MEMPHIS APPEAL

BY

GALLAWAY & KEATING.

Terms of Subscription, Daily & Weekly

DAILY:

One copy, one year, by mail	$ 8 00
One copy, six months, by mail	4 00
One copy, one month, by mail	75
One copy, one week, in city	15

WEEKLY:

One copy, one year	$2 00
One copy, six months	1 25

Rates of Advertising.

First insertion, per square	$1 00
Subsequent insertions, per square	50

Eight lines solid nonpareil makes one square, and twelve lines make one inch.

Local Notices are twenty cents per line first insertion, fifteen cents per line per week.

Wants, etc., are ten cents per line first insertion, five cents per line each subsequent insertion.

Death and Marriage notices, Funeral notices and Obituaries, are charged at regular rates.

We will not accept any advertisement to follow reading matter.

To Contributors and Correspondents.

We solicit letters and communications upon subjects of general interest, but such must always be accompanied by a responsible name.

We will not return rejected communications.

In ordering papers changed from one postoffice to another, the names of both postoffices should be given.

Our mail-books are kept by postoffices, and not by individual names.

Specimen copies sent free of charge.

All letters, communications, or anything else for the APPEAL, should be addressed

GALLAWAY & KEATING,
282 Second street,
Memphis, Tenn.

M. C. GALLAWAY, | J. M. KEATING.

MEMPHIS APPEAL

SUNDAY, : : JULY 14, 1878.

DEMOCRATIC JUDICIAL TICKET.

For the State at Large.

JAS. W. DEADERICK, of Hamilton.
PETER TURNEY, of Franklin.

For the Eastern Division.

ROBERT M'FARLAND, of Hamblen.

For the Middle Division.

WILLIAM F. COOPER, of Davidson

For the Western Division.

THOMAS J. FREEMAN, of Gibson.

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY TICKET.

Sheriff.
C. L. ANDERSON.

Probate Court Judge,
J. E. R. RAY.

County Trustee,
J. J. RAWLINGS.

Chancery Court Judge,
GEORGE W. WINCHESTER.

Circuit Court Judge,
ROBERT BUTCHINSON.

Criminal Court Judge,
L. H. CORRIGAN.

Attorney-General Criminal Court,
C. W. GORDON.

Attorney-General Bartlett Circuit Court,
GEORGE C. DENT.

Clerk Shelby County Circuit Court,
JOHN WORSHAM.

Clerk Bartlett Circuit Court,
FELIX M. JONES.

County Register,
J. A. STEGELL.

Criminal Court Clerk,
N. C. PERKINS.

County Court Clerk,
ROBERT J. BLACK.

Constables—Fifth District.
E. T. GARRETT,
THOS. GARVEY.

Constable—Fourteenth District.
T. S. MALLORY.

THE CANVASS IN SHELBY.

The canvass in this county is now regarded as the same old fight between Radicalism and Democracy. The party which has plundered and persecuted the southern people, and which, nine years ago, voted against the enfranchisement of the white tax-payer, seeks to regain power under a new name and a new banner. But the people of Shelby county are not fools. They see that Pierce, and Kortrecht, and Shaw, and Eaton, and Garrett, and Smith are the high priests ministering at the altar of the new party, and on the first day of August, two weeks from Thursday next, they will indicate by their votes that they will remain true to the Democratic party, which nine years ago routed Radical proscription and disfranchisement. Sanguine of success, and reposing implicit confidence in the intelligence of the people of Shelby, the APPEAL has not worried its readers with party appeals, believing that the daily publication of the names of the nominees, which float from our masthead, was all the argument that was necessary to induce Democrats to perform their duty. But, as the Radicals are swaggering and sweating in their efforts to manufacture confidence and enthusiasm, it is the duty of the Democrats not to imitate the tactics of the Radicals by engaging in fussy, rant and hectoring gasconade, but to commence preparing for the march to that grand and glorious victory which awaits them. In all the southern States the Democrats are united in a solid and impregnable phalanx against Radicalism, and the Democrats of Shelby, living in the great heart of the southern people, will show by their votes that they are not so verdant as to be transferred to Radicalism, which seeks power by fighting under the National banner. To prevent such a result, from now until the close of the polls on the first day of August the Democrats must work unceasingly. There is every incentive for work. Our candidates are all men of unexceptionable character. Every man in Shelby county knows that George W. Winchester is the superior of C. Kortrecht in all the relations of life. Then what inducement is there for a Democrat to vote for a broken-down Republican in preference to a vigorous Democrat, who sympathized with the southern people while Kortrecht was sustaining all the usurpations and infamies of Grant and Radicalism, debauched with power? Who does not know that Horrigan would make a superior judge of the criminal court to superannuated P. T. Scruggs? Is there a Democrat, a tax-paying citizen of Shelby county, who can conscientiously vote for such a Radical as J. O. Pierce, an old Brownlow office-holder, in preference to Robert Hutchinson? J. E. R. Ray towers above T. D. Eldridge as high as the stars. The idea of electing G. P. M. Turner over G. W. Gordon is an absurdity. The people of Shelby are not ingrates. If governed by no other motive, self-interest will induce them to stand by faithful public servants, and they have no idea of exchanging C. L. Anderson, J. J. Rawlings and N. C. Perkins for the untried men that are opposing them. Even the opponents of Robert J. Black concede his pre-eminent qualifications. There is not a man within the limits of Shelby, we care not for his politics or his nationality, who does not know that R. J. Black would make a superior officer to Owen Dwyer. The Democratic ticket is every respect superior to that of the mongrel opposition. Then let us elect it. The triumph of the Nationals in this county, led by Eaton, Garrett, Shaw, Smith, Kortrecht and Pierce, would be, to all intents and purposes, a Radical triumph, and would be justly heralded abroad as a Radical victory. It would endanger this congressional district in the November election, and thereby hazard the Democratic majority in the next house of representatives. Such a victory would give new life and vitality to the Radicals, who have so long persecuted and plundered the southern people. They would flock to the standard of the Nationals, and hope for a restoration to that power from which they were driven by the Democracy. Elsewhere the Democratic party is united and marching to victory. Oregon has just elected a Democratic governor and legislature, which secures a Democratic United States senator. The dawn of Democratic ascendancy is beaming across the land, and the people are looking hopefully forward to the fullness of its noonday sun. We cannot believe that as the era of restoration approaches the Democrats of Shelby will be the first to desert their colors.

