

COPY

U.2142

ALIENS ORDER, 1920, as SUBSEQUENTLY

AMENDED

DETENTION ORDER

WHEREAS in pursuance of paragraph (2) of Article 22 of the Aliens Order, 1920, as subsequently amended, (hereinafter described as the Aliens Order) I have directed that the provisions of the said paragraph shall not have effect in relation to the Alien.

Johan Bernard UBBINK @ UDEMA @ Frans Van Der HALEN:

AND WHEREAS a Deportation Order has been made with respect to the said:

Johan Bernard UBBINK @ UDEMA @ Frans Van Der HALEN

AND WHEREAS I am of opinion that the deportation of the said alien would be prejudicial to the efficient prosecution of the war and that the detention of the said alien is necessary or expedient for securing the defence of the realm:

NOW, THEREFORE, in pursuance of the power conferred on me by paragraph (3A) of Article 12 of the Aliens Order, I hereby direct that the said

Johan Bernard UBBINK @ UDEMA @ Frans Van Der HALEN

be detained.

One of His Majesty's Principal
Secretaries of State.

23.5.44.

Home Office,
Whitehall.

TOP SECRET
F/1795/127.

copy
TOP SECRET

16th June, 1944

My dear Anthony,

I am sending you a copy of a letter I have sent today to the Home Secretary, together with copies of the enclosures therein referred to.

I am somewhat concerned about the question of detention places for possible S.O.E. cases. As in the present case, one naturally wants to ensure segregation so that detainees such as these two Dutchmen do not mingle with other detainees who may be released at any time. I believe the Security Service appreciates S.O.E.'s point of view in the matter, not only in the present case, but generally. I understand the question of accommodation is sometimes considered a difficulty. I should personally like to feel that an adequate range of places of detention did exist: I hope we shall not have many other cases, but I should like to know that I had your support in pressing, in proper cases, for a more flexible range of treatment.

As you will see from my letter to Morrison, I hope that the special reasons for the detention of these two Dutchmen may be considered to have elapsed, and I am asking S.O.E. to raise this now with the Security Service.

Yours ever,

Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden, M.C., M.P.,
Foreign Office,
S.W.1.

WESTERN

WN1051/4/G

1950

NETHERLANDS

4.

F.O. minute
H. Ramsden

Dated 1. 24. 50

Rec'd 1. 2. 50

Englandspiel.
Transmission to the Hague
of the comments of Mr. Reilly's
friends on points raised by
Dr. Danker.

Last Paper

(WN1051/30)

(Minutes)

See within:-

References

Z 7242/1051/292198

Z 7674/

See with

A) balance The Hague no 1091/5/50
to W. Dept of 13/2/50

(Print)

(How disposed of)

Dfr) The Hague
no. 28

Feb. 2nd

with encls.

W/C
20-2

(Action completed)

LR 2/2

(Index)

W/C

Next Paper

Englendspiel

Mr. Reilly's friends have now considered the points raised by Dr. Donker in his conversation with Mr. Mason (see E.7342, marked by side flag), and the questions put by Western Dept. for its own information (see minute on E.7674, similarly flagged).

Their observations are to be found in Mr. Bicknell's minute (attached to E.7342), and on this basis I have drafted a despatch to Sir P. Nichols to which will be annexed

WN 1051 4

(1) Annexe A.

Memorandum of Dr. Donker's conversation with Mr. Mason. It should be noted that the reference to "S.I.S." at the bottom of page I will have to be altered to "Intelligence Service", in accordance with J.I.C. Standing Instructions.

WN 1057 4

(ii) Annexe B

Replies to points to which reference is to be made in the Commission's report.

(iii) Annexe C

Replies to points on which Dr. Donker asked for information for his personal use, and not for publication.

I should be grateful if P.U.S.D. would clear these drafts with Mr. Reilly's friends as soon as possible. Dr. Donker's report is to be published in March or April, so that time presses.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

C. O. I. Ramsden
C. O. I. Ramsden
24th January, 1950

John Russell
25.1.50

J. R. RUSSELL,
WESTERN DEPT.

~~P. U. S. D.~~

No comments or amendments.

Nigel Bicknell
BICKNELL 287,

CB
31/1

CR
7/2

Registry
No. WNIOSI7G

Top Secret
Confidential
Restricted
Other

CR

FOR SEPARATE ENTRY

+ Dep't. 2nd February 1950.
OUTFILE.

