FORUM XXII TO FEATURE PRIZE-WINNING BIOGRAPHERS
RON CHERNOW AND ANNETTE GORDON-REED ON PRESIDENTS WHO FOLLOWED LINCOLN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

By Harold Holzer

Two of the most honored and renowned historians of our time—Ron Chernow and Annette Gordon-Reed—head the list of scholars who will appear at the 22nd annual Lincoln Forum Symposium at Gettysburg November 16-18, 2017. Though best-known for their works on the Colonial era, Hamilton biographer Chernow and Jefferson biographer Gordon-Reed, each of whom has won both the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Award, will join a stellar faculty roster set to examine the theme, “Lincoln and His Contemporaries: Friends, Enemies, and Successors.”

Focusing on the decidedly different men who succeeded Lincoln in the White House during Reconstruction a century-and-a-half ago, Chernow will speak on his eagerly anticipated new biography of General-turned-President Ulysses S. Grant. And Gordon-Reed will return to a subject she addressed in a book published in 2011: Lincoln’s vice president and immediate successor, Andrew Johnson of Tennessee.

In addition, James B. Conroy, co-winner of the 2017 Lincoln Prize, will return for his second Forum appearance to discuss life in Lincoln’s White House, the subject of his own riveting new book; Charles B. Strozier will make his Forum debut to speak on his extraordinary 2016 volume exploring Lincoln’s close friendship with his Springfield roommate Joshua Fry Speed; Purdue historian Caroline E. Janney makes her own Forum appearance to explore the 1865 demobilization of Robert E. Lee’s enormous Confederate army; the prolific young scholar Jonathan W. White of Christopher Newport University returns to speak on his brand-new book about Civil War-era songs. Florida-based scholar Stephen D. Engle discusses his award-winning new book on Lincoln-era war governors; and journalist and author Melanie Kirkpatrick makes her Forum debut to discuss a seasonal topic never before addressed at our symposia: Lincoln and Thanksgiving, the national holiday he all but invented, and the subject of her latest book.

Returning for his second Forum will be journalist-turned-historian Walter Stahr on his eagerly anticipated new biography of Lincoln’s secretary of war, Edwin M. Stanton. In a return engagement by popular demand, the acclaimed U. S. Army Chorus will pay a second visit to the Lincoln Forum to perform another stirring program of Civil War-era songs.

“We are pleased and proud to be welcoming one of the most distinguished and appealing rosters of historians in the entire history of the Forum,” said Chairman Frank J. Williams in announcing the 2017 schedule. “We have chosen the best of the best from a list that just keeps expanding. So much new scholarship is emerging, so many new themes are being
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According to C-SPAN’s recently issued, third survey of presidents, Abraham Lincoln still tops the chart for presidential greatness. In the polls of academic experts conducted since Harvard’s Arthur Schlesinger Sr. pioneered this form of presidential assessment back in 1948, Lincoln has consistently ranked as the greatest. Yet, when elected in 1860—with just 39% of the popular vote—he was widely considered a country bumpkin who would be destroyed by the secession crisis brought forth by his own election. So thought many of his cabinet members who believed they were smarter than he, especially his Secretary of State, William H. Seward, who, on April 1, 1861, penned the president a presumptuous letter recommending that he decide policy as a sort of American prime minister because Lincoln was not up to the task. Of course, Seward was wrong. Lincoln possessed the stuff of greatness: judgment, persistence, resilience, integrity, fortitude, empathy, and political courage. Later Seward acknowledged that he had underestimated his chief, telling his wife, “The President is the best of us.”

This tale of greatness, so familiar in presidential history yet always fresh in the telling, raises the eternal, unanswerable question: How can we know, before a candidate becomes president, how he will perform in office? Or can we ever? In truth, we really can’t know how a president will perform. We cannot know whether noble attributes will supersede petty ones, or whether steadfastness will prevail over indecision once he or she gets tossed into the maelstrom of national leadership in a “house divided” and a world of turmoil that even a president as great as Abraham Lincoln could not foresee. History suggests, unfortunately, that it is really a crapshoot. But it also holds out the hope that leaders like Lincoln—unrecognized until their hours of trial—will emerge just when we need them most.

