



# Lincoln Lore

Bulletin of The Lincoln National Life Foundation...Mark E. Neely, Jr., Editor. Published each month by The Lincoln National Life Insurance Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46801.

July, 1973

Number 1625

## NEW PERSPECTIVES ON GRANT

In 1948, when Arthur M. Schlesinger asked fellow historians to rank the Presidents of the United States on their administrations, Ulysses S. Grant got the lowest rating of all. In 1962, in a similar poll, he was next to Warren Harding in having the lowest ratings again. By contrast, Abraham Lincoln's administrations got very high ratings.

In April of this year, at a conference co-sponsored by Northern Illinois University, Southern Illinois University, and the Illinois State Historical Society, the historians present were of a much different opinion about the accomplishments of Ulysses S. Grant. Grant was the hero of most of the papers presented at the conference; the villain, oddly enough, was the historian. Grant's reputation for failure is strictly the verdict of historians, it was asserted; it was not the verdict of Grant himself or of the faithful Republican-voting masses whose admiration for Grant was so strong and so well known as to lead some politicians to desire running Grant for an unprecedented third presidential term. Even in pre-Civil War periods of economic hardship, Grant himself never became dejected and never seems to have thought of himself as a failure.

Professor Thomas L. Connelly further enhanced Grant's military reputation by defending his tactics; Grant's strategy has long been a subject of admiration among military historians. Connelly furthered this judgment by arguing that Grant was not a "butcher" when compared with Robert E. Lee, who lost enormous numbers of men in the Seven Days' campaign, whose ambulance train after Gettysburg was twenty-five miles long, and who never faced the North's "first-string" Generals until the end of the War. The bulk of the conference, however, was given over to rescuing Grant's reputation as a statesman and politician.

Professor Arthur Zilversmit made the most compelling argument in a paper on "Grant and the Freedmen." There was little in Grant's early background to indicate that he would establish a record of dealings with blacks noted for its humaneness. Grant married into a slaveholding family, his wife owned at least one slave (who was freed at a time of economic adversity), and Grant supported James Buchanan in 1856 and Stephen Douglas in 1860 rather than John C. Fremont and Abraham Lincoln. At one point during the Civil War, Grant even predicted that the war would lead to servile insurrections and that Union troops would be asked to put them down. His prediction included no indication that this would be a task he would especially dislike having to do.

During the War, Grant's record was characterized principally by his willingness to obey orders, whether the orders aided the cause of the Negro or not. In Missouri, Grant ordered his subordinates to carry out Fremont's orders aimed at emancipating the slaves of the disloyal. Months later he also ordered them to obey General Halleck's General Order No. Three, which required that no fugitive slave should come into the lines of his troops.

Gradually, however, Grant began to reveal a basically humane outlook on the question of what to do with the freedmen. On his own initiative he issued government supplies to freedmen although he was authorized to do so only if the freedmen were actually employed as laborers by the Union Army. Grant's attempts to send freedmen to Illinois, which was suffering a wartime labor shortage,

were resisted by Illinois and the War Department, both nervous about the popularity of a program that would mean an influx of blacks into the North. Grant fully supported the Lincoln administration's policy of employing blacks as soldiers. As Zilversmit put it, Grant would have obeyed it as an order anyhow, but he also liked the policy, praising Negro troops for their valor on the field and worrying about their treatment as prisoners of war.

Grant the President was as humane, according to Zilversmit, as Grant the General. Here again, however, Grant's beginning was modest enough. There was no strong indication in the election of 1868 that he supported any particular policy (humane or otherwise) towards the freedmen. Like the General, the Presidential candidate claimed that he would simply obey orders, this time, the orders of the people. His duty was to execute the policies determined by the people through Congress.

During Reconstruction, however, simply executing the law placed Grant among those who were most concerned about the fate of the freedmen. While Congress showed an ever-increasing reluctance to vote the funds necessary to give administrative punch to the laws enacted to protect the recently freed blacks, Grant continued rather steadily to attempt to enforce the laws that were on the books, sending more Federal troops into South Carolina in 1876 than had been in the State since 1865.

