



Forum 4

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

**Comparing Sources**by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, February 14, 2015, 9:51 PM

To post, you will click the "reply" link MY post. If you want to reply to a specific comment made by another student, click the "reply" link located on that student's specific post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES As in all forums, put something descriptive in the subject line of your post, based on one of the three topics you are discussing. Other students wanting to talk about the same issue can click the "reply" button to your post, thus helping organize this discussion.

Sum of ratings: -

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Video not uploading**by [Heather Reed](#) - Tuesday, February 17, 2015, 4:53 PM

I am the only one out there having problems getting the video to launch? I even tried the link and nothing!! Please advise me on what to do.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Video not uploading**by [Gabrielle Jones](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 10:04 AM

I got the video to play for maybe 4 minutes and then it just stopped and I tried the link and nothing happened.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Video not uploading**by [Edgar Rodriguez](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 9:37 PM

I just had the same problem and can't seem to find out what is wrong.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Video not uploading**by [Heather Reed](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 9:41 PM

I was finally able to watch it on my phone. My computer is now giving me debugging messages every ten minutes after trying to watch the video. So if you have a smart phone try it that way.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**SOURCES!SOURCES!SOURCES!**by [Jordan Hevern](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 10:06 PM

1. Robert E. Lee and Ulysses S. Grant

When comparing these two generals, I would say they both were kind of the same type of general. They both were hard workers, and fought for what they believed in. They did everything in their power to win every battle they encountered. All three sources give the same general idea of the bravery of these two generals, though in the Kevin Burns film, I think that they make Ulysses seem weaker than Lee, which could be true and debatable all at the same time, because Lee was considered one of the greatest commanders, even Lincoln believed so. Though the battle ended with Lee surrendering and Ulysses concurring, these two were very similar in their way of fighting. To me, the video compares them as, in a sense, "equals," though they don't use that word, the narrator talks highly of both of them,

2. Civil War medical care and hospitals

Disease killed more people in this war than bullets. This is stated in all sources, because clearly they did not have the medicine or knowledge they do now. In the Kevin Burns film, they do talk a lot about disease, and how the south had more fatalities with disease because they were less resourceful than the north. Unlike Kevin Burns, the short clip you had us watch, got more into detail of how un-useful medicine really was. The video clip talked about how they did not have sanitized instruments. Also stated more of how when a wounded soldier would come in and be seeking medical help, they would highly end up dying, rather than surviving. In the Kevin Burns film, it was also more clear that the North had more advantage with things in general. It's also stated in the clip that when there were injuries, buildings would close down to be used for hospitals.

The Battles of the Wilderness, Cold Harbor, and Kennesaw Mountain

I am not going to lie, I can not compare these battles, I don't know much about either of these three.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Covered topics

by [Heather Reed](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 10:08 PM

It's kinda hard to really comment on the 12 minute video clip from documentary series The Divided Union only because it was so short. I did talk about the telegraph and the technology being a big part of war and that had helped Grant. It also mentioned Grant taking a licking but not retreating. It even mentions that he got the nickname Butcher Grant because of the risk he took that seemed to have no regard to human life. Lee didn't seem to be mentioned much in this short video. In Ken Burns' film he went into more detail about the two Generals' personal lives. Yet again it seemed more about Grant than Lee. Both of the videos talked about hospitals. Ken Burns' film called the hospitals warehouses for the dead and stated that there were 350 hospitals in the Union and only 154 hospitals in the Confederacy. However, Burns' film gave more details about the nurses and the medical care. It spoke of the fact that the nurses couldn't be younger than 30 years of age and needed to dress in brown or black dresses. It also spoke of Dorothea Dix being the head of the nurses for the Union army. Burns' film also discussed the Battles of the Wilderness, Cold Harbor and Kennesaw Mountain. I would assume that The Divided Union series would have spoken of all of the preceding in much more detail had we watched the entire series like we are doing with Ken Burns' film. I think all three of the sources that we have used this week play very well with each other. If one of the sources doesn't cover the material it seems that another one will or makes it a little bit clearer. I have a hard time just reading information out of a book so it is nice to be able to put the pieces together sort-of speak with the films.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



video is better than book

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 9:50 PM

Heather, I also feel that the three sources played off each other pretty well. I don't know if the short clip was beneficial for us to watch, only because it seemed like a repeat of already known information. The films really did help me out as well. The chapters in the books are just way too long. What do you think of the book?

