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I come before you this evening with much diffidence: the rarest gifts and the best eloquence might well be employed here and now, and yet fail of justice to the dignity and solemnity of this occasion, as well as the character of the illustrious deceased we tonight remember.

Had Abraham Lincoln died from any of the numerous ills to which flesh is heir; had he reached that good old age of which his vigorous constitution and his temperate habits gave promise; had he seen the end of the great work which it was his good fortune to inaugurate, our task this evening though sad and painful would be very simple.

But dying as he did die, by the red hand of violence, snatched suddenly away from his work without warning—killed, murdered, assassinated, not because of personal hate, for no man who knew Abraham Lincoln could hate him; but solely because he was the president—the faithful, loyal president of the United States—true to his country, and true to the cause of human freedom, for these reasons he was slain—murdered, assassinated. And for this he, today, commands our homage as a glorious martyr.

Today, men all over have been thinking of Abraham Lincoln. Our statesmen, scholars, and poets have been celebrating as never before the memory of our martyred president. It is well. He is worthy of it all, and it is becoming in all to join, however humbly in these tokens of respect and veneration.

One thing will be at once conceded by all generous minds. No people or class of people in this country have a better reason for lamenting the death of Abraham Lincoln, and for desiring to honor and perpetuate his memory than have the colored people of this country. And yet, we are about the only people who have been in any case forbidden to exhibit our sorrow. The attempt to exclude colored people from his funeral procession in New York was one of the most disgraceful and sickening manifestations of moral emptiness ever exhibited by any nation or people professing to be civilized.

What was Abraham Lincoln to the colored people of America or they to him, as compared with his predecessors? Abraham Lincoln, while unsurpassed in his devotion to the welfare of the white race, was also in a sense emphatically the black man’s president: he was the first to show any public respect for their rights as men.

To our white fellow countrymen therefore we say, follow your martyred president to his grave, lay the foundation of his monument broad and strong—let its capstone rise towards the sky, do homage to his character, forever perpetuate his memory; but as you respect genuine sorrow and sincere bereavement, let the colored people of this country—for whom he did so much, have space at least, for one stone in that monument, one stone which shall tell to after coming generations the story of the colored people’s love and gratitude to Abraham Lincoln.

Those love most to whom most is forgiven. One of the most touching scenes connected with the funeral of our lamented President Lincoln occurred at the gate of the presidential mansion: a colored woman standing at the gate weeping was asked the cause of her tears. ‘Oh! Sir,’ she said, ‘we have lost our Moses.’ ‘But,’ said the gentleman, ‘the Lord will send you another.’ ‘That may be,’ said the weeping woman, ‘but, ah! We had him.’ To her mind, one ‘as good,’ or ‘better’ might come in his stead—but no such possibility to her was equal to the reality—the actual possession—in the person of Abraham Lincoln.

The colored people of America, from first to last, fully believed in Abraham Lincoln. Though he sometimes wounded them severely, yet they firmly trusted in him. This was, however, no blind trust unsupported by reason. They early caught a glimpse of the man, and from the evidence of their senses, they believed in him. They viewed him in the light of his mission, and viewing him thus they trusted him, as men are seldom trusted.

Under Abraham Lincoln’s beneficent rule, they saw themselves being gradually lifted to the broad plain of equal manhood. Under his rule, they saw millions of their brethren proclaimed free and invested with the right to defend their freedom: under his rule, they saw the Confederate states broken to pieces and swept from the face of exist...
ence. Under his rule, they saw the independence of Haiti and Liberia recognized and the whole colored race steadily rising into the friendly consideration of the American people.

And so, we speak here tonight not merely as colored men and women, but as American citizens, and we find the prospect bright and glorious.

The greatness and grandeur of the American republic never appeared more conspicuously than in connection with this death of Abraham Lincoln. Though great and powerful, this nation seemed to have need of some great and widespread calamity, some overwhelming sorrow, to reveal to ourselves and the world all the elements of our character—our national strength.

While it cannot be affirmed that our long torn and distracted country has reached the desired condition of peace, it may be said that we have survived the terrible agonies of a fierce and sanguinary rebellion and have before us a fair prospect of a just and lasting peace.

Already a strong hand is felt upon the helm of state; the word has gone forth that traitors and assassins, whether male or female are to be punished: loyal and true men are to be rewarded and protected. Slavery, that damming offense of generations, is to be entirely and forever abolished: the emancipated negro, so long outraged and degraded is to be enfranchised and clothed with the dignity of American citizenship: the poor white man of the south, scornfully denounced by the rich slaveholders, as the ‘poor white trash,’ are to be delivered from their political and social dungeon: the loyal and patriot dead, they predicted that though beautiful to the eye, and swift upon the wave, our gallant bark would go down in the first great storm. They had little faith in the wisdom or virtue of ‘We—the people’—and in the form of our popular government. I have no reproaches for these foreigners of little faith, for it cannot be denied that many thoughtful and patriotic men here at home, have doubted and trembled while contemplating the possibility of just such a conflict as that through which we have now so nearly passed.

I will not here argue the value of the results of our conflict. I will, however, argue the inevitability of the conflict. It was beyond the power of human will or wisdom to have prevented what has happened. We should never forget that this dreadful war was a part of and sprung out of the fundamental elements of our national structure, and was unavoidable. We have but reaped where we have sown.

When slavery was first planted in the national soil, treason, rebellion, and assassination were planted with it and their bloody fruit was bequeathed to the present generation.

And if in the coming reconstruction or restoration we shall incorporate any of the seeds of injustice, any of the remaining seeds of slavery, we shall repeat the mistake of our fathers, with the certainty that our children will reap a similar harvest of blood to that we have just experienced.

All the great nations of this earth, no matter how isolated their location, no matter how carefully they exclude the light of new ideas—are fated to pass through certain epochs, coming upon them whether they will or not. These epochs come when they are ready to come and they depart when their work is done.

As a people, we are no exception to the rule. One such period as this happened to us, four score and nine years ago, when our delegates sat in solemn assembly in Philadelphia and openly declared our independence of Great Britain. Then the American people with a courage that never quailed and a faith that knew no doubt marched through bloody fields during all the length of seven years to make that declaration a reality. Another and mightier than that is the one compressed within the narrow limits of the last four years. Nothing strange has happened unto us. We have been playing our appointed part in the machinery of human advancement and civilization.

