

AD-A263 946



DTIC

ELECTE

MAY 12 1993

C

D

2

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

STUDY
PROJECT

**ETHICAL UNDERPINNING OF CERTAIN
STRATEGIC LEADERS: 1861 - 1865**

BY

**LIEUTENANT COLONEL THOMAS J. HODGINI
United States Army**

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for public release.

Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1993



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

93 5 07 011

93-10060

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS

2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY

3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S).

6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks

6b. OFFICE SYMBOL
(If applicable)

7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION

6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013-5050

7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING
ORGANIZATION

8b OFFICE SYMBOL
(If applicable)

9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS

PROGRAM
ELEMENT NO

PROJECT
NO

TASK
NO

WORK UNIT
ACCESSION NO

11 TITLE (Include Security Classification)

Ethical Underpinning of Certain Strategic Leaders: 1861-1865

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

LTC Thomas J. Hodgini

13a. TYPE OF REPORT

Final MSP

13b TIME COVERED

FROM _____ TO _____

14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)

93/04/15

15 PAGE COUNT

42

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17 COSATI CODES

FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP

18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

This study examines four Civil War leaders in order to identify the key and essential elements that combine and define the ethical framework of effective strategic leaders. In addition, the project determines the impact of religion in their formation. A Biblical base ethical framework is offered as the start point from which to examine the ethical codes embraced by four senior military leaders of the American Civil War. The top two commanders of the North and South, Generals Grant and Lee along with their right-hand men, Generals Sherman and Jackson, are studied to gain insight into the principles or reasons that guided their conduct and determination of right and wrong, good and bad. The study examines their lives, decisions, and writings during the Civil War to discover the basis for their personal ethical codes. When a Biblical basis is not apparent alternative underpinnings are suggested and examined. An ethical base is the cornerstone of the military because it governs the support and resources that our citizens are willing to entrust to it. In times of danger, it is the ethical element of leadership that will bond units together and enable them to withstand the stresses of combat. Strong ethical codes formed from absolute (see reverse side)

20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT

☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS

21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL

Chaplain (COL) Thomas H. Norton, Project Adviser

22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)

(717) 245-3479

22c OFFICE SYMBOL

AWCAA

Item 19. Abstract continued

values are key to effective military leadership. All leaders must be committed to embrace ethical principles derived from these values.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

ETHICAL UNDERPINNING OF CERTAIN STRATEGIC LEADERS: 1861 - 1865

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas J. Hodgini
United States Army

CH (COL) Thomas H. Norton
Project Adviser

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

Accession For	
NTIS	CRA&I ☒
DTIC	TAB ☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Thomas J. Hodgini, LTC, USA

TITLE: Ethical Underpinning of Certain Strategic Leaders:
1861 - 1865

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 15 April 1993 PAGES: 42 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This study examines four Civil War leaders in order to identify the key and essential elements that combine and define the ethical framework of effective strategic leaders. In addition the project determines the impact of religion in their formation. A Biblical based ethical framework is offered as the start point from which to examine the ethical codes embraced by four senior military leaders of the American Civil War. The top two commanders of the North and South, Generals Grant and Lee, along with their right-hand men, Generals Sherman and Jackson, are studied to gain insight into the principles or reasons that guided their conduct and determination of right and wrong, good and bad. The study examines their lives, decisions, and writings during the Civil War to discover the basis for their personal ethical codes. When a Biblical basis is not apparent alternative underpinnings are suggested and examined.

An ethical base is the cornerstone of the military because it governs the support and resources that our citizens are willing to entrust to it. In times of danger, it is the ethical element of leadership that will bond units together and enable them to withstand the stresses of combat. Strong ethical codes formed from absolute values are key to effective military leadership. All leaders must be committed to embrace ethical principles derived from these values.

INTRODUCTION

In the early part of the 19th century the French government commissioned Alexis de Tocqueville to travel throughout the United States to discover the secret behind America's success in democracy. Dwight D. Eisenhower quoted de Tocqueville as proclaiming that "America is great because she is good. When she ceases to be good, she will cease to be great."¹ America's "goodness" depends on the ethics of her people, both those who lead and those who are led. Among the many insights in his masterpiece, Democracy in America, Tocqueville found that religion played a fundamental and critical role in forming values, mores, and standards of conduct which effect reasoning and ultimately, decision making. He found that

in the United States, it is not only mores that are controlled by religion, but its sway extends even over reason. Among the Anglo-Americans there are some who profess Christian dogmas because they believe them and others who do so because they are afraid to look as though they did not believe in them. So Christianity reigns without obstacles, by universal consent; consequently, as I have said elsewhere, everything in the moral field is certain and fixed, although the world of politics seems given over to argument and experiment.²

Many of America's leaders made ethical decisions based upon religion.

Historically, America's strategic leaders have placed a premium upon the importance of ethical behavior. Our nation's first president and commander-in-chief, General George Washington, emphasized the impact of personal virtues derived from religion, on character and leadership. Upon assuming command of the Continental Army, he immediately published a

general order calling for divine services every Sunday and stating that, "To the distinguished character of a Patriot, it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of a Christian." Christianity served as the basis for his standard of conduct and judgement of right and wrong.

American military strategic leaders have extolled the requirement for ethical behavior. Perhaps General John A. Wickham, past Chief of Staff of the Army, best summed up why ethical leadership is important:

our service must rest upon a solid ethical base, because those who discharge such moral responsibilities must uphold and abide by the highest standards of behavior. That ethical base is the corner stone of our Army because it governs the support and resources that our citizens are willing to entrust to our stewardship, and ultimately because it governs our human capacity to prevail on the battlefield. In times of danger, it is the ethical element of leadership which will bond our units together and enable them to withstand the stresses of combat.⁴

Strategic leaders are characterized by their tasks, competencies, vision, and character. Underlying these elements is an ethical base. The Army ethic, described as an informal bond of trust between the nation and its soldiers, remains a vital ingredient forming the essence of the Army.⁵

Given its importance to the Army, and thus to its most senior leaders, one must seek to define the essence of this ethical base. Does Christian religion, as Tocqueville surmised a century and a half ago, serve as the foundation for ethical decisions? This study project seeks to identify the key and essential elements that combine and define the common ethical

framework of effective strategic leaders. In addition the project will determine the impact of religion in their formation. A Biblical based ethical framework is offered as the start point from which to examine the ethical codes embraced by four senior military leaders of the American Civil War. The top two commanders of the North and South, Generals Grant and Lee, along with their right-hand men, Generals Sherman and Jackson, will be studied to gain insight into the principles or reasons that guided their conduct and determination of right and wrong, good and bad. The study will examine their lives, decisions, and writings during the Civil War to discover the basis for their personal ethical codes.

ETHICS, LEADERS, AND RELIGION

Before proceeding to the examination of specific Civil War generals, two questions will be addressed. First, what is ethics and how important is it to effective strategic leaders? Second, what type Biblical framework is useful for interpreting ethical codes of civil war leaders? These questions are discussed in an attempt to show the link between ethics and religion in relation to strategic military leaders.

