

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

PUBLISHED IN

'DOCUMENTEN BETREFFENDE DE
BUITENLANDSE POLITIEK VAN NEDERLAND 1919-1945'

(DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE
FOREIGN POLICY OF THE NETHERLANDS 1919-1945)

april 1 1932 — mei 30 1933

THE HAGUE 1987

This book contains the complete text of the 'List of documents' from:

Documenten betreffende de buitenlandse politiek van Nederland 1919-1945.

Periode B: 1931-1940. Deel II: 1 april 1932 — 30 mei 1933.

Bewerkt door W.J.M. Klaassen en J. Woltring.

(Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatiën, Grote Serie 199).

's-Gravenhage, Martinus Nijhoff, 1987.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS¹

¹ The numbers in the first column refer to the numbers of the documents. The date of the documents, the sender's and the addressee's names and the place where the document was written, if it was not The Hague, are shown in the second column. Where the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs was the sender or addressee, this is not indicated. Where names might be confused, first initials have been added; titles have not been added. Where notes and other documents that were not dispatched are concerned, only the author's name has been indicated (i.e. without the addition of *from* or *to*). The third column contains a short description of the text of the documents. Some names have been simplified, e.g. *Beelaerts* instead of *Beelaerts van Blokland*.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
1	1.4.1932 from the League of Nations Affairs Division to the delegation to the disarmament conference	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> Explanatory notes to the Netherlands memorandum for the disarmament conference should be drawn up. The Aviation and Budgetary Commissions' questionnaires would be dealt with by the ministries of Public Works and Defence.
2	1.4.1932 from Van Nispen tot Sevenaer (Brussels)	<i>Belgium: coal imports.</i> Talks between Belgian and Dutch coal producers attended by Van Romburgh had proved fruitless. A more diplomatic tone on the part of the Dutch and more thorough preparations for such negotiations were to be recommended.
3	2.4.1932 from Van Nispen tot Sevenaer (Brussels)	<i>Belgium: treaty amendment.</i> Considering the mood of the Upper House, it was as well that no agreement had been reached on the amendment to the 1839 treaties. The appointment of a new envoy in Brussels as from 1 October 1932 was requested.
4	2.4.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Von Bülow had been informed that Germany's attitude towards the reciprocal balance of trade had caused widespread dissatisfaction in the Netherlands. Special attention requested for the import of Dutch coal and eggs. Suggestion that additional exchange be made available for purchases in the Netherlands.
5	4.4.1932 De Marees van Swinderen to Simon (London)	<i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> The Netherlands Government objected to the impending imposition of a discriminatory import duty on tea. The drop in tea prices was not due to imports from Java and Sumatra; moreover, an open-door policy was still pursued in NEI.
6	4.4.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Negotiations Committee	<i>Germany: trade.</i> Discussion of feasibility of imposing exchange controls if full payment was not received for Dutch exports to Germany. Nederbragt opposed to this particular measure but in favour of taking action against German exchange regulations. Resolved that Hirschfeld and Ries draft instructions for a delegation (No. 12).
7	6.4.1932 Schlingemann to Ringers	<i>Pollution of the Rhine: France.</i> Residual salts discharged into the Rhine by the potassium industry in Alsace raised the chlorine content at Lobith to over 120 g/m ³ only when the water was at its lowest level. The French Government should be invited to participate in a joint study of the question, for which task the Central Commission for the Na-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
8	7.4.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<p>vigation of the Rhine did not seem to be the appropriate body.</p> <p><i>Trade policy.</i> Referring to vol. I, No. 370, Nederbragt stated that a study was being made of what the tariff lists attaching to the draft trade agreement with Belgium should comprise. During a discussion of the plans for a Danube federation, Nederbragt stressed that the Government should continue to uphold the most-favoured-nation principle and, at the same time, promote the creation of larger economic units in Europe.</p>
9	9.4.1932 from Van Nagell (Guatemala)	<p><i>Central America: diplomatic service.</i> Account of contact with two agents of the Koninklijke Nederlandsche Stoomboot Maatschappij in Guatemala and with consular officials in El Salvador and Costa Rica. The writer proposed his own appointment as envoy in El Salvador, Costa Rica and Panama.</p>
10	11.4.1932 from De Marees van Swinderen (London)	<p><i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> The British Government's adoption of a protectionist policy was deliberately calculated to inflict considerable damage on foreign industries. The legation could only advise Dutch industrialists to urge their British clients to exert pressure on the commission appointed to make recommendations on import duties.</p>
11	11.4.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<p><i>Trade policy.</i> A disadvantage of the Emergency Imports Act was that quota measures were time-consuming and put relations with other countries on an uncertain footing. Hirschfeld advocated the abolition of proportional quotas and the introduction, by Royal Decree, of a system along Swiss lines.</p>
12	[12].4.1932 Hirschfeld and Ries to Ver- schuur and De Geer	<p><i>Germany: trade.</i> The German Government should make exchange available for imported goods, ships' cargoes and debt payments, and facilitate the import of butter, eggs and herring. The Netherlands balance of payments should be protected by a special arrangement. If the German negotiators proved intractable, the Netherlands delegation should be instructed to inform them that the Government was contemplating the restriction of currency exports to certain countries.</p>
13	12.4.1932 Themps to Nederbragt	<p><i>Central America: consular service.</i> Proposal that an experienced career consul be posted to Central</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
14	12.4.1932 from Deckers	America to supervise the honorary consuls in Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, who were badly informed. <i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The Netherlands delegation should be very firm in its defence of submarines, which had greatly improved the maritime position in the Far East. The simultaneous banning of submarines and warships was unacceptable to the Netherlands.
15	12.4.1932 from W. van Rappard (Copenhagen)	<i>Denmark: import duties.</i> Minister Mohr had stated that the Danish Government was prepared to maintain the traditional ratio of 3½:1 for imports from and exports to the Netherlands. The writer hoped that the Netherlands Government would allow increased imports of Danish meat.
16	12.4.1932 Jager to De Graaff	<i>Defence: neutrality.</i> Enclosure of draft neutrality proclamation (annex). The majority of the Interdepartmental Committee were ad hoc advocates of control of fuel oil exports from NEI ports.
16A	[12].4.1932 draft neutrality proclamation	<i>Defence: neutrality.</i> Interdiction against entering or crossing Netherlands territory placed upon belligerents; offenders would be disarmed and interned. The provision of active support for a belligerent power prohibited.
17	14.4.1932 to W. van Rappard	<i>Denmark: import duties.</i> Instructions to ascertain whether the Danish foreign exchange authorities were handling the import of Netherlands products more stringently than those of other countries, and if that proved to be the case, to protest. The Minister of Colonies was concerned about the import of NEI products in Denmark.
18	16.4.1932 Beelaerts van Blokland (Geneva)	<i>Oslo cooperation.</i> The writer had discussed the central European preferential treatment plans (see No. 8) with Munch, Braadland, Ramel and Hyman, acceptance of which could perhaps be made conditional on the reciprocal acceptance of preferential treatment for the Oslo states. It had been agreed that senior officials would meet in Stockholm on 28 May.
19	17.4.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>France.</i> Suggestion that No. 11 be sent to Beelaerts. France was not greatly affected by Netherlands quota measures nor could French exports to the Netherlands be termed excessive.
20	20.4.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: trade.</i> Writer's displeasure that Ries and Hirschfeld had not informed Nederbragt of their

No.	Date; from/to	Description
20A	(Berlin) 20.4.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	instructions (No. 12). Care should be taken that other departments did not arrogate competence. <i>Germany: trade.</i> That Ries had surprised the writer the previous day with No. 12, was proof of careless and faulty working methods which should be avoided in future.
21	22.4.1932 from Nederbragt	<i>Germany: trade.</i> Doubts about both Ries' competence in the conduct of negotiations with foreign governments and Hirschfeld's qualities as a leader. Talks with Ritter and Köpke had led the writer to conclude that Berlin was favourably disposed towards the Netherlands, and that the flexible application of German exchange regulations was within the bounds of possibility.
22	22.4.1932 from Zimmerman (Velp)	<i>Austria: League of Nations loan.</i> Discussion in the Control Commission for League of Nations loans of a transaction of the Austrian Credit-Anstalt which would increase Austria's foreign debt. It remained to be seen whether the Austrian Government would be able to meet the obligations thus incurred.
23	22.4.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>Germany: trade.</i> Exchange problems had been discussed several times with a German delegation which was to study the Netherlands proposal referred to in No. 12. Talks on the export of butter, eggs and herring to Germany had yielded no direct results. Prospects were bleak in view of Germany's strong tendency towards autarky.
24	23.4.1932 Van Doorninck, Hirschfeld and Heringa to Verschuur	<i>Aid to the shipping industry.</i> Proposal that the Government aid the Dutch shipping industry by financing a new company subject to three conditions. The Java-China-Japan line's application for a subvention was not relevant in this context; that company should first restrict its general expenditure and reorganise its internal structure, preferably in cooperation with the Koninklijke Paketvaart Maatschappij.
25	26.4.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> A talk between Nederbragt and Ritter (see No. 21) led Beelaerts to conclude that in the present circumstances the most advantageous and the safest option would be to extend the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty. Query whether Verschuur approved of this being proposed to the German Government.
26	28.4.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Germany: trade.</i> No new Netherlands delegation should be sent to Berlin as the German Govern-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
27	30.4.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<p>ment was likely to respond negatively to No. 12. The Trade Treaties Negotiations Committee should now make recommendations.</p> <p><i>Germany: trade.</i> There was little point in convening a meeting of the Trade Treaties Negotiations Committee to discuss the exchange problems the Netherlands was experiencing with Germany. Suggestion that consultations be held between the ministry (Beelaerts, Snouck Hurgronje and Nederbragt) and the legation (Van Limburg Stirum and Wolff).</p>
28	2.5.1932 from Van Roijen (Washington)	<p><i>United States: import duties.</i> A statement by the most fervent advocate of import duty on oil had prompted the writer to defend the interests of the West Indies oil industry in a memorandum.</p>
29	3.5.1932 from Pabst (Tokyo)	<p><i>Japan.</i> A talk with Nagai had led the writer to conclude that contact with the military authorities concerned would be detrimental to the interests of the Maatschappij van Havenwerken (see vol. I, No. 335). It would be wise to continue acting through the intermediary of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</p>
30	4.5.1932 to Ruijs de Beerenbrouck	<p><i>Czechoslovakia: abolition of visas.</i> The Czechoslovakian Government would greatly appreciate the abolition of visas for persons travelling between Czechoslovakia and the Netherlands, and was prepared to grant Netherlands nationals work permits without first instituting inquiries. The wishes of the Czechoslovakian Government should be met if at all possible.</p>
31	7.5.1932 Crena de Iongh to Colijn (Amsterdam)	<p><i>Germany: trade.</i> The writer feared that the only way of maintaining a semblance of trade with Germany would be through some form of barter.</p>
32	7.5.1932 Van Voorst tot Voorst to Deckers (Geneva)	<p><i>Belgium and the Netherlands: defence.</i> General Galet had called the willingness to defend Netherlands Limburg in the event of a German attack advantageous for Belgian defence, which was completely divorced from the French system. Galet had also expressed his appreciation of the 'Fortress Holland' principle.</p>
33	8.5.1932 Schaepman to Nederbragt	<p><i>Western Europe: wool duties.</i> The Dutch wool industry had agreed provisionally to lower duties on woollen goods as proposed by their Belgian and French counterparts. The indispensable partnership of the British wool industry in this arrange-</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
34	9.5.1932 from Nederbragt	ment was unlikely. <i>Belgium: Ouchy draft agreement.</i> The writer had drafted an agreement, in consultation with Van Langenhove and Suetens, to be concluded between states prepared to institute the gradual reciprocal reduction of import duties. He proposed bringing up the subject at a meeting of the Oslo states.
35	10.5.1932 from Pabst (Tokyo)	<i>China: sale of aircraft.</i> Fokker's agent Moedlhammer had signed an agreement with Chang-Hsueh-liang annulling two contracts of April 1931 for an indemnity of some 450,000 dollars. The writer had adopted an attitude of reserve towards Van der Hoeven's overtures to the Manchukuo Government and those of Moedlhammer to the Mitsubishi concern.
36	12.5.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trades Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> The committee wished the question of preferential tariffs between the Netherlands and NEI to be examined in detail. A discussion of the desirability of submitting the matter of the German customs quota for butter to the Permanent Court of International Justice elicited sharp criticism of the Government from Posthuma and a proposal from Dubois that currency restrictions be introduced for the payment of German products.
37	12.5.1932 Cramer to De Jonge (Bandung)	<i>NEI: defence.</i> A defence force was required in addition to the fleet if the neutrality of NEI was to be safeguarded. A demoralised constabulary force would, however, be less capable of maintaining law and order in the country.
37A	18.5.1932 De Jonge to De Graaff (Batavia)	<i>NEI: defence.</i> Approval of No. 37 provided expenditure on the defence force did not exceed f. 50.000.000. Agreement in principle with the army reforms on Java proposed by Cramer.
38	14.5.1932 Van Nispen tot Sevenaer to Ruijs de Beerenbrouck (Brussels)	<i>Belgium: treaty amendment.</i> Review of the failure to negotiate amendments to the 1839 treaties. The general impression that the Government had wished to make far too many concessions to Belgium was false. Beelaerts' successor should be able to renew negotiations on the basis of the points of agreement already reached. Fear that the economic recession in Europe would deepen.
39	17.5.1932 Ries to Hirschfeld	<i>Germany: foreign debts.</i> It would be unwise to form national consortia of Germany's creditors, which would soon be regarded as failed enterprises. The writer was more in favour of individual

