

# Morton's History of Nebraska

Authentic—1400 to 1906—Complete

(Copyrighted 1904. 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 (15)

After arriving at Washington Mr. Johnson says:

"Hon. A. C. Dodge, senator from Iowa, who had from the first been an ardent friend of my plan, introduced me to Judge Douglas, to whom I unfolded my plan, and asked him to adopt it, which, after mature consideration, he decided to do, and he agreed that he would report a substitute for the pending bill, which he afterwards did do. . . . The Hon. Bernhart Henn, member of the house from Iowa, who was also my friend, warmly advocated our territorial scheme."

The important part which Senator Dodge played in the great national drama—or perhaps the prologue which was to be followed by the tragedy of the Civil war—aids greatly in the interpretation of its motive and meaning. Many of us Nebraska remember him as the suave, kindly and gracious gentleman of the old school. By virtue of his ability and experience as statesman and politician, as well as his official position, Senator Dodge represented the interests and wishes of the anti-slavery state of Iowa, which demanded the early organization of the great empire on its western border.

Indeed, until the last, when the question of the adjustment of the interests or demands of slavery became paramount, Senator Dodge might well have been regarded as the leader in the project of territorial organization rather than Douglas himself. In the terrific but short struggle at the last, when slavery was pressing its over-reaching and self-destructive demand, he preserved his independence. His democratic, anti-slaveholding spirit breaks out in his rebuke of Senator Brown of Mississippi in the course of the Kansas-Nebraska debate. Brown had defended negro slavery on the ground that it was necessary to the performance of menial labor which he referred to contemptuously as beneath white people:

"There are certain menial employments which belong exclusively to the negro. Why, sir, it would take you longer to find a white man in my state who would hire himself out as a boot-black or a white woman who would go to service as a chamber-maid than it took Captain Cook to sail around the world. Would any man take his boot-black, would any lady take her chamber-maid into companionship?"

This spirited retort of Senator Dodge's is not that of a doughface: "Sir, I tell the senator from Mississippi—I speak it upon the floor of the American Senate, in presence of my father (Henry Dodge of Wisconsin) who will attest its truth—that I have performed and do perform when at home all of those menial services to which that senator referred in terms so grating to my feelings. As a general thing I saw my own wood, do all my own marketing. I never had a servant of any color to wait upon me a day in my life. I have driven teams, horses, mules and oxen, and considered myself as respectable then as I do now, or as any senator upon this floor is."

This incident serves also to illustrate the great change in customs and manners which has taken place in the short time since the birth of our commonwealth. This Cincinnati—foreman of the founders of Nebraska—was yet of courtly manners, a senator of the United States, and minister to the court of Spain.

When, at the last, the Kansas-Nebraska bill involved a question of vital importance to the democratic party, Douglas, as the conceded and imperious leader of the party, overshadowed all others. But from first to last Dodge co-operated with Douglas for the organization of Nebraska. He showed that he consistently supported the popular sovereignty principle of the Nebraska measure by showing that he had advocated that principle as a solution of the still vexed slavery question in his support of the compromise measures of 1850.

Senator Dodge discloses clearly his reasons for desiring the division of the territory:

"Originally I favored the organization of one territory; but representations from our constituents, and a more critical examination of the subject—having an eye to the systems of internal improvement which must be applied by the people of Nebraska and Kansas to develop their resources—satisfied my colleague who was a member of the committee that reported this bill, and myself, that the great interests of the whole country, and especially of my state demanded that we should support the proposition for the establishment of two territories. Otherwise the seat of government and leading thoroughfares must have fallen south of Iowa."

Though Bernhart Henn, member of the lower house of Congress, lived at Fairfield, as early as June 11, 1853, he had established a land and warrant broker's office under the firm name of Henn, Williams & Co., at Council Bluffs, the residence or rendezvous of the potent promoters of territorial organization and of Omaha City.

In a speech in the House, urging the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, he discloses the objects and motives of the promoters even more clearly than Senator Dodge had done: "The bill is of more practical importance to the state of Iowa, and the people of the district I represent than

to any other state or constituency in the Union."

In answer to "the unjust charge made on this floor by several that it was the scheme of southern men, whereby one of the states to be formed out of these territories was to be a slave state," he demands: "Do they not know that the delegates sent here by the people interested in the organization of that country proposed this division?"

