

TRY OUR 15 CENT DINNER!

Choice of TWO SOUPS, THREE MEATS, THREE VEGETABLES, DESSERT, BREAD AND BUTTER, TEA OR COFFEE.

TRY OUR DINNER

once and we will make a customer of you.

Absolutely THE BEST DINNER in the City, OYSTERS, SOFT SHELL CRABS and everything in season.

JANNETT'S DINING ROOMS

303 East Fayette Street, BALTIMORE.

KEYSTONE HOUSE

522 WEST LEXINGTON STREET, BALTIMORE, MD.

Eating House & Restaurant.

The undersigned begs leave to inform his many PATRONS and PATRONS of HOWARD COUNTY that he has removed from 312 West Lexington Street, where he has been located for many years, to 522 WEST LEXINGTON STREET, which he has purchased and newly furnished throughout.

I am better prepared to serve my customers with MEALS and LODGING than ever before.

THE BAR WILL MAINTAIN THE OLD REPUTATION, being supplied with the best LIQUORS, ALES and BEER.

PRIVATE DINING ROOM FOR LADIES.

Extend a cordial invitation to call and see the FINEST RESTAURANT in the WEST END.

RESPECTFULLY,

LOUIS ZITZER,

Proprietor, 522 WEST LEXINGTON STREET.

JOHN U. O'BRIEN

Cor. Main Street, near E. & O. Depot, and Across Patapsco Bridge.

ELICOTT CITY.

CHOICE WHISKIES, FRENCH BRANDIES, GINS and WINES.

ICE-COLD BEER always on draught. Select brands of

GLD BEER and MILWAUKEE BEER BOTTLED BEER sold for Family Use, Bass's Ale, Brown Stout, Champagne, Pommery and Brumm's.

CIGARS and TOBACCO. ALL ORDERS PROMPTLY FILLED.

A. H. TRUEHEART'S

Wine & Liquor Store

OPPOSITE ODD FELLOWS' HALL Main St., Elicott City.

FINE STOCK OF WINES, WHISKIES, BRANDIES, GINS, CIGARS and TOBACCO.

ALWAYS ON HAND.

His BUFFET, the finest in the city, is stocked with the BEST OF WINES, LIQUORS AND CIGARS.

Special Garden Brewery celebrated VESTA PALE BEER, the purest and most tonic known. Ice cold on draught and in bottles for family use.

JOHN BANNON'S

SALOON,

231 West Pratt Street, Cor. Howard, BALTIMORE, MD.

Fine Imported Wines, Liquors and Cigars. Among our

best Brands of Cigars is

THE "CHIPPY"

BAUER'S

SKYVILLE HOTEL

Main Street, SKYVILLE, MARYLAND.

Reopened and re-fitted. Accommodations for permanent and transient guests. Appointment book stocked with FINE LIQUORS. Bottled beer for family use.

Eight doors from E. & O. Station, JOHN H. BAUER, Proprietor.

The Eigenbrot Brewing Co.

BREWERS & BOTTLERS OF THE CELEBRATED ADONIS PALE BEER

AND

STOCK LAGER.

Wilkins Street, Baltimore, Md. TELEPHONE 562.

LOUIS KIEFER'S

New Restaurant, Southwest Corner Eutaw & Pratt Sts., BALTIMORE, MD.

MEALS AT ALL HOURS, LUNCH ALL DAY.

BEST BEER & LIQUORS in the CITY.

Also Proprietor of the Southern Hotel, 407 East Fayette Street.

Send us the local news.

DISCOVERY!



The point of sight is the first, foremost, highest, and most important. Seeing is more than believing. It's seeing the whole of life. Every eye has its own point of sight.

Glasses Are The Great Sight Makers, Sight Savers, and Sight Preservers, but for Spectacles.

The number of sufferers from blindness would be multiplied, whether you insure your life or not, if you do not have the best of eyesight.

YOUR EYESIGHT. If your EYES are in any way affected you cannot see the distance clearly or read distinctly without your eyes hurting or you suffer from HEADACHES.

Remember we examine your eyes FREE and GUARANTEE YOU PERFECT SATISFACTION.

You ought to make your eyes your first thought and come to the

MARYLAND OPTICAL CO.,

Skilled and Scientific Opticians, 109 W. Lexington St., Near Park, BALTIMORE, MD.

N. B.—Remember We Examine Your Eyes FREE.

AT THE VIENNA DINING

and Lunch Rooms, 208 East Baltimore St., between Calvert and North Sts., Baltimore, you can get a FIRST-CLASS DINNER for 15, 20 or 25 cents.

Everything is of the best, is scrupulously clean, served quickly and cooked perfectly.

Out-of-town visitors will find here everything to make them comfortable and welcome, as we cater for this trade.

Specially reserved tables for Ladies.

SOFT SHELL CRABS and EVERYTHING THAT IS IN SEASON.

Try us once and be convinced.

VIENNA DINING and LUNCH ROOMS, 208 E. Baltimore St., between Calvert and North, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

ECKER'S

JUSTLY FAMED

ICE CREAM.

Every facility for supplying orders in any quantity to suit.

All Flavors and Styles.

C. ECKERT,

Main Street, ELLICOTT CITY, MD.

USE HOLLYDAY'S EUREKA CONDITION POWDERS FOR HORSES AND CATTLE.

Purifies the Blood, Cures Coughs, Epizootic, Death to worms and will cure Heaves when taken in the earlier stages. Used by Col. H. H. Holt, Gen. Washburn, Esq., Gen. Felix Agius, J. H. Hollenhorst, Esq., and many others.