No.	Date; from/to	Description
40	17.5.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	arrangements between German debtors and their creditors. <i>Trade policy.</i> Report on questions of trade policy relating to France, Romania, Spain (the export of cheese was threatened), Portugal, Chile, South Africa and Germany. Discussion of the forthcoming conference of the Oslo states after Nederbragt had explained No. 34 and the import duties on woollen goods (see No. 33).
41	[20].5.1932 Instructions for delegation to Berlin	<i>Germany: trade.</i> The Government was pressing for special treatment for Dutch exports to Germany, and thus expected flexible application of the German exchange regulations and non-prohibitive import duties on butter and eggs (cf. No. 12). Settlement of the most urgent points was to be preferred to a new trade agreement.
42	20.5.1932 from François (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The conference's technical commissions met day after day without making any notable progress. A Netherlands national was being sought for a new commission on central European affairs, the importance of which was growing.
43	26.5.1932 to Staal	<i>Australia: tea imports.</i> Instructions to make clear to the Australian Government that it was of vital importance to NEI to retain the Australian tea market, and to seek assurance that the Australian Government would not act contrary to Netherlands interests at the forthcoming Ottawa conference.
44	26.5.1932 The delegation to the German -Netherlands talks (Berlin)	<i>Germany: trade.</i> The German delegation had rejected the Netherlands proposal (see No. 12) concerning the regulation of payments between the two countries but had made no counterproposal. It had intimated that the limited release of 'Sperrkonti' and the exchange of goods on small scale would be possible. Van Limburg Stirum had discussed the import of butter and eggs and the forthcoming Lausanne conference with Von Bülow.
45	27.5.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Trade policy.</i> The Trade Treaties Negotiations and Trade Treaties Review Committees should work in cooperation. The abridged minutes of the former committee would henceforth be sent to members of the latter, in accordance with the demand that officials should be able to express their opinions freely.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
46	27.5.1932 Van Roijen to Castle (Washington)	<i>United States: aviation treaty.</i> Beelaerts expected the early conclusion of an aviation treaty now that the negotiators De Veer and Johnson had reached agreement on an alternative to the equal treatment of American and Netherlands aircraft. Enclosure of a draft aviation treaty.
47	4.6.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> Enclosure of a draft trade treaty with Belgium, the tariff lists of which were not very extensive. It was highly desirable that a trade treaty be concluded at an early date in view of the international situation.
48	9.6.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> Relatively lengthy discussion of the pros and cons of a convention on the reduction of import duties (see No. 34) and the draft trade treaty with Belgium (see No. 47).
49	10.6.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Belgium: Ouchy draft agreement.</i> Appreciation of the idea of No. 34, albeit that the Oslo states would not be considered economically homogeneous. Although individual exceptions to most-favoured-nation treatment in the area of tariffs could be desirable, a quota system could only be applied on a national scale.
50	11.6.1932 from Nederbragt (Hamburg)	<i>Oslo cooperation: Ouchy draft agreement.</i> The attitude to No. 34 of the Swedish representative was extremely negative, the Danish rather less so and the Norwegian sympathetic. They urged that a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Oslo states be held. Advice that a delegate to the consultations be appointed.
51	11.6.1932 Résumé of talks between representatives of Oslo states (Hamburg)	<i>Oslo cooperation: Ouchy draft agreement.</i> Andvord had spoken favourably of the draft agreement on the reduction of import duties (No. 34), Clan had considered Britain's attitude to be of fundamental importance and Richert was opposed to the draft which Nederbragt and Suetens wished to recommend to the British Government.
52	13.6.1932 Van Voorst tot Voorst to Röell	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The question whether permanent defence works were potentially offensive was essentially political. The Netherlands delegation in Geneva had to date refrained from adopting a principled attitude, thereby avoiding taking sides with Germany against France.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
53	15.6.1932 De Graaff to De Jonge	<i>NEI: defence.</i> The NEI army should continue to be responsible for defending NEI's neutrality even though the budget had to be reduced to f. 500.000.000.
54	20.6.1932 to H.M. the Queen	<i>Oslo cooperation.</i> Beelaerts had discussed the general economic situation in Geneva with Hymans, Munch, Braadland, Ramel and Bech; a joint anti-protectionist communiqué had been issued at the conclusion of their talks. Denmark and Sweden had approved the Ouchy draft agreement but had not wished to take a decision until after the Ottawa Commonwealth Conference.
55	20.6.1932 Rutgers to Colijn (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The disarmament conference had not yet progressed to the main questions, partly because of cabinet crises in France. The Swedish, Danish and Netherlands representatives would be able to inform Henderson of their concern on the following day.
56	21.6.1932 from Rutgers (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The representatives of the Oslo states had called on Henderson formally to inquire about proceedings during the coming weeks. The writer presumed he would not be required in Geneva until 7 July.
57	22.6.1932 De Graaff to De Jonge	<i>NEI: tea restrictions.</i> The promotion of tea restrictions by the British and Netherlands Governments was premature. The writer merely wished to inform those concerned that the Government's attitude to private negotiations was sympathetic.
58	22.6.1932 Minutes of meeting of Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs	<i>Belgium.</i> Beelaerts gave an explication of the Ouchy agreement which had been signed by Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, but to which the Scandinavian countries did not wish to accede. He expressed his dissatisfaction with the way the disarmament conference was dragging on, and explained why the negotiations with Belgium on the amendments to the 1839 treaties had been suspended.
59	22.6.1932 from Verschuur	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> Query as to the consequences of the Ouchy agreement for the trade treaty to be concluded with Belgium. If the other European states were to recognise the agreement the draft trade treaty would have to be amended; if not, it would probably be advisable to proceed with the present draft.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
60	23.6.1932 to Reymer	<i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Treaty.</i> Reymer's comments requested on the report of a Paris meeting of the Rhine Navigation Commissioners. It was still likely that a proviso would be introduced; there was a tendency to favour the appointment of one commissioner per state; the Netherlands proposal regarding the procedure for decisions by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine had been accepted in principle.
61	24.6.1932 to Reymer	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The idea that civil aviation should be internationalised was not wholly unacceptable, but the delegation in Geneva should not express an opinion on the matter until it was known what had been decided regarding military aircraft.
62	25.6.1932 Hirschfeld to Trip	<i>Trade policy.</i> The possibilities for applying the Emergency Imports Act were approaching their limit. It was proving extremely difficult to use trade policy to promote exports. The Ouchy agreement had little to offer for the immediate future.
63	27.6.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany.</i> Beelaerts had had no contact in Geneva with senior German officials. He was rather concerned about the feelers being put out about private German debts, and hoped that the German Government would pay the first instalment of the war reparations promptly and in full.
64	28.6.1932 from Verschuur	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> The extension of the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty would have to be prepared in close consultation with the Trade Treaties Negotiations Committee. It was desirable that the German tariffs be maintained and extended somewhat, unilateral provisions discarded and provisions relating to credits amended.
65	29.6.1932 to Nederbragt	<i>Belgium.</i> Beelaerts hoped that Nederbragt would reach agreement with the Belgians on the mode of procedure to be followed regarding the Ouchy agreement. Instructions to draft the Bill of ratification and to come to an agreement with the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour on the tariff lists for the draft trade treaty with Belgium.
66	30.6.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> Response to No. 63. There was no cause for alarm about the payment of the first instalment of the war reparations. German bonds seemed bound to decrease in value. The writer feared that the National Socialist left wing would seek

No.	Date; from/to	Description
67	6.7.1932 to Thorbecke	<p>closer relations with the trade unions.</p> <p><i>China: Sino-Japanese conflict.</i> The Chinese chargé d'affaires had been informed that the Netherlands Government did not intend to recognize the new Manchukuo Government, but would not take any steps independently of the League of Nations to oppose recognition.</p>
68	6.7.1932 from François (Geneva)	<p><i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> It was extremely doubtful whether the talks between the eight neutral powers would have any effect while France insisted on its reserve for the battlefield in the event of air attacks. François had attended a luncheon the previous day; the delegation had given two luncheons the previous week.</p>
69	6.7.1932 to De Marees van Swinderen	<p><i>Great Britain: Ouchy agreement.</i> Instructions to make discreet mention in British circles of the Ouchy draft agreement, which was as much an initiative of the Netherlands as of Belgium. It was in any case desirable that the states of the greatest importance to the Netherlands should not oppose its implementation by Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.</p>
70	8.7.1932 Heringa to Nederbragt	<p><i>League of Nations: international production arrangements.</i> Concurrence with the Industrial Council's view that international production arrangements for industrial goods should be initiated by the branches of industry concerned, and that a League of Nations' initiative to this end was not to be welcomed.</p>
71	9.7.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<p><i>Germany: Lausanne conference.</i> The German Government could be satisfied with the results of the Lausanne conference. Dutch creditors could benefit from new credits for Germany, but Germany would probably take even less account than hitherto of the economic interests of other countries.</p>
72	12.7.1932 to Schuurman	<p><i>British Commonwealth: Ottawa conference.</i> Instructions to devote special attention to the export of cotton to India, radio parts and cables to Ceylon and Java tea to Australia and South Africa when reporting on the British Commonwealth Conference in Ottawa. These exports were threatened by the imposition of preferential import duties.</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
73	13.7.1932 to Van Haersma de With	<i>Czechoslovakia: abolition of visas.</i> Instructions to inform the Czechoslovakian Government that the Netherlands Government was willing to come to an arrangement regarding the abolition of visas for the nationals of the two countries. It should take the form of an exchange of Notes, apply to territory in Europe only and include a reservation in respect of undesirable subjects of the reciprocating country.
74	13.7.1932 from Rutgers (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The talks between the eight neutral powers (see No. 68) had gained in significance. The universal outlawing of air attacks, if necessary by amendment, was to be proposed. The writer requested consultation before the forthcoming meeting of the General Commission.
75	14.7.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: state of inland shipping.</i> Consideration would be given to the appointment of a delegate to consult with an international commission, but it was preferable first to await the result of the forthcoming talks between those concerned with the navigation of the Rhine.
76	14.7.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> Announcement that consultations would be held on desiderata for new trade agreements with Germany and Belgium. Discussion of the attitude of other powers to the Ouchy agreement and NEI's possible accession to it. The Government was prepared to meet Portugal's wishes regarding wine trade names but only at the price of a substantial reciprocal concession.
77	15.7.1932 Minutes of 91st meeting of Assistance Council	<i>Trade policy.</i> Discussion of the Council's position after the reorganisation of the economic information service. R. Patijn was of the opinion that the Council should either disband or alter its working methods. The Council resolved to return its mandate, also partly in view of the institution of the Economic Council. No official minutes kept of the discussion of international payments and currency reform.
78	15.7.1932 from De Geer	<i>Belgium: Ouchy agreement.</i> There was nothing in the Ouchy agreement to prohibit the raising or imposition of duties between its signature and its entry into force. No further objection to the Protocol relating to clause 2, and agreement with the provisional inclusion of the 'déclaration annexe'.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
79	18.7.1932 Van Limburg Stirum to Hirschfeld (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> The writer would expect from Ritter the same favourable treatment as that accorded to Italy. He had few illusions about a talk with Von Papen, who could soon be replaced by General Von Schleicher.
80	19.7.1932 to Doude van Troostwijk	<i>Refugee policy.</i> The Government saw no reason for extending the validity of Nansen passports beyond one year. It did not wish to leave the extension or renewal of these passports to the discretion of consular officials and reserved the right to repatriate holders of Nansen passports illegally in the Netherlands.
81	[20].7.1932 Diplomatic Affairs Division and Economic and Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<i>Europe: Franco-British arrangement.</i> The French envoy, followed later by the British representative, had asked the Netherlands to join France and Britain in a somewhat vague, preponderantly political declaration of 13 July 1932 (comprising a certain guarantee for the security of France and a sly dig at the United States). There would seem to be no reason for the Netherlands to enter into this arrangement before Germany.
82	21.7.1932 to De Geer (Pralongnan)	<i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs estimates.</i> Beelaerts had with difficulty pared his estimates as required but urged the restitution of an item of f. 30.000. — for the establishment of a Government Press Service. He hoped it would be possible to spare Belgium and Luxembourg the proposed levy of a surcharge on import duties.
83	26.7.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: exchange problems.</i> Report on the first talk with Von Neurath, who hoped that the question of butter quotas would soon be resolved, viewed the Ouchy agreement in a positive light and stressed the need for short-term trade agreements. The writer had urged as favourable an exchange arrangement with the Netherlands as had been accorded, for example, to Italy.
84	27.7.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum (Pralongnan)	<i>Miscellaneous.</i> Beelaerts found it understandable that the German demand for equality of rights had not been referred to in the disarmament conference resolution. He hoped that the talks on German butter imports would be successfully concluded and that discussion of other economic questions could get under way.
85	28.7.1932 to De Marees van Swinderen	<i>Great Britain: Ouchy agreement.</i> Instructions to inform the British Government, also on behalf of

No.	Date; from/to	Description
85A	28.7.1932 De Marees van Swinderen to Simon (London)	the Luxembourg Government, of the Ouchy agreement and annex. <i>Great Britain: Ouchy agreement.</i> The purpose of the Ouchy agreement concluded between Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands was gradually to remove the barriers to international trade. It was hoped that the British Government would accede to the agreement, and that it would not be opposed to its implementation by the signatories.
86	28.7.1932 to De Graaff	<i>NEI: communication by telegram.</i> Permission for Pabst to send coded telegrams to De Jonge and Thorbecke as he had requested. Enclosure of the necessary documents.
87	28.7.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: political situation.</i> It was astounding how easily the Prussian Government had fallen. Von Neurath's continuation in office uncertain; the appointment of Goering and G. Strasser to ministerial posts expected.
88	2, 3, and 4.8. 1932 Report from Joustra (Berlin)	<i>Germany: butter imports from Denmark and the Netherlands.</i> Ritter had first proposed a system of proportional import quotas and then the introduction of an import monopoly which had been rejected by the Dutch and Danish delegations. The Danes, but not the Dutch, had found a further proposal of the German cabinet to be worth considering. Nederbragt had voiced criticism of the organisation of the talks.
89	3.8.1932 to Russell	<i>Iraq.</i> In view of the agreement between Great Britain and Iraq, the Netherlands Government was prepared to surrender its capitulatory rights in Iraq if all other governments concerned did likewise.
90	4.8.1932 to De Graaff	<i>Australia: frontiers in New Guinea.</i> Beelaerts was inclined to reply in the affirmative to the query whether the Australian Government should be informed that the frontier had been moved as a consequence of the positioning of the 141st meridian on hydrographic maps in accordance with the latest data.
91	4.8.1932 from Reymers	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> Formulation of provisional guidelines for the delegation in Geneva. The Netherlands Government was prepared to cooperate in the internationalisation of civil aviation if this was necessary to achieve a substantial reduction in the air forces and would

