



Universiteit Leiden

**Hendrik Brugmans, the Federal Solution,
and the Cultural Renewal of Europe**

Lisa Maat

Master History, Faculty of Humanities
Political Cultures and National Identities

Supervisor: G.P. Scott-Smith

June 10, 2012

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Chapter 1 The Origins of European Federalism	7
1.1 A Climate of High Hope.....	7
1.2 Different Directions.....	9
1.3 Unionism vs Federalism	11
1.4 Conclusion	14
Chapter 2 Hendrik Brugmans' views on European Integration.....	15
2.1 Personal and Political Background	15
2.2 The Federalist Solution.....	17
2.3 Peace, Reconciliation and World Federation.....	20
2.4 Federalism and the Cold War	21
2.5 Culture and Morality	24
2.6 Conclusion	27
Chapter 3 A Promising Start: the 1948 Congress of Europe and the Marshall Plan	29
3.1 The Congress	29
3.2 The Political Resolution	32
3.3 The Economic and Social Resolution	33
3.4 The Cultural Resolution.....	34
3.5 The Final Pledge: The Conclusions and Implications of the Congress.....	35
3.6 The Marshall Plan	36
3.7 Conclusion	38
Chapter 4 From Words to Action; Initiatives by Hendrik Brugmans	39
4.1 The Union of European Federalists.....	39
4.2 The European Movement	41
4.3 The College of Europe.....	42
4.4 Conclusion	45
Conclusion	46
Literature.....	49

Introduction

After World War II many European countries pledged for closer collaboration within Europe. The continent was suffering severely from the ravages of a catastrophic conflict that had entailed enemy occupation, the creation of huge debts, the wholesale destruction of industrial capacity, and the separation by the Iron curtain of the western industrial areas from many of their normal sources of food supply.¹ As John Selden, Lieutenant General of the United States Marine Corps, ventilated: “*Though we had Peace, yet ‘twill be a great while e’er things be settled. Though the Wind lie, yet after a Storm the Sea work a great while*”.² Europe was aware that it had to unite to prevent future political instability and many believed it needed to be reconstructed along the federal lines.

Of course, this was not a new conception. For centuries past, statesmen and philosophers have dreamt of a united Europe. Sully, Immanuel Kant, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Voltaire and Jeremy Bentham, are among those who have pleaded this cause.³ Kant for example, believed that universal peace could only be obtained by first creating a European federation of free states. Jean-Jacques Rousseau stated that the opposition of particular interests resulted in the establishment of different societies. Therefore, a common interest should be the basis of how a society is governed. Throughout history, many people like Rousseau tried to create awareness of the common interests and the manifest necessity of a united Europe and a common European policy. These common interests diverge from economic matters to a shared culture and from peace to religion. The idea was that although Europeans were divided into many states and nations, they belong to a single family and should therefore be united in some kind of community.⁴ Still, it would take centuries for this to become a widespread popular sentiment.

Even the French Revolution, which had profound effects on social organization, did not succeed in creating a United Europe. Attempts by hegemonic rulers like Napoleon to ‘unite’ Europe behind one national flag all failed; Europe did not want to be forced into a Union.⁵ After the overthrow of the Napoleonic empire, the Holy Alliance sought to unite the European world and prevent any future imperialism, revolution and war within the continent. It was a league of rulers however, not of peoples. Giuseppe Mazzini did make its appeal

¹ Hollis and Carter, *Europe Unites: The Hague Congress and After* (London 1948) pp. 3.

² R. Mayne, *The Recovery of Europe* (London 1970) pp. 22.

³ Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 4.

⁴ Altiero Spinelli, *The Eurocrats: Conflict and Crisis in the European Community* (Baltimore 1967) pp 3.

⁵ Count R.N. Coudenhoven-Kalergi, *Europe Must Unite* (Glarus 1939) pp. 78.

directly to the peoples; he was the spiritual leader of Young Europe, a movement that arose out of the struggle against the Holy Alliance. Although his organization was never of great significance, his ideas were rendered through Europe and had profound effect on the younger generation of his age.⁶

During the course of the nineteenth and start of the twentieth century, most European states were divided by on the one hand a call for modernization, and on the other conservative forces that wanted to restore the old nation state system. Furthermore, unification remained thwarted by extreme nationalism and later Bolshevism. The first leads to war and contempt for other peoples, races, and states. The political history of Europe is not one of reconciliation and increasing harmony; it is of envy, oppression and nationalist tendencies.⁷ Federalists believed that the roots of national hatred are to be found in oppression and hence there would be no cause for hatred when all nations are free and have equal rights.

Extreme internationalism, or Bolshevism, is dangerous since it desires to destroy national tradition. Count Coudenhove Kalergi, one of the most famous promoters of European Unity, once said that “this would not signify the salvation of Europe but its annihilation, for the greatness of Europe consists in the articulation and number of its nations”.⁸ Although Communists also combated European division, they fought for a Communist World Republic, not a European Union. Bolshevism is in conflict with all elements of Western culture such as the conception of free science, property and the family, and individualism and personality. It is aimed at the destruction of Europe’s traditional culture and could therefore be regarded as incompatible with the pan-European vision.

The most constructive ideas regarding the future of Europe came from the resistant movements during World War II. The people that risked their lives day in, day out and fought against Nazism, expected that after liberation spectacular renewal would take place. National renewal but also renewal regarding the coexistence of the peoples. In 1944 they organized an international conference in Geneva where they launched a radical yet also practical manifest: Europe should refrain from vague cooperation, the continent should unite into a real federation, responsible for its shared European interests. However, after the war a call for national restoration overruled the idea of renewal and many ex-resistance people seemed influenced by either communism or nationalism.⁹

⁶ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Europe Must Unite*, pp. 83.

⁷ Hendrik Brugmans, *Denkend aan Europa: De Charme van één Vaderland* (Tielt and Utrecht 1972) pp. 12.

⁸ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Europe Must Unite*, pp. 118.

⁹ Hendrik Brugmans, “Negentig jaar, Catalogus tentoonstelling 15 november” (13 december 1996) pp. 7.

Despite these negative forces, several important organizations were established that promoted European Unity, such as the European Movement in 1948. Hendrik Brugmans, one of the intellectual leaders of the European Movement and first president of the Union of European Federalists, firmly believed that Federalism was the doctrine that would present the solution for the chaos that reigned through Europe after the Second World War.¹⁰ It is evident that Brugmans believed that Europe should stand on its own; the great powers would never find the right solutions to problems like the German issue.¹¹ It is the federalist spirit alone that could guide Europe into a system of balanced autonomies which would create a peaceful and open society.

Throughout history, this desire for a peaceful system was at the heart of the European project and it was also central to Brugmans' strive for European Unity. He believed all forms of nationalism and imperialism should be resisted. According to Brugmans, European Federalism did not mean that nationalist forces of all separate countries would be merged into one European nationalist awareness. Neither would it result into a situation where Europe as a whole, instead of its separate countries, would be vulnerable to other powers. European federalism meant that Europe would finally find the strength to take fate into its own hands and pursue a policy of peace and reconciliation.¹²

As I mentioned before, other vital forces that drove plans for European Unity were economic matters and a shared culture and religion. Many believed that a United Europe would enhance economic growth. The Italian Industrialist, Giovanni Agnelli, stated that: "Only a federal Europe will be able to give us a more economic realization of the division of labour, with the elimination of all customs barriers."¹³ Others say that our shared culture, which also encompassed Christianity, is the historical basis of European Unity and should be preserved by uniting Europe in a political community and creating a common awareness.

Brugmans devoted a large part of his life to the cause of European unification and was a prominent figure in the European integration process, both in front and behind the scenes. In his early work, written during and right after the Second World War, he elaborates on how the ideal Europe should look like: free, prosperous, peaceful and most importantly federated. Brugmans' vision was quite radical compared to other proponents of European Unity; he was convinced the time had come to break down the walls of the nation state. Not only because he

¹⁰ Hendrik Brugmans, 'L'Europe, Société Ouverte', *Fédération* 25 (1947) pp. 5.

¹¹ Brugmans, 'L'Europe, Société Ouverte', pp 5.

¹² Hendrik Brugmans, *Europa één in een Verenigde Wereld: Montreux* (Amsterdam 1947?) pp.4.

¹³ Giovanni Agnelli, "The Europe of 1992" in *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 68, No. 4 (Fall, 1989) pp. 61-70.

believed that it would be a method to solve the problems in the political sphere, he also saw an opportunity to create the pluralistic and peaceful society he envisioned.¹⁴

In the years right after the Second World War, many political figures and organizations started to ventilate their thoughts on how Europe should be shaped and governed. It was a time of high hopes and ideals and above all, there was the belief that in the future Europe should never have to suffer from such horrible violence again. The idealism of the time is intriguing and during those years Hendrik Brugmans became a well-known supporter of the federalist vision. Europe was politically and economically ruined and people were highly susceptible of new ideas and promises; they simply wanted change and a better future. These delicate yet extremely important times for the future of Europe, together with Brugmans' fascinating personality and ideas, form the foundation of this research.

Brugmans has always been a prominent figure in literature on European integration and much has been written on him and his efforts. He was a highly gifted speaker and writer and was active in different social movements and political organisations since his adolescence. As mentioned before, he was an idealistic man, though he did not only convey federalist ideals; he was also an active socialist and Christian. All these characteristics make Brugmans a unique leading figure and an interesting subject of study. He did not only wanted to unite Europe into one political mechanism, in addition he believed in the strength of Europe's shared history and culture and thus also called for the cultural renewal of the continent. In this dissertation I will seek to determine Brugmans' early visions and ambitions for Europe as accurately as possible. Both published articles and other written work, as well as his speeches and unofficial sources like personal notes, will be used to reach an estimated conclusion on his insights. The questions central to this research are: What were Hendrik Brugmans' goals for European unification? What caused him to hold these views? And via what ways did Brugmans try and realise his goals in the first years after the war (1945-1950)?

The first chapter will elaborate on the origins of European federalism and explain the different approaches on the unification of Europe that originated during the first half of the twentieth century. The second chapter will provide a personal background on Brugmans and will outline his personal views on European Unity. It will discuss his speeches, articles and other written material and will help understand how his views on Europe were shaped. Subsequently, Brugmans' position within the broader trend of ideas on European unification can be sketched. Chapter three will elaborate on one of the first efforts to promote integration

¹⁴ Hendrik Brugmans, *Fundamentals of European Federalism* (Montreux 1947) pp. 9. (1-14)

within Europe, the 1948 Congress of Europe, as Hendrik Brugmans was its co-founder and delivered an impressive speech at the Congress. It will seek to outline the immediate post-war motives for integration from a European perspective, yet also discusses the American interest and influence in the matter. The fourth and last chapter aims to determine how Brugmans intended to contribute towards the goals he envisioned for Europe in the period right after WWII, like the creation of the Union of European Federalists and the establishment of the College of Europe in Bruges. It is interesting to explore how he understood his own role in the process of European unification, and why he did so. This dissertation will conclude by evaluating Brugmans' views and connecting these views with his personality, beliefs, past and actions. This might nuance Hendrik Brugmans' life-long strife for European Unity and shed light on the start of the European integration process.

Chapter 1 The Origins of European Federalism

1.1 A Climate of High Hope

It would take until after the First World War, before Europe finally left its path of national chauvinism that reigned during the nineteenth century. The first popular movement that strived for a united Europe was the pan-European movement and was founded in 1922 by count Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi. It aimed at a voluntary union of Europe in a league of free and equal nations. Important to note is that it would rather gradually create a European union than see it realized under the sway of a Bolshevist or nationalist dictatorship; Europe's freedom and culture should be preserved at any cost.¹⁵ Count Coudenhove was disappointed in the outcome of Versailles and had concluded that the only true solution for Europe was a common political mechanism.¹⁶ In promoting his cause, he organised several spectacular congresses and influenced different leading figures. At least until the Second World War he was the prophet preaching the new day, a future of peace and progress, which he believed would certainly dawn when Europe would be united. When Hitler invaded France in 1940, Coudenhove left Europe for the United States and continued his efforts to convince people of his ideal.¹⁷

In the 1920's the spirit of Locarno and of the Kellogg-Briand Pact provided a favourable climate to the growth of the idea of a united Europe. The essence of Locarno was to offer a solution for the Franco-German problem; it reconciled the French desire for security with the German wish to rehabilitate into the community of Europe. Of course the importance of this reconciliation for Europe as a whole cannot be overstressed. Many believed that all Europe, and not just France and Germany alone, should put aside its quarrels and take the next large step of uniting, not under the pressure of compulsion by any one of its members, but because of a freely consented decision.¹⁸

In October 1925 the Locarno agreements were concluded and although they undoubtedly contained ambiguities - and despite contemporary criticism -, it created a new

¹⁵ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Europe Must Unite*, pp. 140.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 117.