Ethics involves the actions of self and others. It deals with the fundamental question of determining what behavior is right and wrong. The concept consists of several parameters such as values, moral duty, obligation, standards of behavior, determination of right and wrong or good and bad, and principles

guiding conduct. A definition that incorporates most commonly accepted concepts of ethics is, "standards of conduct that indicate how one should behave based on moral duties and virtues arising from principles about right and wrong."⁶ The result of an ethical decision then, is right or wrong behavior based upon certain standards of conduct formed by moral virtues and guiding principles.

These moral virtues and guiding principles are particularly critical to leaders empowered to make strategic decisions. In essence, ethics is about making decisions. Any ethical theory must provide a decision procedure for moral choices.⁷ Strategic leaders' choices have wide ranging impact that could affect individuals, entire armies (U.S., coalition, enemy, etc.), and possibly the larger U.S. and international society now, and into the future.

Ethical decisions are tough. Most senior military leaders experience an ethical dilemma that "comes from the conflict between self interest and selfless service."⁸ For example, there are certain tensions within the Army that are fertile ground for ethical abuse. Five such tensions are the ethical use of authority, ethical use of military force, quotas, debate on people versus mission, and honesty versus deception.⁹ These stem from the underlying struggle between promoting one's own selfish interests over the interests of others (selfless service). Conflict and its accompanying stress further complicate ethical decision making.

...leaders under pressure must keep themselves absolutely clean morally (the relativism of the social sciences will never do). They must lead by example, must be able to implant high mindedness in their followers, must have competence beyond status, and must have earned their followers' respect by demonstrating integrity.¹⁰

Whatever the situation, the senior military leader must first recognize the importance of all ethical decisions and then weigh their impact on the interests of individuals, institutions, and sometimes, societies.

Where does the ethical decision begin? What is its genesis? Two possibilities exist. It is either a human or a divine invention. The former, designed by and for humans, can be relatively easily and conveniently altered by man. The latter, created by God and for man, can be changed only by God. If man devises ethics, it must be based upon reason and rules with cultural roots. To some it appears that:

...morality is a human invention, that it is designed to do some jobs but not others, and of course that moral concepts are human creations, and that the very concept of morality itself has cultural roots.¹¹

To others, morality ethics has its roots in divine revelation. Both provide certain rules and principles for guiding conduct and making moral choices. Both require a system to interpret these rules that are found in documents such as the Bible, U.S. Constitution, Congressional Law, DOD policies, and Army regulations and field manuals.

The Christian Bible contains certain rules and principles that provide a basis for ethical decision making. "Our Western value system of right and wrong is based primarily on what Jesus

taught concerning the origin and value of human life, augmented by the Old Testament lawgivers and prophets."¹² God revealed His foundational principles through the ten commandments and Jesus' new commandment based upon love. Paraphrased, the commandments are:

- 1: You shall have no other gods before me.
- 2: You shall not make for yourself an idol.
- 3: You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain.
- 4: Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.
- 5: Honor your father and your mother.
- 6: You shall not murder.
- 7: You shall not commit adultery.
- 8: You shall not steal.
- 9: You shall not give bear false witness.
- 10: You shall not covet.¹³

God gave these commandments to Moses as an expression of His own eternal moral nature. The first three deal with man's relationship with God; the remaining seven, with moral responsibility toward man. Most are proscriptive in that they describe what men ought not to do. Jesus later summarized these into one prescriptive commandment when he stated, "This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends"¹⁴ This new, love based commandment, provides a general precept of what men ought to do. Since "all ethics is prescriptive and/or proscriptive,"¹⁵ the old and new commandments conveniently form a suitable foundation for an ethics model.

To be useful in this study, the model must translate these into a format that will facilitate the analysis. The Executive Leadership Foundation in Atlanta has interpreted each of the ten

commandments into a "business commandment" or ethical principle in their pamphlet entitled "Executive Guide To Ethical Decision Making." These principles are intended to help corporate executives make wise decisions based upon values that are absolute.¹⁶ Several are useful in designing a biblical based ethical model and are incorporated in the following chart.

BIBLICAL COMMANDMENT	GUIDING PRINCIPLE	STRATEGIC LEADER ISSUE
Have no other Gods.	God is only supreme being. Proper respect for authority.	Impact of religion in decisions. Ethical use of authority.
Shall not make an idol.	Singleness of purpose. Commitment to ethical framework.	Importance of duty. How react under pressure? Realities of war impact?
Honor father and mother. Love one another.	Respect for others.	Selfless service.
Shall not murder. Love one another.	Respect/value for human life.	How deal with enemy, slaves, suffering, POWs?
Shall not steal. Shall not give false testimony.	Honesty, Integrity, Purity.	Character and values.

This framework interprets six of the ten commandments along with Jesus' new commandment into ethical guiding principles and then further correlates the principles into strategic leader issues. Each commandment has a literal meaning and an ethical

principle interpretation. For purposes of this study, the ethical interpretation (guiding principle) will be used. The issues serve as a test or measure to analyze how the four generals reacted to moral choices in the context of their positions during the Civil War. By analyzing each general's decisions and actions in terms of the above issues and principles, one can gain insight into his personal ethical framework and establish the correlation to the biblical framework.

For example, consider the third set of commandments, honor your father and mother, and love one another. The corresponding guiding principle is showing respect for others while the leader issue deals with the question of selfless service. Should evidence show that decisions and actions result from promotion of self interests, one could postulate that respect for others is not a guiding principle in that general officer's ethical framework. However, if selfless service is evident, the principle of showing respect for others is relevant. Alone though, this piece of evidence would be insufficient to draw a conclusion on the impact of religion (Judeo-Christian religion within the context of this study) in formation to his ethical code. More is needed. All issues must be examined against the backdrop of the central tenant of Christianity: faith.

Faith signifies more than a mere credence of God's Word, the Bible. It requires reliance upon all God says. The three basic elements of faith mirror the three aspects of the model. Faith

requires (1) firm conviction [to Biblical commandments], (2) a surrender to what God has revealed [guiding principles], and (3) conduct that is produced as a result [issues].¹⁷ It is not only possible, but quite likely, that similar conduct will be prevalent in leaders with dissimilar ethical underpinnings. In these cases, one also must postulate whether faith or another tenant such as reason drives decisions and conduct. Several issues within the scope of this study, will be examined to find the extent to which religion influenced each officer's ethical framework.

THE GENERALS

The study's four officers were effective senior leaders whose decisions had strategic impact. During the war, each officer, with his unique leadership style, made choices and reacted to situations that effected people and institutions. The basis for their decisions and actions will be examined beginning with the confederate leaders.

