

result in intense bitterness and might cause an undesirable, if not a serious situation. On the other hand, contracts for and sales of contraband are mere matters of trade. The manufacturer, unless peculiarly sentimental, would sell to one belligerent as readily as he would to another. No general spirit of partisanship is aroused—no sympathies excited. The whole transaction is merely a matter of business.

This government has not been advised that any general loans have been made by foreign governments in this country since the president expressed his wish that loans of this character should not be made.

(14) **Submission to arrest of native born Americans on neutral vessels and in British and their imprisonment.**

The general charge as to the arrest of American-born citizens on board neutral vessels and in British ports, the ignoring of their passports, and their confinement in jails, requires evidence to support it. That there have been cases of injustice of this sort is unquestionably true, but Americans in Germany have suffered in this way as Americans have in Great Britain. This government has considered that the majority of these cases resulted from over-zealousness on the part of subordinate officials in both countries. Every case which has been brought to the attention of the department of state, has been promptly investigated, and, if the facts warranted, a demand for release has been made.

(15) **Indifference to confinement of non-combatants in detention camps in England and France.**

As to the detention of non-combatants confined in concentration camps, all the belligerents, with perhaps the exception of Serbia and Russia, have made similar complaints, and those for whom this government is acting have asked investigations, which representatives of this government have made impartially. Their reports have shown that the treatment of prisoners is generally as good as possible under the conditions in all countries, and that there is no more reason to say that they are mistreated in one country than in another country, or that this government has manifested an indifference in the matter. As this department's efforts at investigations seemed to develop bitterness between the countries, the department on November 20 sent a circular instruction to its representatives not to undertake further investigation of concentration camps.

But at the special request of the German government that Mr. Jackson, former American minister of Bucharest, now attached to the American embassy at Berlin, make an investigation of the prison camps in England, in addition to the investigations already made, the department has consented to dispatch Mr. Jackson on this special mission.

(16) **Failure to prevent transshipment of British troops and war materials across the territory of the United States.**

The department has had no specific case of the passage of convoys of troops across American territory brought to its notice. There have been rumors to this effect, but no actual facts have been presented. The transshipment of reservists of all belligerents who have requested the privilege, has been permitted on condition that they travel as individuals and not as organized, uniformed or armed bodies. The German embassy has advised the department that it would not be likely to avail itself of the privilege, but Germany's ally, Austria-Hungary, did so.

Only one case raising the question of the transit of war material owned by a belligerent across United States territory has come to the department's notice. This was a request on the part of the Canadian government for permission to ship equipment across Alaska to the sea. The request was refused.

(17) **Treatment and final internment of German steamship "Geier" and the collier "Locksun" at Honolulu.**

The Geier entered Honolulu on October 15th in an unseaworthy condition. The commanding officer reported the necessity of extensive repairs which would require an indefinite period for completion. The vessel was allowed the generous period of three weeks to November 7th to make repairs and leave the port, or failing to do so, to be interned. A longer period would have been contrary to international practice, which does not permit a vessel to remain for a long time in a neutral port for the purpose of repairing a generally run down condition due to long sea service. Soon after the German cruiser arrived at Honolulu a Japanese cruiser appeared off the port and the commander of the Geier

chose to intern the vessel rather than to depart from the harbor.

Shortly after the Geier entered the port of Honolulu the steamer Locksun arrived. It was found that this vessel had delivered coal to the Geier en route and had accompanied her toward Hawaii. As she had thus constituted herself a tender or collier to the Geier she was accorded the same treatment and interned on November 7th.

(18) **Unfairness to Germany in rules relative to coaling of warships in Panama Canal zone.**

By proclamation of November 13, 1914, certain special restrictions were placed on the coaling of warships or their tenders or colliers in the canal zone. These regulations were framed through the collaboration of the state, navy and war departments and without the slightest reference to favoritism to the belligerents. Before these regulations were proclaimed, war vessels could procure coal of the Panama Railway in the zone ports, but no belligerent vessels are known to have done so. Under the proclamation, fuel may be taken on by belligerent warships only with the consent of the canal authorities, and in such amounts as will enable them to reach the nearest accessible neutral port; and the amount so taken on shall be deducted from the amount procurable in the United States ports within three months thereafter.

Now, it is charged the United States has shown partiality, because Great Britain and not Germany happens to have colonies in the near vicinity where British ships may coal, while Germany has no such coaling facilities. Thus it is intimated the United States should balance the inequalities of geographic position by refusing to allow any warships of belligerents to coal in the canal until the war is over. As no German warship has sought to obtain coal in the canal zone the charge of discrimination rests upon a possibility which during several months of warfare has failed to materialize.

