the *Nation*, in a highly libellous statement, if not true, and one which, if true, it would be practically impossible to get witnesses to prove. It entailed, I remember, a long litigation and a large expense, and in the end it was, I think, settled by a vindication which consisted of what amounted to an admission that the *Nation* had no means of proving the mine to have been plastered and ingrafted with silver ore. The public verdict, however, on the Emma Mine was very different.

An early article which caused a great commotion and was considered by "hostiles" (critics of the *Nation* came to be divided by the editors into "Hostiles" and "Friendlies"—the white man's division of the Indians) as proof positive of the evil animus of the *Nation*. This was an article describing the United States as a "Paradise of Mediocrities." The author of it was no doubt one of the best friends and stanchest and most courageous supporters of the *Nation*, and an American who never flinched. If I remember right, the authorship was not really secret, but the odium entailed by the publication of the "Paradise of Mediocrities" fell as usual upon the *Nation* I doubt if American self-esteem, then far more sensitive than now, had ever been more wounded by anything published since "Martin Chuzzlewit" and "American Notes" than by the appearance of this article. The "muckrakers" have destroyed sensitiveness. *"It is hard to say it, but there are very few first-rate things in America, and scarcely any first-rate work done here."* The writer of the article was willing to admit that the Croton Water Works, Central Park, and the new Academy of Design at the corner of Twenty-third Street and Fourth Avenue, were exceptions. Another exception, curiously enough, was the *thoroughness expressed in four years of civil war.* Moreover, we were not always to remain as we were. Our scholarship and learning were mediocre, and we worshipped the great goddess Mediocritas, but we had the germs of good in us, and our democracy was not to end in mediocrity. But the sting of the article was in its title. Here was a new paper just started, inviting subscriptions of Americans, deliberately writing down America, or rather the United States, as a "Paradise of Mediocrities." Was this impartiality? Was this disinterested criticism? Then, for Heaven's sake, let us have no more of it, nor of the *Nation*. The outrage was keenly felt. Can it be that in that distant day we were "parochial"? Read these early numbers to-day and ask yourself whether the *Nation* was, after all, anything other than it promised to be—a really conscientious organ of disinterested criticism. Later, when it discussed the great "nose-pulling case" in Massachusetts, it was accused of supporting an estimable Bostonian who was trying to "establish caste" in New England From treason and "incivism" to snobbishness, there was no sin or crime of which Godkin did not stand accused. The Athenians had not been told that Socrates was more wicked.

The "Nation" and Its Contributors

By GUSTAV POLLAK.

Few periodicals in the history of journalism can claim, like the *Nation*, to have preserved their original features essentially unchanged during fifty years of continuous existence. The *Nation* of the present day may safely challenge comparison with the number which, on July 6, 1865, was issued by Edwin Lawrence Godkin, as editor-in-chief, and Wendell Phillips Garrison, as literary editor. Perhaps not many subsequent issues have surpassed the initial number in solidity, maturity of judgment, and attractiveness of style. Then, as now, the leading editorials and the book reviews appeared anonymously. The imposing list of contributors, which in the course of time came to include the foremost names in American literature and science, was represented in the first number by half-a-dozen men, the most conspicuous of whom was Charles Eliot Norton. To him, to Frederick Law Olmsted, and to James Miller McKim, the founding of the *Nation* is principally due. Olmsted's connection with the incipiency of the *Nation* was the closest. He had elaborated with Mr. Godkin the scheme for a journal such as actually emerged in 1865, and he was, until the firm of E. L. Godkin & Co , in the following year, assumed control of the paper, its temporary proprietor. He died, famous as the landscape architect of Central Park, in his eighty-second year, August 28, 1903.

It is difficult to overestimate the aid rendered to the *Nation* by Charles Eliot Norton during the years when the experiment of conducting a journal of its character in this country was on trial. "If the paper succeeds," wrote Mr. Godkin, in one of his letters to Norton (July 6, 1866), "I shall always ascribe it to you"; and when the success of the *Nation* was assured, Mr. Godkin could say: "Its existence is largely due to the support and encouragement which you gave me."

Norton's contribution to the first number of the *Nation* was a review of Richard Grant White's first volume of his edition of Shakespeare, followed, in the second issue, by a memorable essay on "The Paradise of Mediocrities"—more hopefully patriotic, as we now see, than was conceded at the time. From among Mr. Norton's contributions during the early years of his active connection with the paper, one recalls a few whose very titles show the variety which his pen lent to its columns: "Draper's Civil Policy of America," "Tuscan Sculptors," "Waste," "The American Lectureship at Cambridge, England," "Sir Alexander Grant's Ethics of Aristotle," "Mr. Longfellow's Translation of the Divine Comedy," "Mr. Emerson's Poems," "The Harvard and Yale Memorial Buildings," "Female Suffrage and Education."

