Harper, 1947.

- Ludlow, N. Piers. "European integration and the Cold War," in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War vol. 2: Crises and Détente*, edited by Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, 179-197. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Lundestad, Geir. *The United States and Western Europe since 1945: From 'Empire' by Invitation to Transatlantic Drift*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Lundestad, Geir. "Empire by Invitation? The United States and Western Europe 1945-1952." *Journal of Peace Research* 23:3 (1988): 263-277.
- Maar, Rimko van der. *Welterusten Meneer de President: Nederland en de Vietnamoorlog 1965-1973*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2007.
- Maar, Rimko van der and Hans Meijer. *Herman van Roijen (1905-1991). Een diplomaat van klasse*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2013.
- Maddox, R.J. *The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Maier, Charles. "Empires or Nations? 1918, 1945, 1989." In *Three Postwar Eras in Comparison: Western Europe 1918-1945-1989*, edited by Carl Levy and Mark Roseman, 41-66. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Marjolin, Robert. *Architect of European Unity: Memoirs 1911-1986*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1986.
- Megens, Ine. *American Aid to NATO Allies in the 1950's: the Dutch Case*. Groningen: Thesis publishers, 1994.
- Megens, Ine. "Ambitions and Ambivalence: Initiatives for a European Nuclear Force, 1957-67." In *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith, 18-37. Paris: Soleb, 2011.
- Meijer, Wouter. *Ze zijn gék geworden in Den Haag: Willem Oltmans en de kwestie Nieuw-Guinea*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009.
- Melissen, Jan. "Beyond the New Public Diplomacy". *Clingendael Paper No. 3*. The Hague: Netherlands Institute for International Relations 'Clingendael', 2011. Accessed 16 December, 2016. https://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/20111014_cdsp_paper_jmelissen.pdf
- Mills, Nicolaus. *Winning the Peace: The Marshall Plan & America's Coming of Age as a Superpower*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- Morgenthau, H.J. "Historical Justice and the Cold War: The Politics of War, by Gabriel Kolko" *The New York Review of Books*. July Issue (1969): 68-83.

- Mary Nolan. *The Transatlantic Century: Europe and America, 1890-2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Palayret, Jean-Marie. "De Gaulle Challenges the Community: France, the Empty Chair Crisis and the Luxembourg Compromise." In *Visions, Votes and Vetoes: The Empty Chair Crisis and the Luxembourg Compromise Forty Years On*, edited by Palayret, Wallace and Winand, 45-78. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Parmar, Interjeet. *Foundations of the American Century: the Ford, Carnegie, & Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Parmar, Interjeet. "Anglo-American Elites in the Interwar Years: Idealism and Power in the Intellectual Roots of Chatham House and the Council on Foreign Relations." *International Relations*, 16:1 (2002): 53-75.
- Perkins, Robert and Alistair Thomson, eds., *The Oral History Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.
- Perron, Régine. *The Stability of Europe: The Common Market: Towards European Integration of Industrial and Financial Markets? 1958-1968*. Paris: PU Paris-Sorbonne, 2004.
- Persdienst Ministerie van Economische Zaken. *Het Marshall Plan: Handleiding tot het Europese Herstel Programma*. The Hague: Stichting Economische Publicaties, 1948.
- Philipsen, Ingeborg. "Diplomacy with Ambiguity: the Bilderberg Organization 1952-1977." PhD dissertation, Københavns Universitet, 2009.
- Pigman, Geoffrey Allan. *Contemporary Diplomacy: Representation and Communication in a Globalized World*. Cambridge: Polity, 2010.
- Pijl, Kees van der. *The Making of an Atlantic Ruling Class*. London: Verso, 1984.
- Price, Harry B. *The Marshall Plan and its Meaning*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955.
- Priest, Andrew. "George W. Ball, the Multilateral Force and the Transatlantic Alliance." In *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith, 172-191. Paris: Soleb, 2011.
- Reinalda, Rob. "The Development of a Postwar International Economy." In: *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, eds. Hans Krabbendam, Giles Scott-Smith, Kees van Minnen (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009),
- Reyn, Sebastiaan. "Atlantis Lost: The American Experience with De Gaulle, 1958-1969." Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden University, 2007.

- Richardson, Ian N., Andrew P. Kakabadse and Nada K. Kakabadse. *Bilderberg People: Elite Power and Consensus in World Affairs*. London/New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Ross, Carne. *Independent Diplomat: Dispatches from an Unaccountable Elite*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Rutten, Charles. *Aan de wieg van Europa en andere Buitenlandse Zaken: Herinneringen van een diplomaat*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2005.
- Ryan, David. *The United States and Europe in the Twentieth Century*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Salzmann, Walter H. *Herstel, wederopbouw en Europese samenwerking: D.P. Spierenburg en de buitenlandse economische betrekkingen van Nederland 1945-1952*. Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers, 1999.
- Schwabe, Klaus. "United States and European Integration, 1947-1957." In *Western Europe and Germany: The Beginnings of European Integration, 1945-1960*, edited by Clemens Wurm, 115-136. Oxford: Berg, 1995.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. *Networks of Empire: The U.S. State Department's Foreign Leader Program in the Netherlands, France, and Britain, 1950-70*. Brussels: Peter Lang AG., 2008.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. "Expanding the Diffusion of US Jurisprudence: The Netherlands as a 'beachhead' for US Foundations in the 1960s." In *American Foundations and the Coproduction of World Order in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Helke Rausch and John Krige, 210-231. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Scott-Smith, Giles and David J. Snyder. "'A Test of Sentiments': Civil Aviation, Alliance Politics and the KLM Challenge in Dutch-American Relations." *Diplomatic History* 37:5 (2013): 917-945.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. *Western anti-Communism and the Interdoc Network: Cold War Internationale*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. "Not a NATO responsibility? Psychological warfare, the Berlin Crisis and the formation of Interdoc." In *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges Beyond Deterrence in the 1960s*, edited by Anna Locher and Christian Nuenlist, 31-49. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. "Maintaining Transatlantic Community: US Public Diplomacy, the Ford Foundation and the Successor Generation Concept in US Foreign Affairs, 1960s-1980s." *Global Society*, 28:1 (2014): 90-103.

