"Sine studio et ira"; only as a case interesting a specialist.

1937 Lincoln Av.
Chicago, March 17 1915.

86

Dear President, Goethe has well said that what we dont discuss we dont rightly understand. This must be my excuse for saying the following.

The Lusitania was a British ship, laden with war material for the British government to be used in killing German fathers, husbands, sons. There is no war between Germany and us, hence a moral responsibility rests on us when we help in this business. It is not true — very far from it, that by forbidding exports of this kind to only one party when we know the other is prevented ~~to do so~~ to receive any by its enemy, gives the latter a cause for war with us. Think that over please, for you are clearly wrong. But letting this matter aside the purely legal aspect is: 1) That the Lusitania was used by the British government for the transport of war material. On this point hinges all the rest

2) That such a transport ship is treated the same as any war vessel. Just as soon as the ship, ~~was~~ is 3 miles from our shores it was British ground, under British jurisdiction, both martial and civil;

3) The ship was the agent, the British govt the principal

4) The loading the ship with volunteer passengers has nothing to do with the question before us, except as to damages charged to the British.

5) The sub-marine sent only one torpedo into the Lusitania which would not have made it sink under an hour, perhaps not at all, had it not been for the war material on board (I refer to the Berlin report, also to the statement of the captain of the ship.

hence it is certain that but for the cargo all the passengers and crew would have been saved.

On a German ship, with better system and more intelligence, the swimming belt, (which are easily and rapidly put on) would have saved every one. But the British are conservative and dull. Even as it was there was ample time. Cf. Titania. Cf the captain in the Sound condemned to the penitentiary because he had neglected the swimming belts

6) Had not the detonation, following the torpedo, proved that the cargo had exploded, the submarine would have allowed time for all to leave the ship, and would then have sent off another torpedo. Compare case on land: ammo hauling mili supplies. Any stranger on the vehicle would be smashed into atoms by the enemy, if caught all would be executed.

This is legitimate warfare. Every nation owes it to its people to think of them first and to prevent by all possible means, (mines, airships &c), any war material to reach the enemy. This is martial law recognized everywhere, and was energetically made use of by Grant, Lee, Sherman &c

In conclusion, Bryant's note is offensive, arrogant and asinine. No decent American should stand by such a poor representation of this country. — It seems to me you must be of British parentage to defend such incredible action. I hope and pray that the German gov't will give an answer that will make Bryant and Co and id omne genus feel very small. And as for other Lusitanias? V. vat sequens!

Very cordially C. A. Eggert.

We should remember that on the previous trip the Lusitania was challenged but refused to answer, hurriedly to sheer off instead.

Chicago, May 18, 1915

Dear Mr. Eggert:-

Your favor of the 17th inst. is received. So long as you take the view that a merchant vessel is a "transport" because it has contraband of war as a part of its cargo it is idle for us to discuss this matter. Furthermore, the Collector of the Port of New York certified that no part of the cargo in question consisted of high explosives. I note by the tone of your concluding paragraph that you are German, which is a further reason for not continuing the discussion. I had supposed that you were an American citizen.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. C. A. Eggert,
1937 Lincoln Ave., Chicago.

Chicago, May 18, 1915

Dear Mr. Eggert:

Your favor of the 17th inst. is received. So long as you take the view that a merchant vessel is a "transport" because it has contraband of war as a part of its cargo it is idle for us to discuss this matter. Furthermore, the collector of the port of New York certified that no part of the cargo in question consisted of high explosives. I note by the tone of your concluding paragraph that you are German, which is a further reason for not continuing the discussion. I had supposed that you were an American citizen.

Very truly yours,

H.A.V. Bryant

Mr. C. A. Eggert, 1037 Lincoln Ave., Chicago.

Since it is certain that but for the cargo all the passengers and crew would have been saved.

On a German ship, with better seamanship and intelligence, the swimmingly easily and rapidly for the would have saved every one. But the British are conservative and dull. Even as it was there was ample time. Cf. Titania. (The captain on the Armed condemned to death because he had neglected to) Had not the detonation following the torpedo proved that the cargo would have allowed the submarine would have sent off another torpedo. Anyone should be shot by the enemy if caught all would be executed. Any stranger on the vehicle would be angrily int glooms by the enemy if caught all would be executed. This is legitimate warfare. Every nation owes it to its people to think of them first and to prevent by all possible means, (mines, airships etc.) and war material to reach the enemy. This is martial law recognized everywhere, and energetically made use of by Grant, Lee, Sherman &c

In conclusion, Bryant's note is offensive, arrogant and asinine. No decent American should be such a poor representative of his country. It seems to me you must be of British parentage to defend such incredible action. I hope and pray that the German govt will give an answer that will make Bryant and Co and id omne genus feel very small. And as for other Lusitanias? V. vat sequens!