General Robert E. Lee

Robert E. Lee embodied the finest characteristics of a gifted strategic leader. The President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, fought to obtain Lee's services as his top commander. With Lee, Davis felt he,

...now had on his hands the one officer above all others whom the Federal government had most regretted losing; the man whom General Scott considered the greatest military genius in America; the man to whom Francis P. Blair had less than three months before offered the command of the entire Union Army; the man

whom the Virginia Convention had spoken of as "first in war," and likened to the father of his country, a title first applied to Caesar.¹⁸

Many of Lee's accomplishments support Davis' praise. General Lee took command of a disorganized army which was poorly equipped, untrained, and lacked discipline. Many leaders, chosen by the men and appointed by the state governors, were incompetent. He made choices that transformed the Armies of the Confederacy into an effective force revered by senior officers in the North.

Lee saw God as a joint partner in decision making. "Being a man of emotion, he accepted religion without question. His interpretation was simple and literal. His deity participated closely in human affairs. His was a practical, every-day religion, which supported him all through his life."¹⁹ God was ever present to help in discerning the best course of action.

Lee compassionately used his authority to enhance the competence of his senior subordinates. Two approaches to the leadership challenge facing Lee are commonly employed. The directive approach demands compliance with little or no regard to the individual. It is top driven. An alternate approach inspires subordinates to compliance. Lee preferred the latter. Shortly after assuming command, he called his general officers together for a conference that began a transformation of defeatist attitudes to a sense of teamwork toward a common cause. He instilled discipline that depended upon morale rather than iron adherence to regulation and superiors.²⁰ Lee valued others. He thus preferred to use his authority to co-op rather than force

compliance. To Lee, proper respect for authority was a shared proposition. Although empowered with limitless authority, he sought help on the day of battle. Lee explained the principle that guided his control in this way:

I strive to make my plans as good as my human skill allows, but on the day of battle, I lay the fate of my army in the hands of God; it is my generals turn to perform their duty. And again he said: My interference in battle would do more harm than good. I have to rely on my brigade and division commanders.²¹

At times during battle, Lee would appear to submit to the judgement of subordinate commanders. Actually, as in Manassas when Longstreet was reluctant to attack after Lee had urged him to do so, he was using his power to empower subordinates while relying on God for the ultimate outcome. Thus his use of authority led to respect and enhanced the position of subordinate leaders.

Lee's personal commitment to others drove his compelling sense of duty. "Duty first was the rule of his life, and his every thought, word, and action was made to square with duty's inexorable demands."²² It was a matter of commitment to a purpose for which he had dedicated himself. His actions were governed by loyalty to the Confederacy and it's President, his men, and the campaign. For Lee, duty to this cause and the position entrusted to him took priority over personal pleasures and needs. On one occasion he received a letter informing him of his daughter's death. Rather than permitting himself the immediate and "more selfish indulgence of private meditation, grief, and prayer,"²³ he acted on military matters requiring

decisions first.

The demands of war coupled with prestigious position can lead to self-righteous pride. The opposite was true for Lee. He was a humble man. His conduct of selfless service communicated a sincere respect for others. To indulge in personal comforts afforded high position is a tempting offer to any senior leader. Throughout the war, those who attended to the general often offered comfortable quarters more appropriately suited to his rank and position. While his army encamped, he could have moved his headquarters into vacant houses for greater personal comfort. He chose to remain subject to the elements, "thus giving an example of endurance of hardship that might prove useful to his troops."²⁴ Selfless service was a way of life that stemmed from a respect for others rooted in genuine love. Love guided his interpersonal relationships. Earlier in his career, while West Point Superintendent, Lee took on a paternal interest in each cadet. He watched carefully over the cadets' progress and grades by means of weekly reports, and discussed any problems with the instructor, or with the boy himself.²⁵ Lee's responsibilities did not require a higher level "paternal interest," yet that is where he met others. Love naturally leads to respect and selfless service. Lee exemplified the best of these characteristics.

Perhaps love's greatest test comes in times of war. Lee valued not only friend but foe as well. He intended to defeat the enemy on the battlefield, nevertheless, he valued this enemy

as a fellow human being.

...when speaking of the Yankees he neither evinced any bitterness of feeling nor gave utterance to a single violent expression, but alluded to many as his former friends and companions among them in the kindest terms. He spoke as a man proud of the victories won by his country and confident of ultimate success under the blessings of the Almighty, whom he glorified for past successes, and whose aid he invoked for all future operations.²⁶

Following battle, Lee showed his deep love for people by personally checking on the wounded who were suffering.

Immediately after the battle of Chancellorsville. "his care was for the wounded of both armies, and he was among the first at the burning mansions, where some of them lay."²⁷ His was a real love manifested by action. The hardships and realities of war seemed to draw the best out of him. He did not harbor malice toward enemies, nor did he neglect the suffering. Rather, his dealings with others, whatever their circumstances, present evidence that his respect for human life knew no bounds.

History records General Lee's open, simple, and absolute trust in God. His decisions, actions, and dealings with others reveal a man whose guiding principles of conduct were based upon an unwavering belief in God and teachings of the Bible. Religion undergirded every ethical decision. Authority was a means to develop stronger subordinates. Duty was preeminent. The realities of war offered a medium to highlight His commitment to an ethical framework based upon absolutes. Through selfless service that knew no bounds between Confederate and Yankee, healthy or sick, and slave or free, Lee displayed a practical

respect and love for others. Finally, his Christian values yielded a father, friend, and senior leader with impeccable integrity and character. His children described him as one who "set them a lofty example of truth and virtue." Doubtless, General Lee derived his personal ethical code from a Biblical ethical code.

General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson

General Lee's Christian character was typical of many of his subordinate leaders. One such officer was General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson. Of all the Civil War's senior leaders, perhaps Stonewall Jackson is most prominently identified by his religious character. Furthermore, he is characterized as the southern general who most aggressively pursued the objectives of the Confederacy. Stonewall pushed hard to achieve success in battle. Take for example, the Valley of Virginia Campaign:

In thirty days his army had marched nearly four hundred miles, skirmishing almost daily, fought five battles, defeated four armies, two of which were completely routed, captured about twenty pieces of artillery, some four thousand prisoners, and immense quantity of stores of all kinds, and had done all this with a loss of less than one thousand killed, wounded and missing. Surely a more brilliant record cannot be found in the history of the world, and General Jackson might well say this was accomplished through God's blessing.²⁹

Jackson exercised a high degree of discipline in both his position and following religious laws. He trusted God implicitly. At war's beginning, in November 1861, Jackson wrote to his wife stating, "I shall have a great labor to perform, but

through the blessing of an ever-kind Heavenly Father, I trust that He will enable me and other instrumentalities to accomplish it."¹⁰ In all circumstances, Jackson believed in the providence of God and habitually prayed for Divine guidance and intervention. His motto for life seemed to be, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"¹¹

Stonewall respected God's authority. Similarly, he exercised firm and caring authority over his command while preparing for battle. Although some may have seen his training demands as harsh, he drove his men hard out of a pure motive related to their own well being. He shunned praise and was quick to give credit to subordinates. After his successful capture of Winchester in 1862, he issued General Order number 53 in which he included a note of appreciation to his subordinates:

The General commanding would warmly express to the officers and men under his command his joy in their achievements, and his thanks for their brilliant gallantry in action, and their patient obedience under the hardships of forced marches, often more painful to the brave soldier than the dangers of battle.¹²

Even in times of toughest personal hardship, he refused to abuse his authority. After being wounded, Jackson was carried off the battlefield on a litter. A litter bearer stumbled and allowed his end to fall. When he asked the wounded general if he was hurt, Jackson replied, "No, my friend; don't trouble yourself about me."¹³ Lessor men would have snapped back at such "carelessness" of a subordinate. Stonewall did not. He was a caring leader who exercised his authority compassionately.