---

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

By Harold Holzer

Historian Richard Brookhiser, a leading authority on the Colonial Era who made his Lincoln Forum debut in 2016 with a talk on “Lincoln and the Founders,” has been voted the best speaker at Forum XXII, in the evaluation survey conducted at the symposium. Cited by several attendees for his “excellent speaking skills,” Mr. Brookhiser received a vote of 9.77 out of a maximum rating of 10. He was closely followed, in order, by the team of Craig L. Symonds and John F. Marszalek, with their discussion of Joe Johnston’s surrender; Ronald White Jr. for his dinner talk on the “American Ulysses, Ulysses S. Grant;” James I. “Bud” Robertson, Harold Holzer, Frank J. Williams, and Sidney Blumenthal.

Also earning acclaim was Lincoln enactor George Buss, the Spangler Farm tour (9.2), and the panel on black voting rights, which earned one of the highest ranking ever achieved for a group session: 9.8. Once again, breakout sessions elicited high praise, with special kudos to the John Marszalek-Ron White discussion (“could not have been better”); Harold Holzer’s talk with Craig Symonds (“awesome”); and Douglas Egerton’s chat with Edna Greene Medford (“Dr. Medford is exceptional”). The annual “Chief and Chef” cooking class was rated as “superb.”

Our attendees participate in an average of 1-4 history conferences each year, and travel from as close as the village of Gettysburg to as far as 2,700 miles away. Nearly all attendees rated the conference near a perfect “10” overall. “A very high caliber experience,” said one. “Great program with fine speakers,” stated another. Additional comments included: “pleased to see emphasis on teachers & students,” “love being part of this amazing event,” “will be back,” “I can’t wait to come back,” “an outstanding conference,” “a lot of 10s, but I love it every time,” “I am attending for the second time and will continue to attend as long as I am able,” “the speakers you get every year are just excellent,” “always have superb speakers and everyone enjoys each other’s comments and company—continued on page 12
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THE FUTURE IS TODAY; RISKY BUT NECESSARY

Frank J. Williams
Chairman
FORUM XXII TO FEATURE PRIZE-WINNING BIOGRAPHERS RON CHERNOW AND ANNETTE GORDON-REED ON PRESIDENTS WHO FOLLOWED LINCOLN IN THE WHITE HOUSE
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addressed, and so many standard beliefs reconsidered and upended that one can only conclude that the recent, golden age of Lincoln and Civil War scholarship is continuing as robustly as ever. Most important of all, many of the leading thinkers and writers of this era clearly continue to think the Forum—and its participatory membership—to be among the best audiences in the country. We cannot wait to both introduce and welcome back the accomplished, provocative, and renowned writers who will be heading to Gettysburg to grace Forum XXII.”

As customary, the 2017 Forum will also feature presentations of both the Richard Nelson Current Award for lifelong individual achievement in the history field; and the Wendy Allen Award for institutional excellence. The program will also include: the traditional recitations by leading Lincoln enactor George Buss; panel discussions led by Forum chairman and vice chairman Frank Williams and Harold Holzer (one session on “Lincoln’s Friends,” the other on “Lincoln’s Enemies,” to include, among others, Forum favorites Catherine Clinton and Edna Greene Medford); and small breakout sessions featuring several of the visiting historians along with special extra guests—including Forum favorites Craig Symonds and John Marszalek, leading bibliophile Daniel Weinberg of Chicago’s renowned Abraham Lincoln Book Shop (on the state of Lincoln collecting), and veteran Forum member Mel Maurer presenting his own Lincoln dramatization. Chairman Williams will offer yet another of his beloved cooking classes, and once again, teachers and students from around the country will be awarded scholarships to attend the entire three-day program.

Annette Gordon-Reed is the Charles Warren Professor of Legal History at Harvard University, where she also serves as the Carol K. Pforzheimer Professor at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study. A graduate of Dartmouth College and Harvard Law School who began her career at a major New York law firm and in city government, she authored the groundbreaking 1997 study, *Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy*, followed in 2008 by *The Hemingses of Monticello: An American Family*, which won the Pulitzer Prize plus an astonishing 15 additional major awards, making it one of the most honored works of non-fiction ever published. Notably, she was the first African-American to win a Pulitzer for History. In her critically acclaimed 2011 book, *Andrew Johnson*, Professor Gordon-Reed argued that much of the deprivation suffered by African-Americans after the Civil War—and for generations to come—might well have been avoided had Lincoln’s White House successor pursued a policy granting land to the former enslaved people of the South. In 2016, Professor Gordon-Reed returned to the Jefferson theme with *Most Blessed of the Patriarchs: Thomas Jefferson and the Empire of the Imagination*, co-authored with Peter Onuf. Among her many awards, she has also won the Frederick Douglass Prize, the George Washington Book Prize, a MacArthur Foundation “genius award,” and, in 2010, the National Humanities Medal from President Barack Obama.