PROF. WINCHELL AND THE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

In the middle of June last, Prof. Winchell, of Ann Arbor, Michigan, who had been engaged as a lecturer at the Vanderbilt university, in Nashville, Tennessee, published a communication in the Nashville *American*, stating that he had been excluded from his position in that university on the ground of heresy. The matter was not to the credit of the managers of the university, and it would have been convenient to "hush it up," but the standing of the professor as a man of scientific attainments and unusual ability, and as a gentleman, was too high for the "hush-up" system to prevail, and, after the lapse of a month, a reply to the professor's communication appears in the Nashville *Christian Advocate* of July 13th. The letter of the professor was such as became a man of his character and position to write; it was direct in its statements and frank in its explanations. Neither directness nor frankness marks the Vanderbilt university reply. It has the smoothly expressed irritation of the politic big boy who has been caught, but who is determined not to confess, and is too well cornered to be able to explain away. The let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay of christian conversation, is not in it. Prof. Winchell, put in a position where he must defend himself, cites expressions of commendation he had received from the managers of the university. The reply calls this citation of witnesses to professional character, an attempt to set "the faculty by the ears," by the publication of private conversations. A subtle way of turning the tables upon him who has suffered wrong, such as we find some instances of in Fox's *Book of Martyrs*, when the early Protestants were under examination. We do the writer of the reply, as well as the professor, the justice to state that the former acknowledges that "the university derived benefit generally from his [Prof. Winchell's] labors and reputation." But, says the *Advocate* writer, "His development of evolution and polygenism became so pronounced in the last year as to raise and press the question, 'Is Prof. Winchell's connection with the university beneficial to it?'" As the professor was filling a lectureship, and was deprived of his position as a lecturer, it appears as if polygenism and evolution becoming so pronounced the last year in those lectures, was the reason why the professor was deprived of his position. It is only appearance, however, an ingenious way of leading the reader to an inference the writer has not expressed, of insinuating what has not been said. Plain men, who call things by their names, term this way of covertly conveying an unfruth—jesuitism. In his statement, Prof. Winchell says: "I have always taken pains in my lectures at Nashville to avoid the utterance of opinions which I supposed were disapproved by the officers of the university." This statement his respondent does not venture to deny or to question. Thereupon the "officers" of Prof. Winchell consisted in his having opinions that were not the opinions of the university officials, and of expressing them, though never running in connection with his duties as university lecturer. The next charge of the respondent to the professor's card is that "the claims, like another Galileo, to have been the victim of ecclesiastical proscription." The professor's letter does not claim the Galileo honor, the only mention of that martyr to truth occurs in a conversation between the professor and Bishop M'Tyeire, as related by Prof. Winchell, in which the bishop said to him: "We do not propose to treat you as the inquisition treated Galileo." To term this word in the mouth of the bishop a claim on the part of the professor, was a masterly stroke, and worthy of the Peter Dens logic of a writer whose sagacity in the use of words is admirable. The writer next objects to Prof. Winchell's theories, as, of course, he has as much right to do as the professor has to object to his. But the way to meet an erroneous theory is not to get rid of him who entertains it by a little quiet, indirect maneuver, such as the university officials resorted to. They did not openly and straightforwardly dismiss the professor, they abolished the lectureship, and so left him out of office without being put out. The *Advocate* writer turns from Prof. Winchell, for a moment, to complain of "a certain class of editors" who have blamed the persecuting spirit manifested by the university officials. A little theological billingsgate is let loose upon this class—atheistic, materialistic, anti-church, especially anti-Methodist! Never did church dignitaries abuse their position without stigmatizing those who denounced their injustice, their enmity to truth, and their dictatorial arrogance, as men warring against God, and opposers of religion. *C'etat c'est moi!* Oppose me and you oppose God. Christ, Paul, Martin Luther, all had this *odium theologicum* poured out upon their heads; but it has lost its power in our day, and the Vanderbilt university people are only raising a smile where they desire to plant a terror. They have, say what they please, taken the part of Galileo's persecutors. True, as the New Orleans *Presbyterian* says, the professor was not treated to imprisonment and other attentions such as the inquisition showed towards Galileo. But the modern and the ancient persecutors were alike in this—the inquisitors behaved toward Galileo as bad as it was in their power to do, and the Vanderbilt university officials behaved toward Prof. Winchell as bad as they had it in their power to do. His opinions disagreed with nothing in the first chapter of Genesis, but they were not the same as those of the *Advocate* writer and the university officials, so, as far as was in their power, they crushed him. Such treatment from such a quarter is leading the public to view educational institutions, when connected with religion, as biased by prejudice against the fair consideration by which truth is established, and therefore as behind the age and unfit for the instruction of youth. In this way the interests of religion are injured and its sacred truths robbed of their due influence. We say again, as we said a month ago upon this subject, "Those who love religion as Christ taught it, and as the early christians practiced it, undimmed by priestly hate, pure from persecution for conscience sake, can view such proceedings as the dismissal of Prof. Winchell from the Vanderbilt university at Nashville, only with sorrow, and with prayers that God may send a purer belief and a meeker spirit among the heads of his church." [illegible] April 5th last gave

