Dear Mr. President, 

I have here a well-written statement that I would like to discuss. The author's argument is clear and well-supported. This is an valuable resource for our discussion.

I have enclosed a copy of the same for your information.

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 by its enemy, gives the latter a cause for war with us. Think that over please, for you are clearly wrong.

Next letter, 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 hangs all the rest.

2) That each ship is treated the same as any war vessel.

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

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

5) The submarine used 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. (Refer to the Berlin report also to the statements 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-balls (rapidly put on) would have saved everyone. The British are conservative and dull. Even as it was there was ample time. Cf. "Titania". Captains in the Sound condemned to death for having caught a German ship. But the naval hero of the war was a gentleman, and not a captain.

6) Had not the detonator following the torpedo proved that the cargo had exploded, the submarine would have allowed time for all to leave the ship, and then have sent off another torpedo. German men on land, among hostile military men. They throw every vehicle. Would be awed into action by the enemy of death. Everybody would be converted. 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 etc.

In conclusion, Bryan'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 government will give an answer that will make Bryan and Co. and its enemies feel very small. And as for the Lusitania? Vital sequel!

Very cordially, O. A. Eggert.
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.
OFFICE, WED, 19, 1912.

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

On a German ship, with better armament, trained and commanded,

she swimming away rapidly but we should have saved every one. But the Allies were conservation and well. Even as it was,

I may have a German service, for as you now see the view is a

recent one. So long as you take the view that there was ample time. If the German officer in the cruiser, continued to

require of her as a part of the convoy of the undersea, and

had not the destination following its order, which, in the event of

our having had intercourse with the submarine would have

allowed the cruiser to attack the German ship instead of the

base of the transporting department of the coast guard.

I have no right to the tone of your statement.

I have not concluded the discussion. I have announced that

people to think of them first and to prevent all possible

means (mines, air-ships, etc.) and war material to reach the

enemy. This is martial law recognized everywhere,

and energetically made use of by Grand Lee, German etc.

In conclusion, Bryan's note is offensive, arrogant and

assimilable. No decent American could stand 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 note will give an answer that will make Bryan and Co

and its followers feel very small. And as for the Lusitania. Viva sequan.

Very Cordially, C. A. Eggert.
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 domain, they laid mines extensively; the Germans followed. In the case of the Lexington, the loss of lives, the sea being calm, was easy. The submarine people had surely no wish to injure any human being.
Palmer House
Chicago

The Chicago Hotel Co., Lessee

1937 Lincoln Ave 5/13 1915

Dear President— I hope you don't 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, too.

1. Germany is not chargeable with the sale of war material to a party actually at war. In the Boer war or Germany declared neutrally 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 this 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 a submarine cannot call for any criticism.

There was ample time for rescue, but there was bravely as on the Titanic. Why was the captain of that boat in the Long Island Sound condemned to be penitentiary? Because of his neglect in regard to the swimming belts.
It takes at least 20 minutes to
ship by a torpedo.

We know that women and children
why did not the men put on their swim.
Is it 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
miscalculous, careless men—and Americans
who under circumstances such as exist
take their chances in a British vessel deserve
military.

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 prohibition 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—Russia is much larger than the U.S.
Germany deserves our sympathy. Fighting
the Russian colonies.
The best blood is shed in this horrible 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 everything we can afford to be fair.

Yours very truly,
C. A. Sagar
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 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 ship by a torpedo. We know the women and children were saved. Why did not the men put on their swimming belts? It is quite possible to hold out for several hours in the water.

Office May 16, 1917

No, my dear Sir — on any grounds we may put the loss of lives down due to recklessness, carelessness — and Americans who under circumstances such as these

Your arrest for treason was made necessary by the arrest of a German by the British vessel whose

I am in the presence of war conditions and if peace were to come it is impossible for us here safe

in a large country to try to increase the

I cannot believe that the restriction of a vessel

Don't know why the war is going on

on my own behalf and also the German engineer.

Because the German engineer was not included in the proclamation acts.

The Georgia Engineer was not included in the proclamation acts.

Many who agree with me, but I would like to have more opportunity to

Tell me what I can do to improve conditions or war.

If Germany is not prepared for war, she is not prepared for peace.

This thing is a great pity. The world is at war.

Patriotism is not war with our enemies, we must have

The terms of peace are not blueprints for a

are not meant to be fair.

Please consider everything. We can afford to be fair.
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.
Palmer House
Chicago

May 10, (1937, Lindell, 1915)

Dear President Scott,

In regard to your opinion reported in to-day's papers I would like to call your attention to a novel fact, viz. the novelty of the submarine boats. They were first manufactured on a large scale by France, and Germany did not introduce them. Being newly introduced they require special treatment from International Law. A submarine, working under such limitation as those imposed in Germany by Britain's naval colonial inferiority, cannot be regarded as coming within the rule made when such preponderance did not exist. Similarly, in 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 rule I beg to call your attention to the fact that International 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 us. I know that the press
press that this can be done—but is it
that the present enormity—Americans who
hired workmen or servants to put death in
angry to convince the user on one side.

British, while a friendly country suffers its efforts in the
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 to claim
from the point of international law, as it unfair 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 other Lusitania, perish through their own stupidity
or ignorance, the whole nation, at least the newspapers,
how like hungry wolves for war.

Germany has been very courteous and patient,
she uses what means she has to fight an merciless
enemy. Look at Britain's claiming the North Sea as
her domain, laying mines extensively. Germany followed
suit. Then Britain's in the Channel, it was too difficult
American ships (for Brown) to go where they must strike
mines. But enough. I am considerably through my all this
and as an old student of Internet law (which I studied in part
under the venerable Flaxworthy) I naturally feel interested in what you say.
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 consent of practically all civilized nations. The use, therefore, of these vessels for the purpose of conveying the "Lusitania" was a violation of international law and is an act of piracy. The sinking of the "Lusitania" was a violation of international law, which is now recognized by all nations.

In fact, Germany has uniformly obtained such articles, that doesn't prevent the rightful seizure of the traffic. In fact, Germany has uniformly dealt with all contraband. Therefore, Germany has dealt with all contraband. It is idle to protest against the conscription of the "Lusitania".

In my opinion, the sinking of the "Lusitania" was a violation of international law, and in my opinion was simply a violation of common ethics.
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.
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,

N. F. J. - L.
Office of Secretary of State

To: The Honorable Secretary of State

Dear Mr. Secretary:

May I as an American citizen and an instructor of international law express the earnest hope that the Government of the United States will make no compromise with the insurrectionary movement of the "Interminables" in South America? I am in the United States on a trip of investigation.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Red Circle]