

Minutes.

23711

The Hague Press Review
April 27th

Englandspiel: Britain Not to Blame

After a twelve-day trip, during which they covered 4250 kilometres in Germany, two officials of the State Institute for War Documentation have returned to Amsterdam. These two officials, Mr. L. de Jong and Dr. A.E. Cohen told press correspondents that in their discussions with various former Nazi officials, they also succeeded in getting considerable information on the Englandspiel. Mr. de Jong told a reporter of Het Parool that 'he now has sufficient information at his disposal to show that the arguments brought forward by Noel de Gaulle (Major de Graaf) and Dr. van der Storp to prove that the fault lay with Britain, are totally incorrect'. The two gentlemen refused to give any further information on this subject, but added that the Parliamentary Enquiry Committee was already in possession of all the facts.

+ + +

Noth

BRASSI WILHELMSTRASSE 60/600 1247 A.B. E.W.L.M. CP-443
CENTRO WILHELMSTRASSE 150/000 364

RECEIVED IN
DIVISION
16 MAY 1949
REV. 17/5
SERIALS

Satisfactory if the Commission
to issue a statement along these lines.

Perhaps you would care to approach
Danker on this subject and ask him
what lies behind this report. You
might also ask him whether the
Commission contemplates issuing a
statement, and intimate to him that

/Now / from

able
in have
effect,
etc
mission
these
of the
e
able

Registry No. 3711/1051/29

OUT FILE

+00. 2
25/5

Top Secret.
Secret.
~~Confidential~~
Restricted.
Open

Row

[Dear]

Draft Letter to:
Sir Philip
Nichols
The Hague
from
Mr. Shuckburgh

I noticed with interest a paragraph in your ~~review~~ Dutch Press Review of April 27th to the effect that two officials of the State Institute of War Documentation had obtained information ^{in Germany} ~~Germany~~ ^(showing) which enabled them to show that the arguments put forward by "Noel de Gaulle" and Van der Starp to prove that Britain was responsible for the "Englandspiel" are incorrect. I attach a copy of the paragraph.

John
19.5
H

If Mr. de Jong and Dr. Cohen have in fact unearthed evidence ^{to this effect,} ~~which~~ proves to the satisfaction of the Commission of Enquiry that the "Englandspiel" allegations are baseless, we should ^{of course} be delighted. ^{only too pleased} It would be even more satisfactory if the Commission ^{were} able to issue a statement along these lines.

Perhaps you would care to approach Danker on this subject and ask him what lies behind this report. You might also ask him whether the Commission contemplates issuing a statement, ^{and intimate to him that} ~~and intimate to him that~~
/Now from

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

50,000 1247 A.9 E.W.L.H. Op.645
150,000 1848

RECEIVED IN
DIVISION
16 MAY 1949
17/5

from our point of view, it would be
preferable for these "Englandspiel"
allegations to be denied by the
Netherlands authorities than by
ourselves.

[Yours]

Now or whether action is to await
the findings of the Parliamentary
Committee. The first alternative
would of course suit our book
much the best, but it might not
be wise to say so to Daamen, or he
may think that we are trying to get
the Dutch to hold the Englandspiel
baby for us.

CM
12/5

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

OUT FILE

FOREIGN OFFICE S.W.1.

20th May, 1949.

(Z 3711/1051/29)

RESTRICTED

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN ON THIS PAGE

My Dear Phil

I noticed with interest a paragraph in your Press Review of 27th April, to the effect that two officials of the State Institute of War Documentation had obtained information in Germany showing that the arguments put forward by "Noel de Gaulle" and Van der Storp to prove that Britain was responsible for the "Englandspiel" are incorrect.

If de Jong and Cohen have in fact unearthed evidence to this effect, we should of course be only too pleased. It would be even more satisfactory if the Commission were able to issue a Statement along these lines.

