

# SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

## American Journal of International Law

VOLUME 12

1918

---

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

---

PUBLISHED FOR

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

BY

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: 35 WEST 32D STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

Agent for Great Britain: Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, London

Agent for Toronto, Melbourne and Bombay: Oxford University Press

**COPYRIGHT, 1918**  
**BY**  
**THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW**

# OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

## CONTENTS

NETHERLANDS — GREAT BRITAIN. Correspondence respecting the transit across Holland of materials susceptible of employment as military supplies

### *List of Papers*

No.	Name	Date	Subject	Page
1	Memorandum communicated by Netherlands Minister	1917 Oct. 9	The Netherlands Government are bound by the Rhine Convention on the one hand and the Fifth Hague Convention on the other. Thus (a) only goods which have no connection with military operations are allowed to pass through the Netherlands from Belgium to Germany, nor is passage allowed to requisition goods. Certain melted copper, which was clearly nonrequisitioned, has, however, been allowed to pass. (b) The amount of gravel, etc., allowed to pass through the Netherlands from Germany to Belgium has been restricted to the quantity which seems to the Netherlands Government, as the result of the investigation conducted in Belgium by two Netherlands engineer officers, to be necessary for non-military purposes — 370,000 tons to be allowed through between 15th September and 15th November, in order to arrive before the waterways freeze. The Netherlands Government consider that in permitting transit to the above extent they have acted in full conformity with their duties as a neutral and with their conventional obligations.	

No.	Name	Date	Subject	Page
		1917	They are therefore painfully surprised at the British Government's intention to discontinue all facilities for Dutch cables until the transit traffic entirely ceases.....	175
2	Mr. Balfour to M. van Swinderen to Mr. Balfour	Oct. 23	Transmits reply of His Majesty's Government to No. 1.....	178
3	Sir W. Townley (Telegraphic)	25	Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs says that M. van Swinderen's statement in No. 1, that copper was being allowed to pass, was made under a misapprehension, and that, in fact, none has been allowed to go through since his note of 10th June.....	182
4	M. van Swinderen to Mr. Balfour	26	Gives certain references in answer to request contained in No. 2 for information as to the stipulations of the Rhine Conventions.....	182
5	Mr. Balfour to M. van Swinderen	30	Transmits a further memorandum to meet request of Netherlands Government for evidence that sand transited across Holland has in fact been used for warlike purposes on arrival in Belgium. Also a sworn declaration on the subject.....	183
6	" " "	Nov. 6	As to the arguments based by the Netherlands Government on the treaties and regulations referred to in No. 4.....	190

*Annexes*

No. 1. — Article VIII of the Treaty of Vienna of March, 1815.....	193
No. 2. — Preamble to the Rhine Convention of 31st March, 1831.....	193
No. 3. — Article IX, sections 1 and 5, of the Treaty of London of 19th April, 1839.....	194
No. 4. — Preamble and Article II of the Rhine Convention of 1868.....	195

NETHERLANDS — GREAT BRITAIN. Correspondence respecting defensively armed British merchant vessels

*List of Papers*

No.	Name	Date	Subject	Page
1	Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Chilton (Telegraphic)	1914 Aug. 8	Dutch Government should be informed that British armed merchantmen are armed only for purposes of defense and ought not to be interned or disarmed. As German merchantmen can be converted on the high seas, they should be interned, unless neutral government are prepared to assume responsibility that no such conversion shall take place.....	196
2	Mr. Chilton to Sir Edward Grey (Telegraphic)	9	Contents of No. 1 communicated to Minister for Foreign Affairs. Dutch Government agree as regards treatment of British and German merchant vessels, but Dutch officials must examine British vessels for form's sake.....	197
3	do (Telegraphic)	10	Reports naval attaché's conversation with Minister of Marine. Netherlands Government placed in a difficult position by request to differentiate between auxiliary cruisers and merchant vessels defensively armed.....	197
4	Sir Edward Grey to Sir A. Johnstone	1915 Mar. 7	Owing to submarine menace, number of defensively armed British merchant vessels may be increased. Do Netherlands Government still object to their entry into Dutch ports?.....	197
5	Sir A. Johnstone to Sir Edward Grey	April 8	Transmits reply of Dutch Government to No. 4. They are quite firm that such vessels may not be allowed access into their ports.....	198

No.	Name	Date	Subject	Page
		<i>1915</i>		
6	Sir Edward Grey to Sir A. Johnstone	June 9	Transmits memorandum and pamphlet on the subject of defensively armed merchant ships for communication to the Netherlands Government.....	199
7	Sir A. Johnstone to Sir Edward Grey	July 31	Transmits note from Netherlands Government giving reasons which make it impossible for them to change their attitude.....	202
8	Sir E. Grey to Sir A. Johnstone	Sept. 1	Acknowledges No. 7. His Majesty's Government learn of decision with keenest regret. While adhering in every way to views they have already expressed, they do not wish to continue the discussion with the Netherlands Government at the present time.....	203
		<i>1917</i>		
9	Sir W. Townley to Mr. Balfour (Telegraphic)	March 6	British steamship <i>Princess Melita</i> arrived at Hook of Holland with gun. She was ordered out again, but returned later, having dismantled gun. Captain refused to leave port again without convoy.....	204
10	do. (Telegraphic)	7	Captain dropped gun overboard outside territorial waters. Vessel now at Rotterdam, and will eventually proceed to sea with convoy.....	204
11	Mr. Balfour to Sir W. Townley (Telegraphic)	10	Views of His Majesty's Government on the exclusion of defensively armed merchantmen from Dutch ports.....	204
12	Sir W. Townley to Mr. Balfour	April 6	Transmits note from Netherlands Government setting forth in detail their reasons for refusing to allow armed merchantmen to enter their jurisdiction.....	205

