

HST 209: American History: Civil War W14 (Escobar 32165)

Home ► My courses ► Winter 2014 ► HST 209 W14 (Escobar 32165) ► February 16 - February 22 ►

Forum 4 ► Comparing Sources



Search forums

Forum 4

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Comparing Sources)



Comparing Sources



by Joe Escobar - Sunday, February 16, 2014, 7:01 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



favorite sources



by Austin Crook - Tuesday, February 18, 2014, 6:06 PM

I enjoyed each of these sources for different reasons. My favorite of the three was the short film for a few reasons. I felt like I was able to retain the same amount of key information from the short film that I did from the reading and Ken Burns film. From that short film it was able to cover important technology invented during the war, three or four key battles, and the causes and effects of disease in the war. It defended all of the information I learned from the textbook and the Ken Burns film. Key information such as the importance of the minie ball, and the telegraph having influence on the war was pointed out in each of the sources. They all explained the details of the Battle at Wilderness, and Cold Harbor. In Cold Harbor, Grant lost about 7,000 in twenty minutes and got the nickname the "Butcher". All of the key concepts were covered and defended by each source.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: favorite sources



by Debra Moran - Saturday, February 22, 2014, 11:26 PM



The book and the videos provides information on Grant and Lee both but there is not near enough information the cause and effect of disease I would be interested in finding out what was used to treat these diseases and who treated them and what the progress in medical technology and procedures were in greater detail but I guess as this is only a ten week course I will have to do further research, maybe there will be more answers in the weeks to come.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: favorite sources

by Tiffani Brizendine Schnetzer - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 7:52 PM

I was curious about the medical side of The Civil War too. There was information in the book and documentary, but I've been doing additional research too. The page I've found with the most information is <http://www.civilwar.org/education/history/civil-war-medicine/civil-war-medicine.html> I was actually reading up on Jonathen Letterman when I found this article. Looking up just Letterman is extremely informative too, he saved tons of lives by recognizing that a faster response time was needed and orchestrating an efficient way of doing so. If you want to know more about Union medicine William Hammond is the name to look up. He learned the most about how to prevent infection and what was needed to make hospitals more hygienic. http://history.amedd.army.mil/surgeongenerals/W_Hammond.html

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re:Same story, Different Source

by Katherine Frank - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 12:08 PM

To me the book is more detailed in the treatment of the battles, the men fighting and the losses. The films both seem to skip over some battles, as far as details, and focus on the major battles and the major players.

I didn't see any real comparisons of Lee and Grant as to wives, history ,habits ect in the book or the second film but a large section of Ken Burns film is devoted to backgrounds which makes the subjects more interesting.

All of the materials focused on the hospitals, or lack of medical care. The care and improvements in care were not as well covered in the book as in Ken Burns film, nor was the subject as well covered in the short film.

I think the reading of our text dovetails nicely with Ken Burns Civil War, and the film adds some interest to the sometimes overwhelming amount of information in the book. I didn't think the second film added anything that the book and Civil War by Ken Burns had not already provided.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re:Same story, Different Source

by Austin Crook - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 1:30 PM

Hey Katherine, I definitely agree that the book goes into much more detail in regards to the battles. I do think that the overall concepts from battles and main topics are accurately described in that short 12 minute video as well. I did not find much difference in the depictions of Generals Grant and Lee. I thought that all the sources had similar if not exactly the same opinions of the men.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re:Same story, Different Source

by Debra Moran - Friday, February 21, 2014, 10:23 PM

I am a huge biography reader I love to read them, I also have a policy that whenever I read about a famous person (typically male) I then try to find and read the biography of their wife. There has been a great deal of information about the two generals but very little about their wives and families, most of that being found in the video series and usually addressed through letters home so it is kind of a backwards information, as to the medical I haven't felt that any of the materials have offered more than just a general sense of what happened. The book has offered a few facts the videos definitely give a larger overview but still not much more than the numbers of it all.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re:Same story, Different Source

by Eryne Grant - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 2:29 PM

I agree with you on the idea that the film adds interest to the overwhelming amount of book information. To me, the visuals in the film make the facts, battles, and people more tangible in the sense of understanding that they were real people. I'm a visual learner, but I think the idea of using three sources that are different types of sources really make all types of learners be able to comprehend the material.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Strengths