Duty drove Stonewall Jackson. One could almost describe

duty as Jackson's obsession during his early years of service. While a cadet at West Point, he compiled a book about rules of an ethical nature. One section gives insight into his developing thoughts on duty: "Through life let your principle object be the discharge of duty. - Disregard public opinion when it interferes with your duty." Furthermore, during the Mexican war, when asked if he had reservations about killing women and children with his artillery, Jackson replied sharply, "None whatsoever. What business have I with what happens to noncombatants. My duty is to obey orders." These two incidents occurred before his religious awakening. Subsequently, Jackson tempered duty with compassion and loyalty to his men. Like Lee, out of a sense of duty, Jackson did not take leave from his command for even a day.

Duty also drove his determination to succeed. "No general in the South was more determined than Stonewall Jackson." Often, his determination was manifested in tough, seemingly impossible marches and maneuvers. His decision to push hard stemmed both from his sense of duty and welfare of his soldiers. This singleness in purpose served him well when faced with the pressures of war.

Stonewall remained committed to his principles in spite of the harsh realities of war. When asked what force enabled him to make clear decisions during the pressures of battle, Jackson identified faith: "In the commander of an Army at the critical hour, it [faith] calms his perplexities, moderates his anxieties, steadies the scales of judgement, and thus preserves him from

exaggerated and rash conclusions."⁹ His actions supported his words. At First Manassas, General Bee cautioned Jackson that,

...they are beating us back. Jackson turned slowly on his horse and replied, "Sir, we'll give them the bayonet." After this brief inspiring conversation, Bee rode back to his troops and shouted: "Look yonder! There is Jackson and his brigade standing like a stone wall. Let us determine to die here and we will conquer. Rally behind them."¹⁰

Jackson practiced faith and intensified his prayers before and during battles. Before the battle of Fredericksburg and opening of the Chancellorsville campaign, he spent time in prayer for the success of his army.¹¹ Stonewall remained steadfastly committed to his faith in God. Following Jackson's death, General Lee published General Order number 61 in which he stated:

The daring, skill, and energy of this great and good soldier by the decree of an all-wise Providence are now lost us. But while we mourn his death we feel that his spirit still lives, and will inspire the whole army with his indomitable courage and unshaken confidence in God as our hope and strength.¹²

The realities of war did not break his unshaken confidence in God.

Nor did these realities deter him from selfless service. A reference to selflessness appears in his West Point book of rules: "-Spare no effort to suppress selfishness, unless that effort would entail sorrow."¹³ As mentioned earlier, he refused to take leave. Mrs. Jackson requested that he return home for a visit at Christmas (1862). He replied that he felt it would be better to remain with his command and gave justification for his decision as selfless concern for his troops. "...as my officers and soldiers are not permitted to go and see their wives and

families, I ought not to see my esposita, as it might make the troops feel that they were badly treated, and I consult my own pleasure and comfort regardless of theirs."" Certainly Jackson could have granted himself a brief period of leave. Rather, he elected to remain with his troops.

Stonewall respected others. He was unencumbered by man's position. For example, he had a high regard for his slaves. He seemed to love them in the manner a parent loves his children. They routinely attended family prayer meetings. His love was manifested in providing them with what Stonewall most cherished: spiritual instruction. Following one particularly great battle, Jackson sent a letter to Lexington. A crowd gathered to hear of Stonewall's victory, "but heard to their very great disappointment a letter which made not the most remote allusion to the battle or the war, but which enclosed a check for fifty dollars with which to buy books for his colored Sunday-school, and was filled with inquiries after the interests of the school and church."" People came first. War stories could wait.

War and suffering are inseparable. By driving his troops hard Jackson induced difficulty to prevent tougher suffering ahead. For example he often moved great distances in a short span of time to capture supplies to feed his troops. Many came to recognize that "by the sweat of their brow, he was saving their blood."" A wound received during battle would eventually lead to Jackson's own death. However, he refused to blame the enemy for his own pain. Rather, "he bore his sufferings, and the

amputation of his arm with the utmost Christian fortitude, saying repeatedly that he was perfectly resigned to God's will and would not, if he could, restore the arm, unless assured that it was his Heavenly Father's will."⁴ Even when it came to the ultimate sacrifice, Stonewall never compromised on valuing the lives of others over his own.

Stonewall Jackson was known for his piety, described as pure gold refined by the furnace. His character affected others. During a council of war one evening, Jackson enlisted his officers' views to help him make a decision. Generals A.P. Hill and Ewell were attending. Following the discussion, Jackson said he would make a decision the following morning. Later that evening, Ewell found Jackson on his knees praying for guidance.

The sturdy veteran Ewell was so deeply impressed by this incident and by Jackson's general religious character, that he said: "If that is religion, I must have it;" and in making a profession of faith not long afterwards he attributed his conviction to the influence of Jackson's piety."⁵

Stonewall's leadership affected not only the battlefield outcome, but also, and perhaps more importantly in his view, the lives of those with whom he served.

General Stonewall Jackson professed deep religious convictions, adopted Biblical principles, and chose to live by both. His experiences in command during the Civil War appear to have strengthened his resolve to follow those principles. His ethical conduct reflects implicit trust in God.

Both Confederate generals in this study relied upon a Biblical based framework to underpin their ethical conduct. The

study will now examine two of their counterparts in the Union Army.

General Ulysses S. Grant

Just as the South boasted of the strength of its strategic leaders, the North was endowed with some of the finest as well. The Union's General-in-Chief, General Ulysses S. Grant

...was the leader whose name was the harbinger of victory. He was the most aggressive fighter in the entire list of the world's famous soldiers. ...His methods were all stamped with tenacity of purpose, originality, and ingenuity. He depended for his success more upon the powers of invention than adaptation and the fact that he has been compared at different times to nearly every great commander in history is perhaps the best proof that he was like none of them.⁴⁷

His success is well documented. His conduct has been debated by some; misunderstood by many. The determination of Grant's ethical underpinning is more difficult. What principles guided Grant's ethics and what were those principles based upon?

