

2019

Incident of War: Civil War Soldiers and Military Executions of Deserters

Ruofei Qu

College of William and Mary ('18); Harvard Law School, rqu@email.wm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/jbhr>



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

Recommended Citation

Qu, Ruofei (2019) "Incident of War: Civil War Soldiers and Military Executions of Deserters," *James Blair Historical Review*. Vol. 9 : Iss. 1 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/jbhr/vol9/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in James Blair Historical Review by an authorized editor of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

Incident of War: Civil War Soldiers and Military Executions of Deserters

Ruofei Qu

During the American Civil War, deserters in both the Union and Confederate armies sometimes faced the extreme penalty of death. Soldiers who observed these executions generally found the scene impressive and distressing; but most soldiers found the executions necessary, or at least refrained from taking an explicit moral stance. The soldiers' attitudes toward capital punishment for desertion and the rituals of military execution influenced each other. Their mixed feelings both sanctioned and limited the practice of execution for desertion. Rituals of military execution were designed to maximize deterrence, and military officials customarily adjusted them to minimize their negative effects on morale. The rituals, however, sometimes had unintended effects depending on individual observers' sensitivities. For most soldiers, however, perceived deterrent effects sufficiently justified the cruelty and humiliation involved in executions.

Limited literature has focused on Civil War military executions, and most has focused on the Union Army, probably because more primary documents written by Union soldiers are extant. Historian Aaron Bachmann explores the relationship between executions of deserters and wartime expansion of the federal government's power.¹ He argues that the state attempted to demonstrate control over individual citizens through these executions, but that the effort failed because citizens viewed the executions as cruel and unjust. Citizen-soldiers rejected military executions of deserters to reject the government's expanding power. Historian Steven J. Ramold describes the application of punishment in the Union Army, including executions.² He observes that soldiers usually had no sympathy for prisoners executed for the offenses of

spying, raping, or deserting to the enemy, but soldiers disagreed on whether executions for other offenses, such as sleeping on guard or desertion from the army, were justified. He also argues that as citizen-soldiers, Civil War soldiers tended to challenge executions for desertion as unjust. This paper complicates this narrative by showing that soldiers had mixed feelings toward executions and that they did not oppose executions for desertion more than those for other offenses.

Other scholars focus more broadly on the wartime justifications of killing and death. Historian James McPherson examines soldiers' reasons for fighting the war and their justifications for battlefield killing.³ This paper argues that these factors fail to justify the calculated killings in military executions, which must have had a different, necessity-based rationale. Historian Drew Gilpin Faust explores the idea of the "Good Death" and how soldiers and civilians worked together to preserve the idea throughout the war.⁴ She argues that military executions were designed to contrast with the "Good Death," but that the centrality of readiness persisted and was even reinforced by the rituals of execution. This paper confirms Faust's argument and further shows how rituals of execution both manipulated and were influenced by the idea of the "Good Death" among soldiers and civilians.

Analyzing soldiers' letters and diaries, newspaper articles published during the war, and manuals of military law, this paper makes three related observations. First, most soldiers accepted executions for desertion, relying on necessity-based, rather than ideology-based, justification. Second, the rationales for battlefield killing failed to justify executions, creating a tension between the soldiers' moral abhorrence of and practical acquiescence in the practice. Third, this tension shaped the way rituals of military executions evolved during the war.

For many Civil War soldiers, military executions, while designed to impress observers, were in fact the most horrible scenes they witnessed during the war, despite the prevalence of brutal deaths on the battlefield. Having to witness the calculated, humiliating killing of a fellow soldier was the nightmare of many soldiers. Private Moses Parker from Vermont wrote in a family letter that battlefield scenes "are bad enough but are not compared to the one we witnessed to day; the shooting of a comrade for desertion."⁵

Charles William Bardeen from Massachusetts also emphasized in his memoir the difference between battlefield killings and executions: “In battle men fall all around you, but you don’t know who it is going to be or when. To see a man sitting on his coffin and know that the instant the word is given he will pass out of this life in another is solemn.”⁶ The woeful comparison of battlefield and execution killings in these soldiers’ words emphasizes the distinction that soldiers tended to make between the two kinds of death.

