



---

2013

## Ours is the Harder Lot: Student Patriotism at the University of Michigan during the Civil War

Julie Mujic  
*Sacred Heart University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/his\\_fac](https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/his_fac)



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mujic, Julie A. "Ours is the Harder Lot: Student Patriotism at the University of Michigan during the Civil War." *Union Heartland: The Midwestern Home Front during the Civil War*. Eds. Ginette Aley and J.L. Anderson. Carbondale IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2013.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the History at DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact [ferribyp@sacredheart.edu](mailto:ferribyp@sacredheart.edu), [lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu](mailto:lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu).

## “OURS IS THE HARDER LOT”

---

### STUDENT PATRIOTISM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DURING THE CIVIL WAR

*Julie A. Mujic*

According to the *Peninsular Courier*, a local newspaper of Ann Arbor, Michigan, students on the University of Michigan campus reacted excitedly in February 1862 to the news of General Ulysses S. Grant's capture of Fort Donelson. All but one student, that is. When confronted by an appointed committee of his peers who demanded an explanation, the law student defended his lack of spirited celebration. The newspaper reported that he “was constitutionally incapable of boo-booing at every telegraph report. As to his sentiments, he had a right to them and he meant to keep them.” This answer was highly unsatisfactory to the other Michigan law students, who promptly hired a notary public to come to campus. The notary administered an oath of allegiance to the young men as a way for them to confirm their loyalty to the Union. All of the law students took the oath, including the one whose actions initiated the spectacle.<sup>1</sup>

If the patriotism of these University of Michigan college students was so intense and they felt the need to exhibit it in such an explicit manner, the natural question to ask is why these young, obviously military-age men did not enlist in the Union army and go forth onto the field of battle. Many of them surely did; in fact, more than half the graduating class of 1861 either immediately or eventually served in that capacity. Nonetheless, the university's enrollment grew in the midst of war. In 1860, the University of Michigan boasted more than 670 students.

By the 1865–66 school year, over 1,200 young men registered for classes at Michigan, thus surpassing Harvard as the nation's largest university. While the war may have dismantled many schools across the country, the University of Michigan moved forward in a remarkable manner. This chapter considers how University of Michigan students during the war expressed their understanding of patriotism, the home front, and their role in the hostilities. By examining the shift from ambivalence about enlisting to a notion of patriotism that embraced education as the equivalent of military service, it is evident that most students at the University of Michigan found ways to justify the expressions of nationalism available to them on campus. This study explores the change that occurred in student perspectives on patriotism by the middle of the war and then analyzes the ways in which students utilized university resources to “practice” for what they believed would be their eventual positions on the national stage.<sup>2</sup>

Certainly, university students were a small, distinctive subset of the nation's white, male population. These young students often related to the war in ways different from others in American society. Moreover, far from the throes of battle, college students had a unique opportunity to explore their own maturation process while learning about the world outside of their parents' homes. When a young man arrived at school, often barely eighteen years of age, he learned to take pride in his associations with groups outside of his immediate family. He joined a fraternity, a literary society, or the campus choir. He made friends with others in his same course of study or with his fellow student-residents at a local boardinghouse. For those who came to a university during the American Civil War, circumstances forced them to ponder the pros and cons of staying in school versus enlisting to serve their country. For those who left, it was often a decision weighed down by the knowledge of what they might sacrifice, the money they had worked so hard to raise for tuition, the future that had been so carefully planned, or, like many others, the loved ones they would leave behind. Some left in a passion and never looked back. Others returned later, hopeful that they could pick up the pieces and still achieve their intellectual goals.

As the war progressed, many University of Michigan students made very conscious decisions to pursue their studies rather than enlist in the military. These were not easy choices. A small but vocal segment of young men on campus eventually identified themselves as Copperheads and remained in school because of their ideological opposition to the

government. Even those who considered themselves loyal to their new Republican president initially felt ambivalent regarding military duty. However, by the middle of the war, the self-doubt of this latter group disappeared, and they became inclined to rationalize their continued enrollment by arguing that their education at a university of such rising prominence would serve as preparation for their future leadership in the nation. They recognized that there would be a period of postwar reconstruction and intended to use their schooling to build the foundation for their roles in that next era. University of Michigan students engaged their fraternities or literary societies as vehicles through which to practice debating decisions of the national government, including passing judgment on military matters. Even if these men did not intend to become national politicians, they believed that the best citizens in any profession were active, well-educated, political participants. They valued education as the primary tool for shaping the general population into a loyal citizenry and viewed their own intellectual development as the first step in being able to teach the masses.

Rather than portraying patriotism as purely the province of the soldier, many young men at the University of Michigan defined it in alternate ways that mirrored their own home-front experience. Their devotion to their country became, over the course of the years, indistinguishable from pride in their university. In some cases, students went so far as to compare the growth in size and prestige of the University of Michigan to the fate or progress of their nation at war; they believed that their patriotic duty included being a part of the university's success. The students sometimes implied that this version of duty was a contribution equal to that of the soldier. Historian Melinda Lawson argues that Abraham Lincoln believed "the blood sacrifice of the soldiers defined the highest type of patriotism." Surely, Michigan college students heard his rhetoric and understood how their president characterized national duty. However, Lawson further notes, "[T]he notion that loyalty to country entailed sacrifice did not always come easily to Americans." Despite widespread encouragement to join the ranks and serve their country, University of Michigan students managed to assure themselves that their collegiate educations also distinguished them as patriots.

Understandably, these young men sought to justify their decision to remain in school. All men of military age during the Civil War era were motivated to go to war or stay at home by a variety of reasons. Copperheads often continued in school as a way to express their opposition to the

war and, in so doing, sometimes drew hostile criticism from pro-Union students and the community at large. Others who resolutely supported Lincoln and his party believed that their interests were best served by comparing themselves favorably to those fighting in the war. Through this choice of rhetoric, these aspiring leaders pursued the ideological course that they felt best positioned them to be significant contributors in the postwar period. The students quickly recognized that soldiers had the opportunity to earn glory and prove their manhood on the battlefield, so they adjusted the way that they depicted their own learning experiences in the classroom to incorporate the patriotic and manly qualities they believed Americans valued in soldiers. These promising scholars had an opportunity to be a part of something thriving; they took pride in their personal potential and the success of their university as a way to offset any criticism that might come their way for not enlisting in the army.<sup>3</sup>

The University of Michigan was one of six institutions of higher education in the state of Michigan before the Civil War. It was by far the most distinguished and it attracted students from nearly every state in the country. The territorial government initially founded the university in Detroit in 1817, but following several reorganizations, the institution moved to Ann Arbor in 1837. Its location in the northern part of the Midwest isolated this university from the physical destruction of the Civil War. The state did not, however, escape the region's notorious political and ideological conflicts between those loyal to the government and the raucous opposition of local Copperheads. Michigan residents, and by extension the students at its state university, were not immune to the turmoil that occurred in surrounding states like Ohio and Indiana, although the pro-Southern posture that held sway in much of lower Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois did not permeate Michigan's boundaries. Instead, prominent New York transplants largely shaped the culture of the town and the university. One Empire State native, Dr. Henry P. Tappan, served as president of the University of Michigan from 1852 until 1863. He oversaw important developments at the school during the prewar era, including a significant increase in enrollment and the opening of a law school. On the eve of war, most students embraced the faculty's political ideologies and enjoyed a promising economic and social relationship with the five thousand residents of Ann Arbor. Faculty encouraged, even expected, antislavery attitudes but did not promote an abolitionist agenda. In fact, students and townspeople drove traveling abolitionist speakers from the village prior to the war. The majority of

Michigan's students supported Lincoln in the election of 1860 and, as the nation succumbed to civil war, reflected the community's eastern influences regarding increasing hostility toward the South.<sup>4</sup>

After the fall of Fort Sumter, Tappan called on the students to organize themselves into military companies, hired someone to train them, set aside university property for practice, and made it clear that he expected them to drill daily. Tappan and another student favorite, history professor Andrew D. White, persuaded most of the students who were preparing to graduate that spring to wait until after commencement to enlist. For those not graduating, the war raised difficult choices. White recalled that in the fall of 1861, two students struggled with the decision of whether to enlist or continue with school. They had saved money for years to pay for college and hesitated to walk away from their dreams. White later recounted, "They could resist their patriotic convictions no longer." The students woke him up early one morning to say good-bye and departed for the army. These two men could not separate their understanding of patriotism from military duty in a time of war. For others, even this initial period of excitement in 1861 did not make enough of an impression. In November 1861, John Bennitt, a medical student, wrote home to his wife that army service did not appeal to him: "I am not very anxious to go into the Army, unless you can go along. Still I will if duty calls. . . . I shall however remain here as long as I can, for the opportunities here are too good to be lost."<sup>5</sup>

Many of the young students were not willing or able to make the decision alone. It is not surprising that the influence of home and parents still held significant sway in something as important as the decision to go to war and the abandonment of the pursuit of an education. Students anticipated that their parents would have strong views on the subject and often did not feel it appropriate to make the choice without consulting them. Immediately following the outbreak of hostilities, Stanton B. Thomas, a sophomore from Schoolcraft, Michigan, wrote home to his mother and inquired, "How does father feel about war? The citizens here had a meeting yesterday and appointed a committee to take the names of volunteers. The students have got up a large company. Don't know but I shall join it?" Presumably, the reply was not favorable, because Thomas graduated with his bachelor of science degree in 1864. Some were more determined in their requests. Joseph V. Quarles, a freshman from Kenosha, Wisconsin, implored his mother in November 1862, "Wm English writes that Col. Lane wants me to take the position of

Adjutant. . . . How I wish you would let me accept it! Although I am much pleased with this institution it would please me more to stake my life in my country's cause—The present time seems one inappropriate to be devoted to one's self when the common interests of mankind are at stake and when the future of our country depends upon the exertions of the American Youth."<sup>6</sup> Many young men who were strongly in favor of leaving school to enlist still requested a parental blessing before making such a decision.