¹⁷ Arnold J. Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe 1940-1958* (New York 1958) pp. 9.

¹⁸ R. Albrecht-Carrié, *One Europe: The Historical Background of European Unity* (New York 1965) pp. 221.

climate abroad Europe often expressed as the “Spirit of Locarno”.¹⁹ French Prime Minister Aristide Briand illustrated this expression accurately during one of his memorable oratorical performances: “*Away with rifles, machine guns and cannons. Make way for reconciliation, arbitration and peace*”.²⁰ In reality, the Treaty of Locarno failed to contain the Nazi regime and in 1936 Hitler started to militarize the Rhineland. After 1945, many historians dismissed the treaty as a shallow compromise between Great Britain, France and Germany and their pursuit of security. Nevertheless, Locarno remains an important initiative in instigating the idea of a United Europe.

The 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact was another declaration that expressed the climate of high hope of the day. It was underwritten by virtually the whole world, including the United States and Russia, and stated that war should be renounced as an instrument of national policy.²¹ Although no implementing provisions were included and it could be regarded as a meaningless aberration, it does disseminate the spirit of the time. According to René Albrecht Carrié, author of the book ‘One Europe’, the climate of the late nineteen-twenties was favourable towards the concept of union: “It was a time when economic conditions were encouraging, the revulsion from war still very strong, and the view was gaining ground that what had happened in 1914 was a mistake that the civilized powers of Europe should never have allowed to happen”.²² Furthermore, with rising powers like Russia and China, there was reason to entertain second thoughts about the future of Europe and in addition, the balance of power that would come about.

Briand was determined to solve the French security problem through a strong pro-League policy, pursuing the reintegration of Germany into the community of Europe. He has been regarded as one of the first politicians who publicly spoke about a Union of European Nations. On 5 September 1929, he delivered a speech before the Assembly of the League of Nations in which he stated:

“ I think that among peoples of Europe constituting geographical groups, like the peoples of Europe, there should be some kind of federal bond; it should be possible for them to get into touch at any time, to confer about their interests, to agree on joint resolutions and to establish among themselves a bond of solidarity which will enable them, if need be, to meet any grave emergency that may arise. This is the link I want to forge. Obviously, this association will be

¹⁹ Albrecht-Carrié, *One Europe*, pp. 220.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 220.

²¹ *Idem*, pp. 220.

²² *Idem*, pp. 222.

*primarily economic, for that is the most urgent aspect of the question, and I think we may look for the success in that direction, Still, I am convinced that, politically and socially also, this federal link might, without affecting the sovereignty of any of the nations belonging to such as association, do useful work; and I propose, during this session, to ask those of my colleagues here who represent European nations to be good enough to consider this suggestion unofficially and submit it to their Governments for examination, so that those possibilities which I see in the suggestion may be translated into realities later”.*²³

Together with Coudenhove-Kalergi, Briand was one of the first promoters of European Unity after the First World War. However, the enthusiasm towards unification did not last; threatening political developments and economic downfall amplified the sensitivity on the score of sovereignty. Briand realized that the times were not suited to the pursuit of his ideals. As Mussolini said; “the spirit of Locarno had evaporated and the heyday of the League of Nations was past history”.²⁴ This became evident by the cooperation of Hitler and the Bolsheviks against Poland. The League of Nations that was created in 1919 by the victors of the First World War, was lacking physical power. This resulted in a Europe torn by vengefulness, nationalism, and hate, instead of a serious attempt to unite and reconcile the continent.²⁵ The League failed to stop the wars its members conducted in Asia, America and Africa and could not prevent a second world war; it had lost all of its moral authority and once again nationalism had won the pledge.

1.2 Different Directions

Still, Briand’s federal ideals did not perish and different movements were established that promoted unification. After the horrors of World War II and after Europe’s leaders realized what dangers rigid nationalism and power politics could generate for the future of the continent, the call for European Unity was renewed. When count Coudenhove-Kalergi returned to Europe in 1946, he discovered that Europe had become much more receptive to his cause. It was no longer to be a one-man crusade, Winston Churchill and other European leaders would be more than willing to vigorously sponsor the movement in Europe.²⁶

²³ Idem, pp. 223-224.

²⁴ Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe* , pp. 191.

²⁵ Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Europe Must Unite* , pp. 141.

²⁶ Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe* , pp. 18.

However, in the process of integration the position and power of a participating state is affected directly. Hence, fundamental differences have developed in the way in which integration should be institutionalised. Whereas some pledged for a system based on intergovernmental cooperation, others believed that nothing short of a supranational structure could really overcome Europe's traditional nationalism as a source of inter-state conflict.²⁷ A European Federation would force countries to hand over important parts of their power to federal authorities and naturally, national governments were reluctant to do so. Different methods have been devised to cope with these questions such as federalism, functionalism, con-federalism, and unionism. These approaches differ from each other in the way that they stand to institutional problems, in the ideal role they assign to a united Europe, and in the position their promoters occupy in the political life of Europe.²⁸ While all methods have been proposed, discussions on how to organize Europe were mainly between unionists and federalists. Still, it is important to be aware of the differences between the approaches.

Federalists believe that only common interests should be handled by federal authorities; national governments should take care of their own interests and problems. This division of power must be firmly based on a Federal Constitution. Political institutions need to be constructed that take certain powers from the national executives, parliaments, and judiciary. Although some federalists regard a European Federation as the final stage in a long evolutionary process, others believe these steps must be taken at once, others²⁹ In their book "The Ordeal of Unity", Max Jansen and Johan K. de Vree define the difference between both Federalist Movements as follows: "Whereas the Evolutionary Federalists (or Integralists as they are sometimes referred to) want to improve the living conditions for the people and create a perfect society, the aim of the Constitutionals is to establish a powerful framework to cure the ills of European inter-state relations."³⁰

Functionalists think that certain public activities should be regulated by suitable European administrations. These administrations would operate independent from their national counterparts, yet they will receive their common directives from the national governments which would be formulated in international agreements or treaties.³¹ Functionalists believe that cooperation in several areas will result in further cooperation. An

²⁷ M. Jansen and J.K. De Vree, *The Ordeal of Unity: The Politics of European Integration, 1945-1985* (Bilthoven 1985) pp. 50.

²⁸ Spinelli, *The Eurocrats*, pp. 11.

²⁹ Jansen, *The Ordeal of Unity*, pp. 52.

³⁰ Ibidem, pp. 52.

³¹ Spinelli, *The Eurocrats*, pp. 10.

integrated European bureaucracy should therefore look after the progressive assembling of common interests and customs so that European Integration could deepen itself step by step.

The main goal of the confederalists is to achieve intergovernmental cooperation through a permanent league of states. These states would maintain their sovereignty but will be obliged to make decisions about matters of the common interest.³² Confederalists wanted Europe to join in a league or confederation to keep its position and restore its glory, power and grandeur it had lost during the years of European anarchy. Fundamental is that whereas the federalists want to create a new political society with a supranational government, the last two groups evidently oppose a supranational political authority and strive for cooperation on an intergovernmental basis. Yet it is hard to point out which matters are supposed to be regulated independently, and which should be handled jointly. It is a rather vague concept and no con-federation ever lasted in history: it either fell apart or developed into a federation.

Unionists also pursued a European Union just like the federalists. Yet, whereas the federalists wanted quick action, the unionist approach was a gradual one, aiming at closer cooperation between the participating states which would eventually result in a union of sovereign states, rather than in a federation.

1.3 Unionism vs. Federalism

During World War II federalist thought mainly developed in sectors of the democratic left of the various resistance movements. Altiero Spinelli, born in Rome in 1907, was an influential figure in the federalist struggle in favour of European Unity. Together with other federalists and anti-fascists he founded the Movimento Federalista Europeo in Milan in 1943.³³ They organized different federalist meetings in Paris and Geneva. Immediately after the war, two calls for European unity were voiced in the West: The Hertenstein meetings of 1946 and The Hague Congress of 1948; the latter is elaborately discussed in chapter two.

In Hertenstein, Switzerland a large group of federalists gathered and drafted a programme in which they called for the immediate creation of a federal state.³⁴ The European Union would not be involved in any conflict between America and the Soviet Union, which is a significant difference with the approach of Churchill, President of Honour of the Congress in The Hague. Moreover, the federalists considered the unification of Europe as a vital step towards world federation.

³² Ibidem, pp. 12.

³³ Spinelli, *The Eurocrats*, pp. 6.

³⁴ Jansen, *The Ordeal of Unity*, pp. 55.

In September 1946, at a convocation at the University of Zurich, Churchill applauded broadly the whole movement for unity. He thanked Coudenhove-Kalergi and Briand for their efforts on behalf of European integration. He stated that: “much work has been done upon this task by the exertions of the Pan-European Union which owes so much to count Coudenhove-Kalergi, and which demanded the services of the famous French patriot and statesman Aristide Briand”.³⁵ Yet, Churchill was not as radical as these last two men; he did not strive for a United States of Europe yet rather, he wanted to prevent future aggression and ensure closer cooperation. Naturally, for years the idea of a united Europe was largely identified with count Coudenhove-Kalergi. Before the outbreak of the Second World War, he had become a sort of symbol of the entire movement to unify Europe. After Churchill’s speech in Zurich however, by reason of his great prestige as a leader and statesman, he became the acknowledged head of the movement that promoted European integration.³⁶ Coudenhove focused on the European Parliamentary Union, an organisation which held several conferences in Switzerland and Italy between 1946 and 1949. In Interlaken in 1948, they presented a fairly comprehensive plan of federal union which was received with great support. This strained the count’s relation with Churchill somewhat; most British considered a confederation as the maximum plan, preferable something less.³⁷

Churchill’s Unionism was adopted in Britain by the strongly conservative United Europe Movement and in France by the French Council for a United Europe, a body that consisted of practically all the French parliamentary and governmental supporters of the unification.³⁸ The Hertensteiner federalists created the Union of European Federalists. The UEF was essentially of Socialist persuasion and approached the requirements of a mass organization with truly multinational support. Other federalists who wanted to promote European unity on a socialist basis organized themselves in the Movement for the Socialist United States of Europe. When they foresaw that it was unlikely this aim would be attained, they changed the name of their organization in Socialist Movement for the United States of Europe. Immediately, a parallel organization was established by the Christian Democrats of Europe, commonly called by its French name Les Nouvelles Equipes Internationales. Its leader, M. Robert Bichet also wanted to use the organization to rally the Catholic parties that encouraged continental unity, especially those in the Romance states.³⁹ Lastly, the European

³⁵ Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe*, pp. 21.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 25.

³⁷ *Idem*, pp. 26.

³⁸ Jansen, *The Ordeal of Unity*, pp. 56.

³⁹ Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe*, pp. 22.

League for Economic Cooperation was founded, which was based on the idea of unity as a prerequisite to overcome the economic problems of Europe.⁴⁰ These last two organizations were less outspoken on the issue of federalism although especially the Christian Democrats did not reject the possibility of a European Federation.

Although all these groups were engaged in promoting European Unity, it proved difficult to promote a united Europe through joint action; their different approaches simply clashed. In 1947, in an attempt to change this situation and work more effectively, the Union of European Federalists, the United Europe Movement, The French Council for a United Europe and ELEC founded the International Committee of the Movements for European Unity. During the first major event organised by the Committee, the Hague Congress, nevertheless it proved difficult to reconcile the unionist and federalist approaches.

This inability to work together was seriously frustrating evolutionary federalists like Brugmans; he was a pluralist who believed diversity was valuable, yet could not be sustained without a minimum of autonomy and mutual tolerance. Evolutionary federalists perceive the world as a complex whole in which people are part of overlapping and overarching groups, communities, connections, and institutions of different nature and size. Of course, in a reality in which autonomous parts tolerate each other, conflicts will always arise. Therefore, it is important that they should be handled by treaties in which mutual tolerance is redefined. An attempt to solve these conflicts by eliminating diversity (totalitarianism) or resorting to the principle “might is right” (particularism) will not succeed. Integral federalism furthermore implies personalism; humans are unique persons with their own identity yet at the same time they are connected with their fellow men. The preservation of polarity and dynamic relations will prevent a society from becoming individualistic or collectivistic. The following chapter will provide an extensive analysis on Brugmans views and their place in the framework sketched in this chapter.

⁴⁰ Jansen, *The Ordeal of Unity*, pp. 56.