We had within our midst a gigantic system of injustice and barbarism. Slavery was a shocking offense against the enlightened judgment of mankind—a system which the world had outgrown, one which we were required by the necessity of our existence to put away—peaceably if we could, forcibly if we must.

What men have done, men will do; what great nations and states have done great nations and states will do. During this tremendous struggle for national unity and national identity, so fierce, bitter and sanguinary, so long protracted and so desperate, we have illustrated and exemplified the best and noblest qualities which distinguish human nature, as well as those which must blot and disgrace it.

The history of this war for the union and for free institutions will possess many thrilling chapters but none which will so interest, so astound mankind as that which shall contain a faithful record of the events and scenes which have transpired in our country during these last seven weeks.
We have here seen and felt the concentrated virus—the moral poison—accumulated by more than two centuries of human slavery, pouring itself out upon the nation as a vial of wrath, in one dreadful and shocking crime—the first of its kind in the annals of this nation.

That accursed thing—slavery—so long defended in the name of the Bible and religion, in the name of law and order, properly celebrates its own death by a crime that sends a shudder around the world by this appropriate exhibition of slaveholding hate. It is well that slavery should give this mean and bloody sign at its death. It is meet that it should go to its grave under a storm of execration from every quarter of the globe.

Hereafter, when men think of slavery, they will think of murder; hereafter when men think of slave-holders, they will think of assassins; hereafter, when men think of southern chivalry they will think of our starving prisoners at Andersonville; hereafter, when men think of southern honor, they will think of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. Deny it who will, doubt it who may, that hell-black deed—the murder of our president, sprang from the very heart of the aristocratic class of southern “honor.”

I know that some of the leaders of the rebellion have affected to deplore it, but slave-holders know we know, and the world knows where the responsibility for this crime belongs. The assassin—John Wilkes Booth—not less than any member of the late Confederate government, represented a cause and was the very image of that cause.

Booth the assassin is of the south. His affiliations were of the south. He fired his deadly shot in the interest of the south; his motto of defiance after committing the atrocious crime was copied from the south “sic semper tyrannis,” or “thus ever to tyrants.” After he leaped onto the stage he shouted “the south is avenged.” From the first of the war he took sides with the south. His first thought, upon the commission of the crime, was escape to the south. There is nothing in his morals or manners, or in the crime itself to separate him from the south—or that should make the south disown him.

Let us not mistake public opinion either at the north or the south. Such a mistake is the danger. We have done too much of this. Public journals all over the north, have had sympathies with the rebels and traitors. Take the federal soldiers from the Confederate states today, and tomorrow the very elite of the south will drink to the memory of Booth the assassin.

You see, assassination accords well with the horrid profanation of the graves of our brave soldiers and making ornaments of their bones. It accords well with the system of starvation adopted by the Confederate government in its treatment of our prisoners. Men who whip women with their hands tied, and burn their names into their flesh with hot irons, cannot be allowed any especial abhorrence of assassination.

Friends, southern responsibility for the assassination is found in the fact that this crime was freely talked of at the south, and the time and the place were specified previously to Mr. Lincoln’s first inauguration. His journey to Washington was the time and Baltimore was the appointed place for the planned tragedy. Men at the north gave us to understand—that though elected, Mr. Lincoln could never be inaugurated. That the evil prophecies were not fulfilled, we all know, was owing to his travelling by an irregular train and arriving in Baltimore at an unexpected time. John Wilkes Booth only did at the last what was mediated, threatened, and expected at the very outset of the rebellion.

Booth, however, is not one whit guiltier than General Lee and President Davis. They were all servants and brothers in a common cause, a common conspiracy and a common crime. The beginning of the rebellion was assassination and the end of the rebellion is assassination. It is consistent throughout. It ends as it began.

It has been sometimes regretted that Booth was not captured alive. I waste no regrets upon this point. The ends of justice in his case have been satisfied. His punishment has been indeed swift and terrible. In his ten days wandering after committing his crime, he must have suffered more than a hundred deaths. I can conceive of no torture more extreme than his.

This world is old, and its experience vast, but was there ever such an hour, caused by the announcement of the death of any monarch, as was caused by the news of the death of Abraham Lincoln? Was ever any people so instantly and so universally overwhelmed with grief? Did ever a great and victorious nation so suddenly pass from exaltation and joy to the very dust and ashes of mourning. I know of none and this world knows of none.

The blow came when we were rejoicing in great and decisive victories. The rebel capital had fallen, General Lee had surrendered; the loyal press had put off the wrinkled front of war, and was appealing for clemency on behalf of the defeated rebels. The feeling of resentment and wrath was everywhere giving way to a spirit of forgiveness; the whole national horizon seemed fringed with the golden dawn of peace; when all at once we were startled, amazed,At the north or the south. Such a mistake is the danger. We have done too much of this. Public journals all over the north, have had sympathies with the rebels and traitors. Take the federal soldiers from the Confederate states today, and tomorrow the very elite of the south will drink to the memory of Booth the assassin.
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We remember vividly the circumstances. While seated with his wife, in a private box at Ford’s Theatre, set apart by its proprietor for the president and his family—while putting off the burdens of state for the moment, observing the play entitled Our American Cousin, which he had been specially invited to witness—all unconscious of danger to himself or to the state, Abraham Lincoln was shot down by an assassin who stood behind him, and died from the wound the ensuing morning. Along with it came that stunning announcement that Secretary of State William H. Seward had been assassinated in his chamber, and that both himself and his son must die from the terrible wounds inflicted by the assassins. Fortunately, that news was incorrect.

Then came the intimation that these assassinations were not individual outbursts of malignant passions. The assas-
sins had only accomplished a part of the bloody work. Murder was to have had a more extended circle. All the heads of the state and the head of the army were to have fallen. Men everywhere recognized in these horrors the head and heart of the rebellion. The life taken was not the life the murderers sought. It was not the president but the country—this nation—us—you and me—the United States of America—they would strike down through him.