Sir,

In my despatch No. 597 of the 14th December last I referred to the visit of Dr. L.A. Donker, Chairman of the Netherlands Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry, ^{who visited} London from the 3rd to the 10th October, last, and transmitted a letter and enclosures from Mr. G.P. Mayhew to Dr. Donker.

2. During the course of this visit Dr. Donker raised certain additional points in a conversation with Mr. R.H. Mason, a record of which is attached at Annex A.
3. Enquiries have now been made on these points raised by Dr. Donker and the information resulting therefrom is summarised in Annexes B and C to this despatch.

It will be seen from Annex A that the questions raised by Dr. Donker fall into two classes:

- (a) those points to which he wished to refer in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry. These are dealt with in Annex B;
 - (b) those on which he requested enlightenment for his personal information but which were not for publication. These are covered by Annex C.
4. I shall, ~~therefore~~, be grateful if you will hand Dr. Donker in person copies of the 3 Annexes to this despatch.

I am,

etc.

Sd. G.A.E. Shuckley
CAM 3/1

Draft C

Draft Despatch
to The Hague

No. 28

2.7342/1051/19

251

RECEIVED IN
DIVISION
2 FEB 1950
3/2
6/2

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

BRUSH: WARRINGTON 10000 10000
BRUSH: WARRINGTON 10000 10000
A. A. B. W. L. L. A. O. P. M. S.

No. 28

OUTFILE. FOREIGN OFFICE, S.W.1.

(WN 1051/40)

2nd February, 1950.

TOP SECRET

Sir,

In my despatch No. 597 of the 14th December last I referred to the visit of Dr. L.A. Donker, Chairman of the Netherlands Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry who visited London in October last.

2. During the course of this visit Dr. Donker raised certain additional points in a conversation with Mr. R.H. Mason, a record of which is attached at Annex A.

3. Enquiries have now been made on these points and the information resulting is summarised in Annexes B and C to this despatch.

It will be seen from Annex A that the questions raised by Dr. Donker fall into two classes:

- (a) those points to which he wished to refer in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry. These are dealt with in Annex B;
- (b) those on which he requested enlightenment for his personal information but which were not for publication. These are covered by Annex C.

4. I shall be grateful if Your Excellency will hand Dr. Donker in person copies of the 3 Annexes to this despatch.

I am, with great truth and respect,

Sir,

Your Excellency's obedient Servant,

(For Mr. McNeil)

Sd. C.A. Shuckburgh

His Excellency

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

etc., etc., etc.,

The Hague.

Registry
No.

2 cp/se

Top Secret
~~SECRET~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

Annex B

Points to which Dr. Donker wishes to refer in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry.

1. Radio Finger-Printing Technique

His Majesty's Government have no objection to reference being made in the Report to this point. Dr. Donker is correct in thinking that this technique was not sufficiently developed at the relevant time, to play any significant part in detecting the fact that the agents concerned were under German control.

2. Central decoding.

His Majesty's Government have no objection to the inclusion in the Report of a statement that incoming messages from agents in the field were decoded at a central station and not by the individual country or other section of the appropriate organisation.

3. The development of S.O.E. operations after the formation of SHARP

His Majesty's Government see no objection to the inferences drawn by Dr. Donker from the remarks of Major General Sir Colin Gubbins. They would point out, however, that the improvement in the operational methods of S.O.E. during and after 1944 was due to a combination of circumstances of which the transfer of responsibility was only one.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

BRASSI 25/10/1945 1417 A.S.E.W.A.L. Cp.ARS
RETRIC 25/10/1945 14000 845

Registry
No.

2 cpl/se.

Top Secret.
Secret.
Confidential.
Restricted.
Open.

Draft.

Annex C

Points on which Dr. Donker wishes enlightenment for his personal information, and which should not be published.

1. Position of Colonel Cordeaux

Dr. Donker is correct in assuming that Colonel Cordeaux occupied a position in the Intelligence Service analogous to that of Colonel Brock in S.O.E.

2. Decoration awarded to Thijs Takonis

Photo

The award to Private Thijs Takonis of the Military Medal was approved on the 16th June, 1943 and the insignia was presented to his next of kin in June 1946. Although the citation, a copy of which is attached, refers mainly to the supposed Kootwijk exploit, there is every reason to believe that Takonis in fact performed extremely valuable work between November 1941, when he was dropped into Holland, and his arrest by the Germans in March 1942.