After the war began in earnest, the students were aware that other civilians and soldiers might question their choice to remain at the University of Michigan. Self-consciously, the fraternities published their annual magazine, the *Palladium*, in December 1861 with the following editorial: "Amid' the din of a nation at war . . . it is not without some misgivings that the PALLADIUM ventures to present its humble attractions to the world. We are deeply impressed with the fact that we belong to the class of 'nobodies,' who stay at home; and with all-becoming modesty, we publish our names, merely to satisfy agonizing friends and parents that we have not all 'gone to the wars.'" A later *Palladium* editorial, written by Lincoln T. Farr of Michigan and Edward D. W. Kinne of New York, submitted, "Many whose names the Palladium of '62 proudly published to the College world as among the ardent devotees at our 'shrine of Learning' will now be found in the ranks of the army. A less warlike, perchance less patriotic and ambitious class, still remain at the University." These early years reveal that there was a sense of embarrassment running through campus, enough that students felt the necessity to articulate it through a written medium that would be saved for posterity. These thoughts were likely representative of the student body, as egregious distortions would have incurred the disapproval of others enrolled. In this way, the *Palladium* editors succeeded in reflecting the perspectives of their fellow students and giving readers some idea of the state of affairs at the Ann Arbor campus.<sup>7</sup>

In addition to the internal struggle they felt pressed to explain to others, students at the University of Michigan also had to address the way they were preparing for war on campus. "To our friends who may be surprised at the absence of all military organizations, suffice it to say, that we are possessing our souls in patience until the arrival of a new military professor," explained the students in the December 1861 *Palladium*. The board of regents had passed a resolution earlier in 1861 to pursue the creation of a military department, and while waiting for that situation

to flesh out, the students felt that the pause in their drilling companies was a "necessary delay" given the circumstances. Their defensiveness of the situation is palpable, as they wrote in their annual publication that they hoped their explanation "will account for all apparent deficiencies in that respect at present." The students hoped to have a professor with more military experience rather than the "mere drill-master" President Tappan provided upon the outbreak of war. The three student companies formed after the fall of Fort Sumter "served their purpose admirably, and supplied an immediate want, that of drill." Such experience "enabled those who went from us at that time to take the positions which belong to those whom a long, arduous course of discipline had fitted to lead, rather than to follow." Nevertheless, outsiders must have been questioning the quiet coming from campus, as the fervor with which University of Michigan students drilled in the earliest days of war seemed to have diminished. The students attempted to reassure the public that their intentions were to continue to train for war, but they deemed mediocre drilling not worthy of their time. They instead chose to do nothing until the state provided funding for suitable military professors. Thus, even as early as the first winter of war, the students who remained on campus blended the war into their paradigm of education. They were no longer driven by a passion for war but felt that only methodical, professional instruction should shape their wartime preparation.<sup>8</sup>

Students also struggled with how to participate in the Union effort from within the confines of Ann Arbor. An author in the Literary Adelpi literary-society journal, the *Hesperian*, lamented in his 1862 article "The Soldier," "Half a million and more are in the field and we are left behind. The great struggle for liberty and the Constitution is being fought; and we are quietly looking on expecting & hoping to enjoy the triumph without helping to gain the victory." An Alpha Nu member remarked in a welcome message at the start of a new term that the young men returned to school in the fall "fresh from the scenes and pleasures of home aloof from the cares of political anxiety, & far from the dangers of the 'tented field.'" Medical student Francis Thomas, a Quaker from Maryland, referred to the war in a letter as "the great game on the chessboard of the union," which "those of us who stand off out of danger" could only follow through newspapers. These young men recognized that their involvement in the nation's challenge would be from a distance.<sup>9</sup>

Many University of Michigan students thus demonstrated their patriotism through their sense of duty on the home front. As one Alpha



Nu member asserted, the students understood that “to be hopeful is our duty.” The editor of the *Hesperian* wrote in 1862 that although they could not directly witness the war and feel the emotions that accompany victory or defeat, “does it follow from this, that we can take no part in the conflict? that we have no duties to perform? No! certainly not. Every American of today has a duty to perform. The present should be a time of labor, of activity, of industry, of economy & of self-sacrifice.” In his view, the home front was responsible for providing for the needs of the soldiers in the fields and of the families who were left behind with potentially decreased resources. He implored his fellow classmates to assist, both financially and emotionally, those neighbors whose sons, fathers, brothers, and husbands were off fighting. These actions would fulfill their “duty” and “bring honor to the American cause.”<sup>10</sup>

One of the ways in which Michigan students felt they were supplying assistance to their nation was through the promotion of education. They consistently asserted that education could aid the country in its current plight and decrease the chances of future national crises. This line of thinking provided both a justification for the students’ personal choices regarding enlistment and a way to help them to define their contribution to the nation’s cause. In an 1863 article in the Alpha Nu literary-society magazine, *Sibyl*, student William B. Hendryx of Ann Arbor defines patriotism as “that feeling of attachment, which we all possess for the land that gave us birth. It is a nation’s bulwark and without it no government can exist. Within the hearts of the people, lies the strength of the nation.” He gave an example from Roman times of a soldier who was willing to put the fate of Rome above his own life, ultimately arguing that “the great aim of the American education” should be to instill this devotion in the citizenry. In the fall of 1865, when discussing questions of Reconstruction, Alpha Nu members reasoned that the ignorance of Southerners was one of the most influential factors in causing the war and strongly suggested that the national government focus on educating the Southern populace “for our own safty . . . for their own good. . . . Education is the cornerstone of a republican government when the poor whites and blacks are able to read and understand loyal papers, then they will be loyal citizens.” The students even declared that placing an army in the former Confederacy to enforce Reconstruction would be uncalled for “if the masses are properly educated.”<sup>11</sup> As part of their own growing belief that education defined their respective contributions to the war, these young men insisted on it as crucial for the rest of the American populace.

The students pursued this spread of education within their own home front in Ann Arbor by inviting speakers to address the public on important topics of the day. Faculty, students, and residents attended the presentations, which were often held in a local church. For example, in 1863, the Students' Lecture Association hosted, among others, Major General Cassius M. Clay, who spoke on the Emancipation Proclamation. The following year, Edmund Kirke, author of *My Southern Friends*, came to Ann Arbor and gave a talk, "The Southern Whites." Author Anna E. Dickinson spoke in 1864 on that year's presidential election, and Benjamin F. Taylor, a journalist for Chicago's *Evening Journal*, came to talk about his observations at Missionary Ridge. The students took their task very seriously and, in fact, stationed themselves around the room, armed with clubs, to allow the controversial abolitionist Wendell Phillips to get through his entire oration in 1862. Even if the young men could not travel south to begin educating the masses immediately, they adhered to their convictions by offering intellectual programs for the university community.<sup>12</sup>

As the University of Michigan students gradually formulated ways to associate themselves with the attributes assigned to soldiers, they began to mix the praise they offered of those who left to become soldiers with reassurances that the school and the men who stayed were also flourishing. In the fall of 1861, Illinois native Theodore Hurd and Reinzi Baker of Michigan, serving as editors of the *Palladium*, offset their inner struggle about remaining at home by linking their personal sense of nationalism with the success of the university: "Our corps of professors is full, classes well nigh swell to their accustomed numbers, and society halls are crowded. But that this is to be imputed to our prosperity, and not to our lack of patriotism, let our 'Army List' show." After less than one year of war, the students differentiated between their contribution on the home front and that of their fellow student-soldiers in the field, stating that those still in Ann Arbor "watch their careers with jealous eyes. . . . Ours is the harder lot, to stay behind, and envy their noble, patriotic self-sacrifice, and their destined honorable reward, whether the soldier's death, or the conqueror's wreath." The students who stayed behind initially expressed frustration at their position as outsiders to the country's martial endeavors but began to articulate their own claim for recognition by invoking the achievements of their college.<sup>13</sup>

Early in the war, the students were more overt in their acknowledgment of the space that separated them from their soldier brethren.

Many of the young men who returned to the university in the fall of 1861 would have known those who chose to forfeit their education to join the army. They were classmates, fraternity brothers, and friends. By the later years, it was not as often that fellow students left school for the battlefield. Instead, most who chose to enlist never began at the university in the first place. Thus, the group of young men who toiled over their books instead of marching with their weapons seemed to have felt further removed from outside judgment than those students who matriculated in late 1861.