Best-selling, prize-winning biographer Ron Chernow is perhaps best-known as the author of the 2004 book, *Alexander Hamilton*, adopted in 2015 for the fabulously successful, Tony-sweeping Lin-Manuel Miranda Broadway musical, *Hamilton*, for which Chernow served as historical consultant to the production. Chernow’s other triumphs have included The *House of Morgan: An American Banking Dynasty and the Rise of Modern Finance* (1990; National Book Award); *The Warburgs: The Twentieth-Century Odyssey of a Remarkable Jewish Family* (1993; Columbia Business School award for excellence in economic writing); *Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller Sr.* (1998; nominee for the National Book Critics Circle Award); and *George Washington* (2010; Pulitzer Prize for Biography and the American History Book Prize). His eagerly anticipated new biography of Ulysses S. Grant—a project Chernow has described as a natural “progression” following his book on Washington (another heroic general who became a two-term president)—has been six years in the making and will be published in October. In 2013, Chernow won the Biographers International Organization “BIO” Award for advancing the art and craft of biography; and in 2015 President Obama awarded him the National Humanities Medal. Several of his books have inspired TV documentaries, in which Mr. Chernow has often appeared as an on-screen commentator.

The 2017 Forum roster is abundant with additional award-winners. Professor Engle, for one, won the
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By David Carlyon

To call a politician a clown is a joke, and an old one (Lincoln was called a clown throughout his career). But to call a clown a politician takes us deep into American history, when a circus clown ran for president—no joke.

Dan Rice, a contemporary of Lincoln’s, was a talking clown whose quips made him one of the country’s first celebrities, attracting thousands to summer tents and to major city theaters in the winter. As the “Great American Humorist,” he expanded his comic commentary into criticism of Abraham Lincoln, which led to serious campaigns for the Pennsylvania state senate, Congress, and president.

His politics got buried by history, which adopted the new view of circus in the late 19th century as a child-oriented enterprise. But for a century after the first American circus in 1793 Philadelphia, circus aimed at adults, offering sex, violence, and politics, in skimpy costumes, clowns’ suggestive quips, and Rice’s jokes about his own adultery; in daily fights between locals and circus workers, with Rice leading his troupe into action; and in his “hits on the times.”

Rice began his career with general topical jokes. Playing Washington in the weeks before James Buchanan’s 1856 inauguration, Rice sang about the new cabinet, and later claimed he had gotten the names first, scooping the newspapers. But as the country’s partisanship increased in the 1850s, so did Rice’s. At an 1859 performance in Philadelphia’s Walnut Street Theater, 300 Southern medical students came to hear him, and he advised them to ignore the “John-Brownites,” whose “fanatical principles” made them a fringe group. He sang he’d “like North and South to leave slav’ry alone,” and his band played “The Marseilles,” as new defiant lyrics had made it “The Southern Marseilles.”

Sailing his circus south, he was in New Orleans on January 26, 1861 when Louisiana seceded from the Union. During that night’s performance, he repeated what he’d been saying for years: the South was aggrieved, with union threatened by abolitionists. Locals applauded. The New Orleans Delta lauded him “as clown, philosopher, moralist, and politician and patriot of the combined Palmetto and Pelican school,” referring to secessionist leaders South Carolina and Louisiana. The Picayune considered him “peculiarly well adapted, by association and sympathy, to please our people.” When he headed north, the Natchez Daily Free Trader called him a “true Southerner,” adding “Dan is Southern, feels it, talks, it, acts it.”

For the rest of the war, controversy swirled around whether he was “secesh,” a Northern patriot or, not exactly the same thing, a Union man. Republican papers claimed he scorned flag and country in New Orleans. Rumors had him running guns for the South, hidden on his steamboat. Horace Greeley, who disliked Rice for his popular appeal, reprinted the tales. Democratic papers like the Cincinnati Enquirer offered Rice’s version, that facing pistol-waving fanatics, he had bravely refused to lower the American flag. Still, Rice remained popular. In 1863, reporting on the first Sanitary Fair to raise funds for wounded soldiers, Leslie’s Illustrated highlighted the pairing of president and clown: “Busts of A. Lincoln and Dan Rice were placed together at the great fair in Chicago, and labeled ‘The two American humorists.’”

