Introduction

Organization of States at War

States at War: Michigan presents the period between January 1860 and December 1865 in chronological order. Preceding the chronology is an introductory section that provides Michigan’s background as a state, a people, and an economy as well as a snapshot of Michigan in 1860. Introductory materials include Michigan’s War Geography, Economy in 1860, Governance and Politicians, Slavery and Race, and Demography, each further divided into separate issues.

War Geography considers Michigan’s geographic position not only as it influenced its economy (e.g., lakes for shipping, proximity to the war, and borders) but also as these affected the state’s experience with territorial insecurities. Thus, Michigan’s border with Canada and its vulnerability to Confederate and insurgent operations and hostile navies influenced how the state allocated resources to frontier troops, coastal fortifications, garrisons, and militias.

Economy in 1860 highlights state industries, commerce, finance, agriculture, and railroads on the eve of war.

Governance and Politicians summarizes Michigan’s state constitutional provisions that are especially relevant to wartime matters. It lists congressional districts in the Thirty-Seventh Congress and delegations to the Thirty-Seventh and Thirty-Eighth Congresses, noting legislators’ standing committee assignments. It also gives biographical information about Michigan’s federal senators, representatives, and the most crucial “protagonists” of SAW, its governors and adjutant generals.

Slavery and Race sketches the history of Michigan’s African American population and its history with racial discrimination. It also discusses its experience with the Fugitive Slave Act, abolition, and antislavery sentiment among its white and black populations.

Demography and Immigrants and Immigration sketches Michigan’s 1860 population, the distribution of the population, and its ethnic groups. This section covers issues related to immigration, considering both the state’s relatively inconsequential experience with the 1850s Know-Nothings and the far more consequential efforts to attract European immigrants.

Chronology

Following the brief introductory essay, the chapters present a detailed chronology outlining some major events and themes important to Michigan’s involvement in the Civil War. A chronology is presented for each year between 1860 and 1865. Each year’s chronology of key events is followed by sections on Selected Legislation and Military Affairs.

Key Events are “key” from Michigan’s perspective and deal chiefly with in-state events. The actors whose doings matter are governors, lieutenant governors, adjutant generals, and also presidents, vice presidents, the secretary of state, secretaries of war, members of Congress, senior (and sometimes junior) War Department bureaucrats, and state political party officials. Occasionally, individual state legislators appear, as do state supreme court judges, general officers, newspaper editors, civic and religious leaders, and private citizens with something to say. This cast is occasionally leavened by the acts of Confederate raiders, POWs, racist mobs, peace men, genuinely disloyal citizens, social activists, philanthropic men and women, and a few spies. Together with the Chronology, Key Events hopes to provide a skeletal narrative of how Michigan responded to some of the war’s challenges.

Selected Legislation sections are organized by date and include war-relevant statutes, resolutions, and committee reports. Each legislative session is introduced by a quotation from the governor’s message to that session, which often set the agenda for the session. Readers should note that the summaries of statutes and resolutions have been substantially abridged.

Military Affairs concludes each year’s entry. This section attempts to summarize the year’s military events or trends, which can be difficult to place chronologically. “Military” is broadly defined: among other things, it in-
cludes state financing of military necessities and recruiting expenses; conscription, enrollment, and recruitment data; and Michigan operations supporting soldiers’ health and morale, often a few miles from the battlefield. It is well to note here one aspect of the Civil War that bedeviled contemporaries as much as it has later historians: the utter irreconcilability of competing claims (between states and the War Department) about the number of men credited under various volunteer and draft calls. Michigan usually argued that they had sufficient credits, while the War Department confronted the reality of insufficient men; the answer depended on when one counted, whom one counted, and especially how one counted.

**Editorial Considerations**

Biographical notes generally are not given for federal executive-branch officials at the cabinet rank, or for senior federal army and navy officers (except those with strong state connections, such as Lewis Cass, Orlando Willcox, or Israel Richardson). Some minor figures are excluded, such as minor-party gubernatorial contenders and unsuccessful candidates for Congress, unless they were important contributors to Michigan’s Civil War experience. One of States at War’s (SAW’s) objectives is to revive the narrative of state action during the war, which means providing biographical treatments of now-obscure figures. Some 195 men and women are presented. SAW aspires to a uniform presentation of these lives more often than it succeeds. Less is known about some now-obscure figures, and what is known is sometimes based on conflicting information. Moreover, the information that does exist is often gathered from many texts, and the editor asks readers’ patience with what may appear to be excessive sourcing. The intention is to provide a bibliographic footprint that many readers may find useful.