Moreover, Grant went beyond the mere letter of the law and beyond the realm of mere obedience to orders. Zilversmit noted that Grant's Inaugural Ball for the first time in American history included blacks as guests. He got strong support from Negro leaders like Frederick Douglass, who considered Grant their friend.

Grant eventually gave up. In the face of an increasingly hostile Supreme Court and a reluctant Congress, Zilversmit said, Grant eased his enforcement efforts, decided the Fifteenth Amendment was a mistake, and supported Rutherford B. Hayes's removal of support for the Federal regimes in Louisiana and South Carolina in 1877.

Professor Michael Les Benedict's "Grant and the Decline of Republican Radicalism" presented rather a different picture of Grant, though Zilversmit had admitted that Grant's attitude towards the race question varied and stated explicitly that it was unclear what he stood for in 1868. Benedict made clearer what Grant stood for as a presidential candidate: he was backed by conservatives to head off the chances of men more radically inclined on Reconstruction issues, especially Benjamin F. Wade and Salmon P. Chase, who aspired to the Republican nomination also. In New York, Grant's support came from the conservative William Seward-Thurlow Weed faction which had collaborated with President Andrew Johnson. In Pennsylvania, the conservative Andrew Curtin faction, not Simon Cameron's faction, favored Grant. In Indiana, Grant's support came from Oliver P. Morton and not from radical George Washington Julian. Even some Democrats were considering running Grant on their ticket. Grant's nomination was assured by the results of the 1867 elections which Republican politicians interpreted as a rebuke to radical Reconstruction policies.

The comment on Professor Benedict's paper, while a predictable enough observation from the standpoint of an historian (Paul Kleppner) interested in examining

what the masses of American voters thought, was perceptive and suggestive of problems sometimes ignored by historians of the Civil War era. *Lincoln Lore* No. 1622 was an attempt in part to address some of these same questions. Kleppner suggested that Benedict's view was based on a study only of party elites and not of the broad base of party voters. He also suggested that Benedict saw only traditional Civil War and Reconstruction issues, while ignoring issues that were of vital concern to many voters and politicians, in particular, the issue of the large numbers of immigrants who had come to America from Ireland and Germany since the potato famine and the unsuccessful 1848 revolutions. The Republican party before the Civil War absorbed most of the anti-Catholic and anti-foreign Know-Nothing party voters, and Kleppner suggested that factions in the party stemming from this issue may simply have taken different sides on Reconstruction issues. Civil War and Reconstruction may not have determined the factions.

A free-wheeling panel discussion held on the last day of the Grant conference provided a stimulus to future historical investigation and also gave rise to suggestive comparisons between Grant and Lincoln. Surprisingly, Grant had to that point been compared to Dwight D. Eisenhower and Lyndon B. Johnson, but Lincoln had been kept in the background. Zilversmit had mentioned that Grant's policies towards the freedmen had developed much as Lincoln's had, gradually, pragmatically, and largely as a result of military necessity.

In the panel discussion Lincoln scholar Richard Current stated flatly that Grant learned nothing from Lincoln on the race question, for Grant's commitment to Negro suffrage went far beyond any policy Lincoln was ever committed to on a national scale. Others suggested that Grant's poor standing with historians, when considered in relation to Lincoln's higher standing, was a product of circumstance. On the one hand, Lincoln faced tremendous opposition within his own party in 1864, as Grant did from the Liberal Republican movement in 1872. Had the Civil War not been seen to a successful conclusion before Lincoln's assassination, historians might have been as concerned with his failures as with Grant's alleged failures. On the other hand, Grant's administration was marked by controversy over corruption, a sort of controversy from which Lincoln's administration was relatively free. Yet, as Professor Benedict pointed out, Grant bore the blame for corruption with which he had nothing at all to do. Benedict cited the example of Henry Adams, who became disenchanted with Grant at the same time he was doing research on the corruption of the Erie Railroad Wars in New York. Grant had nothing to do with the Erie Railroad scandals, but Adams came to blame Grant as a sort of symbol of a corrupt age.