3. The two agents in Brixton Prison

The two men concerned, Ubbink and Dourlein, arrived in this country in February 1944. In accordance with standard procedure in such cases, ~~procedure which~~ was (applicable to all escaped agents of whatever nationality) ~~they~~ were housed at one of the S.O.E. country establishments, while investigations...

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

investigations were made into their story. It will be realized that this was an essential step ^{in such cases} in view of the possibility that ~~escape~~ "escapes" might be arranged by the enemy as a means of penetrating allied organizations.

The investigations took a considerable time owing partly to the complexity of the case, partly to the illness of Ubbink and partly to the desire of the two men to offer additional evidence from time to time.

When the investigations had been going on for some weeks, the special measures which had been decided on as a general pre-invasion precaution were introduced. These were extremely far-reaching in scope, and when the question of the future of the two men came up for discussion, it was decided that, as it had not ^{been possible} ~~be~~ yes fully to elucidate the circumstances surrounding their escape, they should be detained until after this period of special precautions was over. This was in no way a judgement on the two men: it was merely an executive step decided on in the interests of the allied cause as a whole.

4. Van t' Bent

His Majesty's Government regrets that it cannot ~~accede to~~ ^{act} Dr. Donker's request for further information about this man.

5....

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

Registry
No.

Top Secret.
Secret.
Confidential.
Restricted.
Open.

Draft.

5. The Selborne Report

His Majesty's Government have no objection to references being made in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry to the existence of Lord Selborne's Report ~~and~~^{or} to its broad conclusions, but they must request that the Report itself should not be published either in full or in part.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

BRUSH WILMINGTON BLOOMINGTON A. & W. WILSON CO. 488

TOP SECRET

ANNEX B

Points to which Dr. Donker wishes to refer in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry.

1. Radio Finger-Printing Technique

His Majesty's Government have no objection to reference being made in the Report to this point. Dr. Donker is correct in thinking that this technique was not sufficiently developed at the relevant time, to play any significant part in detecting the fact that the agents concerned were under German control.

2. Central decoding

His Majesty's Government have no objection to the inclusion in the Report of a statement that incoming message from agents in the field were decoded at a central station and not by the individual country or other section of the appropriate organisation.

3. The development of B.O.S. operations after the formation of SHANP

His Majesty's Government see no objection to the inferences drawn by Dr. Donker from the remarks of Major General Sir Colin Gubbins. They would point out, however, that the improvement in the operational method of B.O.S. during and after 1944 was due to a combination of circumstances of which the transfer of responsibility was only one.

The intelligence was a considerable time being built up to the complexity of the work, partly to the illness of Gubbins and partly to the desire of the two men to offer individual evidence from time to time.

ANNEX C

Points on which Dr. Donker wishes enlightenment for his personal information, and which should not be published.

1. Position of Colonel Cordeux

Dr. Donker is correct in assuming that Colonel Cordeux occupied a position in the Intelligence Service analagous to the of Colonel Brook in S.O.E.

2. Decoration awarded to Thijs Takonis

The award to Private Thijs Takonis of the Military Medal was approved on the 16th June, 1943 and the insignia was presented to his next of kin in June 1946. Although the citation, a copy of which is attached, refers mainly to the supposed Kootwijk exploit, there is every reason to believe that Takonis in fact performed extremely valuable work between November 1941, when he was dropped into Holland, and his arrest by the Germans in March 1942.

3. The two agents in Brixton Prison

The two men concerned, Ubbink and Dourlein, arrived in this country in February 1944. In accordance with standard procedure in such cases, (applicable to all escaped agents of whatever nationality) they were housed at one of the S.O.E. country establishments, while investigations were made into their story. It will be realized that this was an essential step in such cases in view of the possibility that "escapes" might be arranged by the enemy as a means of penetrating allied organisations.

The investigations took a considerable time owing partly to the complexity of the case, partly to the illness of Ubbink and partly to the desire of the two men to offer additional evidence from time to time.

/When...

When the investigations had been going on for some weeks, the special measures which had been decided on as a general pre-invasion precaution were introduced. These were extremely far-reaching in scope, and when the question of the future of the two men came up for discussion, it was decided that, as it had not yet been possible fully to elucidate the circumstances surrounding their escape, they should be detained until after this period of special precautions was over. This was in no way a judgement on the two men: it was merely an executive step decided on in the interests of the allied cause as a whole.

4. Van t' Zant

His Majesty's Government regrets that it cannot meet Dr. Donker's request for further information about this man.