No.	Date; from/to	Description
		not adversely affect the development of civil aviation.
92	5.8.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>Germany: trade.</i> After the failure of the talks in Berlin (see No. 88) Ritter had told Nederbragt that a German delegation would shortly go to The Hague to discuss the butter question. He had told the writer that Germany wanted an interest or import concession from the Netherlands. The writer himself now saw less possibility of gaining anything from Germany by means of reprisals.
93	7.8.1932 from Visser (Calcutta)	<i>India: political report.</i> The writer and Freeman-Thomas had discussed at length the Indianisation of the civil service in India, the difficulties attending the implementation of the results of the Round Table Conference in London and the problem of the tens of thousands of political prisoners. Visser perceived strong anti-British feelings amongst Indian leaders, particularly in the cities, and increasing interest in the system of government in NEI on the part of British administrators.
94	9.8.1932 Hirschfeld	<i>Germany: exchange problems.</i> Report on talks with Ritter in Berlin. The writer had urged that an additional exchange quota be allocated to the Netherlands as had been allowed by the German Government in the case of Switzerland, but Ritter had declared that to be impossible in view of the position of the Reichsbank.
95	12.8.1932 Verschuur to Hirschfeld	<i>Germany.</i> In a discussion in Rolduc with Joos on the sad state of German-Dutch relations, the writer had arranged to send him a discussion document which could be used by representatives of the National Catholic Party and the German Centre Party. Request that Hirschfeld draft the document.
96	12.8.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>Germany and Belgium: butter and coal imports.</i> The Dutch negotiators were very much opposed to the German delegation's proposal concerning monopolisation of butter imports, but had agreed to consult the agricultural organisations. After talks with coal mine managers, the writer advised presenting an official protest against the Belgian Government's plan to reduce the coal import quota.
97	15.8.1932 Ries to De Geer	<i>Germany: exchange problems.</i> It could be concluded from a series of talks in Berlin that the Netherlands' position was weak because, though econo-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
98	15.8.1932 Hirschfeld to Van Gelderen	mically of great importance, the country was politically insignificant for Germany. The writer recommended that the causes of the Reichsbank's very real need of guilders be investigated and that consideration be given to the German offer of extra exchange in return for the placing of more orders in Germany. <i>NEI: trade policy.</i> All in all, the writer approved of the report compiled by the working party on NEI quotas for cotton manufactures. He had the impression that the NEI authorities were too apprehensive of countermeasures in other countries.
99	16.8.1932 from Verschuur	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> The Belgian list of tariff reductions was very modest and a reduction of Netherlands import duties further than provided for in the Ouchy agreement was not feasible. Early reception of the definitive Belgian tariff proposals would be appreciated.
100	17.8.1932 from Verschuur	<i>Germany: foreign debts.</i> The private debts amounting to 23 million marks were a heavy burden for Germany, while it was not the amount of the national debt of 24 billion marks which was disquieting but the rate at which it was increasing. It seemed prudent for the major creditors to distinguish between good and bad private debts, partly in view of the danger that the state would reschedule all debts.
101	19.8.1932 from Beuckèr Andreae	<i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Treaty.</i> The introduction of an arbitration procedure that allowed appeal to institutions superior to the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine was not in the interests of the Netherlands. There was no objection to the emergency settlement of disputes regarding plans for bridge construction which were considered to be contrary to treaty obligations.
102	19.8.1932 Minutes of meeting on Germany	<i>Germany: 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty.</i> Chairman Hirschfeld pointed out to representatives of commerce and industry that the Netherlands, which held few winning cards against Germany, was bound to its free trade policy by the most-favoured-nation clause. Van Voorst tot Voorst urged that a firm attitude be adopted towards Germany, but Hirschfeld was not in favour of an aggressive tone.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
103	20.8.1932 Van Walré de Bordes to Nederbragt (Geneva)	<i>Central and Eastern Europe: Stresa conference.</i> The Netherlands Government should send not only a financial expert but also an expert on trade policy to the forthcoming meeting of the Central and Eastern European Committee in Stresa. If Nederbragt himself were to go, he could defend the principles of the Ouchy agreement.
104	21.8.1932 from Colijn (Oosterbeek)	<i>League of Nations: General Assembly.</i> The writer was again available for delegation to the League of Nations Assembly but stated that he would no longer be able, on practical grounds, to act as defender of general and unlimited most-favoured-nation treatment.
105	24.8.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: consulate in Cologne.</i> There was no objection to the promotion of Scheibler from vice-consul to consul-general in Cologne provided he was prepared to meet all the costs of the consulate himself.
106	24.8.1932 Van Limburg Stirum to Hirschfeld (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> Expectation that Von Hindenburg would appoint a presidential cabinet to govern the country. The best person to maintain contact with Walter was Joustra in Berlin rather than Bonthuis in The Hague.
107	25.8.1932 from De Marees van Swinderen (London)	<i>Great Britain: Ottawa conference.</i> There was little enthusiasm in London about such results of the Ottawa Conference as had been made known. Import duties on butter, cheese and eggs from the Netherlands would be raised from 10% to about 15%. The possibility of negotiating with Great Britain on tariff questions had now been reduced to a minimum.
108	26.8.1932 to Verschuur	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> As the members of the commission of experts had already been nominated and Trip proposed by the Bank for International Settlements, Colijn's candidature now had so little prospect of success that official steps at this stage would be of doubtful wisdom.
109	27.8.1932 De Graeff to Van Limburg Stirum (Overveen)	<i>Miscellaneous.</i> The present cabinet was generally regarded as weak and opportunistic; the writer's opinion of the individual ministers. He himself had few responsibilities since his chairmanship of a committee of inquiry concerning envoy Van Ketwich Verschuur and consul-general Steyn Parvé.
110	31.8.1932 from De Marees van Swinderen (London)	<i>Great Britain: air service to Australia.</i> There was little chance that KLM would be accorded airmail carrying rights between Britain and Australia, but

No.	Date; from/to	Description
111	1.9.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	application could nevertheless be made if KLM anticipated substantial material advantage from the arrangement. <i>Trade policy.</i> Nederbragt pointed out that the unstable conditions in Germany would complicate the extension of the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty. A memorandum on the Ottawa conference would be issued shortly (No. 113); the trade agreement with Portugal had been temporarily extended.
112	2.9.1932 Verschuur to Ruijs de Beeren- brouck	<i>Promotion of exports.</i> The idea of the Provincial Executive of North Holland concerning the promotion of exports by reciprocal orders had been dismissed on both policy and practical grounds. On the other hand, an overview of government orders placed abroad could be useful in negotiations. The writer would welcome suggestions.
113	[3].9.1932 Van Essen	<i>British Commonwealth: Ottawa conference.</i> The time had come to enter into negotiations with Great Britain even though the scope would be limited in view of the Ottawa agreements. Resumé of prospects for negotiating with India, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and Ireland.
114	3.9.1932 Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<i>Central and Eastern Europe.</i> The countries of central and eastern Europe should endeavour to consolidate their short-term debts. The Netherlands Government had no objection to a preferential regime between these countries (cf. No. 8) unless this led to economic isolation. Unilateral preferential treatment (for cereals only) would have to be temporary and subject to the most-favoured-nation clause.
115	6.9.1932 De Geer to Verschuur	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> No objection to a tariff reduction of more than 8% for Belgian products provided substantial concessions were made to the Netherlands. Query whether it would not be wiser to postpone negotiations on tariff lists until the fate of the Ouchy agreement had been decided.
116	6.9.1932 Crena de Iongh to Hirschfeld (Amsterdam)	<i>Germany: debt problem.</i> It was understandable that Hirschfeld should wish to propose a general clearing measure only as a last resort. A recent meeting of bankers concerned with the 'Stillhaltung' gave no ground for optimism regarding the approach to the German debt problem. Request

No.	Date; from/to	Description
117	7.9.1932 from Beucker Andreae	for a personal discussion on his return from Berlin. <i>Bolivia: export of munitions.</i> The League of Nations Covenant did not prohibit the export of arms to a belligerent as long as the League of Nations Council had not named an aggressor. A government permit being required for the export of arms under the Firearms Act, it would be advisable in the case of the Bolivian-Paraguayan conflict to refuse such a permit.
117A	[9].9.1932 from François	<i>Bolivia: export of munitions.</i> Concurrence with No. 117, with the addition of a note to the effect that the special circumstances of the conflict would have to be given as the reason for refusing the permit.
118	7.9.1932 Bruins to Snouck Hurgronje (Stresa)	<i>Central and Eastern Europe: Stresa Conference.</i> The cereals exporting countries, which were too dominant at the Conference, demanded fixed quotas in the importing countries in addition to preferential treatment, and a special fund for their agricultural credits. A French counterproposal seemed acceptable to the Netherlands but would be largely detrimental to others (notably Germany). The writer, who referred to No. 114, had no faith in the efficacy of fresh loans.
119	8.9.1932 Beelaerts van Blokland	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> A call from Spitzmüller, who had not contradicted the writer when he remarked that Germany could not remain indefinitely in an inferior position and that François-Poncet was rumoured to be sounding the German Government.
120	8.9.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Von Braun had defended the need to introduce a quota system for the import of agricultural products but was willing to consider the interests of the Netherlands. He had also raised the question of German agriculture's interest problems.
121	13.9.1932 to De Geer	<i>Government Press Service.</i> The immediate institution of a Government Press Service was essential. In view of the impossibility of cutting other items, Beelaerts asked that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' budget for 1933 be increased somewhat.
122	13.9.1932 from De Marees van Swinderen (London)	<i>Great Britain: Ouchy agreement.</i> The British Government's refusal to accede to the agreement could be explained by the agreements recently con-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
		cluded in Ottawa. British industry's attitude and the preferential treatment the members of the British Commonwealth accorded each other explained the British invocation of the most-favoured-nation clause.
123	15.9.1932 from Doude van Troostwijk (Berne)	<i>Switzerland: import duties.</i> The application of the quota system in Switzerland meant that imports from the Netherlands could probably be maintained at the 1931 level; imports of Dutch sugar and coal had even increased. It would be wise to refrain from taking steps for the time being.
124	[17].9.1932 Van Romburgh (Brussels)	<i>Belgium: coal imports.</i> In talks between the Belgian and Netherlands delegations Nederbragt had pointed out the dangers of the Belgian coal quota policy for the Netherlands. Hirschfeld had advocated special licences for the import of Dutch coal, which suggestion Suetens promised to study.
125	17.9.1932 Bruins to Nederbragt (Stresa)	<i>Central and Eastern Europe: Stresa conference.</i> The representatives of Britain, Belgium, Switzerland and the Netherlands would reject the proposal to institute an agricultural fund. The writer was in principle in favour of strengthening the position of the Bank for International Settlements by means of a stabilisation fund. He suggested that he inform the Dutch members of the European Study Commission in Geneva personally.
126	21.9.1932 Minutes of meeting of Council of Ministers	<i>Hedjaz.</i> The extraordinary expenditure of f.1.793. — on Emir Feisal's visit approved.
127	22.9.1932 to De Marees van Swinderen	<i>Great Britain: Ouchy agreement.</i> The British response to the agreement (see No. 122) was disappointing, particularly in view of the 1837 trade and shipping treaty. The Netherlands, Belgian and Luxembourg Governments would continue to uphold the principle of an open, multilateral agreement for the lowering of trade barriers. The subject was to be kept open.
128	22.9.1932 from Beucker Andreae	<i>Bolivia: export of munitions.</i> Enclosure of a draft reply to questions tabled in Parliament by Albarda concerning the refusal of a permit for the export of arms to Bolivia. His motion calling for a ban on the export of arms and munitions to belligerents had been defeated earlier.
128A	23.9.1932 1st Annex to No. 128 from Van Kleffens	<i>Bolivia: export of munitions.</i> The draft reply (see No. 128) would create a dangerous precedent as the Government should not treat Bolivia any diffe-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
128B	[24].9.1932 2nd Annex to No. 128 Beelaerts van Blokland	rently from, say, Japan. Advice that the munitions destined for Bolivia be released. <i>Bolivia: export of munitions.</i> It would be better to grant a permit for the export of munitions to Bolivia after all. The League of Nations Affairs Division was asked to advise on steps that might be taken to effect the international regulation of arms exports to belligerents.
129	[23].9.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>Trade policy.</i> A more active free-trade policy was called for now that the economic depression was endangering the Netherlands. Instruments, which could be employed with prudence, included the use of quotas as a bargaining level, reciprocal sales orders with other countries and action against countries not party to trade agreements with the Netherlands. Discussion of trade policy vis-à-vis Belgium, Britain, the Soviet Union and, in greater detail, Germany.
130	24.9.1932 Bruins (Wassenaar)	<i>Central and Eastern Europe: Stresa conference.</i> The writer had attended all meetings of the financial commission and, together with Nederbragt, some of the agricultural economic commission meetings. The draft convention, in which there were serious lacunae, had been based largely on French, German and Italian proposals. The financial commission, which categorically rejected new credits for Central and Eastern Europe, had not yet made definite proposals concerning a 'stabilisation fund'.
131	27.9.1932 Report of Belgian-Netherlands talks	<i>Belgium: dredging in the Western Scheldt.</i> Discussion of the Belgian request for permission to conduct dredging operations in the Western Scheldt at night and Belgium's payment of a small compensation for the sand thus dredged.
132	27.9.1932 from Nederbragt (Luxembourg)	<i>Germany.</i> Talk with Zech about Germany's quota plans which portended no good for the Netherlands market gardening industry. <i>Belgium.</i> Talks with Suetens on the surcharge of 30% on Netherlands import duties and draft trade agreement with Belgium. Verschuur was reluctant to be the third signatory of the explanatory memorandum accompanying the Ouchy agreement.
133	28.9.1932 from Snouck Hurgronje	<i>Miscellaneous.</i> The Brazilian envoy was to leave and the Spanish envoy had suddenly been dismissed. The writer agreed with Russell that the Prince