Very cordially C. A. Eggert.

Note: Wilson should remember that the Lusitania was allowed to proceed on her fatal trip with full knowledge that she was to be torpedoed without warning by a German submarine.

I just read in the papers about the two American ships wrecked in the North Sea some time ago

They were directed by British officers to take the course along the North shore of Holland and Germany — on their way to Bremen, a German port. They struck a mine, but every man on board was saved. The British claimed that the North Sea was their demain, they laid mines extensively — the Germans followed In the case of the Lusitania the loss of lives, the sea being calm, was easy. The submarine people had surely no wish to injure any human being.

Lusitania

Pa

48

Palmer House
Chicago

THE CHICAGO HOTEL CO., LESSEE

1937 Lincoln Ave 5/13 1915

Dear President — I hope you dont attribute to me the intention of setting you right on International Law — I know your competency. But the matter is so serious that I must allude to, if not correct, two errors.

1) Germany is not chargeable with the sale of war material to a party actually at war. In the Boer war the Germany declared neutrality and allowed no exports of war material. In the case of Russia during the war with Japan there may have been sales by smuggling across the long frontier, nearly 900 miles, but nothing of the kind authorized by the government. The same is true as to the late Balkan war. The supplies were from England and France.

This is a question of International Ethics, and here Germany is strong.

2) As you admit that the destruction of a vessel carrying war material is legal, the destruction of the Lusitania cannot call for any criticism.

There was ample time for rescue. But there was bungling as on the Titania. Why was the captain of that boat in the Long Island Sound condemned to the penitentiary? Because of his neglect in regard to the swimming belts.

It takes at least 20 minutes to
slip by a torpedo.

We know that women and children we
Why did not the men put on their swimm
It is quite possible to hold out for an hour
several hours in the water.

No, my dear Sir — on any ground we
may put it, the loss of lives was due to
recklessness, carelessness — and Americans
who under circumstances (such as exist)
take their chances on a British vessel deserve
no pity.

It would be an outrage for us here, safe
in a large country, to try to increase the
hardships from which Germany suffers

Do you know why the sale of war material
was not included in the prohibiter acts?
Because it was argued that the case might
arise when a small country had to defend
itself against a large one?

Germany is a small country compared with
Russia (which is much larger than the U.S)
Germany deserves our sympathy, fighting
the Russian colossus.

Her best blood is shed in this terrible war,
and we are helping the English to help the
Russians by killing as many Germans as possible.
By the way — how would it be if an American
were killed by a foreign airship?

Please consider every thing. We can afford to be fair

Very truly C. A. Eggert.

Chicago, May 14, 1915

Dear Mr. Eggert:-

Yours of the 13th inst. is at hand. I did not suppose that the German Government took any hand in the sale of contraband of war during any of these wars in question. It is individuals who have a right to deal in the matter.

2. I don't admit that the destruction of a vessel carrying war material or any other material is legal unless the passengers and crew are given opportunity to escape.

May I add with regard to dealing in contraband or war - it should not be forgotten that the United States is not at war with Great Britain? That being the case, Great Britain has every right to trade with the United States, although it is at war with another country as it would have in time of peace. If the United States should interfere with that trade by laying an embargo on any portion of it

It takes at least 20 minutes to sink a large ship by a torpedo.

We know that women and children were saved. Why did not the men put on their swimming belts. It is quite possible to hold out for an hour or several hours in the water.

Chicago, May 14, 1915

No, my dear Sir — on any ground we may put it the loss of lives was due to recklessness, carelessness — and Americans who under circumstances such as these take their chances on a British vessel deserve no pity.

It would be an outrage for us here, safe in a large country, to try to increase the hard steps from which Germany suffers.

Dear Mr. Eggert:-

Yours of the 13th inst. is at hand.

I did not suppose that the German Government took any hand in the contraband of war during any of those wars in question. It is individuals who have a right to deal in the matter.

I don't admit that the destruction of a vessel carrying war material or any other material is legal unless the passengers and crew are given opportunity to escape.