Among the other contributors to the initial number of the *Nation* were Prof. E. W. Gurney, of Harvard ("Matthew Arnold's Essays in Criticism"); the essayist, Charles Astor Bristed, better known by his pseudonym of "Carl Benson" ("Critics and Criticism" and "Club Life"); G. P. Marsh, the philologist and diplomat ("Were the States Ever Sovereign?"), and Henry James, father and son, the former of whom, well-known as a Swedenborgian philosopher and a gifted essayist, wrote on "Carlyle's Frederick the Great," the latter on "The Noble School of Fiction." Prof. Gurney held the chair of history at Harvard, and for a time taught Roman law. As Dean he was President Eliot's principal adviser in the extension of the elective system. He was for a year editor of the *North American Review*, after Mr. Lowell and Mr. Norton withdrew from it. His contributions to the early numbers of the *Nation* were marked by his extensive knowledge of the classics, modern as well as ancient, and his wide reading in the fields of philosophy, law, and politics. George Perkins Marsh, for more than twenty years United States Minister to Italy, was one of the foremost American scholars of his time. Equally interested in matters of philology and the natural sciences, he published a "Compendious Grammar of the Icelandic Language" and a remarkable work on "The Earth as Modified by Human Action." Besides his striking series of articles on the subject of State sovereignty already referred to, he contributed to the early volumes of the *Nation* a number of papers, entitled "Notes on the New Edition of Webster's Dictionary," and wrote on such subjects as "Pruning Forest-Trees," "Agriculture in Italy," "The Mont Cenis Tunnel," "Physical Science in Italy," and "The Proposed Revision of the Bible." At the age of eighty he still contributed to the *Nation* a charming "Biography of a Word" and a letter on Lanciani's "Aqueducts of Ancient Rome." He died in July, 1882, at Vallombrosa, in his eighty-second year.

Other writers were probably represented in the first number of the *Nation*, but their identity can no longer be established. A comment, under the heading of "A Strange Story," on a letter written to the *Evening Post* by a chaplain of the First New York Volunteers, foreshadows the campaign against Gen. B. F. Butler waged by the paper for so many years with extraordinary skill and effectiveness Mr. Godkin's own article on "The Essence of Reconstruction" and his paragraphs in the Week sounded the keynote of the *Nation's* campaign on the Southern question. And with the initial number began the *Nation's* long fight for civil service reform, in a paragraph on the need of protecting the President against the assault of "office-seekers, pardon-seekers, delegations and busybodies of both sexes, who threatened to make an end of him."

It is lamentable [Mr. Godkin wrote] that some way cannot be hit on of sifting the President's business before it comes before him. This is done to a certain extent with his letters, but the men and women who want to see him reach him,

chaff and all. The easiest way of doing it would be to render access to him more difficult. Whether this could be arranged without raising doubts of his "democracy," we must leave it to others to determine.

It took fifty years and the determination of a latter-day President to realize Mr. Godkin's prophetic hope.

The second number of the *Nation* introduced, in a review of Praed's poems, a new member of the staff, John Richard Dennett, who for nine years, with the exception of a short period spent at Harvard as assistant professor of rhetoric, devoted his rare talents entirely to the *Nation*. Like Mr. Garrison, he was only twenty-six when he became connected with the paper, and his maturity was as remarkable as that of the literary editor. The experience gained by Mr. Dennett, shortly after his graduation from Harvard, on a cotton plantation in South Carolina, and his thorough familiarity with all the phases of the Southern question, enabled him to act as the *Nation's* correspondent in the Cotton States, and he wrote in this capacity for the first two volumes of the paper a series of articles on "The South as It Is," which attracted wide attention. The first of these letters appeared in the third number. Through the whole of his short career the shadow of the disease to which he finally succumbed was upon him. "Of what he might have accomplished with a constitution better adapted to his surroundings," wrote the *Nation*, "one got an idea, however faint, from his extraordinary powers of apprehension, which we have rarely seen equalled and never surpassed."

Two other writers, whose connection with the *Nation* as more or less frequent contributors was lifelong, appeared in the second number—Daniel C. Gilman and Octavius B. Frothingham. It is interesting to notice that the future president of John Hopkins, in discussing the projected Cornell University, unconsciously outlined his own plans for the founding of a university, which he was later to carry into effect at Baltimore. He said in the number of the *Nation* referred to:

> The new university, we presume, will not be fettered by precedents, but will mark out for itself a new path, enlightened by the past, but adapted to the present. . . . It may be intrusive for us to offer a suggestion to the managers of the new university, but we cannot refrain from doing so when we reflect how constantly in this country one error is repeated. It is not bricks and mortar, but men and books, which constitute a university. We delight in appropriate and decorated architecture. . . . But we trust that a desire for suitable edifices will not prevent a supply of higher wants. Let first-rate teachers be first secured. Let no expense be spared to secure the highest educational ability which the country will afford. Then, as the scholars assemble, as the courses and plans of the university are developed, let such buildings go up as will best provide for the wants which have been created.

