

I next on a mountain lofty and far,  
 Was placed, and beheld the fair evening star;  
 (For the sun was just setting afar in the west,  
 And all living creatures were going to rest.)  
 I looked and beheld that the sky was aglow;  
 The sun, setting, splendors untold did show;  
 And the doors of his light, as it were, did unfold,  
 And flooded the mountain with glories of gold.  
 And the world down below with her carpet of green,  
 And the blue sky above, with the sun's light between,—  
 All these it was granted to me to be seen.  
 I paused in reflection; for thinking in mind,  
 I wondered if any one ever could find  
 A power to compare with the power of the mind.


---



---

LIBERTY.

---

HEN a comparison is made between the liberty we really possess, and that which we should have, it will be found that we are far from *practically* realizing that liberty which, in principle, we make the corner stone of our Republic. To be sure, we are no longer burdened with some forms of oppression. Governmental interference with private rights, and the despotism of personal rule are but little felt; and as these are the most common and obvious forms of oppression, we often flatter ourselves that the last foe to liberty has been subdued, and that nothing remains to be done in the future.

But I fear we flatter ourselves too soon. We must remember that there can be an oppression by society but little, if any, less burdensome than the most absolute personal rule. The individual may have little liberty, on account of the prejudices and customs that society impose upon him.

Liberty of act, liberty of thought even, have narrow limits for development, since the majority seldom grant to others the full and free expression of their opinions. But those who think that the individual is of minor importance, and believe that all men should be moulded after a pattern which they themselves determine, will insist that the individual cannot be allowed

to develop himself as he will; but that the restraining power of society must be brought in to curb the infamous and destructive doctrines propagated by him. But why are these opinions branded with the epithets infamous and destructive? Who is to decide whether these innovations are right or wrong? Evidently, those only, who are in favor of the established custom, and who are opposing the desired change. But what authority have *they* to determine for others what is right, and what is wrong? None at all, unless we are ready to admit that "Whatever is, is right," and also to grant that any thing established by custom is infallible. But what would be the result of such a principle? First, to cut off all change, and thus to prohibit any advancement in the future; and next, to bind men down to a similarity in thought and action; of itself, destructive to all progress. But, perhaps, the opponents of individual liberty will reply that this is an extreme view, and that, in this day and age of the world, no one wishes to curtail the liberty of the individual except in cases where his actions are manifestly injurious, not only to himself, but also to other members of society; hence *mutual* rights demand that he should be restrained by law or custom. If this were true, it would be all we could