- Scott-Smith, Giles. "A Dutch Dartmouth: Ernst van Eeghen's Private Campaign to Defuse the Euromissiles Crisis." *New Global Studies* 8:1 (2014): 141-152.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. "Private Diplomacy, Making the Citizen Visible." *New Global Studies* 8:1 (2014): 1-7.
- Scott-Smith, Prof. dr. Giles "Ghosts in the Machine? Ernst van der Beugel, the Transatlantic Elite, and the 'New Diplomatic History.'" accessed December 15, 2016
<https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/19602/Oratie%20Scott-Smith.pdf?sequence=2>
- Segers, Mathieu. *Reis naar het continent: Nederland en de Europese integratie - 1950 tot heden*. Amsterdam: Bakker, 2013.
- Segers, Mathieu. "De Gaulle's Race to the Bottom: The Netherlands, France and the Interwoven Problems of British EEC Membership and European Political Union, 1958-1963." *Contemporary European History*, 19 (2010): 111-132.
- Segers, Mathieu and Max Kohnstamm. *De Europese Dagboeken van Max Kohnstamm. Augustus 1953-September 1957*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2008.
- Segers, Mathieu and Max Kohnstamm. *Diep Spel: De Europese dagboeken van Max Kohnstamm, september 1957-februari 1963*. Amsterdam: Boom 2010.
- Silver, Lara C. "The Political Use of Metaphor in the Construction of the Atlantic Community." In *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, edited by Aubourg, Scott-Smith and Bossuat, 60-73. Paris: Soleb, 2008.
- Sloan, Stanley R. *NATO, The European Union, and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005.
- Smits, Boudewijn. *Lou de Jong, 1914-2005*. Boom: Amsterdam, 2014.
- Staden, A. van. *Een trouwe bondgenoot: Nederland en het Atlantische bondgenootschap 1960-1971*. Baarn: In den Toren, 1974.
- Steel, Ronald. "Walter Lippmann and the Invention of the Atlantic Community." In *European Community, Atlantic Community?*, edited by Aubourg, Scott-Smith and Bossuat, 28-36. Paris: Soleb, 2008.
- Steel, Ronald. "How Europe became Atlantic: Walter Lippmann and the New Geography of the Atlantic Community." In *Defining the Atlantic Community: Culture, Intellectuals, and Politics in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, edited by Marco Mariano, 13-27. New York: Routledge, 2010.

- Streit, Clarence K. *Union Now: a Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic*. New York: Harper Bros., 1939.
- Stuldreher, Coen. *De Legale Rest: Gemengd getrouwde joden onder de Duitse bezetting*. Amsterdam: Boom, 2007.
- Szabo, Stephen F. *The Successor Generation: International Perspectives of Postwar Europeans*. London: Buttersworths, 1983.
- Gerke Teitler, ed. *Tussen Crisis en Oorlog: maatschappij en krijgsmacht in de jaren '30*. Dieren: De Betaafse Leeuw, 1984.
- Trachtenberg, Marc. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Vanthoor, Willem F.V. "Zeventig jaar Economische Faculteit binnen de Universiteit van Amsterdam 1922-1992." In *Samenleving en economie in de twintigste eeuw*, edited by Martinus M.G. Fase and Ids van der Zijpp, 3-42. Leiden: Stenfert Kroese, 1992.
- Vlekke, B.H.M. *Tweespalt der wereldrijken, de tegenstelling tussen Oost en West in wezen en wording*. Haarlem: H.D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1953.
- Voorhoeve, J.J.C. *Peace, profits and principles. A study of Dutch foreign policy*. Den Haag: M. Nijhoff, 1979.
- Vries, Tity de. "Een brede verspreiding van de berichtgeving is wenselijk." In *Van Strohalm tot Strategie: Het Marshall Plan in Perspectief*, edited by Ridchard T. Griffiths et al, 38-48. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp, 1997.
- Wala, Michael. *The Council on Foreign Relations and American Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War*. New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 1994.
- Wansink, Willem. "De Groep van Tien: PvdA Ambtenaren en buitenlands beleid 1947-1952", MA-Thesis, Utrecht University, 1988.
- Weenink, W.H. *Bankier van de wereld, bouwer van Europa: Johan Willem Beyen 1897-1976*. Amsterdam: Prometheus, 2005.
- Weisbrode, Kenneth. *The Atlantic Century: Four Generations of Extraordinary Diplomats Who Forged America's Vital Alliance With Europe*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2009.
- Weisbrode, Kenneth. "The State Department's Bureau of European Affairs in the 1970s." In *Atlantic, Euratlantic, or Europe-America?*, edited by Valérie Aubourg and Giles Scott-Smith, 192-207. Paris: Soleb, 2011.
- Weisbrode, Kenneth. *Old Diplomacy Revisited: A Study in the Modern History of Diplomatic Transformations*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.

- Weisbrode, Kenneth. "The Political and Cultural Underpinnings of Atlanticism's Crisis in the 1960s." In *More Atlantic Crossings? European Voices in the Postwar Atlantic Community*, *GHI Bulletin Supplement 10*, edited by Jan Logemann and Mary Nolan, 41-59. Washington DC: German Historical Institute, 2014.
- Weisbrode, Kenneth. "The Task Ahead", September 20, 2012, accessed 15 December, 2016 <http://newdiplomatichistory.org/the-task-ahead/>.
- Wesseling, Henk. *De man die nee zei: Charles de Gaulle, 1890-1970*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2012.
- Wijngaart, Kim van der. *Bondgenootschap onder Spanning: Nederlands-Amerikaanse Betrekkingen, 1969-1976*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2011.
- Wilford, Hugh. "The CIA, the British Left, and the Cold War: Calling the Tune?" In: *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960*, edited by Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam, 225-261. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003.
- Winand, Pascaline. *Eisenhower, Kennedy and the United States of Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Zuijdam, Frank. *Tussen wens en werkelijkheid: Het debat over vrede en veiligheid binnen de PvdA in de periode 1958-1977*. Amsterdam: Aksant, 2001.
- Zuijdam, Frank. "Dutch Left-Wing Political Parties and NATO." In: *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations*, edited by Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis van Minnen and Giles Scott-Smith, 652-662. Amsterdam: Boom, 2009.
- Zuijdam, Frank. *Tussen wens en werkelijkheid: Het debat over vrede en veiligheid binnen de PvdA in de periode 1958-1977*. Amsterdam: Aksant, 2001.
- Zwan, Arie van der. *H.M. Hirschfeld: In de ban van de macht*. Meulenhoff: Amsterdam, 2004.

Dutch Summary

In dit proefschrift wordt de diplomatieke rol van de Nederlandse Atlanticist Ernst van der Beugel in de transatlantische betrekkingen ten tijde van de Koude Oorlog geanalyseerd - als overheidsfunctionaris én als privépersoon. De nadruk ligt hierbij op de continuïteit van zijn diplomatieke rol. Na een carrière als overheidsvertegenwoordiger in de frontlinies van het Marshall Plan, de Europese integratie en de transatlantische politiek, vertrok Ernst van der Beugel in 1959 naar de private sector alwaar hij het leiderschap van de KLM op zich zou nemen. Deze overstap zou de indruk kunnen wekken dat dit het einde was van Ernst van der Beugels rol in de transatlantische diplomatie. Dit proefschrift laat echter zien dat dit niet het geval was, maar dat Ernst van der Beugel ook nadat hij de overheid verliet een rol van betekenis bleef spelen op het transatlantische diplomatieke speelveld.