Perhaps you would care to approach Danker on this subject and ask him what lies behind this report. You might also ask him whether the Commission contemplates issuing a Statement now or whether action is to await the findings of the Parliamentary Committee. The first alternative would of course suit our book much the best, but it might not be wise to say so to Danker, or he may think that we are trying to get the Dutch to hold the Englandspiel baby for us.

Yours ever.

(sigd) (C.A.E. Shuckburgh.)

Sir Philip Nichols, K.C.M.G., M.C.,
The Hague.

WESTERN

Z3717/G

10.

1949

NETHERLANDS

Z 3717/1051/29G

let P. Nichols,
The Hague

to
Mr. Shuckburgh

150/32/49

TOP SECRET.

Dated 12/5
rec'd 14/5.

Reports that Foreign Office letter about Anton VAN DER WAAALS, Dutch collaborator, was handed to Mr. G. JONKER, his Defence Counsel, on May 11th.

Last Paper

Z 3156

References

Z 2738/1051/29G

(Print)

(How disposed of)

(Action completed)

letch
13/6

(Index)

W/B

Next Paper

Please see ^{also} the attached extract from The Hague Press Review about the trial of Van Der Waals.

2. It is quite clear that the Dutch court does not intend to allow the question of Van der Waals' guilt to be confused by the "Englandspiel", and this is all to the good from our point of view. There would no doubt have been a greatly increased public demand for an immediate statement on the "Englandspiel" if the Court had ordered a suspension of Van der Waals' sentence pending the result of the Commission of Enquiries investigations.

3. Jonker appears to have ignored our letter entirely (See ^{press} extract within) and to have based his defence on the theory that S. was an Allied agent. As our letter directly contradicts this theory it is most unlikely that J. will publish it. We could therefore safely assume that our admission that Van der Waals was employed as a "double agent" will not become public property.

R. H. Mason

(R.H.Mason)
16th May, 1949.

Jonker's line of defence is neither vigorous nor ingenious: he might

as

as well try to prove that Hitler was
in British pay.

But this line of defence
can only annoy the court and is
therefore of no great annoyance to us.

John Rundle

17.5

D. Richard ~~18/5/5~~

16/5

- 1) Extract from The Hague Press Review,
dated 12th May

16/5
8.6

- 2) Extract from Dutch Press Review,
no. 121 of 1st June

19/6

one of
theory
England
of the

the
ret
if
Ger
to
as

into
be
deat
ver



105

Z 3717 *auth. G*

BRITISH EMBASSY,
THE HAGUE.

TOP SECRET

12th May, 1949.

150/32/49

My dear Evelyn,

Many thanks for your Top Secret letter (No. Z2738/1051/29G) of the 7th May about the van der Waals case. We saw no objection to handing over the letter to Mr. Jonker and at once endeavoured to do so. Mr. Jonker, however, proved extremely elusive and his Amsterdam office were very cagey about telling us where he was, despite being told that it might be in his interest to get in touch with the Embassy. It was not therefore until the morning of May 11th that we ran him to earth in the Court, and the letter (receipt enclosed) was given to him just before lunch.

nt
rs.

The letter was actually handed over by Mr. van Loo, our Dutch press reader who had a short conversation with Mr. Jonker. Van Loo reported as follows:-

“ At 12.50 hours today I handed over the Foreign Office letter to van der Waals' Council for the defence, Mr. Jonker, and received his signed receipt for this letter. Mr. Jonker was extremely grateful for the trouble we have taken in this respect, and asked me to convey his thanks to H.M.G. After having read the document, Jonker smiled, however, and said that this was of no use to him whatsoever, since he was not in possession of the original Englandspiel wireless messages.