The shifting ideology on the part of the students, which made the university the main beneficiary of their affection and honor, was reinforced in June 1863 when the board of regents fired President Tappan after a protracted power struggle. That fall, amid the uproar caused by the unexpected change at the school's helm, the students merely offered a passing comment about the war in their annual fraternity publication. Even then, their brief acknowledgment of the national situation was immersed in rhetoric about the college's greatness. The *Palladium's* editors likened the "mighty upheavals" of the formerly calm "University sea" to a "clap of thunder from a clear sky" and attributed the frenzy of the prior year in equal parts to Tappan's removal and the "great commotion and turmoil in the great body politic of the nation." The young men of Alpha Nu wrote an emotional editorial in their society journal about the board's action; reflecting the general perspective of the student body. Interestingly, the irate students chose distinctly martial language to express their displeasure. This choice of prose indicates that the students had adapted to living in a world surrounded by references to war and by 1863 found it suitable to appropriate that vocabulary in order to explain their own daily lives. The Alpha Nu piece warned returning students that the "realm of [their] miniature world has been invaded." As change threatened to alter the sense of security offered by the university, the students reacted by defending the institution and its honor, which they associated with Tappan. Their numerous petitions to the board of regents, demanding a reversal of the decision and Tappan's reinstatement, were met with hostility and condescension. The personal war undertaken in Ann Arbor between the students and the board ended in disappointment, as the board told the students to "attend to our books like good boys."<sup>14</sup>

As their idea of patriotism grew more intertwined with the prestige of the university, there was great concern among the students that they properly represent the institution. They felt that their role as students

contributed an essential element to what made the school "the third institution of learning in our land" by the middle of the war. The editor of the Alpha Nu semi-weekly journal, the *Sibyl*, noted that the class of 1863 graduated "to join in the good work of those, who have preceded them, to do as we trust no dishonor but win laurels for their Alma Mater." As these young men pursued their education, they were protective of their individual reputations and proud to link their names as a group to the University of Michigan. They were quick to defend their school's unique characteristics and were vigilant in monitoring the actions of classmates. In 1863, about thirty-five students went to Windsor, Canada, to see Clement L. Vallandigham, the notorious Copperhead leader from Ohio. William M. Hayes, a Pennsylvania native and a junior in the Law Department, identified the group as being part of the "democratic-copperhead school" and wrote home about the reaction the incident received from the rest of the student body: "[T]he democratic papers throughout this and other western states have published that the students of the University of Michigan visited [Vallandigham] and to counteract this impression the opposition held a meeting yesterday forenoon. It was attended by several hundred of the students and strong resolutions were passed condemning these actions."<sup>15</sup>

This Copperhead presence on campus cannot be overlooked. It was a significant threat to the unity of the students in the development of their wartime ideology of education as patriotism. At points during the war, actions such as this student-led pilgrimage to see a noted Copperhead leader endangered their joint promotion and defense of their enrollment at the university and its growing prestige. Gideon Winan Allen, an outspoken Copperhead student in the Law Department, wrote to his girlfriend, Annie, about the matter. In describing the students' visit to Vallandigham, which he did not attend, Allen insisted that it was "conducted in a modest unostentatious way" and that "it was nobody's business but their own." A student named Henry, in a letter to his mother regarding the same event, wrote regretfully, "[N]othing on earth but poverty hindered my going [to see Vallandigham]." When "loyal students" called a meeting at the university in response, Allen invited his fellow student Democrats to hold their own gathering in order to articulate their position to the public. The faculty tried to suppress the rising tensions by forbidding student political meetings on campus, but that only forced the determined students into a hall in Ann Arbor, where they had a rousing few hours of speeches, music, and resolutions. The

zealous Copperheads, which Allen counted at around three hundred, then formed a procession and marched through the town and the campus chanting and cheering for the Union and Vallandigham.<sup>16</sup>

Conditions became so tense during the height of Copperhead activism in the Midwest that at one point, Allen believed that some students with opposing political views would eventually challenge him to a duel. In his letters, he recorded numerous heated confrontations between himself and other students and town residents. Nonetheless, Unionist student reaction to the Copperhead outcry on campus was not always purely emotional. The young men who took offense to what they perceived as disloyalty mostly did so using the same outlets of academic life in which they analyzed the war overall. In a journal of the Literary Adelpi society in January 1864, one student wrote an essay criticizing foreign intervention in the Civil War. As a part of his discussion, he asserted, “we shall never again see the nation as it was. The nation, as a whole is passing through a revolution. Revolutions never go backwards.” He called those who demanded “the Union as it was” “short sighted conservatives utterly unread in the progress of human events.” Slavery and freedom, the two cornerstones of the republic, were incompatible and were “as explosive as gunpowder and fire.” “Thank God such a Union is gone, gone forever,” exclaimed this ardent literary-society member, “though we cannot have the old one we will have a better.” Students who criticized the Copperheads often cited the latter group’s inability to understand the country’s circumstances as unalterably moving in the direction of revolutionary change. Historian Jennifer L. Weber aptly asserts that it “remains unclear to this day how [Copperheads] expected the nation to return to the *status quo ante bellum*.”<sup>17</sup>

Despite these frictions, it seems that students, whether Copperhead or loyal, agreed clearly on their distaste for conscription. As the Union army determined that drafting soldiers became necessary by 1862, the draft began to decide the fate of some students. For the remainder of the war, conscription was a threat that the students contemplated with mixed reactions. Hayes struggled with his reaction to the draft due to his sincere support for the purposes of the war. He wrote home in late 1863 about his dilemma, “Of course it would not be pleasant or convenient for me to go home to enter the army at the present time.” Hayes asked his parents for their input should he be drafted, explaining that he could not oppose the draft because he “insist[s] on a prosecution of the war until . . . every slave is free.” He did not trust himself to make the

decision because he could not seem to reconcile his ideologies about the purpose of the war with the sacrifice that military service would require of his current academic pursuits. Hayes did not serve his country, by choice or by fate, and returned to Pennsylvania after graduation in 1864 to become a lawyer.<sup>18</sup>

In April 1863, John Hinchman, a freshman from Detroit, wrote to his mother about the students who had recently formed a battalion "for the purpose of learning the drill, in case we should all be drafted." He estimated that five hundred students participated in the one-hour practices, four nights per week. President Tappan remarked that this renewed endeavor by the students "caused no diversion from study, but [took] the place of recreation and questionable indulgences." It is telling that these students prepared to be drafted but did not go enlist of their own free will. However, by May, Hinchman reported to his mother, "Most of the fellows here have made up their minds to go into the army if they are drafted." Again, the point is *if* they were drafted but not otherwise. A resident of Ann Arbor wrote to a friend in July 1864, "[T]imes are here about as usual only that students are not quite so thick—all are excited about a draft and about every one is sure that he will have to go." Members of the student literary society Alpha Nu even proposed a debate in 1863 regarding whether university students should be exempt from the draft, but they never took a vote on the issue. They continued to prepare for the possibility of military service; in May 1863, the Literary Adelphi added three more books related to the conduct of war to its library.<sup>19</sup>

Especially by the middle part of the war when conscription threatened to remove unwilling students from classrooms and place them on the front lines, correspondence between the young men and their loved ones reveals a desire to remain apart from the conflict. Sometimes this was due to political ideology. Henry, the young man who expressed such deep disappointment at not being able to journey with his classmates to see Vallyandigham, wrote to reassure his mother, "I don't worry about [the draft], as I have about come to the conclusion that God Almighty never intended that I should fight for the 'poor nigger.'" Allen, the Copperhead law student, received letters during this period from his girlfriend, Annie, about her fear that he would be called in the upcoming draft. "Suppose you should be one of the fated," she wondered, "I will not think of it." In addition to her pleas that his serving in the war would be too hard on her, Annie also tells him she does not believe him to be "strong enough for camp life." Later that year, her mother even expressed panic to Allen

about the issue: "Do anything, everything to prevent it [being drafted] except that which is dishonorable. . . . I could not give up my darling boy! . . . No, it cannot, must not be."<sup>20</sup>

Allen took a hard stance toward the draft. After his name was collected during the conscription-enrollment process, he wrote to Annie in June 1863, "If I am drafted you may be sure of one thing, there will be a battle soon after. Perhaps, though, I'll just make a speech denouncing the administration and the war. . . . I'll be arrested, have a mock trial, make myself notorious, be sent South, refuse to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy, and be sent back, a la Vallyandigham." Allen did not support the draft nor sympathize with its intentions. He was content with his political views and not hesitant to express them. "This much I think I may venture to say," he concluded with vigor, "at all events, that this war is an abomination in sight of God and honest men; and that our government is in the hands of either fools or traitors." Although a devout Republican, Annie agreed with his revulsion with the draft. Her concern continued through the summer and fall as various conscription acts pulled more young men from the North. Allen assured her that he would buy an exemption from serving, mainly because his feelings were too strong against the war. The draft "is not among my troubles," he promised Annie in September 1863, "and I hope you will think of it no more." Though faced with the prospect of conscription several times during the war, Allen did not receive a summons to serve during the conflict.<sup>21</sup>

Not all students were as pensive on the subject. University of Michigan law student Charles B. Howell from Pontiac wrote to his brother, "I suppose the draft which commences to-day will 'gobble' me up, and then I shall perhaps wish I had got insured for exemption." Howell guessed right, he was drafted, but the next month, he returned to Ann Arbor after having arranged for a substitute. By early 1864, Howell seemed carefree, declaring to his brother, "I am in the most excellent health, and the world moves here pretty much in consonance with my wishes." Students could have chosen to return home to enlist in their local regiment or to join Ann Arbor residents in attempting to fulfill the community's soldier quota and avoid a draft. Yet, despite Ann Arbor's offers of bounties for this purpose, many students stayed in school. If drafted, it appears that some found ways, probably through their parents, to pay for a substitute. The rest did not find the country's apparent need for more soldiers in the field compelling enough to leave what they increasingly considered their own patriotic work as university students.<sup>22</sup>

Other students viewed conscription with dread because they had already served a term in the army and were in no hurry to return. Quarles, the underclassman who had begged his mother to allow him to enlist early in the war, served in a Hundred Days' regiment in the summer of 1864. As his term was ending, Quarles decided not to reenlist and instead to return to school. In a letter to his mother, the young man wrote disdainfully about the draft, remarking that it would be "just my fortune" to have to serve under those circumstances. He feared that the chances of finding a substitute were hopeless, causing "a poor fellow [to] 'tote' a musket." Disillusionment with the prospect of soldiering plagued students on the home front as it did other Northerners by the end of the war.<sup>23</sup>