5. The Selborne Report

His Majesty's Government have no objection to references being made in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry to the existence of Lord Selborne's Report or to its broad conclusions, but they must request that the Report itself should not be published either in full or in part.



Green
P/W
BRITISH EMBASSY,
THE HAGUE.

1051/5/50

15th February, 1950.

WN 1051/4G.

Dear Department,

We thought we should let you know that it has not yet been possible to carry out the instructions in Foreign Office despatch No. 28 (WN 1051/4G) on 2nd February as Dr. Donker is ill. We hope to be able to do so in the course of this week and will then report further.

Yours ever,

CHANCERY.

42

Western Department,
Foreign Office,
LONDON, S.W.1.

WESTERN

WN 1051/5G

5

1950

NETHERLANDS

FROM Sir P Nichols
The Hague

Englandspiel.

61.

No. 1091/6/50

Dated 21.2.50

Received in Registry 23.2.50

Conversation with Dr Donker concerning the Foreign Office reply to points raised by him during his visit to London in October 1949.

REFERENCES

WN 1051/49.

MINUTES

Mr Reilly's friends will no doubt wish to see this, and perhaps to consider whether there is anything they are prepared to add to the account given in Annex C of our despatch (blue reference slip attached). We can however postpone action until we receive Dr Donker's written comments.

(Print)

(How disposed of)

Left) Chancery,
The Hague from Z
Dept. May 10/50

(Signature)

24/2

P.U.S.D

24.2

213/P

(Action completed)

(Index)

RL 14/5
9/6

44

P.W.A)

There seems to be no reason, security or otherwise, why Dr. Donker should not be given such additional information as will convince him and his commission that it was on M.I.5./Home Office instructions that Messrs. Ubbink and Dourlein were detained, and that S.C.E. had no voice in the matter. Lord Selborne's letter to van Lidth de Jeude of the 16th June 1944 (Flag F at WN 1051/3/G might even be quoted in full. In fairness

/to M.I.5.

to M.I.5. and the Home Office the reasons underlying their decision should, I think, be included.

Mjebuhull
(Nigel Bicknell)
7th March, 1950.

I suggest that further action on this paper should await receipt of ^{written} for Donkers/Comments (if any).

(Signature)

9/3

B.V. 9/4

A.R. 17
9.1

B.V. to Miss Alison.

1.5
A.R. 17.

Reminder to Chancery written

(Signature)

A.15

See within.
B. Chancery The Hague to W Dept
HO 1091/10/50 19/5.

There is no need to inform anyone of this, I think, but Mr. Bicknell might like to pass on the information.

P.U.S. *(Signature)* done
NS/6

Miss
21.

(Signature)
7/6

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

There has been no further development here, but the matter is not yet dead.

The Dutch Commission's report is due for publication in May or June and it might be useful for you to see these papers. We shall not see the report before publication, so the Press Comment will probably be the first we hear of the report.

M. B. JACOMB
12/74

Miss Alison
Mr Jones. Thank you.
15/12/74

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.



BRITISH EMBASSY,
THE MAJUK.

21st February, 1950.

No. 51

1001/6/50

TOP SECRET

W 622

WN1051/5

WN1051/5C

Sir,

Owing to Dr. Donker's illness it was not possible until this morning to carry out the instructions contained in your despatch No. 28 (WN 1051/46) of the 2nd February.

2. When Dr. Donker called today I handed to him personally copies of the three annexes to your despatch. He read them carefully and in particular questioned me about the answer given in the case of the two agents in Brixton prison.

This answer, he said, did not, as I gather he had hoped it would, expressly exculpate S.O.S. of the responsibility for the detention of these two men, and in particular did not make it plain whether or not M.I.5 were in fact responsible.

3. As it seemed not impossible that, on further reflection, Dr. Donker might raise other points I asked him to consider these documents and let us have any comments he might wish to put forward later in writing. This he said he would do.

4. During the course of conversation Dr. Donker asked whether he was at liberty to make full use, for the purpose of the Commission's report, of the notes he had taken during his visit to England on the interviews he had had. I reassured him on this point, but added that if he was in any doubt as to whether the publication of some information he intended to include in his report would be detrimental to the interests of His Majesty's Government, he might be

The Right Honourable

Ernest Bevin, M.P.,

etc., etc., etc.

/prepared



prepared to let us see that report in draft form on a private and informal basis. Dr. Donker replied that though he appreciated this suggestion he thought it doubtful whether he could make use of it owing to the constitutional position of the Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry.