In September 1864, Democrats nominated Rice as candidate for the Pennsylvania State Senate from Erie. Accepting, he wrote that his “proclivities were formerly with the Whigs,” so he regretted seeing “the great principles of personal liberty and the rights of property being cloven down by … the machine of Government.” The Erie Dispatch applauded; the Republican Gazette labeled the campaign Rice’s “biggest joke.” That was a rare jab at his job, as most criticisms focused on his politics. (Lincoln got lampooned as a circus tumbler, court jester, and “a fellow of infinite jest” from Hamlet) Reporting on “Dan Rice and Disloyalty,” the Chicago Tribune objected to his “flings at Lincoln and the war [and] anti-slavery sentiment.” The Chicago Post countered, labeling him “a Union man … a representative man,” scoffing that the local Tribune, Greeley’s New York Tribune, and the New York Times failed to understand that patriotism didn’t require being “an abolitionist and a
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Dan Rice—a Period Photograph. Lincoln the “Clown”—as portrayed in the Civil War-era humor magazine, Phunniest Sort of Phun. (Courtesy Dr. Steven Lomazow)
The Friends of Gettysburg Foundation hosted a tour of the George and Elizabeth Spangler Farm for nearly 100 members of the Lincoln Forum on November 18, 2016 during their annual symposium in Gettysburg. Four volunteer docents, Mary Turk-Meena, Howard Buell, Randy Grimsley and Paul Semanek, led the tours and discussions concerning the role the Farm played during and after the Battle of Gettysburg.

The Gettysburg Foundation purchased the Farm in 2008 and has been involved in the ongoing process of restoring it to its 1863 condition. The barn was restored during the winter of 2015–2016, and the smokehouse was also rebuilt during that same time. Completed in May, the Farm had over 3,600 guests, 132 Ranger programs were presented and 11 Foundation volunteers donated over 400 hours during its 10 weekend 2016 season. The Spangler Farm stands today as the most completely restored field hospital from the Battle of Gettysburg.

At the time the Farm was purchased by George and Elizabeth Spangler in 1848, it consisted of 80 acres. In March of 1861 the Spanglers purchased an additional 65 acres. Located approximately one mile south of the Borough of Gettysburg between the Baltimore Pike and Taneytown Road, it was an ideal location for a farm, with easy access to roads, relatively flat ground and a good water supply. In 1863 the Farm had several buildings including a large “Pennsylvania Style Bank Barn.” These factors, along with the ebb and flow of the Battle, also made it an ideal location for the Union Army's 11th Corps Field Hospital.

On July 1, 1863 a group of Union officers, doctors and staff rode down the driveway to the Spangler house and informed the family that their farm would be the site of a field hospital. The Spanglers were given a choice to leave or if they stayed, George and Elizabeth along with their four children would be allotted one room in their house. The family choose to stay and for the next five weeks they witnessed unimaginable suffering and hardships which they also had to endure themselves.

During that five week period, approximately 1,900 troops were treated at the Farm, both Confederate and Union soldiers. Approximately two hundred men succumbed to their injuries and did not survive. Among those were Confederate General Lewis Armistead and Union Private George Nixon, great-grandfather of our 37th president Richard M. Nixon. During the first week of August 1863 the remaining wounded were transferred to Camp Letterman outside of Gettysburg.
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By Roger D. Billings, Jr.

On inauguration day in 1861, the conflict between Indians and white settlers in the West was probably far from Abraham Lincoln’s thoughts. Later that year, however, the conflict began to intrude upon his conduct of the Civil War. In the fall of 1861 Lincoln learned that the Confederates were trying to enlist Cherokees in Indian Territory (present-day Oklahoma) to fight against the Union. In November an Indian leader with the improbable name of John Ross led the Cherokees into an alliance with the South and Indian Territory became a separate military department. One year later, while still dealing with John Ross, Lincoln was confronted with the bloodiest massacre of whites in American history, the Sioux uprising in Southwest Minnesota.

Thousands of Minnesotans were terrified in August 1862 when Sioux Indians went on a rampage and killed an estimated 800 white settlers. Surviving settlers abandoned their homes and demanded that the government force the Indians out of Minnesota. Governor Alexander Ramsey warned Lincoln that the uprising would affect recruitment of Union soldiers, so Lincoln responded by sending General John Pope, fresh from his devastating defeat at Second Bull Run, to quell the uprising.