An interesting contrast of personality was made by John Y. Simon, editor of the Grant papers, whose depth of knowledge about Grant did much to make the conference the gold mine of information that it was. He pointed out, with Benedict's help, that Grant lacked Abraham Lincoln's driving ambition, and especially his driving political ambitions. As a soldier, Grant's tendency was to serve as a duty. He replaced Edwin Stanton as Secretary of War in Andrew Johnson's cabinet largely because he feared the position might go to a worse man, perhaps a disloyal Democrat. He had an apparently genuine reticence about the Presidency, and again it was the disastrous results of the 1867 elections and the likelihood that neither Chase nor Wade could beat the Democrats (whom Grant equated with Copperheads) that persuaded him it was his duty to serve. To the degree that he was an adept politician, much of his acumen stemmed from natural personality traits of being extremely withdrawn and reticent to make his feelings public to anyone and of a life-long tendency to reward friends for their loyalty to him.

#### The View From *Lincoln Lore's* Perspective

Up to this point I have reported the results of the conference with little comment on the merits of the case for Grant. In conclusion, however, a few remarks on what the conference indicated for Lincoln scholarship seem in order. Zilversmit's allusion to similarities between Lincoln and Grant in regard to the developing race issue seems much more accurate than Professor Current's appraisal. Professor Current's comment that

Grant was committed to issues that Lincoln never was ignores, of course, the thrust of much recent Lincoln scholarship by such historians as Eric Foner and Herman Belz, which has suggested, first, how strong the Republican commitment on the slavery question was *when seen in juxtaposition to the Democrats' policies* and, second, how rapidly issues moved during the Civil War era and how willingly Lincoln moved along with them. The implication is that Lincoln might have moved to Grant's position had he lived. Moreover, Zilversmit's case itself ignores the implications of the fact that Grant had the issue forced upon him (by having to deal with refugee slaves in the field) to a much stronger degree than Lincoln and was a very reluctant Republican indeed, it not being clear what his partisan identification was (after 1860) until almost 1868. If anything, Grant's rapid changes on the race issue are an index to the degree of caution that must be exercised by the historian who would speculate on Lincoln's course during Reconstruction had he lived.

On the other hand, the point of the Grant specialists must be heeded. Historians cannot be mere camp-followers who react favorably to Lincoln in general merely because of the success of the Northern armies in the Civil War or, conversely, unfavorably towards Grant because of instances of corruption which are connected with him only by virtue of having occurred *while* he was President or by partisan charges against the Reconstruction governments in the Southern States.

Presidents' historical reputations often move in pairs. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt falls in the historians' esteem, Herbert Hoover generally rises. When Pierce and Buchanan are on the rise, Lincoln's reputation among historians dips. There was some tendency towards such a phenomenon at the Grant Conference in regard to the reputations of Lincoln and Grant, but there was as strong a reverse tendency to see Lincoln's and Grant's central concerns with race and nationalism as of a piece. Grant and Lincoln may rise in historical esteem together.

### The "Beast" in Norfolk, Virginia

In the June, 1973 *Lincoln Lore*, a newly acquired letter to Lincoln occasioned a consideration of certain aspects of General Benjamin F. Butler's rule of the conquered city of New Orleans. An attempt was made there to argue that Butler's reputation for sternness and corruption should not be allowed to overshadow entirely the quality of the programs and the motivation behind the programs initiated by Butler in New Orleans. At least, Butler's case for himself should be heard. A New Englander in what was to him a strange, almost tropical land, Butler taxed, organized, and administered to the end of making New Orleans a more familiar place.