No.	Date; from/to	Description
134	30.9.1932 Van Essen	of Wales should prolong his short stay in the Netherlands by a day in order to call on H.M. the Queen at The Loo Palace. <i>Great Britain: preferential import duties in Sierra Leone and Gambia.</i> Arguments in support of the proposition that preferential import duties in Sierra Leone would be contrary to the 1871 Anglo-Netherlands agreement. The door to negotiations on this point should be kept open in view of trade relations with both Britain and British possessions in West Africa.
135	30.9.1932 W. van Rappard to Hirschfeld (Copenhagen)	<i>Denmark: import duties.</i> The import of Netherlands products was being curtailed by the Danish foreign exchange authorities, and only the unrestricted import of Danish meat into the Netherlands could change the situation.
136	1.10.1932 to Nederbragt (Geneva)	<i>Belgium:</i> Enclosure of the text of No. 127 revised by Hymans. <i>League of Nations.</i> The European Study Commission had devoted two days to the Stresa conference (see No. 130).
137	3.10.1932 from Beucker Andreae	<i>Venezuela: arbitration agreement.</i> The Venezuelan draft of an arbitration agreement contained the unacceptable clause that disputes submitted to a court of justice would be excluded from arbitration. Moreover, it was strange that the Spanish President had been accorded a mediating role.
138	3 and 4.10.1932 Report of German- Netherlands talks	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Walter had stated that the introduction of quotas for a large number of products was the only means of supporting German agriculture. Nederbragt did not consider the German proposals to be worth discussing. The Government had laid down three conditions for further negotiations with the German delegation, which was to present the Netherlands' view to its Government.
139	4.10.1932 to Patijn	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> The Government had decided that the German plan to introduce quotas for agricultural products was not to be discussed (see No. 138). Instructions to inform the Italian Government in confidence and to report on its attitude to the German plans.
140	5.10.1932 to Munch (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> Comment on the Danish draft of the first chapter of a disarmament convention. Doubts about the proposed major role of the permanent disarma-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
141	5.10.1932 Beelaerts van Blokland (Geneva)	ment commission, the supplying of matériel to states which were the victim of aggression and of reconnaissance aircraft to the League of Nations, and the proposed procedure for decisions on sanctions. <i>Oslo cooperation.</i> Discussion of possibility of joint consultation between the Oslo states before the international conference in London. Decision that the designated senior officials would meet after the first meeting of the Trip commission (see No. 173). No objection to Finland's accession to the Oslo Convention; Denmark and Sweden used their negotiations with Great Britain as an excuse for not acceding to the Ouchy agreement.
142	8.10.1932 from Thorbecke (Peking)	<i>China: Lunghai railway.</i> Need to remind the Chinese Government of its commitment to complete the construction of the Lunghai railway. Advice that instructions be given for a diplomatic démarche to be taken simultaneously with the Belgian and French missions, though not identical with theirs.
143	10.10.1932 to De Vos van Steenwijk	<i>Germany: treatment of Dutch workers.</i> Instructions that action be taken to bring about a radical improvement in the treatment of Dutch workers still employed in Germany in accordance with the German-Netherlands agreement of 7 October 1930.
144	10.10.1932 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>Economic Council: membership.</i> Of the candidates for the Economic Council proposed by Beelaerts van Blokland only Heldring, Trip, Bruins, Beyen and Van Walree could be considered. Expertise was a prime qualification for membership and the different branches of trade and industry should be represented. Economic information and trade policy committees should be instituted at an early date.
145	11.10.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Negotiations Committee	<i>Germany: trade.</i> Discussion of various measures (tariffs, exchange, quotas, notably for coal, and negotiations on orders) which could be taken against German plans to restrict the import of agricultural products. Nederbragt emphasized that such measures should not be of a retaliatory nature.
146	13.10.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> Hirschfeld and Verschuur explained the Government's wait-and-see attitude to Germany, but the Committee urged that the 1925

No.	Date; from/to	Description
147	15.10.1932 from Donner	Customs and Credit Treaty, which was due to expire soon, be dealt with at an early date. Nederbragt stated that no tariff lists would be attached to the draft trade agreement with Belgium, and he opened a discussion of trade relations with the British Empire after the Ottawa conference.
148	15.10.1932 from Donner	<i>Belgium: deportation of gypsies.</i> It would be extremely difficult to reach agreement with Belgium on the deportation of gypsies. The proposed arrangement was unacceptable because it was based on the gypsies' nationality and prohibited their deportation. Even establishment of the status quo would be difficult, as it would require absolutely reliable execution on the part of the Belgian authorities.
149	19.10.1932 to Pabst	<i>NEI: immigration restriction.</i> The draft immigration regulations, designed primarily to restrict unlimited immigration by the Chinese, would specify a certain annual maximum number of immigrants per country of origin. Although perhaps not in accordance with the 1912 Japanese-Netherlands trade treaty, the draft regulations should be proceeded with. Instructions to telegraph any strong objections.
149	20.10.1932 to Pabst	<i>Japan: arbitration agreement.</i> Matsunaga had stated in mid-September that he hoped the negotiations on an arbitration agreement with Japan in progress since 1925 would be brought to a successful conclusion. Nagaoka had subsequently expressed the same hope in Geneva.
150	20.10.1932 from Donner	<i>Consular service: visas.</i> The fact that many consular officials issued visas to aliens without means of support, such as Romanian street vendors, was to be deplored. The writer asked that an end be put to this undesirable situation by informing all consular officials that this practice would no longer be tolerated.
151	20.10.1932 s'Jacob to Nederbragt (London)	<i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> The Netherlands should not propose talks on tariff questions as Britain was unlikely to reduce its tariffs. The writer saw no point in discussing the question whether the British Government was justified in discriminating between the dominions and other countries in the matter of import duties.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
152	25.10.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Von Neurath opposed the German Cabinet's import quota plans (see No. 138), but the influence exercised by the autarkic-minded German National Socialists on Von Papen boded no good. Von Neurath considered the situation in the Far East to be extremely grave and was pessimistic about Britain's economic future.
152A	[25].10.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Suggestion that Zech be asked to make clear to the German Government, and via the Government to Von Hindenburg, the disastrous effect the German import quota plans (see No. 138) would have on trade relations with the Netherlands.
153	25.10.1932 from De Marees van Swinderen (London)	<i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> Tariff discussions should not be proposed but the results of the consultations awaited. The British Government persisted in adhering to the most-favoured-nation clause for itself and constantly used the argument of its negative balance of trade.
154	29.10.1932 from Verschuur	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> No objection of the final wording of the draft trade agreement, with a secret declaration on the Belgian 'taxe de transmission'. Reciprocal tariff concessions would require further negotiations.
155	31.10.1932 to W. van Rappard	<i>Denmark: import duties.</i> Instructions to negotiate increased imports of plants from the Netherlands in return for an extra Danish meat quota. The imposition of a 30% surcharge was a tax measure from which meat imports could not be exempted and which could not lead to the abolition of the quota system.
156	3.11.1932 Instructions for the Rhine Navigation Commissioners	<i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Treaty.</i> The delegation should give no information to the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine on works in other waterways. It should be adamant on the standpoint that the authority of the Central Commission ended at Krimpen and Gorinchem. Standpoint concerning the reorganisation of the Central Commission as discussed in Geneva in September.
156A	25.10.1932 Draft article 1 of the Rhine Navigation Treaty	<i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Treaty.</i> The Rhine Navigation Treaty was applicable between Basle and Gorinchem (or Krimpen, respectively) and on the lateral canals. In addition, certain articles were applicable on the waterways between Go-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
156B	[3].11.1932 Draft article of the Rhine Navigation Treaty	rinchem (or Krimpen) and Hook of Holland and on those connecting the Rhine with Belgium. <i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Treaty.</i> All disputes regarding the interpretation of the Rhine Navigation Treaty would be submitted to the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine. Disputes not settled within two months of a meeting of the Central Commission would be laid before the League of Nations Communications and Transport Commission and, if necessary, the Permanent Court of International Justice. Provision for an emergency procedure.
157	3.11.1932 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> After a discussion of relations with Germany, Nederbragt warned the Committee that the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty should not be underestimated and that extreme prudence was called for in the application of drastic measures. Crone, Hirschfeld and Posthuma elucidated two projects for an exchange of goods with Germany. Ways of improving trade relations with the British Empire, notably Britain itself, were discussed.
158	4.11.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Trade policy.</i> No. 129 assessed. The continued pursuance of current trade policy was to be preferred to the adoption of an active free-trade policy. The trade agreement with Germany should be abrogated only in the last resort; the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty could be extended unamended. The Government should continue its firm commitment to the Ouchy agreement.
159	5.11.1932 Ries and Meijers to the Interministerial Export Expansion Committee	<i>Export promotion.</i> Now that the Netherlands had lost perhaps half of its normal exports to Germany, the Government would have to seek other outlets without delay. The unsystematic provision of aid to various sectors of agriculture could cease thereafter.
160	7.11.1932 Minutes of meeting of Council of Ministers	<i>Belgium: treaty amendment.</i> Beelaerts was authorised to reopen talks with Maskens on the Ghent-Terneuzen Canal (see No. 164).
161	8.11.1932 to Van Nispen tot Sevenaer	<i>Belgium: import duties.</i> Exporters were greatly disappointed at the Belgian Government's abolition of the proportional quota system for butter, livestock and meat. Steps to be taken.
162	9.11.1932 Trip to Nederbragt (Amsterdam)	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> The writer would report to the Government (see No. 173) that many changes would first be needed if the in-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
163	9.11.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<p>ternational conference in London was to succeed. A major obstacle to success was the attitude of Britain and that of France on economic questions.</p> <p><i>Germany: import duties.</i> Talk with Von Neurath about the need for consultation on the new German import restriction plans, the position of Von Papen and Von Schleicher, and the German demand for equality of rights at the disarmament conference in Geneva.</p>
164	10.11.1932 to Van Nispen tot Sevenaer	<p><i>Belgium: treaty amendment.</i> After due consideration, the Government was prepared to concur with Maskens' suggestion that the Ghent-Terneuzen canal question and the trade treaty be settled at the same time, but required as quid pro quo the settlement of rail freightage to Terneuzen and improvement of the waterways between Liège and the Netherlands. Instructions to elucidate this standpoint if necessary.</p>
164A	9.11.1932 Beelaerts van Blokland	<p><i>Belgium: treaty amendment.</i> Readiness to normalise the canal between Ghent and the sea provided the question of rail freightage to Terneuzen was settled and the waterways between the Netherlands and the Liège basin improved.</p>
165	10.11.1932 Minutes of first meeting of Export Expansion Committee	<p><i>Export promotion.</i> A survey should be conducted of the orders placed abroad by central, provincial and municipal authorities to enable the Government to stipulate conditions for Dutch exports, especially to Germany.</p>
166	11.11.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<p><i>Germany: trade.</i> Warning against part of the programme of the National Institute for the Promotion of Trade between the Netherlands and Germany, which had chosen this unpropitious moment to call for a boycott of German products.</p>
167	12.11.1932 Nederbragt to Andvord	<p><i>Oslo cooperation.</i> Andvord's objections to the choice of Hamburg as meeting-place for the Oslo states shared by the writer who, like Suetens, would prefer Brussels or, if need be, The Hague. Suggestion that the Ouchy agreement be placed on the agenda in view of Sweden's change of attitude.</p>
168	12.11.1932 from Verschuur	<p><i>Economic information.</i> Suggestion that correspondence relating to 'local economic information' be conducted direct between diplomatic and consular officials and the Trade and Industry Division, and that data on trade policy questions be included as far as possible in the direct correspon-</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
169	14.11.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	dence with that Division, preferably as of 1 December 1932. <i>Germany: trade.</i> The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour had declared the programme referred to in No. 166 to be lagging behind the facts. Correspondence with Hirschfeld on this matter was not advisable. A delegation had had business-like, pleasant talks in London on British bacon imports (see No. 176).
170	14.11.1932 to the Economic and Consular Department	<i>Norway: loans.</i> Beelaerts had replied to Bull's complaint that Norwegian shares were no longer quoted on the Amsterdam stock exchange with the statement that the Government would refrain from any form of intervention with the Stock Exchange Association.
171	15.11.1932 to Thorbecke	<i>China: debts.</i> Instructions not to submit a list of claims on the Chinese Government until it was certain that a second conference on the consolidation of China's debts would be held. The right reserved to raise the question of other claims at the conference.
172	15.11.1932 Wolff (Berlin)	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> The German Government was not prepared to extend the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty unamended for protectionist reasons. A limited number of tariff consolidations could perhaps be extended, albeit conditionally. No steps should be taken to initiate talks on its extension.
173	16.11.1932 Trip (Amsterdam)	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> The preparatory committee was on the whole inclined gradually to remove the abnormal trade barriers, including the current monetary insecurity, subsisting since 1929; Britain, on the other hand, did not seem to be in favour of the de facto stabilisation of sterling. The impuls of an American anti-protectionist plan was probably needed to give the international conference in London a chance of succeeding.
174	17.11.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> Elucidation and appreciation of the writer's private correspondence with Hirschfeld (see No. 169). The political situation in Berlin was more confused than ever.
175	17.11.1932 from De Marees van Swinderen (London)	<i>Great Britain.</i> Appreciation of Beelaerts' letter on the bacon negotiations (see No. 176), which had been ably conducted by experts. Negotiations on the freehold of the envoy's house were in progress.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
176	19.11.1932 to Russell	<i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> Cooperation pledged regarding proposed gentleman's agreement on bacon and ham imports even though it would mean a sacrifice for Dutch exporters.
177	19.11.1932 from Heldring (Amsterdam)	<i>Belgium.</i> Consultation requested at an early date concerning a lecture the writer was to hold in Brussels in defence of the Ouchy agreement. <i>Argentina.</i> Suggestion that Minister Roca be invited to the Netherlands after the negotiations on Anglo-Argentine trade relations.
178	21.11.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Economic information.</i> Views on Verschuur's proposal (No. 168). No objections to direct correspondence on local information between consular officials and the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour (provided the legation received a copy), but correspondence between diplomatic officials and the Ministry and the early date suggested were unacceptable.
179	21.11.1932 from W. van Rappard (Copenhagen)	<i>Economic information.</i> Views on Verschuur's proposal (No. 168). The time-saving and centralisation aspects appreciated but objections to a structure which was too bureaucratic. A system preferred whereby all requests for economic information from the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour would be forwarded via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to diplomatic and consular officials, who could reply direct (with a copy to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).
180	21.11.1932 from Doude van Troostwijk (Berne)	<i>Switzerland.</i> Information on the external and internal use of languages by the Swiss Government. Motta was deeply concerned about the disarmament conference. Fewer complaints about the quota system.
181	22.11.1932 Minutes of second meeting of Export Expansion Committee	<i>Export promotion.</i> Although Nederbragt saw no way of making practical use of data obtained from a survey of orders placed abroad (notably in Germany) by central and local authorities, the Committee resolved to conduct such a survey mainly for reasons of trade policy.
182	23.11.1932 from Van Roijen	<i>Economic information.</i> Views on Verschuur's proposal (No. 168). The greater part of national economic information and some local information should continue to be channelled through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs if this ministry wished to be kept abreast of economic contacts abroad. The