Continuing in the same strain he urges that the 40th parallel, the proposed line of division, is nearly on a line dividing the waters of the Platte and the Kansas rivers:

"A line which nature has run for the boundary of states; a line that will insure to each territory a common interest, each having a rich and fertile valley for its commercial center; a line that will be of immense importance to the prosperity and commerce of Iowa; a line that will make the commercial and political center of Nebraska on a parallel with the great commercial emporiums of the Atlantic and the harbor of San Francisco. . . . The organization of two territories instead of one has advantages for the North, and for Iowa in particular, which should not be overlooked. It secures in the Platte valley one of the lines of Pacific railways by making it the center of commerce, wealth and trade. It brings to the country bordering on Iowa the seat of government for Nebraska. It at once opens up a home market for our produce. It places west of us a dense and thriving settlement. It gives to western Iowa a prominence far ahead of that which ten years ago was maintained by the towns in the eastern portion of our state. It brings Iowa nearer to the center of power and commerce."

While these members of Congress from anti-slavery Iowa thus strongly urged division of the territory, those from pro-slavery Missouri merely acquiesced in the plan. In the Senate Benton opposed the passage of the bill on account of the repeal of the compromise. Atchison took little part in the debate on the bill, but while he said that he thought slavery would go into Kansas if the compromise should be repealed, it does not appear that he ever urged division.

In the House Lindley, Miller and Oliver discussed the measure but said nothing about division. Lindley urged that organization must precede settlement, which must precede "that great enterprise of the age, the great Pacific railroad." Miller and Oliver discussed the question of Indian cessions.

Facts thus rudely obtrude themselves as a substitute for the guessing of the historians as to the primary motive of Douglas for the division scheme, namely, subservience to the hope and intent of the slave power to make Kansas a slave state, and they seem positively to preclude that theory. On this point there is a strong and significant consensus of northern opinion. Douglas himself expressed his belief that it would be impracticable to fix slavery upon either of the territories. In his noted speech on the 30th of January, 1854, he urged that slaves had actually been kept in the Northwest territory in spite of the prohibition of the ordinance, and that they were then kept in Nebraska in spite of the prohibition of the Missouri compromise; but the people of all the northern territories had abolished slavery as soon as they had the local authority to do so. And so he said of Nebraska: "When settlers rush in, when labor becomes plenty and therefore cheap, in that climate, with its productions, it is worse than folly to think of its being a slaveholding country. I do not believe there is a man in Congress who thinks it could be permanently a slaveholding country. I have no idea that it could. . . . When you give them a legislature you thereby confess that they are competent to exercise the powers of legislation. If they wish slavery they have a right to it. If they do not want it they will not have it, and you should not force it upon them."

Benton in his speech in bitter opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska bill said: "The question of slavery in these territories, if thrown open to territorial action, will be a question of numbers, a question of the majority for or against slavery; and what chance would the slaveholders have in such a contest? No chance at all. The slave owners will be overwhelmed and compelled to play at a most unequal game, not only in point of numbers but in point of stakes. The slaveholder stakes his property and has to run it off or lose it if outvoted at the polls."

Benton dreaded and deprecated opening anew the slavery contest by the proposed repeal of the compromise. For the sake of peace he had promoted the clause in the constitution of Missouri prohibiting the legislature from emancipating slaves without the consent of their owners.

Senator Dodge insisted that, as touching slavery, the bill would have the effect of freeing several hundred slaves who would be taken into Kansas and Nebraska as domestic servants on the promise of freedom at some fixed time. The owners of slaves, he said, would be too timid and conservative to take them into new and unfavorable communities in larger numbers. This theory was peculiarly confirmed in Nebraska, and

doubtless would have been in Kansas after conditions had become settled there, but for the Civil war which swept slavery away entirely.

In his speech in the House, in which he urges the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill with all his powers, Mr. Henn argues that, "These territories will, nay must become non-slaveholding states. . . . My experience in the settlement of new countries so teaches." Emigration moves on a line south of west for the betterment of physical as well as financial conditions. "Hence," he continues, "all of Nebraska, if not all of Kansas, will be settled by emigrants from non-slaveholding states. Three thousand of these, from free states, are now on the line of Nebraska and fifteen hundred on that of Kansas ready to step over as soon as the bill passes." A network of railways in this latitude already embraced the Mississippi and would soon reach the Missouri. Without a word of testimony, unprejudiced eyes should see why commercial and political considerations, entirely independent of the slavery question, should have discovered the advantages of division to Iowa and Illinois also, and stimulated to the utmost their demand for it. Douglas was the natural mouthpiece of this sentiment by virtue of his residence in Chicago, which was vitally interested in securing the location of the Pacific railway as a direct extension of her great trunk lines to the West, and of his position as chairman of the Senate committee on territories. So far from being surprising it is quite natural that these advantages of division should have appeared and been presented now, when the long-mooted question of territorial organization was at last plainly to be settled, and which quickened, and for the first time made the question of a Pacific railway practicable and imminent. This now certain prospect of the opening of the way for giving value to the bordering territory and for the most gigantic project for a commercial highway that had yet been imagined suddenly increased the importance of every local consideration or possible advantage, and resulted in the project of division for northern commercial interests and by northern commercial initiative.