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Grant and Lee

by [Jessica Ballestrazze](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 10:32 PM

I was surprised to find that all three of our sources seem to line up fairly well with each other when it comes to Ulysses S.

Grant and Robert E. Lee. The source I actually wished provided a little more depth of background was *Battle Cry of Freedom*, although I know that there are bits of information scattered throughout the whole book about both of them. It was helpful for me to see the short biographical sections in the Ken Burns videos on both of the leaders.

It did seem in the short video clip that the interviewees seemed to favor Lee over Grant. They used words like, "innovative" and "clearly superior" to describe Lee and the Confederate forces. When referring to Grant, the language was "maintain pressure without pity", "total war", and "Butcher Grant". I felt that the documentary series portrayed them a little more fairly, and addressed a fault of each General: Lee's terrible temper, and Grant's tendency toward the bottle. Burns' description of Lee as warm and sensitive matches up perfectly with McPherson's statement: "A gentleman in every sense of the word" (280). It also seems that McPherson and Burns are aligned in their statements that Grant only drank out of boredom, such as during the siege of Vicksburg.

One small thing I noted in the PBS video was their explanation that Lee turned down a position in the US army "not because he approved of slavery or secession," but to be loyal to his home state of Virginia. This could have been stated a little more clearly. McPherson states that Lee dubbed slavery "a moral and political evil," and that he spoke out openly against secession (281). I think there is a big difference between not approving of something, and openly speaking out about it politically. It adds an interesting dimension to Lee's character, and speaks to the level of commitment both northerners and southerners felt to their home states. This is not something easily understood in modern-day America, but grasping that concept puts the entire war in a different perspective.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Grant and Lee

by [Heather Reed](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 7:40 PM

I agree with you in regards to wishing that the book provided a little more depth of the backgrounds of both generals. It makes it difficult to process when information is scattered though out a source. I really enjoyed how the Ken Burns film gave a little more background on the generals in a quick and easy to understand format. It would be nice to know even more about the background and personal lives of both Grant and Lee but I also understand that for time constraints.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Grant and Lee

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:06 PM

I love what you said about Lee in this because he really was one of the best generals and natural born leaders of his time. I also like that you pointed out he didn't really believe what he was fighting for, but he fought for the south because he loved his home in Virginia so much.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Ken Burns Still Rocks

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 11:02 PM

Ken Burns, for me is the best resource for me to learn. I like that it is a video, mainly because it keeps my attention with all the photos, music, and voices that it displays. It is also easier for me to just sit here and watch it than to open up McPherson's book and try to get through all those pages. When talking about the generals, I like that it goes into depth. Burns gives Lee and Grant more personality than the short clip or the book. I actually enjoyed learning that Grant wasn't such a rough man that I thought he was. Burns was able to show more of a gentle side of Grant that I didn't expect. Lee also looked more human in this episode as well. I also think Burns did a great job featuring medical care and the three battles. I think the photos that he chose added to the message that he was trying to convey to the audience.

The Divided Union clip was too short. It did convey some good information but I felt that it was lacking on information about Lee and Grant. The clip did not keep my attention like Burn's episode did even though it did show photos. I think that since it was so short, it didn't have the attention grabbing make that kept my attention. It seemed like it was just spitting facts out. What I did think was a positive note was when the one man was actually standing on some battleground. It was a great visual to see where it actually took place. When the man was talking about not being able to see the other side, I was able to see what he meant by that portion of the clip showing the battlegrounds.