But terrified by these scenes as they were, soldiers rarely spoke out against the practice of executing deserters and often sought, at least tacitly, to support the practice. They typically wrote detailed descriptions of the executions in letters and diaries, then either proceeded to endorse the practice or kept silent on its moral legitimacy. They were disturbed by the executions emotionally but at the same time justified them rationally. Moreover, what are usually considered soldiers’ reasons and justifications for fighting and killing on the battlefield failed to balance against the horror of orchestrated killing. Explanations of soldiers’ shifting justifications for different sorts of killings follow a general trend among modern historians. Historian James McPherson argues that patriotism and cultures of honor and manhood motivated soldiers to fight; thus, brave soldiers disparaged deserters for their cowardice.⁷ But these sentiments seem to have disappeared at scenes of execution. No observer expressed hatred or contempt in writings toward the deserter being executed, as would be expected in the framework of patriotism and a manhood-honor culture. Moreover, while historian Steven J. Ramold argues that unmanly acts such as “crying” or “pleading for mercy” would convince observers that the “convicted soldiers deserved their deaths,” sources show that these behaviors could in fact earn sympathy.⁸ Alabama Private John Milton Hubbard’s description of an execution included the following: “the poor fellows...gave forth the most pitiful wailings. The cries of one of the condemned, a mere stripling, were particularly distressing.” “Guilty or not guilty,” he “somehow wished that these victims of their own acts would escape the impending doom.”⁹ The sentiments of patriotism and manhood, while forceful on the battlefield, paled before the horror of publicly executing a fellow soldier. Soldiers also developed rationales to overcome the religious commandment

of “Thou Shalt Not Kill,” which required clarification in cases of executions.¹⁰ The self-defense justification and the combat-murder distinction even intensified the horror of seeing a hand-tied and blindfolded man, seated on his coffin, “shot down like a dog,” as observers put it.¹¹ Most historiography has failed to note this distinction in the writings of Civil War soldiers and does not often repeat the most common justification for the execution of deserters: safety.

The only thing that could justify the orchestrated taking of a soldier’s life was the safety of more soldiers’ lives. Wartime necessity was the primary, if not the only, justification accepted by soldiers themselves. Union General George Gordon Meade boasted after an execution of five deserters, “not a murmur against the justice or the propriety of the act was heard. Indeed, the men are the most anxious to see this great evil [of desertion] cured, as they know their own security will be advanced thereby.”¹² While Meade might have been biased by his position as a general, many soldiers, northern and southern alike, started or ended their accounts of executions with a justification. Confederate soldier McHenry Howard wrote, “Desertions...were increasing and it was necessary to make a stern example.”¹³ Spencer Glasgow Welch from South Carolina believed that “severe punishments,” including executions, “seem necessary to preserve discipline,” and that “there is no other way to put a stop to desertions.”¹⁴ Josiah Marshall Favill from New York wrote, “There are many cases of desertion...and in order to keep the army together it is indispensable to resort to the most severe punishment.” He thought that the duty to carry out an execution was “certainly an awful and solemn duty, yet necessary for the safety of the forces.”¹⁵ Oliver Wilcox Norton from Pennsylvania also justified an execution he observed by claiming, “desertions had become so common that energetic action alone could stop them.”¹⁶