Door de focus op de natiestaat en op de uitkomsten van het diplomatieke proces, en niet het proces zelf, waar traditionele benaderingen van de diplomatieke geschiedenis door worden gekenmerkt, blijft een groot deel van Ernst van der Beugels diplomatieke activiteiten – en die van vele andere niet statelijke actoren – onderbelicht. Onder de noemer ‘*New Diplomatic History*’ probeert een groep historici hier verandering in te brengen. Zij doen dit onder andere door meer aandacht te besteden aan de rol en identiteit van het individu in het diplomatieke proces en de *modus operandi* van de diplomaat. Zij trachten ook nieuwe onderzoekslagen aan de bestaande historiografie toe te voegen door aandacht te besteden aan de onofficiële dimensie van de diplomatie en de rol van niet-statelijke actoren - ook als zij los van een natiestaat opereren. Terwijl traditionele benaderingen van de diplomatieke geschiedenis het woord ‘diplomaat’ exclusief hanteren voor overheidsvertegenwoordigers, neemt dit proefschrift de diplomatieke rol van een actor als uitgangspunt voor haar definitie van het woord ‘diplomaat’. Daarbij wordt wel onderscheid gemaakt tussen ‘formele’ of ‘officiële’ diplomaten – aangesteld door een natiestaat – en ‘informele’, ‘onofficiële’ of ‘private’ diplomaten die in privécapaciteit een diplomatieke rol vervullen.

Dit proefschrift erkent niet alleen de diplomatieke rol van niet-statelijke actoren zoals Ernst van der Beugel, maar benadert het diplomatieke proces ook vanuit het perspectief van de onofficiële diplomaat. Hiermee biedt dit proefschrift dus een andere kijk op de transatlantische diplomatie dan traditionele studies die het diplomatieke proces benaderen vanuit het perspectief van de staat, veelal op basis van onderzoek in overheidsarchieven. Zonder de rol van natiestaten in het diplomatieke proces te negeren, laat dit proefschrift zien dat Ernst van der Beugel en andere leden van de onofficiële transatlantische elite ook los van de natiestaat diplomatieke activiteiten ontplooiden. Als gevolg hiervan zijn deze activiteiten vaak niet terug te vinden in overheidsarchieven. Het beeld van de rol van onofficiële diplomaten vanuit het perspectief van de natiestaat en haar vertegenwoordigers is dus beperkt. Alleen als een onofficiële diplomaat het territorium van de natiestaat binnenstapt, verschijnt hij of zij op de radar van de traditionele diplomatieke geschiedenis. Hierdoor kan de

indruk ontstaan dat de diplomatieke activiteiten van een individu als Ernst van der Beugel slechts incidenteel waren, terwijl dit proefschrift laat zien dat ze onderdeel waren van een voortdurende inspanning en niet beperkt tot een enkel individu, maar van een grotere groep private actoren in een poging bij te dragen aan het beheer van de transatlantische betrekkingen. Dit wordt echter pas echt duidelijk als we deze activiteiten bestuderen vanuit het perspectief van de onofficiële actoren zelf.

Dit perspectief vereist ook het gebruik van andere bronnen dan gebruikelijk in traditionele diplomatieke studies die veelal gebaseerd zijn op onderzoek in overheidsarchieven. Zonder de traditionele overheidsarchieven te negeren, is dit proefschrift dan ook voor een aanzienlijk deel gebaseerd op onderzoek in private archieven van prominente leden van de onofficiële Atlantische elite, archieven van private organisaties zoals de Bilderberg Meetings en archieven van de Amerikaanse filantropische instellingen die veel van deze private diplomatieke organisaties en activiteiten financieel ondersteunden, zoals de Ford Foundation. Door Ernst van der Beugel te volgen in de diverse sferen waarin hij actief was, biedt dit proefschrift een unieke blik achter de schermen van de transatlantische betrekkingen ten tijde van de Koude Oorlog met oog voor zowel de formele als de informele dimensie van de naoorlogse Atlantische gemeenschap.

Aan de hand van een analyse van de continuïteit van de diplomatieke rol van Ernst van der Beugel in de transatlantische betrekkingen als overheidsfunctionaris én als privépersoon, laat dit proefschrift zodoende zien hoe *New Diplomatic History* voor een andere waardering van Ernst van der Beugel's rol in het diplomatieke proces zorgt. Het kijkt daarbij naar wat deze rol inhield, welke factoren de continuïteit van deze rol in een privécapaciteit faciliteerden, wat de motivatie was die Ernst van der Beugel hierin dreef, maar ook welke belangen en ideeën hij als privédiplomaat vertegenwoordigde en hoe zijn onofficiële diplomatieke activiteiten zich verhielden tot de formele diplomatie. Om hier zicht op te krijgen is het echter ook van belang om vanuit dit perspectief aandacht te besteden aan de periode voor 1959, toen hij de overheid verliet, met name om beter zicht te krijgen op de ontwikkeling van zijn netwerk en ideeën die ook in zijn latere rol als privédiplomaat van fundamentele betekenis zouden zijn.

Het eerste hoofdstuk van dit proefschrift gaat dan ook in op de jeugd en studententijd van Ernst van der Beugel en beschrijft het milieu waarin hij opgroeide alsmede het begin van zijn levenslange fascinatie voor de Verenigde Staten. Ernst van der Beugel werd in 1917 geboren in een Joods gezin in Amsterdam en groeide op in de aanloop naar de Tweede Wereldoorlog. Oorspronkelijk was het plan geweest dat Ernst in de voetsporen van zijn vader – een voorname bankier met sociaal-democratische sympathieën – zou treden. Met dit vooruitzicht in gedachten studeerde Ernst van der Beugel economie aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Hier werd hij lid van het Amsterdamsch Studenten Corps, alwaar hij bevriend raakte met mensen als Max Kohnstamm, Pieter Blaisse, Emile van Lennep, Hans de Koster, Ynso Schlten, Jaap Kymmell en Joseph Luns die hij ook later in zijn carrière weer tegen zou komen

Als student was Ernst van der Beugel reeds opmerkelijk internationaal en politiek geëngageerd. Samen met een aantal dispuutsgenoten raakte hij zeer onder de indruk van de Amerikaanse New Deal politiek van president Roosevelt. Anderzijds maakten zij zich grote zorgen over de opkomst van Adolf Hitler in Duitsland en het 'demonische karakter' van het Nationaal Socialisme. Ernst van der Beugel was reeds in een vroeg stadium bewust van de existentiële dreiging die hier van uitging. De appeasementpolitiek die in 1938 in München werd gevoerd, waarbij Engeland en Frankrijk toegaven aan Hitlers eisen in de hoop zo een oorlog te voorkomen, zou hij zich voor altijd blijven herinneren als 'de grote fout van het Westen'. Hij verweet Engeland en Frankrijk te hebben gehandeld vanuit een positie van zwakte - met desastreuze gevolgen. Deze ervaring zou een blijvende indruk op Ernst van der Beugel achterlaten die bepalend zou zijn voor zijn houding ten opzichte van de Sovjet-Unie ten tijde van de Koude Oorlog. Machtsverhoudingen zouden bij hem centraal staan. Iedere nieuwe autoritaire dreiging, of deze nu van links of van rechts kwam, moest tegemoet worden getreden vanuit een positie van (militaire) kracht. Tegenover de afwachtende houding van de Europese landen die in 1938 hadden gefaald om Hitler tegen te houden, stond voor van der Beugel de actieve houding van de Amerikanen. Hij ontwikkelde grote bewondering voor de Verenigde Staten als bevrijder, maar ook voor de Amerikaanse rol in de naoorlogse wederopbouw van West-Europa.