No.	Date; from/to	Description
183	24.11.1932 from Verschuur	<p>same applied in respect of legations and consular officials.</p> <p><i>Trade policy.</i> Reply to No. 158. The advantages to trade policy of the application of the quota system should constantly be studied. An enabling act was being drafted as a weapon against countries with which the Netherlands had not concluded agreements (e.g. the Soviet Union). Early negotiations with Germany on the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty and exchange problems were necessary.</p>
184	24.11.1932 from Verschuur	<p><i>Argentina: trade agreement.</i> The importance of an agreement with Argentina, partly in view of the forthcoming Anglo-Argentine negotiations. It should include unconditional and unlimited most-favoured-nation treatment for trade and shipping; tariff negotiations could be conducted later.</p>
185	24.11.1932 Moresco to François	<p><i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The General Commission would probably not meet before 5 December, and the Aviation Commission not at all for the time being. The writer was attending the meetings of the Drafting Commission but was too busy to report on them.</p>
186	24.11.1932 from Teppema (Buenos Aires)	<p><i>Argentina: trade agreement.</i> Talk with Minister Lamas on concessions granted to Chile and subsequently extended to some European countries. Lamas was willing to conclude a trade agreement with the Netherlands but only on the basis of reciprocal preferential treatment.</p>
187	28.11.1932 Hirschfeld to Trip	<p><i>Germany: exchange agreement.</i> The Government intended to conclude an exchange agreement with Germany on the lines of the recent German-Swedish agreement. Query whether the Nederlandsche Bank would be prepared to cooperate.</p>
188	28.11.1932 Minutes of meeting of delegation to disarmament conference	<p><i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> Some members considered the French disarmament plan (Conf. D.146) unpracticable. Vliegen thought it a good plan and Rutgers saw two major drawbacks. Discussion of the progress made in the various commissions of the disarmament conference.</p>
189	29.11.1932 Minutes of meeting of Christian Historic parliamentary party	<p><i>Parliamentary business.</i> Snoeck Henkemans announced a meeting of parliamentary party chairmen to discuss the Foreign Affairs budget and the revision of the Belgian-Dutch treaty of 1839.</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
190	30.11.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Consular service: visas.</i> With reference to No. 150 the consular officials in Germany were to be instructed that Netherlands visas were not to be issued to foreign (especially Chinese, Polish and Romanian) small tradesmen and vendors.
191	30.11.1932 to Moresco	<i>League of Nations: Sino-Japanese conflict.</i> Request to represent the Netherlands at the forthcoming Special Session of the League of Nations Assembly. Need for a more reserved attitude than that taken by Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and Spain, and for the importance of the Lytton Report to be stressed.
192	30.11.1932 Nederbragt to Suetens	<i>Belgium: import duties.</i> Proposal that consultations be held in the near future, in the presence of Hirschfeld, on the efficiency of various quota measures in Belgium and the Netherlands.
193	30.11.1932 from Van Ketwich Verschuur (Istanbul)	<i>Turkey: removal of legation.</i> Greater emphasis on Ankara, where only the Swiss, Danish, Spanish and Dutch legations had no pied-à-terre. Postponement of the removal of the legation from Istanbul to Ankara was more difficult to explain to the Turkish authorities each time a new head of mission was appointed. Hence proposal that the old German embassy at Ankara be purchased.
194	1.12.1932 Minutes of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> Discussion of the prospects of the forthcoming international monetary and economic conference in London; Nederbragt and Crone regarded it as an opportunity to stress the merits of the Ouchy agreement. The meeting was in favour of a German-Netherlands agreement analogous to that recently concluded between Germany and Sweden concerning transfer of payments.
195	2.12.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> Ritter considered it too late for negotiations on the extension of the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty, which the German Government apparently wanted to expire. The German quota plans were not expected to be revived but there was no willingness to institute new tariff consolidations.
196	2 and 3.12.1932 Official report of the Oslo states talks	<i>Oslo cooperation.</i> Discussion of preparations for the London conference (Trip believed the Oslo states could help to bring about the necessary agreement on certain important questions), of existing undesirable trade barriers and of the Oslo states' trade policy (Suetens and Nederbragt had

No.	Date; from/to	Description
196A	3.12.1932 Draft resolution of the Oslo states	<p>urged the merits of the Ouchy agreement). Customs terminology and Finland's accession to the Oslo Convention were also discussed.</p> <p><i>Oslo cooperation: London conference.</i> With a view to the London international conference, the Oslo states had resolved that currency be stabilised as soon as possible, foreign exchange control abolished, import restrictions lifted or at least relaxed through negotiations, non-fiscal import duties raised no further and questions concerning desirable unconditional most-favoured-nation treatment discussed at an early date.</p>
197	3.12.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<p><i>Germany: political situation.</i> Von Schleicher's appointment as Chancellor favourable for the Netherlands (less likelihood of import quotas) and for Germany (less internal turbulence). More radical opposition was expected from the National Socialists though Von Schleicher might be able to placate G. Strasser.</p>
198	5.12.1932 Draft letter from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<p><i>Germany: import duties.</i> Von Braun had suggested that agreement might be reached on the German lard quota. He was prepared to offer compensation for the import duty on eggs but it was doubtful whether the German Cabinet would agree.</p>
199	7.12.1932 from Thorbecke (Peking)	<p><i>China: sugar imports.</i> A clear-cut programme designed to retain the Chinese market for NEI sugar was required. This would entail some reduction in prices, the institution of sales and distribution organisations, more substantial credit facilities and consultation with the Chinese Government on the tariff question as a whole.</p>
200	8.12.1932 to Verschuur	<p><i>Export promotion.</i> Concurrence with instructions that official bodies were not to exert pressure on the private sector so that offers from certain countries were discriminated against. Some Governments (Germany and France) had complained that provincial and municipal authorities were biased in favour of Netherlands tenders.</p>
201	9.12.1932 to De Graaff	<p><i>NEI: economic information.</i> Reply to three suggestions made by Governor-General De Jonge. Training for the consular service took adequate account of NEI interests; the posting of junior consuls in NEI gave rise to financial problems; the whole question of economic information was</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
202	9.12.1932 to Sweerts de Landas Wyborgh	being studied in consultation with the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour. <i>Oslo cooperation.</i> The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and, to a lesser degree, Norway had now taken a firm stand (see No. 196) against the reluctance which Britain was recently manifesting to cooperate with continental states. Sweden's attitude was relatively encouraging, but that of the Dane Waerum downright disappointing. The Scandinavian countries' willingness to negotiate with Britain on an unequal footing was regrettable.
203	9.12.1932 from Doude van Troostwijk (Berne)	<i>Switzerland: Ouchy agreement.</i> Switzerland had no wish to accede to the Ouchy agreement and was virtually certain to oppose its entry into force.
204	13.12.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Relations between ministry and legation.</i> Van Limburg Stirum displayed a highly critical attitude towards the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in general and the Economic and Consular Department in particular. Good mutual relations were necessary, especially in view of the efforts being made by the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour to expand its area of competence.
205	13.12.1932 Hirschfeld	<i>Germany and Britain.</i> Background and substance of the proposed German-Dutch exchange agreement, which appeared promising. Analysis of the consequences of the impending expiry of the 1925 Customs and Credit agreement with Germany. Nothing could be expected from economic negotiations with the British Government.
206	14.12.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> Enclosure of draft trade agreement with Belgium due to be initialled on 23 or 24 December. Beelaerts expected a Belgian reservation in respect of rail freightage and a Belgian letter on the 'taxe de transmission'.
207	15.12.1932 to De Geer	<i>Switzerland: trade relations.</i> Request that De Purry's complaint regarding the consequences of the proposed luxury tax for the Swiss watchmaking industry be given a sympathetic hearing as the Swiss Government had hitherto spared imports of Dutch products.
208	15.12.1932 to Verschuur	<i>Economic information.</i> Although Beelaerts would prefer a system such as had been proposed by W. van Rappard (No. 179), he was prepared to cooperate in an arrangement whereby a senior official of

No.	Date; from/to	Description
209	15.12.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour could request information direct from consular officials and via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from diplomatic officers. Instructions to take steps could only be given by Beelaerts himself. <i>Relations between ministry and legation.</i> Criticism of the Economic and Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was not without foundation (see No. 204). Explanation of a private exchange of letters with Ries. Suggestion that the Ministry draw up a weekly list of matters awaiting settlement.
210	17.12.1932 Hirschfeld to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: exchange agreement.</i> Various points connected with the German-Dutch exchange agreement soon to be concluded. Minister Verschuur reported considerable sympathy in the Parliamentary Committee on Trade Policy for government policy on Germany. The writer nevertheless expected open criticism after the expiry of the 1925 Customs and Credit agreement with Germany on 31 December.
211	[19].12.1932 from Schaepman	<i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Treaty.</i> During the preliminary talks at Strasbourg on 7-10 November 1932 Kröller had defended the Netherlands standpoint concerning the territorial purview of the Rhine Navigation Act and the reorganisation of the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine (see No. 156). The delegation had then expressed itself in similar terms with regard to the 1868 Mannheim Treaty.
211A	26.12.1932 from Van Kleffens	<i>Amendment to the Rhine Navigation Act.</i> The Belgian Government was likely to continue its efforts to establish a shorter route between the Scheldt and the Rhine than via the existing waterways. Belgium would have to accept the Netherlands standpoint (see No. 156); Baldwin's offer to act as intermediary was unacceptable.
212	19.12.1932 to Deckers	<i>Belgium: dredging in the Western Scheldt.</i> The 1839 and 1842 treaties accorded Belgian officials the right to carry out soundings in the Western Scheldt without prior permission from the Netherlands Government. This information could be passed on to the Belgian Permanent Commissioners.
213	19.12.1932 from Verschuur	<i>Great Britain: 1824 and 1871 treaties.</i> The British Government could be required to observe the 1824