What a day! What a day to the American people was that fourteenth of April. For a moment we were suspended over a howling abyss of anarchy and social chaos; a hush went out over the land. Men spoke to each other with bated breath, voices broken and scarcely audible. What a tumult of emotions throbbed in all loyal hearts that day. We were smitten with a feeling of shame for the fiendish possibilities of human nature. For a moment there stole through men’s hearts a strange distrust of each other. They looked at their fellow citizens with a searching glance, for no one could tell how far the dark spirit of assassination had travelled nor where the blow could next fall.

As I look back seven weeks to that day, the one feeling—the one that stirred deepest the hearts of men, and caused their eyes to alternate between tears at one moment, and sparks of fire at another, was a feeling of sorrow, a sense of personal bereavement. What was the cause of this deep sorrow? Who can explain whence came the hold this man had upon the American people? His high, official character, no doubt had something to do with it, but very evidently not all. Other presidents have died, though none have been assassinated before; yet none were ever so mourned as has been our president, Abraham Lincoln.

What, then, was the cause of our grief? Humbly, may I affirm that it was not because the country had lost a president; it was because the world had lost a man—a man whose like we may not see again. The fact is the people of America, in the very depths of their souls, loved this man. They knew Abraham Lincoln, and knew him as one brother—one sister—knows another, and they loved him as one brother—one sister—loves another. He was not only the president of this country, but a member of each loyal family in this country. The very picture of his plain, American face was loved as the picture of a dear relation.

Abraham Lincoln was not exotic. He was thoroughly American in all that distinguishes his character. There was not a fibre in his whole composition that did not identify him with his country. He was a self-made man and the American people saw in him, a full-length portrait of themselves. In him they saw their better qualities represented, incarnated and glorified and as such they loved him. Other men have, perhaps, been as much honored, but no American has been so much loved by the American people.

You see, friends, tonight we stand too near the newly made grave of Abraham Lincoln, either for a just analysis of his character, or for a dispassionate review of his official life. The wound caused by his death is yet too deep, too fresh, the sorrow too lasting and the mind too excited with the scenes of sorrow for just criticism or an unbiased eulogy.

The sad and solemn pageantry of his funeral has not yet faded from our vision: the long and imposing procession winding its way through distant states, towards the setting sun is still in sight. The booming of distant cannon proclaiming a nation’s grief, has hardly ceased to reverberate, the national flag waving its way through distant states, to the last smile of a loving mother just quitting the shores of time.

It was my privilege to know Abraham Lincoln and to know him well. I saw and conversed with him at different times during his administration and upon two occasions at least, by his special invitation. He was the first American president, who thus rose above the prejudice of his times and country. I mention this as a proof of his independence, because he knew that he could do nothing which would call down upon him more fiercely the ribaldry of the vulgar than by showing any respect to a colored man.

I found him as you all know him to have been a plain man. There was neither paint nor varnish about him. His manners were simple, unaffected, unstudied. His language was like himself, strong, sinewy and earnest. I never met a man who could so easily and swiftly state just what he wished to make apparent. There are probably few men who could. He was conscious of the vast responsibilities resting upon him, but bore himself as one able to bear them successfully. His dignity as the president never stood in the way of his amiability as a man. He was the same man from whichever side you viewed him. Far from feeling restrained in his presence, he acted upon me as all truly great men act upon their fellow men—as a liberator. From the first five minutes I seemed to myself to have been acquainted with him during all my life. He was one of the most solid men I ever met, and one of the most transparent.

Born in Kentucky, living in Illinois, he was accustomed to seeing the colored man in most unfavorable conditions, but, once in office, Mr. Lincoln came to look upon the black man as an American citizen.

During my first interview with him, his secretary twice announced that Governor Buckingham of Connecticut, one of the most patriotic of the loyal governors of the time, was in an adjoining room. Mr. Lincoln said, “Tell the governor to wait for I want to have a long talk with my friend, Fred Douglass.” I interposed and begged that the president would receive the governor at once, as I could wait; but no, President Lincoln persisted and I remained a full hour after this with him, while Governor Buckingham waited patiently in an adjoining room. This was probably the first time in the history of this democratic republic when the chief magistrate of the country kept the popular governor of an important state waiting in another room for an interview, while he, the president, held a protracted conversation with an ex-slave and a member of a despised, persecuted and widely hated race. From the manner of Governor
Buckingham when he was admitted, he was about as well pleased with what Mr. Lincoln had done as I was. In the time spent with him, I felt myself in the atmosphere of a great soul—one altogether too great to remind me of my humble condition or my inferiority as to race or color. I learned quickly that the man Mr. Lincoln was greater than the president Lincoln.

While I am perhaps bragging of the relations subsisting between this man and myself, I may add that I found one night—at the door of the house where I was stopping—the carriage of one of the directors of the Department of Indian Affairs—Secretary Dole—with an invitation from President Lincoln to take tea with him at the Soldiers’ Home, where he spent his nights. I have seldom allowed anything to induce me to break an engagement which it was possible for me to keep, but I have often in these past weeks—and probably will for years to come—regretted that I allowed a previous engagement to come between me and this invitation to the Soldiers’ Home. No such opportunity had ever come to me before in this country and as I look back to it, I might well have been excused by a pretty large crowd to have such a meeting with our friend, Abraham Lincoln.

We can truthfully say that this was a great man. His memory will never cease to be sacredly cherished by a grateful and loyal nation, and we like the colored woman attending his funeral seen crying at the gate of the presidential mansion, when reminded that the Lord will send another, we can say: ‘That may be,’ ‘but, ah! We had him.’

I hope I did not take his attentions to me altogether as due to my personal qualities while the fact of my being like himself after a fashion—a self-made man—gave me some special hold upon his friendship. I know the main thing was that I represented in some measure the colored people of the republic and could help in his great work of suppressing rebellion and restoring the American Union.

Conscious always of the tremendous responsibility which the crisis devolved upon him, and conscious always of his own insufficiency, at the last he was still resolved to do what he could to save the country and to receive counsel from even the humblest quarter to that end. Abraham Lincoln felt himself to be the president of the United States of America, but the great dignity of the presidency never stood in the way of his availability as a man. From which ever side the observer beheld him, Abraham Lincoln was always the same man—animated by the same great purpose: Union and Liberty for all.
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From Mr. Lincoln to Abraham Lincoln, from the Personal to the Historical: Google’s Ngram Viewer as a Research Tool

Digital platforms provide refreshing ways to look at the familiar. Whether it is mapping or searching digitized newspapers, the digital revolution is certainly forcing us to reconsider how we do research while opening up new opportunities for the scholarship of discovery. One such digital vehicle is the Google Books Ngram Viewer. While the Ngram Viewer may or may not shed new insights on Abraham Lincoln (or any research topic, for that matter), it certainly encourages us to view and understand the man—or how people thought and remembered him—from a new perch.