Na de oorlog ternauwernood te hebben overleefd, besloot Ernst van der Beugel niet in de voetsporen van zijn vader te treden, maar voor een carrière bij de overheid te kiezen teneinde aldaar mee te werken aan de wederopbouw van Nederland. Het tweede hoofdstuk beschrijft het begin van zijn carrière bij de overheid en zijn rol in het Marshall Plan. Deze rol begon toen hij in de zomer van 1947 werd aangesteld als Secretaris van de Nederlandse delegatie op de conferentie over het Marshall Plan in Parijs. Het beschrijft ook zijn allereerste reis naar de Verenigde Staten in het najaar van 1947 en zijn rol aan het hoofd van het Marshall Plan Bureau van Regeringscommissaris Hans Max Hirschfeld, die hem de kneepjes van de internationale politiek leerde op het snijvlak van de internationale betrekkingen, economisch beleid en veiligheidsvraagstukken. Deze periode zou het begin vormen van Ernst van der Beugels niet aflatende betrokkenheid in de na-oorlogse transatlantische betrekkingen.

Het tweede hoofdstuk laat ook zien hoe het organisatorische karakter van het Marshall Plan, dat heel bewust was opgezet als een joint venture tussen de publieke en de private sector - samen met de aan de Marhsall hulp verbonden eis tot Europese samenwerking - heeft bijgedragen aan de totstandkoming van een onofficiële na-oorlogse transatlantische elite die niet alleen bestond uit overheidsfunctionarissen, maar ook uit mensen uit het bedrijfsleven en de financiële wereld, het defensieapparaat, vertegenwoordigers van vakbonden, wetenschappers en andere experts. In de context van deze nauwe samenwerking in het kader van de wederopbouw werden vele nieuwe transnationale vriendschappen gesmeed die de nucleus zouden vormen van een sociaal netwerk -verbonden door gedeelde ervaringen, collectieve waarden en gemeenschappelijke doelen - dat zowel over Europese

landsgrenzen als over de Atlantische oceaan zou reiken. Ernst van der Beugel raakte sterk in dit transatlantische web verweven. Als hoofd van het Marshall Plan Bureau onderhield hij nauw contact met alle betrokken partijen in Nederland, in Europa en in de Verenigde Staten, zowel met overheidsfunctionarissen als met vertegenwoordigers uit de private sector, waardoor hij in staat was een indrukwekkend divers netwerk op te bouwen. De Marshall Plan-periode was dus niet alleen een belangrijke formatieve periode voor Ernst van der Beugel en zijn Atlanticistische sympathieën, maar ook voor zijn netwerk en voor de ontwikkeling van een na-oorlogse Atlantische elite in het algemeen.

Het derde hoofdstuk gaat vervolgens vooral in op de ontwikkeling van de politieke ideeën van Ernst van der Beugel tijdens zijn carrière bij de overheid, met name ten opzichte van de Europese integratie en de transatlantische betrekkingen – eerst als topambtenaar op het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken en tussen januari 1957 en december 1958 als Staatssecretaris van Buitenlandse Zaken. Terwijl Van der Beugels herinnering aan de appeasementpolitiek in de aanloop naar de Tweede Wereldoorlog leidde tot een grote waardering van machtsdenken, leidde de Amerikaanse rol in de bevrijding en de wederopbouw van Europa tot een diepe sympathie voor en identificatie met het Amerikaanse leiderschap in die periode. In de context van een nieuwe gepercipieerde dreiging uit het oosten in de vorm van de communistische Sovjet-Unie leidde dit bij Ernst van der Beugel tot de overtuiging dat de veiligheid van het Westen alleen gewaarborgd kon worden als West-Europa en de Verenigde Staten, die samen een waardengemeenschap vormden, hun krachten zouden bundelen in een Atlantische gemeenschap onder Amerikaanse leiderschap. In de context van de Koude Oorlog, zo geloofde Ernst van der Beugel, was West-Europa voor haar veiligheid geheel afhankelijk van de Amerikaanse veiligheidsgarantie die in 1949 werd geformaliseerd door de ondertekening van het Noord Atlantisch Verdrag. Samenwerking in NAVO-verband zou dan ook de hoeksteen moeten vormen van het Nederlandse en Europese veiligheidsbeleid. Samen met het economische belang van vrijhandel zou dit een centrale rol spelen in zijn begrip van het Nederlands nationale belang, waar andere zaken aan ondergeschikt waren. Hier behoorde ook het proces van Europese integratie toe. Dit diende volgens Van der Beugel niet als doel op zichzelf te staan, maar altijd ten dienste te staan van het versterken van het Atlantische bondgenootschap in de context van de Koude Oorlog.

Aangezien de Europese integratie nauw verweven was met het Marshall Plan, als gevolg van het feit dat de Amerikanen Europese samenwerking als een eis voor deelname aan het herstelprogramma hadden gesteld, kwam Ernst van der Beugel ook een centrale rol te spelen in de Nederlandse beleidskringen die zich met dit vraagstuk bezighielden. Begin jaren '50 had hij als jong PvdA lid nog meegewerkt aan een poging met een groep gelijkgestemden, die zichzelf de Groep van Tien noemden, om de partijleiding aan te sporen tot een voortvarender Europabeleid. Naarmate hij de indruk kreeg dat de Europese integratie zich in een richting ontwikkelde die niet bevorderlijk, maar wellicht juist schadelijk zou kunnen zijn voor de Atlantische samenwerking, werd Ernst van der Beugel echter sceptischer over het proces van Europese integratie. Een centrale rol hierin speelde de groeiende macht van de Gaullisten in