6. He hopes the report of the Commission will be ready in May or June next.

I have the honour to be,

with great truth and respect,

Sir,

Your most obedient and humble Servant,

Arthur North

Registry
No. *WAR 102/176*

Top Secret
Secret
Confidential
Restricted
Open

TOP SECRET
Draft

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

(2000) WASHINGTON BRUNNEN 248
DTSDE A.B. 2.10.11.11 05.458

RECEIVED IN
DIVISION
9 MAY 1950
2
10/5

OUTSIDE

10th May, 1950.
Jean Chancier,

Your ~~letter~~ ⁱⁿ dispatch

no. 64 (102/16/50) of 21st Feb, 1950
about the papers given to
the Dutch Commission of Enquiry
in connection with
that ~~son~~ subject the
ENIGMA operation, and that it
had been suggested that Mr.
Donker might let us have
some written comments if we
had further points to raise.
We ~~presume~~ ^{assume} since we

Chancier.
The Hague.

we have heard nothing
further, but the Commission found
the material adequate for their
purposes, and ^{that they} were going
ahead with their plans for
submitting a report in May or
early June.

Tons eva

Western Dept.

Boett

8/5

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

OUYALE

(WH 1051/50)

FOREIGN OFFICE, S.W.1.

TOP SECRET

10th May, 1950.

Dear Chancery,

Your despatch No. 61 (1091/6/50) of the 21st February about the papers given to the Dutch Commission of Enquiry in connexion with the Englandspiel, said that it had been suggested that Dr. Donker might let us have some written comments if he had further points to raise.

We presume since we have heard nothing further that the Commission found the material adequate for their purposes, and that they are now going ahead with their plans for publishing a report in May or early June.

Yours ever,

WESTERN DEPARTMENT

The Chancery,
British Embassy,
The Hague.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

OUYFILE.

(WH 1051/50)

FOREIGN OFFICE, S.W.1.

TOP SECRET

10th May, 1950.

Dear Chancery,

Your despatch No. 61 (1091/6/50) of the 21st February about the papers given to the Dutch Commission of Enquiry in connexion with the Englandspiel, said that it had been suggested that Dr. Donker might let us have some written comments if he had further points to raise.

We presume since we have heard nothing further that the Commission found the material adequate for their purposes, and that they are now going ahead with their plans for publishing a report in May or early June.

Yours ever,

WESTERN DEPARTMENT

The Chancery,
British Embassy,
The Hague.

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN



BRITISH EMBASSY,
THE HAGUE.

B.

19th May, 1950.

1091/10/50

TOP SECRET

1005
WN1051/SG

W.

Dear Department,

With reference to your letter (WN 1051/SG) of the 10th May about the Dutch Commission of Enquiry into the Englandspiel, it so happened that we had just heard from Dr. Donker that the Commission were entirely satisfied with the information we had given them and they had no further points to raise. He also told us that the report cannot now be published before July.

Yours ever,
CHANCERY.

Western Department,
Foreign Office,
London, S.W.1.

1950

WESTERN

WN 1051/6G

NETHERLANDS

FROM F.O. minute
Miss Alison

Intention of M. S. BINGHAM to sue
a Mr de GRAAF for libel, in connection
with the latter's articles in the press
concerning the part played by
M. Bingham in Englandspel.

No.

Dated 20.4.50

Received in Registry 22.4.50.

REFERENCES

Z7336/1051/29a.
1949
Z7337/1051/29a
1949
Z5523/..

MINUTES

See minutes within

(Print)

(How disposed of)

Dft) The Hague
no. 151
April 24th

(Action completed)

RR 13/5

(Index)

W.H.

Minutes
WN1051

/G
6

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN IN THIS MARGIN.

The Englandspiel has
cropped up again. Mr. Bingham
has seen Mr. Mason & informed
him that in view of the fact that
the allegations made against him in
the Dutch press are damaging to his
reputation & are preventing ^{him} from getting
a job in Indonesia he has decided to
sue a Dutchman called de Geop (also
writes under the name of Noel de Geop)
in the Dutch Courts.

WN1051/56.

25523/1051/296.

! attach the latest paper
on this sorry subject from which it
will be seen that the report of the
Dutch Commission will appear in May
or June & Mr. Mason has previously
advised Mr. Bingham to hold his hand
until then. Now however Bingham
has instructed a Dutch lawyer to
institute proceedings on his behalf
& is calling at the F.O at 11.30
to find out whether we have any
objection.