He then voluntarily told me what his line of defence would be. He intended to expound the theory that Britain had sacrificed a number of Dutch agents in order to cover Schreider, who was regarded as the

/sole

C.A.E. Shuckburgh, Esq.,
Western Department,
Foreign Office.

one of the top collaborators during the occupation, based his defence on the following theory, according to the NIEUWE HAAGSCHE COURANT. Jonker's ideas about the Englandspiel were as follows: both van der Waals and Schreider were in the service of the Allies. Schreider, however, was so important to the allied cause that

the Allies purposely allowed Schreider to develop the Englandspiel, in order to retain him in Holland. The Allies, according to Jonker, were of the opinion that if only Schreider could be a tremendous success he would not be replaced by the German Intelligence Service. In such a way, he would be of continuous service to the Allies in the Netherlands. E-spiel agents were sacrificed in the same way as were the Commandoes who landed in Dieppe, Jonker argued.

The Public Prosecutor, Professor Langemeijer, refused, however, to be drawn into a discussion on the Englandspiel and said that this was a matter which was to be investigated by the Parliamentary Enquiry Committee. He demanded that the death sentence, as pronounced by the Rotterdam Court, should be maintained. The verdict will be pronounced on 8th June.

+ + +

BRITISH EMBASSY,
THE HAGUE.

sole non-party member of the German Intelligence Service. Schreider was a good Catholic and could therefore be counted on to have no scruples with regards to the Nazi Government. It was clear, from what Jonker told me that he intended to base his defence on an unprovable theory, and thereby hoped to save his client's head. I attended part of the hearing this morning, and came to the conclusion that van der Waals' own defence was extremely weak, and that Jonker will have a difficult time in trying to establish the accused's innocence."

After reading this account, as well as the text of the letter, I do not think there is much risk of Mr. Jonker making the letter public.

Yours ever
W. H. Mitchell

... before the Court of Appeal for A. van der Waals, one of the top collaborators during the occupation, based his defence on the following theory, according to the NIEUWE HAAGSCHE COURANT. Jonker's ideas about the Englandspiel were as follows: both van der Waals and Schreider were in the service of the Allies. Schreider, however, was so important to the allied cause that

the Allies purposely allowed Schreider to develop the Englandspiel, in order to retain him in Holland. The Allies, according to Jonker, were of the opinion that if only Schreider could be a tremendous success he would not be replaced by the German Intelligence Service. In such a way, he would be of continuous service to the Allies in the Netherlands. E-spiel agents were sacrificed in the same way as were the Commandoes who landed in Dieppe, Jonker argued.

The Public Prosecutor, Professor Langemeijer, refused, however, to be drawn into a discussion on the Englandspiel and said that this was a matter which was to be investigated by the Parliamentary Enquiry Committee. He demanded that the death sentence, as pronounced by the Rotterdam Court, should be maintained. The verdict will be pronounced on 8th June.

RECEIVED:

Letter No. Z 2738/1051/29G, dated 7th May, 1949,

addressed to Mr. G. Jonker,
Van Eeghenstraat, 102,
Amsterdam.

Paulley

23717 C

Yesterday has been based on his statement more in particular a long list of underground workers.

The President trying to cover Englandspiel. But so much publicity up for discussion. E-spiel had of treason.

... will be given the same treatment by this Court. I cannot believe that the British agent to which you continually refer (John Verhagen) allowed you to enter the Secret Service on the sole grounds that you informed him that you were anti-German. I think I know who this John Verhagen is: you are John Verhagen yourself.

"According to your information, Schreider was also a member of a Secret Service. I suppose that you will also try and convince us that Panter was also a member of that organisation. But we can leave the Secret Service outside our discussions, and it still remains for you to defend yourself on 44 counts of treason, for which you were paid; you first received 200 guilders per month, and, later on, 1100 per month for this work. You were also given German decorations."

The case was adjourned until the afternoon, when the Council for the Defence demanded that the case should be opened for reinvestigation, since he did not believe that van der Waals had been given a fair trial in the Rotterdam Court.