Frankrijk. Ernst van der Beugel verdacht Charles de Gaulle en zijn sympathisanten ervan de Europese integratie te willen kapen teneinde de Franse grandeur te herstellen door van Europa een derde macht onder Frans leiderschap te maken die zich onafhankelijk zou opstellen van zowel de Sovjet Unie als de Verenigde Staten. Aangezien Ernst van der Beugel ervan overtuigd was dat West-Europa voor haar veiligheid geheel afhankelijk was van zo nauw mogelijke banden met de VS, beschouwde hij dit scenario als een groot gevaar. Dit leidde ertoe dat wanneer hij het idee had dat de Europese integratie een kant op dreigde te gaan die zijns inziens tot een verzwakking van de transatlantische banden zou kunnen leiden – of anderzijds het Nederlandse belang dreigde aan te tasten – hij direct op de rem trapte, tot grote frustratie van de voorstanders van een rappe integratie. Hiervoor werd onder andere gepleit door aanhangers van Jean Monnet, de architect van het Schuman Plan en de eerste president van de Hoge Autoriteit van de EGKS, waar een aantal van Ernst van der Beugel's nauwste vrienden, waaronder Max Kohnstamm en Conny Patijn, toe behoorden. Hoewel Monnet ook een groot voorstander was van nauwe transatlantische betrekkingen, vond van der Beugel dat hij te weinig oog had voor de dreiging die uitging van toegeven aan de Gaullisten, waardoor Monnet volgens van der Beugel onbedoeld de transatlantische betrekkingen op het spel zette teneinde zijn Europese droom zo spoedig mogelijk te verwezenlijken. In 1955 richtte Monnet het Actiecomité voor de Verenigde Staten van Europa op, dat een hoogst effectieve pressiegroep voor Europese integratie bleek te zijn waarmee de Fransman als privépersoon achter de schermen van de Europese en transatlantische betrekkingen invloed wist uit te oefenen op het diplomatieke proces. Monnet wist enerzijds druk op de Europese regeringen uit te oefenen door een beleidslijn uit te zetten waar voornamelijk parlementariërs in de Europese landen zich door lieten inspireren, maar ook door zijn toegang tot de hoogste kringen in de Amerikaanse regering die over de besluitvorming gingen en de laag die daar net onder zat: degenen die het Amerikaanse buitenlandse beleid in de dagelijkse praktijk vormgaven. Door de Amerikanen te overtuigen van zijn zienswijze kon hij via de Amerikanen ook weer druk uitoefenen op de Europese regeringen. De activiteiten van Monnet frustreerden Ernst van der Beugel, die zich – nota bene als formele overheidsfunctionaris – beperkt voelde in zijn handelen door de acties van deze private speler op het diplomatieke speelveld. Monnet's activiteiten zouden Ernst van der Beugel echter ook inspireren. Onderdelen van de handelswijze van Monnet zouden namelijk ook voor meer Atlanticistische doeleinden ingezet kunnen worden, zo redeneerde van der Beugel.

Van der Beugels zorgen over de richting waar de Europese integratie op afkoerste waren voor het eerst duidelijk naar boven gekomen tijdens de onderhandelingen over de Europese Defensiegemeenschap begin jaren '50. Zijn zorgen en frustraties verergerden echter tijdens de onderhandelingen die leidden tot de verdragen van Rome, waarin Frankrijk volgens van der Beugel vaak haar zin kreeg door zich steeds als de moeilijkste speler op te stellen, en leken een climax te bereiken met de benoeming van Charles de Gaulle tot president van Frankrijk. Toen Ernst van der Beugel vervolgens Staassecretaris van Buitenlandse Zaken werd, raakte hij nog verder gedesillusioneerd in het proces van Europese integratie met het

Frankrijk van de Gaulle. Als voorstander van vrijhandel en een Atlantisch georiënteerd Europa achtte Ernst van der Beugel het van groot belang dat Groot-Brittannië zo nauw mogelijk bij het proces van Europese integratie werd betrokken. Wat dit betreft had hij zijn hoop gevestigd op de creatie van een Europese vrijhandelszone die de zes continentale landen van de EEG aan de overige OEEC landen – en dus ook aan Groot Brittannië – zou koppelen. Deze onderhandelingen liepen echter al snel vast. Het was in deze context dat Ernst van der Beugel in het voorjaar van 1959 voor het eerst werd uitgenodigd voor een speciale Bilderbergconferentie, alwaar de deelnemers – in privécapaciteit – veel vrijer met elkaar konden spreken dan Van der Beugel in formele diplomatieke contexten gewend was. Hier werden van der Beugels donkere vermoedens over het Frankrijk van De Gaulle bevestigd: Frankrijk streefde de Europese integratie slechts na teneinde het leiderschap van de zes landen van de EEG naar zich toe te trekken. De Europese vrijhandelszone zou dit doel frustreren, dus zelfs als al haar eisen werden ingewilligd, zou Frankrijk nog niet bereid zijn een dergelijke vrijhandelszone te accepteren, zo concludeerde hij.

Tegen de tijd dat van der Beugel deze Bilderbergconferentie bezocht, was hij echter al geen Staatssecretaris van Buitenlandse Zaken meer. Het vierde Kabinet Drees was in december 1958 gevallen, maar Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Luns had Ernst van der Beugel een tijdelijke positie als buitengewoon en gevolmachtigd ambassadeur gegeven teneinde zijn rol in de onderhandelingen met betrekking tot de Vrijhandelszone voort te zetten terwijl hij zich op een volgende carrièrestap zou oriënteren. In de zomer van 1959 verliet Ernst van der Beugel het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken – als een overtuigd Atlanticist en gedisilluseerd met het proces van Europese integratie zoals het zich ontvouwde – teneinde president-directeur Aler van de KLM op te volgen, die in 1961 met pensioen zou gaan. Het vierde hoofdstuk gaat in op deze transitieperiode en de wijze waarop Ernst van der Beugel in staat bleek om ook als privépersoon een diplomatieke rol in de transatlantische betrekkingen te blijven spelen.

Ernst van der Beugel was geen onbekende van de KLM. De luchtvaartmaatschappij was één van de belangrijke ontvangers van Marshallhulp en als Staatssecretaris had Ernst van der Beugel namens Nederland onderhandelingen geleid over landingsrechten voor de KLM in de Verenigde Staten. Hoewel de KLM niet alle landingsrechten had gekregen waar de Nederlandse regering op uit was geweest, hetgeen de transatlantische betrekkingen geen goed had gedaan en nogal wat verontwaardiging onder de Nederlandse bevolking had opgeroepen, waren zowel de Nederlandse bevolking, de regering en de KLM-leiding vol lof over de wijze waarop Ernst van der Beugel deze onderhandelingen had gevoerd.

Voor Van der Beugel was de keuze voor het KLM-leiderschap een puur rationele keuze, gebaseerd op het verlangen zijn carrière uit te bouwen zonder verlies van status of financiële zekerheid. Zijn leiderschap van de KLM werd geen succes en zou slechts tot 1963 duren, waarna hij zich terugtrok om een proefschrift te schrijven over de Europese integratie als onderdeel van de naoorlogse Amerikaanse buitenlandse politiek. In 1966 werd hij vervolgens benoemd tot bijzonder hoogleraar aan de Universiteit Leiden met “Westelijke Samenwerking

na de Tweede Wereldoorlog” als leeropdracht. Ook vergaarde Van der Beugel een indrukwekkende verzameling commissariaten bij vooraanstaande bedrijven zowel in Europa als in de VS. Reeds tijdens zijn periode bij de KLM wist Ernst van der Beugel zich echter ook een weg te banen als privépersoon op het transatlantische diplomatieke speelveld en een centrale positie binnen de onofficiële transatlantische elite te verwerven. De continuïteit van zijn diplomatieke rol in de transatlantische betrekkingen werd gefaciliteerd door een aantal persoonlijke en externe, meer structurele, factoren die niet alleen nauw met elkaar verbonden waren, maar elkaar ook versterkten.