Besides Mr. Frothingham, widely known as the head of the First Independent Liberal Church of New York, another clergyman of great scholarly attainments, Dr. Joseph P. Thompson, contributed to the second number of the *Nation*. Dr. Thompson, in addition to filling the pastorate of the Broadway Tabernacle in New York city from 1845 to 1871, was, successively, editor of the *New Englander* and the *Independent*, and was recognized as a profound student of Oriental literature. His connection with the *Nation* lasted until his death, in Berlin, in 1879. Dr. Noah Porter, president of Yale from 1871 to 1886, also began to write for the *Nation* with the second number.

The name of Arthur G. Sedgwick, whose association with the *Nation* and Mr. Godkin was probably closer, and certainly more continuous, than that of any other member of its staff, and whom, fortunately, the paper may still claim among its occasional contributors, occurs in the annotated file before me as early as the third number. The mere quantity of matter contributed by Mr. Sedgwick to the columns of the *Nation* for more than forty years was prodigious; the style of the youthful contributor impressed one, in his very first article, as unmistakably the *Nation's* own. What was true of him, was true of the *Nation's* contributors in general. It was observed, early in the history of the paper, that a peculiar literary flavor and a certain uniform elevation of treatment, no matter what the subject, were among its chief characteristics. Mr. Lowell, in a letter to E. L. Godkin of September 25, 1866, remarked: "Every Friday morning, when the *Nation* comes, I fill my pipe and read it from beginning to end. Do you do it all yourself? Or are there really so many clever men in the country?"

With the third number of the *Nation*, Russell Sturgis, an authority on architecture and kindred subjects, began to write on the fine arts, his contributions continuing until his death, February 11, 1909. In the same issue appeared the first of three notable papers by Henry Villard, entitled "Army Correspondence."

The list of "regular or occasional contributors," published in that number, contained the names of Henry W. Longfellow, John G. Whittier, and James Russell Lowell. Whittier wrote a poem, "To the Thirty-ninth Congress," for the issue of December 7, 1865, but it does not appear that either Longfellow or Lowell, interested as they were in the new venture, felt moved to contribute to the first volume. Lowell, with characteristic humor, and with his equally characteristic inclination to procrastinate, wrote to Mr. Godkin under date of January 10, 1866:

> I have got something half written for you and hope to finish it to-day—some macaronic verses on the editorial sham-fight at Richmond, under some such title as "Kettleo-Pottomachia." I am not yet sure whether it is not dull. However, I will send it, and you can use it or not, as you like. I had begun an essay on "Autographs" when I was drawn off by this. Meanwhile, I have raked out of my desk a little poem which I wrote for an autograph for the St. Louis Fair two years ago. (The Muse doesn't come often to professors!) I do not know that it has ever been printed, and don't think it has. I send it merely to justify my name on your list of contributors. I will send you the macaronics in a day or two, and you may put them in the fire if you like.

Evidently, the "macaronics" referred to are identical with the poem printed in the *Nation* of January 25, 1866, under the title of "A Worthy Ditty. Sung before the President his Excellency at Washington, to a Barrel-Organ Accompaniment." The "little poem," entitled "What Rabbi Jehosha Said," appeared in the previous number.

Mr. Lowell's poetic contributions to the *Nation*, though infrequent, were well-timed, and always produced a telling effect. They were generally on the political subjects of the day, such as his caustic "The World's Fair" and "Tempora Mutantur," both printed in August, 1875, and his "Campaign Epigrams," in the number of October 12, 1876. In a different vein were his touching tributes to two of his friends—the great physiologist, Jeffries Wyman (*Nation*, September 10, 1877), and Edmund Quincy (May 31, 1877), himself a valued contributor to the *Nation* from its foundation. Of Mr. Lowell's prose writings in the *Nation* only a few can now be identified with certainty, such as a review of Henry James, jr.'s, "Tales and Sketches" (June 24, 1875), two essays on "Forster's Life of Swift" (August 5 and 26, 1875), and a review of White's "Natural History of Selborne" (April 27, 1876).