THE IRISH CATHOLICS AND THE TWELFTH OF JULY.

The cause of Irish Catholic opposition to the celebration of the twelfth of July are cumulative and of many centuries growth. Ever since Ireland was presented to Henry II by Pope Adrian III, the unhappy island has been a prey to civil commotion and religious broils. The celebrated bull, by which the people and their country was given as a free gift, was issued in 1156, just seven hundred and twenty-two years ago. It confirmed England in the possession of Ireland, and brought the Irish church under subjection to that of Rome. With a mile to the island from the viceregent of God, Henry lost no time in asserting what he deemed his rights. Resistance followed, but superior training and military prowess, aided by traitors and local dissensions, enabled the Normans to rescue victory from the jaws of defeat, and ultimately to establish themselves in the south, east and west of the island beyond any power of the Irish to dislodge them. Gradually the limits of the pale was extended, the assertion of the new authority being marked by confiscations and outrages, the history of which are passed from father to son, the sign and seal of an endurance and spirit of resistance as fresh to-day as it was when Henry was declared lord of Ireland. Adrian was an Englishman full of the divine right idea. Emperors and kings were the Lord's anointed, but the pope was boss over all. He represented the Creator, and as such representative disposed of kingdoms as the land-stealers of California have in our day of counties and townships. Ireland belonged to God, and as the agent of God he gave it to Henry, who immediately proceeded to dispossess those who by right of possession through centuries of occupation supposed themselves to be the owners. They resisted and were murdered, and the lands were taken. For four hundred years war was waged between the English thieves on the one side and the Irish people on the other. The country was laid waste, famine ensued, the plague in one form or other followed, and those who had been spared by the sword perished miserably like dogs in a ditch. "Such," says a tory historian, "was the multitude of afflictions to which this ill-fated country was doomed during the reign of sixteen English princes that its inhabitants were reduced not unfrequently to feed upon grass, leaves, and even, hideous nourishment," he indignantly and horrified exclaims, "upon the flesh of of their fellow-creatures." To-day the Chinese are doing the same and the christian world is shocked. But the church has grown in grace since the middle ages. Henry VIII, prompted to reformation in religion, but not in morals, declared the Church of England the church of God by law. He disowned the pope, repudiated his authority, unmindful of the fact that he held Ireland by virtue of that authority, and he required all Irishmen to repudiate the church which had been forced upon them four hundred years before and accept the Reformed, become Anglicans in faith as they were English subjects by law. They refused. They were Roman Catholics from choice, and would remain so. Thus religion was brought in to increase the hate and fury of a war that had continued four hundred years. Most of the English colonists conformed. Protestantism therefore became to the native Irish the evidence of English domination. This religious war knew no cessation. It was continued during the reign of Edward VI and Mary, his sister, and was renewed with vigor by Elizabeth, who resolved to effect the reformation in religion, even to the extermination of the people of Ireland and the repeopling of it by English and Scotch Protestants. The chieftains, already in the field, determined to prevent the carrying into effect of so sanguinary a measure. They resisted bravely, and received such accessions of numbers as showed the red-headed virgin that she had made a mistake. There was a lull—a few weeks of peace. But it was as the calm that precedes the storm. Twenty thousand freshly accoutered men-at-arms under Essex renewed the struggle. The country was devastated so that it would not support its inhabitants, and the putrid exhalations from unburied carcasses brought on a pestilence which threatened to do what Elizabeth attempted by the sword—annihilate the Irish. With the death of Elizabeth there was not peace, but a truce. The Stewarts, weak, impolitic and perfidious, ascended the throne. The first of them, James I, colonized Ulster after a well-matured military plan, and thus fresh fuel was added to the already great occasion for Irish disaffection. The first national parliament was assembled in his reign. It opened a very pandora's box of religious hate. The Catholics objected to some irregularities in the election of Protestant members, and refused to take the oath of supremacy. Another pope, Adrian, the eighth of the name, exhorted them to suffer death rather than take that oath. They suffered that penalty in all sorts of forbidden forms. A rebellion broke out in Ulster, which