McPherson....well this has really been a struggle for me during the term. I think that McPherson does a great job in

describing battles and political elements. I just have a hard time retaining the information, since there isn't a lot of pictures and the chapters are lengthy. Between the chapters that we are reading, Burns' film, and other resources, I do think that it has confused me a lot more than it should have.

Overall, Burns is still the best tool for me. I do think that all three are helpful, but I don't really think that they help each other. It just seems like repeats of the same information, just Burns makes it more entertaining.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Ken Burns Still Rocks

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:15 PM

McPherson I feel like is the dry textbook stuff, and Burns is the theatrical version of the history being talked about. Both make good points, and each bring something to the table for us to learn from. I do tend to find myself more annoyed by Burns always tending to glamorize history though, I wish there was a better happy medium between Burns and McPherson. Because although the two are very helpful in some aspects, like you said the two together can get confusing and long.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



McPherson pretty entertaining

by [Jessica Ballestrazze](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:33 PM

I can relate that sometimes the McPherson book can seem a little thick, especially if I procrastinate and try to power through two chapters in one sitting. But compared to some of the other history textbooks I've read, I think it is really well-written and entertaining. I actually have a harder time enduring the PBS series, because so much of the time they're not even saying anything! I've actually found myself reading through the transcript available because there is so much empty time when they're just playing music.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Book vs Film

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:50 PM

Jessica, I've found it helpful to read the transcript as well. Especially when you are taking notes, it makes it easier. I guess I just like the pictures and music so I don't mind the empty time. I sound like a child! But I can't help but like it better because of those factors.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: McPherson pretty entertaining

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 11:13 PM

Thank you! That music just puts me to sleep, and I feel like I'm missing valuable points during Burns films. I know he's thought to be a great scholar but really I think he much rather should have been a producer and director with all the crap he puts on top of the war.

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



sources

by [Roxanne Lindquist](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 11:08 PM

Ken burns portrays Lee as "an aristocratic, bountifully gifted officer who wins most of his battles and confronts defeat with dignity." In his film. I think that the book and the ken burns video both shows that grant and lee were a lot alike in their way of fighting, bravery and they were both passionate about their country and winning. In the video clip it seems that it was leaning more towards lee over grant in the way they described them. It states in the book that grant did not share the belief in lee's superhuman qualities. I think that grant was more cautious than Lee who seemed to be more aggressive, but both vary strategic in battle. I do think that the book goes more in to describing lee than it does grant.

I think that the battle of the wilderness was rightfully described as bushwhacking on a grand scale as said in the video clip. I feel that the book did a good job at describing the battle of wilderness. But I feel that the video clip, the book and ken burns video did complement each other on this. In all of them it is described as a great loss of men to both sides.

The video clip I believe did a good job describing the medical issues. It describes how treatment was basic and often more dangerous than the original injury and described that there were often limbs out side of the doctors tents. In the ken burns Video it seemed to go along with this clip and the background on medical care but I think the clip did a better job in by opinion. I don't feel that the book discussed much of this subject and does better in discussing the actual battle parts.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: sources

by [Roxanne Lindquist](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 9:45 PM

Medical

After watching the Ken Burns Video more I think that it did an adequate job on the medical care part. I for one did not know Walt Whitman was a nurse I have always associated him with poetry. I feel that Dorothea Dix is someone to learn about and I'm sure there are countless other that had a great impact in areas of the war that are not well known. Only a hand full of hospital at beginning of war existed, by the end of the war the union had more than 350 and the confederates had 154 hospitals (from ken Burns video). The book states how the conditions during the civil war were an improvement from previous wars. Its amazing to think how much health care has improved and continue to improve. I have to agree with another post that when most of us see something horrible or horrific it seems to stay with you more easily than reading something. I for one have had a hard time with retaining a lot of what I have read in the textbook though when it comes to the battle part of the war it does a good job from what I can tell. Though I think with all the sources they work well together but alone lack in areas. Also got to think that this was a long time ago and were learning from what others said and there is probably a lot that was not recorded.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: sources

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:25 PM

I enjoy the fact you brought up this point that we are just learning what other perceived to be the correct history during this time. With these multiple sources we get to see three peoples views on what this time during the war was like. But what we may not realize there is so much more than we probably know, and that these three even can tell us went on. We often get caught up in the little facts that are provided to us because we forget there are so many other scholars and opinions to go off of.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Short Clip

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 9:54 PM

Roxanne, I noticed that you thought that the short clip was better than Ken Burn's film in describing medical issues. Do you think that the clip would have been better if it was longer?