NOTHING

13/May

The Englandspiel: Defence for van der Waals

The Council for the defence before the Court of Appeal for A. van der Waals, one of the top collaborators during the occupation, based his defence on the following theory, according to the NIEUWE HAAGSCHE COURANT. Jonker's ideas about the Englandspiel were as follows: both van der Waals and Schreider were in the service of the Allies. Schreider, however, was so important to the allied cause that

the Allies purposely allowed Schreider to develop the Englandspiel, in order to retain him in Holland. The Allies, according to Jonker, were of the opinion that if only Schreider could be a tremendous success he would not be replaced by the German Intelligence Service. In such a way, he would be of continuous service to the Allies in the Netherlands. E-spiel agents were sacrificed in the same way as were the Commandoes who landed in Dieppe, Jonker argued.

The Public Prosecutor, Professor Langemeijer, refused, however, to be drawn into a discussion on the Englandspiel and said that this was a matter which was to be investigated by the Parliamentary Enquiry Committee. He demanded that the death sentence, as pronounced by the Rotterdam Court, should be maintained. The verdict will be pronounced on 8th June.

23717

HOME AFFAIRS

12/May

The van der Waals' Trial

The trial of A. van der Waals before the Court of Appeal yesterday has been given considerable publicity. Van der Waals' own defence was based on his statement that he was under the impression of working for the Allies, and more in particular for the British Intelligence Service. He has to face, however, a long list of charges, including the accusation that he caused the arrest of 83 underground workers.

Van der Waals' arguments did not have a favourable reception. The President of the Court made the following statement: "You are continually trying to cover your deeds with the argument that you are part and parcel of the Englandspiel. But there is no relation between the two. It is to be deplored that so much publicity has been given to this subject in the press before your case came up for discussion. It would indeed be extremely important to find out exactly how the E-spiel had worked. But this matter is entirely separated from your own acts of treason. Your allegation that you were a member of the Secret Service will be given the same treatment by this Court. I cannot believe that the British agent to which you continually refer (John Verhagen) allowed you to enter the Secret Service on the sole grounds that you informed him that you were anti-German. I think I know who this John Verhagen is: you are John Verhagen yourself.

"According to your information, Schreider was also a member of a Secret Service. I suppose that you will also try and convince us that Pauter was also a member of that organisation. But we can leave the Secret Service outside our discussions, and it still remains for you to defend yourself on 44 counts of treason, for which you were paid; you first received 200 guilders per month, and, later on, 1100 per month for this work. You were also given German decorations."

The case was adjourned until the afternoon, when the Council for the Defence demanded that the case should be opened for reinvestigation, since he did not believe that van der Waals had been given a fair trial in the Rotterdam Court.

NOTHING

13/May

The Englandspiel: Defence for van der Waals

The Council for the defence before the Court of Appeal for A. van der Waals, one of the top collaborators during the occupation, based his defence on the following theory, according to the NIEUWE HAAGSCHE COURANT. Jonker's ideas about the Englandspiel were as follows: both van der Waals and Schreider were in the service of the Allies. Schreider, however, was so important to the allied cause that

the Allies purposely allowed Schreider to develop the Englandspiel, in order to retain him in Holland. The Allies, according to Jonker, were of the opinion that if only Schreider could be a tremendous success he would not be replaced by the German Intelligence Service. In such a way, he would be of continuous service to the Allies in the Netherlands. E-spiel agents were sacrificed in the same way as were the Commandoes who landed in Dieppe, Jonker argued.

The Public Prosecutor, Professor Langemeijer, refused, however, to be drawn into a discussion on the Englandspiel and said that this was a matter which was to be investigated by the Parliamentary Enquiry Committee. He demanded that the death sentence, as pronounced by the Rotterdam Court, should be maintained. The verdict will be pronounced on 8th June.

Brit. Embassy Press & Inf. Service: Dutch Press Review No. 124
1/6/49.

-2-

Englandspiel: Schreider Was Unimportant

After thorough investigations over a period of months Major General I.A. van Hilten, formerly of the Netherlands military staff, came to the conclusion that Schreider was not the man to devise the Englandspiel, but Lt. Colonel Hermann J. Giskes, of the German Military Intelligence Service (A'wehr).