The Google Books Ngram Viewer allows for a word or phrase search of all the books and other printed material from 1500 to 2008 that have been scanned by Google. To begin, go to books.google.com/ngrams. There you will find a sample chart that illustrates a search result using the key terms Albert Einstein, Sherlock Holmes, and Frankenstein. To proceed, go to the search box, delete the three names listed, and commence your own search by entering a word, or words, a phrase, or phrases, separating each by a comma. While there is a checkbox that provides the option for conducting a case-insensitive search, a researcher must enter the phrase or word exactly how one wishes for it to be searched. For instance, should a search include Mr. Lincoln with the period to mark the abbreviation of Mister, or should it leave the period off as is customary with British English and search Mr Lincoln? What is exciting about the Ngram viewer is that the engine can search both simultaneously.

Furthermore, the Google Books Ngram Viewer allows one to search multiple languages. One can search scanned books written in English (English in general, American English, British English, or English Fiction), Chinese, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. All the languages listed above, with the exception of Chinese, Hebrew, and Russian, yielded results for Abraham Lincoln. This is not entirely surprising since the latter languages use different characters.

When the terms Abraham Lincoln, Abe Lincoln, President Abraham Lincoln, President Lincoln, Mr. Lincoln, and Mr Lincoln are entered for the purpose of graphing in Google Books Ngram Viewer, some things become immediately apparent. Those of us in the Midwest may be surprised to learn that Abe Lincoln is not used very often. While in terms of the vernacular this may be surprising, when it comes to books and periodicals it is not. Abe Lincoln is much too informal for written work. Likewise Mr Lincoln (without the period after the abbreviation) and President Abraham Lincoln are used so little in English language texts in general as to be statistically insignificant. In English language books scanned by Google, the terms Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Lincoln, and President Lincoln are mentioned most frequently.

As one would expect, 1858, the election year in which Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas engaged in a series of well-publicized debates, is when Lincoln made his mark with the American public. This is reflected in the books and periodicals published at the time. While Abraham Lincoln and, strangely, President Lincoln begin to be mentioned enough for a showing on the graph, it is Mr. Lincoln that is by far the preferred term when discussing Abraham Lincoln in the contemporary literature. Anyone familiar with nineteenth-century American life would not be surprised by the formal salutation of “Mister” when discussing a prominent member of a community or a country or even, for that matter, one’s husband.

The three most-used terms reach their apex in 1865 when the Civil War—and Lincoln’s life—ended. What may surprise us today is that mention of Lincoln in the decade that followed his death takes a nosedive, reaching its nineteenth-century nadir during the late 1870s, around the controversial 1876 election. This suggests that the business of reconstruction and redemption, among other issues not pertaining specifically to Abraham Lincoln, occupied the minds of those publishing and reading books and periodicals in English.

Around 1890, Mr. Lincoln remained the preferred mode of referring to the deceased sixteenth president of the United States, but a change begins to happen with the other
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two most used terms. At this time, the words Abraham Lincoln bypass those of President Lincoln. This, I believe, marks the first phase in Lincoln’s apotheosis into the pantheon of historic American heroes. While the memories of veterans and other adults who lived during the Civil War may have begun to fade, there were still enough contemporaries of Lincoln among the living that in the literature written in English, Mr. Lincoln remains the preferred way of referring to Abraham Lincoln.

Following the eclipse of the term President Lincoln, Abraham Lincoln continued to grow in usage, but not quite reaching the more formal Mr. Lincoln. The ups and downs of usage of the two terms mirror each other until 1915, during the first full year of the Great War. It is at this time that Lincoln, the graph suggests, truly becomes a historic figure, and not the president of one’s personal memory. After this moment in time, the term Mr. Lincoln goes into steady decline, with a brief resurgence during World War II, but never coming close to recovering its former status, especially in comparison to its nomenclature competitor, Abraham Lincoln.

The results become both more interesting and complicated when we divide our search between American English and British English. As for the latter, even though the British liked to think of Lincoln as one of their own in the wake of the Great War, the Ngram Viewer results suggest that he becomes a historical figure much sooner in Great Britain (1891) than in the United States (1912). One might expect this trend since there would have been fewer emotional ties to the person and the president in Great Britain than in America.

The ability to expand the scope of the search beyond the United States, or even Great Britain, allows us to further our understanding of President Lincoln’s international standing, especially in the years and decades following his death. When viewing the search results of different languages, it becomes clear that Lincoln’s popularity transcended time and space during times of global crisis, most notably during the two world wars. For contemporaries of both of these defining twentieth-century events, Lincoln was the one leader who lived through a crucible of carnage and destruction, ultimately forfeiting his own life and becoming one of its final victims.

More than any other American leader, transatlantic friends of the United States identified with Abraham Lincoln. British Prime Minister David Lloyd George expressed eloquently this resonance at the 1920 dedication in Parliament Square of a replica of Augustus Saint-Gaudens’s Lincoln: The Man (or more readily known as Chicago’s “Standing Lincoln”). On that rainy summer day, the prime minister told the crowd that Abraham Lincoln was “also our possession and our pride.” “In his life he was a great American,” the prime minister added, but he “is no longer so. He is one of those giant figures, of whom there are very few in history, who lose their nationality in death.”

Likewise, when the mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt, visited Springfield in 1959, he told attendees at the sesquicentennial celebration that Lincoln “spoke of the eternal struggle between democracy and tyranny.” The struggle of which Lincoln spoke, Mayor Brandt told the audience, “has torn apart the European continent and . . . has assumed world-wide dimensions.”

As the graphs in this article suggest, the Ngram Viewer is another tool in the historian’s toolbox for considering similar or dissimilar trends over time. It helps conduct an additional layer of analysis that complements the qualitative evidence of Lincoln’s international influence as expressed in the words of Brandt and Lloyd George. The Ngram Viewer hints at the scope of influence Abraham Lincoln had on a world increasingly racked by military violence.