The fourth number of the *Nation* marked the advent of two writers who were among the most important and prolific of all the contributors to its columns—William Francis Allen and Michael Heilprin. Allen was an historical scholar of rare attainments, who held the chair of ancient languages and history in the University of Wisconsin from 1867 until his death, in 1889. The *Nation* said of him, in its obituary notice, that he was perhaps the most constant, if not the most voluminous, contributor in the quarter-century of the journal's existence. Scarcely a number had appeared without something from his pen. His first essays were political, and connected with his visit to South Carolina in 1865. On that journey he noted down the old slave songs—words as well as music—which he afterwards embodied in a volume ("Slave Songs of the United States") that has remained the best work of its kind. The range of his interests was remarkable. He wrote in the *Nation* on minority, personal, or proportional representation, on civil-service reform, on city government, village communities, etc., and he reviewed, with competent knowledge, books on ornithology, political economy, English literature, and ancient and modern history. His character was in keeping with such mental endowments.

There was a certain intellectual and moral kinship between William F. Allen and Michael Heilprin. The extent of Mr. Heilprin's scholarship, as revealed in his contributions to the *Nation*, was during his lifetime known to comparatively few. On his death, in May, 1888, the editors wrote of him:

How great is the loss sustained by American scholarship through the death of Mr Michael Heilprin, the general public, owing to the man's invincible modesty, cannot know. To this journal and its readers it may fairly be pronounced irreparable, so largely has he contributed during the past twenty years to whatever reputation the *Nation* may have acquired for literary accuracy or breadth of information.

From the day he furnished in his first article—on "The Crisis in Austria"—a comprehensive sketch of the political history of the Empire since the revolution of 1848, Mr. Heilprin gave the *Nation*, in the words of the editors, "the benefit of his extensive command of all the leading tongues of modern Europe, besides the Latin and Greek classics, the Hebrew, and other Oriental speech." And as in his articles on European affairs, so in his critical reviews, Mr. Heilprin set an encyclopædic standard for the *Nation* to which few literary periodicals in any language have been able to conform.

With the appearance of such writers, the work of creating a *Nation* public was now well under way. From the beginning, and until they laid down their pens, Mr. Godkin and Mr. Garrison had, in their conduct of the paper, only one aim in view—to make it representative of the most enlightened American opinion. That they felt it necessary, in the beginning, to "educate their writers" (as Norton wrote to Lowell), as well as their readers, merely added zest to their task. But the paper was fortunate enough to have among its early contributors several who possessed something more than the art of "weekly journalizing." Young in years, but with all the maturity and grace of the master of the craft, James and Howells wrote sketches and essays for the *Nation* which have long since passed into literature. The first volume contains, from Mr. Howells's pen, such reminiscences of his Italian days as "A Pilgrimage to Petrarch's House at Arquà," "A Visit to the Cimbri," "A Day in Pompeii"; and for the second he wrote on "Certain Things in Naples," on "Massimo d' Azeglio," "Men and Manners on the Way from Ferrara to Genoa," etc. In addition, Mr. Howells contributed in 1865 and 1866 editorial articles to the columns of the *Nation*. Henry James, jr., was barely twenty-two years of age when he wrote his article for the first number. Among his contributions to succeeding volumes of the *Nation* were critical papers on Miss Braddon, Walt Whitman, Eugénie de Guérin, and Dickens's "Our Mutual Friend"

Until a few months ago there was still among the living one of the most valued of the contributors to the first volume of the *Nation*—Prof. Thomas R. Lounsbury, who utilized his experiences in the Civil War in an editorial on "The West Point Military Academy" (December 28, 1865). He subsequently gave the *Nation* the benefit of his insight into military matters, in such papers as "Ought Soldiers to Vote?" and "The Militia System"; among his contributions to literary criticism were reviews of "Dowden's Shakespeare," "A Dictionary of English Phrases," and "Mrs. Oliphant's England."

Gradually the foremost American authorities in many fields gathered to the support of the editors of the *Nation*, solicited or unsolicited, most of them to remain true to the paper throughout life. Among these earliest friends—to mention only a few—were the scientist and philosopher, Chauncey Wright, the philologist, William Dwight Whitney; the jurist, Francis Wayland; the diplomatist and student of Russian history, Eugene Schuyler; the philanthropist, Charles Loring Brace, and the art critic, W. J. Stillman, widely known as the United States Consul, during a memorable period, at Crete and Rome. His relations with Mr. Garrison were of the most intimate.

Chauncey Wright gave a course of university lectures on psychology in Harvard College in 1871, and three years later conducted there a course in mathematical physics. Prof. William James wrote of him in the *Nation* at the time of his death, in September, 1875, at the early age of forty-five: "If power of analytic intellect pure and simple could suffice, the name of Chauncey Wright would assuredly be as famous as it is now obscure, for he was not merely the great mind of a village—if Cambridge will pardon the expression—but either in London or Berlin he would, with equal ease, have taken the place of master. . . . As little of a reader as an educated man well can be, he yet astonished every one by his omniscience, for no specialist could talk with Chauncey Wright without receiving some sort of instruction in his specialty." Wright's contributions to the *Nation* included articles on "Speculative Dynamics," "Sir Charles Lyell," "McCosh on Tyndall," and "German Darwinism."