SAMUEL K. DASHIELL, of Howard county says: I have used Hollyday's Eureka Horse and Cattle Condition Powder in all the troubles I have had in my stock. It is a grand remedy, take pleasure in saying that they are all that is claimed for them.

HOLLYDAY'S EUREKA HORSE AND CATTLE CONDITION POWDERS FOR HORSES, SPRAINS, THRESH, SCRATCHES, &c.

PRICE 25 CENTS.

Try HOLLYDAY'S EUREKA LINIMENT for Swelling, Croup, Toothache, Rheumatic Pains, Cuts, Bruises, &c.

Send for samples and testimonials. GEORGE T. HOLLYDAY & CO., 32 E. HOWARD STREET, BALTIMORE

J. H. DEUBER & CO.

DEALER IN PAINTS AND OILS.

Full stock of Ready Mixed House, Carriage and Engine Paints.

HARVEST MACHINE OIL.

Also a full line of Carriage Paints in JAPAN OIL, Glass, Putty, Brushes, and every article generally kept in a first class paint store. Come see us before you buy and get our prices.

J. H. DEUBER & CO., 1920 FREDERICK AVENUE, Baltimore, Md.

J. ALONZO NACE,

NEWS DEPOT,

I am located at 302 WEST CAMDEN STREET, My friends from Howard and nearly opposite the depot.

Two doors in Howard county will find it to pay to trade with me. Meet your friends at home or on your way to work. I will go to them to bring them the best of news. The best news of the city at my store. All the daily papers and magazines always on hand.

All kind of tobacco at cut prices. Don't forget. Don't forget the place. 302 WEST CAMDEN STREET, Baltimore, Md. J. ALONZO NACE.

WAGNER'S

Green House Restaurant,

12 & 14 E. PRATT ST., BALTIMORE, MD.

Dining Room for Ladies.

Try The Times for job printing.

WE RETAIL AT WHOLESALE PRICES!

FRESH, SALT, AND SMOKED MEATS!

Corn Beef 5c and 6c!

Pure Lard 9c!

Sugar Cured Shoulders 8c!

Picnic Hams 9c!

Breakfast Bacon 10c

Sugar Cured Hams 12 1/2 c!

All Goods Delivered Free at Camden Station

Mail orders with cash receive prompt attention and put on cars free.

S. Baltimore Packing Co.,

127 Hanover Street, (NEAR CAMDEN), BALTIMORE.

KNABE

GRAND SQUARE AND UPRIGHT PIANO FORTES.

These instruments have been before the public for nearly fifty years, and upon their excellence have obtained an UNDISPUTED PREEMINANCE, which establishes them as UNEQUALLED in

TOUCH, WORKMANSHIP, EVERY PIANO FULLY WARRANTED FIVE YEARS.

SECOND-HAND PIANOS. A large stock at all prices, constantly on hand, comprising some of our own make but slightly used.

3000 CENTS for the celebrated SMITH AMERICAN ORGANS AND OTHER LEADING MAKES.

Prices and Terms to Suit all Purchasers

WM. KNABE & CO.

22 and 24 E. BALTIMORE ST. 112 FIFTH AVE., New York, 1422 Ponna. Ave., Washington

RED STAR

CORN AND BUNION PLASTER.

Are good for Lumpy people because they are no trouble and good for Industrious people, because they SAVE TIME, PAIN AND TROUBLE. Sent by mail anywhere, on receipt of 75 cts. in two cent stamps, or cash.

W. H. TUTTLE & CO., 304 North Howard Street, BALTIMORE. : : : MARYLAND.

WIRE RAILING

Ornamental Wire Works.

DUFUR & CO., 311 N. HOWARD ST., BALTO.

Wire Railing for Cemeteries, Lawns, Gardens, Offices and Balconies. Window Guards, Tree Guards, Wire Cloth, Slaves, Fenders, Cages, Sann and Coal Screens, Iron Bedsteads, Chairs, Settees &c.

CHARLES SAUTER,

Manufacturer Repairer and Tuner

of all kinds of PIANOS, PARLOR and CHURCH ORGANS, Also Manufacturer and dealer in ELECTRIC PIANOS, 904 Sharp Street, BALTIMORE, MD.

E. WANGEMAN'S

DINING ROOMS,

17 N. HOWARD ST., BALTIMORE.

Dinners 25 cents, from 12 to 13 o'clock

GENTLEMEN WHO COME TO BALTIMORE with their families can be suitably accommodated in our dining rooms.

LEGAL TENDER CORSETS

PRICE \$1.00 AND \$1.50

And Made Exclusively at Our Factory. CLEANING and REPAIRING PROMPTLY DONE.

Order Work a Specialty—Fit Guaranteed. Every really first-class Corset, imported and domestic—as well as the Jackson, Ferris and other extra—made at lowest prices.

K. B. SONNEHILL, LEGAL TENDER CORSETS, 216 W. Lexington Street, Baltimore.

Do not fail to forward us what is due on your subscription account.

THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO.

Tuesday, June 18, was the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo. Eighty years have passed since that decisive combat, and military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how, if such and such things had happened, it would have resulted otherwise. From the point of view of military science, the subject will always be interesting; in the broad perspective of history such discussion is futile. Napoleon was unsuccessful at Waterloo, not because he was slow in concentrating his forces, or because of the military writers are still discussing it, still trying to explain why it resulted as it did, and how