deteriorated into a series of neighborhood fights, in which nameless atrocities were committed on both sides, such as filling houses with women and children and setting fire to them, putting women *enceinte* to exquisite tortures, impaling children, and so on; and this continued hot and heavy, only now and then interrupted by breathing spells, until William III finished what his predecessors, including the brutal and ruthless man-of God and man-of-war Cromwell had in vain essayed. He received the submission of all Ireland. He was conqueror. Three thousand nine hundred and seventy-eight persons were outlawed, and their possessions were confiscated, thus completing the forfeiture of the wholeisland for the third time. William, by the treaty of Limerick, bound himself to secure the Irish Catholics in certain rights guaranteed to them by Charles II. He utterly failed to do so. On the contrary, he increased their burdens, and added to those borne by all the inhabitants alike. He completed and enforced the penal laws; and he gave his sanction to acts for the destruction of the industries and trade of the country. The export of beef cattle was prohibited, and the export of anything from Ireland to America or from America to Ireland was prohibited without first unloading in England or Wales. All trade to Asia was prohibited, and an absolute prohibition was laid on the exportation of Irish wool. The industries of the people were thus ruthlessly destroyed by law. Driven to idleness and to consequent poverty, they were cursed for their laziness. It was made a penal offense to open schools, and they were held up to derision for their ignorance. The penal laws were rigidly, nay, brutally enforced, and although there were periods when peace seemed assured, it was only for a few months at most. Discontent was chronic. The battle of the Boyne, celebrated by the Protestant masters, to whom it secured ascendancy in all affairs of state, was a reminder to the Catholics of the violated pledge of William and of the most wicked system of oppression ever devised by man. It was to them the culmination of a long series of crimes by divine right. In Ulster, in 1798, where for the six years preceding a few leading Protestants had been preparing for it, the great rebellion broke out, which was followed by an expiring effort in 1803, and later that of 1848, and subsequently, in our own time, by the Fenian raiders, impotent though loyal and zealous attempts to right the wrongs of Ireland, wrongs many of which remain to this day and will remain until Ireland is at least legislated for by Irishmen, as Canada by the Canadians and Australia by the Australians. This by a series of wars and religious turmoils, commotions and broils since 1690, when Protestant ascendancy was fixed by law, the Irish difficulty has been perpetuated to this day, so that the zealous Orangeman who commemorates the battle of the Boyne insultingly commemorates the enslavement of his fellow-countrymen, commemorates more than seven hundred years of unparalleled suffering, commemorates the enactment and enforcement of the penal laws, of which Lecky, the Irish historian, himself a Protestant, says: "It is impossible for any Irish Protestant, whose mind is not wholly perverted by religious bigotry, to look back without shame and indignation to the penal code." Burke, also a Protestant, said of them, that they were "a machine of civil and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." No wonder the Irish Catholics of Canada cannot see, without their blood boiling, those vindictive measures commemorated. No wonder they cannot view in peace what recalls their own and the degradation of their forefathers. And yet, in a free country like ours, the prejudices of Irish Catholics have been conquered, and they regard with indifference or contempt the displays of the bigots in whose hearts hate holds the place of the religion of peace. So it will be in Canada in a few years. The Orangemen will there be some day regarded as they are here, the representatives of an era when even England groped in darkness, men who are to be pitied for the perversion of heart, soul and intellect that willingly links them with all that is odious and infamous in English history.

MURTAGH, of the Washington *Republican*, and Ex-Secretary Robeson, are fast approaching that condition when they will tell what they know of each other. Robeson took possession of the paper some time since to secure money he had advanced to keep it out of the sheriff's hands. At the late session back pay was allowed on some advertisements published during Murtagh's ownership, and Robeson is trying to collect the money, which is also claimed by Murtagh. "If these exemplars of Grantism," says the Chicago *Times*, "get into a quarrel, the tales they will have to tell will throw into the shade all the efforts of Anderson, Weber, and the Jenkses. It is to be hoped no injudicious peacemaker will interfere to stop the exposition."

FLOYD'S candies are often imitated, but never equalled.