Observers’ reactions to last-minute pardons further show that executions of deserters were more about deterrence than about retribution or some high-minded patriotic ideal. Confederate soldier Richard Ramsey Hancock, initially endorsing an execution because “the disposition to leave camp without permission...prevailed to such a degree as to render severe measures imperative,” was “glad to say” that they “returned to camp without seeing any one shot.” As an officer declared the pardon, Hancock heard “a loud cheer...went

up from the whole brigade.”¹⁷ Similarly, Union soldier Charles H. Lynch heard “a few faint cheers from some of the boys” when the prisoner received a last-minute pardon from President Lincoln and was “thankful that [he] did not have to witness the execution.”¹⁸ Soldiers endorsed the practice of executing deserters generally, but did not wish to see a specific person executed. More interesting evidence comes from a news article published during the war, “A Solemn Warning to Wives.” Reporting the execution of a deserter, the article claimed that “[i]t was ascertained [the deserter] was as true as steel to our cause, and that it was on account of his wife that he deserted. He received a letter from her full of complaints.”¹⁹ While explicitly saying that the deserter was not responsible for his offense, the article did not even hint that the penalty was unjust, but rather tried to maximize utility from the execution by warning wives not to complain in letters. Necessity seems to be the only consideration behind executions for desertion.

With soldiers abhorring the scenes of execution but appreciating their value as deterrents, officials faced the challenge of maximizing deterrence without appearing excessively cruel. Rituals of military execution, spelled out in manuals and adjusted in practice, served these carefully balanced goals.²⁰ The rituals deliberately violated some aspects of the “Good Death” concept to dramatize the execution and impress the observers.²¹ Yet the rituals strived to maintain other aspects of the Good Death, mostly to give the appearance of a religious endorsement of the execution.

Historian Drew Gilpin Faust points out that military executions in particular manifested “the centrality of readiness to the Good Death.”²² Indeed, readiness was perhaps the most strictly obeyed aspect of the Good Death, both because the officials themselves believed that the execution of an unprepared person was inhumane and because readiness lent religious legitimacy to the execution. Confederate Sergeant McHenry Howard received the order of a deserter’s execution with “a direction that the sentence should not be communicated to the prisoners until the morning of the day fixed for the execution.” He wrote in his memoir, “I passed a wretched night, with broken sleep and dreams that I had overslept myself and had waked to find the sun high in the heavens and that I was full of remorse at having lost the men so much of their scanty time for preparation.”²³ Before Union General George Gordon Meade

executed five deserters on August 29, 1863, the deserters had petitioned him for clemency or, alternatively, an extension of their execution: “We...at the present time, are unprepared to die...Two of us are Roman Catholics; we have no priest, and two are Protestants, one is a Jew and has no rabbi to assist us in preparing to meet our God”²⁴ While refusing to reduce their sentences, Meade managed to find proper clergymen for the prisoners. His efforts were appreciated, at least by a newspaper: “The spectacle was an unusual one: the Protestant, the Hebrew, and the Catholic stood side by side, uttering prayers for the departed souls.”²⁵

After preliminary preparations, the “great ceremony” of military execution was to be observed by a large number of troops.²⁶ As provided in the manuals, the troops would form three sides of a square, waiting for the prisoner to march in from the open side. Some soldiers protested such mandatory attendance. Union soldier William Bircher wrote, albeit in a non-desertion case, “Nobody wished to see so sad a sight. Some of the men begged to be excused from attending, and others could not be found when their drums beat the ‘assembly;’ for none could well endure, as they said, ‘to see a man shot down like a dog.’”²⁷ But observers generally captured the message of warning and solemnity, with almost all of them describing the arrangement of troops in their writings and some of them placing it in a landscape of a “large open field” or a “lonely, wild valley” or in “dull and cloudy” weather.²⁸ These solemn sites and situations apparent in soldiers’ writings reflect the intended message of the execution.

