On Picket Duty.

An East Indian paper says that a number of Italian builders have given up Manhattan, where King Thaddeus is ambitious of having a chapel erected which shall be similar to St. Peter’s at Rome. The heisten monarch evidently does himself a “bigger man” than the pope.

Cyrus W. Field, whose fears of communism are said to cause him much sleep of late, announced, through his new organ, the “Mail and Express,” the discovery of forty thousand socialists in the city of New York who are waiting an opportunity to seize his property and upset all the plans of further robbery which he and Jay Gould have connected. Let us hope he is right.

The “Banner of Light” has always been an interesting and well-conducted paper, but, since its enlargement to twelve pages, which has enabled it to present new and attractive features, it may certainly be taken as standing at the head of spiritualistic journalism.

It has the advantage of being managed by skilled and experienced journalists, who, moreover, are liberal-minded men, showing little or no trace of the spirit of bigotry that narrows the influence and injures the tone of many of its competitors. Its columns afford from week to week an exhaustive history of the progress of the movement of which it is an organ, as well as intelligent discussion of the same, and are especially valuable to the devout in their efforts to investigate the subject. Liberty takes very little interest in the “summer-land,” but many of her friends and supporters take a great deal. To all such we recommend the “Banner,” which costs but three dollars a year.

Address: Isaac B. Hanch, Banner of Light, Publishing House, Boston.

Mrs. Lucy Stone and her wing of the woman suffragists have put themselves on record in opposition to the admission to Congress of George Q. Cannon of Utah, on the ground that “he is living in open violation of the laws of the United States.” If Mr. Cannon were enough of a hypocrite and a sneak to be willing to follow the example of the majority of his fellow-congressmen, who live in secret violation of the laws which they make, the virtuous Lucy and her martinet of a husband would probably hold even both hands in favor of admitting them. But their attitude in the matter will make no difference either way, for the report that Mormons emissions have been engaged in investigating the daily (and nightly) habits of our national legislators has put a sudden damper on the enthusiasm of the anti-Mormon movement in Congress. A revelation of the “true inwardness” of congressmen’s lives would make mighty interesting reading; and the salacious are already chafing at the prospect of its forthcoming. “Senses” Cox, with his usual wit, squarely hit the mark the other day, when, in answering a Kansas member who had shown a conspicuous anxiety concerning Mr. Cannon’s morals, he remarked: “Why, if Solomon, with his wisdom and his plural wives, were to come here elected to a seat, the gentleman from Kansas would cry out about a scarlet-robed woman; and had that gentleman been present when it was said, ‘Let his that is without sin among you cast the first stone,’ the gentleman would doubtless have reached for a bowlder of the glacial period and mashed the poor woman flat.”

John Hay.

The “Index” delights to say fine things about the nihilists in Russia, but regards as vagrants and fanatics the class of radicals in America whose principles and objects the nihilists are most in sympathy. We suspect that the “Index” knows little of these principles and objects that it is unable to identify their supporters. The extreme tyranny practised by the czar has made it fashionable in “cultured” circles to sympathize with a movement which these circles know only as a protest against it, and the “Index” floats with the current thus created. Once let it be recognized that nihilism is a phase of Comstockism, no one is likely to hear of it, and it will be frowned upon by the “Index” with the same severity that that journal now bestows upon all the other phases.

Representative Crapo has raised his bid for the Massachusetts governorship. Not satisfied with soliciting, as chronicled in our last issue, a twenty-years’ extension of the national banks’ privilege to steal, he now proposes to move (so the Washington despatches say) to strengthen their privilege by allowing them to issue currency to the amount of ninety per cent. of the market value, instead of the par value, of their bonds. Mr. Crapo is proving true to the trust which capital has placed in him. It will exhibit fresh proof of its well-known ingratitude if, in answer to his prayer for political advancement, it does not say to him: “Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.”