Pope reported to Lincoln on October 9 that “The Sioux war is at an end,” and that many of his 1,500 prisoners would be tried by a military commission. Lincoln immediately recognized that the trials could result in the execution of some Indians who were innocent. On October 17 he directed that no executions be made without his sanction, although almost everybody warned Lincoln not to spare the Indians. Two men advised him otherwise, however: William Dole, the Indian Commissioner in the Department of the Interior, an old friend of Lincoln’s from Illinois, and Episcopal Bishop Henry Whipple. They urged him to be merciful and not be stampeded.

On November 10 Lincoln wired General Pope to “forward, as soon as possible, the full and complete record of these convictions.” The record consisted of the trials of 303 Sioux men who were condemned to death and it showed that the trials had been speedy; each had lasted on average only ten to fifteen minutes. Most Minnesotans were comfortable with a mass execution; Lincoln was not. He was shocked by what he saw in the record. As a result he worked

until late one night with two young government lawyers reading all of the files until they reduced the list of those who were to be executed to 39 (one was later spared). Lincoln distinguished between those who were merely present at the battlefield (sentence commuted) and those who had been found guilty of killing or rape (sentence allowed to stand). The 38 hangings took place the day after Christmas 1862, the largest mass execution in U.S. history. Ironically, Lincoln’s humanitarian effort to spare 265 of the condemned came only a few months after the Battle of Antietam where tens of thousands were killed.

There is reason to question why any Indians should have been executed considering the flimsy procedures of the military commission. Arrests and the use of military commissions was the subject of important Civil War era Supreme Court cases. In Ex parte Merriman (1861) the detention of a Southern sympathizer in Maryland was challenged as a violation of the right of habeas corpus. Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, sitting as a circuit judge, held that a military officer could not arrest and incarcerate a person who was not a soldier except when assisting a civil court and the offense was against the United States.

The case offered no comfort for Indians because at that time they were not U.S. citizens subject to the jurisdiction of civil courts. In Ex parte Milligan (1866) the Court said military commissions could not try civilians in states where civilian courts were in normal operation. But this case, even if it had been decided in 1862, would not have helped the Indians, either, because they were not “civilians.” The U.S. Constitution said “Indian Tribes” were to be dealt with as independent political entities. In other words they were citizens of nations different from the U.S. and their nations could negotiate treaties with the U.S. The word, “treaty,” means a contract between sovereign nations. But regarding Indian tribes as sovereign nations was a fiction, because Indian tribes had no written laws or fixed boundaries. Thus, treaties between the U.S. and Indian nations rested on dubious legal ground.

Since the Sioux Indians had no access to U.S. civil courts, there was no legal obstacle to the Army setting up a military commission to try them for murder. On September 28 Colonel Henry Sibley appointed five officers to serve on the commission. These men, however, were the very soldiers who had recently fought against the Sioux during the uprising. The possibility they were prejudiced against the defendant Indians who had fought them was manifest. Although the appointees had a right to recuse themselves from service on the commission none of them exercised the right. A Christian minister, Steven Riggs, interviewed prisoners and brought the names of likely defendants to the attention of the commission. Lieutenant Rollin Olin, who fought against the Sioux, was appointed Judge Advocate for the trials. His job was to see that defendants’ rights were protected, yet there is no evidence in the transcripts that he ever said a word.

continued on page 9
LINCOLN, THE LAW, AND THE 1862 INDIAN UPRISING

continued from page 8  Such a commission lacked fairness. Lincoln must have noticed the speed of the trials, weakness of the testimonies, and lack of the procedures that are guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. These included the right to trial by jury and to remain silent. Since a "Miranda" warning was not required in the 19th century confessions could be offered without defendants knowing they were confessing. Some testimony was “hearsay,” not admissible in civil courts. One participant in the Indian uprising, Joe Godfrey, turned states evidence. A newspaper reported that he was “a half-negro son of a Canadian Frenchman . . . and grew up in close relations with the Indians . . . It was in large measure upon his testimony that the Indian butchers were convicted.” In return for his frequent testimony he received a sentence of only ten years although evidence was adequate to put him among those condemned to be hanged. In case after case he testified to an Indian’s participation in a battle. His memory of an individual Indian’s actions on the battlefield was improbably prodigious.

To add to the problems, the Commission relied on a single interpreter, Antoine Frenier, who was present at all the trials. The dubious quality of his interpreting obviously was critical to the defendants. Isaac V. Heard served as recorder, but his failure to include questions asked of witnesses made the transcripts “difficult to follow and hard to understand.”