by Eryne Grant - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 5:31 PM

I think that the strengths of the three different sources when compared to one another were that the three sources described the events, people, and facts in different ways that, put together, made the learning process more understandable for the learner. For example, the Ken Burn's video heavily relied on the use of photographs and quotes from war

personalities to portray the people of the war. The McPherson book relies on facts and smaller details from the war to create a sense of overall understanding of the war. Lastly, the clip from the Divided Union documentary relied heavily on visuals and a small amount of facts to show the viewer the place of battle and what occurred on the certain sites. With all three sources used by the learner, it creates a well-rounded source of information for a learner of the Civil War.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Strengths



by Katherine Frank - Thursday, February 20, 2014, 1:09 PM

I agree with you, put together and overlapping each other has been reinforcing and more interesting for me. The book seems to focus more heavily on battles and facts while the Ken Burns film shows a little more of the interesting side issues such as medical care and personalities.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Strengths



by Austin Crook - Thursday, February 20, 2014, 1:12 PM

I definitely agree that the three different sources can enhance someone's ability to retain all of this information. Depending on if the order of the sources is strategically given to the student, these sources could increase one's ability to understand all of this information. I do think that the order in which it is given can drastically affect whether or not the student will shut down and not take the time to view the other two sources.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Strengths



by Debra Moran - Saturday, February 22, 2014, 11:50 PM

I have also found that the materials worked together to make the learning of what sometimes can be dry facts, when left on their own, bond together with the other more visual materials provided to offer, a more as you say, well-rounded source of information.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Strengths



by Lauren Grant - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 2:51 PM

I definitely agree with you that when all three sources are used together that they

create an overall well-rounded source for the audience. McPherson's book gives a more detailed look at the battles and the Burn's film uses photographs and quotes to give the viewer a better understanding of what it was like to live or be apart of that time period. I did realize also that the Divided Union short clip relied more on interviews and visuals than facts but I think that they made the short clip a nice conclusion to the other three sources.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lee and Grant

by Lauren Grant - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 6:51 PM

In regards to the descriptions of Grant and Lee's lives I feel like Ken Burns had the most information that helped shaped a better understand of the way that both fought the war. Burns included information such as their wives, children, jobs, and a richer description of their military background. After watching Burn's film I felt like I had a better understanding of who Lee and Grant were as people. The short clip discussed briefly Grant's military tactics while going into a bit more detail regarding Lee's military style. Both were described in relation to the way that they directed their troops and fought the war, much like McPherson does. McPherson, like the short clip described them in regards to how they reacted in battle and planned during the war but in greater detail. Overall, I didn't feel like any of the three sources described Lee and Grant any differently but just went into more detail in different places.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Lee and Grant

by Tiffani Brizendine Schnetzer - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 8:10 PM

I agree, the three sources definitely focused on different areas of Lee and Grant's lives. Ken Burns needed to captivate his audience by allowing us to get to know Lee and Grant more personally through their backgrounds and families, but I feel like in regards to the war itself, knowing how Lee and Grant were in battle is the most important information. It wasn't as much their pasts or families that made an impact on the war, it was their actions during the war. That's why I feel like the book is the most useful resource; but then again knowing who Lee and Grant were as people does help us understand the reasons behind the decisions they made.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Lee and Grant

by Christopher Plourde - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 11:01 PM

I think this was a time in history where the personality of the generals made a vast impact on how they performed. Both McClellan and Lee graduated 2nd in their class at West Point but the performance on the battlefield clearly brings to

light how little that mattered. Lee's ability to size up his opponents was probably his greatest strength and his willingness to have faith in that and take the chances that he did made him the commander that he was. Grant's calmness under fire (the 4 am courage that Shelby Foote mentioned), his ability to clearly define his objectives and focus on them doggedly were his defining characteristics. In both cases it was there will to do what needed to be done despite the adversities and setbacks that made others crumble and fall back.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Observing the source

by Bryan Sanders - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 7:12 PM

Looking at the three sources we're working with, I've found each one more or less mirrors the other. That said, I found Ken Burns' take on Grant and Lee to be the most compelling. The music combined with the pictures and the narration of the two men's lives really impressed me. It's interesting to see Grant and Lee, similar in their relentless battle tactics but different in their backgrounds. Where one comes from a tanner's family, the other came from a prominent plantation owner and soldier. Most of the information on these two in all the sources went pretty well together.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Observing the source

by Austin Crook - Saturday, February 22, 2014, 12:06 PM

I think your comment about the three sources "mirroring" each other is a good description of the three. They all cover the same information and defend the claims made by the other two, but they also have a little more detail for different concepts as well.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Lee and Grant

by Benjamin Trautman - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 10:04 PM