In addition to the threat of the draft, students at the University of Michigan also dealt with how their decision to remain in school affected the "quest for manhood." Historian Lorien Foote calls this pursuit "a central question . . . in the Civil War era" and argues that manhood "indicated an achievement rather than an innate nature that all biological males possessed." These students surely felt that their education symbolized a significant level of personal accomplishment, but the war complicated this notion. Suddenly, the successes for which they strove may not have been the feats and triumphs valued by the larger American society. By late summer 1861, the young men who had been motivated to join the war from their hearts, or for other reasons, had already done so. Others waited, perhaps for parental permission, while some considered their decision regarding enlistment from a different perspective. Spurred not by a hatred of slavery or a sense of duty, these students, like many other American men, instead waited to determine the level of personal benefit that would come from fighting in the war. What they sought was associations with the war that would further the public's perception of them as gentlemen. Charles L. Watrous, a junior at University of Michigan from Freetown, New York, implored White, his professor and fellow Empire State native, regarding an officer commission in August 1861. Despite a letter of recommendation from Tappan, Watrous had failed to obtain a commission from the state of Michigan. If he enlisted in Michigan, Watrous would face "carrying a musket, which I don't feel just ready to do." Quite sure that he "had the material of which officers are made," Watrous wrote to White to see if the professor had any connections back in their home state. Although it was obvious that the young man sought individual recognition before he would lower himself to join the military



rank and file, he tried to persuade White to respond quickly, as “at present, it is very hard to work to ‘keep cool’ and study.” Soon, however, students who remained at the university argued that they were still developing the traits of those who left to fight.<sup>24</sup>

Indeed, by 1863, students came to assert that their involvement in the University of Michigan’s achievements was an accomplishment equal to that of valor on the battlefield. *Palladium* editors Farr and Kinne boasted that year that though some may consider the students a “less patriotic and ambitious class” than those in the ranks of the army, “the fact that our zéal continues unabated, the labors of our several Professors untiring and successful, and that our number, although somewhat diminished, exceeds that of many institutions located nearer the Atlantic;—these facts speak eloquently in commendation of the present flourishing condition, and the encouraging prospects of our University.” They even linked the courage former students demonstrated on the battlefield as inspiring those who remained in Ann Arbor to rededicate themselves to their studies in order to prove that “college life has not yet ‘begun to swoon.’” These descriptive choices highlight the negotiation underway by the students to ally themselves with the manly characteristics ascribed to their compatriots on the battlefield. The students also refuted any suggestions that remaining on campus challenged their manhood. They described life on campus in ways that conjured up images of strength and endurance and used gendered language to emphasize further that their continued presence on the home front was not feminizing them. In fact, they shaped an argument by which their education provided them the manly qualities that they perceived the public likely believed they could only obtain by fighting.<sup>25</sup>

In 1864, this assertion about the increasing prestige of the university became more explicit. Confidence replaced self-consciousness regarding the attention of these young men to their education rather than to their possible national military duty in wartime. “Though the nation may be struggling for life,” stated that year’s *Palladium* editors, Scovel Stacy of Michigan and Schuyler Grant of Connecticut, “though the din of arms and roar of battle may greet us from without, though the noble sons of our Alma Mater are falling by scores in defence of their country’s flag, yet the University of Michigan rides proudly on, buffeting the stormy waves, acquiring continually, strength, beauty and renown, an honor to the State, a center of learning for the great north-west, and an object of pride and reverence to her sons.” This kind of prose encompassed the

characteristics of manhood so sought by the young men of this generation; a university education now symbolized more than intellectual accomplishment. It provided strength, honor, pride, and beauty—all attributes of gentlemen and specifically during the Civil War terms used to pay tribute to Union officers and gloried soldiers.<sup>26</sup>

Whether for political or personal reasons, the initial hesitation students had about their role in the conflict was replaced by new ideas concerning their contributions to the nation's conflict. As the war passed its midpoint, the persistent theme in the students' discourse on patriotism, duty, and honor revolved specifically around their individual education at the University of Michigan. These young men believed that they were to become members of the future generation of leaders who would help the nation reconcile after the war. As the conflict progressed, the students spent less time bemoaning their dilemma regarding the choice between education and military duty and more time boasting of the invaluable role they would play in returning the country to greatness. In 1863, the *Palladium* described the students as "gratified, that in this the hour of our country's peril . . . the sons of Michigan, and of her sister States gathered together at this 'Western Athens,' are not found recreant to their sacred duties and obligations, as scholars, true patriots, and as sharers of the common blessings that our Government bestows." The fraternity members proclaimed confidently toward the end of the war that despite the failure to yet achieve peace, "the country is alive to her educational interests, and the coming generation will not be wanting in strong and cultivated minds." Hendryx filled his *Sibyl* article with inspirational prose about the destiny that undoubtedly lay ahead for University of Michigan graduates: "A shattered society will have to be reconstructed. . . . To shape the future destinies of this nation aright we shall need men of sterling worth and integrity . . . always supporting the cause of truth and justice upon the shoulders of the young men of to-day fall the burden. Let us prepare to receive it."<sup>27</sup>

Soon after the Union victory in 1865, the *Palladium's* editor, Henry Smith of Johnstown, Ohio, spoke even more passionately regarding the advantages derived from an education at the University of Michigan. He argued that no school offered a better opportunity for someone who wanted to participate in the "profound knowledge and deep research" that would be necessary during Reconstruction. "No period of a young man's life is so important and critical as his years at college," the editor insisted. "Here is the turning point to future prosperity and usefulness,

or to oblivion." According to these ambitious young Americans, four years spent in the military, defending the nation's Constitution, did not apparently measure up to a college education. And by way of further convincing themselves that their efforts in the classroom were as demanding and manly as time spent in uniform, the editor remarked that veterans who enrolled in the university in the fall of 1865 "have proved themselves as strenuous in the pursuits of education as they were valiant in war."<sup>28</sup>

During the war years, University of Michigan extracurricular clubs and organizations threw themselves into their patriotic public responsibilities. Literary societies especially concentrated their attention on current events, routinely staging rigorous debates and formal votes about contentious topics of the day. Essentially, University of Michigan students utilized these venues as a means by which to practice and hone their leadership skills. Their debates allowed them to examine and pass judgment on the political, economic, and military decisions made by their incumbent national government. By pretending to stand in the shoes of a Union general, President Lincoln, or Congress, these young men rehearsed how they would scrutinize and react to similar situations and began to build their agendas and ideas regarding the future direction of the country. Considering the changing patterns of their views also reveals how Michigan students actively shaped their involvement in the war despite their distance from it.

The Alpha Nu literary society followed a largely conservative Republican ideology. In 1860, the young men agreed that the concept of popular sovereignty was "unsound in theory and unsafe in practice." Following Lincoln's inauguration, they called for his government to end the secession movement with military force and supported the administration's request that General John C. Frémont modify his proclamation that liberated slaves in Missouri in 1861. Members of Alpha Nu did not accept emancipation as a military tactic but did believe that it should be required of the Southern states following their eventual defeat. Students debated several major national political decisions from the Trent Affair to foreign intervention in the war. In December 1862, they believed that separation from the South was better than a Union with slavery but the next month denied that the federal government should assume more centralized power during the war. Their position on slavery held the Republican line in 1862, as they found the abolition of slavery in Washington, D.C., acceptable and declared that the Emancipation Proclamation was "demanded by the exigencies of the times."

Alpha Nu members also supported Lincoln in the limitations he placed on the Northern press and his decision to withhold speedy trials for some of those arrested and imprisoned during the war.<sup>29</sup>

Military matters held special interest for these young men. For example, they debated the propriety of prisoner exchanges with the Confederacy, the decision to remove General George Brinton McClellan, and General William Tecumseh Sherman's order to evacuate civilians in Atlanta, Georgia. Abstract military ideas also piqued their attention. In May 1863, the students defeated a resolution that "a monarchy is better adapted than a Republic for successfully waging war." The next year, students disagreed that "victories are due more to the bravery of the soldier than to the skill of the general." One wonders whether their former classmates-turned-soldiers would have agreed. Foreign policy also received thoughtful attention; in April 1865, for example, the students resolved that the U.S. government should enforce the Monroe Doctrine against Maximilian's regime in Mexico.<sup>30</sup>

The Alpha Nu students' dedication to Lincoln was unwavering, and they agreed that he should retain his position in 1864. During the war and following Lincoln's assassination, the Alpha Nu *Sibyl* contained many poems and articles in tribute to their leader. "The Honest Man, our Saviour and our Friend, the Great Emancipator," one contributor mourned on April 21, 1865, "now lies enshrined. . . . Nature might stand up and say to all the world, This was a man." These young men consistently supported both Lincoln's political and military policies but clearly remained aloof from the more far-reaching aims of the left wing of his party. As the war came to a close and Republicans started to divide over questions of Reconstruction policies toward the rebellious states and the freed slaves, the conservative character of the Alpha Nu members' Republicanism became apparent. Twice in 1865 (February and September), members voted that blacks should not be granted the franchise. That fall, they voted against the idea that the Southern states formerly in rebellion should be reorganized as territories.<sup>31</sup>

Literary Adelphi followed an unmistakably different trajectory during the war era. These students began the secession period from a chiefly Democratic standpoint. Despite adopting a resolution that "neither Congress nor the legislature of a territory have the right to protect slave property in the territory," they upheld the decision to execute John Brown and contended that it was appropriate for states to nullify federal laws that they deemed unconstitutional. As 1861 opened, the students of this group

called on the president to prepare Washington, D.C., for invasion but did not support the use of arms to put down the rebellion. Instead, the Literary Adelphi decided against the idea that "the separation of the gulf states would be detrimental to civilization." They declared that the Union should be preserved "as it is and the constitution as our fathers bequeathed it."<sup>32</sup>