Douglas had from the first striven for a northern territory. His prompt acquiescence in the proposal of division is quite explicable and consistent when coupled with the fact that his bill of 1844 provided for a territory, whose northern boundary line was identical with that of present Nebraska and whose southern line was only two degrees farther south than the dividing line between the two territories, and with the further fact that the proposed northern boundary in his bill of 1848 was that of the present state, and the southern boundary was the same as the division line between the two territories and states, namely, the 40th parallel.

But this cogent consistency of circumstance and specific human testimony must, it seems, give way to the exigencies of contrary historical authority. For we are told in no inconclusive tone and terms that,

"We can not clearly trace the ways leading up to the division of Nebraska which apparently formed no part of the original plan. Nor is the explanation of Senator Douglas sufficient. It is almost certain that if there had been no question of slavery this change would not have been made."

And again: "For the division of the Nebraska country had no meaning if it were not made in order to secure a part of it to slavery." This author brings to the discussion of the question great ability, but a zeal that leaps the bounds of fairness and reason. It certainly seems as if he has retained his powers to discredit and smirch Douglas to the utmost. This palpable predetermination naturally leads to disingenuous if not false statements. Thus, to sustain his pre-conception that the primary object of the organization of the Nebraska country, and especially its division into two territories, was to further the interests of the slavocracy, he insists that there were no white men in the territory, keeping back the fact that theoretically or legally there could be none since they had been interdicted by the law of Congress of 1834; and he neglects to mention the very relevant fact that the advocates of organization in Congress rightfully urged that the population would be forthcoming, and, more scrupulous than the Israelites of old, in general waited legal permission to "go up and possess the land." Organization therefore must needs precede population, or else be indefinitely postponed.

Douglas himself completely answered these objections in his great 3d of March speech by correctly stating that, in spite of the formal legal prohibition, there was a goodly number of white settlers within the proposed territory; that there was an immense traffic through it to the Pacific coast, now entirely unprotected, and organization was necessary on that account; and that people would inevitably invade the territory in spite of legal barriers which therefore had better be removed in response to the popular demand. The first census of Kansas taken within six months after the passage of the organic act indicates that there was already a population not far from five thousand.

(To be Continued)

## CASSATT'S CAREER.

His Way of Running the Pennsylvania Railroad.

How did Mr. Cassatt work? Just as Paderewski plays—apparently without trying. Facility in the actual details of the work gave him faculty in the big affairs.

Mr. Cassatt had the faculty of appreciating that he could not do everything himself, that his duty was to select the task of greatest importance and attend to that and then to take the next most important task and attend to that, and so on. The rest was done by his generals, and the best chief is the one who can pick the best generals.

Most men are eaten up by details. They never get time to do the big things because they are slaves to the little things. They confound the necessity of knowing how to do little things with the necessity of doing them.

Mr. Cassatt did that first which was life and death to the Pennsylvania. This is why he was a general in fact as well as in title. Mr. Cassatt knew the proper relations between work and rest. When he quit work he made a good job of the change and courted the play as ardently as he had courted the toil. He applied this rest rule to the army under his command, and no set of railway employes work under more humane and considerate rules than those of the Pennsylvania.

There are ten or twelve vitally different methods of running a great railroad. The Pennsylvania way stands first, because it is the most highly developed on the continent.

The method from this point of view, is simple. It follows the old adage: "A place for everything and everything in its place." The system of administration is perfect. Pennsylvania railroad officers come as close to being perfect machines as it is possible for men to come. There are more than 600 of them. Every one has his specific duty. If he falls in that he is reprimanded or discharged. If he does more than he is listed for he is again reprimanded. There must be neither dereliction nor interference.

The Pennsylvania school produces automatic railroad men. They may be successfully transplanted from one division to another, but history has failed to record that they can be moved to any other system.

Mr. Cassatt was first and foremost an engineer. He also remembered that it takes money to make the mare go. Certainly he took money, more than a barrel of it, to make the Pennsylvania go from New York to Chicago, a distance of little less than 1,000 miles, in eighteen hours. The long, glittering steel pathway over which the flyer makes its daily trip has been literally paved with dollars, just as much so as if President Cassatt had taken the entire output of the United States mint and strewn it along the whole distance. For in the past six years there has been no less than \$200,000,000 put into improvements of the road between the metropolis of the East and the great distributing center of the West.