It was also argued that there were threads of consistency in Butler's varied career from attorney for the female factory workers in Lowell, Massachusetts, to employer of the poor and unemployed in New Orleans and even to membership in the Greenback party. There is some evidence of consistency as well in Butler's policies towards conquered cities. On November 2, 1863, Butler assumed command of the Department of Virginia and North Carolina. Within this department, Union forces controlled the cities of Portsmouth and Norfolk, though Butler's headquarters were located at Fortress Monroe.

The account in the autobiography, *Butler's Book*, is by no means as extensive as the account of his actions in New Orleans, but from all appearances Butler's rule of Norfolk was quite similar to his rule of New Orleans both in aim and in amount of controversy resulting from it. According to Butler, he again sought financing for his projects from local sources: "No dollar of it ever came out of the treasury of the United States, but it was collected in various ways under my command." The ports of the department were blockaded, and nothing could be landed at Norfolk from the North or foreign countries that was not certified by the commanding general as not constituting contraband of war. Butler taxed the men engaged in this legitimate trade.

Butler also taxed recruiters who came to his department to recruit former slaves to fill the quotas for their home states. Recruiting black males left "the women and children to be taken care of by the United States."

Butler therefore issued an order that no recruiting agent should take a Negro out of his department "until he paid over one third of the bounty money for the support of the wives and children of the blacks."

Butler also repaired the inefficiency of the Treasury Department by establishing his own appointed agent to collect the twenty-five per cent tax on cotton brought to the North from the Confederacy. The Treasury Department was slow in appointing agents to administer this law, and Butler's move was made to tax the cotton which was being shipped out of his department at a feverish rate to beat the arrival of the Treasury agents. Eventually, the Treasury Department appointed Butler's agent as its own.

*Butler's Book* explains what he did with the money:

Now what did I do with the money thus gained,—not one cent of which came out of the treasury of the United States? I paid largely the expenses of digging Dutch Gap Canal; I built a hospital at Point of Rocks and furnished it with gas and water, and with cows for milk, and I expended a portion of it in sinking an artesian well, and built barracks for the soldiers at Fortress Monroe.

I found convicts, deserters, and others imprisoned at Fort Norfolk, doing nothing but eating their rations. I got a live Yankee and put him in charge as superintendent, and sent to Massachusetts and got prison uniforms, half black and half gray, and scarlet caps, with which to clothe these convicts, so that they could not easily escape when at work. I gave the superintendent charge of these men and told him to put them to work on the streets of Norfolk. I said to the men: "If you will work well and behave yourselves you shall have so many days deducted from your sentence according to your merits." In consequence they labored well and did an exceedingly large amount of work. The result of this was that permanent work was done which was charged to the city of Norfolk, for paving, etc., and on the Dismal Swamp Canal to which the United States paid large rents, to the amount of about \$38,000, while my whole prison labor cost less than \$9,000. Besides this, from the 15th of April to the 15th of June there was taken a thousand loads of filth per week from Norfolk, and by this means the yellow fever was kept out.

... Again, I found that the poor of Norfolk were cared for in this way: Every commissioned officer could give a certificate to any one, that he or she was an indigent citizen, and when this certificate was taken to the commissary's office, rations might be drawn upon it. The result of this was that there were a great many poor young women in Norfolk drawing rations from the government, the number being in proportion to the number of commissioned officers. I broke up that practice. I established a commission to examine and decide who really needed assistance, and thereafter rations were issued to those only who were deserving, numbering something like five thousand white people daily,—for the negroes took care of themselves,—and the expense of this assistance to the needy of Norfolk, under the regulations adopted under my administration, averaged for each ration eight or nine cents a day.

To some degree, then, Butler initiated a program of care for the poor, city improvements, and yellow-fever prevention not at all unlike the one he initiated in New Orleans.

The result, however, was like the result in New Orleans: conflict and complaints. In Virginia, the problem was that Butler's military rule conflicted with the civilian rule of a quasi-legal loyal Virginia government under Francis H. Pickens. Both attempted to rule Norfolk at once, and eventually Butler ordered an election to let the people of Norfolk decide whether they preferred martial law under Butler or whatever kind of law Pickens's regime would provide.