Eugene Schuyler's varied diplomatic career was interestingly reflected in the articles and reviews furnished to the *Nation* during the quarter-century of his connection with it as a frequent contributor. He began to write for the paper with its ninth number, and a week before his death, on July 16, 1890, as Consul-General of the United States at Cairo, the *Nation* had a brief contribution from his pen. He wrote on "The Progress of Russia in Asia" not long before he was made Consul at Moscow, and during all his subsequent changes of residence—at St. Petersburg, where he was Secretary of Legation; on his travels in Central Asia; at Constantinople, where he was Consul-General; while holding the Consulship at Birmingham, and as Minister-Resident to Greece, Servia, and Rumania—he continued to write for the *Nation*. His most important work is his two volumes on Turkestan.

The foreign correspondence of the *Nation* assumed from the beginning the character it has ever since maintained. Edward Dicey, for many years editor of the London *Observer*, sent his first letter to the *Nation* in August, 1865, and Auguste Laugel, a noted contributor to the Paris *Temps* and the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, began in December of that year a series of letters which ranged for a period of forty years over a vast field of French literature and political history. Laugel's connection with the United States dated from the Civil War, during which he accompanied the Orléans princes who served on McClellan's staff. He died in November, 1914, at Paris, at the age of eighty-four. Friedrich Kapp, one of the most prominent of the German patriots who sought our shores after the Revolution of 1848, and whose works on early German-American history are of lasting value, acted, after his return to Berlin in 1870, for many years as the *Nation's* Berlin correspondent. His connection with the paper began with the first volume, to which he contributed articles on Bismarck and the Prussian constitutional crisis. Dr. von Holst, the eminent author of the "Constitutional and Political History of the United States," who first began to write for the *Nation* in 1869, became one of its foreign correspondents after his return to Europe in the seventies. Jessie White Mario, a noble-souled Englishwoman, married to one of the Idealist leaders of the *risorgimento*, was for forty years the principal Italian correspondent of the *Nation*. Another valued writer from Italy for many years, after his withdrawal from Cornell, was Willard Fiske, widely known for his Petrarchan collections. The polyglot Karl Hillebrand wrote occasional letters from Florence, outdone in absolute mastery of a foreign idiom by the Pole, E. Gryzanowski, whose comments on Italian events and philosophic discussions of certain aspects of the Franco-German war ("International Ignorance," "Popular Notions of Prussia," etc.) are among the most brilliant pages of the *Nation*. Conspicuous among the correspondence from the British Isles were the London letters of Lieut.-Col. Robert D. Osborn, who had made India and Afghanistan his special province, and the first-hand discussion of Irish matters, as keen and far-sighted as it was patriotic and humane, sent by Alfred Webb from Dublin. Leslie Stephen also wrote much, for a number of years, on British topics. That the *Nation* is still privileged to retain on its list of London contributors the names of Lord Bryce and Prof. A. V. Dicey is one of its chief distinctions. It is more than forty years since the *Nation* printed the first contributions of James Bryce and Professor Dicey. The number of June 18, 1874, contained the former's review of Cleasby and Vigfusson's Icelandic Dictionary—possibly not the first of his contributions to the paper. It is safe to say that few important contemporaneous events in British public life and the deaths of few British leaders in politics, literature, and science have been left uncommemorated in the pages of the *Nation* by its distinguished English contributors.

It is not possible, within the space at my disposal, to do more than allude to some of the important events in our own country of which the *Nation* for fifty years has been the spectator and—as must be conceded—one of the most influential of commentators. Mr. Godkin, in his "Retrospect," on the twenty-

fifth anniversary of the paper, touched upon the great political and social changes that had taken place within that quarter of the century. Surely not less remarkable has been the transformation since then. It is profitable to recall some of Mr. Godkin's comments on the events of the earlier period. The bare facts stated emphasize the share which the men who spoke through the *Nation* had in promoting political progress. What Mr. Godkin said, as to the passing away of the military spirit, is of peculiar interest at the present day. In the issue of July 3, 1890, he wrote:

In the year in which the *Nation* was started there was hardly any political observer who did not look for the permanent retention among us of the military spirit, for a considerable increase in the standing army, and for an increased disposition to use it either for purposes of foreign aggression, or for the more complete and peremptory assertion of a strong central authority. All did not go as far as Wendell Phillips when he declared in that year, in a speech in Boston, that our old farming and reading republic was at an end, and that a strong military and perhaps predatory republic was to take its place. But certainly few looked for the rapid disappearance of the army, and the almost abrupt banishment of military topics from the forum of popular interest, and for the eagerness with which a community which had just been throwing all its powers into a fierce military struggle, diverted its energies to the business of money-making. There was something very fine, as well as unexpected, about this, and it called forth the admiration, as well as the surprise, of the civilized world.