1.4 Conclusion

In between the two world wars, several influential people had become sufficiently enthusiastic about the idea of a united Europe. Aristide Briand seriously tried to make the ideal count Coudenhove-Kalergi had promoted the policy of a major European power. However, Briand's effort came during a period of fateful European affairs; the world economy was about to undergo one of the severest and longest depressions in history and Germany's nationalistic policy of revenge and aggrandizement caused serious tensions within the continent. Yet, the dream of Coudenhove-Kalergi never evaporated. Already during WWII it became evident that a European patriotism was being forged; the Europe of oppression and resistance fought for autonomy and freedom. The hopes of a continent freely federated did not perish and different groups believed that Europe needed to solve its problems not on a local, national, or universal level, but by the means of a collective grasp on the European level. Different streams of thinking arose on the matter, such as federalism, functionalism, con-federalism, and unionism.

These different groups all had different ideas regarding the institutionalization of European integration. Many European states were reluctant to hand in parts of their sovereignty and whereas federalists wanted to create a supranational authority, functionalists and confederalists only aimed at intergovernmental cooperation. The Unionists, led by Winston Churchill, did not aspire a federal United States of Europe either but rather wanted to prevent future aggression and promote closer cooperation. Although many organisations were established that promoted the integration of the continent during the years after WWII, it proved difficult to reconcile their different views. An important effort was the creation of the International Committee of the Movements of European Unity by several important organisations, yet it remained difficult to bridge unionist and federalist approaches.

Chapter 2 Hendrik Brugmans' views on European Integration

2.1 Personal and Political Background

Hendrik Brugmans was born on December 13, 1906, which made him part of a generation that witnessed how rapidly the world changed after 1914. In the nineteenth century world politics were centred in Europe, whereas in the twentieth century the scope and centre of world politics began to change rapidly. The First World War had an immense impact on Dutch daily life and Brugmans believed that 1914 brought an early end to a long period of peace, stability and certainty.⁴¹ Whereas the older generation still believed in an established order and in the moral principles which they thought were indispensable for state and society, the youngsters began to think differently during the first few decades of the twentieth century. During the end of the 1920's they experienced serious rotations, inflation and an economic world crisis that dislocated all certainties in life.⁴²

In Brugmans' book "Wij, Europa" his second wife Johanna Bral, who publicizes under the name Hanna Kirsten, questions him about his pursuit of emancipation and European federalism.⁴³ He starts with elaborating on his youth and the first steps towards what he self refers to as "a militant life".⁴⁴ Brugmans' father taught history at the University of Amsterdam and was a socially involved and active man, which undoubtedly explains his son's early interest in politics and other developments in the world around him. In "Wij, Europa", Brugmans admits that his father influenced him deeply; he introduced him to the world of books and challenged him intellectually. He was taught how to read in his fathers' "History of the Seventeen Provinces", which taught little Hendrik that the Netherlands and Belgium were united during the end of the sixteenth century. It was his first acquaintance with the united Holland thought and it would mark the beginning of his broader notion of unity.

Hendrik Brugmans attained excellent education in Amsterdam and when he was fifteen years old he was sent to Paris to improve his French. After grammar school he chose to study French Language and Literature at the University of Amsterdam and the Sorbonne in

⁴¹ Hendrik Brugmans and Hanna Kirsten, *Wij, Europa: Een Halve Eeuw Strijd voor Emancipatie en Europees Federalisme* (Amsterdam 1988) pp. 13.

⁴² Brugmans, H., *Crisis en Roeping van het Westen: twee en een halve eeuw Europese cultuurgeschiedenis* (Haarlem 1952) pp. 555.

⁴³ Hendrik Brugmans, Curriculum Vitae [1981?] pp.1.

⁴⁴ Brugmans, *Wij, Europa*, pp. 38.

Paris, and was an active member of different organizations, both cultural and social. His political participation started during the end of his studies when he joined The Flemish Movement, via which he became a socialist.⁴⁵ Brugmans firmly believed that one should always side with the suppressed and he turned into an idealistic young man who stood up for what he believed in. Although Brugmans was convinced that the model of the Russian revolution could not simply be transferred to other countries, he was highly intrigued by it. Russia was a pioneer in the practical implementation of the socialist idea, the first that established a planned economy. He wanted to be part of the movement that would overthrow the civil-liberal society in which he never belonged. Yet, Brugmans knew that there were more ways to a socialist society and he became a member of the Socialist Party, rooted in the West. In Paris he attends many socialist meetings and back in Holland he starts to work with two Flemish activists on a magazine called “Schakels”, that focused on both the national (Belgium) issue and socialism.

From 1931 until 1935 he educated French at different schools after which he became professor in Modern French Literature at the University of Utrecht. In 1939 he joined the House of Representatives for the SDAP (Sociaal Democratische Arbeiders Partij). He realised however, that politics was not his game; the institute on the other hand gave him the opportunity to use his pedagogic skills. He preferred to inspire, to transfer ideas and ideals; not to deal with a political game of tactics. Among other initiatives, he co-created “The Handbook of The Plan”, inspired by Flemish socialist Hendrik de Man. The Plan is relatively radical and aims for crisis prevention and structure change; on the one hand it entails an ambitious plan for public works, on the other hand it pursues structure reform that should free the economy of the dictatorship of the financial sector.

Meanwhile, Europe was threatened by the aggressive moves of the Nazi's and Brugmans was part of several anti-fascism meetings around this time. During the war he was taken hostage in camp Saint Michielsgestel. This experience taught him that pessimism could be an extremely useful attitude in life. As he once wrote: “certain prisoners channelled their energy into being optimistic; they continued to believe that they would be liberated but this did not happen. I belonged to the minority which said ‘we will remain here until the end of the war and if we are released earlier, it will be extraordinary good fortune’ ”.⁴⁶ He was released in April 1944 and during the last two years of the war Brugmans was part of the resistance

⁴⁵ Ibidem, pp. 53.

⁴⁶ Speech of H.R.H. Princess Margriet of the Netherlands, President of the European Cultural Foundation, on the occasion of the departure of Denis de Rougement and Hendrik Brugmans as Governors [1985?] pp3.

group "Je Maintiendrai", which printed an illegal paper and channelled information to England.⁴⁷

In his Curriculum Vitae Brugmans points out that contact with fellow prisoners resulted in the preparations for the foundation of the personalist-socialistic Movement (NVB), which aimed for radical renewal of the political landscape and was founded right after the war in 1945.⁴⁸ Mr. Brugmans was profoundly influenced by the personalist philosophy, which focuses on the problems of modern society: man in relation to the over-intruding machine, and man in conflict with himself, exiled from the spiritual realities which not long ago were the source of his fervour. To be more exact: personalist socialists (as they called themselves) condemned both totalitarian collectivism as well as relativistic individualism.⁴⁹ To be a personalist is to believe in the Christian inspiration of European civilisation and to pursue the purpose of existence through interaction with others and involvement in the struggle for human dignity and freedom.⁵⁰ In collaboration with Je Maintiendrai, the NVB attempted to become a mass movement but never succeeded. Still, it was an important intellectual platform that brought together prominent figures of different pillars of Dutch society to discuss the future of Holland.⁵¹

2.2 The Federalist Solution

After the Second World War, Brugmans developed his integral federalist life vision while being part of the Dutch working group "Europese Actie". As a result of international cooperation with sympathizing movements in other Western European countries, the Union of European federalists was founded, and Brugmans became the first president. In these years Europe was economically ruined and many feared that with the loss of Indonesia, Holland would never be able to recuperate. Brugmans concerns were of other nature however; he was afraid that the European nations would become 'provincial' when they would lose their overseas empires. He regarded European Federalism as the response to decolonisation and as the discovery of a joint calling for our continent towards the West, East and South.⁵²

According to Brugmans, federalism was the natural political implementation of personalist socialism. He was inspired by the personalist model of Denis de Rougemont, a

⁴⁷ Hendrik Brugmans, Curriculum Vitae, pp.1.

⁴⁸ Ibidem, pp. 2.

⁴⁹ Joost Ballegeer, "Brugmans 90 jaar? 90 jaar Brugmans!" in Europa één Federaal 36 nr 5 (October 1996) pp. 5.

⁵⁰ Speech of H.R.H. Princess Margriet of the Netherlands, pp. 1.

⁵¹ Ballegeer, "Brugmans 90 jaar? 90 jaar Brugmans!", pp. 5.

⁵² Brugmans, *Wij, Europa*, pp. 169.

Swiss writer and famous European federalist, who's books he had read while he was a war prisoner. Denis de Rougemont and Hendrik Brugmans have fought a double and similar struggle since their youth: the one for the "person", the responsible man or woman, bound as he is to others by both thought and action; and the other, for a Europe, united in its diversity, an unique bastion against totalitarian rule and a necessary dimension for renewal. Denis de Rougemont and Hendrik Brugmans saw "Europe" as a propitious framework for their endeavour. Another federalist thinker that influenced Brugmans deeply around that time was Dr. H.D. Salinger. He was a Prussic Jew who published a clandestine book during occupation: "The rebirth of Europe". Brugmans had an intense conversation with him about a united and federal Europe, which was supposed to be the solution for the German problem.⁵³ Yet, federalism should not be forced on the Germans as a punishment, the consequence of their 'unconditional surrender'. Rather it should entail all of Europe, an intelligent utopia with which Brugmans agreed without believing in it practically; would the French for example, ever be willing to give up their 'one and indivisible Republic'? Although Hendrik Brugmans had his doubts about Salinger's ideas, also since the latter did not believe in a democratic federalist movement, Brugmans was asked to join him to Hertenstein, Switzerland, where the Swiss 'European Union' organised a federalist congress.

According to Brugmans, the Dutch delegation, lead by Salinger, dominated the meetings in Hertenstein. Furthermore, Brugmans began to realize that federalism was the only form of government that could underwrite both democracy and effective policy. After Salinger, there were two others who influenced Brugmans strongly: Anna Siemsen and Adolf Gasser.⁵⁴ Siemsen was a leftist socialist who had not only tried to resist Hitler, she also tried to understand the phenomena of his demonic popularity. Her conclusion was to reject state nationalism and embrace the idea of 'One Europe'. Gasser was the perfect representative of Swiss federalism as a logical consequence of democratic pluriformity. His book 'Gemeindefreiheit als Rettung Europas' was a real eye opener for Brugmans and he considered both Siemsen and Gasser as vital pioneers of European federalism.⁵⁵

After the meetings the Hertenstein federalists presented their doctrine and in his final address Brugmans elaborated on rising war risks, polarisation between the Soviet Union and the United States and the necessity to create a third neutral power, a 'Switzerland of the World': a United Europe. Diplomatic agreements would not be sufficient. Instead, the peoples

⁵³ Ibidem, pp. 169.

⁵⁴ Idem, pp. 172.

⁵⁵ Idem.

of Europe should swear their loyalty to each other. Back in the Netherlands, they heard that in Luxembourg another federalist congress had taken place and although the views of these Luxembourgers appeared less radical, the Hertensteiners merged with them in December 1946. In the same year Hendrik Brugmans became president of the Union of European Federalists which officially heralded his strife towards European Unity. From this point on Brugmans actively devoted his life to the European cause.

During occupation, plans were made for a social “New Deal” and right after the war these “reformers” had enormous prestige. After a few months however, national restoration seemed to have won the pledge. It was evident that the space in which renewal should take place should be larger than the separate nation states, since radical changes would never occur within these conservative entities.⁵⁶ However, history was about to repeat itself. After the First World War, the League of Nations was established; the first international organisation which main goal was to ensure world peace. Yet, the League was not able to prevent another world war and had many structural flaws. The United Nations turned out almost as disappointing as the League, All members of the Security Council received veto power and the UN did not succeed in establishing an international military power of any meaning. It never became “A League with teeth”, the kind of organisation Churchill envisioned it to be.⁵⁷ Brugmans was aware that the situation after the Second World War was completely different from the times the League was established. Whereas the League was dominantly European, the United Nations was much more heterogeneous in nature. Yet, while striving for homogeneity would be a lost cause, the members of the UN should have aimed for agreement on different vital areas. They should have put their differences aside and aimed for rapprochement in order to create a peaceful system . Brugmans believed another sort of trans nationality had a larger chance on success: continental integration which is based on cultural and geographical affinities. Although Brugmans admits there are only a few success stories regarding integration, optimistic as he was he referred to the words of Charles Peguy who said: “the most fruitful ideas are those which are never doubted, but those which people have come back to time and again”.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ H. Brugmans, “Europa: Welke type van Samenleving” Vrije Tribune (3 May 1973).