No.	Date; from/to	Description
214	20.12.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	treaty in levying preferential import duties in India and Malaya. Suggestion that consultations be held with the British Government on the reciprocal relinquishment of commercial rights deriving from the obsolete treaties of 1824 and 1871. <i>Germany: coal imports.</i> Beelaerts was still of the opinion that 'Ausgleichsteuer' was levied unfairly on coal imported from the Netherlands but did not consider it advisable that the question be submitted to arbitration. This was to be mentioned en passant at the German Foreign Ministry.
215	20.12.1932 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> Instructions to ascertain whether the German Government wished to conclude a new trade agreement with the Netherlands, in anticipation of which the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty could be extended by six months, preferably but not necessarily without the provisions relating to the extension of credit.
216	21.12.1932 from Moresco (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: Sino-Japanese conflict.</i> Report on two preliminary talks between representatives of eight neutral states and on the special session of the League of Nations Assembly held to discuss the Sino-Japanese conflict in Manchuria, at which the writer had not put forward his own draft resolution but had confined himself to a short statement.
217	22.12.1932 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> Ritter had declared that it was impossible for the German Government to extend the 1925 Customs and Credit Treaty (see No. 215). He was prepared to enter into negotiations on a new trade agreement but foresaw difficulties regarding imports of important agricultural products.
218	24.12.1932 from De Graaff	Great Britain: 1824 and 1871 treaties. Recommendation that it be ascertained whether the Netherlands could be released from the obligations deriving from the treaties of 1824 and 1871 to which the British Government attached little importance. It would be wise to determine what disadvantages could be expected from preferential import duties in British territory before raising the question of reviewing the treaties.
219	30.12.1932 from Beucker Andreae	<i>China: court at Shanghai.</i> The extension of the arrangement of 17 February 1930 concerning the court at Shanghai was favourable to the Nether-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
220	31.12.1932 from Patijn (Rome)	lands. The declaration made by the Netherlands could thus also be deemed to be extended. <i>Italy: Netherlands Historical Institute.</i> Hoogewerff had suggested that the Netherlands Historical Institute be opened by a minister, as the Romanian institute had been. The writer passed on the suggestion that he personally was more in favour of a simpler opening ceremony.
221	2.1.1933 De Kat Angelino (Batavia)	<i>China: Sino-Japanese conflict.</i> The time was ripe for a plan for the reconstruction of China, to which political power in Manchuria should gradually be transferred. The development of the infrastructure was an essential part of such reconstruction which merited the support of the League of Nations.
222	5.1.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Von Neurath had agreed that cheese import quotas would be unfair to the Netherlands and that negotiations should be properly prepared in advance with experts in the legation. He had not been in favour of long-term trade agreements.
223	5.1.1933 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> In Nederbragt's opinion cooperation with Belgium had been the redeeming feature of 1932. Britain's considerable influence on the Scandinavian countries had been evident at the Oslo states conference (see No. 196). Molenaar and Dubois urged that a firm attitude be adopted towards Germany.
224	6.1.1933 to Lorentz	<i>South Africa: trade treaty.</i> Proposal that trade relations with South Africa be regulated provisionally by means of an exchange of Notes supplemented, if possible, by letters relating to the import of cows, cheese and condensed milk. The exchange of Notes should be valid for a year, in anticipation of agreement being reached on a definitive trade and shipping treaty.
225	6.1.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> A talk between Louwes, Joustra and Von Braun seemed to have brought a solution closer, provided the Netherlands Government were to offer to introduce quotas for the export of cheese, vegetables, bacon and eggs. Wolff and Joustra would discuss the matter with Ritter (see No. 233).
226	9.1.1933 from De Graaff	<i>NEI: Trade Treaties Committee.</i> The writer urged that the colonial element in the Trade Treaties Re-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
227	12.1.1933 from Verschuur	view Committee be strengthened so that the interests of the overseas territories might be promoted concurrently and on a more or less equal footing with those of the Netherlands. Suggestion that four new members be appointed to the Committee (preferably Kalff, Ligthart, Staal and Schabeek). <i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> The restriction of coal imports from Germany could be postponed for the time being in anticipation of negotiations on a new trade agreement, the main object of which should be to avert disaster for Dutch exports, and of agricultural exports in particular.
228	13.1.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Economic information.</i> The arrangement proposed by Beelaerts (No. 208) was unacceptable because it permitted direct correspondence between the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour and representatives abroad only in certain cases, thus making it impossible for the ministry to furnish information to industry with the necessary promptitude. The writer adhered to his original proposal (No. 168).
229	17.1.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: border incidents.</i> Concurrence with the informal practice of customs officers being permitted to enter foreign territory temporarily in order to obtain information from their opposite numbers, but acts by German customs officers which were accompanied by violence or coercion or were illegal, were not to be tolerated.
230	18.1.1933 to Donner	<i>Naturalisation.</i> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was in no way obliged to lend assistance in the legalisation of foreign documents as long as the Government had not reached a decision with regard to the desirability of naturalising aliens.
231	19.1.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Belgium: Ouchy Convention.</i> The British Government's suggestion that the Convention be discussed at the London international conference (see No. 122) created the impression that Britain wished to shelve the matter indefinitely. Information required on the standpoint of other governments which had responded and the attitude of the Belgian and Luxembourg Governments to their response.
232	23.1.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: military information.</i> The writer and the legation staff lacked the technical knowledge to report unaided on German military matters. He suggested that a retired NEI officer be appointed

No.	Date; from/to	Description
233	24.1.1933 Wolff and Joustra (Berlin)	military attaché in Berlin. <i>Germany: import duties.</i> Ritter considered a special arrangement possible for the import of bacon, but not of cheese, eggs and vegetables. Discussion of the separate tariff items had created the impression that the Netherlands would be able to obtain few tariff consolidations. It would probably be extremely difficult to arrive at an acceptable formula for trade between the two countries.
234	27.1.1933 from Pabst (Tokyo)	<i>Japan: foreign policy.</i> Japan claimed that it worked for peace in the Far East but demanded a free hand in the process, as in Manchuria. The other powers in the Far East would do well to build up their defence against Japanese imperialism.
235	28.1.1933 to Verschuur	<i>Economic information.</i> Believing that little was to be gained from further consultation (on No. 228), Beelaerts had instructed the Economic Affairs Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the diplomatic and consular missions that copies of all letters connected with economic information were henceforth to be sent to the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour.
236	28.1.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany.</i> The meeting of the general committee of the disarmament conference was expected to be postponed on account of the cabinet crises in France and Germany. The delegation to the economic talks in Berlin would have to be headed by Van Limburg Stirum.
237	30.1.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Hirschfeld (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Concurrence with the participation of interested private parties in negotiations with the German Government, which should preferably take place in The Hague. The writer foresaw greater difficulties with the new ministers Hitler and Hugenberg than had been encountered with the Von Schleicher government.
238	31.1.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: Ouchy Convention.</i> The accession of France and Germany was to be welcomed, but not that of Germany alone. This should be made plain in unofficial talks.
239	31.1.1933 from Trip (Amsterdam)	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> The Trip Committee (see No. 173) had at its second meeting drawn up an agenda for the London international conference which had still to be discussed by the United States, Britain, France and Italy: 1. Monetary and credit policy; 2. prices; 3. flow of capital;

No.	Date; from/to	Description
240	31.1.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	4. trade barriers (Oslo states consultations prior to conference of particular importance); 5. organisation of production and trade (including cereals and sugar). <i>Germany: import duties.</i> The writer had pressed Von Bülow for an early start of economic negotiations and for a meeting between Hugenberg and Louwes. The reasons for the delay, in Von Bülow's opinion, related solely to membership of the delegations.
241	31.1.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: political situation.</i> Hitler's chancellorship was attributable to Von Papen and undermined Von Hindenburg's authority. Hugenberg's economic dictatorship constituted a grave danger, though Von Neurath and Von Schwerin Krosigk could perhaps provide some counterweight.
242	1.2.1933 from Reymer	<i>United States: aviation treaty.</i> Although the American Government no longer insisted that the aviation agreement of 16 November 1932 (see No. 46) be implemented before ratification, steps should be taken to open the way to the admission of American aircraft to the Netherlands. An arrangement in the spirit of the aviation agreement would be greatly appreciated.
243	2.2.1933 Ruijs de Beerenbrouck to Albarda	<i>Prince Hendrik: Germany.</i> Absolute incorrectness of the rumours that Prince Hendrik has done services to the ex-emperor of Germany. In the rare cases that the prince visits him at Doorn, their conversation only takes place in company with others.
244	2.2.1933 Hirschfeld to Nederbragt	<i>Switzerland: import duties.</i> The writer had informed De Pury that the import restrictions imposed on radios by the Swiss Government had made an extremely unfavourable impression, and had urged that these restrictions, which were in sharp contrast to the Netherlands' restrictions on cotton goods, be lifted.
245	3.2.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> According to Ritter, Hugenberg had been persuaded by other ministers to open negotiations with a Netherlands delegation before 15 February; Ritter appreciated the importance of the forthcoming talks between Hugenberg and Louwes.
246	4.2.1933 from Van Nispen tot Sevenaer (Brussels)	<i>Belgium: customs union with the Netherlands.</i> The Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in Belgium and its Belgian counterpart had instituted a

No.	Date; from/to	Description
247	6.2.1933 from Snouck Hurgronje	joint committee to study the lowering of customs tariffs and the abolition of obstacles to trade between the Netherlands and Belgium. <i>Germany: import duties.</i> Van Limburg Stirum should remain in Berlin during the economic negotiations. The composition of the Netherlands delegation discussed with Hirschfeld; it should, on practical grounds and for considerations of prestige, include Nederbragt.
248	10.2.1933 from De Geer	<i>Belgium: trade treaty.</i> There were no objections to the draft declaration relating to the 'taxe de transmission', which only laid down the obligation of consultation with the Belgian Government. The declaration regarding the imposition of turnover tax on goods imported from Luxemburg should be worded in the same terms as that relating to imports from Belgium.
249	10.2.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Von Neurath had stated that the German Cabinet wished to regularise relations with the Netherlands immediately after the elections in March. The writer had pointed out the need for an early decision on imports of bacon and cheese (see Annex). Opinions varied with regard to Hugenberg's policy; several dubious measures taken by National Socialist ministers.
249A	10.2.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Von Neurath (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> The newly announced higher import duties would cause consternation in the Netherlands and could well lead to counter-measures. Von Neurath urged to help avert this threat to German-Dutch trade relations.
250	11.2.1933 from Deckers	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The French proposals (Conf. D. 146) designed to effect a reduction in present armaments levels merited Netherlands support, even though they would entail more detailed arrangements for sanction measures (unfortunately only applicable in Europe).
251	14.2.1933 Van der Waals to Nederbragt	<i>Great Britain: 1824 and 1871 treaties.</i> Response to a letter from s' Jacob. The writer did not doubt that the 1824 Sumatra treaty was receiving the close consideration of the British Government. It would not be tactical to submit the question of the 1871 Gold Coast treaty to the Permanent Court of International Justice; it would be wiser for the present merely to enquire about the functioning of a number of preferential import duties in British territories.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
252	14.2.1933 from Vliegen (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: delegation to the disarmament conference.</i> The writer felt compelled to resign his membership of the delegation to the disarmament conference because of the way in which the mutiny on the 'Zeven Provinciën' had been quelled; the aerial bombardment of the ship was contrary to the main proposal which he had defended in the air force commission.
253	15.2.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> The negotiations in Berlin on German import duties on butter, cheese and eggs had failed because of Hugenberg's incompetence and Von Rohr's intransigent attitude. The writer had declined to continue the discussions and now gave preference to official negotiations between delegations.
254	16.2.1933 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Discussions had been held in Berlin from 9 February between German and Dutch officials and representatives of agricultural interests on German imports of agricultural products. There had still been a wide divergence of opinion at the decisive meeting of 15 February. Now that the German Government wished to impose severe restrictions on agricultural imports, Dutch consternation at this measure should be made public as soon as possible.
255	17.2.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Both Kreuter and Von Neurath regretted the discontinuation of the German-Netherlands talks (see No. 253), partly because of Hugenberg's ineptitude. Von Neurath supported the writer's suggestion that Kreuter be sent to The Hague for further consultation.
256	18.2.1933 to Verschuur	<i>Sweden: import duties.</i> The Government had made known its objections to higher import duties on six items through Adlercreutz. The Swedish Government's attention should not be officially drawn to the fact that it had not observed the term specified in the 1930 Oslo Convention.
257	19.2.1933 De Jonge to De Graaff (Batavia)	<i>NEI: defence.</i> Koster had drawn attention to the time it would take to send an extra detachment to defend Balikpapan and Tarakan in the event of a Japanese attack. De Graaff's opinion on the expedience of such a measure asked.
258	19.2.1933 from Van Roijen (Washington)	<i>United States.</i> Expression of thanks for the replacement of Van Roijen junior by Van der Wijck, who was needed to maintain the legation strength