There seems to be no limit to the petty outrages to which Mr. George A. Trainer, an irresponsible and unprincipled individual, is subject for the gratification of his spite and the annoyance of his enemies. For years he has been trying to injure in all possible ways Dr. E. B. Foote and his son, of New York, publishers of the “Health Monthly” and two of the most uprightmen, and we supposed that he had exhausted his resources in that direction. But no! Only a few weeks ago he induced a post-office department to deny mail facilities to a regular and respectable weekly newspaper, “House and Home,” simply for printing an advertisement of Dr. Foote’s “Hand-Book of Health Hints and Ready Recipes,” a perfectly clean and valuable work. Dr. Foote at once procured counsel, who soon convinced the postal authorities that they had gone too far, and consequently the order was rescinded, but not before the entire edition of “House and Home” had been held back one week, to the great annoyance of the subscribers and damage of the publishers. And so great is the terror inspired, even in the most powerful quarters, by the acts of this Comstockite, that Dr. Foote actually unable, pending the decision, to get a simple recital of the facts to the columns of the New York dailies as a paid advertisement. But, after all, is there anything to wonder at in this? Comstock is a true child of the State, of which nearly everybody is morally afraid. The State is, by necessity, a breeder of sneakiness and slyness. It cannot live without them. Therefore all liberals who oppose the State must cast aside any other platform than that of the abolition of the State are wasting good ammunition. By some fortunate chance they may succeed in dispensing the man himself, but Comstockism will live after him, and will fall only with the State, its creator and sustainer.

The following despised rebuke, administered by the Boston “Globe,” indicates a desire for fair play in that journal which is not shared to the extent that it should be by any large portion of the daily press: “It was charged recently by the Chicago ‘Herald’ that Justus Schwab was expelling from the Socialistic Labor party for appropriating party funds. Schwab at once addressed a note to the editor, denying the charge and saying that he and his friends were expelled for disregarding the dictates of the would-be authorities of the party!” In this note Schwab, who is a foreigner, was so unfortunate as to spell the word principle thus: ‘principle.’ The ‘Herald’ printed the note, but made no answer to it except to ridicule the misspelling at length. The ‘Globe’ does not condemn Mr. Schwab or his theories. For aught it knows, the latter may be the devil’s own invention, and the former Beezebeb disguised, but it cherishes a decided conviction that the day when the enemies of the devil cannot answer his arguments except by ridiculing his inability to spell correctly any other than his native tongue will prove a cold day for the saints.

John Bright says that he justifies the Irish coercion policy on the same ground that he would justify the suppression of a mutiny by putting the mutineers in irons. But would he always justify such suppression of a mutiny? Suppose Mr. Bright were first mate of a vessel, and for months had witnessed the intermittent flogging and persistent starvation, by order of the captain, of a crew well-disposed when well-treated; suppose, further, that this regime having been carried on, only tracing them back far were to always recall his voices in earnest protest, and advise the others to do no more work until the captain should cease his cruelty; suppose, finally, that the captain were to put these ringleaders in irons,—what would Mr. Bright consider his line of duty, not as first mate, but as a man? Judging by his past, he would resign his office, side with the crew, and advise them to throw overboard, or at least depose, so tyrannical and cruel a captain. But, judging by his present, he would support the captain in his infamy. For that is just what he has done in the case of Ireland. Instead of withdrawing, as he should have done, from Gladstone’s cabinet, he has sided and abetted Gladstone and Forster in putting into prison men whose worst offence consists in advising their countrymen to pursue a policy of passive resistance toward the tyrants who, for centuries, have kept them in a state of semi-barbarism. Mr. Bright’s parallel is an unhappy one, and tells decidedly against him. He further says that he favors “such a degree of freedom as will give security to freedom, but not such a degree as would destroy it.” What nonsense! When will our political philosophers learn that violations of freedom, only traceable back far, are always result from other violations of freedom, and that the more freedom there is, the better, in the long run, it is secured?
Liberty.
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"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; he is neither blinded by passion, nor hindered or driven by superstition, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—FREEDOM.

Do Liberals Know Themselves?

Liberty not infrequently receives the compliment of being considered the most radical and revolutionary sheet ever published in this country. So startling has seemed the project of abolishing the States to not a few radicals in the other reform spheres that they have hailed it as and treated this paper in that family circles and places of business, lest they might be ticked by Mrs. Grundy and "good society" as Nihilists, enemies of law and order, and dangerous citizens.