Interestingly, though, the results of Literary Adelphi debates began to take a clear turn toward a Republican stance in the fall of 1861. At the start of the new term in October, these members declared support for Frémont's proclamation. Although they did not encourage wholesale emancipation when debated later that month, they decided by April 1862 "that the present condition and future prosperity of the country demand that the constitution be amended as to entirely exclude slavery within its limits." Again in April 1863, the students agreed that immediate abolition was necessary, and in October, they insisted that Congress should not accept a peace at war's end without complete emancipation. While their position on freedom appears consistent by the middle of the war, the students voted in March 1864 to support a prisoner exchange with the South "without regard to colored troops." Their political perspective, therefore, still adhered to the more moderate elements of the Republican Party.<sup>33</sup>

Throughout the war, Literary Adelphi members also debated military affairs and twice in 1862 declared that Lincoln should not remove McClellan from command of the Army of the Potomac. General Ambrose Everett Burnside, however, did not receive similar tolerance, as his failure at Fredericksburg prompted the students to encourage his dismissal in December of that year. They supported Lincoln in his suppression of the freedom of the press, in his suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, and in his decision to arrest and then banish Vallandigham. Only in May 1864 did this group finally decide that McClellan's removal was justified. Despite these pro-Lincoln tendencies, there appears to be a decided shift towards a Radical Republican stance in the Literary Adelphi hall during the last year of the war. In the fall of 1864, the students denounced the proposal that the government should arrange a peace conference to end the hostilities and, for the first time, took a critical position on a question about Lincoln: They found him at fault for the failures of McClellan's Peninsula campaign. Unlike their counterparts in the Alpha Nu, these young men twice voted in 1865 (April and November) to extend the right to vote to black men. In March 1866, the students sided with Radical Republicans in their denial of admission to representatives sent to Congress from the former Confederate states. These Literary Adelphi

members traveled the furthest ground politically during the war era, from a Democratic viewpoint to that of the Radical Republicans.<sup>34</sup>

Both literary societies offered their members the opportunity to express their developing opinions in written form. Individual students wrote articles, poems, and stories to share with each other. During the war years, themes about the nation's plight dominated the pages. In 1861, one Literary Adelpi student outlined "our nation's duty" in his persuasive commentary on the need for immediate emancipation. He called slavery a "heaven-closing and man-degrading institution" and identified it as the cause of the war. These views were already somewhat ahead of the general opinion regarding abolition so early in the war, but the student leapt in front of popular discourse when he insisted, "[E]mancipate every negro and if need be put arms into their hands." His tone was confident, his demands clear, and his awareness of historical and current political exigencies exhibits the characteristics of leadership that these young men felt they needed to master. As the fall term commenced in 1865 and the postwar period started to take shape, Alpha Nu members began to articulate their self-proclaimed importance to the new era. "Armed resistance is vanquished," the students declared in their journal, "but reconstruction is not effected. Time alone can solve the problem; meanwhile we may exercise the right of American citizens—the privilege of recommending and suggesting our own views."<sup>35</sup>

When debating current events, members of both literary societies explored their positions on questions that would have been facing them had they been leaders in the national government, their own towns, or churches at that time. Their belief that an educated citizenry would guide the masses through Reconstruction drove their consistent return to these issues. They argued, played devil's advocate, prepared and gave speeches, and conducted their meetings in a manner that they felt would prepare them for their future responsibilities. Admittedly, throughout the period, these young men also entertained topics that had nothing to do with the war. They frequently deliberated on subjects such as the character of Oliver Cromwell, the intentions of the Church of Rome, the historical benefit of the Crusades, and whether "man is greater in his affection than in his intellect." The literary societies chose subjects from a broad spectrum of personal enhancement, economics, political history, and religion, to name a few. The propriety of protective tariffs, for example, repeatedly appeared for debate. But their regular interest in contemporary themes of national concern demonstrates that they

considered themselves involved in the affairs of their country and engaged in those real-world situations as best they could from Ann Arbor. It is intriguing to note that although these young men agreed that their education and participation in debate societies like the Alpha Nu or Literary Adelphi shaped them for their inevitable positions among the highly regarded of their generation, these two groups came to represent the two opposing factions of the Republican Party. By the end of the war, the University of Michigan sent into the world educated and talented men who would essentially populate at least two of the major viewpoints on the political landscape.<sup>36</sup>

The demographic makeup of each organization may have played a significant role in the differing and shifting political positions of these two groups of young men at the University of Michigan. In considering the six school years from 1860–61 to 1865–66, the percentage of members in the Alpha Nu literary society who originally hailed from Michigan significantly outnumbered the same category in the Literary Adelphi society. For example, in the 1860–61 school year, 73 percent of Alpha Nu's members identified a town in Michigan as their primary residence, compared to 57 percent of Literary Adelphi's membership. The following year, the ratio was even more drastic, as Alpha Nu remained about even at 72 percent, while Literary Adelphi claimed 48 percent of its members from within Michigan's borders. This pattern continued throughout the war. Michigan residents constituted more than half of Alpha Nu's membership each year until 1865–66, while Literary Adelphi attracted at least half or a majority from outside the state every year after 1861. By 1865–66, only 33 percent of Literary Adelphi's membership cited Michigan residency. It is potentially a large generalization to draw conclusions based on these figures, but it appears that the influence of larger numbers of non-Michigan residents may have affected the perspective of the Literary Adelphi in swinging it to a more Radical Republican political stance as the war continued. The catalogues show that more students from the East began to enroll in the University of Michigan as the war progressed, and these students would have eventually come to sway or offset those of the midwestern students who may have been more susceptible to the volatile political loyalties of their region. That Alpha Nu remained Republican but leaned more toward the Conservative side is also explainable by the fact that large majorities of their membership came from within the state until the war was over. Even in this Northern, Midwest state, Democrats had regained some political power during the

midwar years, and Republicans found themselves needing to moderate controversial positions. Michigan youth who took their oath to Alpha Nu at the University of Michigan, not surprisingly, reflected their state's wartime ambivalence to the political agenda of the Radical Republicans.<sup>37</sup>

Beyond the practice that literary societies afforded them in preparing for their future positions of leadership in the country, the students sought and created other opportunities to build upon their roles as student-patriots and hone skills that they might need upon graduation. Hosts of other student-run organizations existed, with elected leadership positions and plenty of chances to develop and hold large public events, social affairs, or ceremonies that represented occasions these young men could use to gain important experiences. For example, in a January 1864 letter to his brother, Charles B. Howell wrote about a speech he gave in the law school's moot congress regarding Lincoln's Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction. In another instance one morning after chapel, close to the election of 1864, the students in the Literary Department took a vote on Lincoln versus McClellan. Lincoln garnered 131 votes, while McClellan polled 24. William H. Boardman gleefully wrote home to his father in Illinois, "It was the first time I ever had the pleasure of casting a vote for old Abe."<sup>38</sup>

Quarles recognized the importance of the presidential election in his November 9, 1864, speech. He called it "one of the great dates in history" because both Europe and the soldiers of the rebellious states were waiting in "breathless suspense for the result." Quarles clearly delineated what the American people were choosing between—either to continue the war or seek immediate peace. He was confident that Lincoln would win because "we prefer war, bitter war to such a peace as our enemies declare they will alone accept." The speech is remarkable in its lucid analysis of the political and military consequences of the election. Quarles drew parallels between this event and other historical moments in American history to help make his argument about the date's significance. Interestingly, though, there are clear similarities in prose between Quarles's oration and the Gettysburg Address. The young man obviously invoked Lincoln as his muse while lifting phrases, such as "mystic chords," directly from the president's inaugural message. In seeking to earn the right to someday replace their idols and lead the country, University of Michigan students learned by mimicking these men.<sup>39</sup>

Brothers in the Delta Kappa Epsilon fraternity (Omicron chapter at the University of Michigan) had the opportunity to practice their own



formula for communication between North and South when, in March 1862, they replied to a letter from the Gamma chapter at Vanderbilt University in Tennessee. The Omicron members extended their “promises of sincere and eternal fidelity” to the Southern chapter despite location, political party, or “whether they owe allegiance to Lincoln or to [Jefferson] Davis.” The author’s superior attitude is apparent despite his best attempts to make statements of brotherhood; it is as if he cannot bring himself to be truly pleasant without reminding the Gamma members of the current situation. “I hope you will be able to prosper as well as you always have deserved,” one part of the letter begins, “notwithstanding the trials which beset you and your state. It does not become me to allude to the causes which have brought on the trouble in our country whatever they may be.” Later, there is a reference to a conversation between Delta Kappa Epsilon soldiers on opposing sides in the eastern theater of the war. The condescension is obvious in the remark that “we were very much pleased to hear from them and to hear of their regret for the necessity which compels them to take up arms against their brothers in ΔKE.” This clearly places blame for the war on Southern shoulders. The overall tone of the letter is warm, but it was obvious that the Omicron brothers in Michigan wanted to subtly indicate that the relationship was, and would continue to be, affected by the war’s circumstances.<sup>40</sup>

Whether hosting a national figure for a public speech, practicing arguing a point in a moot court, or participating in a mock election, these young men found a variety of ways to train for their future endeavors. Through these forms of practice, students ultimately defined their ideas of patriotism and their understanding of their role in the war. Their function as citizens of the nation in this time of martial conflict was to prepare themselves to hold positions of leadership as the country began its inevitable rebuilding process. Their active intellectual engagement in the most pivotal issues facing their government, including their concentrated attention to the possible needs of the Reconstruction period, makes it evident that the University of Michigan became not just a place to obtain an education in the classics or prepare for a certain standing in society. These young men expanded the purpose of the university to suit their specific needs, through these clubs and organizations, and shaped their developing ideologies regarding the nation’s future. In the end, their understanding of their role encompassed not only the verbal expressions of loyalty to the country expected from home-front citizens but also the utilization of the resources at their fingertips in a way that

would label them as patriots and, thus, as men, despite the shadow cast by not wearing a military uniform.