Figure 2. During World War I, Abraham Lincoln became more thoroughly a historical figure, judging by the use of Abraham Lincoln instead of Mr. Lincoln.

Figure 3. This graph depicts the frequencies of terms associated with Abraham Lincoln in British English. The term Abraham Lincoln is used much earlier than in American English and English in general, suggesting an earlier transformation from the personal to the historical.
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Your membership is essential to the ALA’s success. It allows the ALA to provide you with the For The People newsletter and the Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association and to sponsor many worthwhile programs related to the life of Abraham Lincoln. Please join.

William G. Shepherd, Membership Chairman

*If you have not renewed your membership for 2015, please do so now.*

Give a gift membership to someone you think might enjoy the ALA.

It is easy to do so by using the ALA website at: abrahamlincolnassociation.org

Or call the ALA personal shopper Mary Shepherd toll free at (866) 865- 8500.

Brooks Simpson: Thank You for Your Service

Brooks Simpson has been a member of the Board of Directors of the ALA since 1998. He has served the ALA in many capacities from his perch at beautiful Arizona State University. During my term as President, he was most generous with wise advice and counsel. I know that his generosity continued under Presidents Lenz and Stuart. For the last six years, Brooks has chaired the ALA Benjamin P. Thomas Symposium Committee, and the programs he created for us stand as an ALA high point.

My favorite memories of Brooks occurred during the 2009 Bicentennial. Brooks’s daughter Becca was present, and Brooks was a most loving father in making sure that she was up front and participating in all of the events of that special period — especially the appearance of President Obama. Brooks’s wife Cheryl was always a wonderful addition to any ALA event. What a marvelous family.

Brooks is now retiring from his Chairmanship and as a Director of the ALA. Brooks, thanks for your service and Godspeed to you and your family in all future endeavors. We will miss you.

Richard E. Hart
Commemoration of 150th Anniversary of Ratification of the 13th Amendment by State of Illinois

On February 3, 2015, the Illinois State Senate commemorated the 150th anniversary of the ratification by the Illinois General Assembly of the 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution. The program of this commemoration began with the Color Guard of the 114th Illinois Volunteer Infantry Reactivated led by ALA Board member Jim Patton. Also contributing to the program were a number of other ALA Board members, including James Cornelius, Matthew Holden, and Bob Davis. The Lincoln Land Community College Choir sang the National Anthem to begin the proceedings and concluded them with the “Battle Hymn of the Republic.” The State Senate also adopted a resolution commending its predecessor state senators who in 1865 were the first legislative body in the United States to ratify the constitutional amendment that abolished slavery. William Shepherd

Why Illinois Could be Called the Emancipation State

By Michael Burlingame
Chancellor Naomi B. Lynn Distinguished Chair in Lincoln Studies
University of Illinois Springfield

Illinois played a supremely important role in the destruction of American slavery, which was abolished nationwide by the Thirteenth Amendment in 1865. Not only had President Abraham Lincoln paved the way with his Emancipation Proclamation and other steps, but Lyman Trumbull of Alton and Chicago, chairman of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, was co-author of the document. On February 10, 1864, Trumbull reported out the following amendment to the Constitution:

SECTION 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SECTION 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The wording was borrowed from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which had prohibited slavery from expanding into what became Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota. To become part of the Constitution, Trumbull’s amendment had to win approval by two-thirds of each house of Congress and by the legislatures of three-fourths of the states.

After much debate, the Senate passed Trumbull’s amendment in April 1864. In June, however, the U.S. House failed to do so, voting in favor of the amendment by a majority of less than the required two-thirds. On January 31, 1865, the House reconsidered its earlier action and approved the amendment. (That story has become familiar thanks to Steven Spielberg’s recent film *Lincoln.*)

A member of the House later recalled that fateful day: “The time for the momentous vote had now come, and no language could describe the solemnity and impressiveness of the spectacle pending the roll-call. The success of the measure had been considered very doubtful, and depended upon certain negotiations, the result of which was not fully assured. . . . The anxiety and suspense during the balloting produced a deathly stillness, but when it became certainly known that the measure had prevailed, the cheering in the densely packed hall and galleries surpassed all precedent and beggared all description. Members joined in the general shouting, which was kept up for several minutes, many embracing each other, and others completely surrendering themselves to their tears of joy.”

Immediatley after the House voted, Senator Trumbull telegraphed Illinois Governor Richard J. Oglesby, imploring him: “Let Illinois be the first to ratify.” Next morning, Oglesby complied, urging the General Assembly to “Let Illinois be the first State in the Union to ratify by the act of her Legislature this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is just, it is humane, it is constitutional, it is right to do so.” In response, the state senators suspended the rules, listened to a reading of the resolution endorsing the amendment, briefly debated it, narrowly defeated a motion to table it, and passed it by a vote of 18-6, with five Democrats joining all the Republicans in favor. The House then concurred by a straight party vote: 48 to 28.

William Bross, the lieutenant governor then presiding over the state senate, later recalled the “deep solemnity which accompanied the passage of the resolution. The whole history of the struggles of mankind for freedom through all the ages seemed pictured on the minds of the members. Especially did visions of the dear ones sleeping their last sleep [in order] that the Union might live, that by this sublime act this dark, foul blot might be wiped from her proud escutcheon, appeared to drive out every other thought. Men spoke in whispers, as if standing among the tombs of the past, and before them was the angel of light and liberty pointing to the glorious future of the Republic.”

Many of the legislators’ constituents rejoiced. A Chicago Tribune reporter in Springfield noted that when the senate vote was announced, “The result was hailed by terrific applause from the floor, the lobby, and the galleries.” The Tribune spoke for many of its readers when it expressed pleasure in the result: “The last shackle is gone from the limbs of Freedom. There is henceforth no shelter for the oppressor in all the land. The man-seller and the woman-whipper, the negro-driver and the man-hunter, may read their doom gone forth in the record of yesterday, which will shine on the page of all time with the greatest events that have blessed our race. In the halls where pro-slavery, rancor, and hate through long years held Liberty bound and gagged to be buffeted by her enemies, Freedom has been decreed, and a glad nation comes rejoicing to its remotest bounds. Liberty is the law of the land. No barbarism out of the past will threaten a nation whose law-givers have dared to hold fast to the primal law of human progress — human rights. This gigantic stride in our progress towards national purity, universal liberty, and righteous peace will be hailed with deep exultation and religious gratitude by our liberty-loving American people. We congratulate the friends of Freedom in the present Congress that they have redeemed the name of that body. They have removed, so far as they had the power, the last moral stain from our National escutcheon — the only disgrace from our flag.”