One gains insight into Grant's ethical basis by examining his answer to a question, which when posed, could have elicited a religious based response. When asked why he was never provoked to swearing he replied,

Well, somehow or other, I never learned to swear, he replied. When a boy I seemed to have an aversion to it, and when I became a man I saw the folly of it. I have noticed, too, that swearing helps to rouse a man's anger; and when a man flies into a passion his adversary who keeps cool always gets the better of him.⁴⁸

Grant reasoned that swearing was counterproductive. There are indications that reason tempered by experience, served as Grant's basis for decision making and personal conduct. In the question

above regarding swearing, Grant's reasoning led him to an ethical conclusion not to swear. An examination of several situations will help to surmise if reason alone guided his conduct and to what extent other factors may have influenced him.

The proposition that reason and experience guided his conduct is validated in how he chose to deal with subordinates. Following his first few years of service after graduating from West Point he reflected on the use of authority and its relationship to successful officers selflessly serving their country:

It did seem to me, in my early army days, that too many of the older officers, when they came to command posts, made it a study to think what orders they could publish to annoy their subordinates and render them uncomfortable. I noticed, however, a few years later, when the Mexican war broke out, that most of this class of officers discovered they were possessed of disabilities which incapacitated them for active field service."

Grant discovered that the best way to gain respect was to earn it. He was a common man, a man of the people who recognized that "by being honest, straightforward, fair, looking out for the interests of and welfare of his men, and assuming no grand airs, he won their regard and they did what he wanted."⁵⁰ Just as his men respected Grant, the great Union general respected his troops, whatever their rank. He listened with equal deference to general and private alike. One account of an interaction with General Thomas at Nashville in which Grant was trying to convince Thomas to attack Hood swiftly, demonstrates his patient and compassionate, yet firm use of authority. Because of his

cautious nature, Thomas had been moving too slowly. Grant sent several dispatches to encourage him to act decisively, yet Thomas hesitated. Grant considered relieving him, but did not. Rather, he patiently tried to impress upon Thomas his views of what action was required. A relief would have quickly yielded the desired battlefield results. Grant chose to use his authority to teach, rather than impeach, his hesitant subordinate.⁵¹

Duty was a reality. In many of his personal papers he shared his thoughts on his obligations in serving the Union. On 26 February 1862, he wrote to his wife Julia concerning his potential position in the Union Army.

Since my promotion some change may take place in my command, but I do not know. I want however to remain in the field and be actively employed. But I shall never ask a favor or change. Whatever is ordered I will do independently and as well as I know how. If a command inferior to my rank is given me it shall make no difference in my zeal.⁵²

He felt a deep obligation to serve his country to the best of his ability, despite the demands placed upon him. Later that year, Grant wrote that "having been educated a soldier, at the expense of the nation, it was my clear duty to offer my services. I never asked for any position or any rank but entered with my whole soul in the cause of the Union, willing to sacrifice every thing in the cause, even my life if needs be, for its preservation."⁵³ His single purpose was to serve the nation that had educated him. This seems to have been based predominantly upon a sense of patriotism and obligation to the Union.

The pressures of war seemed to have strengthen his commitment to the cause. Several accounts record his calm and decisive manner in the midst of battle. During the Battle of the Wilderness at a particularly critical moment in which it appeared that Grant might be personally overrun, an officer asked him, "General, wouldn't it be prudent to move headquarters to the other side of the Germanna road till the result of the present attack is known? The general replied very quietly between the puffs of his cigar, It strikes me it would be better to order up some artillery and defend the present location."⁵⁴ Throughout the most difficult, harassing and important year of the war, 1864, "General Grant never in any instance failed to manifest those traits which were the true element of his greatness. He was always calm amid excitement, and patient under trials."⁵⁵ War's pressures seemed to strengthen his resolve to remain in control emotionally. "In the midst of the most exciting scenes he rarely raised his voice above ordinary pitch or manifested the least irritability."⁵⁶ His guiding principle seemed to be a commitment to control his emotions regardless of the situation. The evidence suggests he succeeded.

One gleans some insight into the selfless service issue through the words of a main adversary. General Longstreet claimed that Grant's most important attribute was his concern for others: "General Grant had come to be known as an all-round fighter seldom, if ever surpassed; but the biggest part of him was his heart."⁵⁷ Grant respected others. He practiced healthy

interpersonal relations. Careful not to criticize officers in the presence of others, Grant only once directly reprimanded a subordinate. This occurred when an officer abandoned his soldiers to exaggerate dangers from enemy maneuvers."

Grant valued human life. His dealings with the enemy, enemy civilians, and POWs reflect a high regard for others. He treated confederate soldiers almost as sons. Once, "two of Meade's corps went hungry for several days that their Southern brothers might be fed."⁵⁹ His generous terms of surrender reveal a compassionate leader. On 3 July 1863, Grant met Pemberton to discuss terms of surrender at Vicksburg:

After some hard bargaining, it was agreed that the garrison would march out and lay down their arms on condition that each individual would sign a written parole not to serve again during the war. They would be free to return home, each officer being allowed to retain his sword and one horse, and his personal baggage.⁶⁰

Grant offered similar terms in April 1865, when the Army of Northern Virginia surrendered. Upon receiving the terms, General Lee, "was greatly touched by Grant's generous permission for his officers to retain their swords, and remarked: 'This will have a very happy effect on my army.'"⁶¹

The problem of innocent suffering troubled General Grant. A leader who could not bear the sight of suffering, his compassion extended beyond the battlefield to innocent civilians. In a letter to his wife, written in June 1862, Grant described families who were casualties of the war: "Now it [Corinth] is desolate the families all having fled long before we got

possession, windows broken furniture broken and destroyed, and no doubt the former occupants destitute and among friends but little better off than themselves. ...All the hardships come upon the weak...⁶² He acted decisively to protect noncombatants. During the Fort Donaldson campaign in 1862, he sent a strong message to Colonel Cook, commander of 3rd Brigade, 2nd Division, regarding his unit's treatment toward enemy civilians.

Some two or three hundred of your Brigade, embracing ~~two or three hundred~~, have been out to-day, robbing and plundering most disgracefully. Some of them were of the 50th Ills. and some of the 7th, and no doubt other Regiments were represented. I hope you will take active measures to ascertain what men have been out, and report their names to me. Officers will be sent immediately off, and be recommended for dismissal without trial, and Non-Commissioned Officers will be reduced to the ranks, and otherwise punished.⁶³

Subsequently, he issued General Field Orders No. 7 addressing the harsh consequences of this misconduct and announcing his displeasure. Part of the order states, "...In an enemy's country, where so much more could be done by a manly and humane policy to advance the cause which we all have so deeply at heart, it is astonishing that men can be found so wanton, as to destroy, pillage and burn indiscriminately without enquiry."⁶⁴

General Grant possessed substantial virtues stemming from a solid value base. Those around him benefitted from his humble, loyal, and honest character. One historian described him as a simple man, somewhat naive, with childlike trust in the integrity of others. Rather than drawing attention to himself, he avoided "anything in the way of bombast or pompous display."⁶⁵ His interest in others produced a reciprocal effect. By his actions,

he imparted ethical standards to them. "...Grant was so complacent in his manner, so even in temper, and so just in his method of dealing with the conflicting interests and annoying questions which arose, that whatever his subordinates may have thought of one another, to him they were at all times well disposed and perfectly loyal."⁶⁶ His fidelity yielded loyalty.