Yet, after all, what is any radical, whose protest means anything, but a person who is attempting to abolish the State? Bear in mind that the State typifies any organized machine which attempts to enforce its laws and methods and to check all individual per- scriptions and custom and at other than its own cost. Messrs. Seaver and Mendum of the Boston "Investi- gator" are materialists. They see in the way of progress an organized machine prised over by ecclesiastical attempts to suppress them, their theological constitution upon those who never subscribed to it. Its dogmas are crammed down the throats of the unthinking and gullible through authoritative posting of certain theological maxims. It erects an omnipotent God to suit its own despotic purposes, and saddles the expense of supporting him and his hierarchical retinue upon those who do not acknowledge allegiance.

Now, the thing that Messrs. Seaver and Mendum are endeavoring to do is this: to put an end to a State, a State which, if they will examine it, is almost the exact counterpart of the political State, or, rather, is one phase of it. So true is this that to attempt to abol- ish the theological State without abolishing the polit- ical is as hopeless as to abolish religious liberals do not see this at a glance.

Take, again, the Free Religiousists, with their famous "demands of liberalism." Many of their leading demands were simply attempts to abolish certain despotic appendages of the State. Those who initiated the movement, is calling it Free Religion, asked for the abolition of the State to that extent that they conceived the State to be the antipodes of Liberty. The movement promised well, and might accomplish much if it had sufficient sagacity and bravery in its constituency to pursue the State versus Free Religion far enough to see that the main purpose of the State is to deny freedom, whether in religion, morals, or politics. The Free Religiousists unfortunately have achieved little more than an exchange of the orthodox God for enforced "culture," "morality," "purity," and other undeveloped fictions—thus becoming more offensively bigoted in the eyes of the free believer than those were ever enforced. But all religious liberals, to the extent that they institute effective protests against a real enemy, will find, upon knowing themselves better, that that enemy is the State in some of its allied forms, and that they are engaged in a movement to abolish it. There is a theological State, a political State, an educational State, a social State, an industrial State. The pernicious element of all them is that species of organization which is based upon compulsion and authority rather than upon reason and consent. Though our attitude towards Spiritism is a skep- tical one, we nevertheless accord to its friends the credit of being, in one respect, the most augustious body of liberals in the world, in that they largely discard organ- ization and machinery, and yet, on the whole, make the result is seen in the rapid and wonderful growth of their numbers.

The State is simply a mammoth organization, held together by usurration and force. All minor organi- zations in society are merely fragments of the grand organization Liberty is the arrows enemey. It violates individual right. It is unscientific. It is the universal foe of progress. It must go. Curiously enough, some of our liberal friends, who, in all they do, rely on force and organization, are fighting that same foe, yet have to learn the logic of their own dis- sent. But they, too, like the benighted bigots whose servility they deplore, are still bound in the shackles of custom and revered names. They, how- ever, are fighting a battle of force for the overthrow of the State, and the ideal of Free Religion is a battle with some of one of the prevailing moralities. A solemn, decorous bush pervades the room, as the assembled guests draw nigh and swear in subdue speech to "serve to live a just and honorable life, that no re- pression may be put upon our cause through any act or word of ours."

And what is to be the upshot of this new consecrate union? What shall issues forth from this civiliza- tion of Free Religious and the new one? What shall a new social body resulting in the embrace of the New Religion of the "Index."

The "New" Morality of Free Religion.

The last issue of Liberty called attention to the claim set up by the teachers and preachers of Free Religion, to wit, that they have succeeded in getting the States to exterminate slavery; and that they are now free to any state wherein the oppression of serfdom and denial, and are now serenely encamped on the broad plains of a new constructive, philosophical science, preparatory to leading the world onward by new paths of wisdom and righteousness. While this claim was contested, Liberty maintaining that, what- ever of denial! Free Religious have left behind, no new affirmative gospel as yet has fallen from their lips. And this, we stated, is true as regards both the New Religion and the practical moral problems of the time.