(Continued on page 10)
PRESIDENT ROBERT A. STUART’S GREETING

Fellow members of the Abraham Lincoln Association,

The Abraham Lincoln Association does not have the largest membership for a not-for-profit association, nor does it have a huge endowment. But it has a wealth of talent within its ranks and a multitude of members with passion for our mission of preserving Mr. Lincoln’s legacy. This was evident over the last several months, culminating in the activities surrounding our February 12th birthday celebration.

From celebrating in the reconstruction of the Gate into Oak Ridge Cemetery, which will play a significant role in the reenactment of Lincoln’s funeral in April and May of this year, to the selection and presentation of the Lincoln the Lawyer award to Richard Thies, to the tireless efforts in putting the symposium and banquet together, at every stage our members were there and working both up front as well as providing the labor behind the scenes.

If you were present, you know exactly what I am talking about. If you had to miss these events, I hope you will mark your calendar to attend next year.

It is a true privilege for me to serve with such dedicated individuals and to count you as a loyal supporter. Enjoy this newsletter produced from the passion and efforts of yet another tremendous member and which reflects on these activities.

We look forward to seeing you at our upcoming events and having you become further involved in the Abraham Lincoln Association.

Robert A. Stuart, Jr., President

(Continued from page 9)

The editor of Springfield’s Republican newspaper, the Illinois State Journal, immediately wired the president: “Joint resolution ratifying amendment to the Constitution has just passed both branches of our Legislature with a great hurrah.” That evening, Lincoln told a crowd of well-wishers who had gathered outside the White House to celebrate the amendment’s adoption by Congress: “The occasion was one of congratulations to the country and to the whole world. But there is a task yet before us, to go forward and consummate by the votes of the States that which Congress so nobly began yesterday. I have the honor to inform those present that Illinois has already to-day done the work. Maryland was about half through; but I feel proud that Illinois is a little ahead.”

As soon as the General Assembly had finished voting, a journalist in Springfield accurately predicted that “Probably Illinois will prove to be the first state to ratify this second Magna Charta of human liberty.” In fact, Illinois just barely did win the race to be the first state to ratify the amendment. The following day, February 2, the legislatures of Rhode Island and Michigan followed the Prairie State’s example.

The Illinois State Journal speculated that by leading the way, the action of the twenty-fourth General Assembly of Illinois “will render the Legislature of 1865 immortal.”

Delaware is so proud that it was the first state to ratify the U.S. Constitution that it calls itself “The First State,” a title displayed on its license plates. Illinois might justly call itself “The Emancipation State,” but as a Lincoln scholar, I would not recommend changing the current language found on our state’s license plates.

CALL FOR ARTICLES

Do you have an article that would be suitable for publication in the newsletter? Don’t be shy, as this newsletter is a forum for the exchange of new material and viewpoints. Also, if you have a student who has written a particularly fine paper, consider submitting that paper. All are invited to make a submission to:

Richard E. Hart
Editor, For The People  217-553-0055  rhart1213@aol.com
Remarks to the Illinois State Senate, February 3, 2015: Illinois’s Black Laws and Their Repeal

Matthew Holden, Jr.
Wepner Distinguished Professor in Political Science, University of Illinois Springfield

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My assignment is to offer some remarks as a basis for discussion on the Black Laws and their repeal in 1865. It is, of course, a great professional honor to be asked to participate in a session to make some remarks related to the Lincoln Presidency, as we come to the end of the 150th year after Lincoln’s death. The Thirteenth Amendment was the step to make chattel slavery thereafter out of the question.

On February 1, 1865, the day that Congress sent forth the Thirteenth Amendment, the Illinois legislature ratified it. Eleven months and seventeen days later, December 18, 1865, Lincoln was dead, but the Thirteenth Amendment was in motion. The Secretary of State declared by proclamation that the amendment had been ratified by three-fourths of the States and had become part of the Constitution. Illinois, and your very body, led the nation. We are here today to pay recognition to that.

President Lincoln faced three strategic problems. There are many “detail” problems of government, but there are a few strategic problems.

Problem Number One was maintenance of the Union. That was mystical. It was practical as well. Without maintaining an effective Union government, nothing else would have been achieved.

Problem Number Two. We, in the 21st century, should re-learn that the interests (the Slave Power) put forth a strong demand that chattel slavery should be recognized as constitutional anywhere the American flag flew. As the Senate knows already, the Emancipation Proclamation was a war measure and applied where the military was.

The Lincoln accomplishment in this second problem was leadership in emancipation, though Frederick Douglass and others prodded him to move earlier and faster.

The Thirteenth Amendment highlights Problem Number Three. If the Thirteenth Amendment was to mean anything in practice, it would have to be respected in the laws and administration of every state, North as well as South, Illinois as well as my native Mississippi.

Illinois had not allowed legal slavery per se, but its legal restrictions upon Blacks were very severe. The Illinois Black Laws amounted to a system of near-slavery without anybody claiming ownership.

Understanding the Black Laws

Illinois was not the only place without legal slavery but with these special laws upon persons of African ancestry. Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin were the other four states of the former Northwest Territory. Marion B. Lewis, reviewing a study of all these states, says, “The record is stark: virtual slavery at its worst and domination at its best.”

Mr. President, few of us, myself included, have studied the Black Laws and their connection to the Thirteenth Amendment in depth. There would be great value in a detailed documentary history of the Black Laws, their introduction, group support, sponsorship, actual administration and change, but some essentials should be described here, particularly as summarized from Ms. Sally Heinzel’s recent work at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

Perhaps the most severe restrictions were those put on purely personal behavior. You were the least free if you were indentured. Indentured servants could be whipped if they were “lazy” or “disorderly,” traveled more than ten miles from their master’s home without a pass, or assembled in groups of three or more for the purpose of “dancing or reveling.”

