

Morton's History of Nebraska

Authentic—1400 to 1906—Complete

(Copyrighted 1906. All rights reserved.) By courtesy of Editors and Publishers of Morton's History, the Publishers Newspaper Union of Lincoln, Nebraska, is permitted its reproduction in papers of their issue

CHAPTER V CONTINUED (14)

It was conceded on both sides that the states had the absolute power to adopt or reject slavery by provisions in their constitutions, and, as Douglas points out, it was inconsistent to deny this principle to the territories: "These things are all confided by the constitution to each state to decide for itself, and I know of no reason why the same principle should not be confided to the territories."

A severe critic of Douglas' selfish subserviency in the Nebraska affair admits that,

"Probably he had at first no more intention of actually enlarging the arena of slavery than had Daniel Webster in laboring to remove the legal restriction from the territory of Utah. Northern free labor was moving westward, as he knew, by leaps and bounds. It was not likely that slavery would ever gain any foothold in the region between the Rocky mountains and the states of Minnesota, Iowa and Missouri. Douglas no doubt sought to further his presidential prospects without making any actual change in the practical situation respecting slavery extension."

But what more or what less could be said of Clay, Webster or Lincoln, each of whom, while as ardently seeking to further his presidential prospects, temporized upon the slavery question? And in view of the probability, confirmed by the result, that slavery could not be forced upon Kansas or Nebraska, whatever might be done with the Missouri restriction, did not the course of Douglas result in a distinct gain in that, "the southerners abandoned the claim to their inherent right to take their slaves into the new territories and united—both whigs and democrats—in support of Douglas' bill?"

Furthermore, Douglas emphasized the fact that there was a grave question as to the constitutionality of the Missouri restriction; and may he not be credited with sagacity and patriotism in fortifying against the event of the Dred Scott decision in 1857, which confirmed his fears, by interposing his Kansas-Nebraska popular sovereignty device as a new bar to the door against slavery in the territories which that memorable decision had otherwise opened wide? For "Kansas was the only territory in which slaveholders tried to assert their rights"—that is, the constitutional right to carry slaves into the territories against attempted prohibition by Congress or its creatures, the territorial legislatures. And as it turned out, they had the best of the argument, and nothing could have hindered their design but the popular sovereignty provision of the Nebraska bill.

But this spontaneous harshness toward Douglas reaches the climax of its unreasonableness when it discovers in southern pro-slavery motives a rare nicety of moral discrimination and self-renunciation, and exalts it to contrasting heights above the groveling motives of Douglas. Thus we are told that the bill that passed the House in 1853, "being naturally objectionable to the pro-slavery politicians who still respected the Missouri compromise, was defeated by them in the Senate." But in this bill there was no allusion to slavery, and the compromise was not attacked. Moreover, on the final passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which repealed the compromise, only nine votes from the South—two democrats and seven whigs—could be mustered against it in the House, while forty-two democrats and forty-five whigs from the North voted against it. But in one instance Douglas has been grouped with the patriots—though perhaps inadvertently. For "the ardent advocates of the compromise of 1850 were all devoted to the Union"; and Douglas advocated every part of the compromise.

The impartial judge of contemporary circumstances will conclude that Douglas thought and had good ground for thinking that in this first organization of new territory since the new compromise or temporizing arrangement between the slavery and the anti-slavery element in 1850, another controversy was inevitable, and that the statement that the "new policy thus sprung so unexpectedly upon the country was the secret contrivance of a few aspiring democrats, obsequious to slavery's propaganda," is an inadequate and inconsistent explanation of the new compromise. Dixon's reason for pressing the repeal of the Missouri restriction, which it is generally admitted took Douglas by surprise, illustrates the fact that the pro-slavery leaders of the South intended to fight for a new arrangement, and the solid support which the members from the South gave to the bill makes the contention that the scheme was originated by a few politicians, and that the people of the South "had not dreamed of taking it" little less than ridiculous. Mr. Dixon stated that he never believe in the propriety of passing the Missouri compromise. "I never thought the great senator from Kentucky, Mr. Clay, when he advocated that measure did so because his judgment approved it. . . . And I have never thought that that measure received the sanction of his heart or of his head." He said that he proposed the amendment under the firm conviction that he was carrying out the principles settled in the compromise of 1850, and which left the whole question of slavery with the people

and without any congressional interference. He had always believed that Congress had no authority over the subject of slavery in states or territories, and, therefore, that the Missouri compromise was unconstitutional. In a colloquy with Dixon, Douglas explained that he "and some others with whom he consulted" thought that Dixon's amendment not only wiped out the legislation excluding slavery but affirmatively legislated slavery into the territory; he therefore inserted the repealing clause in his own words to avoid the affirmative force of Dixon's amendment.