The voters of Norfolk preferred Butler, but the conflict provoked Lincoln's interference. The following is part of a draft of an uncompleted letter (dated August 9, 1864) which was enclosed in another letter sent months later to Benjamin Butler from the President:

Coming to the question itself, the Military occupancy of Norfolk is a necessity with us. If you, as Department commander, find the cleansing of the City

necessary to prevent pestilence in your army—street lights, and a fire department, necessary to prevent assassinations and incendiarism among your men and stores—wharfage necessary to land and ship men and supplies—a large pauperism, badly conducted, at a needlessly large expense to the government, and find also that these things, or any of them, are not reasonably well attended to by the civil government, you rightfully may, and must take them into your own hands. But you should do so on your own avowed judgment of a military necessity, and not seem to admit that there is no such necessity, by taking a vote of the people on the question. Nothing justifies the suspending of the civil by the military authority, but military necessity, and of the existence of that necessity the military commander, and not a popular vote, is to decide. And whatever is not within such necessity should be left undisturbed. In your paper of February you fairly notified me that you contemplated taking a popular vote; and, if fault there be, it was my fault that I did not object then, which I probably should have done, had I studied the subject as closely as I have since done. I now think you would better place whatever you feel is necessary to be done, on this distinct ground of military necessity, openly discarding all reliance for what you do, on any election.

The draft was not sent to Butler until December, when reports that a similar election was to be held on Virginia's Eastern Shore reached Lincoln.

The conflicts aside, it is interesting to note the similarity of interests and programs between Butler's rule of Norfolk and his rule of New Orleans. Though he was replaced in the Department of the Gulf by General Banks, Butler obviously did not consider the move a rebuke of the policies he had initiated and administered in Louisiana. He followed a similar plan two years later in Virginia. Moreover, Lincoln appears not to have quarreled with Butler's plan itself but only with Butler's justification of the plan. A President who considered that he had constitutional authority to make his most important public act only upon the grounds of military necessity through his power as Commander-in-Chief, Abraham Lincoln was careful that Butler's own reshaping of the areas of the nation entrusted to his rule be based on the same constitutional grounds.



From the Lincoln National Life Foundation

This cartoon first appeared in *Harper's Weekly* on January 17, 1863, shortly after Butler's removal from the New Orleans post. This cartoonist did not see the removal as a reprimand. He also did not see Butler, as many historians have since his times, as a dirty politician or a beast. Rather, Butler was pictured as a hard-working man who cleaned up dirty jobs. Butler's reputation may have dipped only after Southerners returned to prominence in national affairs and after he became identified with soft-money radicalism as a Greenbacker.

## CUMULATIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY 1972 - 1973

Selections approved by a Bibliography Committee consisting of the following members: Dr. Kenneth A. Bernard, Boston University, 725 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.; Arnold Gates, 289 New Hyde Park Rd., Garden City, N.Y.; Carl Haverlin, 8619 Louise Avenue, Northridge, California; James T. Hickey, Illinois State Historical Library, Old State Capitol, Springfield, Illinois; E. B. (Pete) Long, 607 S. 15th St., Laramie, Wyoming; Ralph G. Newman, 18 E. Chestnut St., Chicago, Illinois; Hon. Fred Schwengel, 404 Union Arcade Bldg., Davenport, Iowa; Dr. Wayne C. Temple, 1121 S. 4th Street Court, Springfield, Illinois. New items available for consideration may be sent to the above persons, or to the Lincoln National Life Foundation.

## 1972

## CARABELLI, ANGELINA J. 1972-25

Abraham Lincoln/His Legacy to American Agriculture/Edited by Angelina J. Carabelli/President, Associates NAL, Inc./© The Associates of the National Agricultural Library, Inc./Beltsville, Maryland/1972/  
Pamphlet, paper, 9" x 6", 20 pp., illus., price, \$1.50.

## LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY 1972-26

Lincoln Memorial University Press/(Device)/Fall, 1972/ Vol. 74, No. 3/Lincoln Herald/A Magazine devoted to historical/research in the field of Lincolnia and the Civil War, and to the promotion of Lincoln Ideals in American/Education./ [Harrogate, Tenn.]

Pamphlet, flexible boards, 10½" x 7½", 121-184 pp., price per single issue, \$1.50.

## PHELAN, MARY KAY 1972-27

(Lincoln in greeting position with right hand extended upward holding top hat)/Mr. Lincoln's Inaugural Journey/(Device)/By Mary Kay Phelan/Drawings By Richard Cuffari/Thomas Y. Crowell Company New York/(Double title page)/[Copyright 1972 by Mary Kay Phelan. All rights reserved. Map illustration by Miklos Pinther.]

Book, cloth, 8¼" x 5½", 211 (1) pp., illus., price, \$4.50. Juvenile literature.

## RUBINSTEIN, LEW 1972-28

Lew Rubinstein Ein Pfad/durch die Wildnis/Das erstaunliche Leben/des Holzfallers, Flossers,/Ladengehilfen, Postmeisters,/ Advokaten und Präsidenten/der Vereinigten Staaten/von Amerika/Abraham Lincoln/(Device)/Der Kinderbuchverlag/Berlin/[Illustrations by Manfred Butzmann. Copyright 1972.][Printed in German language.]

Book, cloth, 8½" x 5¼", 266 (6) pp., illus. Juvenile literature.

## SHERIDAN, LES (1972)-29

(Scenes)/Visit Mr. Lincoln's Logan County His Name-sake City and College/(Picture)/visit/mr. lincoln's logan county/(Caption title)/[Original photographic work by Joseph Lincoln Hoblit. Make-up, composition and printing by Newspapers, Inc., Shelbyville, Kentucky 40065.]

Pamphlet, paper, 15½" x 11½", 39 (1) pp., illus.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 1972-30

Lincoln/Home/National Historic Site. Illinois/(Device)/National Parks Centennial 1872-1972/(Caption title)/[U. S. Govt. Printing Office: 1972-483-437/90.]

Folder, paper, 5½" x 3¼", single sheet folded three times, printed text, illus., map of historical spots in Springfield, Illinois.

## 1973

## BAUER, CHARLES J. 1973-1

Songs/of A. Lincoln/by/Charles J. Bauer/This is number 4 of edition/limited to 266 copies, the/number of words Lincoln spoke/in Gettysburg Address./(Cover title)/[Copyright 1973 by Charles J. Bauer. All rights reserved.]

Pamphlet, flexible boards, 8½" x 5½", (46) pp., illus. Limited edition of 266 copies. Autographed copy No. 4.

## CHANNING L. BETE CO., INC. 1973-2

Meet/Abe Lincoln/(Portrait)/President/of the People/(Cover title)/[Copyright 1972 by Channing L. Bete Co., Inc. 1973 Edition.]

Pamphlet, paper, 8" x 5½", 15 pp., illus., scriptographic pamphlet. Juvenile literature.

## ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL LIBRARY 1973-3

Illinois/History/Volume 26/Number 5/February 1973/ Abraham Lincoln/The Children's Lincoln—Lincoln as a Soldier—The Other Mary—A Legend/of Love—The Wage Earner—The Long/Nine—The Almanac Case—The Bearded/Mr. Lincoln—Slavery Question—A/Case of Smallpox—On the Hanks Trail/(Scene)/The Scholar/(Cover title)/[Copyright 1973 Illinois State Historical Society. Published by the Illinois State Historical Library for the Illinois State Historical Society, Old State Capitol, Springfield, Illinois 62706.]

Pamphlet, flexible boards, 10" x 7¼", pages 99-119, illus., a magazine for young people, price 20¢.