Mr. Godkin did not have to quote from the early columns of the *Nation* to remind his readers what part the paper played in the dark days of Reconstruction, and what share it had in ushering in a new era in the South, with justice to both the negro and the whites. Nor did he allude, in his "Retrospect," to the services rendered by the *Nation* during so many years to the causes of sound money and of civil service and tariff reform. Five years earlier, on the completion of its twentieth year, Mr. Godkin had spoken of some of the difficulties which beset the *Nation* at a very early period, and had dwelt with pardonable pride on some of its achievements:

Almost in the first number it questioned the wisdom and soundness of a plan then in favor among many of its friends for having the Supreme Court do the work of reconstruction, by deciding what was or was not "a republican form of government." At a somewhat later period it questioned, amid much obloquy, the necessity and value of the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, on the success of which a large proportion of the Republican party had set its heart. It maintained that even if Johnson were impeachable, his conviction might work mischief by throwing the Government into the hands of extremists, among whom Benjamin F. Butler was the most influential, and that his acquittal would simply be the end of a piece of elaborate and expensive folly. In one month after the failure of the trial the whole country, including its chief promoters, was ashamed of the undertaking. The *Nation*, too, undertook to expose the pretensions of Butler to be considered an honest and useful politician in 1867, or many years before his party found him out, and while criticism of him still, in Massachusetts at least, seemed an expression of indifference to the results of the war. In fact, it was nearly ten years in advance of popular opinion about this particular politician, and has had the satisfaction of seeing its very earliest diagnoses of him accepted by all Republicans at last. . . .

The *Nation* opposed the greenback theory from the first moment of its appearance, and when it had such very respectable Republican champions as the late Oliver P. Morton; and advocated a return to specie payments when a large number of leading Republicans doubted whether a return would ever be practicable, and, if practicable, desirable. It was, if not the first journal to engage in regular and persistent advocacy of civil-service reform, after Mr. Jenckes, of Rhode Island, had brought it up in Congress, certainly the first to place it in the front rank of public questions. The first foreign complication, its discussion of which attracted any attention, was the Alabama case, in which it, from the opening of the negotiations, attacked the theory of consequential damages, then in much favor with the public, and continued to attack it amid some obloquy, until it was rejected as an absurdity by the Geneva Tribunal. The silver craze it opposed from the beginning, and has had the satisfaction of seeing the correctness of most of its positions as regards the use of silver in the United States acknowledged by most of its opponents.

The political course of the *Nation*, after its consolidation with the *Evening Post* in 1881, is properly part of the history of the latter journal. In Mr. Garrison's hands the *Nation's* literary reputation was secure, while Mr. Godkin was engrossed by his daily labors on the *Evening Post;* and after he had laid down his pen, and Mr. Garrison assumed entire editorial control of the *Nation*, it suffered no loss of prestige. The men who conferred on the *Nation* part of their own scientific and literary lustre continued to write for it, and a new generation worthily filled the gaps caused by death. Of the giants who have passed away, and who, with their services to the paper, had given their friendship to its editors, during the first twenty-five years of its history and a good part of the second period, only a few can be commemorated in this place. One of the foremost, who did not quite round out the first quarter-century of his important contributions to the *Nation*, was Asa Gray, the great botanist, who died in January, 1888. Some of his articles, such as "Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication" (*Nation*, March, 1868), "Evolution and Theology" (January 15, 1874), his summing up of the conclusions concerning insectivorous plants (April 2 and 9, 1874), "What is Darwinism?" (May 28, 1874), and his review of "Darwin's Insectivorous and Climbing Plants" (January 6 and 13, 1876), have become permanent parts of the literature on their subjects. Professor Gray's last contribution to the *Nation* was an exhaustive review of Darwin's "Life." His expositions of Darwinism and kindred philosophical matters were not the least of his great services to science. In his letters to Sir Joseph Hooker and to Sir Charles Lyell, Darwin frequently expressed his deep appreciation of Gray's approval and criticism. He wrote to Lyell in 1860: "No one, I think, understands the whole case better than Asa Gray."

Several of William James's brilliant papers on philosophical and physiological subjects first saw the light in the columns of the *Nation*. One recalls, among others, his "Moral Medication"—a review of Liébault's "Du Sommeil et des Etats Analogues" (*Nation*, July, 1868)—his paper on Taine's "Intelligence" (August, 1872), his discussion of "Vivisection" (February, 1875), his "German Pessimism"—a review of Pfleiderer's "Der moderne Pessimismus" (October, 1875)—and his article on Maudsley's, Ferrier's, and Luys's treatises on the Mind and Brain (June, 1877).