Grant's character appeared impeccable. It was manifested in moral and physical courage. He was even tempered, "patient under trials, sure in judgement, clear in foresight, never depressed by reverses or unduly elated by success."⁶⁷ A well developed set of values seemed to anchor his unwavering character. One could postulate that reason and experiences anchored these values. Strong values plus high ethical standards helped to produce a great strategic leader. "Grants military achievements were largely the product of his innate human qualities, his persona, influenced by his experience of life and environmental conditions."⁶⁸

General William Tecumseh Sherman

General Grant's friend and partner in the grand strategy that eventually led to the South's capitulation was General Sherman. He is best known for the destruction he wrought in his march to the sea, but also for his insight into grand strategy.

William Tecumseh Sherman has come to be recognized as one of the original strategists to emerge from the American Civil War. To Liddell Hart he was "the most original genius of the American Civil War." James McDonough and James Jones, in their recent work on Sherman, speak of him in this manner: "[He] possessed one of the Civil War's finest military minds. He understood the totality of war." At the conclusion of

their study, McDonough and Jones offer this observation: "In the final analysis, although Sherman more than once demonstrated tactical shortcomings in his military career, from the standpoint of strategy, logistics, and communications, the general had no superior on either side of the war; possibly no equal."⁶⁹

Against the background of his campaign across the South and his military genius, one can extract some clues that drove his ethical conduct.

Many have compared Sherman's methods with those of Jackson. "For large numbers of their contemporaries these men epitomized the waging of successful war by drastic measures justified with claims to righteousness."⁷⁰ Both professed offensive and aggressive warfare. However, the basis for their decisions and conduct differed.

Religion may have had some impact on Sherman's decisions, but was not the main factor. Successful soldiering gave his life meaning.

He became that which he wanted more than anything to be, a successful soldier in the United States Army. This was his core, his center, the thing that gave all else in his life meaning. Fulfilling this desire meant that he could have all the other trappings of success - occupation, family, status, respect from peers, recognition, security. Without the core, however, life for Sherman would have been incomplete.⁷¹

The rationale for his decisions seems to have been driven primarily by his drive for success. Among other explanations offered by historians for his relentless pursuit of goals, "was his extreme dedication to the Protestant Ethic."⁷² If Sherman possessed an underlying faith in God and His precepts, it was only secondarily significant in relation to his compulsion in

serving the Union and its righteous cause.

General Sherman sought to end the war through capitulation. Total warfare required punishing the South's homeland until they yielded. He felt so strongly about the Union's cause that he was willing to undergo a reduction in rank to pursue it more directly. Early in the war, during the siege of Donelson, Sherman held a garrison position in which he was providing resources to Grant, then subordinate in rank. Sherman offered to waive his rank if he could be given a field command under Grant.⁷¹

Shiloh (April 62) proved to be the opportunity Sherman sought. Described as a genius born of crisis, he was at his best during battle. Like the other three senior leaders, Sherman reacted calmly and decisively to the pressures of warfare. Twice wounded at Shiloh, he was remembered for his coolness amid chaos. "The men who fought beside him remarked after the battle that all around him were excited orderlies and officers, but though his face was besmeared with powder and blood, battle seemed to have cooled his usually hot nerves."⁷⁴ Shiloh was a turning point. From that point forward he regained confidence in himself, trust of subordinates, and fear from the enemy.

One could postulate that Sherman's devotion to duty and singleness of purpose clouded his judgement in making ethical decisions during his march to the sea. Reality meant total war. In his total war, the enemy reaped the punishment for what it had sown. For example, many questioned the indiscriminate burning,

looting, and destruction of Columbia. While Sherman looked upon the burning city that night, he remarked to General Hazen, "They have brought it upon themselves." Later that evening, when speaking to the Reverend Porter of Columbia, he blamed the Governor for leaving liquor in the city: "Your Governor being a lawyer or Judge, refused to have it destroyed as it was private property, and now my men have got drunk and have got beyond my control, and this is the result."⁷⁵ Sherman then attempted to restore order. He seemed to be suggesting that his own strategy had gotten out of control. Yet he blamed the enemy rather than his own inability or desire to control the situation.

Perhaps the greatest controversy surrounding General Sherman's professional ethics revolves around how he dealt with others. First is the question of his selflessness. "Those who have studied Sherman also agree that he was selfish, prejudiced, at times politically naive, highly image-conscious, capable of arrogance, and quick to pass judgement."⁷⁶ Yet, at times, such as after the Vicksburg campaign, he gave others credit when he could have easily claimed praise for himself. Sherman had opposed Grant's final plan at Vicksburg against the Confederates, "...yet Sherman followed orders to the letter, and when it proved successful it was Sherman who made public his opposition. To a group of civilians, he said, "Grant is entitled to every bit of credit in the campaign. I opposed it; I wrote him a letter about it."⁷⁷

General Sherman did claim credit for the strategy of

destruction in his march to the sea campaign. He did not claim responsibility for creating the hardships endured by those in his path. Those hardships were severe.

Sherman's techniques brought economic and psychological disorganization to much of the South. But accompanying this disorganization was the sociological disruption of that region. Families were put in disarray, complete communities destroyed leaving the inhabitants adrift. Institutions were rendered dysfunctional, and local governments disorganized. Social cohesion, a necessity for human life, was seriously threatened and, in some cases, destroyed. Values, customs, rules were uprooted leaving hundreds of thousands of people adrift in a state of semi-normalness.⁷⁸

From Vicksburg to Columbia, Sherman consistently responded to complaints of undue cruelty to civilians by blaming the victims. The leaders of secession were responsible. Their followers would pay the price. "The way to stop such outrages, he said, was to stop the war. Sherman was now [following Vicksburg] convinced that the quickest way to victory was to lay waste to Southern property."⁷⁹ After the battle of Chattanooga (November 63) a woman complained that his men had done much stealing. The general replied, "Madam, my soldiers have to subsist themselves even if the whole country must be ruined... War is cruelty... The crueler it is, the sooner it will be over."⁸⁰ Sherman did recognize the anguish of those unfortunate enough to be in his path. Responding to a letter during his drive to Atlanta, Sherman wrote:

Even yet my heart bleeds when I see the carnage of battle, the desolation of home, the bitter anguish of families; but the very moment the men of the South say that instead of appealing to reason, to our Congress, to our country, to religion, and to the experience of history - then will I say peace, peace...⁸¹

The realities of war's suffering did not effect his decision to pursue relentlessly, this strategy until the South capitulated. In Atlanta, Sherman stated that "those who brought war into our country deserve all the curses and maledictions a people can pour out. ...and if it involves the destruction of your improvements, we cannot help it."⁸² After the destruction of Columbia, several citizens complained of their hardships. Sherman threatened one woman, "You have suffered much already, but if I have to come back!"⁸³

Throughout the long march, Sherman made little attempt to protect the well-being of innocent civilians. He used their suffering to accomplish his purpose, which was nearly completed at Durham, North Carolina. Sherman planned to offer the same surrender terms to Johnston as Grant had offered to Lee. He even proposed extending the terms to include a general amnesty and a recognition of Southern State governments and officials as a quick way to unite the South in jump starting restoration.⁸⁴ His goal of peace was within reach. With these generous terms, he sought to hasten the rebuilding of his beloved country.