As for Lee and Grant in our textbook, the text seems to do a very good job in providing us with the essential information about the two. During our earlier chapters, Lee and Grant were described with their character, who was more old fashion than the other, or who had what kind of tendencies in both life and battle. The text also seemed to cover the actions Lee and Grant took in battles, not in great enough detail though. I wish the textbook we are reading really went into depth about the emotions each general was feeling off and more importantly on the battlefield. Although it is probably very hard to pinpoint what kind of emotions the generals had during battle, I think the text could have given us more though. It would have been helpful to know if Lee was hesitant in some of his decisions, and if that maybe led to Grant being aggressive, or the other way around.

I feel as if Ken Burns' video series goes into a little greater detail about the emotions and responses Lee and Grant were giving their men during battle. How they acted to an enemies advancement or retreat, what their spirit may have been, and how the generals approached some of the men after battle. The video series also does a good job of providing the viewer with background information on the two, not as well as the text does, in my opinion. The strategies that were used by Lee and Grant during battle were not as current or fully explained in the video series as the text did.

From what I could tell from the short clip we watched, there is a poor effort to explaining the relations, emotions, and tendencies of Lee and Grant. Probably just because it was such a short clip but Grant was briefly mentioned, Lee as well, maybe it was just enough for the audience to grasp the thought process of both generals. I would give the award of emotion to Ken Burns, McPherson takes the facts award, and the, "Divided Union" gets an orange slice.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Comparing Sources

by Debra Moran - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 10:41 PM

I find the textbook to be a more completely detailed source of information at least with details of battles and facts, the documentaries are designed to be more emotional whereas the textbook is fact driven. I find that there is adequate information on the Generals of both sides in the textbook as well as in the Burns series. I wish that there was more information on medical care during the war. We have learned about the disease and the wounded (mainly the numbers) I would like to learn more of how they were treated, and who treated them. What were the procedures for treatment in the field? I know there were shortages of medicines and bandages in the hospitals (as well as the field hospitals) on both sides, but I would like to know more about the treatment given to soldiers in the field. Who cared for them? Were they left there alone and left to die?? We have learned about the famous Generals and Military people but what about those that worked as field surgeons, Doctors and nurses are mentioned every once in a while, along with the creation of the Sanitary Commission but what the armies had in place medically is not detailed enough for me.

I think that the book and the series we have watched do complement each other as they cover a lot of the same in different ways. This makes learning it easier as well as more exciting.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Comparing Sources

by Tiffani Brizendine Schnetzer - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 8:25 PM

From what I've researched, initially the soldiers were left to die unless one of their buddies happened to pull them out of harms way. Later (1962 I believe but you may want to do additional research too), at least in the North, an ambulance type system was set up by Jonathan Letterman. It was called The Union Ambulance Corps, I copied and pasted the main parts of The Ambulance Corps from

<http://www.civilwarmed.org/letterman-dinner/the-letterman-plan/> below:

- Apportions ambulances evenly throughout the army, assigning them to individual units
- Gives full control of army ambulance to officers of the ambulance corps
- Makes ambulance officers directly answerable to Medical Directors of the corps and army
- Staffs ambulances with trained and dedicated enlisted men to act as drivers and stretcher-bearers
- Forbids the use of ambulances to carry personal baggage or other non-medical uses
- Forbids the removal and transportation of wounded and sick by anyone not belonging to the ambulance corps

There's also a ton of information
at <http://www.civilwar.org/education/history/biographies/jonathan-letterman.html>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Comparing Sources

by Christopher Plourde - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 11:23 PM