## KELLEY, DARWIN 1973-4

Milligan's/Fight/Against/Lincoln/Darwin Kelley/With a Foreword by L. E. Carlson/(Device)/An Exposition-University Book/Exposition Press New York/[First Edition. Copyright 1973 by Darwin Kelley. All rights reserved.]

Book, cloth, 8¼" x 5½", xii p., 121 pp., price \$5.50. Autographed copy by author.

## MCLAUGHLIN, WILLIAM F. 1973-5

Lincoln Tribute-73/Lincoln/Almanac/Friday, February 16, 1973—Detroit Hilton Hotel—Detroit, Michigan/(Profile of Lincoln facing right)/(Cover title)/[Published by the Michigan Republican Committee.]

Pamphlet, paper, 8¼" x 5¼", 60 pp., illus. (A publication depicting "Lincoln's Life In Brief" along with tribute pages outlining segments of Lincoln's life through photography, cartoons & lithographs. Photographs are also shown of Mary Todd Lincoln and their children, contemporaries and assassination scenes with political advertising pages donated by various business and governmental offices throughout the state of Michigan.)

## MOCHIZUKI, MASA HARU 1973-6

(Device) No. 15/Tokyo Lincoln Center/Report No. Fifteen/February 12, 1973/Tokyo Lincoln Center/Masaharu Mochizuki, Director/2—1, Sarugaku-cho 1-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan/Phone 291—1860/Mail address: P. O. Box 5001 Tokyo International, Tokyo Japan/(Cover title)/[Printed in Tokyo, Japan in both Japanese and English languages.]

Pamphlet, paper, 10½" x 7½", 7 (1) pp., illus. (List of acquisitions, write up on medals, silver spoons and recent book collections [Lincoln broden down separately by Japanese & American, old edition and Abraham Lincoln: A Press Portrait by Herbert Mitgang].)

## PATE, A. M., JR. 1973-7

(Profile of Lincoln facing right)/Pate Collection Of Abraham Lincoln/[From the Library of A. M. Pate, Jr., 48 Valley Ridge Road, Fort Worth, Texas.]

Pamphlet, 9" x 6¼", fr., (30) pp., illus. (Listing of Pate collection of basic books, pamphlets, artifacts and autographs of Abraham Lincoln.)

## TRUEBLOOD, ELTON 1973-8

Abraham Lincoln/Theologian of American Anguish/Elton Trueblood/Professor-At-Large Earlham College/Harper & Row Publishers/New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London/[Copyright 1973 by David Elton Trueblood. All rights reserved.]

Book, cloth, 8¼" x 5¼", ix p., 149 pp., price \$4.95. Autographed copy.

## LINCOLN NATIONAL LIFE FOUNDATION 1973-9

Lincoln Lore/Bulletin of The Lincoln National Life Foundation . . . Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry, Editor/Published each month by The Lincoln National Life Insurance Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana/46801/Number 1619, January 1973 to Number 1620, February 1973.

Folder, paper, 11" x 8½", 4 pp., illus. Number 1619, Re-Discovering The Supposed Grave Of Lincoln's Brother. January 1973; Number 1620, The Indiana Election—October 11, 1864. February 1973.

## LINCOLN NATIONAL LIFE FOUNDATION 1973-10

Lincoln Lore/Bulletin of The Lincoln National Life Foundation . . . Mark E. Neely, Jr., Editor, Published each/month by The Lincoln National Life Insurance Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46801./Number 1621, March 1973 to Number 1624, June 1973.

Folder, paper, 11" x 8½", 4 pp., illus. Number 1621, The President And The Historian: Lincoln And George Livermore, March 1973; Number 1622, Lincoln, Douglas And The "Maine Law", April 1973; Number 1623, "I like Mr. Whiting very much . . .", May 1973; Number 1624, John Touro To Abraham Lincoln, January 7, 1865: New Orleans Under The "Beast" And Banks, June 1973.