The impacts of execution were not limited to the tone set by positioning of the executed and fellow soldiers. The Provost-Marshal would lead a march, followed by a band playing the “Dead March,” the execution party, the coffin carried by four men or in a horse wagon, the prisoner, the chaplain, and the escort.²⁹ The dirge, contrasted by the silence of the troops, caught the attention of many observers, as reflected in their writings. Union officer Josiah Marshall Favill, for example, wrote, “The doomed man marches to his own funeral, to the solemn music of the band, in presence of the whole command.”³⁰ Union private Oliver Wilcox Norton also described the march with “the muffled roll of the drum and the mournful shriek of the fife alone breaking the silence of that assembled multitude.” The harsh scene of the prisoner walking

behind his own coffin was another focal point of the writings. These audial and visual elements achieved their goal of dramatizing death and making the execution as unforgettable as possible for the observers. Some soldiers paid attention to the prisoner's clothing: "the prisoner walk[ed] close behind, his buttons and regimental insignia stripped from his clothing."³¹ The clothing was intended to shame the deserter and distance the army from his behaviors.

Before the execution was carried out, the Provost Marshal would read the order for execution and the chaplain would pray with the prisoner. The procedures endowed the execution with legal and religious legitimacies. While both steps were provided in the manuals and were probably done in all executions, the prayer appears more frequently in soldiers' writings. Perhaps the prayer provided the witnesses of the moral nightmare with some important consolation.

The manuals did not provide that the prisoner should be seated on his coffin, but it became the custom in executions of deserters. Reporting on the execution of William Henry Johnson, the first Union soldier executed for desertion, *Frank Leslie's Weekly* wrote, "He was too weak to stand; he sat down on the foot of the coffin."³² The custom was intended to portray the prisoner as weak and unmanly. Observers almost invariably mentioned the prisoners' posture in their writings; some also said that prisoners were blindfolded and sometimes tied, but it is unclear whether the observers endorsed the message of humiliation or found the scene excessively cruel.

In Johnson's execution, two German soldiers in the firing party did not discharge their guns. Johnson died a slow and tortuous death, and the two soldiers were "immediately put in irons."³³ Many soldiers probably had similar difficulties shooting at their former comrades, and the custom of not loading all guns was intended to solve this problem. Confederate physician Spencer Glasgow Welch wrote about an execution, "[the prisoner] was hit by but one ball, because eleven of the guns were loaded with powder only. This was done so that no man can be certain that he killed him. If he was, the thought of it might always be painful to him." In other cases, half of the guns could be loaded, or all could be loaded but one. However, when the prisoner was especially hated, such as when he deserted not to the rear, but to the enemy, such custom could be abandoned.

Union soldier Charles William Bardeen wrote, “When a company of the 71st Indiana captured one of their own number who had become a deserter and a spy...they all begged for permission to shoot him. The number detailed was fifteen, and fifteen bullets were found in his body.”³⁴

Immediately after the execution, surgeons would examine the body, which could be a grave moral burden on the surgeons. Union physician John Gardner Perry wrote before an execution, “I expect to be detailed as one of the surgeons to examine the body after it falls. I feel too sad to write.” Finally, the manuals provided that troops should “move past the body in slow time,” probably to deepen their impressions of the execution.³⁵ This practice, however, could distress the already horrified soldiers and devastate morale. Confederate private John Milton Hubbard observed that after an execution, “there was a profound sensation among the soldiers, which it took a battle to shake off.”³⁶ Officials sought to counter this sensation by speeding up the process and directing the band to play music. Union officer Josiah Marshall Favill wrote that when the execution was over, “the bands strike up a lively air, and at a quick step the troops march back to their camps.”³⁷ Union soldier William Bircher also wrote, “The bands and drum-corps of the division struck up a quick step as the division...marched past the grave.”³⁸ But as a musician, he “could not help being sensible of the harsh contrast between the lively music...and the fearfully solemn scene I had just witnessed. The transition from the ‘Dead March’ to the quick step was quite too sudden.”³⁹ Observers could receive different messages from the rituals, depending on their individual sensitivities and roles in the ritual of execution.