One of the most important discoveries made by Gen. Hilten, was that the Germans knew about the invasion some 24 hours before the Allied troops landed. This was due to the fact that Britain used the same code that had already been used to contact dropped agents, and which was therefore known to the Germans. The invasion message, Hilten writes, was destined for the French underground movement in Normandy and Brittany. The message came too late, however, for the Germans to organize large scale defense in the regions concerned, but the landing itself was no surprise.

Hilten then turns to the Englandspiel, and discloses that while Giskes originated the E-spiel, Schreider's organization was merely used to capture and imprison the agents. Since May 1942, the Germans had 20 'lines to London' while during a certain period, no less than 14 of these operated simultaneously. The result was that large quantities of war material for the resistance movement fell into German hands. It also cost a large number of allied aircraft.

There was close collaboration with the German commander of night fighters who was stationed at Driebergen.

A certain Ernst May was responsible for 'reconstructing' the codes found on the agents dropped over Holland. He appears to have been extremely clever in this job and managed to decypher all the codes used. If, Hilten writes, the dropped agents realized that May knew practically all there was to be known about their secret instructions, they gave up all they knew, and usually augmented it with the necessary details. The extensive information which thus came into the hands of the enemy, was made good use of by the German military intelligence service.

A surprising point in the E-spiel, Hilten continues, was the fact that agents continued to be dropped in spite of the fact that so many of them had fallen into German hands. Hilten does not explain this point, but writes that the droppings were terminated after one agent managed to escape to Britain.

(NO SOURCE)

WESTERN

Z3738 /G

11. 1949

NETHERLANDS

Z 3738 /1051/29G.

F.O. minute
ht. Mason.

Amended form of statement on
the "Englandspiel", issued by
H.M. Government.

Dated 14th May
Rec'd 16th May

Last Paper

Z 3717

See within :

(Minutes)

References

Z 3156 /1051/29G.

Raw

23/May.

(Print)

(How disposed of)

Tel) The Hague 738,
14th May

(Action
completed)

X.17

(Index)

W.B.

Next Paper

Attchms. Green

1051

Z3758

N. T. Mason

Nothing to be Written in this Margin.

attached slip shows
suggested amendments to
"Englandspiel" announcement
telephoned by Hague this p.m.
Please examine, see whether
we need object, submit pp

1st sentence delete "operations"
subst "the penetration
by the Germans"
2nd "the suggestion that" delete ~~the~~
3 words / substitute "this
penetration was aided in
any way by".

in answer.

JK
13.5

Reason - parts don't hang together

statement lacked. You will no doubt recall
that ~~the~~ we objected to the use of the
expression "Englandspiel" and put forward
explanatory phrases instead. Sir P.
Nichols obviously considers that these
phrases were not sufficiently precise.

~~(See ~~the~~)~~

/ I see no

Attchms. Green

1051

Z3758

N^o Mason

attached slip shows
suggested amendments to
"Englandspiel" announcement
telephoned by Hague this p.m.
Please examine, see whether
we need object, submit PP
& draft Telegram in answer.

JWK
13.5

The attached Circular has been transmitted to posts abroad. It is sent for your information and for circulation to all members of your department. A copy should be placed in the departmental order book when you consider it desirable.

statement lacked. You will no doubt recall that ~~it~~ we objected to the use of the expression "Englandspiel" and put forward explanatory phrases instead. Sir P. Nichols obviously considers that these phrases were not sufficiently precise.

~~(See)~~

/ I see no

Nothing to be written in this Margin.

Z3738 G

Sir Philip Nichols rang on 13 May and suggested that the statement which he has been authorised to issue on the "Eng-landspiel"/s ^(See Z 3156 G) could be amended slightly. The revised statement would read as follows :

" The Attention of HMG has been drawn to allegations which have appeared in certain sections of the Netherlands Press and more recently in pamphlet form concern- ing the penetration by the Germans of the Netherlands Resistance Movement.