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: sources

by [Roxanne Lindquist](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:09 PM

Grant and Lee

I think that these men were ment to lead. I have to agree with another student that posted it's important to add William Tecumseh Sherman when talking in regards to generals of the cival war. I think it was interesting that both Generals had armies that would follow them with out much question. In the ken Burns video it stated that a union girl once saw lee and said that she wished he was ours Also say that a man says i would charge hell its self for that man. It also go's on to say that he had the Unqualified love from his men. It says that he was never to busy to hear complaints from his men. Also known as uncle Robert or harsh Robert.

It was said that grants men did not salute him but watched him with a reverence. He did not like marching bands. He was a drinker but not when his wife was around. Was said to have punished a man for hurting a horse. But I think both men were determined and if things were different and they were both on the same side I think that would be something to see.

I think the ken burns video did a better job when it comes to little details like this but I also think that the book is important to go along with the videos for the more in-depth battle areas. And again how much of it all is hear say and how much actually happened and what could you be missing with all the stories that dies with the war.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: sources

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:30 PM

I think the short video was my favorite as well. I mean all three played their part but I feel like I got the most out of the short clip just because it wasn't as long, and didn't drag on with the glitz and glam Burns does.

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Medical or Mid-evil?

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 11:45 PM

Watching and reading thinking these poor poor people. It is insane to me that you got your arm chopped limb chopped off if you got shot, and you weren't even put under for it! 261:1 would die from wound related causes such as blood loss, or infection, and people simply not having real medical training. It's wild to think of how far the medical world has come since then, and especially how much its improved on the battle field! These men may lay in a field for hours after being wounded. And now we have trauma teams, and fancy equipment that has made it possible for men and woman to make it home to their families after fighting for their country. Just something I find really amazing how much has changed since then medically and military as well.

I mean Grant and Lee did what they could with what they had but their tactics and choices when going over them were some times questionable. They loved their country and fought nobly for it, but how much different do you think the outcome may have been if there were more tactics involved. I always felt they both did the same kind of thing over and over.

While now with strategies, and people trained to come up with brilliant attack manuvuers to out wit the other side. Back than 1 in 7 soldiers would die in battle, and they still may not have made it home from the lack of food, cold winters, or the disease that was rapidly spread.

I found these sources to work fairly well together, I love hearing different sides to the story being told. Seeing it from different points of view can help you learn so much more, and catch things you may have missed prior.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Horses in War

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:02 PM

Opal! I didn't know that you were taking this class! I do agree that it seems insane that people would just get limbs chopped off for one potentially minor injury. I know that you have horses and I was wondering if you have thought about horses during the Civil War? If a person got their limb amputated because of one injury, I can only imagine that the horses used had no hope. It's really sad!!

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Horses in War

by [Opal Burdge](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:26 PM

How have I never seen you post on these? And thank you. I was shocked by the medical abilities in this time era. I am so beyond grateful for what modern medicine has come our way since!

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Different Groups

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:34 PM

I bet that we just never get put in the same forum group.

Sum of ratings: (1) 0

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Source Material.

by [Edgar Rodriguez](#) - Thursday, February 19, 2015, 5:53 PM

The source material is very good when it's put together and works off of other sources, in my opinion the comparisons are quite good. I would say that the comparisons between Robert E. Lee and Ulysses S. Grant are okay. The documentary is not the best at explain those differences among the two generals, in fact it does a poor job at explaining. In the documentary series it talks about them briefly and has photos to show the progression of the two generals. I think that the only reason that someone might find the documentary effective is because of the fact that it is on TV and people can get a grasp on the material being presented. I know that TV is more effective than most other sources because people have the capacity to see what they are learning even though they aren't doing it on a hand to hand basis.