But let it be understood that we by no means galax- sany the fact that the disciples of Free Religion make a point of morality. Equally with their Christian brethren of the present day, they come boldly to the front, vindicating the standard code moral. They are opposed to theft, lying, adultery,—indeed, they reaffirm the ten moral rules of the decalogue with as much unetion as the most devout Biblical sects. We do not contest the right to say that there is nothing new or especially "affirmative" in it. It is the old, the old story again, the same rehearsed in the Episcopal service for so, these many centuries, with its "Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners." But therein lies the change. The old commandments will go in shaping the new civilization is a matter of speculation. Some may think, as doubt...not Free Religious friends do, that, in the absence of religion, the new scientific religi- on, a good stiff emphasis on the old-time moral dog- mals will serve them and the world in good stead. We note in a recent number of the "Index" a special commendation given to a new "Association of Moralists" which was held at Hannibal, Missouri. The one great aim of this new organization is "to show to the world that liberalism does not mean lawlessness or immorality, but, on the contrary, it is conducive to the highest type of moral- ity and moral rectitude. The men of moralists have a form of admission to membership," one clause of which reads as follows: "Do you faithfully promise that, if received into this brotherhood, you will strive to live a just and honorable life, that no evil course shall pass through your lips, and that you will not act or word of yours?" And the good "Index" adds: "A society organized on such a basis ought not to fail of success." The other "affirma- tion" which this society offers is to the effect that it will make such earnest efforts to promote the religion of humanity."

Have we now in this illustration exhausted the "affirmations" of Free Religion? We should not, we suppose, get credit for being serious if we re- for the seal of the "Index" against the circulat- ion of "obscene literature," or to its unabated de- mand for the suppression of that "twin relic of bar- barism" in the far-away territory of Utah. Though both of these attitudes must be described as highly "affirmative," these are neither of these the popular claim as to entitle them to rank among Free Reli- gious "affirmations." There remains, then, simply the summary of the Simon-pure "moralest" of Han- nibal with which to furnish the marriage table of Free Religion and the new one. And so the what a feast are the assembled guests feasted! The centre of this world-round table is set apart for a wide-spreadish dish, on which, gently simmering in a bluish, ethereal flame, lies the "Religion of Ele- gance," or, rather, a hybrid dish mixed with some of one of the prevailing moralities. A solemn, decorous bush pervades the room, as the assembled guests draw nigh and swear in subdued speech to "serve to live a just and honorable life, that no re- pression may be put upon our cause through any act or word of ours."

And what is to be the upshot of this new consecrate union? What shall issues forth from this civiliza- tion of Free Religious and the new one? What shall a new social body resulting in the embrace of the New Religion of the "Index."

Celebrate the eve of the "Index!" but tell us what new affirmative moral truth shall come to stand as a pillar of humanity on the earth upholding the hea-vens.

Surely, so far as we can observe, Free Religion has no courage, no faith, no purpose,—no courage to face the world and proclaim the necessity of new moral relations in the great practical world of indus-try; on every issue of this nature it sides with the old, upholding landlords, money-longs, and monopolists; no faith in human nature as equal to its destiny of freedom; but sides with the oppressor in placing Liberty always on the debatable ground of expediency; no purpose beyond that of a drifting tub, catching only with the elegant swash of the times tos to its embrace.

Take its own excuse for being,—a devotion to free- dom. How free is Free Religion? The last half- dozen years have been given in great part to a crusade for "restricting individualism" and "private judg- ment," and for the restraining influence that comes of "organization." Nearly all of its distinguished leaders have proclaimed that the era of the indi- vidual is at an end. Henceforth there must be the "consensus of the speech" or the "social religion," private individual judgment must be held in abeyance or set aside in deference to the concurrent judgment of what practically might as well be called "the church" as by any other name. "Consensus of the com- munity." The new "Social Religion" is of its invention for Mother Church and Papal authority.