When Alexander J. Cassatt became president of the Pennsylvania railroad in 1899, he had an idea stowed away in his mind—the feasibility of establishing an eighteen-hour schedule between New York and Chicago. It might be better to say that he had an idea of a fourteen-hour schedule, for that is what he was aiming to establish. How long Cassatt had had this idea no one knows.

His engineering schemes appeared to demand the supernatural.

It is told that at a meeting of the directors of the Pennsylvania railroad a year ago one of them turned angrily to the president and said:

"Cassatt, you have gone engineering mad."

But Cassatt had his vindication when two trains, one going east and the other west, covered the distance between New York and Chicago in three minutes less than eighteen hours, the time scheduled for their run a scant week before.

Is there any ground for wonder that men doubted the sanity of President Cassatt, when he declared that to successfully operate the Pennsylvania railroad it was necessary to blow away the sides of the mountains in order to lay six tracks where there were already four, to increase from one to four tracks the Fort Wayne lines between Pittsburg and Chicago, to spend millions upon millions to reduce grades that were apparently satisfactory already, to eliminate curves that could be easily rounded with a little care, and finally to spend \$100,000,000 for a

tunnel from Jersey City to a site covering two blocks of the heart of New York for a passenger terminal?

## A Lost Circus Monkey.

It was a cold dark night, the wind was blowing and a mournful sound heard where the leaves went sweeping back and forth under the trees. In a house on the outskirts of a little town a light burned near the window and several times since dark a little boy who sat inside, had gone to the door to look down the road upon which he expected his father to return.

It had been a fine day for the boy, he had been to the circus, and his mind was crowded with thoughts of the wonderful sights and questions he wished to ask his father about them.

Soon he heard steps outside and in another minute the two were talking eagerly and laughing aloud about the funny tricks of the clown. The front door through which the father had entered was closed and locked, but suddenly, though no sounds had been heard on the porch, there was a distinct knock on the door.

"Who can that be, Billy?" asked the father, "we are not apt to have visitors at this hour."

"It must be a tramp," replied Billy, "you know they often follow a circus and are not always good looking fellows, either; suppose we do not open the door."

"Oh, that wouldn't do," answered the father, "it might be some one who needed help, or a message from a neighbor."

So Billy hurried to the door and called from the inside.

"Who is it? What do you want?" But not a word came in reply, only a kind of grunting such as might be made by one who was suffering.

At this the father stepped forward quickly and threw open the door, saying: "If it is a tramp he must be in trouble."

"Oh, maybe he is sick!" exclaimed sprang the tramp who had been Billy, but the door swung open and in crouching in the dark. Billy gave a little scream of surprise, then stepped back, for somehow he felt he would like to have his father meet this strange tramp first.

But not a question would the visitor answer, he only shook his head, and then, spying a loaf of bread on the table leaped toward it and began to help himself without the least hesitation.

By this time Billy was laughing and the visitor heartily joined in, that is he winked his eyes, cocked his head on one side, and did many funny things which were much the same as laughing.

"Strayed from the circus," said Billy's father directly; "we must give him a night's lodging in some safe place and telegraph to the company about him in the morning."

So this is what they did, and by noon the next day Billy's tramp, a great big monkey, was put on the train, to join his circus company and soon was again busy entertaining the children who watched outside his cage.—Pittsburg Press.

## Graceful Hands.

It is next to impossible to make the hands slender. You can make them graceful by indulging in certain DeBarte exercises, stretching the fingers to the utmost and closing the hand slowly and gracefully. You can also keep your hands soft and white by using a pure soap and cosmetic jelly. If, in addition, the nails are beautifully manicured, the extra plumpness will not matter so very much. The main thing is to have the hands white and soft, the nails polished and clean and to move the hands gracefully. All these delightful conditions can be cultivated.

## Trains are Back Again.

Once again long, graceful trains are to be seen, and as they are becoming alike to short and tall, stout and slender, it is to be hoped that the fashion has come to stay—were such a thing to be dreamed of. It is to be noticed that most of the younger women still have their ball gowns cut rather short—that is, while long all around, the train is scarcely noticeable. Naturally, the comfort of a short dancing gown is great, but then the charming lines given to the figure by a long sweep of silk or satin should more than compensate for the slight inconvenience, and as a matter of fact, a long train is no more difficult to manage and looks far better when gathered up than a shorter one.