How was your movement and behavior to be policed? Under the Black Laws, people could be required to register their families with a circuit court clerk.

If a Black person, such as Jameson Jenkins or William Fleurville — Lincoln’s barber, friend, and law client — who are well known to Springfield historians, moved to Illinois, he or she had to produce a certificate of freedom and give a bond.

The statutes also provided fines for those who harbored, aided, or employed any Black person who lacked a certificate of freedom.

In 1819, the first general assembly passed legislation that disqualified Blacks from testifying in court cases involving whites.

There were other restrictions.

People of African origin:
Could not sit on juries
Could not vote
Could not hold office
Did not have the right to marry whites
Could not send their children to public schools.

Reconsideration of the Black Laws

Ms. Heinzel writes, “At stake was who could belong in Illinois—physically and ideologically.” This is a way of stating what I have come to see as Lincoln’s Third Problem, whether the freed African population could be “forever free,” as much as anyone else was.

Mr. President, the first consideration was to make the restrictions more severe. In 1853, just five years before Lincoln and Douglas debated for the U.S. Senate, the legislature adopted an anti-immigration act that made it illegal for African Americans to move to Illinois. Those found violating this act were subject to being fined, and if unable to pay, the law ordered the offenders to be sold “at public auction.”

If a person — man, woman, or child — were sold at public auction, who would the buyer be? Such a buyer would be an owner, and the prohibition on slavery would amount to very little.

Moreover, it was a Democratic state. From the beginning, all the governors had been Democrats, at a time when the Slave Power was dominant in interest groups and parties. Dissident anti-slavery Democrats and former Whigs, including Abraham Lincoln, converged and took on the “Republican” name.

The new Republicans had some political trouble in dealing with the Black Laws. In 1857 — the year of the Dred Scott decision, and a year before the Lincoln-Douglas campaign — a House committee considered abolishing some of the state’s Black Laws. House members voted 50-17 to maintain the laws as they were. In this body were 31 Republicans. A substantial group of them voted to uphold the Black Laws. The Republicans were not that strong and secure a party at the time. They were obviously afraid of white public opinion.

(Continued on page 12)
In 1858, Lincoln ran against Douglas for the U.S. Senate, but lost. In the same year, Illinois Senator Lyman Trumbull — who today gets high praise from Lerone Bennett — showed what I interpret as a public opinion fear. Trumbull said he wanted “to have nothing to do, either with the free negro or the slave negro.” He said the Republican party “was the white man’s party and (he) believed it better that [the Black people] should not be among them.”

Lincoln became nationally famous as a result of the 1858 campaign and was elected President in 1860. The Republicans won the state in 1860. They had never had control of the state government before. Lincoln went ahead in 1862 to announce an emancipation decision and to proclaim it officially for the first time on January 1863. However, as a result of war losses and anti-emancipation feeling, they had a big mid-term electoral loss in 1862.

The President’s party, in the President’s state, was put under considerable pressure to get in line with what the President would need. He wrote a public letter almost eight months after the Emancipation Proclamation and sent it to his Springfield friend James Conkling. The Conkling letter drew the line. Lincoln made it clear that he would continue to use Black troops; he would not break faith by renouncing the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Republicans got out of their political fears and supported Lincoln. Belief in his policy was one thing. Practical politics also had to have been in the picture. Illinois Republicans had more than their share of the Federal patronage. In February 1865, they would have expected to deal with him for four years more. The President left the Illinois Republican leaders no option.

The Democratic senators split on accepting the Thirteenth Amendment, but they did not split on the Black Laws. The Illinois State Register warned its audience that the Republicans no option.

Governor Yates in his outgoing message to the state legislature, and Governor Richard Oglesby, in his inaugural address, also backed immediate emancipation. Within two days of convening, both houses of the general assembly introduced bills to repeal the Black Laws.

Five days after the legislature ratified the Thirteenth Amendment, the Senate voted for repeal by a vote of 13-10 and the House voted by 49-30. In both houses the Black Laws repeal vote strictly followed party lines.

On the Black Laws, in contrast to the Thirteenth Amendment, Illinois was still catching up to Lincoln. The repeal, important as it was, basically was limited to the personal restrictions on indentured persons and on personal rights.

While the Illinois Republicans could not know it in February, outgoing Governor Yates, who kept in touch with Lincoln, might well have known that Lincoln needs were shifting.

The new General Assembly convened in January, and in April Lee surrendered at Appomattox. President Lincoln, knowing that the “rest of the world” expected something from him, referred to allowing the vote in Louisiana to the “very intelligent” and “those who have fought with us.” This was beyond what Lincoln had previously allowed his imagination to display in public.

Even after the repeal, Illinois statutes had not gone far enough to provide for African Americans to sit on juries, to vote, or to hold office. Members of this Senate will be aware, for instance, that the first African American official in the state was John Jones, a tailor from North Carolina, elected as Cook County Commissioner in 1872. The rights to vote and to hold office were acquired by the provisions of the Illinois Constitution of 1870 and the further influence of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

Some forward change was occurring. John W.E. Thomas, another native North Carolinian, was eighteen years old in 1865. Eleven years later, he was elected to the House of Representatives, and then again in 1882 and 1884. Thomas’s legislative influence contributed to the state civil rights legislation that was Illinois’s response to the adverse U.S. Supreme Court’s negation of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1875. Members of this Senate will have their own views of the state laws adopted in response to the civil rights cases of 1883.

The Black Law provision still remained that prevented African Americans’ sending their children to public schools. Then in 1874, the state adopted a statute that allowed “colored children” to attend schools with white children. Alton still operated in an abrogated mode in 1896, and limited Black students to two Black schools. The authorities evaded the state Supreme Court’s decisions — five times — even in the face of a severe criticism from that court (211 Illinois 548). The Alton authorities successfully fought to maintain segregation at least as hard as the Southern states later fought Brown v. Board of Education. Alton never brought its schools into compliance until about 1952.

Concluding Observations

Mr. President, I repeat a question posed earlier. “If the people of African origin were ‘forever free,’ as the Emancipation Proclamation said, would they have the full freedom of all? This question is also tied to what the Thirteenth Amendment, and the repeal of the Black Laws, has meant in practice even into the 21st century, for today’s issues and tomorrow’s issues.