True, Free Religiousists, as a class, have hardly realized this abridgment of Liberty, and will doubtless dispute the fact. No more did Unitarians per- mit and surrendered Liberty when they pro-claimed the Lordship of the Christ. But those who then abandoned the old Christian despotism saw it, and determined to have their religion "free." No one doubts the sincerity of those free religious protestants whom "organized religion" has driven out of the Church and into the world at large, and now they are free enough on the purely theological issues; but, just where their religion becomes in- volved in the practical moral issues of the day, where it is afforded a chance to become truly the "Religion of Humanity," there it shrank back; free discussion is disliked, if not thrust wholly out in the cold; there the "consensus of the competent" looms up to settle and bash the disputing reformers. This is the cue to the new effort of the Hannibal "moralists." They now have a word to say for a new "Affirmation" of mean lawlessness and immorality." (The Italics are Liberty's.) In other words, they accept what that world they fear calls "law" as law, and what it deems "moral" they, too, swear is moral. And they are very anxious, too, that, after the fashion of the world, they may appear as representing the highest type of morality and the best interests of society.

Think of it!
Liberty says of such “liberalism,” it has gone to seed.

Take now the attitude of Free Religionists towards the great labor movement that has arrived at such proportions in every intelligent country on the face of the earth. Scarcely ever touching the subject, and, when it does, with one or two exceptions, never touching it but to rebuke the pretensions of capitalists. Industrial freedom has no noice in its new temple. Its new president, having some rather crude, yet sympathetic, words to utter in behalf of the claims of labor, preached to the deaf ears of the freewill devotees, who were warming themselves around that live-coal on the altar of the Parker set up. But, plainly, all they knew was, Parker put it there. When Adler tried to say what he thought it meant, capital had no ears to hear, for he was “taining” the same, instead that the human says that “Weber, in his later years, was in bonds to the bankers, manufacturers, and merchants.” Is Free Religion in like bonds of servitude?

Liberty so thinks.

And Liberal Progress to take up great issues of a particular affirmative morality, not in fear of the world, not in deference to any prevailing opinion or party now potent in the land, but in obedience only to those “unwritten laws” of Justice, Equity, and Liberty which are fundamental in human nature, the only guarantees of universal prosperity and enabling peace.

Capital the Chief of Criminals.

One of the most frightful of the abuses resulting from the tremendous power now lodged in the hands of capitalists is their utter disregard for human life. In the most notable instances of their anarchic sway they have been heedless to the safety of their employees than to the protection of their property. The lives and limbs of laborers are regarded as the merest trifles in comparison with the prospective loss or gain of a few cents, of some security, or a few dollars. In Maine, a boiler explosion occurred in the engine-house of the Kennebec Framing Company, killing three men and seriously crippling several others. It now appears that the boilers had been in such notorious bad condition for two years past that the engineer after he had come and gone, refusing to work in so close proximity to these potential instruments of death and destruction. The stockholders and directors, nearly all of them men of immense, wretched and degrading wealth, except a few who had done something for the state. In fact, they were repeatedly warned and expostulated with and connoted in regard to their criminal neglect, but all to no purpose. They thought only of their pocket-books and bank accounts, and shut their eyes to the danger that was hanging over them. By forming for themselves a mighty community of additional laborers. In no other respect, however, was this an exceptional occurrence. Similar cases, more or less glaring, daily meet the eyes of all who read the newspapers. Nor is there likely to be any improvement until a more enlightened and popular direction is given.

D. G. Croly says in the New York “Hour,” that an Ohio paper, in an article on the marriage questions, wrote of the Onedia Communists were the most honest, conscientious, religious people I ever knew.” Does Mr. Croly mean to say that the Onedians held their ideas of marriage dishonestly and in violation of their convictions, and, if he does institute as much only because he is afraid to say a good word for that feature of their system which has contributed most to their unpopularity?
LIBERTY.

To the Editor of Liberty.