CONTENTS

v

No.	Name	Date	Subject	Page
		<i>1917</i>		
13	Lord Robert Cecil to Sir W. Townley	May 18	Arguments in No. 12 have received most careful consideration. Gives views of His Majesty's Government, who must hold Netherlands Government responsible for all losses to British ships trading to Holland if they may not be defensively armed.....	209
14	Sir W. Townley to Mr. Balfour	June 20	Transmits further note from Netherlands Government on the subject..	214
15	Mr. Balfour to Sir W. Townley	July 17	Transmits reply of His Majesty's Government to No. 14.....	220
16	Sir W. Townley to Mr. Balfour	Aug. 16	Further observations of Netherlands Government in reply to No. 15....	223
17	Mr. Balfour to Sir W. Townley	Sept. 8	Points out general conclusions emerging from correspondence between the two governments. His Majesty's Government do not propose to continue discussion.....	226
18	Sir W. Townley to Mr. Balfour	Oct. 23	Comments of Netherlands Government on No. 17. They agree that further discussion of the question would present no advantage.....	228
19	Mr. Balfour to Sir W. Townley	Nov. 14	Observations of His Majesty's Government in reply to the last note, which attributes to them an attitude which they have never taken up, and which can not pass uncorrected.....	231

*Appendix*

Art. 4 of Netherlands proclamation of neutrality.....	232
---	-----

NETHERLANDS — ENTENTE ALLIES. Diplomatic correspondence regarding  
the admission of armed merchant vessels to Dutch ports

*List of Papers*

Name	Date	Subject	Page
British Legation to Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs	1914 Aug. 11	Calls attention to rule of international law requiring a neutral government to prevent the arming or fitting out or departure from its jurisdiction of any merchant vessel intended to be employed for warlike purposes, and requests issuance of necessary orders to prevent abuse of Netherland neutrality in this respect.....	233
	1915 Aug. 2	Calls attention to use of Dutch ports by British armed merchant ships and requests the Netherland Government to treat such ships as vessels of war.....	234
Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs to the German Legation	Sept. 7	Replies that Netherland Government regards armed merchant ships as assimilated to belligerent warships and denies that any such ships have been admitted to Dutch ports during the war.....	235
French Legation to Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs....	1917 March 15	Contends that belligerents have the right to arm merchant ships for self-defense against submarines; declines to admit contention of Netherland Government that the admission of merchant vessels armed for self-defense is a question of neutrality to be settled by each country as its interests demand irrespective of the principles of international law; and maintains that only such merchant ships as are converted into warships according to the Hague Convention may be assimilated to warships and treated as such in neutral ports.....	236



Name	Date	Subject	Page
Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs to the French Legation	April 26	Replies that Holland's peculiar geographical situation made it necessary, in order to insure respect for its neutrality, to forbid armed merchant vessels from entering its dominion; defends the legality of its action in view of the Hague Conventions and maintains the distinction between the right of a belligerent merchant ship under the law of war to arm and defend itself against attack, and the right of a neutral to refuse admittance of such armed merchant ships to its ports under the law of neutrality; declines to change its attitude of assimilating armed merchant ships to warships.....	238
American Legation to the Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs	March 13	Inquires whether American vessels armed for self-protection will be permitted to enter and depart from Dutch ports.....	242
American Legation to Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs	March 17	Asks whether, in the treatment accorded to armed neutral vessels in Dutch ports, any distinction will be drawn between vessels armed privately by their owners and ships which carry an armed guard placed on board by the United States Government.....	243
Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs to American Legation	March 22	Replies that presence of warships or vessels assimilated thereto of foreign Powers is not permitted in Dutch waters, regardless of whether the armament is provided by the owner of the vessel or his Government.....	243
American Legation to the Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs	April 2	Assumes that above attitude of Holland refers to armed merchant ships of belligerents and not of neutrals, and asks confirmation of this view.....	244

Name	Date	Subject	Page
Netherland Ministry for Foreign Affairs to American Legation	1917 April 14	States that belligerent warships and armed merchant vessels assimilated thereto are not permitted within the jurisdiction of the state, including colonies and overseas possessions, while such vessels of neutral Powers are barred only from the dominion of the Kingdom in Europe.....	244

NORWAY — UNITED STATES. General agreement relating to exports. <i>April 30, 1918</i> .....	246
UNITED STATES. Proclamation concerning the possession and utilization of Netherland vessels. <i>March 20, 1918</i> .....	259
———. Executive order taking possession of equipment on board Netherland vessels. <i>March 28, 1918</i> .....	260
———. Proclamation including certain citizens or subjects of Germany or Austria-Hungary as enemies for purposes of the Trading with the Enemy Act. <i>May 31, 1918</i> .....	261