If Washington politicians, the Army, and Minnesota citizens had had their way probably all of the condemned Indians would have been hanged. That Lincoln took time during his conduct of the War to save eighty percent of them is remarkable. On December 26, 1862 in Mankato, Minnesota, the hanging of the 38 he did not spare brought a major episode in Indian relations to a close. The last words the Indians heard were the readings of their sentences: “Your Greater Father at Washington, after carefully reading what the witnesses have testified in your several trials, has come to the conclusion that you have each been guilty of wantonly and wickedly murdering his white children, and for this reason he has directed that you each be hanged by the neck until you are dead . . .”

3 Nichols at 99.
4 Constitution of the United States, Article I, section 8(3) (“Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.”)
6 Id. at 9, 16.
7 Id. at 34-36.
8 Id. at 12.
9 Id. at 11.
10 Id. at 406, n. 682.
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continued from page 3  most recent Barondess Award from New York’s Civil War Round Table for his 2015 Gathering to Save a Nation: Lincoln and the Union’s War Governors; Conroy shares the 2017 Gilder Lehrman Lincoln Prize for his second book, Lincoln’s White House: The People’s House in Wartime; and Professor White won the 2015 Abraham Lincoln Institute Book Prize (and was a 2015 Lincoln Prize finalist) for his Emancipation, the Union Army, and the Re-Election of Abraham Lincoln. Craig L. Symonds, who returns for a November 18 breakout session, is also a Lincoln Prize laureate, as is Vice Chairman and Panel Moderator Harold Holzer, who also won a 2008 National Humanities Medal. Marszalek’s awards (he will dialogue with Symonds) include a recent citation for his collection of The Best Writings of Ulysses S. Grant.

“We are honored to be presenting scholars who have been honored so often by so many,” commented Vice Chairman Holzer. “We are confident that they will discover in our Lincoln Forum Family an audience passionate about Lincoln and the Civil War era, eager to learn more about these subjects, and fully prepared to engage with America’s greatest historians even as they renew friendships founded in a shared reverence for history.”

Once again the Forum will be headquartered at the Wyndham Hotel Gettysburg, and will include three dinners (November 16, 17, and 18), two lunches, and two breakfasts. As always, the program leads up to the annual November 19 observances of the anniversary of Lincoln’s greatest oration, the Gettysburg Address, marked each year by open-to-the-public ceremonies at the Soldiers National Cemetery a few miles from the Wyndham, and followed by the annual meeting of the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania.

Registration will be open soon, on a first-come, first-served basis—and is expected to fill quickly in response to the outstanding 2017 Faculty. Only active Lincoln Forum members will be eligible to participate. For information on registration, consult the Forum website at www.thelincolnforum.org.
By Ron Keller

The Lincoln Forum Symposium, which in 2017 will enjoy its 22nd continuous year of honoring the life and memory of Abraham Lincoln, has for the past eight years extended all-expense paid scholarships for teachers to attend the annual symposium in Gettysburg. This past November, scholarships were granted to four educators of varied backgrounds and experiences. The 2016 winners of the highly coveted and competitive Teacher Scholarship Initiative of the Lincoln Forum were: Joren Anderson, of Auburndale, Wisconsin (Auburndale High School); Winifred Anderson, of St. Cloud, Minnesota (Sauk Rapids Rice High School); Jennifer Connolly, of Bronx, New York (Preston High School); and Cathy Fratto, of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Oakland Catholic High School).

A three-member committee comprised of Lincoln Forum Advisory Board members selected the winners from a pool of many qualified teacher applicants. The committee consists of Ruth Squillace, Lincoln Forum Teacher Scholarship Initiative Coordinator and high school Social Studies teacher in Long Island, NY, Ron Keller, Associate Professor of History and Political Science at Lincoln College in Lincoln, IL; and Ken Childs, Esq., of Columbia, SC.

For teacher Joren Anderson, the setting of Gettysburg itself inspired her personally and educationally during her Lincoln Symposium experience. She has since utilized pictures which she took at the Spangler Farm, the National Soldiers Cemetery, and Gettysburg Battlefield to demonstrate to her students the significant impact of the Civil War on civilians. Several symposium lectures resonated with her as well. She remarked, “I enjoyed how Craig Symonds and John Marszalek presented ‘Johnston and Sherman: The Two Surrenders.’ I was also inspired by Ronald C. White, Jr. with his presentation of ‘Opposites Attract: Abraham Lincoln & Ulysses S. Grant.’” The Auburndale (WI) High School social studies teacher earned her degree from the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. Anderson has distinguished herself in her teaching career, winning in 2015 both the Wisconsin VFW Teacher of the Year and the VFW District 7 Teacher of the Year. She earned her Juris Doctorate from Hofstra University School of Law. Connolly won her school’s Distinguished Faculty Award in 2015. Among her other professional accomplishments, she founded and has since directed the 2009 Preston Scholars Program which created an honors program and provides mentoring services for students. She developed and taught the curriculum for Race, Class, & Gender in the U.S., an honors level senior elective course. Among her favorite Forum sessions, Connolly remembered, “The break out session on race and gender was amazing!”