No.	Date; from/to	Description
259	20.2.1933 Trip to Hirschfeld (Amsterdam)	in Washington. It was hoped that President Roosevelt would stimulate a return to prosperity. <i>Germany and Britain.</i> Pending the outcome of the elections in Germany and of the international conference in London, it might be worthwhile to look at ways of expanding the trade between Britain and the Netherlands. The writer warned against shipping subsidies to compensate for the necessary wage reductions.
260	21.2.1933 to De Graaff	<i>Japan: political situation.</i> Pabst had reported that moderate elements had succeeded in preventing the Japanese Government from withdrawing from the League of Nations. The Japanese fleet and army were however prepared for an attack on NEI oil ports.
261	22.2.1933 Snouck Hurgronje to Six	<i>NEI: defence.</i> Beelaerts did not believe that the League of Nations would apply sanctions against Japan, or that Japan would attack NEI oil ports. However, he considered it wrong to delay sending troops until such time as a conflict might begin.
262	24.2.1933 Van Nispen tot Sevenaer to Ruijs de Beerenbrouck (Brussels)	<i>Miscellaneous.</i> The international activities of socialists and communists in Belgium were not expected to create serious difficulty. Bongaerts should not be reappointed minister after his recent election speech on relations between the Netherlands and Belgium; the Catholic party should be warned against such views.
263	[25].2.1933 Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> The delegation should first endeavour to come to an arrangement regarding the export of products which were seriously threatened by German measures, thereby promoting the conclusion of a new trade agreement with Germany. The delegation was not authorised to offer any quid pro quos, and should only be prepared to consider proposals of this kind if they offered positive advantages. It could stress the significance for German industry of orders placed by Netherlands government bodies.
264	28.2.1933 to W. van Rappard	<i>Oslo cooperation.</i> Considering the divergent interests involved, there was no need to urge an earlier meeting of the Oslo states in Stockholm with a view to discussing Germany. Should the occasion arise, Van Rappard could suggest that such a meeting would be desirable in the not too distant future for other reasons.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
265	28.2.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Hirschfeld (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> In view of the influence wielded by Von Rohr, there was little point in resuming the negotiations on German imports of Dutch agricultural products. The Reichstag fire was a welcome pretext for Hitler and Goering to attack the communists.
266	1.3.1933 Minutes of meeting of SDAP parliamentary party	<i>Preparations for mobilisation.</i> Albarda raised the question of mobilisation should the situation in Germany or with regard to international affairs deteriorate. Vliegen expressed concern about German Social Democrats; Duys and Schaper urged that the party press adopt a more moderate tone; Van den Tempel called for firm party leadership.
267	2.3.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Hugenberg had expressed willingness to enter into negotiations with a Netherlands delegation as from 9 March. Kreuter had hoped to conclude a trade treaty for two years, but Hugenberg was opposed to a long-term commitment.
268	2.3.1933 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> Kortenhorst criticised the recent raising of import duties by the Swedish Government (see No. 256) and expressed doubts as to the value of the 1930 Oslo Convention. Dubois recommended that economic pressure be exerted on the German Government. The meeting concluded with a short discussion of the participation of interested parties in negotiations abroad.
269	4.3.1933 Draft letter from Lamping	<i>Oslo cooperation.</i> All the Oslo states were concerned to retain their German market, but at the same time Denmark was a particularly dangerous competitor on that market, for which reason there was nothing to be gained from cooperating more closely with the Oslo states as W. van Rappard urged.
270	6.3.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Economic information.</i> Strong objections to the unilateral arrangements made by Beelaerts (see No. 235). The writer would prefer a system whereby the Ministry of Economic Affairs could request information direct from consular and diplomatic officials, and that ministry and Foreign Affairs would exchange copies of correspondence.
271	6.3.1933 from Van Buttingha Wichers (Tehran)	<i>Persia.</i> Somewhat pessimistic view of Netherlands chances of supplying Persian sugar factories and railways. A mechanical engineer was needed on the spot if orders were to be booked in Persia.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
272	7.3.1933 De Jonge to De Graaff (Batavia)	<i>NEI: sugar and defence.</i> The sale of sugar had been well regulated, though the appointment of a representative of a Chinese firm to the executive committee had met with some opposition in NEI. The protection of the oil ports was quietly going ahead. It was necessary to economise further on defence but not at the cost of the equipment of the armed forces.
273	8.3.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Canada: consular service.</i> There was much to be said for transferring the consulate-general from Montreal to Ottawa, the seat of the Canadian Government.
274	8.3.1933 Posthuma to Verschuur	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Now that the German Government had suddenly imposed much higher import duties on cheese and eggs, the writer saw no point in the departure of a delegation for Berlin unless the German Government should meanwhile express its willingness to lower these duties.
275	9.3.1933 to Gerth van Wijk	<i>Morocco: import duties.</i> Instructions to join other diplomatic representatives who had protested against the imposition of a 'taxe de compensation' in Morocco, which was contrary to the 1906 Act of Algeciras, and to ascertain whether the rumour of a general increase in Moroccan import duties was correct.
276	10.3.1933 to Pabst	<i>Japan: arbitration agreement.</i> Matsuoka had spoken to journalists about New Guinea and the Borneo oil fields on 6 March. During a luncheon on 7 March he had suggested to Beelaerts that Japan might give a formal assurance of its peaceful intentions, whereupon Beelaerts had drawn his attention to the Japanese declaration of 5 February 1922 (Series A, vol. 3, No. 161A).
277	10.3.1933 to W. van Rappard	<i>Denmark: import duties.</i> Verschuur considered the Danish Government's offer of extra import licenses for Dutch goods to the value of 110,000 kroner insufficient to justify an extra import licence for 250 tons of Danish meat. Instructions to obtain a more favourable quid pro quo through negotiations proceeding from the 1931 import-export ratio.
278	11.3.1933 Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> The delegation, headed by Hirschfeld, was authorised to conduct negotiations on the export of agricultural products to Germany on the lines indicated in No. 263. Special ar-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
279	13.3.1933 De Graaff to De Jonge	rangements could be made for eggs, cheese and bacon. <i>NEI: defence.</i> Query whether the permanent naval protection of Balikpapan and Tarakan would be necessary once the proposed security measures had been completed. Request that the detachment of the 'Banckert' be reconsidered in view of the improvement in the international situation and the need to economise.
280	13.3.1933 Ries to De Geer	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Indignation that the German Government, not knowing what it wanted, had cancelled the discussions with a Netherlands delegation at the last moment. Kreuter had stated that the cancellation was due to disagreement between Hugenberg as spokesman for the agrarian sector and Hitler as spokesman for the workers. The writer suggested that negotiations now be conducted in The Hague.
281	13.3.1933 Moresco (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> At a meeting of the representatives of eight small states Benes had expounded the plan for a limited disarmament agreement. De Madariaga had opposed it; the writer had advocated awaiting further developments. The discussion of the Sino-Japanese conflict had proved fruitless.
282	14.3.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Beelaerts had not backed Verschuur's suggestion that Van Limburg Stirum be recalled from leave for the discussions, which had been postponed owing to disaccord in the German Cabinet (see No. 280). Suggestion that Van Limburg Stirum be ready to return to Berlin if the discussions were resumed.
283	15.3.1933 from Adriaanse (Sana's)	<i>Yemen: treaty of friendship.</i> The Treaty of friendship with Yemen had been signed on 12 March after agreement had been reached on the Dutch draft (see vol. 1, Nos. 157 and 338) with the exception of one linguistic point.
284	16.3.1933 Verschuur to De Geer	<i>Trade policy.</i> Concern that its system of unlimited most-favoured-nation treatment in fact rendered the Netherlands powerless against other states' actual (Soviet Union) or potential (Germany and France) unfair measures, which made the possibility of retortion desirable. Suggestion that steps be taken to establish a statutory basis, and enclosure of a draft Bill enabling the Government to proceed

No.	Date; from/to	Description
285	16.3.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Valescure)	to import retaliation. <i>Germany: import duties.</i> Reply to No. 282. The writer had made thorough preparations for the discussions on agricultural imports (see No. 254), and had given the German Government sufficient warning with No. 249A; there was nothing he could do in the face of Hugenberg's refusal to offer more acceptable terms. He would return to Berlin on 26 March.
286	16.3.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Hirschfeld (St. Raphael)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> The writer had also been annoyed by Germany's sudden raising of the import duty on eggs (see No. 274), but unfortunately saw little chance of persuading the Hitler government of the value of sound economic concepts and therefore anticipated a losing game in the next few years.
287	17.3.1933 Nederbragt to Andvord	<i>Oslo cooperation: Ouchy Convention.</i> The writer had reached agreement with Suetens and Braun on the <i>modus procedendi</i> . Partly in view of Mowinkel's reappointment as Minister for Foreign Affairs, he now suggested that consultations be held on the subject at an early date.
288	17.3.1933 Van Haersma de With to Snouck Hurgronje (Prague)	<i>Czechoslovakia: Philips Gloeilampenfabriek NV.</i> Beelaerts had to make clear to Plesinger-Bozinov that the failure to fulfil the undertaking to repay a fine to the Philips company (see vol. 1, No. 197) made a most unfavourable impression in the Netherlands.
289	18.3.1933 Nederbragt to s' Jacob	<i>Great Britain: Ouchy Convention.</i> The most-favoured-nation clause in the 1837 treaty with Britain was of a provisional nature for goods. The Netherlands could therefore implement the Ouchy Convention without prejudice and could demand for itself the preferential treatment Britain accorded the dominions in return for certain advantages.
290	18.3.1933 from De Graaff	<i>NEI: tea restrictions.</i> The Government approved of the recent agreement between British and Dutch tea producers on the restriction of production and exports and would endeavour to put the relevant statutory regulations into effect as from April 1933. The British Government was to be informed accordingly.
291	18.3.1933 De Jong van Beek en Donk to François (Geneva)	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> Surprise that Moresco denied having supported Benes' proposed emergency convention; the Danish

No.	Date; from/to	Description
292	20.3.1933 from Patijn	and Swiss representatives were equally astonished. The writer criticised the recent negative attitude of the Netherlands delegation. <i>Italy: Netherlands Historical Institute.</i> De Ligne had mentioned the importance to Italian-Belgian relations of the opportunity for prominent Belgians to meet Mussolini. With this in mind Patijn now recommended that Van Karnebeek perform the opening ceremony of the Netherlands Historical Institute (cf. No. 220).
293	20.3.1933 s' Jacob to Nederbragt (London)	<i>Great Britain: Ouchy Convention.</i> Reply to No. 289. No state had as yet protested against the anomaly that the British Government levied higher import duties on goods from other countries than on those from the dominions. The British Government could not accede to the Convention on practical grounds, and did not intend to accept its implementation.
294	21.3.1933 to Rutgers	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The delegation was instructed to support the main points of the British draft (Conf.D. 157). However, the Government was of the opinion that the figures for both the average daily manning levels and the number of aircraft were too low.
295	22.3.1933 to Teppema	<i>Uruguay: trade treaty.</i> Beelaerts was prepared to accept the stipulation of most-favoured-nation treatment in a new trade treaty with Uruguay, preferably in the form of an exchange of Notes. He would appreciate the inclusion of provisions relating to the equal treatment of shipping and to an exception to most-favoured-nation status in connection with the Ouchy Convention.
296	23.3.1933 Nederbragt to Pelt	<i>League of Nations: Economic Committee.</i> The writer was interested in the preparations for the London international conference, one of the items on the agenda of the Economic Committee. Pelt asked to approach the League of Nations Secretariat for an invitation.
297	23.3.1933 Posthuma to Bonthuis and others	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Invitation to attend a meeting with the writer, Steenberghe and Valstar on 30 March on how the Netherlands Government could convince the German Government that its measures, which were catastrophic for the export of agricultural products, were unacceptable to the Netherlands.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
298	23.3.1933 from Scheltus (Oslo)	<i>Norway: Oslo cooperation.</i> Mowinckel, who wished to put the Norwegian legation in The Hague on a permanent footing, deplored the fact that the 1930 Oslo Convention had not yielded the anticipated results, but hoped that the Oslo states would be able to act jointly in London (see No. 196A). Mowinckel had little faith in the Ouchy Convention because of Britain's attitude, and saw no chance of Norway returning to the gold standard.
299	24.3.1933 from Verschuur	<i>United States: trade treaty.</i> A proposal to be made to the American Government that the negotiations on a trade and shipping agreement, which had been broken off in 1925, be resumed. The agreement should in any case include unconditional most-favoured-nation treatment for the Netherlands.
300	[25].3.1933 to Zimmerman	<i>Austria: League of Nations loan.</i> It was highly desirable that a loan be made to Austria in accordance with the protocol of 15 July 1932. The Austrian Government should be enabled to transfer the sums still outstanding without endangering the exchange rate of the schilling.
301	28.3.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: state of inland shipping.</i> Instructions to propose to the German Government that the unofficial talks on inland shipping (see No. 75) be continued as official discussions between representatives of the two governments. The Government would not relinquish the rights embodied in the 1868 Mannheim Treaty and the 1851 trade treaty with Germany.
302	28.3.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Straight talk with Ritter, who had tried to arouse sympathy for Hugenberg's difficult position. Ritter had stated that Hugenberg himself wished to lead the negotiations on the import of bacon, cheese and eggs.
303	28.3.1933 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Negotiations Committee	<i>Trade policy.</i> Discussion of the desirability of changing the Netherlands trade policy (from most-favoured-nation system to reciprocity) in view of the French Government's plans to monopolise the allocation of quotas. It was resolved to recommend to the Government that the Committee be commissioned to study the question.
304	30.3.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: state of inland shipping.</i> Seeliger had responded positively to the proposal contained in No. 301. Von Bülow's opinion of Hitler's general