⁵⁷ H. Brugmans, “Middelpuntzoekende en Vliedende Krachten in de wereld” (februari 1978) pp. 3.

⁵⁸ Ibidem, pp. 3.

2.3 Peace, Reconciliation and World Federation

In his book “Histoire Générale de l’Europe”, Brugmans discusses six centuries of European history. It is a rather personal book with a fundamental vision: the “Classic Europe’ that originated from the religious wars was build up by nations, something we should still regard as an awful state of affairs. The “raison d’Etat” would rudely disrupt the ideal of “Concert Européen”, the actual objective of the European foundations, and eventually this latter concept was ruled out.⁵⁹ For the last centuries destructive nationalist forces dominated the continent and in the twentieth century they resulted in two horrible world wars. Brugmans was convinced that Europe would never be able to overcome its economic, political and social issues if it would not rise above its lack of unity. In order to stimulate economic cooperation and functional integration that would make Europe prosper again, different institutional organizations and appropriate policies should be created.⁶⁰ Political cooperation is vital to reach our other common goals. Although such an organization should differ from nation states not only by its proportions, but also by its structure, Hendrik Brugmans believed that it was not unrealistic to consider a supranational authority that would be responsible for a certain sector throughout whole of Europe, like the railways or the production of coal. Evidently, this is a rather functionalist approach, yet for Brugmans functionalism was not radical enough. He stressed that he did not conceive European federalism without global solidarity and without aiming for world peace. As he mentioned in his speech at the Hague Congress, he strongly believed that a prosperous and united Europe is a prerequisite for a sustainable world balance.

Moreover, Brugmans had always said that he did not believe in a peace order without federal elements. Several vital universal problems, like the pollution of the seas, could only be solved on a global level. However, these solutions should not only be written down in cordial treaties, they should be implemented by an executive authority. Brugmans stated that this would not imply a federal world government that intrudes in all matters of life, it would be more of a “functional federation” that only focuses on global problems that need a joint answer.⁶¹ He believed that European federalism could be a contribution to a world that is more united on certain essential areas, yet on the other hand wants to retain its different identities and originalities. Consequently, although Brugmans’ ambitions were obviously reaching beyond Europe, uniting the continent could mean a start of a more united and

⁵⁹ H. Baudet, “Histoire Générale de l’Europe: Boek van Hendrik Brugmans zal discussie afdwingen” in *Het Parool* (13 juni 1961).

⁶⁰ Hendrik Brugmans, ‘L’unité de l’Europe’, *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* 6 (1947) pp.192.

⁶¹ H. Brugmans, “Welke Europa’s voor het jaar 2000?”, pp. 5.

harmonious world. Hendrik Brugmans did not think that regional integration would mean the downfall of global integration, on the contrary; a confederation of federated continents would bring the members to a practical minimum and make the organisation more effective. Naturally, ideological contrasts and interest differences would not vanish yet negotiating will get less hard, as would it be to reach consensus.

Of all famous historic thinkers, Montesquieu was one of the few who believed that the government could exist of different entities and still be effective. In 1789 the American ‘founding fathers’ validated his ideas by creating a federal republic and an institution which is still in effect. Although the implementation of the system remains a popular topic for discussion, the political doctrine is based on a solid set of principles. Evidently, heads were turned to America when European Unity became a popular sentiment.⁶² The Americans had discovered the method that lead to federation; we would only need to call together a legislative meeting, draw up a constitution and propose it to the government, parliament and the peoples involved. Unfortunately, the European case is fundamentally different from the American in time and space, tradition and psychology. Whereas in America ‘nationalism’ increased solidarity between the different states and created national awareness, in Europe generations of nationalism resulted in a clash of interests, national stereotypes, and prejudices. Brugmans realised that the parallel with America, which was proclaimed right after World War II, was a false one. Nevertheless, he is convinced that the American example remains interesting since established a system of shared sovereignty, without surrendering one’s own identity; the trademark of federalism. However, while the United States already have an effective political system based on this ideology, European federalism faced an aged society of cultural differences.

2.4 Federalism and the Cold War

While right after the war, peace and reconciliation were the main reasons to aim for a united Europe, after 1947-1948 a new motive had sprang up. P.H. Spaak ventilated this in his speech during a meeting of the United Nations as follows: “Nous avons peur!”⁶³ The western powers believed that the Soviet Union had become a serious threat and that Europe had to unite to restore the balance of power. The strife for a federal Europe had to be adjusted to the new Cold War climate and it proved hard to transfer the federal spirit to Soviet countries. Europe

⁶² H. Brugmans, “Ontdekking van Amerika” *Vrije Tribune* (27 July 1976).

⁶³ H. Brugmans, “Welke Europa’s voor het jaar 2000?” Speech by H. Brugmans (21 June 1990 Paris) 1.

was divided and without widespread support, a sustainable united Europe was not conceivable. A united Europe could serve as an important peace factor and thus become “the Switzerland of the world”.⁶⁴ According to Brugmans, Switzerland had set an example for the rest of the continent: a united, peaceful and pluralist society. Switzerland made sure it was safe, yet it did not pose a threat to anyone. In addition, the Suisse form a federation and consist of different peoples who speak different languages and have other mentalities, yet still remain homogenous and connected with one another.

Important to note is that from the start of the Cold War, European federalists firmly rejected to choose sides between the super powers, the United States of America and Russia. Although the two powers and their governments were based on two opposite ideologies, Brugmans asserts that they have two essential characteristics in common. First, the lack of a Western, traditional, immemorial cultural continuity; the Christianization of Rome by the Renaissance, Humanism and Reformation, democracy, trade union – traditions the Soviet Union never had and the US immigrants did not plant in their new country.⁶⁵ Second, both histories are dominated by the struggle of man against nature and by the economic life. What Brugmans meant, is that both powers were young and founded not on ancient traditions and values, but focus on the here and now, on their (economic) ambitions. He believed this was a dangerous and unconventional development in which the human mind would be overshadowed.⁶⁶

Furthermore, the European federalists believed that by joining one of the two major powers we would risk a new chance of war by threatening the balance of power.⁶⁷ A Third World War would mean the end of European civilization and freedom since it would aggravate the situation and create new problems. Moreover, a Russian victory would mean a new and totalitarian rule and probably a strengthening of dictatorial tendencies. On the other hand, while a U.S. victory would perhaps mean that our civil liberties would not be harmed, it could force Europe into a capitalist colonization in which it would be very difficult to pursue another perspective of society. Hence, Brugmans argued that Europe should find its own way in modern history, reconciling the two super powers’ clashing ideologies. In that way, federalism would be able to represent its true nature: a ‘third way’ between centralization and anarchy. He stresses that our most vital task is to unite Europe and that intergovernmental

⁶⁴ Brugmans, “Welke Europa’s voor het jaar 2000?”, pp. 6.

⁶⁵ Brugmans, *Crisis en Roeping*, pp. 571.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 573.

⁶⁷ Brugmans, ‘L’unité de l’Europe’, pp. 194.

committees and treaties will not be sufficient; European institutions will be needed that look after shared European interests.⁶⁸

In his address at the Conference of Montreux, Hendrik Brugmans stated that three main factors determined international life in Europe in 1947: The Marshall Plan, the setting up of its Soviet countermove the Cominform, and the breakdown of the Conference of the Big Three.⁶⁹ These developments could easily stimulate disintegrative forces within Europe and therefore the European federalists were convinced more than ever that they were right by proclaiming the necessity of completing the European Union. The United States also emphasized the need for the unification of Europe through the Marshall Plan, since they were fed up with pouring their money into a worn-out multi-national system. Brugmans thought it was a disgrace that Europe had to wait for an initiative from the other side of the Atlantic before realising the urge for unity.⁷⁰

While Brugmans thought it was essential for Europe to be on her guard against American domination, he recognized that their future would be seriously jeopardised without the tremendous aid that only the American economic potential could supply.⁷¹ Therefore, we must prevent that America relapse into her previous isolationism because she fears that her investments in our disintegrated continent will never pay off. Brugmans claimed that American public opinion was a serious enemy and that it was now overturning regarding Europe. Anti-European forces within and outside of Europe had expanded more than the pro-European forces the last two years. Due to our hesitation and since we had lost track of what outsiders thought of Europe, the American people started wondering why they would invest their money in an empty vessel.⁷²

Furthermore, the German issue was in need of a collective solution and therefore quick action was required. In addition, Brugmans plead for the creation of an European spirit by emphasizing our shared culture and morality. Thus, around the end of the 1940's Brugmans called for collaboration and reflection - radicalism and patience. His pursuit for a better world and structure could be clarified by his socialist convictions; he aimed at a radical change into a federal system. The need for a mentality change could be derived from his personalist, Christian background, and this would naturally be a gradual process. In an interview

⁶⁸ Brugmans, 'La question préalable' Speech the Hague Congress (May 7, 1948) pp. 2.

⁶⁹ Hendrik Brugmans, 'Fundamentals of European Federalism', speech delivered at the Conference of the Union of European Federalists at Montreux 1947, Publication: British Section of Union of European Federalists (London 1948) pp. 3.

⁷⁰ Brugmans, 'Fundamentals of European Federalism', pp. 3.

⁷¹ Ibidem, pp. 4.

⁷² Author unknown, "Drie zienswijzen op het Europees vraagstuk" In Brugsch Handelsblad [1980?] pp. 2.

Brugmans confirms that he believes both are required; altering the structure without adjusting mentality would not lead to the desired result.⁷³

2.5 Culture and Morality

During the Second World War Brugmans started to write his book “Crisis en Roeping van het Westen”, which was published in 1952 after twelve years of work. His central question was: how is it possible that the European civilization, one of the most prosperous in the world, could create a monster like Adolf Hitler? His answer was founded on the connection between revolution and nationalism.⁷⁴ Throughout history, kings and emperors used nationalism as an instrument to justify their wars. This national solidarity had proved to be a serious threat for peace since it was often utilized for the wrong cause. Brugmans believed that the real battle of our time was fought within the minds en souls of people. Not the American nuclear bomb or the Russian army, but doubts and scepticism about the future of Europe pose the real threat. After two world wars and the disintegration of culture and religion in the broadest sense of the word, Nihilism reigned through Europe. Brugmans claimed that because of a lack of a new and leading principle or idea, the reconstruction of Europe failed after 1920. To fight Nihilism, Europe should strive for a pluralistic community in which different groups, with their different beliefs and religions consider each other equals and show respect to one another.⁷⁵

In one of his articles on global integration, Brugmans stated that the Catholic Church is an excellent example of a global institution that is organized effectively. Europe was represented by only one man, the chair of the European bishops’ conference. Of course, the Church does not have to deal with the antagonisms a global political organization has to endure. Nevertheless, there are rather important differences between the more conservative and more progressive churchly provinces, yet they can appeal to a shared faith when necessary. Something similar, a world ideology, is not present between the different members of the U.N. but still, the organization of the Synod could be a worthy example. Nationalism however, remains a thwarting power for integration. Not our attachment to our own language and lifestyle withholds us from further integration, but our unwillingness “to do better together, what we do worse alone”.⁷⁶ This counter force could only be overcome when it

⁷³ Luyten M., “Vraaggesprek met Prof. Hendrik Brugmans” [1990?] pp. 9.

⁷⁴ Brugmans, *Crisis en Roeping*, pp. 28.

⁷⁵ Bouman, E., “Aan Brugge heb ik mijn hart verloren” in VW (16 October 1980) pp. 4.

⁷⁶ H. Brugmans, “Middelpuntzoekende en Vliedende Krachten in de Wereld” (February 1978) pp. 3.

becomes clear that with uniting sovereignty rights, one's freedom and independence will not be lost but seized back on a larger scale.

In a draft letter addressed to the Belgian bishops he states that historically, the church of Christ is strongly connected to European culture. Throughout history European missionaries have preached the Christian faith in all parts of the world and it became a widespread belief. Although Christianity is now a universal faith, universalism does not equal uniformity; in South-East Asia, Latin America and Africa people as well as the church, have their own problems and practises.⁷⁷ However, the Christian faith remains rooted in Europe and therefore Brugmans claimed that Europe's downfall would be a serious problem for the church, while Europe's recovery could not be separated from Christian renewal – and vice versa.