General Sherman's ethical framework defies clear characterization. Just as his nature was diverse and complex, so was the force that drove his conduct. He was truthful and honest. He was also ruthless yet compassionate. His ethical conduct may have been rooted in a set of values that, by their nature, permitted deviation in ethical conduct. One historian claims that, while a youth, Sherman had acquired a strong sense

of right and wrong through a socialization process in a prominent family. His values were to achieve recognition in a respectable position, to be successful, and to gain independence." In light of his leadership during the Civil War, one could conclude that these values, particularly the second, offer a reasonable explanation of his ethical underpinning. By the War's conclusion, he had achieved all three.

OBSERVATIONS

Two of the four leaders, Lee and Jackson, clearly relied on religion to underpin their ethical conduct. Both espoused an absolute faith in God. Both derived certain precepts from their faith. Their precepts closely match the proposed model's guiding principles. And in both cases their conduct, when faced with various issues throughout the war, validated their faith.

Generals Grant and Sherman did not publicly profess faith in God as the driving force behind their ethical framework. For Grant, reason and life's experiences formed his ethical foundation. However, his ethical code closely fits the model's parameters. There are three principal possible explanations. First, his reason and experience could have led him to the same conclusions as a Biblically based theory. Second, he may have had a hidden or partial belief in God and translated it to a code for living. Grant hinted at this in the first two sentences of the preface to his memoirs: "Man proposes and God disposes. There are but few important events in the affairs of men brought

about by their own choice."⁶ Third, the model could be too generic and thereby fit many senior leaders whatever their ethical underpinning. The first explanation is most feasible. Albeit, the other two may be factors.

General Sherman's ethical underpinning seems to have been rooted in his drive for success. Many of the model's guiding principles applied. Some did not. Some appeared to be conditional. For example, consider the principles of respect for others and value for human life. Sherman's decisions and conduct as measured by the corresponding issues of selfless service and dealing with others depicts inconsistency. As stated earlier, most historians rate him as selfish, yet he did exhibit selflessness traits at times. During his march to the sea, he conditioned the termination of his destructive activities with capitulation. When he achieved victory, he advocated self rule as the quickest way for the South to recover from war's devastation. He knew the desired end state. Success based values permitted the strategy that got him there.

CONCLUSION

Two lessons are particularly relevant today. First, absolute values are essential. For the most part, every leader studied held unwavering commitment to an absolute ethical code. No matter whether it was based upon values derived from the Bible, religion, reason and experience, or success motivation, the code served as an absolute mark from which conduct and

ethical decisions were based. General Sherman presents a slight deviation from this principle because he derived his ethical code primarily from secular, success based values. Without an absolute reference such as the Bible, he was free to condition ethical behavior to meet the desired end of the highest secular authority. Even so, Sherman did commit to an ethical code.

The danger today is in unhinging or unmooring from a set of absolute values and undergirding of moral principles. The result is that anybody's code of ethics is acceptable. Current trends in American society are to accept a person's morality and corresponding ethical code, based upon his "status." For example, if one were to say, "I'm inclined toward adultery," than that is acceptable because it's the person's right to claim that status for himself. Or, to violate personal integrity by lying is permitted if it promotes the greater good and protects one's organization and institution from apparent harm. If allowed to continue, this unhinging trend will tear apart the fabric of the Army's culture. The Army's unique mission, encompassing the lives of America's sons and daughters requires absolute professional ethics. Anything less is unsatisfactory.

The second lesson is that Biblical based ethical underpinning serves senior leaders well. Values and precepts espoused by the Bible have long been the basis for the Army's moral and ethical culture. The eight professional ethics listed on the Officer Efficiency Report (dedication, responsibility, loyalty, discipline, integrity, moral courage, selflessness, and

moral standards) are congruent with Biblical commandments and teaching.

Both Lee and Jackson believed their mandate for ethical behavior flowed from a higher authority than man. Faith dictated conduct. Respect, commitment, love, value for human life, integrity and other values and principles were unconditionally accepted. Faith provided their rationale for ethical choices. Adherence to a Biblically based ethical code can facilitate leadership challenges. Take compassion for example. Most leaders understand the need to show compassion. For some it is based upon love. For others it is based upon cultural requirements. Other leaders and soldiers can tell the difference. Leaders who truly love will likely foster a higher level of performance, loyalty, and respect than those who go through the motions merely out of a sense of duty.

There are alternatives to a Biblically based ethical code. Some include the Army's culture and professional ethics, reason, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and self-justified values. One could argue that, presently, these supplement a Biblically-based framework. On 13 May 1884, Congress enacted the oath which is still taken by officers of the United States Armed Forces. It ends with a four word sentence eliciting God's help in carrying out duties: ***So help me God.*** Will America's military strategic leaders seek to preserve God given values or yield to pressures to adopt secular-based values? And if they accept the latter, what will be the cost?

ENDNOTES

¹Attributed to Alexis De Tocqueville by Dwight D. Eisenhower in his final campaign address in Boston, Massachusetts, November 3, 1952. Unverified.

²Alexis De Tocqueville, Democracy In America, trans. George Lawrence, ed. J.P. Mayer, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1969), 292.

³Peter Marshall and David Manuel, The Light and the Glory (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1977), 323.

⁴Department of the Army, Guideposts for a Proud and Ready Army (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 March 1985), 3.

⁵Department of the Army, FM 100-1, The Army (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, October 1991), 16.

⁶Michael Josephson, Ethics Awareness Seminar (Marina Del Rey, CA: The Josephson Institute, 1992), 5.

⁷Joel J. Kupperman, The Foundations of Morality, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983), 50.

⁸William W. Braun, An Ethical Army Leadership - Real or Wanting?, Study Project (Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 30 March 1988), 2.

⁹Clay T. Buckingham, "Ethics and the Senior Officer: Institutional Tensions," Parameters 3 (Autumn, 1985): 25-32.

¹⁰James B. Stockdale, "Machiavelli, Management, and Moral Leadership," in Military Ethics, (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1987), 44.

¹¹Kupperman, 15-16.

¹²Buckingham, 23.

¹³Charles C. Ryrie, trans., The Ryrie Study Bible (Chicago: Moody Press, 1978), 123-124.

¹⁴Ibid., 1631.

¹⁵Richard A. Gabriel, To Serve With Honor (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 36.

¹⁶Executive Leadership Foundation, Inc., Executive Guide To Ethical Decision-Making (Atlanta: Executive Leadership Foundation, 1987), 5-33.

¹⁷Kay Arthur, Where are You When Bad Things Happen?, (Portland: Multnomah Press, 1992), 135.