To the manysidedness of the great mathematical astronomer, Simon Newcomb, the pages of the *Nation* bear ample testimony. The titles of some of his contributions to the earlier volumes speak for themselves: "Bowen's American Political Economy" (*Nation*, May, 1870), "Proctor on the Moon" (October, 1873), "The District Investigation" (June, 1874), "Price on Currency and Banking" (December, 1875), "Walker on the Wages Question" (July, 1876), "Who Are the Friends of Negro Suffrage?" (January, 1877), "The Life-Insurance Failures" (March, 1877), an obituary article on Prof. Joseph Henry (May, 1878), "Education at the Naval Academy" (June, 1878), "The Signal-Service Succession" (December, 1880). That even in his later years Professor Newcomb continued to be stirred by the practical questions of the day, was evidenced by such articles in the *Nation* as his "Shall We Raise a Statue to [Boss] Shepherd?" (October, 1902), "The Functions of the Senate" (November, 1903), "The Cost of Life-Insurance Business" (July, 1905), and "What the Navy Needs" (December, 1905).

Particularly intimate were the *Nation's* relations with Gen. J. D. Cox, Grant's high-minded and ill-used Secretary of the Interior. "For a generation," Mr. Garrison wrote in his obituary article, "we have enjoyed with him an intimacy characterized by entire mutual esteem through all vicissitudes of opinion; enlivened by constant intercourse by letter, in connection with that attached and cordial collaboration which has lent so much weight to the reviews of this journal." A few of the subjects treated by Gen. Cox in the *Nation* were: "General Joseph E. Johnston's Narrative" (May, 1874), "General Sherman's Memoirs" (June, 1875), "The Army of the Cumberland" (December, 1875), "The House of Representatives" (an editorial, April, 1878), "Parliamentary Procedure" (editorial, September, 1878), "Howard's Nez-Percé War" (August, 1881), "Van Horne's Life of General Thomas" (October, 1882).

Henry C. Lea, the historian of mediæval

Europe, author of the monumental "History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages," often chose the *Nation* as a medium for expressing his views on some of the many subjects that engaged his attention.

Charles Francis Adams, jr., kept up an active connection with the *Nation* and its editors during all his life. The first of his contributions, as nearly as can be traced, was an article on "The Secret of the Rise in Steel" (*Nation*, March, 1870). In subsequent issues he treated, among many other subjects, "Railroad Subsidies" (October, 1870), "The 'Pooling' of Railroad Receipts" (November, 1870), "Railroad Investments" (August, 1872), "The Farmers' Clubs and the Railroads" (April, 1873), "The Experience of a Great Corporation" (October, 1874), "The Railroad Usury Law" (April, 1881), and "Sewall's Diary" (a book review, July and August, 1882).

It would be an interesting task, did space permit, to follow in the pages of the *Nation* the development of American thought during the fifty years of the journal's existence. That the work of the editors and the writers of the *Nation*—many of whom had so largely aided in the country's progress—was constructive in the best sense of the word, will, after the lapse of so many years, be readily conceded. The story of an important epoch in our economic history is told in such contributions as David A. Wells's luminous comments on matters of internal revenue and on the enormous discretionary powers of the Secretary of the Treasury (October, 1872), and his article on the absurdities in American local taxation (February, 1873); in Edward Atkinson's papers on the contraction of the currency, and in Prof. W. G. Sumner's discussions of the tariff and bimetallism. To enumerate the most noteworthy articles in the *Nation* on subjects connected with the natural sciences, philosophy, jurisprudence, history, Biblical criticism, philology, and a large field of belles-lettres, is to tell the great names of the last fifty years. A few may still be added to the list of the warmest friends of the paper from its early years. None, perhaps, was closer to Mr. Godkin than Francis Parkman, of whom he said: "He impressed me, of all the men I have ever known, as the most of an American." Parkman was not a frequent contributor to the *Nation*, but what he wrote was generally on the subjects nearest to his heart. One recalls his reviews of "Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale" (September, 1876), "Montcalm et le Canada Français" (May, 1877), and "The Chronicle of the St. Lawrence" (July, 1878). Francis James Child, author of the classic "English and Scottish Ballads," and one of the men whose achievements in letters and devotion to the highest interests of the country have made their university illustrious, was from the inception of the *Nation* one of its most valued contributors. Few of the literary men of New England wrote more constantly for the *Nation*, or were more in sympathy with Mr. Garrison's ideals, than Thomas Wentworth Higginson. With him may be linked, as holding all his life a message for freedom, in thought and action, John White Chadwick, for forty years pastor of the Second Unitarian Church of Brooklyn. His connection with the *Nation* began in Volume I, with a notice of the life of Edward Irving, and his last review was printed shortly before his death, in 1904. Col. George E. Waring, who by his work as a sanitary engineer placed New York city and the whole country under deep obligations, began in the early seventies to write for the *Nation* on the subjects which he had so thoroughly mastered. Another specialist of high renown, who for thirty years gave the *Nation* the benefit of his extensive knowledge, was Prof. W. W. Goodwin. The most notable of his contributions to the *Nation* were the articles on Schliemann's discoveries. One who did much important work for the *Nation* in its early years should be remembered—Earl Shinn, who, while studying art in Paris, wrote some graphic letters to the paper, and for a number of years was its principal art critic. The editors said of him that he employed a vocabulary of remarkable scope and originality, and delighted as much in the strokes of his pen as of his brush. One of his early *Nation* letters from Paris attracted the attention of Lowell, who wrote to Mr. Godkin (July, 1869): "I haven't seen a better piece of writing than that French *atelier*. It is the very best of its kind. Cherish that man, whoever he is."