It is no surprise that Brugmans believed that such a renewal could never occur within national boundaries yet should take place within a united framework that suits modern times. Modern technology of transport and production forced us to look across borders and nation states had become too small to fulfil their original tasks: to guarantee safety and development on every level. As a result, states postulated themselves as absolute and as the highest norm, even in moral matters. This modern nationalism viciously took over the Church's role in moral decisions while for Christians, the Lord's word should be decisive. During the rise of National-Socialism this conflict reached a dramatic peak and even after World War two it would remain a serious threat that could only be mastered by the unification Europe. Moreover, due to the fact that states could not ensure progress and lost their grip on global developments the European people started to feel they have lost control of their own lives.

This powerless feeling could express itself in two ways, both highly dangerous for Europe's moral health: they could relapse in sinful individualism, scepticism and cynicism, or they will try to find other means to escape their impotence and resort to meaningless radicalism.⁷⁸ In his letter to the bishops Brugmans clarifies strikingly how political and religious renewal are mutually dependent. He firmly believed that the one could not be realized without the other. Yet, how is this yearning for religious renewal compatible with his aim for a pluriform society? Is it about mere religious values or did he wanted a general mentality change, regardless if it is based on religion or another shared ideology? Above all Brugmans wanted to prevent nihilism and individualism, and moreover, what he deemed necessary for a united Europe was a common morality, shared beliefs. Naturally, in his letter

⁷⁷ H. Brugmans, "Draft Letter to Belgium bishops", pp 1.

⁷⁸ H. Brugmans, draft letter to Belgian bishops, pp 2.

to the bishops his focus is on the Christian faith and although it is evident that Brugmans found it important to preserve Christianity, he did not want to impose it to anyone.

Brugmans was convinced that culture and morality were determining for the future. He did not devote his life to the cause of federalism if it would develop a new continental nationalism, or if the poor area's would get poorer and the wealthy even richer. Without inspiration and without the will to make sacrifices – without the ideal of solidarity – our future would not look bright. Uniting Europe would mean creating the foundations for a unique community that could provide the Third World with hope. Yet, as Brugmans quoted from the bible: “If the Lord does not want to build the house, the builders build in vain”.⁷⁹

A prerequisite for further integration was that the European people were willing to transfer authority from a national to a supranational level. They should not perceive a European authority as an institute that could complete the work of the national states; they should regard it as a supranational government that operates instead of the national governments. This legitimacy cannot be created by treaties or constitutions. Naturally, they can validate legitimacy when she already exists, consolidate her, and define her accurately, yet no more is to be expected of these texts.⁸⁰ Brugmans stated that within the federalist movement, this was an important topic of discussion: would writing a constitution and accepting it by the people be enough to create authority? Brugmans did not think it would since real authority cannot be transferred; she is simultaneously seized, practised, claimed as a right, and accepted.⁸¹ Only when these four components are present concurrently, one could speak of true authority.

⁷⁹ Brugmans, “Ach Metselaar, waarom nog werken?” in *Vrije Tribune* (3 December 1979).

⁸⁰ H. Brugmans, *Europese Gemeenschap zonder Gezag* in *Vrije Tribune* (17 August 1976).

⁸¹ H. Brugmans, *Europese Gemeenschap zonder Gezag*.

2.6 Conclusion

Looking back at the life of Hendrik Brugmans, one could say he was an active man, an idealist, a man who wanted to change the world and make it better. Important to note is that there was more continuity in Brugmans active life than one would believe at first. Already in his childhood Brugmans became familiar with federalist thinking via his father and the Belgium situation. Moreover, the personalist movement of which he becomes part during WWII, strengthens these ideas. Brugmans was part of several social movements and political organisations during his younger years and it is remarkable how easy and fast he seems to fulfil leading positions within these organisations. He is clearly an inspiring man, a gifted speaker and an appealing leading figure for many.

Gradually, Brugmans came to the conclusion that the unavoidable transition from an era of nation states to a world order of more regional integrated parts, such as Europe, would offer an ideal occasion for a peaceful revolution. It would entail the creation of a new order, not only political, but also on a social, economic and cultural level. He was therefore clearly an evolutionary federalist; Brugmans understood that it would take time and patience to create a United States of Europe.

Moreover, Brugmans wanted to solve the crisis of Western civilisation by making Europe aware of its promising calling, and preparing it for new shared responsibilities in its own continent as well as on a global level. European culture, with its ancient elements from Rome, Athena and Jerusalem to later enrichments such as democracy, Renaissance, Enlightenment, industrial and technological revolutions; it could all be used to shape a united Europe. Development and continuity: those two elements were always present in Brugmans' vision of Europe.⁸² According to his religious beliefs, Brugmans thought all cultures owe their existence and their strength to their religious corner stones. He believes that even in a secularized continent, the shared Christian roots can still provide a vital contribution to the revival of a vigorous Europe. Cultural renewal was therefore at least as important as the political reconstruction of Europe. In fact, Brugmans believed they were mutually dependent: Europeans should first be aware of their common morality and shared beliefs before a United States of Europe could be realised.

Hendrik Brugmans' deep and personal conviction in the creation of a European federation gave him all the strength he needed to devote his life to this goal. He once said

⁸² K.J. Verleye, "Hendrik Brugmans: Europees Raspaard" pp. 7.

about his dedicated strife for European Unity: “With regard to those things which are of concern to me, I would not dare to look myself in the face if I had abandoned the struggle. To live with a purpose is not always easy. But to live without a purpose must be abominable. To refuse ones purpose, the worst of all!”⁸³

⁸³ Speech of H.R.H. Princess Margriet of the Netherlands, pp. 3.

Chapter 3 A Promising Start: the 1948 Congress of Europe and the Marshall Plan

3.1 The Congress

It was in a speech at Zurich University in September 1946 that Mr. Winston Churchill formally revived the proposal for the unification of Europe. Comment was varied and it was evident that before any serious progress could be made towards European unity, a powerful campaign of education and propaganda would be required. Different organizations were established to promote European federalism and serious steps were taken to unite the countries of the devastated continent. In 1947 the president of the UEF Hendrik Brugmans visited the United Europe Movement of Churchill, of which his son-in-law Duncan Sandys was the secretary general. Immediately an umbrella organisation was founded: the International Committee of the Movements for European Unity. After the Congress the Committee would be called the European Movement, which is more elaboratively described in chapter four. It was formed to coordinate the action of the different organizations and conduct a joint campaign throughout the continent. One of these initiatives was the Hague Congress of Europe in March 1948, which was convened in the historic Knight's Hall of the Netherlands Parliament Buildings.⁸⁴

During this Congress the voice of Europe had spoken; it proved willing to take the first steps towards federalism in order to safeguard independence and regain lost prosperity.⁸⁵ Although these four days in May 1948 were stowed with propaganda and oratorical deception, the conference proved to be the most remarkable and representative gathering of prominent international personalities that has ever assembled to discuss the fate of Europe. It was attended by some 750 persons of almost every European nationality and in addition, there were observers from the United States, the British Commonwealth, and an impressive company of journalists representing all parts of the world.⁸⁶ Whilst the European delegations were invited in their individual capacity they could, as a whole, claim to represent with authority every important aspect in the life and opinions of Europe.

The primary goal of the Congress was to mobilize public support behind policy efforts that supported European integration. According to Duncan Sandy's, Chairman of the

⁸⁴ Walton, *The Hague "Congress of Europe": A Case Study of Public Opinion* pp. 738.

⁸⁵ B.W. Schaper, 'Europees Congres,' *Vrij Nederland* 38 (1948) pp. 1.

⁸⁶ "Resolutions Congress of Europe", pp. 3.

International Committee, the purposes were threefold: “to demonstrate the widespread support for the cause of unity which existed throughout the free countries of Europe; to secure an exchange of views and make practical recommendations to governments; and finally, to provide a fresh impetus and inspiration to the international campaign”.⁸⁷ The opening session was addressed by the president of Honour, Mr. Churchill, in the presence of Princess Juliana and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, and the Dutch Prime Minister. According to Churchill, Europe was finally representing “not a movement of parties, but a movement of peoples”.⁸⁸ Hendrik Brugmans was very glad with The Hague initiative since he believed the Unity of Europe was the most important challenge of the post-war years.⁸⁹ In his address during the plenary sessions, Brugmans called for Europe to become the “question préalable”: it is the starting point of all major problems with which we are confronted. Suppose we had introduced a series of beautiful reforms while letting Europe crumble. We would have failed in the essential task and built a house on sand instead of rock. Therefore, European unity on a supranational basis is a prerequisite for all efforts towards international understanding.⁹⁰ The crowd was highly enthusiastic about his message – even more enthusiastic than about Churchill’s speech - and Brugmans believed this to be the most important speech of his whole career.⁹¹

During the next stage of the Congress, discussions were conducted in three Committees: political, economic and social, and cultural. These committees debated for three days about the resolutions that were submitted to them by the International Committee of the Movements for European Unity. The detailed resolutions that resulted from these efforts were submitted to three plenary sessions. According to Hollis and Carter, authors of the book “Europe Unites: The Hague Congress and After”, the determination of the members of the Congress to overcome their wide political differences was evidently shown by their unanimous adoption of all three Resolutions.⁹²

Whereas Hollis and Carter solely stress the successes of the Congress and assert it succeeded beyond all expectations, Walton, author of “The Hague “Congress of Europe”: A Case Study of Public Opinion” has a more nuanced notion on the Congress. He states that several cynics criticized the diverse elements of which the Congress was compounded; they

⁸⁷ Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 6.

⁸⁸ Verbatim reports, I, pp. 5-9.

⁸⁹ J.M. Guieu and C. Le Dréau, *Le Congrès de l’Europe a La Haye 1948-2008* (Brussels 2009) pp. 202.

⁹⁰ Verbatim reports, I, pp. 17.

⁹¹ Joost Ballegeer, “Brugmans 90 jaar? 90 jaar Brugmans!”, pp 5

⁹² Hollis and Carter, *Europe Unites*, pp.8

noted that the Conference had its own three ‘rings’ in the three commissions that were established. Indeed, a cursory survey of the personnel who attended the Congress is quite revealing: those present included well-known statesmen and prominent clergymen from the idealist to the realist spectrum, university professors, unionists, scientists, philosophers and many more. This “remarkable” assembly did counter some difficulties during the, sometimes chaotic, proceedings.⁹³ The debates ranged from constructive to highly irrelevant, which resulted in all-night sessions in desperate efforts to draw up conclusions. Moreover, several times during the meetings professional politicians needed to be reminded by the others present that the Congress was not legislative but was merely formulating principles.⁹⁴

During the proceedings of the conference it became evident that most attention went to the political and economic resolution. Only a few realised that uniting Europe would entail a cultural Renaissance.⁹⁵ Most people thought culture was a less crucial topic than trade and industry, politics and diplomacy. Brugmans however, believed that those who wanted to unite Europe and simultaneously neglected culture, pursued a fruitless cause. Culture is not an aspect, but the foundation on which we should build. Not only the arts and literature fall to the notion of culture, it also includes our western human rights and representative democracy. We should cherish these achievements, realise how special they are and accept the obligations they bring. Nevertheless, Brugmans believed we could not fulfil them whilst still be imprisoned by our national thoughts and practices.

Although the Resolutions of the Congress were not legally binding to its members it proved worthy of the laudation it received. Not only did the conference managed to produce a moderate and practical program of action, it actually saw a substantial part of that program realized within the next decade. A remarkable series of achievements, like the conceptualization of supra-national organs, proved that the countries of Europe were indeed willing to “transfer and merge some portion of their national sovereign rights” as envisioned at the Congress.⁹⁶ Among these achievements were the Council of Europe and the realization of the Common Market; their composition and design follow closely the recommendations made at the Hague Congress. Yet above all, to quote the *Times* of London, The Congress of Europe proved “a monumental victory for public opinion” because it was able to overcome the initial opposition of the British Labour party.⁹⁷ The three assemblies succeeded in framing

⁹³ Walton, *The Hague “Congress of Europe”*, pp. 741.

⁹⁴ Verbatim Reports, III, pp. 11.

⁹⁵ H. Brugmans, “De Kulturele Grondslag” in *Vrije Tribune* (5 November 1979).

⁹⁶ Resolutions Congress of Europe, pp. 5.

⁹⁷ Walton, *The Hague “Congress of Europe”*, pp. 742

three separate resolutions in which the different aspects of European support for integration clearly come to the fore.