¹⁸Margaret Sanborn, Robert E. Lee, Vol. 2, (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966-1968), 15.

¹⁹Margaret Sanborn, Robert E. Lee, Vol. 1, (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966-1968), 226.

²⁰John J. Meyers, Robert E. Lee Great Captain of History?, Study Project (Carlisle Barracks: US Army War college, 6 April 1990), 16.

²¹Sanborn, Vol. 2, 72.

²²A.L. Long, Memoirs of Robert E. Lee, (New York: J.M. Stoddart, 1887), 223.

²³Long, 223.

²⁴Ibid., 240.

²⁵Sanborn, Vol 1., 223.

²⁶Long, 229.

²⁷Ibid., 260.

²⁸Sanborn, Vol. 1, 40.

²⁹Warren J. Richards, God Blessed Our Arms with Victory (New York: Vantage Press, 1986), 69.

³⁰Ibid., 78.

³¹Mrs. Walter D. Lamar, comp., Extracts from Christ in the Camp (Macon, GA, 1936), 6.

³²John W. Jones, Christ in the Camp (Richmond: B.F. Johnson & Co., 1887), 91.

³³Long, 257.

³⁴Richards, 17.

³⁵Ibid., 24.

³⁶Ibid., 58.

³⁷Ibid., 69.

³⁸Ibid., 57.

- ¹⁹Lamar, 7.
- ⁴⁰Long, .
- ⁴¹Richards, 17.
- ⁴²Ibid., 64.
- ⁴³Jones, 87.
- ⁴⁴Richards, 60.
- ⁴⁵Jones, 97.
- ⁴⁶Lamar, 7.
- ⁴⁷Horace Porter, Campaigning with Grant (New York: The Century Co., 1897), 513.
- ⁴⁸Ibid., 251.
- ⁴⁹Mary D. McFeely and William S. McFeely, eds., Grant Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant Selected Letters 1839-1865 (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1990) 36.
- ⁵⁰Arthur L. Conger, The Rise of U. S. Grant (New York: The Century Co., 1931), 360.
- ⁵¹Ibid., 359.
- ⁵²John Y. Simon, ed., The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967), 292.
- ⁵³Ibid., 132.
- ⁵⁴Porter, 59.
- ⁵⁵Ibid., 248.
- ⁵⁶Ibid., 249.
- ⁵⁷Ibid., 515.
- ⁵⁸Ibid., 249.
- ⁵⁹Conger, 60.
- ⁶⁰James H. Marshall-Cornall, Grant as a Military Commander (London: B. T. Batsford, 1970), 117.
- ⁶¹Ibid., 220.

⁶²Simon, 137-138.

⁶³Ibid., 177.

⁶⁴Ibid., 178.

⁶⁵Marshall-Cornall, 221.

⁶⁶Porter, 248.

⁶⁷Ibid., 514.

⁶⁸Marshall-Cornall, 221.

⁶⁹Charles E. Vetter, SHERMAN Merchant of Terror, Advocate of Peace (Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing Company, Inc., 1992), 19.

⁷⁰Charles Royster, The Destructive War (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1991), xi.

⁷¹Vetter, 15-16.

⁷²Ibid., 17.

⁷³Ibid., 109.

⁷⁴Ibid., 114-115.

⁷⁵Royster, 26-27.

⁷⁶Vetter, 19.

⁷⁷Ibid., 121.

⁷⁸Ibid., 22.

⁷⁹Richard Wheeler, We Knew William Tecumseh Sherman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1977), 55.

⁸⁰Ibid., 59.

⁸¹Ibid., 70-71.

⁸²Ibid., 77.

⁸³Royster, 30.

⁸⁴Ibid., 347.

⁸⁵Vetter, 16-19.

⁸⁶McFeely, 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arthur, Kay. Where are You When Bad Things Happen?. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1992.
- Braun, William W. An Ethical Army Leadership - Real or Wanting? Study Project, Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 30 March 1988.
- Buckingham, Clay T. "Ethics and the Senior Officer: Institutional Tensions." Parameters 3 (Autumn 1985): 23-32.
- Conger, Arthur L. The Rise of U. S. Grant. New York: The Century Co., 1931.
- Davis, Burke. Gray Fox: Robert E. Lee and the Civil War. New York: Rinehart, 1956.
- DeGeorge, Richard T. "A Code of Ehtics for Officers." Military Ethics. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1987.
- De Tocqueville. Democracy In America. Translated by George Lawrence and Edited by J.P. Mayer. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1969.
- Douglas, Henry K. I Rode with Stonewall. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina press, 1940.
- Executive Leadership Foundation, Inc. Executive Guide To Ethical Decision Making. Atlanta: Executive Leadership Foundation, Inc., 1987.
- Freeman, Douglas S. Lee of Virginia. New York: Scribner, 1958.
- Gabriel, Richard A. To Serve With Honor. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.
- Jones, John W. Christ in the Camp. Richmond: B.F. Johnson & Co., 1887.
- Josephson, Michael. Ethics Awareness Seminar. Marina Del Rey, CA: The Josephson Institute, 1992.
- Kupperman, Joel J. The Foundations of Morality. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983.
- Lamar, Mrs. Walter D., comp. Extracts from Christ in the Camp. Macon, GA, 1936.

- Long, A.L. Memoirs of Robert E. Lee. New York: J.M. Stoddart, 1887.
- Marshall-Cornall, James H. Grant as Military Commander. London: B. T. Batsford, 1970.
- Marshall, Peter and David Manuel. The Light and the Glory. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming J. Revell Co., 1977.
- McFeely, Mary D., and William S. McFeely. Grant Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant Selected Letters 1839-1865. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1990.
- Meyers, John J. Robert E. Lee Great Captain of History?. Study Project, Carlisle Barracks: US Army War College, 6 April 1990.
- Porter, Horace. Campaigning with Grant. New York: The Century Co., 1897.
- Richards, Warren J. God Blessed Our Arms with Victory. New York: Vantage Press, 1986.
- Rouner, Leroy S., ed., Foundations of Ethics. Notre Dame & London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.
- Royster, Charles. The Destructive War: William Tecumseh Sherman. Stonewall Jackson, and the Americans. New York: Random House, 1991.
- Ryrie, Charles C., trans. The Ryrie Study Bible. Chicago: Moody Press, 1978.
- Sanborn, Margaret. Robert E. Lee. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966-1968.
- Sanborn, Margaret. Robert E. Lee. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966-1968.
- Simon John Y., ed. The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.
- Stockdale, James B. "Machiavelli, Management, and Moral Leadership." Military Ethics. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1987.
- U.S. Department of the Army. FM 100-1, The Army. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, October 1991.
- U.S. Department of the Army. Guideposts for a Proud and Ready Army. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 March 1985.

Vetter, Charles E. SHERMAN Merchant of Terror, Advocate of Peace. Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing Company, Inc., 1992.

Wheeler, Richard. We Knew William Tecumseh Sherman. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1977.