CHARLES READE,

The English Novelist, on the Lop-Sided Mania, Takes a Cincinnatian to Task for Daring to Differ with him—He Calls him an

Unmitigated Liar, an Imbecile, a Fool and a Dunce, who has Obtruded upon his Privacy after Reading Garbled Extracts of his Letters.

The Cincinnati *Commercial* recently published the following correspondence, in which the novelist, Charles Reade, proves himself a "blackguard and no gentleman:"

BRADBURY TO READE.

NO. 18 EAST THIRD STREET,
CINCINNATI, U. S., April 1, 1878.

Mr. Charles Reade, Author, London, England:

DEAR SIR—I have seen, in a disjointed and imperfect form, some extracts from your recently republished papers on the subject of ambidexterity. I have only a partial knowledge of what you have said, but concede all you may claim as to possible equality of development of both right and left sides of the body, hands, feet, arms, legs, etc. In doing this I ignore all the arguments which might be adduced from anatomical or physiological reasons, as I am quite unequal to them from ignorance therein. It seems to me, however, that no advantage could result from the cultivation of the equality you seem to lay so much stress upon, but contrarily, great trouble, expense and inconvenience, besides loss of valuable time in pursuing an *ignis fatuus*, and in explanation of my idea will cite a few familiar examples, as they occur to me, and which I think will confirm my objections to your dogma, in at least two subjects with which I have some familiarity:

First—Musical instruments.

Second—Mechanical tools.

I could extend my remarks much further, but have not time to spare.

Now, as to musical instruments. I see in one of your papers you intimate that the violin might be played just as well with the bow in the left hand and the violin in the right, as in the mode prescribed *secundem artem*, which is *vice versa*.

If I fairly understand your meaning, you are certainly mistaken on this point. There are certain peculiarities in the construction of the violin which would require an entire countervailing in the position of all the strings, as well as in the internal structure of the instrument, in order to enable a left-handed man to play upon it with due effect, and this difference holds good in all stringed instruments played upon with the bow or by the stopping of the fingers, etc.—the violin, viola, violoncello, contra-bass, guitar, banjo, cithern, etc.; also for all the reed instruments, as the oboe, clarionet, bassoon, serpent, etc.; also upon the flared brass instruments, and in all instruments with valves the same difficulty is found—that is to say, that to construct any of these instruments in such a manner as to enable a left-handed man to play upon them, the mode of construction would have to be reversed.

In instruments of modern form of the flute family, with intricate mechanism, such as is necessary to meet the requirements of execution demanded by modern composers, the intricacies of a double arrangement of the keys by the reversal of all the appliances as now used would present almost insuperable difficulties, *and without any compensating advantage*. It is true that the fife and tabor, the jew's-harp and the bugle or military bugle may be played indifferently, either by right or left hand, but these are unimportant matters when compared to the things already mentioned, cymbals and castanets may be added to the category of intermediate instruments). As to the organ and piano, the attempt to make them and all the music heretofore composed and printed for them subservient to the system of equal handiness would result only in utter failure.

I note your remarks about superiority of the left hand in pugilistic encounter. Here you mistake effect for cause. The superior efficiency of blows given by the left hand is to be attributed solely to the superior strength and vigor of the *right* side of the body from which the blow emanates, and with which the left arm and fist have nothing to do except to ward off blows, and become the "tool" with which the work is done.

In respect to mechanics' tools, the great majority of them are specially adapted for use by the right hand, although some may be used by the left. A few examples may serve to explain what I mean. The axe, adze, auger, auger-bits, the screw-driver (owing to the fact that the screws to be driven are all made to turn to the right, just as the screws in the universe turn to the right in the same direction), the brace and its bits, notably shell-bits, nose-bits, reamers and countersinks, the sickle, grass-hook, all scythes and an infinite number of cutting implements are made, and have been for ages, unsymmetrical, designed for the use of the right hand, and, in my humble opinion, will continue to be so made and used for all time to come. Any other course could bring about only trouble, expense and confusion.

I will not tax your patience further, as my time is short. Have not said a tithe of what I could say. You see I disagree with you only in one way, which is that, if possible (and I grant you that) to be ambidexterous would be a misfortune instead of a boon. Very respectfully,

V. C. BRADBURY.

Born and bred in Sheffield, but for the last twenty-five years a citizen of this country.

P. S.—Scene-painting is but little better than whitewashing.

In relation to calligraphy, all the signatures of great men I have seen show they were written by the right hand. Perhaps our old friend William Shakespeare was drunk or paralytic when he wrote the two specimens of his writing left to us, or perhaps he was trying to write with his left hand.

READE TO WOODBURY.

NO. 19 ALBERT TERRACE,
KNIGHTSBRIDGE, April 5.