The grave and the coffin were designed to violate the Good Death’s requirement of “preserv[ing] the identity of the deceased from oblivion.”⁴⁰ The coffin always had no inscription. Union General George Henry Gordon described the burial of an executed deserter: “a small burial party lowered the body, filled the grave with earth, covered the slight mound with a green sod and left the scene of this tragedy alone with the dead.”⁴¹ Deliberate oblivion was thus the final way to disgrace the deserter and coerce other soldiers into obedience.

The rituals generally achieved the goal of impressing observers. Union officer Josiah Marshall Favill wrote, “A military

execution is a very solemn and impressive pageant...The utmost pomp and display was made, to render the executions as impressive as possible.”⁴² Union soldier Charles William Bardeen also commented, “It was a terrible sight, likely to haunt the beholder for a long time, but that was what was intended.”⁴³ Soldiers understood that the rituals were designed to impress and accepted them as a wartime reality.

Historian Aaron Bachmann argues that Union soldiers opposed executions for desertion as a way of opposing the state’s expanding control over the individual.⁴⁴ He points out that “many soldiers...argued that the death penalty” for desertion “was a brutalizing experience for everyone involved,” and that executions would only “blunt men’s finer sensibilities.”⁴⁵ Bachmann is partly right: soldiers did complain about the brutalizing effects of executions. Union soldier Green Berry Samuels wrote, “I can bear to see hundreds shot in battle, but everything in me recoils from seeing a man shot in cold blood; and if these horrible scenes do not stop, my whole nature will change.” But most soldiers merely hoped to distance themselves from executions without condemning the practice: as Union soldier Charles H. Lynch’s remarked, “Don’t wish to witness anything more like that.”⁴⁶ Even when condemning executions, they did not blame the officials or the Provost Marshal, but the war generally. Union soldier David Lane exclaimed, “I am forced to see enough of human misery. Would God I might never see more. Oh, this cruel, murderous war! Will it never end?”⁴⁷ For many soldiers, if the government did anything wrong, it was not executing deserters, but waging the war. This distinction reflects soldiers’ conflicting attitudes toward the brutalizing effects of executions: as necessary as they may have been, they are unwelcome for the citizen-soldier and cast into doubt the war effort as a whole for some.

Bachmann also argues that soldiers generally accepted executions for peacetime offenses such as murder and rape while opposing executions for desertion, which shows that they were in fact opposing the government’s increasing control over the individual. Sources show, however, that most soldiers accepted executions for both peacetime and wartime offenses despite finding them dreadful emotionally. The soldiers were even less likely to conceal their sympathy to rapists and murders than to deserters.

Bircher, observing an execution of a rapist, saw “many a rough fellow, from whom you would hardly have expected any sign of pity, pretending to be adjusting his cap...and furtively...dashing away the tears that could not be kept from trickling down the bronzed and weatherbeaten cheek.”⁴⁸ Soldiers never expressed sympathy for deserters so explicitly. Perhaps they did sympathize with deserters—but the real, tangible issue of their own safety prevented them from expressing such sympathy. As Bachmann points out, since the early nineteenth century, American public opinion had started to shift against public executions and toward either private executions or the abolition of the death penalty.⁴⁹ The rituals of military executions were designed in a public and humiliating way that would have stimulated opposition in peacetime, which explains why soldiers sympathized with murderers and rapists executed in military executions. But since deterrence was the rationale for executions of deserters, cruelty and humiliation were to some extent understood as necessary and tolerated in such cases.

When General Gordon was preparing for the execution of a deserter, a local civilian approached him, “Is it true, General, that you are going to shoot one of your men to-day?” He continued, “My dear sir, you must not think any worse of me if I say this execution is a dreadful thing! And yet it is an incident of the war...it is historical, and – bless my soul, sir! – I want to see it; and...I should like to take my little boys with me.” The civilian, who brought his six-, eight-, and ten-year old sons to witness the execution, was “the first on the field and the last to leave it.”⁵⁰ Soldiers were much less eager than this man to witness executions, but their detailed accounts of the executions resonate with the man’s feeling that they were seeing something “historical.” They closely scrutinized the rituals of execution to make sense of this wartime anomaly, the temporariness of which attracted the civilian and soothed the soldiers. The moral agony of seeing fellow soldiers shot publicly, calculatedly, and disgracefully was relieved only by the belief that the executions were merely a result of wartime necessity—that they were an “incident of war” that would soon end with the coming of peace.