(19) **Failure to protest against the modifications of the Declaration of London by the British Government.**

The German foreign office presented to the diplomats in Berlin a memorandum dated October 10th, calling attention to violations of, and changes in, the Declaration of London by the British government, and inquiring as to the attitude of the United States toward such action on the part of the allies. The substance of the memorandum was forthwith telegraphed to the department on October 22nd, and was replied to shortly thereafter to the effect that the United States had withdrawn its suggestion, made early in the war, that for the sake of uniformity, the Declaration of London should be adopted as a temporary code of naval warfare during the present war, owing to the unwillingness of the belligerents to accept the Declaration without changes and modifications, and that thenceforth the United States would insist that the rights of the United States and its citizens in the war should be governed by the existing rules of international law.

As this government is not now interested in the adoption of the Declaration of London by the belligerents, the modifications by the belligerents in that code of naval warfare are of no concern to it except as they adversely affect the rights of the United States and those of its citizens as defined by international law. Insofar as those rights have been infringed the department has made every effort to obtain redress for the losses sustained.

(20) **General unfriendly attitude of Government toward Germany and Austria.**

If any American citizens, partisans of Germany and Austria-Hungary, feel that this administration is acting in a way injurious to the cause of those countries, this feeling results from the fact that on the high seas the German and Austro-Hungarian naval power is thus far inferior to the British. It is the business of a belligerent operating on the high seas, not the duty of a neutral, to prevent contraband from reaching an enemy. Those in this country, who sympathize with Germany and Austria-Hungary, appear to assume that some obligation rests upon this government, in the performance of its neutral duty, to prevent all trade in contraband, and thus to equalize the difference due to the relative naval strength of the belligerents. No such obligation exists; it would be an unneutral act, an act of partiality on the part of this government, to adopt such a policy if the executive had the power to do so. If Germany and Austria-Hungary can not import contraband from this country it is not, because of that fact, the duty of the

United States to close its markets to the allies. The markets of this country are open upon equal terms to all the world, to every nation, belligerent or neutral.

The foregoing categorical replies to specific complaints is sufficient answer to the charge of unfriendliness to Germany and Austria-Hungary. I am, my dear senator,

Very sincerely yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

Honorable William J. Stone,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

NEUTRALITY

Chicago Tribune: Mr. Bryan's letter to Senator William J. Stone may not allay prejudiced opinion which confuses the obligations of neutrality with the offices of partisanship, but it will commend itself to the unprejudiced as sane and convincing.

Mr. Bryan has been accused of bias, but we are certain that in his case, as in the case of President Wilson, distress caused by the European conditions makes no distinctions. Repugnance to war and sympathy for all the victims of it dominate Mr. Bryan's emotions, and we think he is justly entitled to a defense against the charge that he personally is an advocate, and that, whether in consequence or not, the administration adjusts its policies to favor one and injure another set of combatants.

The issue is already troublesome, and might become dangerous, there being elements in our citizenship naturally and violently partisan, and therefore incapable of the clear thinking they would give a question which did not appeal so powerfully to their emotions.

The statement of this government's policy with regard to the nations at war may help compose or it may tend to aggravate our controversies at home, but it certainly will reassure the citizen whose one demand is for neutrality that the administration has no intent other than to preserve it.

Mr. Bryan explains that in many cases in which the United States comes in contact with the belligerents there are no international conventions, and our government relies upon international law and precedents. Consistency has a real value here, and the administration with justice applies not only the rules which the United States itself has made in war but the rules which the warring governments themselves have made or recognized in the past.

Strong opposition to the sale of munitions of war to belligerents has come not only from the naturally prejudiced but from persons whose sentiment is outraged by the thought of this commercial participation in the killing of men. The German government would not recognize such a sentiment as controlling, and Mr. Bryan, by quoting from a memorandum presented by the German ambassador, at the direction of his government, shows that Germany has not objected to such trade, but has conceded the rights of belligerents and neutrals in it.

In dealing with Mexico we put an embargo on munitions of war, but that was not the act of a neutral nation. It was the act of one intervening indirectly in the war to bring about a certain result.

When we were occupying Vera Cruz, although not at war with Mexico, a shipment of German arms, which would have been contraband if there had been a state of war, reached its Mexican consignees and would have been used against our troops if they had been obliged to undertake more extensive operations.

Mr. Bryan makes it plain that if a neutral by embargo endeavors to take away the results of an advantage given a belligerent by the superiority of one of its military factors it has ceased to be neutral and has become a participant. Naval superiority confers an advantage in the procuring of contraband. The United States has been asked, but not by any belligerent, to minimize this advantage and thereby become a factor in the struggle, ceasing to be neutral.

There have been vexed questions in our relations with the nations at war. Mr. Bryan discusses many of them. There undoubtedly will arise more and more of them, but the administration's answer gives us confidence to believe that the government's intent is to mind American business strictly and give cause to no just complaint.