Mr. Abelard Guthrie, who had been elected a delegate to Congress from Nebraska, at Wyandotte, in October, 1852, writing while on his way to Washington in December, 1852, to William Walker, provisional governor, throws light on the attitude of the pro-slavery element toward territorial organization, as follows:

"I traveled in company with Senators Geyer and Atchison of Missouri and Representatives Richardson and Bissil of Illinois. I am sorry to say our Missouri senators are by no means favorable to our territorial projects. The slavery question is the cause of this opposition. I regret that it should interfere—it ought not. Mr. Atchison thinks the slaves in Nebraska are already free by the operation of the Missouri compromise act, and asks a repeal of that act before anything shall be done for Nebraska."

In a letter to the New York Tribune, written August 9, 1856, Mr. Guthrie relates that he was a candidate for re-election as a delegate to Congress in 1853; but because "the repeal of the Missouri compromise was now first agitated, and it was thought important to success that the territory should be represented by one favorable to that measure," Mr. Guthrie complains, the influence of the administration was thrown against him, and he was defeated by a large Indian vote.

The tradition and belief of the Douglas family are worthy of consideration. A son of Senator Douglas thinks that his father had become convinced that the South could and would repeal the Missouri compromise, and he therefore set about to get the best terms he could against the further spread of slavery, and believed he had accomplished this in the formal recognition of the doctrine of popular sovereignty in lieu of the open door which the South was bent on securing.

On the 23d day of January, 1854, Douglas presented the Kansas-Nebraska bill which was passed as a substitute for the Nebraska bill of January 4. It comprised two important additions to the old bill, which were to divide the territory into two—Kansas and Nebraska—and specifically repeal the Missouri compromise. His own reasons for dividing the territory are as follows:

"There are two delegates here who have been elected by the people of that territory. They are not legal delegates, of course, but they have been sent here as agents. They have petitioned us to make two territories instead of one, dividing them by the 40th parallel of north latitude—the Kansas and Nebraska territories. Upon consulting with the delegates from Iowa I found that they think that their local interests as well as the interests of the territory, require that the proposed territory of Nebraska should be divided into two territories, and the people ought to have two delegates. So far as I have been able to consult with the Missouri delegates they are of the same opinion. The committee therefore have concluded to recommend the division of the territory into two territories, and also to change the boundary in the manner I have described."

The change consisted in making the southern line 37° instead of 36° 30', thus avoiding division of the Cherokee country and running between that and the Osages.

The simple reasons Douglas himself gave for finally and somewhat suddenly dividing the Nebraska territory as at first proposed into two territories are not only consistent with the circumstances, but are fairly confirmed by them, and they leave no necessity for the search that has been made for hidden mysterious, and unworthy motives. The two delegates to whom Douglas referred, as he is quoted above, were Mr. Hadley D. Johnson, who was chosen at an election held at Bellevue, October 11, 1853, and the Rev. Thomas Johnson, who was elected at Wyandotte on the same day. Mr. Hadley D. Johnson states that after consultation with citizens it was decided to advocate the organization of two territories instead of one, and that on his presentation of the case to Douglas he adopted Johnson's plan and changed the bill so as to divide Nebraska into Kansas and Nebraska. It was quite natural that the people of the northern part of the territory and of Iowa lying directly opposite should desire the division so as to have complete control, in view of the contemplated Pacific railway, and for other commercial reasons, and Mr. Johnson states that Senator Dodge of Iowa warmly approved his plan for two territories, and took pains to introduce him to Douglas. Just as naturally, too, the people and politicians of Missouri would prefer to have the territory opposite their state, and over whose affairs they would naturally ex-

ercise much control, separated from the northern territory. The general commercial interests, as well as considerations of the slavery question, would lead them to this desire.

Contemporaries of Hadley D. Johnson now living, as well as the important part he played in the affairs of Iowa and Nebraska, testify to his high standing and the credibility his statements deserve. He was elected a member of the Iowa senate for the Council Bluffs district in 1852, was a "provisional" delegate to Congress from Nebraska in 1853, was a prominent candidate for delegate to Congress at the election of 1854, was elected territorial printer by the legislature of Nebraska in 1856, and in general was recognized as a man of affairs in those earlier years.

We have an account of a meeting of citizens of Mills county, Iowa, at Glenwood, in October, 1853. Glenwood was then the county seat of Mills county, which adjoins Pottawattomie, of which Council Bluffs is the county seat, on the south, and borders on the Missouri river on the west, opposite Sarpy county, Nebraska, in which Bellevue is situated. Among those who addressed this "great and enthusiastic meeting" were Hadley D. Johnson, delegate-elect from Nebraska, J. L. Sharp, who was chairman of the committee on resolutions, M. H. Clark who had been chosen provisional secretary of Nebraska at the same Bellevue election which chose Johnson for delegate, and Hiram P. Bennet. Mr. Sharp became president of the first legislative council of Nebraska, and Bennet and Clark were also members of that body.