After close examination of all the available information, HMG/ wishes to state categoriacally that there are no grounds whatsoever to support the suggest- ion that this penetration was aided in any way by treachery on the/ part of British Officers. Further, the allegation that HMG deliberately sacrificed the lives of Dutchmen in order to gain advantage else- where is totally devoid of foundation."

The object of Sir P. Nichols' suggested amendments is to establish a connection between the first and second paragraphs of the statement which the original statement lacked. You will no doubt recall that ~~ix~~ we objected to the use of the expression "Englandspiel" and put forward explanatory phrases instead. Sir P. Nichols obviously considers that these phrases were not sufficiently precise.

~~(See -----)~~

/ I see no

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

Nothing to be written in this Margin.

147

Registry
No. 23738/1051/296

CYPHER

Top Secret.
 Secret.
 Confidential.
 Restricted.
 Open.

please 14th. May 1949
 Despatched 2 25a M.
 30 T FILE

Draft.

Priority
 [Security Classification] RESTRICTED
 -if any

Telegram to The Hague

Addressed to THE HAGUE

No. 2738
 (Date) 14th May 1949

~~PRIORITY~~ telegram No. (date)

repeated for information to

Repeat to:—

Your telephone message of 13th. May about
Englandspiel statement.

We have no objection to your proposed
amendments.

RECEIVED IN C.S.
 13 MAY 1949
 SENT TO C.S.

Rice
 14/May

En Clair.
~~Code.~~
 Cypher.

Distribution:—

Copies to:—

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

1/20/49
 12/19/49
 15/10/49
 16/10/49
 17/10/49
 18/10/49
 19/10/49
 20/10/49
 21/10/49
 22/10/49
 23/10/49
 24/10/49
 25/10/49
 26/10/49
 27/10/49
 28/10/49
 29/10/49
 30/10/49
 31/10/49
 1/11/49
 2/11/49
 3/11/49
 4/11/49
 5/11/49
 6/11/49
 7/11/49
 8/11/49
 9/11/49
 10/11/49
 11/11/49
 12/11/49
 13/11/49
 14/11/49
 15/11/49
 16/11/49
 17/11/49
 18/11/49
 19/11/49
 20/11/49
 21/11/49
 22/11/49
 23/11/49
 24/11/49
 25/11/49
 26/11/49
 27/11/49
 28/11/49
 29/11/49
 30/11/49
 1/12/49
 2/12/49
 3/12/49
 4/12/49
 5/12/49
 6/12/49
 7/12/49
 8/12/49
 9/12/49
 10/12/49
 11/12/49
 12/12/49
 13/12/49
 14/12/49
 15/12/49
 16/12/49
 17/12/49
 18/12/49
 19/12/49
 20/12/49
 21/12/49
 22/12/49
 23/12/49
 24/12/49
 25/12/49
 26/12/49
 27/12/49
 28/12/49
 29/12/49
 30/12/49
 31/12/49

COPY

(Z 8778/1051/29 G)

OUT FILE

Cypher

FROM FOREIGN OFFICE TO THE HAGUE PAGE

No. 738

D. 2.25 a.m. 15th May, 1949.

14th May, 1949.

PRIORITY

RESTRICTED

Your telephone message of 13th May
about Englandspiel statement.

We have no objection to your proposed
amendments.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

COFY

(S 778/1051/29 G)

OUT FILE

Cypher

FROM FOREIGN OFFICE TO THE HAGUE PAGE

No. 738

D. 2.25 a.m. 15th May, 1949.

14th May, 1949.

PRIORITY

RESTRICTED

Your telephone message of 13th May
about Englandspiel statement.

We have no objection to your proposed
amendments.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

13

Z

WESTERN DEPARTMENT

Z 3788

1949

NETHERLANDS

Registry Number | Z 3788/1051/29

The "Englandspiel"

FROM FOREIGN OFFICE
MINUTES Mr. MASON .