It is true that during many days at the University of Michigan, the battlefield seemed little more than a distant concept. The students, of course, saw the disabled and deceased soldiers returning to their towns, watched families mourn the loss of loved ones, and felt the contrasting thrill of final victory followed by the grief over Lincoln's assassination. But for these young men who each at some point contemplated going to war, their daily lives in the "circumscribed college world" essentially intertwined with the way that they experienced the conflict. Granted, for a few days following the fall of Fort Sumter, the university cancelled classes, and the students spent most of their time drilling on the campus greens and attending Union mass meetings. However, there was hardly the same type of paralyzing response long term that so many other universities, North and South, experienced during the war era. In Ann Arbor, students, faculty, and residents managed to integrate the immense changes wrought by the nation's civil war into their daily lives. Often, the hours were passed in mundane ways and lacked drama despite the national crisis. Albert Farley captured the reality of their isolation from immediate physical harm in his January 7, 1864, diary entry: "Nothing wonderful has happened today. Nothing is expected and consequently there is no disappointment." Because daily life at the University of Michigan offered this combination of normalcy and the ability to shape and express one's grasp of worldly affairs in an academic setting, students who attended this Ann Arbor campus had the unique opportunity of being intellectually and emotionally engaged in the Civil War while being effectively sheltered from its military aspects. This distinct combination of elements significantly affected their front experience.<sup>41</sup>

Ultimately, because of their seclusion from the battlefield in the northern part of the Midwest and because of the increasing prestige of the university they attended, most Michigan students came to declare loyalty to both their nation and their college in equal measure. In fact, in some instances, they put drama associated with events transpiring within their midst ahead of the attention they gave to wartime news. University of Michigan students took such pride in their institution that often their patriotism, their understanding of their role in shaping the nation's course during this war, was indistinguishable from their understanding of what it meant to be a student on that campus. They characterized patriotism

within a narrow spectrum of their contemporary experience, effectively enabling them to justify their continued presence in Ann Arbor. Rather than literally engaging in martial combat to save the country, these students considered themselves patriots by their intellectual contributions at the university and dedication to education in general. Staying in school became the equivalent of fighting the rebels. Michigan students embraced gendered rhetoric to highlight the manly qualities of obtaining an education, and they benefited from this altered portrait of the university experience. Even if they could not always agree on the political motivations for their ideas of patriotism, as the rise and decline of Copperhead rhetoric and activity colored the campus during the middle of the war, students at the University of Michigan argued for a Union that they hoped would remain strong and command respect. Especially as the war turned from months into years and talk of entering the army instead of getting a degree lessened, these students felt that they performed their patriotic duty by helping the university thrive and by intentionally participating in the prosperity of their immediate home front.

Another fascinating aspect of the home-front experience at the University of Michigan is that the way that these students molded their ideas about patriotism and duty was through their focus on their future contributions to the nation's reconstruction period. Yes, they were currently not offering their lives on the battlefield, but in their minds, their education was just as important because soon after the war, they would take seats next to the most important local and national politicians, lawyers, and clergymen to help influence the way the country moved forward. Those students who disagreed with the Lincoln administration earned valuable experience in being the voice of opposition during this period, although largely overshadowed in the end by those who pledged their loyalties to the president's agenda. These years in Ann Arbor were more than class pranks or reciting Greek; the students actively engaged and took charge of how they developed their individual characters with the intention of being informed and contributing citizens in the postwar era. They mobilized their extracurricular organizations around questions of wartime policy, including all aspects of political, economic, military, and intellectual issues. In both verbal and written forms, these students sharpened their debating skills, practiced articulating their emotions and opinions in poems or speeches, and learned to hear, respect, and consider the beliefs of others. The University of Michigan continued to grant degrees during the Civil War, with perhaps one of the most

impressive records in higher education given the circumstances. The school also grew to notable new heights in national prestige. More than this, though, the young men who took advantage of the opportunities associated with the institution came of age in a time when they may have faced criticism in order to be there and yet defiantly sought fulfillment of the role they deemed was their destiny.

### Notes

I thank Dr. Leonne M. Hudson, Dr. Lesley J. Gordon, Dr. J. Matthew Gallman, Monika Flaschka, Brenda Faverty, and Anthony Mujic for their insightful comments on this essay. I also extend my deepest appreciation to the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan for the generous Bordin-Gillette Researcher Travel Fellowship, which supported my research for this essay.

1. *Peninsular Courier* (Ann Arbor, Michigan), February 18, 1862, quoted in F. Clever Bald, "The University of Michigan in the Civil War," in Willis F. Dunbar, ed., *Michigan Institutions of Higher Education in the Civil War* (Lansing: Michigan Civil War Centennial Observance Commission, 1964), 21–22.

2. Henry M. Utley and Byron M. Cutcheon, *The Class of Sixty-One: University of Michigan and Something about What "the Boys" Have Been Doing during Forty Years from 1861 to 1901* (Detroit, MI: John Bornman, 1902), 40; Bald, "University of Michigan," 19. Enrollment dropped slightly for the 1861–62 and 1862–63 school years but rose to over 850 by 1863–64. The University experienced another impressive increase to more than 950 students in 1864–65. State University of Michigan, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan), 1860–1866, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter Bentley Library).

Three main departments at the university during the war era were the Literary, Medical, and Law Departments. Enrollment in the Literary Department, which offered courses to undergraduates in the classics, the sciences, and civil engineering, remained below 300 students until the year after the war ended. The Medical and Law Departments contributed the most to the university's overall expansion. The Law Department grew from 156 students in 1860–61 to 386 in 1865–66. The Medical Department saw student registrations jump from 166 in 1859–60 to 465 in 1865–66. Thus, the Literary Department declined from contributing 41 percent of total enrollment to 29 percent over the war period, while the Medical and Law Departments rose from 36 percent and 23 percent to 39 percent and 32 percent, respectively. See State University of Michigan, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students*, for more details. Emerson David Fite attributes the increase in the Medical Department to a larger interest in related professional opportunities in the military but offers no explanation regarding the increases in the Law Department. Fite, *Social and Industrial Conditions in the North during the Civil War* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1963), 238. My current research has not been able to deny or prove his claim, but it seems more likely that the increased enrollments were related to the growing popularity of professional degrees. The University of Michigan was on the cutting edge of offering programs that "responded more directly to the specific problems of society" rather than teaching ancient languages and philosophy. Alan Creutz, *From College Teacher to University Scholar: The Evolution and Professionalization*

of *Academics at the University of Michigan* (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1981), 503; Howard H. Peckham, *The Making of the University of Michigan, 1817-1967* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967), 57.

Historians have considered some aspects of the impact of the war on higher education, but their work usually focuses on student experiences as soldiers or includes brief analyses of the war period in a larger institutional analysis. Their research does reinforce the unique nature, however, of circumstances at the University of Michigan, where the war period saw increases in enrollment and the expansion of curriculum. For example, Richard F. Miller contends that "within a few days [of the fall of Fort Sumter] Harvard itself had almost ceased to function." Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, suffered such enrollment and financial difficulties that they struggled to recover even after the war and closed in 1873 for more than ten years. Many Southern universities closed their doors when the war began and either never reopened or later appeared in a form much different than originally intended. In his institutional history of Tulane University, John P. Dyer asserts that the "parsimonious legislatures and lethargic citizens of New Orleans had failed to kill the university, but the war now administered the *coup de grâce*." Tulane ceased to operate during the four years of war, and its buildings stood "silent and deserted." Richard F. Miller, *Harvard's Civil War: A History of the Twentieth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry* (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2005), 16; John D. Millett, *Higher Education in Ohio* (Ohio Interim Commission on Education, 1962), 33; Willis Rudy, *The Campus and a Nation in Crisis: From the American Revolution to Vietnam* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 1996), 60; John P. Dyer, *Tulane: The Biography of a University, 1834-1965* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 28.

Additionally, in 1964, the Michigan Civil War Centennial Observance Committee published a book of essays regarding the wartime experience of the state's colleges and its one university. No other college in Michigan had as many students as did the University of Michigan, but many were established institutions that weathered the conflict despite significantly decreased numbers in the student body. Kalamazoo College, for example, reached upwards of 400 students in the 1850s but had no students enrolled in the senior class by the middle of the war. In two of the war years, Michigan State Agricultural College graduated no students. Several colleges saw increases in the number of enrolled female students, who were not admitted to the University of Michigan until 1870. Beyond enrollment numbers, administrative decisions, or stories of former students serving in battle, these essays continued the pattern of not providing insight into how the students who remained on campus viewed themselves during the war. Granted, some of this neglect is due to a severe lack of sources from the period. The sheer quantity and quality of sources for University of Michigan students make a more thorough analysis of the ideology of its student body during the Civil War all the more important. See Michigan Civil War Centennial Observance Commission, *Michigan Institutions of Higher Education in the Civil War* (Lansing, MI, 1964).