No.	Date; from/to	Description
305	31.3.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	approach to foreign policy was favourable. <i>Germany: political situation.</i> The conflict between the fanatical National Socialists and the more moderate Hitler was far more serious than the anti-Jewish boycott announced for 1 April. The German Government was not pessimistic about the international political situation.
306	3.4.1933 from Deckers	<i>League of Nations: disarmament conference.</i> The British proposals (Conf.D. 157) were on the whole acceptable, but the number of aircraft (50 instead of 150) and men (25.000 instead of 40.000) allowed to the Netherlands was much too low. The maximum tonnage of old warships and submarines should be fixed.
307	3.4.1933 Hirschfeld	<i>Germany: import duties.</i> Report of economic negotiations with a German delegation in Berlin, which had begun well. Instructions were required for discussions on 6 April, notably regarding the possibility of lowering the interest on the credit granted to Germany.
308	4.4.1933 to De Graaff	<i>NEI: communist propaganda.</i> Three agents of the Russian secret police were reported to be on their way from Prague to Amsterdam to head the Holland colonial section; one agent was coming from Berlin as head of the propaganda department.
309	[5].4.1933 The Government	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> The delegation, headed by Van Limburg Stirum, was authorised to conduct negotiations on a new trade agreement with Germany which would safeguard the export of agricultural products, and to agree to a lowering of the interest on the credit granted to Germany of at most 1%.
310	5.4.1933 to Verschuur	<i>State of inland shipping.</i> Beelaerts had not been officially informed of the Bill concerning the proportional allocation of freight for inland shipping. He declined all responsibility for the Bill, which he considered to be contrary to the principle of free navigation of the Rhine.
311	5.4.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> Arrant nonsense talked by Prince Wilhelm of Prussia at a dinner. Concern felt for the clergy who attached greater importance to the Cross than the swastika. Sharp increase in the number of assaults and murders committed by National Socialists. Indignation at the fact that Jewesses had been forced to give up charitable work.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
312	6.4.1933 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy: Great Britain.</i> Discussion of Verschuur's view that the Government should resign itself to accepting the British standpoint that the 1837 treaty provided for unconditional most-favoured-nation treatment (cf. No. 265). The Committee agreed unanimously with this view.
313	7.4.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> Further to No. 309. Interest lower than 4 ½% on the credit granted Germany was unacceptable, as was an extension of its term.
314	7.4.1933 Nederbragt to Hirschfeld	<i>Trade policy: Germany.</i> Suggestion that consultations be held with the Department of Public Works to ascertain whether the Netherlands Railways could attach special conditions to orders placed in Germany, with which country a cautious economic policy should be pursued.
314A	29.3.1933 Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<i>Trade policy: Germany.</i> The German legation had been informed that the Netherlands Railways acted relatively autonomously, but would generally attach no special conditions to orders placed in Germany.
315	8.4.1933 to Verschuur	<i>Economic information.</i> Some of the main suggestions of No. 270 could be adopted by way of a concession.
316	8.4.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Hirschfeld (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> The writer, at that moment engaged in preparations for a demarche in the Van der Lubbe affair, would send a coded telegram to Hirschfeld containing clear instructions (probably No. 313).
317	9.4.1933 De Graaff to De Jonge	<i>NEI: Japan.</i> Matsuoka had recently hinted at the possibility of Japanese nationals settling in New Guinea; other facts likewise pointed to dangerous Japanese interest in East Asia. It would probably be as well if wider provision were made for exceptional cases in the draft immigration regulations (see No. 148).
318	10.4.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> The negotiations on a new trade agreement had been postponed to enable consultations to be held in The Hague on the lowering of interest to the 4% demanded by Hugenberg (cf. No. 313). Kreuter had emphasized the importance of the negotiations in which Hugenberg, in his opinion, had played a positive role.
319	11.4.1933 Report on a discussion held by Beelaerts van	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> According to Posthuma, the recent negotiations (see No. 307) had been fraught with tension on the question of the rene-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
320	Blokland and Verschuur with the delegation to Berlin 15.4.1933 Hirschfeld to Verschuur	wal of credits for Germany. Ries considered renewal at a lower rate of interest up to 1937 to be a major concession, but Steenberghe anticipated little opposition from industry and Posthuma counted on adequate government support.
321	[18].4.1933 Kröller	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> Unlike the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Economic Affairs had always regarded a lower rate of interest for German credits as an important factor. If necessary, the writer would accept a one-year tariff reduction in exchange for a lower interest rate up to 1937. He advised against linking the current exchange regulations to the new trade treaty, and urged that the coal question be left unsettled for the time being. <i>Germany: state of inland shipping.</i> Report on the discussions held in Duisburg between four government representatives and between these officials, shipowners and self-employed bargees from various countries. Agreement had not been reached, but there was a general preference for international regulations. The writer had also discussed the question of mortgage banks with Klausener.
322	18.4.1933 Snouck Hurgronje	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> Further to No. 313, the delegation was authorised to negotiate a lowering of the interest on the credit granted to Germany to 4 ½% (or, if need be, to 4%) in return for German tariff concessions to run for the same term.
323	19.4.1933 to Van Roijen	<i>United States: Ouchy Convention.</i> Instructions to endeavour to arouse the interest of the American Government in the Ouchy Convention by means of a memorandum drawn up by Belgian, Netherlands and Luxembourg representatives. Enclosure of documents.
323A	19.4.1933 to De Marees van Swinderen	<i>Great Britain: Ouchy Convention.</i> Instructions personally to inform the Foreign Office of the Government's acceptance of the British Government's interpretation that the 1837 treaty provided for unconditional most-favoured-nation treatment. The Government realised that the British Government could prevent the coming into force of the Ouchy Convention but presumed that it would promote an examination of the Convention at the international economic and monetary conference.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
323B	19.4.1933 to the diplomatic missions in Europe	<i>Ouchy Convention.</i> Instructions to ascertain, in personal talks, the Government's views on the Ouchy Convention. An official reply was not to be requested, unless it were positive, in anticipation of the discussion of international trade relations at the forthcoming London conference.
324	19.4.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany.</i> It was hoped that the negotiations on a new trade agreement, in which Ries and Nederbragt would participate, would now succeed. Zech was no longer so certain of his position and feared a rival like Wied, who was not liked in the Netherlands.
325	19.4.1933 Kortenhorst	<i>Economic policy.</i> The influence of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour on the economy should be strengthened. One means to this end was the abolition of the Economic Affairs Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Government needed wide powers to be able to achieve results for exports in its negotiations with other countries.
326	[20].4.1933 De Graeff to Van Limburg Stirum (Overveen)	<i>Candidature for minister's post.</i> The sole point in favour of accepting the Foreign Affairs portfolio was the prospect of regular and useful work; points against it were the social and financial obligations and, above all, the lack of personal experience with European politics, with economic relations and with members of parliament.
327	20.4.1933 to Verschuur	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> Hull had invited Van Roijen to consultations on the agenda for the London international conference (see No. 239). Ruijs de Beerenbrouck had telegraphed that the removal of trade barriers (in connection with the Ouchy Convention) was an item of prime importance. Observations to supplement No. 323 requested.
328	20.4.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Economic information.</i> Concurrence with the arrangement suggested in No. 315, though the writer again stressed the importance for Dutch industry of direct correspondence between the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour and diplomatic and consular posts abroad.
329	22.4.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Beelaerts van Blokland (Berlin)	<i>Germany.</i> Reply to No. 324. Zech's position was as insecure as any other non-National Socialist but Wied would be sent to Stockholm. The members of the diplomatic corps felt ill at ease in Berlin.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
330	22.4.1933 from De Graaff	The writer hoped that De Graeff would be the new Minister for Foreign Affairs. <i>Great Britain: 1824 and 1871 treaties.</i> Further to No. 218. Request that it be ascertained whether there were objections in principle to amending the 1824 and 1871 treaties in such a way as to accord the British and Netherlands Governments freedom of action vis-à-vis each other.
331	24.4.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Switzerland: trade policy.</i> It would be unwise to stipulate an extra condition for the placing of an order in Switzerland in view of the fact that the transfer of payments between the Netherlands and Switzerland was perfectly normal. Municipal and provincial authorities should be informed that they were to refrain from any action that could be detrimental to trade relations with other countries.
332	24.4.1933 from Trip (Amsterdam)	<i>London conference.</i> Approval of emphasis placed in No. 327 on removal of trade barriers. However, no improvement in international trade could be expected until the major powers (currently including the United States) returned to the gold standard. The Netherlands should now stress the need to adopt binding resolutions on this point at the London international conference.
333	24.4.1933 Van Limburg Stirum to Beelaerts van Blokland (Berlin)	<i>Cabinet formation.</i> Members of the Netherlands delegation did not think that Colijn had any particular person in mind for the portfolio of Foreign Affairs. Suggestion that the need for a minister (preferably De Graeff) capable of grasping the immense problem of East Asia be pointed out to Colijn.
334	25.4.1933 from Van Limburg Stirum (Berlin)	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> The Netherlands delegation and Hugenberg had reached agreement on a new trade treaty. Appreciation of Hugenberg's role in the negotiations. The writer urged that the treaty be ratified as soon as possible with a view to exports of lettuce and eggs.
335	26.4.1933 De Graaff to De Jonge	<i>NEI: Siam.</i> Recommendation that the NEI rice import prohibition, against which the Siamese envoy had protested, be restricted to a period of four months. Enclosure of draft reply to the envoy.
336	28.4.1933 to Roosmale Nepveu	<i>Spain: trade treaty.</i> Instructions to endeavour to conclude two provisional trade agreements with Spain, one ending the discriminatory treatment of artificial silk, and one concerning most-favoured-

No.	Date; from/to	Description
337	29.4.1933 to Doude van Troostwijk	<p>nation treatment for a number of export products and the lowering of import duties on cheese; both in return for concessions on imports of Spanish wine.</p> <p><i>Switzerland: import duties.</i> The import restrictions on Dutch coal imposed by the Swiss Government were contrary to the arrangement made by Stucki and Hirschfeld at the beginning of 1932 and to the trade treaty of 26 May 1930; the Netherlands still offered Swiss exporters an almost completely free market. Instructions to ask the Swiss Government for a more favourable coal quota on these grounds.</p>
338	4.5.1933 Albarda to Adler	<p><i>Germany: threatened boycott.</i> The executive committees of the Social Democratic Labour Party and the Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions were of the opinion that the international labour movement could not stand idly by while the German working class was being crushed. They proposed an international boycott of German products as a means of exerting pressure on the German Government.</p>
339	[5].5.1933 Colijn	<p><i>Belgium: treaty amendment.</i> Point 7a: relations with Belgium must be regulated in such a way as to afford general satisfaction in the Netherlands; if this were not possible, it would be better to drop the whole question of a treaty.</p>
340	6.5.1933 from Pabst (Tokyo)	<p><i>Japan: petroleum industry.</i> The writer had pointed out to the Japanese Foreign Ministry that Japan's autarkic oil policy would cause a considerable stir and provoke countermeasures. Advice that the Japanese be prevented from acquiring oil concessions or shares in NEI oil companies.</p>
341	11.5.1933 Hirschfeld to Heldring	<p><i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> Pessimistic view of the forthcoming international conference prompted by the specious American proposal for a tariff settlement (see No. 343) and the probable absence of the protectionists. The conference would have to be restricted to a few of the main problems.</p>
342	12.5.1933 to De Marees van Swinderen	<p><i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> Instructions to present a Note to the British Government requesting that quotas correspond with imports from the Netherlands and that arrangements be made for discussions on the subject between British and Dutch</p>

No.	Date; from/to	Description
343	13.5.1933 to Verschuur	officials at an early date. <i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> The United States Government wished to know whether the Netherlands accepted the tariff arrangement it had proposed. Suggestion that its scope be ascertained before replying and that reference be made to the Ouchy Convention, which provided for the gradual abolition of tariffs, quotas and foreign exchange regulations and which could be complemented by a provision regulating export subsidies.
344	15.5.1933 to Van Butthinga Wichers	<i>Persia: trade and consular treaty.</i> Query whether an early settlement of the question of Persian consular officials' admittance to NEI was still required now that the Persian Government had emasculated the trade treaty to be concluded with the Netherlands. Recommendations requested.
345	15.5.1933 Hirschfeld to Nederbragt	<i>Switzerland: trade policy.</i> Telephone conversation with Stucki on the Netherlands Railways' decision not to order diesel engines from a Swiss firm, but nothing had been said about the coal question (see No. 337). Special permits were available on request for the import of restricted goods from Switzerland.
346	16.5.1933 to Van Limburg Stirum	<i>Germany: meat imports.</i> A visit by three chief rabbis prompted present instructions to ascertain whether British, American and Danish representatives had been instructed to protest against the German ban on imports of ritually butchered meat. Authorisation to take a similar step.
347	17.5.1933 H.M. the Queen to Roosevelt	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> H.M. the Queen was of the opinion that international conflicts should be settled by peaceful means, to which end genuine disarmament was essential; she agreed without reservation with the initiatives proposed by Roosevelt. The Government would urge unrestricted commerce, stable currencies and better prices at the forthcoming London international conference.
348	18.5.1933 from Verschuur	<i>Germany: trade treaty.</i> It would be wise to restrict the negotiations on a German-Netherlands trade agreement to the most urgent questions, which did not necessarily mean that the interests of the colonies would thereby be neglected. There was little point in resuming negotiations before the end of the London international conference.

No.	Date; from/to	Description
349	19.5.1933 from Verschuur	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> The main objections to the tariff arrangement proposed by the United States (see No. 343) were that it failed to regulate currency dumping and that it would result in the raising of tariffs before it took effect. The Netherlands delegation to the London international conference (preferably Colijn, Trip, Nederbragt and Hirschfeld) should devote more attention to the question of the gold standard than to the Ouchy Convention.
350	22.5.1933 Minutes of meeting of Trade Treaties Review Committee	<i>Trade policy: London conference.</i> Discussion of the agenda of the international economic and monetary conference. Trip urged a return to the gold standard and the freer movement of goods. Many speakers were pessimistic about the probable outcome of the conference.
351	[24].5.1933 Beelaerts van Blokland	<i>Cabinet formation.</i> Colijn had first considered Kalf, Ruijs de Beerenbrouck, Van Schaik and Kielstra as possible candidates for the Foreign Affairs portfolio before deciding, in consultation with De Geer, to offer it to De Graeff.
352	24.5.1933 to Verschuur	<i>State of inland shipping.</i> Request to report on whether the Government considered it necessary to take measures prohibiting night and Sunday sailing to put the 'Abeichungsplan' into effect. If such measures proved to be contrary to the 1868 Mannheim Treaty, a special treaty for the Rhine riparian states would perhaps be needed.
352A	[24].5.1933 Kröller	<i>Germany: state of inland shipping.</i> Report on talks in Duisburg between government representatives, shipowners and self-employed bargees from five countries. The shipowners' plan that the volume of freight carried by sailing barges should be restricted (Abeichungsplan) was favourably received. It was now probable that the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine would meet at an early date.
353	27.5.1933 to Russell	<i>Great Britain: import duties.</i> The Government was prepared to accept Britain's proposed temporary import restrictions on dairy products provided they also applied to the dominions and import duties were not raised in the meantime.
354	29.5.1933 from Van Roijen (Washington)	<i>United States: Ouchy Convention.</i> Hull did not expect efforts to propagate the Ouchy Convention at the London international conference to meet

No.	Date; from/to	Description
355	29 and 30.5.1933 Official report of meeting of the Oslo states (Stockholm)	with success but he had not yet decided what position to adopt. Moley was rather sceptical about the possibility of achieving a substantial lowering of tariff walls. <i>Oslo cooperation.</i> Nederbragt was of the opinion that all trade barriers (including drastic currency restrictions) should be tackled concurrently as envisaged in the Ouchy Convention; the forthcoming London international conference should approve the exception of most-favoured-nation treatment for such open conventions as the Ouchy Convention. He advocated returning to gold as the basis for monetary relations.
355A	30.5.1933 Official résumé of meeting of the Oslo states (Stockholm)	<i>Oslo cooperation.</i> The Oslo states delegates agreed on the need to remove many of the existing trade barriers as soon as possible, beginning, if necessary, with a limited number of states, and on the desirability of effecting currency stabilisation. The Oslo states delegations would keep in close touch during the London international conference.
356	30.5.1933 to Colijn	<i>League of Nations: London conference.</i> De Graeff did not consider it wise to comply with Hull's suggestion that the desirability of limiting the duration of the London conference to two months be indicated to the British government through official channels. It would carry more weight if Colijn were to recommend the idea to various prominent persons, which he had declared himself willing to do.
357	30.5.1933 Colijn to De Jonge	<i>NEI: trade policy.</i> The difficulties confronting the cement factory at Padang were not serious enough to warrant farreaching changes in trade policy. There was no objection, however, to the enforcement of a division of the market between Dutch importers and Japanese producers, even if such a step were to result in the restriction of cement imports.