Cathy Fratto, a graduate of the University of Virginia with a BA in history and a Masters from West Virginia University, has taught Advanced Placement US History for the past 11 years at Oakland Catholic High School, an all-girls, college-preparatory high school in Pittsburgh. She is the recipient in recent years of multiple NEH scholarships. Prior to teaching, she worked as a museum curator at Pittsburg’s Senator John Heinz History Center, where she had the opportunity to meet and share her work with historian and presidential biographer David McCullough. Regarding the Symposium, Fratto remarked: “My experience at the Lincoln Forum was one of the most professionally gratifying and exciting encounters I have engaged as an educator. The presentations were excellent, and beyond any expectation I could have had for them.” Of her fellow Forum attendees, she felt “kindred spirits in the many lovely and authentic people” she met, sensing “our mutual shared passion for the history of the Civil War era.” Fratto particularly enjoyed the Richard Brookhiser session, “Lincoln and the Founders,” as well as “Lincoln in the World of Political Party Chaos” from Sidney Blumenthal. However, she called the entire Lincoln Forum experience as “amazing,” “inspiring,” and “nourishing.”

For 2017, the Forum encourages all teachers to apply for a scholarship for an unforgettable experience. What teachers will encounter can be summarized by one 2016 scholarship recipient who declared, “I felt valued and honored—and frankly, pampered— all weekend.” That pampering happens each November—as another teacher recipient witnessed—in “three amazing days devoted to a love of Lincoln, the Civil War and history in general.” If you or a friend/colleague is interested in applying for a Lincoln Forum Teacher Scholarship, please refer to The Lincoln Forum website at www.thelincolnforum.org. Applications should be directed to Ruth Squillace, Coordinator, by June 30, 2017.

The Lincoln Forum continues to develop opportunities and resources for educators. Please consider making a tax-deductible financial gift to the Forum to support scholarship opportunities.

(Ron Keller is an Associate Professor of History and Political Science at Lincoln College in Lincoln, IL.)
VILLANELLE FOR AN AUSPICIOUS OCCASION:
TO THE SACRED MEMORY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

By Herbert Woodward Martin

(The following verses were read aloud by their author, the poet Herbert Woodward Martin, at the dedication of the new Lincoln sculpture in Dayton, Ohio on September 17, 2017. They are reprinted here with the kind permission of the author.)

He gave our fathers and mothers a reason to offer life as an inheritance; the stringencies of their time taught them to look each other in the eye; hope is what provided them with the materials for work and dance.

The nameless men and women who went to war with clear assurance, who had in their possession a notion of what freedom was, breathed a daring sigh. They were the destined mothers and fathers who fortified our sure inheritance.

The inevitability of those political days defined the future of our existence; that was right, and just, and true; now, we have little cause to question why? Hope is what provides us with all the materials for work and dance.

We see eye to eye, we stand shoulder to shoulder with a determined stance.
We shall preserve the wealth of this nation for all those destined to live or die; that is what our fathers and mothers provided for us as a rightful inheritance.

We here, then dedicate with pure purpose, this sweet cause to enhance what Lincoln, with generous justice, did while he stood and braved the laudatory heights to carve out a destiny for our country. In work and dance Lincoln, still, gives light to this very day; let it define our joyous existence; let it state who we are, and what we have become, since history dare not lie.

This gift is what our fathers and mothers gave, rendering it a worthy inheritance, through the valuable materials of hope and work, for love and for our dance.

( Herbert Woodward Johnson, professor emeritus at the University of Dayton, has authored eight volumes of poetry and edited the complete novels and plays of African-American writer Paul Lawrence Dunbar.)