3.2 The Political Resolution

Europe recognized that if it was to influence world affairs at all, unity was a prerequisite. For the first time in modern history, the continent was no longer a leading actor within international diplomatic relations; the diplomatic constellation was now clearly dominated by Russia and the United States. The political committee recognized that it was necessary to create an economic and political union in order to assure security and social progress. Independent but not isolationist, pacific but not pacifist, Europe must pursue her own identity. During the Opening session of the Congress, different speakers had expressed their concerns about the present artificial division of Europe into two parts. For example Churchill stresses that when it comes to unification, “the aim could be nothing less than all Europe”.⁹⁸

The integration of Germany into the broader framework of a United Europe would provide a good solution for the economic and military aspects of the German problem.⁹⁹ Germany’s economic life should be restored while safeguarding her neighbours from the danger of renewed aggression. Germany’s resources would become freely available to the rest of Europe. Furthermore, Europe should secure a joint action for the integration and proper development of their common resources by transferring some portion of their sovereign rights to a higher European authority.¹⁰⁰ A United Europe should be assigned the immediate task of establishing a democratic social system, the aim of which shall be to free men from all types of slavery and economic insecurity, just as political democracy aims at protecting them against the exercise of arbitrary power.

Furthermore, Europe should secure a joint action for the integration and proper development of its common resources by transferring some portion of its sovereign rights to a higher European authority.¹⁰¹ A United Europe should be assigned the immediate task of establishing a democratic social system, the aim of which shall be to free men from all types of slavery and economic insecurity, just as political democracy aims at protecting them against the exercise of arbitrary power.

⁹⁸ Verbatim Report I, pp. 7.

⁹⁹ Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 7.

¹⁰⁰ ‘Resolutions Congress of Europe’, pp. 5.

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 5.

Besides these explicit statements in favour of integration, the political resolution contained several important policy recommendations. The committee pointed out the real urgency of an European Assembly chosen by the Parliaments of the participating nations from among their members and others that would engage in all the necessary measures to bring about an economic and political union of Europe. Furthermore, a commission should be set up to draft a European Charter of Human Rights and lay down standards to which a state must conform to if it is to deserve the name of a democracy. This Charter should be adopted by all nations desiring to enter the European Union.¹⁰² European Assembly should make proposals for the establishment of a court of Justice with the adequate sanctions for the implementation of this charter. The political Resolution concludes that the creation of a United Europe should be regarded as a step towards the ultimate objective of a United World.¹⁰³ Although these policy suggestions were revolutionary for the time, certain observers felt that the drafting of the resolutions was so loose that they considered them equivocal. Yet as mentioned before, a substantial part of the program did become realized during the years after the Congress.

3.3 The Economic and Social Resolution

Europe's old economic system had been shattered by the war, yet thanks to the generous assistance of the United States of America there was a unique opportunity to rebuild and even surpass Europe's economic strength. Europeans needed to work together under a common plan since there is no hope of recovery when each country solely strives for national solutions. There was no change that the economy of Europe could be rebuild upon the basis of rigidly-divided national sovereignty and thus there was an urgent need for an economic union in Europe.

Furthermore, the Economic and Social Committee stated that Europe had to unite to re-assert its economic independence and regain its former prosperity. The committee formulated various recommendations and urged all the governments concerned to promote economic union and to put into effect the immediate economic measures required. These measures, related to trade, currency, production and labour, should ensure that the peoples of Europe enjoy better conditions of life, both material and cultural. These improved conditions would bring about a social and harmonious society and Europe could play her proper role in the world as a force for peace.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 7.

¹⁰³ Resolutions Congress of Europe, pp. 7.

¹⁰⁴ Resolutions Congress of Europe, pp. 11.

While the assembly eventually succeeded in composing the ambitious resolution, it had been a toilsome process. The Committee had become embroiled in violent and acrimonious debate on whether political unity was a necessary prerequisite to economic unity.¹⁰⁵ According to Walton “the crucial issue involved a question of priority regarding economic and political unions respectively”.¹⁰⁶ In the final report however, the committee dodges this issue but does emphasize the necessity of the creation of an economic union in Europe, in cooperation with the United Nations. Furthermore, the preliminary report of the International Committee’s Economic and Social Sub-Committee mentions that the Unification of Europe should be entrusted to an Economic Council of Europe which provides for a permanent Economic Secretariat. These institutions do not appear in the final resolutions though, which suggests that they were contested and that Europe did not yet agreed upon how to organize their economic future. Still the recommendations made at the Hague were the offset of the Common Market which is tribute enough to the vision of those early architects.

3.4 The Cultural Resolution

While the Congress firmly believed in the necessity of a European Union, it recognized that it could only be established -and last- if it was founded upon a genuine and living unity. The present crisis in Europe went deeper than economic and political systems. Although the immediate arguments in favor of integration were economic and political, the unity of Europe was essentially cultural, in the broadest sense of that word. Unfortunately, mistaken identification of the nation with the state had imposed rigid frontiers on entities and cultural exchanges were thereby impoverished. The result was the growth of national individualism which tended towards self-sufficiency.

This was the greatest danger that beset Europe in those fragile years after the war and therefore Union had become the only guarantee of national independence. The peoples of Europe were determined to safeguard the fundamental rights of the individual. In its final report the Cultural Committee stresses that the countries of Europe have a common heritage of shared cultural values and a common loyalty to fundamental human rights. Efforts to unite should therefore “be inspired by an awakening of the conscience of Europe, and that this must be informed, stimulated and provided with the means of expression”.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 68-71.

¹⁰⁶ Walton, *The Hague “Congress of Europe”*, pp. 743.

¹⁰⁷ Resolutions Congress of Europe, pp. 12.

The Committee's most important contribution to the Congress was its advocacy of a charter of human rights which would be legally enforced by a Supreme Court having supra-state jurisdiction and which any European citizen might address.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, the assembly advocated a European Cultural Centre whose central task would be to raise the voice of Europe; i.e. promote European Unity. Since the Congress recognized that the future of Europe depends on coming generations, a European Institute for Childhood and Youth Questions should be created.

3.5 The Final Pledge: The Conclusions and Implications of the Congress

The proceedings of the Congress ended with the reading of a "Message to Europeans" which was adopted by acclamation and clearly stressed the primary goal of the conference: to mobilize public support for European integration. It points out the perils Europe is facing and in addition, sums up the most important reasons for Europe to support unification. "Europe is threatened, Europe is divided, and the great danger comes from her divisions".¹⁰⁹ The Congress claimed that no single country is able to defend its independence or solve the economic problems it is facing all by itself. Furthermore, a European Union was needed not only for the salvation of the liberties the peoples of Europe had won, but also for the extension of their benefits to all mankind. Europe's mission is clear: "It is to revive her inventive powers for the greater protection and respect of the rights and duties of the individual of which, in spite of all her mistakes, Europe is still the greatest exponent".¹¹⁰ In its final pledge, the Congress concludes with the boldest claim it had made so far: European unification offers the last chance of peace and the one promise of a great future for this generation and those that will succeed it. Although its resolutions were not binding, the Congress in the Hague was an event of great importance to the European integration process. It marked the first steps toward a united Europe: The Hague meeting was simultaneous with the signature of the Treaty of Brussels, a pact between the Benelux nations, Britain and France that would broaden the alliance against Germany and provide protection against the Soviet. A month before in Paris, the creation of the OEEC (Organisation for European Economic Cooperation) had brought the Marshall Plan into formal existence.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 88-89.

¹⁰⁹ Message to the Europeans, Resolutions, pp. 15.

¹¹⁰ Message to the Europeans, Resolutions, pp. 15.

¹¹¹ Albrecht-Carrié, *One Europe*, pp. 285.

3.6 The Marshall Plan

Moreover, the Congress heralded the times in which the The United States proved a vital advocate of European unification. Whereas before the Second World War the United States had little interest in fostering the unity of Europe, during the spring of 1947 American policymakers began contemplating a comprehensive plan for European recovery and integration. It had been two years since the war had past and Europe was still economically and politically ruined. Marshall was seriously worried that Soviet domination might expand to Western Europe, the Middle East, and Asia and therefore European recovery became a priority for American foreign policy planners. One thing was clear: Europe possesses the numbers, quality, institutions, resources and propinquity to develop political and economic strength and social wellbeing for all the peoples of Europe; only disunity made them weak. The European Recovery Program was designed to help to end the disunity of Europe and substitute for its weakness the strength of unity.¹¹² The material assistance and the moral encouragement provided by the Marshall plan brought a powerful new impetus to the movement for European Unity. According to Hollis and Carter, authors of *Europe Unites*, it even could be said that “the American policy of economic aid, coupled with the pressure of the Communist danger, created conditions in which, for the first time, the unification of Europe became a practical possibility”.¹¹³

During the war, the several groups that were charged with post-war planning differed on the consequences of a united Europe for the U.S. Yet immediately after the war, while witnessing the extent and threat of Soviet expansionism, American policy and public opinion almost unanimously supported European integration. “Any economic disadvantage anticipated from an integrated Europe were outweighed by the political advantages”.¹¹⁴ A united Europe would be strong enough to defend itself to future aggressors. Evidently, the United states supported initiatives like the Congress of 1948 and contributed to Europe’s economic recovery as well as her integration process.

¹¹² J.D. Dulles, ‘European Unity: address by John Foster Dulles, U.S. delegate to the Third session of the General Assembly, Paris, November 18, 1948’ in *European and British Commonwealth series, U.S. Dept. of state 4* (1948) pp. 8.

¹¹³ Hollis, *Europe Unites*, pp. 5.

¹¹⁴ A. Rappaport, ‘The United States and European Integration: The First Phase,’ *Diplomatic History* 5 (1981), pp. 122.

The Marshall Plan was an “economic program with the political end of stabilizing and strengthening Western Europe by the revival of its war-damaged economy”.¹¹⁵ The origins of the plan were closely witnessed by Clark M. Clifford, a White House counsel to President Truman. In his report of 1946 he emphasized the growing dangers in U.S.-Soviet relations and noted that economic measures could be more effective than guns in blocking communism.¹¹⁶ During his visit to Russia, to attend the 1947 Moscow Conference, Marshall had come to a similar conclusion: far from wanting order restored in Germany, the Kremlin considered drift and crisis in Western Europe advantageous to Soviet interests.

The United States knew that economically as well as strategically she would be greatly benefited by a strong, independent and recovered Europe. Soviet expansionism threatened the American way of life and therefore it was essential to keep Europe in friendly hands. Together with the Marshall Plan the American Committee on United Europe, which brought together highly prominent figures from America’s intellectual, industrial and political life, would mean a start of European integration. This committee also offered Europe substantial financial assistance, supported important research projects and promoted unification among the American public. America had never been so generous in providing funds for a political ideal in another continent.¹¹⁷ When Britain realized that the U.S. sought to create a United States of Europe after its own example this resulted in resistance against the federalist Europe Washington envisaged.¹¹⁸ Britain’s hesitant attitude towards European Unification was severely frustrating the U.S. and therefore the CIA started one of its most elaborate post-war operations. The CIA tried to undermine British foreign policy via many different channels; for example by promoting the replacement of the anti-federalist government, directly financing the European movement, and handing hidden funds to influential British federalists.

¹¹⁵ Robert J. Donovan, *The Second Victory: The Marshall Plan and the Postwar Revival of Europe* (London 1987) pp. 6.

¹¹⁶ Donovan, *The Second Victory*, pp. 8.

¹¹⁷ Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe*, pp. 25.

¹¹⁸ R.J. Aldrich, *The Hidden Hand: Britain, America and Cold War Intelligence* (London 2001) pp. 12.

3.7 Conclusion

The 1948 Congress in the Hague was an important initiative for promoting European Unity. Many important figures had assembled to discuss the future of Europe; they wanted to mobilize public support for the integration of the continent, discuss and instigate the international campaign and provide policy recommendations to European governments. In his famous speech at the Congress, Brugmans elaborates on the necessity of a united Europe; he claims it was the most important address of his career. Although the resolutions of the Congress only formulated principles it was a significant success; it marked the beginning of several vital developments such as the establishment of the Council of Europe. However, Brugmans was disappointed that the economic and political solution were handled more seriously than the cultural issues. He believed cultural renewal was a prerequisite to successfully unite Europe.

Furthermore, after the Second World War the United States became highly interested in the idea of a united Europe. The American government wanted to protect Europe from Soviet influence and domination and therefore it became a priority to help Europe recover from the devastations the war had brought to the continent. A strong and united Europe would not be threatened by Bolshevism and what is more, the United States knew that she would economically and strategically benefit from an independent, recovered Europe. Therefore, America offered Europe substantial financial assistance (the Marshall Plan) and supported unification in many possible ways, even via covert (CIA) operations.

