

Human Happiness

Much of It Is Due to Labor-Saving Machinery.

The History of the World Is Simply One Grand Accumulating Demonstration of the Material Progress of Man—Great in Exact Proportion as the Use of Labor-Saving Machinery Has Spread.

A correspondent of the Chicago Tribune questions the truth of the assertion that labor-saving machinery has contributed largely to the happiness of mankind and seems inclined to the belief that the problem as to whether such machinery is a curse or a blessing is one that is extremely difficult to solve. In answer, that paper proceeds to a discussion of some facts. It says:

Man, in order to live, must produce something. If he doesn't produce anything then he must live on roots and herbs, the fruits of trees, the spontaneous offerings of Nature, and, short, pretty nearly as the monkeys live. But since the supply of roots and herbs and the like, where there is no cultivation, is limited, a small number of people can subsist in this way, only a small population being able to live off the supply of large acreage. It would hardly be deemed, therefore, that some degree of labor-saving machinery was essential to raise mankind out of this primitive condition. And if there is any problem raised by the objects to labor-saving machinery it must be as to what point in the raising of mankind from a material existence to a higher one labor-saving machinery became a curse.

The moment that a man takes the first steps towards production and towards increasing by artificial means the food yield of the earth, then he has taken the first step in progress. It doesn't matter how simple or how crude that first step may be, it is a mark of progress. It may be simply digging holes in the ground with a stick and putting grain in the holes and then enjoying the fruits of his labor. This is the first step that can be imagined. Then comes another step when he subjugates the horse to his own purposes. This was one of the first labor-saving machines which man thought of to supplement his own labor, for by the aid of this powerful animal he was able to substitute a plow for a stick and use the horse to drag the plow. Thus cultivated more ground, raised more crops, had more food to live on, and more food to exchange with other men for their food products of a different kind, for instance, the same thing killed. It could hardly be imagined that in that early time any industry was interfered with by the introduction of this primitive form of labor-saving machinery. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

The immediate effect of the harrow on the farmer was to enable him to raise his crops at a less expenditure of labor, therefore less cost, and hence to sell them more cheaply without decreasing his profits. Then came the plow, which, by the aid of the horse, enabled the farmer to distribute his products more cheaply than before and bring them to remote points easily within his market limits. The ton of wheat which, carried by wagon, became prohibitively expensive at the end of 100 miles, is carried by the railroads for one-half a mile a mile, and a barrel of flour can be transported from Minneapolis to New York for 50 cents. The farmer, thus abetted by the railroad, can stock his farm and supply food to the mechanics living in far-off cities, and with similar ease can have the result of the mechanics' work deposited at his gate-post. It is true that the railroads had perhaps thousands of wagon-drivers, but they made places formerly not in existence directly for about 50,000 employees, and by making possible express companies and other lines of business auxiliary to the railroads opened up remunerative employment for many thousands more. In a material sense alone, therefore, the railroad can hardly be looked upon as anything but a blessing, and the objection to labor-saving machinery must wait yet before locating the point where machinery becomes a curse. But the same obstacle in the form of hard, incontrovertible fact confronts the objector; he continues his survey down to the very present. In whatever direction he turns he is confronted by the same marvelous progress, resulting at each step in some displacement of labor, but a displacement which amounts only to a shifting process and creates new places of employment than are done away with.

Contemplate the telegraph and the telephone, agencies that created new fields of labor for hundreds of thousands of men and women. Walk through the city and view the great buildings and all the countless evidences of progress made possible by labor-saving machinery. Think of the daily paper, an instance, delivered at the homes of the people for a penny a day and containing the latest news of the day from every section of the world—a gigantic accomplishment only made possible by the great development of progress in any part of the world. It is quite as conspicuous in comparing the conditions of the people during the reigns of Queen Victoria and Queen Elizabeth. If our doubting correspondent would read the history which is a treat of the time of Queen Elizabeth and compare the descriptions therein contained of the state of happiness of the people with what he knows it to be now he will hardly question that there has been an immense advance. England then was scourged with pestilence and famine, and even people well-to-do were forced to live in comparative squalor because of their ignorance of sanitary and medical science. England was barely able to do what the Spanish crusade, which the Spaniards would doubtless have subjugated the island and made it a Spanish colony. But England since that time has learned sanitation, has applied such science as has developed to the utmost labor-saving machinery, while Spain has almost entirely neglected these things, so that England today, in power and utility to the world, is worth 100 Spains. England, formerly barely able to care for itself, is at the present time feeding and protecting from famine a considerable percentage of the population of its great Indian Empire, and is keeping from death by starvation, which would come if India were not dependent on England, about 30,000,000 people, which is about the population of England today. In all that time, the correspondent nor anybody else could dream of going back to the time of Queen Elizabeth. To live, then, compared to the little New England State with barren soil and no coal with the States of the South, whose soil is rich and fertile and where coal abounds. Yet the use of labor-saving machinery in New England has so enriched the people that they could buy the coal of the entire South, where progress by machinery has languished, and not for a moment have their standard of living pronounced as this could be multiplied ad libitum, and in fact the history of the world in all time leads to the present day is simply one grand accumulating demonstration of the material progress of man, in exact proportion as the use of labor-saving machinery has spread.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