What is true for less prominent state actors is also the case for many private soldiers’ welfare organizations. While national organizations such as the Sanitary Commission and the Christian Commission are well documented, neighborhood (e.g., sewing circles), city (e.g., local auxiliaries of national organizations or other groups whose activities are confined to a particular town), and even statewide groups have left fewer tracks. Regrettably, this paucity also is reflected in SAW.

State General Orders and Special Orders could be issued or signed by the governor, the adjutant general, or another subordinate, in his own name or on behalf of the governor or adjutant general. With one exception, SAW attributes no special significance to particular signatories, and such orders may be attributed to the state, as in “Michigan issues GO No. 1.” However, whether dealing with states or the War Department, personalities can matter, and where (in the opinion of the editor) they do, the actual signatory is identified and background information provided.

Annual election results for state legislatures are given by party. In weighing these, readers are cautioned that in many cases the “real” divisions might be less than implied by party labels. Readers should pay particular attention to the relationship between a given politician and the war. Unlike Ohio, which elected national “peace” candidates such as Clement Vallandigham and George Pendleton, Michigan politics were not conducive to peace candidates of any party. The state’s Democrats were largely Unionists, and despite occasional rhetorical excesses driven by party competition, were in the main supportive of a vigorous prosecution of the war, despite harsh criticism of Lincoln’s policies on civil liberties, war management, and especially, race and reconstruction.

Readers should be aware of an editing peculiarity present throughout Series III of the Official Records. Many of the letters sent by the War Department to state officials were copied to other recipients, or in some cases to all of the loyal governors or state adjutant generals. For reasons of economy, however, the OR’s editors chose to include only a single example of each letter; a list of other recipients appears nearby, or in a few instances, the statement “Copies sent to all loyal governors” or some such wording is included.

The federal and state statutes and resolutions selected for inclusion under each legislative session or in the Chronology are not the précis of statutes so beloved by law students; although every effort has been made to include original quoted material, the laws reproduced here have been doubly edited: first, statutory provisions that were purely procedural or irrelevant to a law’s main purposes have been omitted; second, what has been included has been paraphrased from the language of legal contingency into something like ordinary prose. However, the original names of statutes and resolutions are retained and sourced; statutes are grouped by legislative...
sessions and, when available, the dates of passage are given. Statutes and resolutions appear in order by date of enactment and not by the statutory or other number later assigned. The section numbers within statutes are in numerical order but with omissions: only sections that embody the statute’s main points are listed, while purely procedural provisions are omitted (with apologies to legal scholars who know that the line between “procedure” and “substance” is often blurry).

**Reading States at War: Michigan**

The streaming chronological structure invites two ways to read States at War: Michigan. The first reading is vertical, which considers Michigan solely as a state at war: its laws, elections, and federal relations; how it financed, recruited, organized, armed, and equipped its military units; its support programs for soldiers and their dependents; and many other matters. When integrated with the Chronology of Events, Battles, Laws, and General Orders, the book might stand alone as a skeletal history of Michigan’s war years.

But SAW also can be read horizontally. In volumes 1 to 6 of States at War, similarly organized Civil War histories of thirteen states allow readers to scan the same month across other states, comparing reactions to the same event, or the different (or similar) solutions that states developed to solve the same problems (e.g., the welfare of soldiers’ dependents), meet challenges (e.g., dissent, recruiting), or cope with frictions that occurred as the federal government intruded into areas previously under exclusive state control (e.g., conscription, and taxation).

What is different about SAW is not the facts it contains—these and the sources from which they derive have long been in the scholarly and public domains—but rather, its parallel presentments of states at war. The editor of States at War can hope for no more than that some future, better mind will read this material and, through the induction that such a presentation invites, discern previously unrecognized differences, similarities, and connections that eluded him.