SIR—My privacy has been invaded on by a letter from you, in which you tell me that you have only read garbled extracts from my letters denouncing the lop-handed mania and disproving it by a mass of evidence; and that you have utterly abandoned the anatomy and physiology really stands in the argument. If, having thus announced your disqualification, you had gone on to say "and therefore I will not have the folly and the arrogance to speak positively on the matter," it would have all been "this dunce is not a fool," and in a world where nearly all the dunces are fools, I should have welcomed you as a novelty. But instead of that, having announced your incapacity, you proceed to sit in judgment on your intellectual superior in a matter where he is profoundly learned, and you are as ignorant as a dirt. Your letter is in three divisions—irrelevant truth, a deliberate lie, a piece of imbecile twaddle. Every fool knows that the musical performer is an honorable except to the lop-handed mania. Have the goodness, Mr. Fool, work, and exercise the whole brain, which is all I require. I have never proposed to reverse the skill of the two hands. You are wronging a folly out of your own head, and forging my name to it. That the left-handed blow of the pugilist owes its force to the right side of the body. Were this so, the right-handed blow of the pugilist would owe its force to the left side of the body. It's a lie. When a blow is struck with a sword, a stick, a cricket-bat, etc., the reverse foot is advanced, and the reverse side is the fulcrum. But in the pugilist's blow, whether with the right hand or left, the corresponding foot is advanced, and the power is derived from force from the sub-clavicular muscles of the arm that gives the blow. Of course, you may not be a liar. You may be simply a chattering noodle, with no eyes in your head; but one of the other you must be, if you persist in stupid falsehood as the above, and send it to one of all people. Who doubts the existence of the lop-mania? And, so long as it does exist, of course many tools will be made to fit it; but even here your mendacity must creep in. You suppress the reaping-hook, the plane, the saw, the gauge, the knife, the hatchet, the scissors, the pen, the sword. Correct your ignorance, my good sir, and as your ignorance declines your self-sufficiency will abate, and you will not be so ready to hurl them both at your intellectual superiors, on matters where they are men and you are a child.

BRADBURY TO READE—FINIS

No. 81 EAST THIRD STREET, CINCINNATI,
May 1, 1878.

Mr. Charles Reade, 19 Albert Terrace, Knightsbridge, London:

Sir—Your of the fifteenth, in response to mine of the first ultimo, received yesterday. It is characterized by ugliness and malignity, pure and simple. When you call me an unmitigated liar, an imbecile, as being utterly ignorant, a dunce or a fool; when you declare yourself as immeasurably my intellectual superior, that I am as ignorant as dirt, and your letter is in three divisions—irrelevant truth, a deliberate lie, a piece of imbecile twaddle. Every fool knows that the musical performer is an honorable except to the lop-handed mania. Have the goodness, Mr. Fool, work, and exercise the whole brain, which is all I require. I have never proposed to reverse the skill of the two hands. You are wronging a folly out of your own head, and forging my name to it. That the left-handed blow of the pugilist owes its force to the right side of the body. Were this so, the right-handed blow of the pugilist would owe its force to the left side of the body. It's a lie. When a blow is struck with a sword, a stick, a cricket-bat, etc., the reverse foot is advanced, and the reverse side is the fulcrum. But in the pugilist's blow, whether with the right hand or left, the corresponding foot is advanced, and the power is derived from force from the sub-clavicular muscles of the arm that gives the blow. Of course, you may not be a liar. You may be simply a chattering noodle, with no eyes in your head; but one of the other you must be, if you persist in stupid falsehood as the above, and send it to one of all people. Who doubts the existence of the lop-mania? And, so long as it does exist, of course many tools will be made to fit it; but even here your mendacity must creep in. You suppress the reaping-hook, the plane, the saw, the gauge, the knife, the hatchet, the scissors, the pen, the sword. Correct your ignorance, my good sir, and as your ignorance declines your self-sufficiency will abate, and you will not be so ready to hurl them both at your intellectual superiors, on matters where they are men and you are a child.

BRADBURY TO READE—FINIS

No. 81 EAST THIRD STREET, CINCINNATI,
May 1, 1878.

Mr. Charles Reade, 19 Albert Terrace, Knightsbridge, London:

DEAR SIR—I have seen, in a disjointed and imperfect form, some extracts from your recently republished papers on the subject of ambidexterity. I have only a partial knowledge of what you have said, but concede all you may claim as to possible equality of development of both right and left sides of the body, hands, feet, arms, legs, etc. In doing this I ignore all the arguments which might be adduced from anatomical or physiological reasons, as I am quite unequal to them from ignorance therein. It seems to me, however, that no advantage could result from the cultivation of the equality you seem to lay so much stress upon, but contrarily, great trouble, expense and inconvenience, besides loss of valuable time in pursuing an *ignis fatuus*, and in explanation of my idea will cite a few familiar examples, as they occur to me, and which I think will confirm my objections to your dogma, in at least two subjects with which I have some familiarity:

First—Musical instruments.

Second—Mechanical tools.

I could extend my remarks much further, but have not time to spare.

Now, as to musical instruments. I see in one of your papers you intimate that the violin might be played just as well with the bow in the left hand and the violin in the right, as in the mode prescribed *secundem artem*, which is *vice versa*.