3. Melinda Lawson, *Patriot Fires: Forging a New American Nationalism in the Civil War North* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), 163, 9. Several historians have addressed patriotism as a concept and as a motivation for enlistment in the Civil War. In addition to Lawson, see also James M. McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Earl J. Hess, *The Union Soldier in Battle: Enduring the Ordeal of Combat* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997); Gerald F. Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat*

in *the American Civil War* (New York: Free Press, 1987); Merle Curti, *Roots of American Loyalty* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).

4. Donald George Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities before the Civil War* (Hamden, CT: Archon, 1965), 215. Students native to states other than Michigan came to the University of Michigan for the 1860–61 school year from Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Canada.<sup>7</sup> State University of Michigan, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students, 1860*; Frank W. Blackmar, *The History of Federal and State Aid to Higher Education in the United States* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1890), 239–41; Bald, “University of Michigan,” 16; *History of Washtenaw County, Michigan; Together with Sketches of Its Cities, Villages and Townships, Educational, Religious, Civil, Military, and Political History; Portraits of Prominent Persons, and Biographies of Representative Citizens*, (Chicago: Chapman, 1881), 2:879, 887; John Edward Shay Jr., *Residence Halls in the Age of the University: Their Development at Harvard and Michigan, 1850–1930*, PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1966, 51, 52, 52n2; New York Society Records (1860–63), New York Society (Ann Arbor, MI), Bentley Library.

It is important to distinguish between being pro-Southern and being an adherent of the Democratic party’s conservative wing, who were labeled Copperheads during the Civil War. In characterizing Copperheads, Jennifer L. Weber argues that they “were consistent, and constant in their demand for an immediate peace settlement. At times they were willing to trade victory for peace. . . . It remains unclear to this day how they expected the nation to return to the *status quo ante bellum*. . . . [The] peace wing never acknowledged Confederate wishes [for independence]. . . . Besides the desire for peace, the common denominator for all conservatives was their concern about personal liberties. Peace men were strict constructionists about the constitution. . . . Peace Democrats universally supported slavery, believing it to be the best situation for a degraded race. . . . Many conservatives blamed the abolitionists for starting the war. Southerners, by this account, were the innocent victims. . . . For their many faults, though, most Copperheads were not traitors. Though some made no bones about their Southern sympathies, most were genuinely committed to the well-being of the nation. . . . [T]he vast majority were loyal to the Union. . . . They did not want the Confederacy to win or the Union to split.” When considering the pro-Southern actions and posturing of many communities in the southern Ohio River border regions of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois during the Civil War, it is clear that the Copperhead activity of Michigan generally falls short of being overtly pro-Southern. Weber’s work, as just one example, illustrates the range of Copperhead activity in the North and does not identify Michigan as being among the most virulent states in its support of either the Copperhead agenda or pro-Southern activities. Weber, *Copperheads: The Rise and Fall of Lincoln’s Opponents in the North* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 3–7.

The state of Michigan polled 57 percent of its popular vote for Lincoln in the 1860 presidential election. For more information on the early development of the university, its characteristics, and its relationship with Ann Arbor, see Peckham, *Making of the University of Michigan*; Burke Hinsdale, *History of the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1906); Wilfred B. Shaw, *A Short History of the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor, MI: George Wahr, 1937); Elizabeth M. Farrand, *History of the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor, MI: Register, 1885); Kent Sagendorph, *Michigan: The Story of the University* (New York: Dutton, 1948); Richard Rees Price, *The*

*Financial Support of the University of Michigan: Its Origin and Development* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1923); Jonathan Marwil, *A History of Ann Arbor* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987); George S. May, "Ann Arbor and the Coming of the Civil War," *Michigan History* 36 (1952): 241-59.

5. Ike Elliot, "Stepped from Class Room to Ranks of Union Army," in Class of 1861 (University of Michigan) records, 1861 and 1910, Bentley Library; Bald, "University of Michigan," 18-20; Charles M. Perry, *Henry Philip Tappan: Philosopher and University President* (New York: Arno, 1971), 271-72; Andrew D. White, *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White* (1905; New York: Century, 1922), i:90; Robert Beasecker, ed., "I Hope to Do My Country Service": *The Civil War Letters of John Bennett, M.D.* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2005), 10-11. Bennett did enlist in the summer of 1862, but it appears that it was more for the financial benefit to his family than for patriotic reasons.

6. Stanton B. Thomas to Mother, April 16, 1861, folder Thomas, Correspondence, 1860-64, box 1, Nathan M. Thomas Papers, Bentley Library; State University of Michigan, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students, 1864*; Joseph V. Quarles to Mother, November 23, 1862, folder Correspondence 1860-62, box 2, Joseph V. Quarles Papers, 1843-1911, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

7. Editorial, *University Palladium*, December 1861, 3, Bentley Library (hereafter cited as *Palladium*). This magazine lists the names of members of the Greek societies, literary societies, religious clubs, departmental organizations, and nonacademic extracurricular activities, such as choir, chess, or cricket. Beginning in 1861, the magazine also published the army roll of alumni and past students. While available evidence seems to indicate that the students were debating their role in the war among themselves and writing primarily for an audience of their peers, it is also possible that they were reacting to pressure to enlist from the outside. Whether they were feeling compelled to join the military effort from fellow students or Ann Arbor residents or friends and family at home, it remains plausible that some portion of their concern for justifying their decision to remain in school stems from the very publicized pressure that the home front was placing on all able-bodied men when the war first broke out. For more, see James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1989), 311; Lindermaier, *Embattled Courage*, 87-90; Jeanie Attie, *Patriotic Toil: Northern Women and the American Civil War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 28. Regarding reenlistment pressure, see John Robertson, "Re-Enlistment Patterns of Civil War Soldiers," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32, no. 1 (2001): 15-35.

8. *Palladium*, December 1861.

9. *Hesperian*, February 7, 1862, box 1, Records, 1857-1939, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan), Bentley Library; *Sibyl*, November 6, 1863, box 3, Records, 1843-1931, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan), Bentley Library (hereafter Alpha Nu's *Sibyl* cited as *Sibyl*). The *Hesperian* and the *Sibyl* are bound volumes kept by the literary societies in the fashion of the day. These are internal literary papers that were read aloud within the society meetings on a regular basis. They were not intended for outside eyes, nor were they published for public consumption. They were often collections of essays, poems, arguments, or other literary expressions meant as another opportunity for personal intellectual growth of members. Francis Thomas to Beulah L. Hailes, March 5, 1865, Francis Thomas Letters, 1864-65, Bentley Library.

10. *Sibyl*, May 8, 1863; *Hesperian*, February 7, 1862, box 1, Records, 1857-1939, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan), Bentley Library.

11. *Sibyl*, May 8, 1863, October 21, 1865.

12. *Palladium*, 1863, 1864, 1865; Bald, "University of Michigan," 23.

13. *Palladium*, 1861.

14. *Sibyl*, November 6, 1863; *Palladium*, 1864, 1865.

15. *Palladium*, 1864; *Sibyl*, November 6, 1863; William M. Hayes to Parents, December 6, 1863, William Mordecai Hayes papers, 1862-64, Bentley Library. Clement L. Vallandigham was an Ohio politician during the war who led the Copperhead movement in the Midwest. In May 1863, he was arrested and sent behind Confederate lines. He escaped to Canada and led a failed attempt to win the gubernatorial seat in Ohio from exile. He continued to cause trouble for the Lincoln administration and serve as an inspiration to Copperheads until the decline of the movement after the 1864 election. Vallandigham returned to Ohio after the war and continued to practice law until his death in 1871. See Frank Klement, *The Limits of Dissent: Clement L. Vallandigham and the Civil War*, as well as Brett Barker's essay in the current volume.

16. Gideon Winan Allen to Annie Cox, December 12, 1863, Gideon Winan Allen correspondence, 1862-67, 1872, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison (hereafter cited as Allen correspondence). Copperheads on the University of Michigan campus most likely felt very comfortable by 1863 expressing their views because the county surrounding the school swayed in that direction politically during the middle of the war. While in 1860, Washtenaw County voted across the board for Republican candidates, Democrats by 1862 won the county's support in every major political contest, including governor and sheriff. These results did little to offset the rest of the state that still continued to support the Republican incumbents, like Governor Austin Blair, but they do reveal political discord on the home front. This movement climaxed in 1864 when the county gave the Democratic presidential candidate, George Brinton McClellan, their majority over Lincoln by more than two hundred votes. Again, they tried but failed to replace the Republican governor with the Democratic candidate who won their voting support in that contest. *History of Washtenaw County, Michigan*, 2:255-56; anonymous letter, November 14, 1863, Bentley Library.

17. Gideon Winan Allen to Annie Cox, October 15, 1863, Allen correspondence; "Foreign Intervention," January 15, 1864, box 1, records, Michigan University Literary Adelphi, Bentley Library; Weber, *Copperheads*, 4. See, for example, letters from Gideon Winan Allen to Annie Cox between April and November 1863, Allen correspondence.

18. Northern volunteerism for the military had waned significantly following the Union's Peninsula campaign in the summer of 1862. Congress therefore found it necessary to pass the first draft law in 1863, the Enrollment Act of 1863. With this first attempt at conscription, a young man could avoid service either by paying \$300 or by finding a substitute. Eugene C. Murdock, *One Million Men: The Civil War Draft in the North* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1971), 6-7; William M. Hayes to Parents, Sister, and Cousin, December 27, 1863, William Mordecai Hayes papers, 1862-64, Bentley Library.

19. Dunbar, *Michigan Institutions*, 11; Joseph B. Steere to [a friend], July 9, 1864, box 4, folder Letters 1860-64, Bentley Library; John Marshall Hinchman to Mother, April 26, 1863, and May 10, 1863, John Marshall Hinchman letters, 1861-64, Bentley Library; undated 1863, box 1, minute book 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan) records, 1843-1931, Bentley Library; May 29, 1863, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi University of Michigan, Bentley Library.