I feel that by reading something someone might get more knowledge than just by seeing clips about it on TV. There is also a point to be made that when people see horrific and disturbing images such as the medical care that was being performed during the Civil War they have a much greater increase in their awareness. We all know that medical care today is much better than it was in the Civil War, like I have said earlier that the documentary does a better job at promoting those facts. Concerning the battles The Battles of the Wilderness, Cold Harbor, and Kennesaw Mountain the same is true when it comes to understanding, TV does a better job at point out the killing and massive amounts of death involved.

The book we use for our reading does have its uses and for those who are more inclined to read the book does a better job at explain events during the Civil War. I guess what I'm trying to get at is that we all have different learning styles and all of these sources have their purposes depending on the person and their learning curve. The sources feed off of one another and I think that is the best part of having options when it comes to learning new material.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Source Material.

by [Jordan Hevern](#) - Saturday, February 21, 2015, 12:00 PM

Edgar,

Since I did not know much of the three battles that he asked to talk about, it was nice to get something, from someone who does. Even though you didn't go into great detail about the sources themselves, you gave me a base. So that helped me understand that part a little better.

Since this is a time period that was not all that into technology and their way of saving/gaining information on a subject was not always creditable, not every source will be the same,

That is a bummer because you can never quite know exactly what happen.

These sources like you said, do feed off one another, mainly because they were made at a different time, so people have collected information that they did not know, and used it to help their piece of work.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Two Great Generals

by [Jordan Hevern](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 1:48 PM

After watching this weeks video, and learning way more about Lee and Grant, I have gained a new respect for them.

Grant: It was interesting enough to find out that he only drank on two conditions, when his wife was not around and when there was nothing going on, even though he was a drunk. Another thing I found very interesting about Grant, is how he punished his men for mistreating a horse. I think with that attitude, his soldiers wanted to fight for him and were willing to die. He was highly respected and in the Kevin Burns film he is highly talked about. Mary Chesnut even stated "Grant fought to win."

Lee: Like Grant in the Kevin Burns film he was highly respected, and one of the historians even stated that there was not a General that Lee couldn't read. When Lee and his son stayed at a hotel, people stood and clapped for him, even Lincoln. This just shows that even though he was a confederate general, he had the respect of the other side.

These general were well compared and contrasted in the Kevin Burns film, and it was nice to get more of an insight of them two.

Another thing that this film got more into depth about was the hospitals and medicine. Nurses were only aloud to look unappealing to the men, and amputation was how they would try and save injured soldiers. Though many did not survive their "surgery" they were at least in a "comfortable" setting where they could go, while nurses, soldiers and other aid would stand before them as they passed.

This weeks video was very interesting and I enjoyed how they got into more detail about aspects of people, medicine and war.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Ken Burns Film vs Other Resources

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:07 PM

Jordan, I noticed that Ken Burn's film really helped you see both generals in a different light. I too thought Ken Burns did a great job in showing the audience a different side. I didn't see that you mentioned anything about our textbook or the short clip. So do you think that they helped out this week in learning the information?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Doing what they could with what they had

by [Jessica Ballestrazze](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 6:49 PM

In terms of medical care, it seemed that the "Divided Union" video portrayed a fairly narrow and negative view toward the treatment of wounded soldiers. To quote directly, "It many ways it was a mercy to be killed outright on the battlefield" (Divided Union). They depict the treatment as uncaring and primitive, with a blatant disregard for hygiene or sanitation.

Though the point that disease and improper medical care plagued both the Union and the Confederacy in drastic ways, I felt that the McPherson book gave a much more in-depth and realistic view of the situation. Despite the unfathomable statistic that two men died of disease for every one man who died in battle, McPherson points out that this was a vast improvement from previous wars, and that surgeons, nurses, and medical attention were at the mercy of the lack of knowledge available at the time. The video explains the dread men would experience if they were taken by ambulance, knowing it was going to get worse as their medical treatment began. But the fact that an ambulance corp even existed is a pretty impressive achievement. I think a disservice was done to the "noncombatant medics" who "risked their lives to reach the wounded in the midst of battle and evacuate them as quickly as possible to the surgeons' stations and field hospitals" (485).