If I fairly understand your meaning, you are certainly mistaken on this point. There are certain peculiarities in the construction of the violin which would require an entire countervailing in the position of all the strings, as well as in the internal structure of the instrument, in order to enable a left-handed man to play upon it with due effect, and this difference holds good in all stringed instruments played upon with the bow or by the stopping of the fingers, etc.—the violin, viola, violoncello, contra-bass, guitar, banjo, cithern, etc.; also for all the reed instruments, as the oboe, clarionet, bassoon, serpent, etc.; also upon the flared brass instruments, and in all instruments with valves the same difficulty is found—that is to say, that to construct any of these instruments in such a manner as to enable a left-handed man to play upon them, the mode of construction would have to be reversed.

In instruments of modern form of the flute family, with intricate mechanism, such as is necessary to meet the requirements of execution demanded by modern composers, the intricacies of a double arrangement of the keys by the reversal of all the appliances as now used would present almost insuperable difficulties, *and without any compensating advantage*. It is true that the fife and tabor, the jew's-harp and the bugle or military bugle may be played indifferently, either by right or left hand, but these are unimportant matters when compared to the things already mentioned, cymbals and castanets may be added to the category of intermediate instruments). As to the organ and piano, the attempt to make them and all the music heretofore composed and printed for them subservient to the system of equal handiness would result only in utter failure.

I note your remarks about superiority of the left hand in pugilistic encounter. Here you mistake effect for cause. The superior efficiency of blows given by the left hand is to be attributed solely to the superior strength and vigor of the *right* side of the body from which the blow emanates, and with which the left arm and fist have nothing to do except to ward off blows, and become the "tool" with which the work is done.

In respect to mechanics' tools, the great majority of them are specially adapted for use by the right hand, although some may be used by the left. A few examples may serve to explain what I mean. The axe, adze, auger, auger-bits, the screw-driver (owing to the fact that the screws to be driven are all made to turn to the right, just as the screws in the universe turn to the right in the same direction), the brace and its bits, notably shell-bits, nose-bits, reamers and countersinks, the sickle, grass-hook, all scythes and an infinite number of cutting implements are made, and have been for ages, unsymmetrical, designed for the use of the right hand, and, in my humble opinion, will continue to be so made and used for all time to come. Any other course could bring about only trouble, expense and confusion.

I will not tax your patience further, as my time is short. Have not said a tithe of what I could say. You see I disagree with you only in one way, which is that, if possible (and I grant you that) to be ambidexterous would be a misfortune instead of a boon. Very respectfully,

V. C. BRADBURY.

Born and bred in Sheffield, but for the last twenty-five years a citizen of this country.

P. S.—Scene-painting is but little better than whitewashing.

In relation to calligraphy, all the signatures of great men I have seen show they were written by the right hand. Perhaps our old friend William Shakespeare was drunk or paralytic when he wrote the two specimens of his writing left to us, or perhaps he was trying to write with his left hand.

READE TO WOODBURY.

NO. 19 ALBERT TERRACE,
KNIGHTSBRIDGE, April 5.

SIR—My privacy has been invaded on by a letter from you, in which you tell me that you have only read garbled extracts from my letters denouncing the lop-handed mania and disproving it by a mass of evidence; and that you have utterly abandoned the anatomy and physiology really stands in the argument. If, having thus announced your disqualification, you had gone on to say "and therefore I will not have the folly and the arrogance to speak positively on the matter," it would have all been "this dunce is not a fool," and in a world where nearly all the dunces are fools, I should have welcomed you as a novelty. But instead of that, having announced your incapacity, you proceed to sit in judgment on your intellectual superior in a matter where he is profoundly learned, and you are as ignorant as dirt. Your letter is in three divisions—irrelevant truth, a deliberate lie, a piece of imbecile twaddle. Every fool knows that the musical performer is an honorable except to the lop-handed mania. Have the goodness, Mr. Fool, work, and exercise the whole brain, which is all I require. I have never proposed to reverse the skill of the two hands. You are wronging a folly out of your own head, and forging my name to it. That the left-handed blow of the pugilist owes its force to the right side of the body. Were this so, the right-handed blow of the pugilist would owe its force to the left side of the body. It's a lie. When a blow is struck with a sword, a stick, a cricket-bat, etc., the reverse foot is advanced, and the reverse side is the fulcrum. But in the pugilist's blow, whether with the right hand or left, the corresponding foot is advanced, and the power is derived from force from the sub-clavicular muscles of the arm that gives the blow. Of course, you may not be a liar. You may be simply a chattering noodle, with no eyes in your head; but one of the other you must be, if you persist in stupid falsehood as the above, and send it to one of all people. Who doubts the existence of the lop-mania? And, so long as it does exist, of course many tools will be made to fit it; but even here your mendacity must creep in. You suppress the reaping-hook, the plane, the saw, the gauge, the knife, the hatchet, the scissors, the pen, the sword. Correct your ignorance, my good sir, and as your ignorance declines your self-sufficiency will abate, and you will not be so ready to hurl them both at your intellectual superiors, on matters where they are men and you are a child.