Chapter 4 From Words to Action; Initiatives by Hendrik Brugmans

4.1 The Union of European Federalists

In December 1946 the Union of European Federalists was founded by two groups of federalists, the Luxembourgers and the Hertensteiners. Brugmans was part of the Hertensteiners and became president of the UEF. He propagated quick action since he believed that after every war there is a short period of time in which everything is possible. However, he believed one should be cautious with presumed advance since it remains vital that action is immediate, tomorrow the chance to bring about change could be gone.¹¹⁹ The federalist movement was established to pursue two great goals: peace and reconciliation. The European federalists believed peace would not only entail a cease of fire, it would furthermore require an order in which responsibility could be taken, in which a clear executive authority exists. This authority should not be established next to the national states, but instead of these separate states. In order to impose certain boundaries on the national states, they should give up parts of their national sovereignty. It would be governed by a central authority with limited yet real power based on the principle of subsidiarity and inspired by the personalist life vision.¹²⁰

Being a European federalist, Brugmans believed these federal elements were inevitable for a sustainable peace order. Evidently, the movement had much in common with the pacifists, who unconditionally rejected all kinds of warfare. The first mission Brugmans needed to focus on as president of the UEF was to merge the Dutch movement “Europese Actie”, founded by Salinger, with the Federalist Union and the European Federalist Movement.¹²¹ Brugmans was called “the flying Dutchman” since he moved from place to place to try and coordinate and merge: the federalist initiative was abundantly present. He was obviously devoted to the cause since he financed large parts of his travels with the money he received from his father’s inheritance, the means of the UEF weren’t sufficient. The organisation was not able to ask the affiliated movements for contribution; on the contrary, those movements expected support from the UEF. Therefore, Brugmans needed to look for money elsewhere, in the corporate sector for example. A gift of the company Nestlé was key

¹¹⁹ Brugmans, *Wij Europa*, pp. 174.

¹²⁰ K.J. Verleye, “Hendrik Brugmans: Europees Raspaard”, pp. 8.

¹²¹ Brugmans, *Wij Europa*, pp. 175.

to the realisation of the Congress in Montreux, yet no other gifts were received and bearing the costs of the secretariat, and Brugmans' private life for that matter, remained difficult. For Brugmans, the Conference in Montreux organised by the UEF was a highlight of his career. The number of participants was considerably higher than in Hertenstein and the resolutions were concrete and radical.

The secretariat of the UEF was located in Paris but later moved to Geneva, according to Brugmans France was a bad location since "everything what happens there is being nationalised".¹²² It was Raymond Silva, a French man who lived in Geneva, who had proposed the new location of UEF's headquarters. He was an important leading figure of the Union, just like Alexandre Marc. Ideologically, Brugmans and Marc had much in common: they shared their love for the philosopher Charles Peguy and they were both socialists. However, later their personalities clashed as well. Meanwhile, Federalism became more popular and different streams of thinking arose. Brugmans sympathized with different approaches, but never did he fully support one. According to Johanna Bral, his wife, this was a repeated dilemma: it was easy for Brugmans to bind people to him but often they later dropped out because they did not find what they expected.¹²³ This was due to his loathing of polarisation and his truculent character. In Brugmans eyes however, the approaches were all aspects of a new society that could arise right there and then. (Brugmans wanted change, action!) Evidently, these differences of opinion thwarted the UEF to convey one shared federalist vision.

After Brugmans became rector of the college of Europe he remained connected to the UEF. During the congress in Luxembourg he was the spokesman of a group of federalists that accepted rift within the movement. He stated that it is always painful when such rift occurs, yet no cooperation can occur when opinions are incompatible.¹²⁴ Spinelli remained radical in his federalist ideals and although Brugmans emotionally agreed with Spinelli's ideas he chose reform and a more realistic approach. Besides the more radical UEF, the Action Fédéraliste Européenne was created. Both organisations did not achieve much and from this point on Brugmans' intellectual and European main focus would be located in Bruges.

¹²² Ibidem, pp. 175.

¹²³ Idem, pp. 186.

¹²⁴ Idem, pp. 195.

4.2 The European Movement

Before the Congress in The Hague disbanded, the International Committee of European Unity established a permanent private organization to work on the European unification process called the European Movement.¹²⁵ Since the International Committee was created by the UEF, the French Council for a United Europe and ELEC, Brugmans is regarded as one of the intellectual founders of the movement. The organisation was led by prominent figures such as Churchill, Blum, Spaak, Adenauer, de Gasperi, and in 1952 Coudenhove-Kalergi also joined. The leaders of the movement wanted a rapid forward movement and advocated the immediate creation of a European Assembly.

This was in accordance with the Brussels Pact of 1948, mentioned in chapter three. Paul Henri Spaak promised the European Movement that he would present tea plans of the assembly to the other governments of the Brussels Pact. Spaak and the other leaders of the Movement wanted to use the Brussels organization as a sort of nucleus for further European integration. The British were rather fearful of the fast developments and later opposed the trend they initially supported. The British had demanded that European organisation should exist of two major bodies, a committee of ministers and an assembly of consultative character. Eventually, after a long process of compromising, the Council of Europe was born.¹²⁶ The Council was a great achievement for the European Movement and expectations were high: for the first time in modern history a permanent institution was established that would concentrate on the integration of Europe.

Although Brugmans was one of the “founders” of the European Movement he did not always agree with the by Churchill dominated organization. As mentioned before Churchill never wanted to create a United States of Europe. He did not support Brugmans federalist ideas and in addition he was the leader of the conservatives and thus fought everything that could approach socialism.¹²⁷ His son in law Duncan Sandys also embodied that complex and Brugmans’ views just could not reconcile with his, which resulted in endless discussions. In the Netherlands, criticism on the British standpoint was not appreciated since it had been them who saved Europe from the horrors of Nazi occupation, which made it hard to compromise.

¹²⁵ Zurcher, *The Struggle to Unite Europe*, pp. 24.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 39.

¹²⁷ Brugmans, *Wij Europa*, pp. 189.

Still, he admits that he believed his own UEF could use some of the British conservative common sense.¹²⁸

4.3 The College of Europe

The idea of a “College of Europe” came from Karel Verleye, he was a Capuchin friar and a philosophy lecturer and believed in the importance of the social, religious, cultural and ethic aspects of unification. He had attended the Cultural Commission at the Congress in the Hague and came up with the idea to found an academic detachment of Rougemonts Centre Européen de la Culture. He received a small sum of money from the city of Bruges to set up a preparational meeting, which was led by the French poet Jean-Paul de Dadelsen, British historian John Bowle, and French Hellenist Hendrik van Effenterre.¹²⁹ While according to Brugmans it would have made more sense if one of these three gentlemen – or even better, sir Verleye - had become reporter at this meeting in Lausanne, they instead asked Brugmans to do the job. In his own words: “This forced me to think about the matter”. In “Wij, Europa”, Brugmans explains how a small series of events made him involved in the College and before he knew it he was (the only) candidate rector of the College of Europe. Evidently, although several prominent figures were behind the initiative, these men believed Brugmans would be the right man to lead the College. In his book Brugmans elucidates that this did not happen due to his own efforts, it were the original founders who approached him: his services were required and they wanted him to become the face of their new institution.¹³⁰

The College of Europe was founded in Bruges in 1949 and Hendrik Brugmans became its first rector. He believed that the creation of a European spirit should be ensured by initiatives like the establishment of the College of Europe. The opening of the first academic year was an important event, attended by several prominent public figures. Don Salvador Madariaga, chair of the international cultural section of the European Movement, hosted the event. He stated: "Let us build a Europe filled with solidarity and prevent a third world war".¹³¹ Evidently, peace was a vital factor for the founders of the College to aim for a united Europe. Brugmans took the floor last during the ceremony, he was a gifted speaker and addressed his audience successively in Dutch, English, and French.

In his mother tongue, he thanked the Bruges, Flemish and Dutch community for the

¹²⁸ Brugmans, *Wij Europa*, pp. 189.

¹²⁹ Author unknown, “Het Europa College steekt van wal” in *Welzijn* (12 October 1950) pp. 1.

¹³⁰ Brugmans, *Wij Europa*, pp.

¹³¹ “Het Europa College steekt van Wal”, pp.1.

initiative of the College. He was very pleased that the College would reside in Bruges and he considered the foundation of the institution unique and revolutionary. The English part of his speech was mainly directed to the absent British and Scandinavians who were slightly sceptical about the new College, to say the least. Still, the rest of Europe would need them; and that works both ways. The most significant part of Brugmans' speech was delivered in French, in which he analysed Europe's psychology: Europeans are concordant when there is a battle to fight, and whenever they cease fire they flare up again. He used this knowledge to determine the programme - and system - of the College: a broad academic education where every student, despite his or her nationality, would show respect for the opinions of his fellow students. Every statement will be discussed unbiased and openly and therefore, the first scholars of the College were not a class of students, but an "avant garde".¹³²

He concludes his speech with the inspirational Antoine de Saint- Exupéry, of whom he cites two thoughts: "True freedom rests only in the realizing act" and "Only the simplified truth justifies the act". With these last words Brugmans showed that he was a true practical thinker. For Brugmans it was never enough to only think of a better world; he wanted to apply his ideas and he understood that in order to bring about change, one needs to act.

The College was a private initiative although financed by public funds. One of the first initiatives of the College was to win support for its cause. First, Brugmans wanted a blessing from "Strasburg", where the Council of Europe was seated. After this, he wrote a brochure – *Du Federalisme utopique au Fédéralisme scientifique* - in which he explains how the College should look like. The study programme was consulted with Jean Willems, director of the Academic association in Brussels, and a team of teachers was composed. The program should combine different elements: general lessons on integration together with specific case studies, discussions about current problems and contact with relevant people. The biggest challenge however, was the recruitment of the students; they should not have passed the age of 30, master both the English and French language, and finished their academic studies. The idea was to all live under one roof, increase human understanding and be inspired by "un esprit de corps". Although the students of the College are a heterogeneous group with different backgrounds and nationalities there is one "centre d'intérêt": Europe. Focusing on this shared interest will lead to academic integration and it is a fact that it has proven to be very fruitful to appoint people with different backgrounds to the same problem. Another challenge of the College of Europe is the recruitment of professors. According to Brugmans, an excellent

¹³² "Het Europa College steekt van wal", pp. 1.

scholar could be a bad European professor due to his linguistic weakness or the inability to adjust to a heterogeneous group of students. Professors of the college should be involved in European problems on both the academic and practical level and should preferably be appointed for longer periods of time.¹³³ A permanent staff could guarantee the continuity of the College and therefore the success and coherence of the project.

In a document found in his personal archive, Brugmans elaborates on his experiences during the first ten years of the College and draws several conclusions. First, he states that the European Rector Congress of Dijon ventilated doubts on the existence of European Studies as such, since it was claimed that European matters could also be dealt with in “normal” subjects such as history, economics etc. Naturally, Brugmans disagreed, since on the one hand he believes in the existence of a European culture that should preferably be studied interdisciplinary, and moreover he is convinced that the European integration process brings about a set of problems that requires academic attention. Therefore, Europe should be regarded as a single study object.¹³⁴ Furthermore, Brugmans emphasizes the need for European educated specialists in a broad variety of fields, like education, the press, governments, and business. Last, Brugmans states that the construction of a united Europe and the psychological victory of traditional nationalism could only occur by means of academic dedication, and pure conviction, without which it would be a soulless effort. One could either perceive a problem with the willingness of solving it or with a certain scepticism, in which the insuperable character of the difficulties receive full academic exposure.¹³⁵

The College of Europe was certainly the major thrust of Brugmans’ life; he stayed rector until 1972. It had become the birthplace for ideas on European renewal, and for a true community of believers. Its founding fathers were imbued with a European spirit and the certainty of having a distinct mission to accomplish. Moreover, Karel Verleye was clearly impressed by Hendrik Brugmans and the way he had lead the college for so many years. He stated that: “due to his (Brugmans) inspiration, the college became a solid, well-known and respectable institution. His intellectual gift and empathy shaped a whole generation of young Europeans, of whom many admit that the year they lived at the College had great impact on their careers as well as their personal lives”.¹³⁶

¹³³ Brugmans, “Ervaringen en Conclusies uit tien jaar Europa-College” [1960?] pp. 3.

¹³⁴ Brugmans, “Ervaringen en Conclusies” , pp. 1.

¹³⁵ Ibidem, pp. 3.

¹³⁶ Verleye, “Hendrik Brugmans: Europees Raspaard”, pp. 7.