May I add with regard to dealing in contraband of war - it should not be forgotten that the United States is not at war with Great Britain, that being the case, Great Britain has every right to trade with the United States, although it is at war with another country as it would have in time of peace. If the United States should interfere with that trade by laying an embargo on any portion of it

Why the sale of war material was not included in the preceding acts? Because it was argued might arise when a small country had to defend

Germany compared with the U.S. (larger than the U.S.) Germany practically fighting Russia, England, France, Japan, Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, Turkey, Italy in this terrible war, and we are helping the Entente to help the Russians by killing as many Germans as possible.

By the way — how would it be if an American were killed by a foreign airship?

Please consider every thing. We can afford to be fair.

Very truly C. A. Eggert.

the United States would be guilty of a hostile act against Great Britain. No doubt such a policy would benefit Germany, and I daresay the German Government would like to have the United States enter on a policy of hostility against Great Britain in German interests. That, however, can hardly be expected. I think it is not worth while to discuss the possibility of saving innocent people in the case of the attack on the "Lusitania". The circumstances are too well known.

I am glad to receive a courteous letter from a German sympathizer with his signature attached to it. Most of the communications I have received on this subject have come in an anonymous form.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. C. A. Eggert,
1937 Lincoln Ave., Chicago.

the United States would be guilty of a hostile act against Great Britain. No doubt such a policy would benefit Germany, and I daresay the German Government would like to have the United States enter on a policy of hostility against Great Britain in German interests. That, however, can hardly be expected. I think it is not worth while to discuss the possibility of saving innocent people in the case of the attack on the "Lusitania". The circumstances are too well known.

I am glad to receive a courteous letter from a German sympathizer with his signature attached to thought of the communications I have received on this subject have come in anonymous form.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - K.

Mr. G. A. Egert,
1527 Lincoln Ave., Chicago.

96

~~Palmer House~~
Chicago

Pres. Judson Pratt
Chicago U'y

May 10. (1937 Lincoln Av) 1915

Dear President Pratt,

In regard to yr opinion reported in to-day's papers I would like to call yr attention to a material point, viz. the novelty of the submarine boats. They were first manufactured on a large scale by France, hence Germany did not introduce them. Being only recently introduced they require special treatment from Internat'l law. A submarine, working under such limitations as those imposed on Germany by Britain's colossal naval superiority, cannot be regarded as coming under the rule made when such preponderance did not exist. Some similar is the treatment of cases of capture of vessels carrying contraband when the capturing vessel has no harbor to which it can convey its capture. Nothing remains but to destroy it: This case is of course different.

As a general fact I beg to call yr attention to the fact that Internat'l (and other) law is based on and derived from a number of precedents. The precedents in this case are new, hence we cannot point yet to any fixed legal usage. A point that in my mind has some precedent is that neutrals should not assist belligerents on the one side

in such an exceptional predicament as is now before
with war material. I know that the prin.
present that this can be done — but is it
that the present enormity — Americans serv
hired workman or servant to put ~~death~~ death
engine &c convenient to the user on one side, i.
Britain, while a friendly country suffers its effects in th
deaths of its citizen soldiers, that is fathers, brothers, hus
carrying sorrow and misery into thousands of households,
that such an outrage constitutes a blemish for the nation
doing this infamous work?

Germany (Prussia) has always stood for the principle
"Free ships, free goods" but Britain opposed it in
favor of legalized piracy. To this end she built an
incredible number of fast and formidable cruisers,
5—10 times as many as any other nation.
Now, from the point of view of International law, is it unfair to claim
that in view of this disproportionate power the submarine may
be granted certain privileges?

Germany feels keenly the great wrong we are guilty of
in respect to her, but let some Americans, as in the
case of the Lusitania, perish through their own stupidity
or ignorance, the whole nation, at least the newspapers,
howl like hungry wolves for war.

Germany has been very courteous and patient, —
she uses what means she has to fight an unscrupulous
enemy. — Look at Britain's claiming the North Sea as
her domain, laying mines extensively. Germany followed
suit. Then Britishers in the channel, direct two different
American ships (for Bremen) to go where they must strike
mines. But enough. I am considerably wrought up by all this,
and as an old student of International Law, which I studied in part
under the venerable Bluntschli, I naturally feel interested in what you say.

Very truly yours C. A. Rogers.