Tot de externe factoren behoorden de 20^e-eeuwse globaliseringsprocessen, vooral op het gebied van transport en communicatie, die het met name na de Tweede Wereldoorlog makkelijker maakten voor privépersonen om deel te nemen aan het diplomatieke proces. Binnen de Atlantische gemeenschap ontwikkelden deze processen zich hand in hand met de proliferatie van een rijke constellatie aan private organisaties die zich inzetten voor het bevorderen van de transatlantische relaties, zoals de International Movement for Atlantic Union, de Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Atlantic Brücke, de Bilderberg Meetings, het International Institute for Strategic Studies in London en het Atlantic Institute in Parijs. Deze organisaties fungeerden op hun beurt ook weer als belangrijke ontmoetingsplaatsen van de na-oorlogse Atlantische elite, die was ontstaan uit de nauwe transatlantische samenwerking tijdens en na de Tweede Wereldoorlog, bijvoorbeeld in de context van het Marshall Plan, de Europese integratie en de ontwikkeling van de NAVO. Zoals eerder reeds aangegeven bestond deze elite niet alleen uit overheidsfunctionarissen, maar ook uit invloedrijke figuren uit het bedrijfsleven en de financiële wereld, de wetenschap, vakbondsleiders en journalisten – een bont gezelschap van invloedrijke personen die zich inzetten voor nauwe transatlantische betrekkingen. Het was in deze context, temidden van deze informele dimensie van de transatlantische betrekkingen, dat Ernst van der Beugel een voorname positie in zou nemen. Zo bekleedde hij posities in de besturen van particuliere organisaties die zich met internationale betrekkingen bezighielden, zoals de Ditchley Foundation, de Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship, het Atlantic Institute in Parijs, het Nederlandse Genootschap voor Internationale Zaken en het prestigieuze International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. Van bijzonder groot belang in deze context echter zijn benoeming tot Honorair Secretaris-Generaal voor Europa van de prestigieuze Bilderberg Meetings, één van de belangrijkste ontmoetingsplaatsen voor de formele en informele Atlantische elite

De Bilderbergconferentie waren opgericht tijdens een periode van oplopende transatlantische spanningen begin jaren '50. Het doel van de bijeenkomsten was om de Atlantische eenheid te bewaren door informele *off the record* bijeenkomsten te organiseren waar invloedrijke Amerikanen en Europeanen vrijuit konden spreken teneinde wederzijds begrip te bevorderen en onenigheden glad te strijken. Het was de bedoeling dat de conferenties op deze wijze bij zouden dragen aan het bevorderen van persoonlijke vertrouwensbanden, de informele uitwisseling van ideeën en het versterken van gedeelde waarden, terwijl er ook ruimte werd geboden voor het venten van frustraties en het

bespreken van meningsverschillen. De bijeenkomsten duurden drie dagen, waardoor er genoeg tijd overbleef om elkaar ook buiten de plenaire besprekingen om goed te leren kennen. Twintig jaar lang – tussen 1960 en 1980 – zou Ernst van der Beugel de drijvende kracht achter deze conferenties zijn.

Op persoonlijk niveau werd de continuïteit van Ernst van der Beugels diplomatieke rol gefaciliteerd door een combinatie van kenmerken die onderverdeeld kunnen worden in sociaal, intellectueel en financieel kapitaal. Op het gebied van sociaal kapitaal beschikte Ernst van der Beugel over een uitgebreid netwerk dat zich uitspande over de gehele Atlantische gemeenschap. Dit netwerk bestond uit invloedrijke figuren uit de publieke en de private sector: politici, ambtenaren, formele diplomaten, bankiers, vakbondsleiders, topmensen uit het bedrijfsleven, filantropen, academici en journalisten. Zijn positie als Secretaris-Generaal van de Bilderberg Meetings voorzag hem van extra transnationaal sociaal kapitaal en zorgde voor een vrijwel continue uitbreiding van dit netwerk in alle sferen die door de deelnemers aan deze conferenties werden vertegenwoordigd. Dankzij zijn ervaring als een formele diplomaat was hij bekend met en had hij ook toegang tot de formele buitenlands politieke elite zowel in Europa als in de Verenigde Staten. Ook nadat hij de overheid had verlaten bleven zij hem erkennen als een serieuze speler op het diplomatieke toneel.

Van der Beugel had tijdens zijn carrière als overheidsfunctionaris niet alleen een groot netwerk opgebouwd, maar ook veel kennis en expertise vergaard - met name op het gebied van de transatlantische betrekkingen en de Europese integratie. Op dit intellectuele kapitaal werd ook nadat hij de overheid verliet veelvuldig een beroep op gedaan. Zijn benoeming tot bijzonder hoogleraar in de Westelijke Samenwerking bij de Universiteit Leiden versterkte zijn status als expert. Zijn sociale status en *trackrecord* als formele diplomaat, maakten hem tot een erkende, vertrouwde, professionele *insider* op het diplomatieke speelveld. Zijn steeds verder uitdijende netwerk en de toegang tot invloedrijke figuren aan beide kanten van de Atlantische Oceaan zorgden ervoor dat Ernst van der Beugel goed op te hoogte kon blijven van de laatste internationale ontwikkelingen en zorgde ervoor dat hij over waardevolle *insider information* beschikte, hetgeen hem weer tot een interessante gesprekspartner maakte – ook voor formele diplomaten. Dit bood vervolgens ook weer mogelijkheden om zijn netwerk verder uit te breiden. Zijn kennis en expertise maakten hem niet alleen een interessante gesprekspartner voor formele diplomaten en andere overheidsfunctionarissen, maar maakten hem ook tot een aantrekkelijke kandidaat voor commissariaten en consultancy posities in het bedrijfsleven en bij filantropische instellingen, zoals de Ford Foundation, die hielpen om een groot deel de private transatlantische organisaties, waaronder de Bilderberg Meetings, te financieren. Deze posities zorgden vervolgens weer voor het nodige financiële kapitaal dat Ernst van der Beugel hielp de levensstandaard te behouden waarmee hij zijn private diplomatieke activiteiten kon faciliteren. De laatste drie hoofdstukken bestuderen meer specifiek de diplomatieke rol en *modus operandi* van Ernst van der Beugel als privépersoon aan de hand van drie case studies, die zich allemaal richten op de diplomatieke activiteiten

die Ernst van der Beugel ontplooidde in de context van een door hem gepercipieerde bedreiging van de Atlantische samenwerking.