The resolutions adopted by the meeting declared that the best interests of western Iowa as well as of the bordering Indian tribes would be secured by the early organization of the territory of Nebraska, and that "the boundaries indicated by Judge Douglas' bill, subserve the interests of the whole country; but if they can not be obtained we would next prefer the parallel of 39½ degrees south and 44 degrees north as the boundaries of Nebraska." This reference to the bill of Douglas "introduced some years ago," which must have meant his bill of 1848, discloses that the boundary which in the opinion of these enterprising border promoters would "best subserve the interests of the whole country" extended half a degree further south than the line that would satisfy them—to the fortieth parallel,—and fell one degree short of the boundary they proposed on the north. There is no material difference in the two boundaries in question, and perhaps the Glenwood resolutions made a mistake in their reference to Douglas' bill; but in any event they show that the men of Iowa wanted a territory, as nearly and exclusively as they could get it, opposite their own state. The proprietary regard of these Iowans for the prospective territory, the key to it, and their resolute intent to bring about territorial organization in the form suited to their ambitious purposes are disclosed in the other resolutions of the meeting. While they "approve of an election by the citizens of Nebraska of provisional territorial officers as well as a delegate to represent their interests in the approaching Congress," they "would not approve any measure which would retard or interfere with the early extinction of the Indian titles to all of said territory." They request their senators and representatives in Congress to use their best efforts to carry out the policy set forth in the resolutions, direct a copy to be sent to each of them and to Senator Douglas, recommend the appointment of a committee to confer with citizens of other counties touching the interests of western Iowa, and ask the St. Mary's Gazette, Western Bugle, Chicago Democratic Press, Peoria Press and New York Herald to publish the proceedings of the meeting. Nor did they neglect the one subject on which all wide-awake border people in this latitude were now always harping, and they resolved, "That the valley of the Nebraska or Platte river and the South Pass is the route most clearly pointed out by the hand of nature for a world's thoroughfare, and a natural roadway for the United States, connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific."

Mr. Hadley D. Johnson states that in the month of November meetings were held at Council Bluffs which were addressed by Senator A. C. Dodge and Col. S. R. Curtis, one of the first United States commissioners of the Union Pacific railway, "who warmly advocated the construction of our contemplated railways, and the organization of Nebraska territory." He further says:

"Before starting (for Washington) a number of our citizens who took a deep interest in the organization of a territory west of Iowa had on due thought and consultation agreed upon a plan which I had formed, which was the organization of two territories instead of one as had heretofore been contemplated."

"Before starting (for Washington) a number of our citizens who took a deep interest in the organization of a territory west of Iowa had on due thought and consultation agreed upon a plan which I had formed, which was the organization of two territories instead of one as had heretofore been contemplated."

(To be Continued)

THE VALUE OF PRAISE.

Benefits to the Employee.

Some will probably remember the story published a few months ago about a prominent business man and millionaire who traced all his success in life to a single word of praise that someone uttered at a moment when he had well-nigh lost all hope of accomplishing anything in life. There have been no doubt, a great many such cases and it is saddening to think that it would require all the figures in the arithmetic to enumerate the people whose lives have been altogether or almost failures for want of praise.

Normal human nature is as dependent on the good will and approval of associates as it is on the good air or wholesome food. To a man of average sensibility an injury to his reputation is more painful than a cinder in his eye, and to live without being conscious of the confidence and approval of at least some other people is a living death. Human beings live in a multitude of relations to each other and it is in these relations that the necessity of praise is most felt.

The policy of praise in business relations is not clear. The generous praise which an employer may from time to time give his employe has a double effect. On the one hand the employe will naturally think that he is only getting what is coming to him and will immediately put a higher estimate on his services. By and by he will begin to figure on an easier time and higher wages. This is one tendency, but there is with sensible employes another. They become less inclined to make changes, for fear they may not "get along so well" with another and unknown employer.

It is impossible to estimate the power of praise, but every reflecting person must see that if sincere and judicious praise were given everywhere that it was deserved, business, politics, religion, the church, the home and the government would all be revolutionized and mankind would behold a new heaven and a new earth.—Chicago Chronicle.

Clara Morris and Her Spat With Augustin Daly.

In the American Magazine Clara Morris writes of a banquet given by her manager, Augustin Daly. Miss Morris was dressed in black grenadine over which she and Daly quarreled. At the banquet she was unexpectedly called upon for a speech—her first speech. Reading it almost makes your own knees shake!

Not the least interesting part of the story is Miss Morris's account of the spat that she and Daly had before the banquet. Miss Morris refused to go because she possessed no suitable clothes.