"Divided Union" seems to take the stand that "Battle Cry" acknowledges many historians take: "the medical services represent one of the Civil War's most dismal failures" (486). Yet despite this belief, great strides in medicine and sanitation were made during the war, which were the groundwork for the increased survival rates of following wars.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Grant and Lee

by [Edgar Rodriguez](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 7:15 PM

Well after careful review of the sources I think I will add more to my previous forum post. I think it's important to know about the leaders that were involved in leading the armies involved in the Civil War. I also would like to say that I think it's important to add William Tecumseh Sherman into the mix when talking about the Civil War generals, well that's my opinion anyways on that matter.

Robert E. Lee: I find it funny that most of the generals in the Civil War studied at West Point. I think that the Ken Burns documentary does a better job at promoting the difference between Grant and Lee. Robert E. Lee seems like a calm old man and from what I've seen in the documentary many people called him the "Marble Man" which seem like and odd name to me. Someone might think that just because Lee is older and has time on this earth that he would have an advantage over

Grant, this is was not the case at all as we have learned. In short, Lee is a rich old man that studied at West Point and then later on as the war started chose to go to his home and defend the Confederacy and lead the army of the Confederacy.

Ulysses S. Grant: The same as Lee, he was at West Point but unlike Lee was more down to earth I would say. Grant did not come from a rich family and did not marry a woman that had plenty of wealth. Grant was a drunk from what I saw in the documentary and did not make it as soldier the 1st time around and that he eventually left to go work with his father. I think that Grant was a 2nd chance soldier because of the fact that he had gone back to the Army during the war and prevailed and became the general in charge of the entire Union army. General Grant is a common soldier unlike Lee and I think this gave him the edge over Lee during the war.

I have said in my previous post that the documentary in my opinion does a better job at promoting the facts to the viewer because most people like to watch TV. Grant and Lee are two men on opposite sides of the war and were opposites before the war. Lee was rich and Grant was poor and in my opinion the reading and the documentary make clear about the two generals. Well in short, Lee lost because the Confederacy did not have the ability to mass produce war items like the north. This advantage gave Grant the ability to defeat Lee and eventually bring the Civil War to a close. I think that Grant was willing to do things that Lee didn't want to do and this added to Grant's ability to win and push forward on many of the battlefields.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Battle vs. Battle

by [Jessica Ballestrazze](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 7:16 PM

As usual, I felt that *Battle Cry of Freedom* was certainly more even in the assessment of the Wilderness, Spotsylvania, and Cold Harbor. They seemed to work fairly well together, as I didn't find any glaring contradictions between the three sources. For me, it is more interesting to read the book, because a victory or a defeat does not come off nearly as one-sided when you see the small nuances of success or failure in each particular day.

Though the Union virtually hemorrhaged casualties during the month of these three battles, I felt that the video clip was a little too glib with their portrayal. Regarding The Wilderness, it stated, "Grant took a licking from Robert E. Lee", and they focus on the decreased northern morale following Cold Harbor. Though these things are true, I think there is a deeper intricacy that can be lost with such generalizations. For instance, though northern morale was clearly down following the first two battles, (Union soldiers pinning their names and addresses on their uniforms so their bodies can be identified), Grant's decision to move his troops to Spotsylvania following the Wilderness, rather than retreat, seems to actually have given northern morale a boost. According to McPherson, "For the first time in a Virginia campaign the Army of the Potomac stayed on the offensive after its initial battle." McPherson says "a mental sunburst brightened their minds," and a veteran recalled, "Our spirits rose...we marched free. The men began to sing" (728).