4.4 Conclusion

Through his lifetime, Brugmans has proven he was a true practical thinker; he was a leading figure in many organisations. Although Brugmans' chose a militant life when he was still a young man, he did not always have to fight hard to reach the positions he was able to occupy. He was often chosen or asked by more prominent figures. His first position as an important European federalist was president of the Union of European Federalists. The Hertensteiner and Luxembourger federalists had founded the organisation to reconcile the continent and create peace and Brugmans was its spokesman. Brugmans was a passionate federalist, an idealist that aimed for quick action. Together with his charming appearance, his intellect, his inspiring character and his impressive oratorical skills he was an ideal leader.

In addition, although Brugmans himself was an evolutionary federalist, he has always been open to different points of view. He was called "the flying Dutchman" since he always was trying to reconcile different groups and coordinate joint action. According to his wife Johanna Bral, Brugmans' habit to sympathize with different approaches also turned out to be a dilemma; many people who initially believed Brugmans agreed with their views later discovered they made a fool's bargain.

The European Movement was established right after the Congress in The Hague and succeeded the International Commission for European Unity. As president of the UEF, Brugmans could be regarded as one of its founders, but his role in the Movement was never as great as in the UEF or the College. Churchill dominated the movement right after the Second World War and Brugmans' views seriously clashed with the British standpoint. Churchill was not a federalist, he never wished for a United States of Europe, he only wanted to ensure peace en security throughout the continent. Furthermore, Brugmans socialist approach naturally clashed with British conservatism.

The most dedicated of all organisations and projects was Brugmans to his College of Europe. As said before, he was a most gifted inspirator, and he did not like to deal with tactical games of politics. Being the head of an institute suited Hendrik Brugmans, and for all those years he offered the college the best of himself: his gift as an educationist, his political passion, his search for the truth, his stubborn battle against prejudices, and above all, his affection with youth.¹³⁷ Due to Brugmans efforts, the college became a respectable institution that educated generations of young Europeans.

¹³⁷ Ballegeer, "Brugmans 90 jaar? 90 jaar Brugmans!", pp. 5

Conclusion

Hendrik Brugmans got acquainted with the idea of a united Europe when he was still a young man. He had always been closely involved in the world around him and believed that one should always side with the suppressed. Hence, his affiliation with the socialist thought. He was part of different socialist movements before the Second World War, became a member of the SDAP, yet knew that politics was not his game; he wanted to actually reach people, inspire, bring about change. Throughout his life, Brugmans was involved in many different political organisations and social movements and proved that he was a practical thinker, an idealist. He was profoundly influenced by the personalist philosophy and condemned both totalitarian collectivism as well as relativistic individualism. Moreover, he was a devoted Christian, which evidently explains why he thought it was highly important that people were aware of the power of their shared religion and culture. He truly believed that this awareness could mark the beginning of a collective struggle for human dignity and freedom.

According to Brugmans, federalism was the natural political implementation of personalist socialism and after the Second World War Brugmans became a prominent promoter of the federalist solution. He was an evolutionary federalist who believed that preservation of polarity and dynamic relations will prevent a society from becoming individualistic or collectivistic. Furthermore, he was a pluralist who believed diversity was valuable, yet could not be sustained without a minimum of autonomy and mutual tolerance. As mentioned in chapter 1, Max Jansen and Johan K. de Vree define the difference between the two federalist streams of thinking as follows: “Whereas the evolutionary federalists (or integralists) want to improve the living conditions for the people and create a perfect society, the aim of the constitutionalists is to establish a powerful framework to cure the ills of European inter-state relations.”¹³⁸ Hendrik Brugmans perfectly matches this description of an evolutionary federalist: he wanted to gradually turn Europe into a perfect society by creating awareness of a shared European history and culture; the cultural renewal of Europe.

Brugmans started to further develop his federalist ideas during and right after WWII. While before the Hertensteiner meetings he was not convinced it was realistic to aim for a federal Europe, he soon started to realise that federalism was the only form of government that could underwrite both democracy and effective policy. He believed that federalism was not only political; it should also enhance functional integration. Specialised organisations

¹³⁸ Ibidem, pp. 52.

should be established that would look after matters of agriculture, social legislation, transport and many more. He stated that polarisation between the two superpowers would bring about future war risks and Brugmans proclaimed the necessity of the creation of a third neutral power, a “Switzerland of the world”. In that way, federalism would be able to represent its true nature: a ‘third way’ between communism and American capitalism, centralization and anarchy. Brugmans was quite radical in his ideas and did not conceive European federalism without global solidarity: he believed a united Europe could help create a sustainable world balance.

It is evident that Brugmans was a true advocate of Europe as an open society; he therefore perceived federalism as the solution to decolonisation, since the latter could result in the undesirable process of renationalisation. Besides improving the organisation of larger and smaller authorities it should also stimulate emancipation at the core.¹³⁹ Because what would refined organisation models mean without conscious and responsible citizens? After two world wars and the disintegration of culture and religion in the broadest sense of the word, Nihilism rendered through Europe. Therefore Brugmans aimed at a pluralistic community in which different groups, with their different beliefs and religions, consider each other equals and show respect to one another.

Brugmans was convinced that political and cultural renewal are mutually dependent. He believed that the church of Christ was strongly connected to European culture and that shared Christian roots can provide a vital contribution to the revival of a vigorous Europe. Yet above all, he emphasized it was necessary to have a common morality, shared beliefs. Without inspiration and without the will to make sacrifices and transfer authority to a supranational level, there would never be a united states of Europe. Brugmans stressed the need for cultural renewal since he believed it was a prerequisite for legitimate political integration. Furthermore, he was a leading figure in different federalist organisations and during his career as a prominent federalist he held several important and inspiring speeches, such as during the Congress of Europe in the Hague in 1948. He was a highly gifted speaker and writer, an inspiring intellectual, an idealist; a perfect leader. You could say Brugmans owes a substantial part of his career to a number of very exceptional qualities. Of course, he was a highly driven man, a socialist with a special sense of righteousness, yet many times he did not have to apply for a position; he was asked. As president of the UEF, Brugmans was always trying to reconcile the different federalist movements and although he was an

¹³⁹ Steven Adriaens, “Via Europa”, [1980?] pp1.

evolutionary federalist, he was always open to other points of view and also adjusted his own views over time. It was not his priority to be unambiguous, above all he wanted to create a peaceful and open society and fight nihilism and individualism. Especially devoted was Brugmans to his College of Europe, where he could offer the students the best of himself and where he inspired several generations of young Europeans. After many years of political involvement Hendrik Brugmans returned to his roots as an educationist since he truly believed: *the real battle of our time is to be fought within the minds and souls of people.*

Literature

Books and Articles

- Agnelli, G., 'The Europe of 1992' in *Foreign Affairs* 68, No. 4 (Fall, 1989) pp. 61-70.
- Albrecht-Carrié, R., *One Europe: The Historical Background of European Unity* (New York 1965).
- Aldrich, R.J., *The Hidden Hand: Britain, America and Cold War Intelligence* (Londen 2001).
- Belof, M., *The United States and the Unity of Europe* (London 1963).
- Boyd, A., and Frances Boyd, *Western Union* (Washington 1949).
- Brugmans, H., *Europa en het Vaderland: Een Culturele Benadering door Prof. Dr. H. brugmans* (The Hague: European Movement 1960).
- Brugmans, H. and Kirsten, H., *Wij, Europa: Een Halve Eeuw Strijd voor Emanicipatie en Europees Federalisme* (Amsterdam 1988).
- Brugmans, H., *Crisis en Roeping van het Westen: twee en een halve eeuw Europese cultuurgeschiedenis* (Haarlem 1952).
- Brugmans, H., *Prophètes et fondateurs de l'Europe* (Bruges: College of Europe 1974).
- Brugmans, H., *Denkend aan Europa: De Charme van één Vaderland* (Tielt and Utrecht 1972).
- Brugmans, H., *Schets van een Europese Samenleving* (Rotterdam 1952).
- Brugmans, H., *Europa één in een Verenigde Wereld: Montreux* (Amsterdam 1947).
- Coudenhoven-Kalergi, R.N., *Europe Must Unite* (Glarus 1939).
- Donovan, R.J., *The Second Victory: The Marshall Plan and the Postwar Revival of Europe* (London 1987)
- Goodwin, G., *European Unity: A Return to Realities?* (1972).
- Guieu, J.M. and C. Le Dréau, *Le Congrès de l'Europe a La Haye 1948-2008* (Brussels 2009).
- Hollis and Carter, *Europe Unites: The Hague Congress and After* (London 1948).
- Jansen, M. and J.K. De Vree, *The Ordeal of Unity: The Politics of European Integration, 1945-1985* (Bilthoven 1985).
- Mayne, R., *The Recovery of Europe* (London 1970).'
- Rappaport, 'The United States and European Integration: The First Phase', in *Diplomatic History* 5 (1981).

- Schaper, B.W., 'Europees Congres,' in *Vrij Nederland* 38 (1948) pp. 1.
- Spinelli, *Eurocrats; conflict and crisis in the European Community* (Virginia 1967).
- Walton, C.C., 'The Hague "Congress of Europe": A Case Study of Public Opinion,' in *The Western Political Quarterly* 12 (1959) pp. 738-752.
- Zurcher, A.J., *The Struggle to Unite Europe 1940-1958* (New York 1958).

Primary Sources

The Peace Palace Library

- Dulles, J.D., 'European Unity: address by John Foster Dulles, U.S. delegate to the Third session of the General Assembly, Paris, November 18, 1948' in *European and British Commonwealth series, U.S. Dept. of state* 4 (1948).
- Verbatim Reports I, II, III, IV, 1: Plenary Sessions. 2: Political Committee. 3: Economic and Social Committee 4: Cultural Committee (The Hague 1949).
- 'Resolutions Congress of Europe', Congress of Europe (1948).
- 'Message to the Europeans', Resolutions Congress of Europe (1948).

European Navigator (www.ena.lu)

- Brugmans, H., 'L'unité de l'Europe' *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* 6 (1947) pp.191-197.
- Brugmans, H., 'L'Europe, Société Ouverte', *Fédération* 25 (1947) pp. 5.
- Brugmans, H., 'Fundamentals of European Federalism', speech delivered at the Conference of the Union of European Federalists at Montreux 1947, Publication: British Section of Union of European Federalists (London 1948) pp. 3.
- Brugmans, 'La question préalable' Speech the Hague Congress (May 7, 1948) pp. 2.

Personal Archive Leuven

- Adriaens, S., "Via Europa" [1980?] pp. 1.
- Ballegeer, J., "Brugmans 90 jaar? 90 jaar Brugmans!" in *Europa één Federaal* 36 nr.5 (October 1996).
- Baudet, H., "Histoire Générale de l'Europe: Boek van Hendrik Brugmans zal discussie afdwingen" in *Het Parool* (13 June 1961).
- Bouman, E., "Aan Brugge heb ik mijn hart verloren" in *VW* (16 October 1980) pp. 4.
- Brugmans, H., "Middelpuntzoekende en Vliedende Krachten in de wereld" (February 1978) pp. 3.

- Brugmans, H., “Ach Metselaar, waarom nog werken?” in *Vrije Tribune* (3 December 1979).
- Brugmans, H., Curriculum Vitae H. Brugmans 1906-1981 [1981?].
- Brugmans, H., “Europa: Welke type van Samenleving” *Vrije Tribune* (3 May 1973).
- Brugmans, H., Draft Letter to Belgium Bishops [1980?] pp. 1-2.
- Brugmans, H., “Europese Gemeenschap zonder Gezag” in *Vrije Tribune* (17 August 1976).
- Brugmans, “Ontdekking van Amerika” in *Vrije Tribune* (27 July 1976).
- Brugmans, H. , “Welke Europa’s voor het jaar 2000?” Speech by H. Brugmans (Paris 21 June 1990) pp. 1-7.
- Brugmans, H., “De Kulturele Grondslag” in *Vrije Tribune* (5 November 1979).
- Brugmans, “Ervaringen en Conclusies uit tien jaar Europa-College” [1960?] pp. 3.
- Brugmans , “Negentig jaar, Catalogus tentoonstelling 15 november” (13 december 1996) pp. 7.
- Luyten, M., “Vraaggesprek met Prof. Hendrik Brugmans”[1990?] pp 9.
- Speech of H.R.H. Princess Margriet of the Netherlands, President of the European Cultural Foundation, on the occasion of the departure of Denis de Rougement and Hendrik Brugmans as Governors, [1985?] pp. 3.
- Verleye, K.J., “Hendrik Brugmans: Europees Raspaard” [1980?] pp. 7.
- “Het Europa College steekt van wal” in *VW* (12 October 1950) pp. 1.
- “Drie zienswijzen op het Europees vraagstuk” in *Brugsch Handelsblad* [1980?] pp. 2