20. Anonymous letter, November 14, 1863, Bentley Library; Annie Cox to Gideon Winan Allen, March 2, 1863, Cox to Allen, June 16, 1863, and C. J. Cox to Allen, November 12, 1863, all Allen correspondence.

21. Gideon Winan Allen to Annie Cox, June 9, 1863, and Allen to Cox, September 20, 1863, Allen correspondence.

22. Charles B. Howell to Brother, October 27, 1863, and January 26, 1864, Howell Family Papers, 1856–84, Bentley Library. Students made their decisions about the personal implications of the draft in an environment that did not fully support the conscription measures. On August 12, 1862, the *Ann Arbor (MI) Journal* criticized the “large numbers of the ‘courageous’ young men” in Michigan who had “suddenly been seized with a great desire for travel” and headed north in Canada to avoid the draft. The author of the segment scolded the men for “romantically idling away their time at the great cataract of Niagara, when their country and their homes are imperiled.” The newspaper demanded, “Let them volunteer, or stand their draft like true men.”

23. Joseph V. Quarles to Mother, August 4, 1864, box 2, folder Correspondence 1863–64, Joseph V. Quarles Papers, 1843–1911, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

24. Charles L. Watrous to Andrew D. White, August 6, 1861, Andrew D. White Papers, Bentley Library; Lorien Foote, *The Gentleman and the Roughs: Manhood, Honor, and Violence in the Union Army* (New York: New York University Press, 2010), 3. Scholarship using gender as a category of analysis for Civil War studies is not as prevalent yet as in other fields of history, but Civil War historians are making significant progress. See LeeAnn Whites, *Gender Matters: Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Making of the New South* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); LeeAnn Whites and Alecia P. Long, eds., *Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009); Catherine Clinton and Nina Silber, eds., *Battle Scars: Gender and Sexuality in the American Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Thomas E. Rodgers, “Billy Yank and G.I. Joe: An Exploratory Essay on the Socio-political Dimensions of Soldier Motivation,” *Journal of Military History* 69, no. 1 (2005): 93–121; Michael T. Smith, “The Beast Unleashed: Benjamin F. Butler and Conceptions of Masculinity in the Civil War North,” *New England Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2006): 248–76. The foundational work on gender as a category of analysis is Joan Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986).

25. *Palladium*, 1863.

26. *Ibid.*, 1864. See Foote, *Gentleman and the Roughs*, 4–6.

27. Philip Shaw Paludan may give us insight into what provoked this growing confidence in earning a college education rather than going to war. In his seminal work on the North, Paludan asserts that the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 “increased the trained leadership of the nation and thereby encouraged the continued growth for the economy. Both were endorsed by the deep patriotism shown in existing colleges and universities of the nation.” The Morrill Act granted each state large tracts of public land to sell for profit that would, in turn, be used to fund higher education specifically aimed at agricultural programs, mechanical arts, and military tactics. As is usually the case when referring to colleges during this era, Paludan relies on statistics from the aristocratic universities, such as Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Bowdoin, and like, to make his point about the high rate of educated participation in the military but does mention that Michigan “was unique among larger schools in gaining students.” Sources from faculty and the board of regents at the University of Michigan do indeed reveal

an intense preoccupation during the war with obtaining the grant money from the Morrill Act in order to expand their institution. Ultimately, the money went instead to Michigan State University in East Lansing. It is plausible then that Michigan students were well aware of the increased attention on colleges during the Civil War and embraced the rhetoric surrounding the Morrill Act to help build their justification for the link between patriotism and education. The interest of the government in improving and enriching higher education during a war might very well have given the students the impression that their contribution to the nation's future was equal to that of the soldiers who were fighting at the same time. However, nowhere in available sources from students found to date do they directly mention the Morrill Act or the struggle that the university was going through in the state legislature to obtain those funds. As intriguing as it would be to identify the passage of the Morrill Act as the impetus for growing student confidence, the sources do not allow that conclusion at this time. Paludan, *"A People's Contest": The Union and Civil War, 1861-1865* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), 132-33; *Palladium*, 1863, 1865; *Sibyl*, May 8, 1863.

28. *Palladium*, 1866.

29. March 16, 1860, March 8, 1861, October 18, 1861, May 3, 1861, October 25, 1861, February 21, 1862, March 21, 1863, December 12, 1862, January 30, 1863, May 2, 1862, November 14, 1862, March 21, 1862, May 30, 1862, box 1, minute book, 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan) records, 1843-1931, Bentley Library.

30. January 20, 1862, January 23, 1863, October 7, 1864, May 8, 1863, May 27, 1864, April 28, 1865, box 1, minute book 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan) records, 1843-1931, Bentley Library.

31. *Sibyl*, April 21, 1865; November 4, 1864, February 17, 1865, September 29, 1865, October 13, 1865, box 1, minute book 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan) records, 1843-1931, Bentley Library.

32. March 9, 1860, October 19, 1860, November 2, 1860, January 11, 1861, April 21, 1861, April 3, 1861, box 1, minutes 1857-60, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library.

33. October 11, 1861, October 25, 1861, box 1, minutes 1857-60, Literary Adelphi, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library; April 25, 1862, April 17, 1863, October 28, 1863, November 13, 1863, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan Records) 1857-1939, Bentley Library. On November 13, 1863, only a few weeks after the first vote, the Literary Adelphi members again voted on the proposition that "the southern states be admitted into the Union only on the condition that they become Free." This resolution lost, but this appears to be an aberration in the pattern. March 11, 1864, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library.

34. April 4, 1862, November 7, 1862, December 19, 1862, April 15, 1864, November 18, 1864, January 27, 1865, May 27, 1864, October 7, 1864, October 28, 1864, April 21, 1865, November 24, 1865, March 9, 1866, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library.

35. *Hesperian*, December 6, 1861, box 1, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library. For more information on how support for emancipation and arming blacks developed in the Midwest during the war, see Victor Jacque Voegeli, *Free but Not Equal: The Midwest and the Negro during the Civil War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967); *Sibyl*, October 21, 1865.

36. See, for example, December 7, 1860, April 27, 1865, box 1, minute book 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan), Bentley Library; May 20, 1864, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library; June 14, 1861, June 6, 1862, March 3, 1865, box 1, minute book 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society (University of Michigan), Bentley Library; May 29, 1863, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi (University of Michigan) Records, 1857-1939, Bentley Library. See, for example, December 7, 1860, April 27, 1865, box 1, minute book 1859-68, Alpha Nu Literary Society; May 20, 1864, box 1, Record Book, 1857-91, Literary Adelphi.

37. These calculations are based on a comparison of the Alpha Nu and Literary Adelphi membership rosters in the *Palladium* for each school year between 1860-61 and 1865-66, with residential identifications from the *Catalogue of Officers and Students*, which was officially published annually by the university. Students who were listed in the society membership rosters as being in the army were not included in the calculations, nor were the few students for whom no hometown could be identified. The question for the calculation was what percentage of each society identified their residence as being within the state of Michigan, and the breakdown of the results is as follows:

| School Year | Alpha Nu | Literary Adelphi |
|-------------|----------|------------------|
| 1860-61     | 73       | 57               |
| 1861-62     | 72       | 48               |
| 1862-63     | 68       | 50               |
| 1863-64     | 66       | 44               |
| 1864-65     | 52       | 34               |
| 1865-66     | 43       | 33               |

38. Charles B. Howell to Brother, January 26, 1864, Howell Family Papers, 1856-84, Bentley Library; William H. Boardman to Father, October 30, 1864, Boardman Family Papers, 1864-65, Bentley Library.

39. Joseph Quarles, November 9, 1864, box 1, folder Quarles Speeches 1864-70, Wisconsin Historical Society. It is unclear what the speech was for, but it was likely for a literary society event or some other student activity. It is a part of his papers found at the Wisconsin Historical Society.

40. March 5, 1862, folder Correspondence of Scriptors, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Omicron Chapter (University of Michigan) Records, 1855-1927, Bentley Library.

41. *Palladium*, 1865; Albert William Farley, diary, January 7, 1864, Albert William Farley diary, 1864-65, Bentley Library. Alumni from the class of 1861 remembered that one of their favorite college pastimes was leapfrog. In their book honoring the 1861 graduates, alumni Henry M. Utley and Byron M. Cutcheon recalled, "It was no unusual spectacle to see future college professors and presidents, congressmen, and clergymen, progressing from the University toward the post-office by means of this exhilarating, if not dignified, game." The students also played practical jokes on each other or took part in pranks among the undergraduate classes. In one instance, the sophomores thought it good sport to go around pulling freshmen out of their beds during the night. A week later, the freshmen responded by stacking benches in front of the classroom in which the sophomores were doing recitations. Then, as the sophomores tried to climb over the barricade to exit, the freshmen pulled the pile of benches

"OURS IS THE HARDER LOT"

down the stairwell, taking the older students with it. There were the usual course of fistfights, and groups of students routinely stole the campus bell that announced the changing of classes. Like others, John Hinchman reveled in the social opportunities of the surrounding community. "I am enjoying myself more than usual," he wrote in 1864 to his mother. "Ann Arbor will be very gay this winter, as each church has a social once in two weeks. College goes on about as usual." Utley and Cutcheon, *Class of Sixty-One*, 38; William H. Boardman to Father, November 20, 1864, November 27, 1864; John Marshall Hinchman to Mother, October 25, 1863, October 24, 1864, John Marshall Hinchman letters, 1861-64, Bentley Library.