THE DAYTON STATUE OF LINCOLN
Sculptor Michael Major of Urbana with his created bronze sculpture of President Abraham Lincoln as he looked in 1859 when he spoke on the steps of Montgomery County’s Old Court House. (Photo: Dayton Daily News)

The Lincoln Forum Bulletin welcomes contributions from members and historians—articles and photos alike. Send to editor Harold Holzer at hh433@hunter.cuny.edu. The editor particularly thanks the contributors to the current issue.
A CLOWN FOR PRESIDENT: NOT LINCOLN, BUT HUMORIST DAN RICE

continued from page 4  devoted of Lincoln.” Rice ultimately lost, with 40% of the district’s votes, but he ran ahead of the ticket, with presidential candidate George McClellan only getting 36%.

On August 1, 1866, Erie County soldiers asked him to run for Congress. The war won, the issue had become Reconstruction.

“Resolved, That we believe Colonel Rice to be opposed to the policy of keeping the Southern States out of the Union, after spending so much treasure and so much blood to keep them in.” His campaign got a boost when Andrew Johnson swung by Erie in his presidential “Swing Around the Circle,” bringing Seward, Grant, Farragut, and Custer. But at the September 10 convention, Rice withdrew his name because the party would not support a non-partisan campaign.

Then Rice ran for president. His newspaper, the Girard Spectator, put his name forward as candidate in September 1867. A newspaper near Pittsburgh copied the article, adding that Western papers and a soldiers’ convention in Iowa agreed that his “unadulterated patriotism [and] enlarged views” appealed to “the intelligent masses.” It also invoked the martyred president, labeling Rice “a second Abraham Lincoln.” Another paper contrasted the two: Rice was a clown by profession, “not, like Lincoln, by nature! No rude and vulgar jokes ever fell from his lips within sight of the mangled forms of his countrymen.” The Elkhart, Indiana Democratic Union saw Rice countering the “ribbed aristocracy” of Republicans, while the Nashville Banner commended Rice’s working man’s ticket. In New York, the Herald compared Rice and McClellan as candidates, and the World compared Rice, Peter Cooper, and Greeley. A Buffalo paper speculated about Rice, Grant, and New York’s governor Horatio Seymour; a Louisville journal joined Rice and an acquaintance, the Copperhead Clement Vallandigham. Meanwhile the New York Vindicator mourned that prospects had fallen to Frederick Douglass, Grant, and Rice. Attacked by a Michigan paper, Rice wrote a letter labeling the editors “mendacious blackguards and malicious liars,” and their principles “the creed of the desperate and the damned; … the battle-cry of Hell.” He signed it “One of your smitters, Dan Rice.”

Then Rice’s candidacy for President of the United States stopped. By February 1868, editorials and letters ceased. Though the abrupt ending encouraged later histories to depict Rice’s run as a joke, such a conclusion ignores the evidence. As primaries in our own age remind us, many politicians have blazed briefly as a prospective president.

Circus was one of the few truly national institutions before the War, when “United States” was more a label than a fact, and circus was also one of the few things all Americans had in common after the war, drawing people of all regions, ages, races, and classes into one of America’s rare, small democratic audiences. Rice breathed that mix. Though he won no election, and histories buried his politics, he remains a vivid reminder of the boisterous era when performance and politics overlapped, voting reached its highest level, Lincoln learned to perform—to speak persuasively, and the circus clown Dan Rice ran respectful and respected campaigns for public office.

(David Carlyon, teacher, lecturer, author, PhD, and JD, was also a clown for the Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus. For more details and sources, see his book, Dan Rice: The Most Famous Man You’ve Never Heard Of (Public Affairs, 2001), especially the Civil War section, 285-352.)

To receive e-mail updates about The Lincoln Forum and other Lincoln news, enter your email address into our automated email system on our home page at:

www.thelincolnforum.org

BROOKHISER EARN HONORS AS MOST POPULAR SPEAKER AT 2016 SYMPOSIUM

continued from page 2  engaging for all,” “Joan Waugh and Bud Robertson were the superstars of this year’s symposium,” “best organized in my experience at the forum, and good free time,” and “100% satisfied customer,” and, “with apologies to Frank and Harold, Pat Dougal was the real star of Forum 2016” (amen).

Criticisms were shared as well. Some attendees would like more battlefield tours, more focused panels, less discussion of modern politics (although one attendee saluted “all the speakers from steering away from politics.”) a new look at the Spielberg film, lower prices for wine at the hotel bar, give us back our notepaper, bring back “getting to know you.”

Forum evaluation sheets allow your leadership team—in the words of one of Lincoln’s favorite poets—to see ourselves as others see us. Please keep your comments coming in. We need and respect your views.

THE LINCOLN FORUM