This paper has examined the writings of Civil War soldiers and officers concerning the executions they observed or participated in.

Among the 17 authors, ten were soldiers and seven were officers. Twelve authors served in the Union army, and five served in the Confederate army. Attitudes toward executions did not significantly differ between soldiers and officers, or between the Union and Confederate Armies. Seven authors wrote letters and six wrote diaries during the war, while the other four wrote memoirs after the war. Descriptions of executions tend to be lengthier and more emotional in memoirs than in letters and diaries, but authors were not more likely to take an explicit moral stance on the legitimacy of the practice in memoirs. The authors were predominantly white, but one black soldier wrote about an execution in a letter. There were at least two physicians, two teachers, one musician, and one lawyer among the authors. This paper focused on executions for desertion, but also included two cases of rape as comparison. It also considered a few wartime newspaper articles to provide additional insights into public opinion and how it helped to shape the rituals of execution. Analyses of the documents lead to the conclusion that soldiers grudgingly accepted the practice of executing deserters as a necessary and temporary wartime anomaly. The tension between perceived necessity and lack of moral justification left a mark on the evolution of rituals of military executions throughout the war. Historiography on Civil War soldiers' responses to military executions and the rituals of executions mostly view them from an ideological perspective. This paper complicates the narrative by exploring the interactions and tensions between ideologies and wartime necessity.

Notes

¹ Aaron Bachmann, "Union Deserter Executions and the Limits of State Authority," (master's thesis, William and Mary, 2006).

² Steven J. Ramold, *Baring the Iron Hand: Discipline in the Union Army* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010).

³ James M. McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

⁴ Drew Gilpin Faust, "The Civil War Soldier and the Art of Dying," *Journal of Southern History* 67, No. 1 (Feb., 2001): 3-38.

⁵ Moses A. Parker to Eliza Hale, 5 January 1865; in *A War of the People: Vermont Civil War Letters*, ed. Jeffrey Marshall (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999), 80-81.

⁶ Charles William Bardeen, Memoir of Charles William Bardeen, in *A Little Fifer's War Diary: with 17 Maps, 60 Portraits, and 246 Other Illustrations* (Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen, 1910), 288.

⁷ McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 15-29, 77-89.

⁸ Ramold, *Baring the Iron Hand*, 376.

⁹ John Milton Hubbard, Memoir of John Milton Hubbard, in *Notes of a Private* (Memphis: Nixon-Jones Printing Company, 1913), 96.

¹⁰ McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, 71-74.

¹¹ William Bircher, Diary of William Bircher, March, 1865, in *A Drummer-Boy's Diary: Comprising Four Years of Service with the Second Regiment Minnesota Veteran Volunteers, 1861 to 1865* (St. Paul: St. Paul Book and Stationery Company, 1889), 177.

¹² George Gordon Meade to Margaretta Sergeant Meade, August 31, 1863, in *The Life and Letters of George Gordon Meade, Major-General United States Army*, vol. 2, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913).

¹³ McHenry Howard, *Recollections of a Maryland Confederate Soldier and Staff Officer Under Johnston, Jackson and Lee* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co., 1914), 226.

¹⁴ Spencer Glasgow Welch to Cordelia Strother Welch, March 5, 1863, in *A Confederate Surgeon's Letters to his Wife* (Washington, DC: Neale Publishing Company, 1911), 45, 78.

¹⁵ Josiah Marshall Favill, Diary of Josiah Marshall Favill, July, 1863, in *The Diary of a Young Officer Serving with the Armies of the United States during the War of the Rebellion microform* (Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1909), 253.