What is equally worth thinking about, Mr. President, is the potential reach and influence of the Thirteenth Amendment in dealing with current and emerging problems and the potentiality of a broader public consensus in that direction. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for your generous invitation and your courteous consideration.

Resources

Laws of Illinois, 1819.


Lincoln Birthday Events 2015
The Benjamin P. Thomas Symposium

Fred Morsell, who movingly performed Frederick Douglass’s little-known *Eulogy to Lincoln* at the ALA Banquet, and ALA Board Member Robert Davis

ALA Past President Robert Lenz and his daughter, Keri Lenz Nekrasz

Loretta Durbin and ALA Board Members Admiral N. Ron Thunman and Robert Willard

Fred Morsell, who movingly performed Frederick Douglass’s little-known *Eulogy to Lincoln* at the ALA Banquet, and ALA Board Member Robert Davis

ALA Past President Robert Lenz and his daughter, Keri Lenz Nekrasz

Loretta Durbin and ALA Board Members Admiral N. Ron Thunman and Robert Willard

The Evening Reception

Center: James Conroy, presenting; Brooks Simpson, Chairman of the Symposium Committee; and Chris DeRose

Thank You, David Blanchette

As he has done for a number of past banquets, David Blanchette took all of the 2015 banquet photographs. His photographs are always wonderful and we thank him for his contribution.
Lincoln Birthday Events 2015

The Evening Reception and Banquet

114th Illinois Volunteer Infantry Regiment, Reactivated

ALA Vice President Kathryn Harris addressing banquet

Sarah Struck, 2014 Lincoln Essay Prize-winner, leads the Pledge of Allegiance.

Fred Morsell performed Frederick Douglass’s Eulogy to Lincoln at the ALA Banquet.


ALA President Robert Stuart presents the Lincoln the Lawyer Award to Richard L. Thies.

Sarah Struck, 2014 Lincoln Essay Prize-winner, leads the Pledge of Allegiance.

Thanks to The Illinois National Bank for Sponsoring the Banquet

Dr. Wayne C. and Sunderland Temple
Dr. Temple is an ALA Distinguished Director.

Julie Cellini, Sarah and Pat Phalen, and Bill Cellini

ALA Board Member Guy Fraker and Symposium presenter Chris DeRose

ALA Board Member Ron Keller, Michael and Anne Moseley, and Dennis Suttles

ALA Board Member Thomas S. Johnson announces the Lincoln the Lawyer Award recipient.

Richard L. Thies accepts the Lincoln the Lawyer Award.

ALA Board Members Dave Joens and Justin Blandford on either side of the banquet keynote speaker Fred Morsell.
Remarks of Richard L. Thies upon Accepting the Lincoln the Lawyer Award at the Abraham Lincoln Association Banquet
February 12, 2015

My good friend Tom Johnson, President Stuart, Members of the Abraham Lincoln Association, and Guests:

I would first like to introduce to you members of my family who are here and have given me so much that has made this possible.

I cannot adequately express the feeling that I have at this moment. To be recognized from among the members of my profession as a lawyer who, in a small way, embodies the qualities displayed by Abraham Lincoln the Lawyer is beyond my comprehension.

I am in my 60th year in the practice of law. I was admitted to the Bar on November 29, 1955, and I took the oath at the Centennial building across from the Supreme Court building here in Springfield. As I reflect on that day, I recall that one of my thoughts was that I had become a member of the same profession as Abraham Lincoln and that I could practice in the same courts as he did. I couldn’t believe it.

A few days after being sworn in I was asked to go from Urbana to Petersburg, the county seat of Menard County, to present a matter in a partition case that our office was handling. At that time, I was reading Carl Sandburg’s multi-volume work on Lincoln so I knew of the Ann Rutledge - Lincoln connection in Petersburg. I also knew that New Salem was nearby. After appearing in court I decided to go to the local cemetery and see if I could find the grave of Ann Rutledge. It was cold, the wind was blowing and it was starting to snow, but I found the monument, and as I stood there I thought about the great man who wanted so much to be a lawyer. I then went a few miles to New Salem where I pondered how anyone who had gone through what Lincoln experienced in his early life could have done what he ultimately did.

The practice of law is much more complex today than when Abraham Lincoln practiced. Indeed it is even more so since I began practice in 1955. The fundamental principles of the legal profession are, however, still the same. Loyalty to clients that transcends self-interest; advocacy for and protection of the rights of people and for justice, human dignity, and the rule of law; and conformance to high ethical standards in dealing with clients, lawyers, judges, and the public. Abraham Lincoln devoted 23 years of his life to the practice of law and to these principles. I have also been privileged to have been a member of the legal profession, and I am honored and humbled by your recognition that in a small way I, too, have tried to exemplify those principles during my professional life.

Again, thanks to the Association for this extraordinary honor.
The Endowment Fund of the Abraham Lincoln Association was established in 2004. Today, eleven years later, it is judiciously managed and prescribed income is used to allow the ALA to diversify and enlarge its schedule of publications, programs, and sponsorships. This is evident in the wide spectrum of events reported in this newsletter.

The Endowment Fund now underwrites the Benjamin P. Thomas Symposium lectures given on each February 12th. It has also allowed the ALA to participate and lead in the commemoration of the Emancipation Proclamation in 2013 and the 13th Amendment and the Lincoln Funeral in 2015, including publication of a commemorative book, *The Funeral of Abraham Lincoln: May 3rd and 4th, 1865*.

If you believe in what the ALA is doing and wish it to continue and expand, please express yourself by making a contribution to the Endowment Fund. A growing endowment will allow these new efforts and assist the ALA in fulfilling its mission in the 21st century.

Those contributing $500 or more will receive *A Day Long to Be Remembered: Lincoln in Gettysburg* by Michael Burlingame with photography by Robert Shaw. Published by Firelight Publishing, Heyworth, Illinois, in association with John Warner IV.

**Won’t you plan now to make a gift to the Endowment Fund in 2015?**

Send your check made payable to the Abraham Lincoln Association Endowment Fund to:
The Abraham Lincoln Association, 1 Old State Capitol Plaza, Springfield, Illinois 62701