Dear Sir,—Allow me to inform your readers that, had I thought it objectionable to any of Mrs. Kendrick’s real friends, I should have been glad to shun the name of the Bible in its funeral, as I do not deem reading necessary part of a funeral service. I am not aware of having used the words Jesus Christ lower than the Lord, as you quote the well-known passage from the Apocalypse, “Blessest are the dead who die in the Lord.” To me the truth itself is the Lord, and I do believe Mrs. Kendrick to have died in love of truth, as her life was for many years a willing sacrifice to the truth as she understood it. I think your readers ought to know that Mrs. Kendrick and I have been warm personal friends, that she was attached to many of the lectures.write, and that I wrote on her behalf to the editor of the Independent and to the publisher of her book, and that I spoke at her funeral in compliance with the earnest request of the former. It is also due to me to state that no one of her friends stated anything in the papers or in conversation to my knowledge, and I have been extremely surprised and unconvinced. If I have “outraged her memory and insulted her friends,” I can only say that she was a very different woman from the Mrs. Kendrick I had the honor of knowing, and her friends must be persons of very peculiar sensibilities, at least. I wish to awaken no controversy, but an attack ought to be treated as the assault on a journal itself.

Yours for the truth,

W. J. COLVILLE.

Mr. Colville errs in supposing that we criticized him for reading from the Bible. That strange book contains a great many passages which Mrs. Kendrick considered common with all sensible people, ardently admired, and which might have been read with peculiar propriety at her funeral. It was the character of Mr. Colville’s selections that aroused our indignation. The key-note of the services was a sentiment not containing the words Christ Jesus (which Mr. Colville certainly used), but directly inculcating the Christian scheme of salvation, for which Mrs. Kendrick entertained no sentiment save that of profound contempt. An intimate friend, a spiritualist, has said to us, “a more inappropriate passage could not have been selected.” To show Mr. Colville that we are not averse to quoting scripture propably, we call his attention, in answer to his strained acumen, to the following passage from the Lord, to the seventeenth verse of the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew: “Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.” It is true that Mr. Colville had no instructions concerning the services, but for the very reason, suppose, that his intimate acquaintance with Mrs. Kendrick, and that he would say nothing inappropriate. We may be accused of imputing unworthy motives in explanation of his conduct, but we had to choose between impeaching his motives and his good sense. That our criticism was substantially correct we have the amplest proof in the thanks and congratulations thereon that continue to pour in on us from Mrs. Kendrick’s dearest friends present at the funeral.

Mr. Colville Explains.

To the Editor of Liberty.

Dear Sir,—Allow me to inform your readers that, had I thought it objectionable to any of Mrs. Kendrick’s real friends, I should have been glad to shun the name of the Bible in its funeral, as I do not deem reading necessary part of a funeral service. I am not aware of having used the words Jesus Christ lower than the Lord, as you quote the well-known passage from the Apocalypse, “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord.” To me the truth itself is the Lord, and I do believe Mrs. Kendrick to have died in love of truth, as her life was for many years a willing sacrifice to the truth as she understood it. I think your readers ought to know that Mrs. Kendrick and I have been warm personal friends, that she was attached to many of the lectures.write, and that I wrote on her behalf to the editor of the Independent and to the publisher of her book, and that I spoke at her funeral in compliance with the earnest request of the former. It is also due to me to state that no one of her friends stated anything in the papers or in conversation to my knowledge, and I have been extremely surprised and unconvinced. If I have “outraged her memory and insulted her friends,” I can only say that she was a very different woman from the Mrs. Kendrick I had the honor of knowing, and her friends must be persons of very peculiar sensibilities, at least. I wish to awaken no controversy, but an attack ought to be treated as the assault on a journal itself.

Yours for the truth,

W. J. COLVILLE.

Mr. Colville errs in supposing that we criticized him for reading from the Bible. That strange book contains a great many passages which Mrs. Kendrick considered common with all sensible people, ardently admired, and which might have been read with peculiar propriety at her funeral. It was the character of Mr. Colville’s selections that aroused our indignation. The key-note of the services was a sentiment not containing the words Christ Jesus (which Mr. Colville certainly used), but directly inculcating the Christian scheme of salvation, for which Mrs. Kendrick entertained no sentiment save that of profound contempt. An intimate friend, a spiritualist, has said to us, “a more inappropriate passage could not have been selected.” To show Mr. Colville that we are not averse to quoting scripture propably, we call his attention, in answer to his strained acumen, to the following passage from the Lord, to the seventeenth verse of the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew: “Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.” It is true that Mr. Colville had no instructions concerning the services, but for the very reason, suppose, that his intimate acquaintance with Mrs. Kendrick, and that he would say nothing inappropriate. We may be accused of imputing unworthy motives in explanation of his conduct, but we had to choose between impeaching his motives and his good sense. That our criticism was substantially correct we have the amplest proof in the thanks and congratulations thereon that continue to pour in on us from Mrs. Kendrick’s dearest friends present at the funeral.