"You only require a very simple dress!" said Mr. Daly.

"Mr. Daly, you are acquainted with both my shabby street dresses. I have besides them only some night dresses, and I fancy they are barred for a banquet."

"He was angry. I was sorry. 'Please, Mr. Daly, don't be vexed. I know no one in New York. I will never be missed.'"

"Then indeed the storm broke. He accused me of meanness incredible; that I wished by my absence to make myself a 'dramatic Cinderella,' to arouse the sympathy of the public—and with head up and eyes blinded with tears I walked out and home.

"Two sulky, sullen days, then—'Miss Morris, can you be ready in half an hour after curtain-fall, to ride over to the hotel with Mrs. Gilbert on Saturday night?'"

"I drew a long breath: 'I can't go, sir!'"

"'You will go!'"

"'No sir! I have no desire to humiliate you or myself. You know I can't go to a banquet in a worn and shabby street dress.'"

"'And you know you have only to name the establishment you favor to have a suitable costume at once!' He drew a checkbook toward him. A sound, wordless sound came from my throat. He glanced up—startled—laughed a nervous little laugh, and exclaimed: 'You—you'll die on the scaffold if you're not careful!'"

"'If I do, it will be for resenting an insult like this!'"

"'I beg your pardon; there's no insult in a manager providing a dress—' 'For a play, I broke in. 'You have provided two for me in the new play; but when a man pays for my personal clothing, that man will be my husband, not to my manager!'"

When Love is Near.
Every storm bends rainbows
O'er the world so wide;
Every road's a bright road,
When love is by your side!
He reaps the sweetest roses
In gardens 'o the cew,
An' gives them with his kisses,
But hides the thorns from you!
And poverty seems riches
A whole world might divide,
And heaven to earth draws nearer,
When love is by your side.
—F. L. Stanton in Atlanta Constitution.

Valuable Education.
Gen. J. Franklin Bell, while at the head of the artillery and infantry school at Fort Leavenworth, was invited to a dinner given in the cause of education. The educators were called upon and glorified education. Then Gen. Bell said:
"I have been interested in what the speakers preceding me have said about education, and still I think that our way, in the west, not so much store is set by it as here in the east. I am reminded of the story of the two boys in Omaha who, I regret to say, were playing poker in a doorway, using kernels of corn for chips. During the game one pushed in a bunch of kernels and said, 'I'll bet you a hundred.' 'I'll raise it a hundred,' said the other. 'I'll raise that a thousand.' 'I'll see the thousand and raise it a million.' 'I'll raise that million a billion.' 'I'll see the billion and raise you a trillion.' The other boy was stumped. He thought a long time, but he couldn't remember what came next, so he said bitterly, 'Take it, you educated son of a gun!'"

About Truth Telling.
Norman Hapgood, says the Buffalo Engineer, was discussing American newspapers. "It is not enough that our papers should tell the truth," he said. "Truth telling in itself is not particularly wise nor praiseworthy."
"Thus, a young man called on a young lady one spring morning very early. He had his automobile along. He wanted to give the young lady a morning spin through the country."
"A little girl, the young lady's niece, answered the bell.
"Is your auntie in?" asked the young man.
"Yes, sir," said the little girl.
"That's good. Where is she?" he went on.
"She's upstairs," said the little girl, "in her nightg, looking over the balustrade."

Rolled Fillets of Flounder.
Sprinkle each fillet with salt and pepper. Spread it with a mixture made of butter, lemon juice and parsley cut in pieces, not chopped fine. Fold the fillet over, roll it, and fasten it with a wooden toothpick, or smaller skewer. Stand the rolled fillets on end in a baking pan; put a piece of butter on the top of each one and pour over the whole a half cupful of white cooking wine (California sauterne). Bake them in a moderate oven for 20 minutes, or until tender, and baste them frequently. Arrange the fillets symmetrically on a platter. Put a piece of parsley in the top of each one, and put cut lemon about the dish. Make a sauce to serve with the fish as follows: Add to the drippings in the pan in which the fish was cooked a tablespoonful of flour and stir constantly until the flour is cooked. Then add enough stock to make a creamy sauce. Add pepper and salt, if necessary.



NEW IDEAS
In cleaning and dyeing work can always be seen at this establishment. We are living in an age of wonderful achievement, and progressive people ALWAYS ADOPT THE NEW IDEAS in place of the old that have outgrown their usefulness. We use only NEW AND UP-TO-DATE METHODS of cleaning and dyeing and so turn out satisfactory work. It is good policy to send your work of this kind to us. You will be pleased with the result.
J. C. WOOD & CO.
EXPERT CLEANERS AND DYERS
1320 N Street
Write for Price List
LINCOLN, - - NEBRASKA