Hoofdstuk vijf gaat in op de diplomatieke rol die Ernst van der Beugel vervulde in de context van het 'Gaullistische gevaar' tijdens de jaren '60. Nadat Charles de Gaulle de Atlantische gemeenschap in 1963 in een crisis had gestort door zijn veto tegen het Britse EEG lidmaatschap uit te spreken, gebruikte Ernst van der Beugel de Bilderberg Meetings als een belangrijk instrument om sociale en intellectuele vervreemding binnen de Atlantische elite tegen te gaan door het verbeteren van de persoonlijke banden en wederzijds begrip, maar ook door de bijeenkomsten als een uitlaatklep voor transatlantische frustraties te laten dienen. Van der Beugel was bovendien bang dat De Gaulle de Amerikanen door zijn anti-Amerikaanse uitspraken van Europa zou vervreemden en dat dit zou leiden tot een terugtrekking van de Amerikaanse inzet op het Europese continent. Door middel van de Bilderbergconferenties kon hij aan de Amerikaanse elite laten zien dat De Gaulle niet voor heel Europa sprak, maar dat het overgrote deel van de Europese elite de Gaullisten niet steunde. Effecten van deze Bilderberg Meetings sijpelden ook door in het formele diplomatieke berichtenverkeer. Nadat de Nederlandse Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Josphe Luns een Gaullist vrijelijk zijn ideeën uiteen had horen zetten op een Bilderberg conferentie, probeerde hij via een speech van koningin Juliana op het Amerikaanse continent duidelijk te maken dat de Gaulle niet voor alle Europeanen sprak. Op hetzelfde moment hielpen de Bilderbergconferenties om in gesprek te blijven met de Fransen; enerzijds om helderheid te krijgen over hun denkbeelden en anderzijds om ook hen – en daarbij ook de niet Gaullistische Fransen – geëngageerd te houden in de transatlantische conversatie. Dit hoofdstuk laat ook zien dat de Bilderberg Meetings uitermate serieus werden benaderd door formele diplomaten en dat ook Ernst van der Beugel, die tijdens deze periode nauw contact onderhield met vooraanstaande diplomaten en beleidsmakers in de VS en Europa, door het formele diplomatieke establishment als een serieuze speler op het diplomatieke toneel werd beschouwd. Hij wisselde regelmatig informatie met hen uit over ontwikkelingen aan de andere zijde van de Atlantische oceaan, bracht berichten tussen Amerikaanse en Europese overheidsfunctionarissen over en werkte op sommige momenten samen aan meer concrete gemeenschappelijke doelen. Zijn activiteiten werden dan ook goed in de gaten gehouden door de Amerikaanse ambassade in den Haag, waar van der Beugel zelf ook veelvuldig contact mee onderhield. Nadat Amerikaanse ambtenaren van het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken hem overtuigden van het belang van de *Multilateral Force*, een transatlantisch samenwerkingsproject voor nucleair bewapende schepen waar van der Beugel oorspronkelijk weinig enthousiasme voor op kon brengen, zette Van der Beugel zich zowel voor als achter de schermen voor dit project in teneinde de plannen van Charles de Gaulle te frustreren en een positieve impuls te geven aan de transatlantische betrekkingen. Hij deed dit onder andere door voorstanders van dit beleid binnen het Amerikaanse *State Department* een podium te bieden op de Bilderberg conferentie in 1964 om deze ideeën uit te venten. Ondertussen wist hij in Nederland steun te bieden aan het onder druk staande Atlanticistische beleid van

Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Luns door een groep van 38 Nederlandse prominenten te verzamelen die in een open brief in vooraanstaande Nederlandse kranten hun steun aan dit beleid betuigden.

Terwijl het vijfde hoofdstuk vooral ging over de rol die Ernst van der Beugel achter de schermen van de transatlantische diplomatie speelde, gaat het zesde hoofdstuk in op een periode waarin hij zich steeds meer een rol in het publieke debat toe-eigende. Dit gebeurde tijdens de late jaren '60 en het begin van de jaren '70, een periode die enerzijds werd gekenmerkt door ontspanning tussen Oost en West en anderzijds door de democratisering van het buitenlands beleid. Van der Beugel zag dit als een grote bedreiging voor de Atlantische samenwerking en met name voor de Atlantische defensie-inspanning. Met de periode van ontspanning raakte het vijandsbeeld van de Sovjet-Unie namelijk op de achtergrond, waardoor een belangrijke legitimering voor de NAVO en de nationale defensie-uitgaven onder druk kwam te staan. Terwijl de bevolking mondiger werd, groeide het anti-Amerikanisme in Europa onder andere door de voortdurende Vietnamoorlog. De internationale betrekkingen werden hiermee uit het domein van de elite getrokken, die niet meer om de stem en mening van het 'gewone volk' heen kon. In deze context begon Ernst van der Beugel een voorname rol te spelen in het publieke debat, waarin hij het Amerikaanse beleid aan een Europees publiek probeerde uit te leggen en een sympathiek beeld van de Verenigde Staten probeerde neer te zetten door de herinnering aan de Amerikaanse rol in de bevrijding en het Marshall Plan in leven te houden. Op hetzelfde moment probeerde hij ook het vijandsbeeld van de Sovjetunie in leven te houden en waarschuwde hij voor het niet aflatende gevaar dat van deze communistische dreiging uitging. Van der Beugel werd in deze periode ook benoemd tot lid van de Commissie van Rijckevorsel, die de Nederlandse regering moest adviseren over haar defensiebeleid. In het debat dat zich over dit onderwerp in de Nederlandse maatschappij ontwikkelde, ontpopte Ernst van der Beugel zich als één van de voornaamste voorvechters voor een hoger defensiebudget. Zijn rol als 'expert' ook op dit gebied werd hierbij onderstreept door zijn benoeming tot voorzitter van het prestigieuze International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. Van der Beugel probeerde niet alleen door zijn eigen directe publieke optredens bij te dragen aan een klimaat dat bevorderlijk was voor de transatlantische betrekkingen, maar hielp ook Nederlandse journalisten waarvan hij dacht dat ze positief over de VS zouden schrijven, bijvoorbeeld door ze toegang te bieden tot voorname mensen uit zijn netwerk, of door of door ze uit te nodigen voor een Bilderbergconferentie of op één van de vele diners met allerhande prominenten bij hem thuis. Naast deze meer publiek-diplomatieke activiteiten bleef Van der Beugel ook een actieve rol spelen achter de schermen van de transatlantische diplomatie. In deze context staat vooral van der Beugels nauwe vriendschap met Henry Kissinger centraal. Deze vriendschap, die tot stand was gekomen toen Ernst van der Beugel nog voor de Nederlandse overheid werkte, voorzag Van de Beugel tijdens deze periode van een directe lijn naar het Witte Huis. Kissinger en Van der Beugel benaderden elkaar tijdens deze periode ook met diplomatieke kwesties. Zo belde Kissinger Ernst van der Beugel op om advies te vragen toen Minister van

Buitenlandse Zaken Luns boos en verontwaardigd reageerde op het feit dat President Nixon op zijn eerste Europese reis wel België en Italië aandeed, maar Nederland niet en hielp Van der Beugel Kissinger contact te leggen met het Actiecomité van Monnet nadat de relaties tussen dit Actiecomité en het Witte Huis met de overgang van president Johnson naar Nixon waren verwaterd. Andersom benaderde Ernst van der Beugel Kissinger bijvoorbeeld om druk uit te oefenen op de Nederlandse regering om het defensiebudget op te hogen, waar Kissinger eenmaal wel een eenmaal geen gehoor aan gaf. Ook schakelde van der Beugel Kissingers hulp in teneinde de Nederlandse regering te helpen in het verkrijgen van de lang begeerde landingsrechten voor de KLM – deze keer wel met succes.