¹⁶ Oliver Wilcox Norton, Memoir of Oliver Wilcox Norton, in *Army Letters, 1861-1865: Being Extracts from Private Letters to Relatives and Friends from a Soldier in the Field during the Later Civil War, with an Appendix Containing Copies of Some Official Documents, Papers and Addresses of Later Date* (Chicago: O.L. Deming, 1903), 283.

¹⁷ Richard Ramsey Hancock, Diary of Richard Ramsey Hancock, February, 1864, in *Hancock's Diary, or, A History of the Second Tennessee Confederate Cavalry: with Sketches of First and Seventh Battalions* (Nashville: Brandon Print. Co., 1887), 309.

¹⁸ Charles H. Lynch, Diary of Charles H. Lynch, February, 1865, in *The Civil War Diary, 1862-1865, of Charles H. Lynch, 18th Conn. Vol's* (Hartford: Case Lockwood & Brainard Co., 1915), 141.

¹⁹ "A Solemn Warning to Wives," *Spirit of the Age* (Woodstock, VT), March 23, 1863.

²⁰ See William C. DeHart, *Observations on Military Law and the Constitution and Practice of Courts Martial* (New York: Wiley and Halsted, 1859), 247-248, and Alexander Macomb, *The Practice of Courts Martial* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1841), 75-76.

²¹ Faust, "Art of Dying," 30.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Howard, *Recollections*, 225-226.

²⁴ Robert I. Alotta, *Civil War Justice: Union Army Executions under Lincoln* (Shippensburg: White Mane Publishing Company, Inc., 1989), 78.

²⁵ "The General Press Dispatch," *New York Herald*, August 31, 1863.

²⁶ Macomb, *Practice of Courts Martial*, 75.

²⁷ Bircher, *Drummer-Boy's Diary*, 177.

²⁸ Charles H. Lynch, Diary of Charles H. Lynch, August, 1864, in *The Civil War Diary, 1862-1865, of Charles H. Lynch, 18th Conn. Vol's* (Hartford: Case Lockwood & Brainard Co., 1915), 110; Norton, *Army Letters*, 284.

- ²⁹ Macomb, *Practice of Courts Martial*, 75-76.
- ³⁰ Favill, *Diary of a Young Officer*, 253.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 253.
- ³² "Military Execution," January 4, 1862.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ Bardeen, *Little Fifer's War Diary*, 288.
- ³⁵ John Gardner Perry, letter, October 9, 1863, in *Letters from a Surgeon of the Civil War* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1906), 100.
- ³⁶ Hubbard, *Notes of a Private*, 96.
- ³⁷ Favill, *Diary of a Young Officer*, 253.
- ³⁸ Bircher, *Drummer-Boy's Diary*, 179.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 180.
- ⁴⁰ Faust, "Art of Dying," 19.
- ⁴¹ George Henry Gordon, Memoir of George Henry Gordon, in *A War Diary of Events in the War of the Great Rebellion, 1863-1865* (Boston: James R. Osgood & Company, 1882), 165.
- ⁴² Favill, *Diary of a Young Officer*, 253.
- ⁴³ Bardeen, *Little Fifer's War Diary*, 288.
- ⁴⁴ Bachmann, "Union Deserter Executions," 59.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 60.
- ⁴⁶ Charles H. Lynch, *Diary of Charles H. Lynch*, August, 1864.
- ⁴⁷ David Lane, *Diary of David Lane*, January, 1864, in *A Soldier's Diary: The Story of a Volunteer; 1862-1865* (Privately published, 1905), 137.
- ⁴⁸ Bircher, *Drummer-Boy's Diary*, 180.
- ⁴⁹ Bachmann, "Union Deserter Executions," 57.
- ⁵⁰ Gordon, *War of the Great Rebellion*, 163-164.