Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND REBELLION

SIR,—Was the Southern Confederacy entitled to the protection of international law during our Civil War? Did the United States Government violate Southern rights guaranteed by international law, by the blockade of the Southern ports? Were the relations between the North and the South international relations or were they the relations between a government and its rebellious subjects?

We know what England's attitude was during the Civil War. In her reply to our protest on behalf of "freedom of the seas" she reiterates that attitude, *viz.*, that the Southern Confederacy was an independent nation, rightly struggling against foreign, *i.e.*, Northern invasion, and therefore entitled to the international status of a free nation, and to the protection of international law. This, apparently, is the attitude of Mr. Maurice Low in his article on "The Freedom of the Seas" in your September number. Is it the correct, the American, attitude? or must we tacitly accept the insult it implies and scarcely veils, lest we hurt the feelings of the "mother country," or lest the present Administration should alienate Southern votes? Must we all acquiesce in the "hyphenation" of "Anglo-Saxonism," dare we not call ourselves merely American?

INQUISITIVE.

JAMESTOWN, MD.

"SERGEANT WHAT'S HIS NAME"

SIR,—If you will pardon a personal letter, not sent through the channels, from so humble a person as a sergeant in Troop D, 1st Cavalry, I wish to express my appreciation of the article by Major-General John F. O'Ryan in the recent issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. If we had more like it, the public would have a much better idea of national defense, and a clearer understanding of the National Guard; what it is, and what it is trying to do. I thoroughly enjoyed reading the article and was pleased to find our commanding officer among the contributors.

ROY A. CHENEY.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

WHAT PREPAREDNESS REALLY MEANS

SIR,—Since the beginning of the present conflict in Europe, there has been a growing agitation for "preparedness" in the United States. That such preparation is essential to the welfare and security of the country no one can doubt—except that the country at large seems to have interpreted preparedness as military organization. Every community is agog with various schemes for training the citizenry, for promoting new inventions of destruction, for enlarging the army and navy, etc., etc. All of which would be very valuable, were they not so hopelessly insufficient.

It seems particularly inconsistent that we should fashion our methods of preparedness after the one country which will surely suffer the most terrible defeat known in the annals of the world. Germany, by means of her remarkable organization and efficiency, has assumed a temporary advantage, but no one familiar with the financial and industrial conditions abroad can