

Due date: Sunday, 9 January 2011, 11:55 PM

Last edited: Sunday, 9 January 2011, 09:36 AM (352 words)

After reading two chapters of Battle Cry of Freedom I can understand why critics say that McPherson writes in a narrative form. If it were not for this writing style I would have a hard time keeping up and interested with so much information. I feel as if McPherson is telling us a story as if sitting across the table from us. I see where McPherson brings the past back to a vivid life again. By McPherson's style of writing he is reaching out to both serious and casual readers.

As one of the reviews states, " Battle cry of Freedom is primarily a military history, concerned with the tactics and strategy of the war, with a secondary but significant emphasis on the political maneuvering and events of the era." This draws me in. I have read in history books and seen so often from the history channel the politics behind the history to many times. I lose interest fast by this type of writing, but by McPherson choosing the tactics and strategy direction is what draws me in and keeps me interested.

One of the critic articles stated that McPherson leaves out Lincoln's assassination but takes us to the next chapter without Lincoln in the story. I realize that this would leave us readers with an impact of what happened, but not something we had to read. However, I would like to read more of the assassination and explore it further. Leaving something like this out is something that worries me in reading this book. I am a person who likes details, and I only hope that where McPherson leaves out significant events he will add in other ways so that I continue to stay interested in the book and not leave with more questions.

Since I have only read two chapters and do not have my own strong opinion yet of McPherson's work I am going to go into this book as a storytelling novel with facts included and not as a required reading that I have to read in order to get a good grade.

Close this window

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)