BRADBURY TO READE—FINIS

No. 81 EAST THIRD STREET, CINCINNATI,
May 1, 1878.

Mr. Charles Reade, 19 Albert Terrace, Knightsbridge, London:

Sir—Your of the fifteenth, in response to mine of the first ultimo, received yesterday. It is characterized by ugliness and malignity, pure and simple. When you call me an unmitigated liar, an imbecile, as being utterly ignorant, a dunce or a fool; when you declare yourself as immeasurably my intellectual superior, that I am as ignorant as dirt, your letter is in three divisions—irrelevant truth, a deliberate lie, a piece of imbecile twaddle. Every fool knows that the musical performer is an honorable except to the lop-handed mania. Have the goodness, Mr. Fool, work, and exercise the whole brain, which is all I require. I have never proposed to reverse the skill of the two hands. You are wronging a folly out of your own head, and forging my name to it. That the left-handed blow of the pugilist owes its force to the right side of the body. Were this so, the right-handed blow of the pugilist would owe its force to the left side of the body. It's a lie. When a blow is struck with a sword, a stick, a cricket-bat, etc., the reverse foot is advanced, and the reverse side is the fulcrum. But in the pugilist's blow, whether with the right hand or left, the corresponding foot is advanced, and the power is derived from force from the sub-clavicular muscles of the arm that gives the blow. Of course, you may not be a liar. You may be simply a chattering noodle, with no eyes in your head; but one of the other you must be, if you persist in stupid falsehood as the above, and send it to one of all people. Who doubts the existence of the lop-mania? And, so long as it does exist, of course many tools will be made to fit it; but even here your mendacity must creep in. You suppress the reaping-hook, the plane, the saw, the gauge, the knife, the hatchet, the scissors, the pen, the sword. Correct your ignorance, my good sir, and as your ignorance declines your self-sufficiency will abate, and you will not be so ready to hurl them both at your intellectual superiors, on matters where they are men and you are a child.

BRADBURY TO READE—FINIS

ALBERT SIDNEY JOHNSTON.

His Life as Recorded by his Son—His Services in the Federal Army During the Texas Revolution and During the War Between

The States in the Confederate Army—The Question of his Resignation from the United States Army Set at Rest Forever—Letter to his Sister.

New York *Herald*: There was no general in the Confederate army who was more highly esteemed both as a man and a soldier than Albert Sidney Johnston. His life, as recorded by his son, Colonel William Preston Johnston, and published by D. Appleton & Co., is sure of a large audience, not only in the southern States, but at the north, where he was known before the civil war as a brave and brilliant soldier. Although General Johnston's career in the southern army was short, it was a striking one, beginning with the war and ending at the battle of Shiloh, April 6, 1862. Albert Sidney Johnston was born on the second of February, 1803, in the village of Washington, Mason county, Virginia, where his father followed the practice of medicine. The foundation of his education was laid at Virginia academies, and in 1822 he entered West Point. He was a hard student, and graduated in 1826, the eighth in his class, and joined the second infantry July 1st of the same year. He married Miss Preston, of Kentucky, in 1828. Johnston distinguished himself in the Black Hawk war, of which this book gives a graphic narrative, based on original documents. His career in Mexico and Texas is given at length, with sketches of the battle of Monterey by General Johnston and Jefferson Davis. The Mormon war of 1857, conducted by General Johnston, occupies a prominent place in the book, but the portion of the volume in which the reader of today will take the greatest interest is that which relates to the late civil war. Colonel Johnston, the writer, in a chapter entitled the "Southern Confederacy," gives the standpoint of the southern people, which will be new and not uninteresting to many of our readers. The causes of this war, he says, due to the difference in social organization between the north and the south, certain real or imaginary collisions of material interests, a different mode of interpreting the constitution and the agitation for the abolition of negro slavery. At the south, he says, the constitution was regarded as a historical document which had created and gave life to the Federal government, as the agent of the States, certain well defined powers for certain specific purposes, all powers not thus explicitly granted being reserved to the several States. This was held to be the true mode to construed, and a breach of the covenant entitled the aggrieved party to redress, the measure of which the State must fix, as no common tribunal had been established for that purpose. This involved the right of withdrawal from the Union, either by peaceable secession or by revolution. In the extreme south the former was regarded as the legitimate method. When the emergency arose those States attempted thus to exercise their right. In the north these primitive views of the constitution were changed by an immense influx of European immigrants, who, controlled by speculative Republicans, regarded the constitution as a mere bill of rights, and the assumption of the republic to be the emancipation and illumination of the world. A modern national, or rather an imperial, theory of the nature of our government prevailed there. Against this grave form and color of authority in all attacks on slavery, which were regarded in the south as willful, d