The casualty statistics in the PBS video and the "Divided Union" clip are also a little misleading. I watched those two sources first, and then read *Battle Cry*. If I had stopped after the first two, I would have a misunderstanding that the Union experienced a bloodbath, while the Confederacy emerged unscathed. But proportionately, following Spotsylvania, Lee's army had lost as many soldiers as Grant's. Lee also lost almost a third of his commanders. Ultimately the North lost far more lives, but because of their vastly superior numbers, they could sustain more casualties and still contend. My perception is that the spring of 1864 was certainly dominated by the Confederacy, but the Union also experienced some gains and successes. I felt that McPherson was the only source to portray these in a fair and detailed manner, but that the PBS video gave an adequate understanding of the outcomes of that spring.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Textbook vs Film

by [Bethany Hunter-Lehman](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:41 PM

Jessica,

I see that you think that the book is a better than the Ken Burns film. I think that it is interesting that you feel that way just because it seems most people in this class like the film better. Do you think that the preference of our textbook over the film came over time or have you always liked the book better?

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



A lot of information

by [Heather Reed](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 8:41 PM

When comparing this weeks three sources of information I would have to say that I got the most out of Ken Burns film in regards to Lee and Grant. Burns' film gave details like Grants birthday to the fact that he was wonderful with horses. Grant was also the first person since George Washington to receive Lieutenant General. Lee's birthday was also given and he was given many nicknames from King of spades to Granny Lee because of his white hair. He graduated second in his class at Westpoint and seemed to have some serious anger issues. While Battle Cry for Freedom does discuss Grant and Lee through out the book I don't feel as though it gave as much clear information as Burns' film. As for Divided Union I feel as though the film clip was way too short to really get much out of it. It mentioned that the Southerns were skilled because of West Point but they had trouble doing other things. with no real mention of Lee at all. However, it mentioned that Grant to a licking but didn't retreat. It also mentioned that Grant had lost 7,000 men in 30 minutes and that he was even called butcher Grant by some.

When it comes to Civil War medical care all three sources seem to agree on how "bad" for a lack of a better word were. Burns' even calls the hospital "warehouses for the dead" and that there were 350 Union hospitals while only 154 Confederate hospitals. Burns' film was also the only source that really touch on Dorothea Dix who was the head of all the nurses in the Union. He talked about the fact that no nurse could be hired that was younger than 30 years of age and that they had to wear brown or black dresses. The nurses also could not be there in hopes of forming a romantic relationship. In the Divided Union it states that disease was the number 1 killer and that the Civil War only had a 1 of 7 survival rate and that wounds killed more than actual killing did. It was also the only source that mentioned that the biggest buildings were taken over for hospitals. In McPherson's book he mentions things on more of a positive note. He looks for the positive instead of the negative. Mentioning how far medicine has come from previous wars to the Civil War.

When it comes to the Battles of the Wilderness, Cold Harbor and Kennesaw Mountain the other source that didn't mention too much was the Divided Union. I think that is due to the fact that we only watched a 12 minute clip of a 5 hour movie. In the Wilderness Battle there were fires that claimed the lives of 200 men that were burned alive. Hundreds of hours were spent on amputations alone and over 17,000 men died in this battle. Lee got to Cold Harbor first. Grant loses 50,000 troops alone. Many Union troops develop "Cold Harbor syndrome" according to McPherson. Both sources state that Grant regrets this battle. As for Kennesaw Mountain, Sherman loses 3,000 troops in a series of frontal assaults and stalls outside of Atlanta.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Sources!

by [Gabrielle Jones](#) - Sunday, February 22, 2015, 10:34 PM

I think that Lee and Grant were pretty similar. They were good people who fought for what they believed in. They did all they could with the power they had to try and win any battle they were apart of. The three sources gave me the idea that they were the same in their attitude about the war and how they fought.

It was stated in all sources that disease killed more people than bullets. It makes sense considering how little they knew and lack of medicine. The south had more deaths by disease than the north because of the lack of resources. The video got into how unhelpful the medicine they did have considering the lack of sanitation.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[HST 209 W15 \(Escobar 32063\)](#)