Het laatste hoofdstuk bespreekt de manieren waarop Ernst van der Beugel zich inzette om het Atlantische gedachtegoed over te dragen aan een nieuwe generatie leiders die de Tweede Wereldoorlog, noch de bevrijding of het Marshall Plan hadden meegemaakt. In plaats daarvan groeiden zij op tijdens een periode van ontspanning tussen Oost en West en associeerden zij de VS met sociale onrust, de Vietnamoorlog en het Watergateschandaal. In deze context beschrijft dit hoofdstuk Ernst van der Beugels rol als consultant voor de Ford Foundation, zijn werk als bijzonder hoogleraar aan de Universiteit Leiden, waarvoor hij door een journalist het predicaat van “NAVO-professor” opgeplakt kreeg, en zijn ondersteuning van uitwisselingsprogramma's. De grootste nadruk ligt echter op de wijze waarop Ernst van der Beugel trachtte om de Bilderberg Meetings te gebruiken om het Atlantische gedachtegoed over te brengen aan een nieuwe generatie leiders door deze in de Atlantische elite op te nemen en te betrekken in het gesprek over de toekomst van de Atlantische gemeenschap.

Uit de voorgaande hoofdstukken blijkt dat Van der Beugel's diplomatieke activiteiten geen incidenten waren, maar deel uitmaakten van aanhoudende en gecoördineerde pogingen van gelijkgestemde private actoren om deel te nemen in en bij te dragen aan het multidimensionale beheer van de transatlantische betrekkingen door natiestaten en private actoren, via formele en informele kanalen. De formele en informele dimensies van de Atlantische betrekkingen waren niet van elkaar geïsoleerd, maar waren nauw verbonden via sociale netwerken en ontmoetingsplaatsen, zoals de Bilderberg Meetings, die interactie tussen beide groepen faciliteerden. Op hetzelfde moment is het van belang aan te geven dat veel van de private Atlanticistische organisaties *grass roots* initiatieven waren, die niet door een staat waren geïnitieerd, hoewel formele overheidsvertegenwoordigers hun rol in het diplomatieke proces erkenden en soms ook toejuichten. Soms werkten ze samen aan gemeenschappelijke diplomatieke doelen. Soms waren overheidsvertegenwoordigers er zelfs van overtuigd dat ze effectiever konden handelen dan overheidsvertegenwoordigers, of formele vertegenwoordigers van de NAVO bijvoorbeeld. Als private actoren konden ze bijvoorbeeld makkelijker vrijuit spreken en kwamen ze geloofwaardiger over wanneer ze publieksdiplomatie bedreven of bijdroegen aan de psychologische oorlogsvoering – zaken die wanneer uitgevoerd door formele overheidsvertegenwoordigers sneller zouden rieken naar propaganda. Op hetzelfde moment boden ontmoetingsplekken als de Bilderberg Meetings

ook overheidsvertegenwoordigers een plek waar ze vrijer konden spreken, hun collega's beter konden leren kennen en gemakkelijker vertrouwensbanden konden smeden. Er waren dus momenten waarop de private actoren nauw samenwerkten met het formele diplomatieke establishment, maar er waren ook momenten waarop ze elkaar uitdaagden, of geheel los van elkaar opereerden. Ze waren niet zonder meer een verlengstuk van de formele diplomatie

Hetzelfde kan worden gezegd van Ernst van der Beugel en zijn verhouding tot bijvoorbeeld Nederlandse en Amerikaanse overheidsvertegenwoordigers. Als privédiplomaat kon hij niet gezien worden als de marionet van één van deze natiestaten. Als formeel overheidsvertegenwoordiger had hij zich beperkt gevoeld door de ambtelijke discipline van de Nederlandse staat – als privédiplomaat kon hij handelen op basis van zijn eigen overtuigingen en was hij vrij om zijn eigen koers bepalen. Zo werkte hij bijvoorbeeld samen met de Nederlandse regering om landingsrechten voor de KLM in de VS te verkrijgen, maar deinsde hij er ook niet voor terug om de Nederlandse regering via zijn Amerikaanse contacten onder druk te zetten om het defensiebudget op te hogen. Hij werkte enthousiast samen met de ambtenaren op het Amerikaanse State Department in hun poging steun onder de Atlantische elite te vergaren voor de Multilateral Force, maar uitte op hetzelfde moment sterke kritiek op de Amerikaanse rol in het proces van Europese integratie toen zij de Britse plannen voor een Europese Vrijhandelszone niet krachtig genoeg steunden of voor het gebrek aan leiderschap dat ze volgens hem toonden binnen de Atlantische gemeenschap. Al met al manifesteerde Ernst van der Beugel zich op het diplomatieke toneel als een onafhankelijke transnationale actor die een realistische stroming binnen het Atlanticisme vertegenwoordigde die streefde naar maximale Atlantische cohesie onder sterk Amerikaanse leiderschap. De doelen die hij hierbij nastreefde hadden een duidelijk diplomatiek karakter, namelijk het versterken van de transatlantische betrekkingen op de lange en korte termijn

Door Ernst van der Beugel te volgen door de formele en informele dimensies van de transatlantische diplomatie ten tijde van de Koude Oorlog heeft dit proefschrift laten zien hoe *New Diplomatic History* een alternatief perspectief biedt op de diplomatieke geschiedenis. Het beeld van het transatlantische diplomatieke proces dat in deze hoofdstukken naar voren komt, is complexer en gelaagder dan veel traditionele studies doen vermoeden. Het laat zien hoe Ernst van der Beugel samen met diverse andere private spelers een integraal onderdeel vormde van het transatlantische diplomatieke proces ten tijde van de Koude Oorlog – en dat zij ook door formele diplomaten als dusdanig werden erkend. Om recht te doen aan de complexiteit van dit diplomatieke proces zullen we dus ook aandacht moeten besteden aan de informele dimensie van de diplomatie en de rol van niet-statelijke actoren zoals Ernst van der Beugel.

Curriculum Vitae

Albertine Bloemendal (Amersfoort, 1984) received both her BA (2006) and MA (2008) in American Studies *cum laude* from the Radboud University in Nijmegen. She also studied a semester as an exchange student at Boston College and did an internship at the Political Department of the Netherlands Embassy in Washington D.C. In 2009 she won the Theodore Roosevelt American History Award for her MA thesis “Abraham Kuyper’s Road to the White House: How Kuyperian Thought Came to Influence American Welfare Reform.” After working for several years as a journalist, which she continued after the start of her PhD research in the fall of 2009, Albertine began working as a lecturer at Leiden University in 2013. Between June 2011 and June 2016, she was a board member of the Netherlands American Studies Association