Discussion between Mr. Mason and Mr. Forward of Western European Information Department, on a suitable line to adopt in conversation with the Netherlands journalists who are due to arrive in London on 16 May.

No.

Dated 12 May .

Received in Registry | 19 May .

Last Paper

Z 3738.

(Minutes.)

See within

References

Reu

23/May.

(Print)

(How disposed of)

(Action completed)

(Index)

JAB 14/5/49

JH 1/10/49

Next Paper

2.3814

Facts

Z3788

Minutes.
"Englandspiel" 2

I discussed the "Englandspiel" with Mr. Forward of Western European Information Dept.² in an endeavour to evolve a line of argument agree upon a suitable line to adopt in conversation with the Netherlands journalists who are due to arrive in London on 16th May (Monday)

I explained to Mr. Forward why we could not adopt the most satisfactory line of all, namely a full explanation of the circumstances.

We agreed that the friendly journalist who does not believe the allegations but who cannot understand why we refuse to speak up in our own defence is the most difficult sort to handle. Such journalists expect, and rightly so, to be treated as if they are responsible persons. However, we agreed that it would be quite impossible to make any exceptions at all.

I explained to Mr. Forward that there are three things which might occur before the arrival of the Dutch journalists:

(a) Foxker might publish the
Statement

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

Statement which we sent him
on the 10th May.

- (b) Sir P. Nichol might issue his
Statement.
- (c) The Commission of Enquiry
might publish a statement
along the lines of the report
which appeared recently in
the Dutch press, that we were
in no way responsible for the
"Englandspiel".

Any of these would obviously
have a bearing on our line with
the Dutch journalists. We agreed
to review the situation on Saturday.

(14th)

However, we agreed that the
less said about the "Englandspiel"
the better, and that the following
would be the safest course :-

- (a) Try to avoid discussing
the "E. Spiel".
- (b) If forced to discuss it,
avoid disclosing any more
information than has been
authorized already disclosed
officially by us : e.g.
Sir P. Nichol's Statement if
it has already appeared.
/ However



NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

(However, if Sir P. Nichols' Statement has still not been issued, we should not mention that he has been authorized to make a Statement. The same, of course, would apply to our letter to Tower).

- (c) Avoid getting involved in discussion of the details - e.g. the Bingham family; the reason why the call sign was not recognized; the "hand-writing" device; use of double agents, etc.
- (d) Take every opportunity to pour scorn on the idea that we plotted to exterminate Dutch patriots.
- (e) Support the suggestion that ~~the~~ "kerel Services" are by nature disinclined to publicize their activities & methods - but only if this point is raised by the visitors.
- (f) Avoid discussing Van der Waals, but if forced to do so, take the line that Van der Waals and the "E. Spiel" are not connected, at any rate as far as we are concerned.
- (g) If asked why we will not issue a detailed Statement, say that no responsible Dutchman believes this nonsense and that it is beneath our dignity to enter into the arena.

You may have some other suggestions to make, & so might Mr. Bicknell, whom I was unable to contact yesterday.

I suggest that we prepare a short brief incorporating these points after Forward, I have reviewed the situation on Saturday.

Reason

12/May.

Mr. Russell.

Mr. Bicknell (S.L.D.)

I agree: but:

- a) Jones is unlikely to publish the letter we sent him.
- b) The Dutch are unlikely to publish any statement in advance of the Parliamentary Committee's report.

We should also make it clear to the Dutch visitors that they are here as our guests to study "a day in the life of the Lesser Boll-weevil" or whatever else we choose to show them - and not to ask better questions on extraneous subjects!

fol. 12.5

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

Minutes.

I have discussed this with the interested friends, and we agree with all your suggestions.

Mr Mason.

Nigel Bicknell
16/5-

I had some 20 copies of the attached brief memo and passed to Mr. Forward of W.E.I.D. on 16/May.

I told him that circulation should be strictly limited and that it would be advisable to keep a note of people to whom it was issued.

Race

13/May

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.