Not the least important part of the *Nation's* work was done by men who cultivated a restricted specialty with life-long devotion, content with the appreciation of the discriminating few. There leap to one's mind two writers on military affairs, Gen. Francis W. Palfrey—"as fine an example of patriot and Puritan stock as this generation has seen," Mr. Garrison said of him—who wrote admirably on Antietam and Fredericksburg and other campaigns of the Civil War, and John Codman Ropes, an eminent student of military history in general and the admirer and authoritative historian of Bonaparte—and yet no imperialist. Robert Traill Spence Lowell, the elder brother of James Russell, enriched the columns of the *Nation* with articles, written in a peculiarly racy style, on his favorite subject—Newfoundland. The Rev. Samuel Beal, professor of Chinese at University College, London, wrote learnedly and agreeably on Buddhism, and Lieut.-Commander Henry H. Gorringe, remembered for his semi-naval exploit in bringing to these shores the Alexandrian obelisk, treated of the Interoceanic Canal, the North African Inland Sea, and other gigantic projects around which his fertile mind played. And there was the stanch American, Fitzedward Hall, many years of whose romantic life were spent in England, teaching Sanskrit, Hindustani, and Indian Jurisprudence, who sent to the *Nation* the fruits of his minute studies in English lexicography. But I must resist the temptation to speak of so many more, who ought to find a place in the list of *Nation* friends and writers.

Some of the earliest contributors, fortunately, remain with us, a few still to labor on in the pursuit of ideals identified with them and the *Nation*. Charles W. Eliot's pen is as tireless to-day as when he began to write on scientific subjects for the *Nation* in 1866, and Basil L. Gildersleeve still graces any subject he touches upon, as in the days when—thirty-four years ago—he wrote his inimitable letters in the *Nation* on the performance of "Œdipus Tyrannus" at Harvard. One of the most important and most prolific of the writers for the *Nation* survives in the person of C. C. Nott, born in 1827, President Lincoln's appointee as Judge of the Court of Claims, who enlightened the earlier generation of *Nation* readers on some of the weightiest aspects of Constitutional law. It is a pleasure to include with these living witnesses of a bygone period contributors like Gen. A. A. Woodhull, who has furnished the *Nation* with so many valuable papers, during so many years, on climatology, modern theories of infection, and other medical subjects; Prof Charles H. Moore, long identified with American art and art criticism; Prof. C. H. Toy, equally prominent at Harvard in another domain, that of Hebrew and other Oriental literatures; the eminent botanist, Prof. George L. Goodale; Horace White, whose important discussions of economic subjects cover almost the entire period of the *Nation's* existence, and the bearer of a name forever associated with the founding of the *Nation*, herself a cherished contributor to its columns, Miss Grace Norton.

While thus dwelling, with not unpardonable satisfaction, on its past achievements, the *Nation* faces the new tasks before it with new hope. Twenty-five years ago, Mr. Godkin, looking forward as well as backward, wrote:

> The leading colleges of the country have been almost transformed since the *Nation* was started, and a class of advanced students have come into existence who were unknown and unexpected at the close of the war. The schools of political science which the principal universities now contain turn out yearly both writers and thinkers whose contributions to the literature of political philosophy, history, archæology, political economy, and administrative law are extremely important, and have placed the country in the very front rank in fields of inquiry in which it was, five-and-twenty years ago, almost wholly unrepresented. Not only have they made the task of conducting a critical journal like the *Nation* increasingly easy, but they carry on periodicals of their own, in which the best thought of the time on political and economic questions finds adequate expression.

The history of the twenty-five years now closed has borne out Mr. Godkin's prophecy. With its old traditions and the impulses of a new life stirring throughout the land, the *Nation* of the future may hope to be worthy of the *Nation* of the past.

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.