Our Befuddled Litterateurs.

In a recent number of Liberty the writer briefly described on Harvard University as a "huge local harem, a new 'good society' institution raised that is and, accordingly, devoted to knowledge, science, and literature, thought for their own sake." The college is really a local harem, because the mention of it is a scornful taunt aimed at the institution, here and elsewhere. In like manner there is a local literary clique, sometimes called "the Cambridge set," the sound of which is divided into one's ears. Among the leaders are "the transcendental writers." I refer, of course, to Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, Howells, Aldrich, of whom some persons of distinction are judiciously ready-to-hand. They acknowledge the "readability" and merit of the above let's of "literature." They are bright and witty, beyond question, and they have a score or more of names that are forever audacious everywhere. Not one of these popular, outrageously beguiled literateurs is a man of reality, quality, or interest. As such, they are banished from the community, banished from the nature. They are soft, sly, highly-exaggerated, and highly-regarded writers merely, fatuous workers-over of current literatur, mental and ideas so superfluous, trite-out of current thought and themes in part, studied, ornamental, phrase, intent mostly upon style and the formars of their sentences, and emulating the Jackaw in the borrowed characters of the fashionable world. After all, the best of this Cambridge lot of superfine scribblers, the "paw" of rough, jaunty Walt Whitman is really refreshing, even with that "large black harem" of geographies and exalted themes. Occasionally a great, original idea crops out of Walt, while out of the Cambridge lot only honeyed rhetoric spouts. Who is that? W. Howells, or "the New Englander," a sort of sugar-cured ham from Ohio, who was pinched for a time in the lambs of Yen. He is a novice in the list of the Paulist sort, whose longest flights are drawn from the gallery of William or of imaginative ring. Howells and Aldrich are far nobler types, auditorable plants which have somehow given rise to magnificent autumns. Howells is the ancient magnificat tree bloomed in the vicinity of Sassy, Scotty Gloucester. Howells excels in amorous dialogues or the vibrating of the inner consciousness; if the wonder and unuttered dreams of the romantic. Governor Long, who besides being a politician, is a nice, learned literateur of the Howells-Aldrich type, exhibited the utter lack of correct literary judgment and appreciation to claim for Whittier superiority as a poet over Virgil, whom he nevertheless tried to translate. —Bottom was translated, however. In "the poor's land," to borrow Schiller's phrase, Virgil has stood for centuries, like Tennyson or Atlas, unmoored, charming with an irresistible spell over men and women, and even his great "deus mortus" Yankee, gubernatorial translator. John D. Long. Line after line and passage after passage of Virgil are as deeply carved in the memory of the Indo-European race as are blakish, line after line. The slow lines of the lips of Virgil which Whittier could not move more written than he could call the semi-bible. It is an exquisite song-book of the best Ayame style, but even his sentiment he is infinitely below Virgil's mark, while he could not sustain himself for a moment in the higher regions of the imagination in which Virgil must breeze by with ease "empyrean air." But Whittier does not overestimate himself, and must be abomined by the fulloms laxation of his admirers. Taken in over-doses of fifty or a hundred consecutive pages, Whittier's poetry clashes with its monotonous sweetness and sameness; and an occasional lyric of his, like "My Play, Lust," for instance, is delightful and medicinal. Literateurs who are overpraised and constantly elaborated, and systematically beaufified are sure, later along, to be unduly degraded. In this line of Virgil having been betrayed into a temporary excess of admiration. An excessive laxation of a few "literary fellers" is gross injustice to others who are as good men as they are.
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