Chicago, May 12, 1915

Dear Sir:-

Your favor of the 10th inst. is received. I understand fully your suggestion. Permit me to point out, however, that a rule of international law requires the assent of practically all civilized nations. The use, therefore, of these undersea craft for the destruction of merchant vessels is something which cannot be made a rule of international law by Germany alone. Private vessels may be stopped and seized by belligerent war vessels of any type. If it is impracticable to take them in for condemnation they may be destroyed. All that gives no right whatever to destroy the passengers and crew. So far as the traffic in contraband is concerned, it is it seems to me idle to protest against an established principle of law and custom. Neutral individuals have a perfect right to deal with belligerents in contraband articles, and if one of these belligerents is unable to

in such an exceptional predicament as is now before
with war material. I know that the pres
present that this can be done — but is it
that the present emergency — Americans
hired workman or servant to put ~~their~~ ~~[illegible]~~
engine &c convenient to the user on one side,
[illegible] friendly country suffers its offers
deaths of its citizen soldiers, that is fathers, brothers,
carrying sorrow and misery into thousands of households,
that such an outrage constitutes a blemish for the nation
doing this infamous work?

Dear Sir:-

Your letter of the 10th inst. is received.

I understand fully your suggestion, permit me to
point out, however, that a rule of international law
requires the assent of practically all civilized nations.
The need, therefore, of these underlying draft for the
consideration of responsible people is something which cannot
be made a rule of international law by Germany alone.
Private vessels may be stopped and searched by belligerent
war vessels of any type. If it is impossible to take
them in for condemnation they may be destroyed. All that
gives no right whatever to destroy the passengers and
crew, so far as the traffic in contraband is concerned.
It is it seems to me ridiculous to protest against an established
principle of law and custom. Neutral individuals have a
perfect right to deal with belligerents in contraband
articles, and if one of these belligerents is unable to
[illegible]

Obtain such
ness of the
herself when
extensively in
of the

in war time, Germany, Britain, claiming the North Sea as
[illegible] mines extensively. Germany followed
[illegible] Britishers in the channel, it was not different
American ships (for Bremen) to go where they
mines. But enough. I am considerably wrought up by all this,
and as an old student of International Law which I studied in part
under the venerable Oliver Wolcott, I naturally feel interested in what you say.

Very truly yours C. A. Sargent.

in spite of international law, Germany
[illegible] the great wrong we are guilty of
[illegible] but let some Americans, as in the
case of the Lusitania, perish through this error, stupidity
or ignorance, the whole nation, at least the Press, papers
[illegible] like hungry wolves [illegible]
[illegible] patient,
[illegible] Germany
[illegible] to fright [illegible] unscrupulous
[illegible] Sea as
[illegible] leaving mines extensively. Germany followed
[illegible] Britishers in the channel, it was not different
American ships (for Bremen) to go where they must strike
mines. But enough. I am considerably wrought up by all this,
and as an old student of International Law which I studied in part
under the venerable Oliver Wolcott, I naturally feel interested in what you say.

Very truly yours C. A. Sargent.

obtain such articles, that doesn't prevent the rightfulness of the traffic. In fact, Germany has uniformly herself when she has been a neutral dealt and dealt extensively in contraband with belligerents. The sinking of the "Lusitania" was a violation of international law, a violation of common ethics, and in my opinion was simply a crime.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. C. A. Eggert,
1937 Lincoln Ave., Chicago.

obtain such articles, that doesn't prevent the rightful-ness of the traffic. In fact, Germany has uniformly herself when she has been a neutral dealt and dealt extensively in contraband with belligerents. The sinking of the "Lusitania" was a violation of international law, a violation of common ethics, and in my opinion was simply a crime.-

Very truly yours,

I understand fully your suggestion, permit me to

H.F.J. - L.

however, that a rule of international law requiring the assent of practically all civilized nations. I am sure, therefore, no those unfortunate for the destruction of neutral vessels is something which cannot be made a rule of international law by Congress alone. Private vessels may be stopped and seized by belligerent war vessels of any type. It is impossible to take them in for condemnation they may be destroyed. All that Congress can do is to deter the merchants and

Mr. O. A. Egert,
1327 Lincoln Ave., Chicago.

Chicago, February 4, 1916

The Honorable the Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:-

May I as an American citizen and as Professor of International Law in this institution express the earnest hope that the Government of the United States will under no circumstances admit, directly or impliedly, that the sinking of the "Lusitania" was anything but an illegal act?

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Chicago, February 4, 1916

The Honorable the Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:-

May I as an American citizen and as Professor of International Law in this Institution express the earnest hope that the Government of the United States will under no circumstances admit, directly or impliedly, that the sinking of the "Lusitania" was anything but an illegal act?

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.