Ask your grocer for **Andersson's** **Sat** For Table and Dairy, Purest and Best

the city and view the great buildings and all the countless evidences of progress made possible by labor-saving machinery. Think of the daily paper, an instance, delivered at the homes of the people for a penny a day and containing the latest news of the day from every section of the world—a gigantic accomplishment only made possible by the great development of progress in any part of the world. It is quite as conspicuous in comparing the conditions of the people during the reigns of Queen Victoria and Queen Elizabeth. If our doubting correspondent would read the history which is a treat of the time of Queen Elizabeth and compare the descriptions therein contained of the state of happiness of the people with what he knows it to be now he will hardly question that there has been an immense advance. England then was scourged with pestilence and famine, and even people well-to-do were forced to live in comparative squalor because of their ignorance of sanitary and medical science. England was barely able to do what the Spanish crusade, which the Spaniards would doubtless have subjugated the island and made it a Spanish colony. But England since that time has learned sanitation, has applied such science as has developed to the utmost labor-saving machinery, while Spain has almost entirely neglected these things, so that England today, in power and utility to the world, is worth 100 Spains. England, formerly barely able to care for itself, is at the present time feeding and protecting from famine a considerable percentage of the population of its great Indian Empire, and is keeping from death by starvation, which would come if India were not dependent on England, about 30,000,000 people, which is about the population of England today. In all that time, the correspondent nor anybody else could dream of going back to the time of Queen Elizabeth. To live, then, compared to the little New England State with barren soil and no coal with the States of the South, whose soil is rich and fertile and where coal abounds. Yet the use of labor-saving machinery in New England has so enriched the people that they could buy the coal of the entire South, where progress by machinery has languished, and not for a moment have their standard of living pronounced as this could be multiplied ad libitum, and in fact the history of the world in all time leads to the present day is simply one grand accumulating demonstration of the material progress of man, in exact proportion as the use of labor-saving machinery has spread.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

The statement originally credited to Bishop Potter, in a New York dispatch to the effect that "labor-saving machinery is a curse to labor, and that the more it is used, the more labor is dislocated of labor. There are a few such instances. Men employed in highly specialized work and trained to do work long and exclusively that they were thrown out of a job by the introduction of the plow and were unable to gain a livelihood. It cannot be imagined either that any appreciable number of men were thrown out of employment by the substitution of the harrow for the sickle. This is the first step in the chain of course caused in one sense a great displacement of labor. For one man sitting in a chair and driving a team of horses could do as much work as formerly was accomplished by twenty sturdy, well-sweated men who formerly wielded sickles found a score of avenues of industry opened to them by the harrow, and their abilities were not so limited to sickle work that they could not with comparative ease successfully embark on these new lines of work. Statistical evidence is so conclusive on this point that no contention is possible, and in the same way all the labor-saving machines preceding the introduction of the harrow, although displacing labor, have demonstrably only diverted the energies of men from one channel into others which the machinery made for them. Up to this point, therefore, there is no opening for argument that labor-saving machines had become anything but beneficial, for the resulting rearrangement of human industry, the displacement of one field of labor and the opening of new fields, have been easily followed in all the ramifications by the close observer.

strain their spirits, for one morning the ex-President awoke to find his yard filled with several hundred ducks and geese of all kinds, which had been borrowed from a duck farm just outside the town, where over 3,000 ducks are raised for the market. Even if Mr. Cleveland could not shoot those, he has had placed at his disposal, a private pond near his house, that is well stocked with black bass, and, it is said, a fishing party is being now arranged.

A Wedding in Bermuda

A correspondent writes as follows: It was a donkey that sent us to the darkey wedding. He was drawing us in a little cart through one of the "parishes" of Bermuda, and out of the crowd of people we saw a man in a dress, almost not distinguished by haste, was quite satisfactory in a land where time is of no consideration. But suddenly the gentle motion ceased altogether. We prodded the donkey with the pointed stick used in such emergencies, we caressed, threatened and pushed, but nothing broke his deep repose. Just as the day was becoming monotonous, a group of young colored girls, in stiff, starched, white dresses, rushed around the corner of a neighboring house, and scurried along under the shadow of a well. Such shame-faced, second-hand indignities, it is not to be said, as I called one of them to me, and asked if anything was going on. She hung her head in an agony of self-consciousness, but finally murmured: "Dar's going to be a mar'ge."

"A what?" "A mar'ge—a wedding in de church." The reading interest in our faces, her tongue was loosened. "Yo' kin go! Yo' kin! But Lize Benson, she no gwine! See her up dar' and she pointed to the house she had just come from. "She sitting in de bush, an' cryin' fo' all she's wuth. Her ma says dis mornin' over she 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

"Near what?" "Flah Stah!" and her finger indicated a flag-staff on a sunny knoll. The knoll was covered with irregular white patches, which were, we inferred, the wash of the neighborhood. "An' she leaves de dress dar' to dry, an' she go for it, an' on de way she see fall, an' de dress catch on de prickly bush, an' git ter. An' she come back, an' she say, 'Lize, yo' do up your white dress fo' de mar'ge,' an' Lize, she washed it, an' she go up near de 'Flah Stah' to dry it, an'—

The Fenian Peril in 1865

Revelations by William O'Brien, Ex-Irish M. P.

What Came Very Nearly Being a Formidable Insurrection.

They Had Not a Resolute Leader or There Might Have Been Much Bloodshed.

In the Contemporary Review for May there is a brilliant and eloquent article written by Wm. O'Brien, under the title "Was Fenianism Ever Formidable?" His reply is "Yes, formidable enough to threaten England was the most serious rebellion she had ever faced in Ireland." Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was but a boy, and his share in it seems to have been confined to attending the illegal drill-meetings, and a solitary excursion in an open boat with his brother and others who were engaged in the movement. He had ever faced in Ireland. Mr. O'Brien was of course heart and soul in the movement himself, although he was