Clearly the book conveyed the greatest amount of information. In the Ken Burn's segment we were told that Siegel, Banks and Butler all had parts to play in the general offensive against the South but no details were given. This gave you the impression that they had an impact of some kind, when in fact you find in McPherson's text they were all miserable failures. I don't believe the short documentary covered them at all. What the Ken Burn's film did convey is what it does best is; to give an impression of the *experience* of the war itself for the people that fought it. That is the Burns' documentary's greatest strength and why it was such a great success in getting the American public to watch it. The short documentary was the weakest of the three...It was "sound bite" history conveying facts, true, but divorced from a larger context.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Comparing Sources

by Katherine Frank - Thursday, February 20, 2014, 1:16 PM

The "experience" of the war. That is a great way to explain the difference between the book and the film. The book is so much more detailed, but the film gets the viewer into the war, as you rightly describe as its function.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Comparing Sources

by Debra Moran - Friday, February 21, 2014, 10:11 PM

I feel that the textbook being the main source of information, I call it this as it doesn't move and is solid and easily accessed, should have the greatest amount of information for the class. Ken Burns video series adds an emotional touch to the text that as you said gives you an "impression to the experience" of the Civil War. Additionally Burns video has made me curious enough to seek out other sources of information on different areas of the of the war such as the women involved, Mary Chestnut, Mother Bickerdyke, and the role of the southern belle and what were they doing, as well as the medical side of the war. I have enjoyed the total experience of the combined materials and I think the play well off each other and that is what has made it such an enjoyable class.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Puzzle Pieces

by Tiffani Brizendine Schnetzer - Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 11:39 PM

In my opinion, the three sources work a lot like a jigsaw puzzle. McPherson's book works like the border pieces of the puzzle. It's best to read the book first so that you can put together a frame with the facts, making it easier to see the most important part of what you're working toward completing. Ken Burns' film represents the majority of the filler pieces, giving a better visual of the overall picture of what you're learning. The clip from Divided Union, like previous forum materials, works as the final pieces you couldn't initially find or see to finish the puzzle. Their importance in regards to seeing the full picture isn't quite as high as the first two sources, but they still add to the final product of knowledge. Together, the three materials nearly finish the overall image. The reason I say nearly, is because I still believe there is no way to know everything about any event in history.

In my opinion, the book is by far the most useful tool with the most in depth adaptation of events, but the more resources the better.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Puzzle Pieces

by Benjamin Trautman - Friday, February 21, 2014, 3:06 PM

Really enjoyed your idea of seeing these sources as a jigsaw puzzle, what a great way to look at it! The explanations you gave were spot on, the book does give us the background of events, the video series maybe fills in the more emotional side to those events, and the short clip we just watched adds the finishing pieces and combines all of the information in timely fashion. Though I may argue that the reason we can look at these sources as a jigsaw puzzle is because, one of them is a book, one is a series of videos, and one is a short clip. Each source offers us pretty much the same

information but it may seem different to us because of how it portrays this information. Yes the video series leaves out some facts that the book does not but do we remember each fact we have read or watched? I do not have photographic memory, not many do, when I read the book I often lose track of some facts, even while note taking. Maybe because there are so many facts put on just one page it leads to this forgetfulness. Possibly some who favor reading over watching something will have a stronger opinion for the book, and miss some important facts while watching the video, or the other way around. Anyways I agree with your idea but I also think it is more importantly about the way each person reacts to the different kinds of sources. How people react to videos and how they react to books. Thank you for the great insight!

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Puzzle Pieces

by Tiffani Brizendine Schnetzer - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 8:57 PM

Hi Ben, you're completely right. I overlooked the importance of the sources similarities and only focused on the facts that were different across the mediums. I agree that it's impossible to take in everything the first time through any source. The three sources together though help us take in what we missed the first time by repeating information in different ways (which as you mentioned, effect different people in different ways) so that we can imbed those repeated facts deeper in our minds than we do the small facts only mentioned in one source. Thanks for pointing that out, I got a little side tracked by looking for differences and didn't think to look at what was the same.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Puzzle Pieces

by Debra Moran - Friday, February 21, 2014, 9:40 PM

I also believe that people learn differently while some may gather more from the written word others are more visual would retain more from the video series. I personally require a little of both and that is why I find the combination to be helpful I do agree that the textbook has so many facts that they get tangled up and requires a lot re-reading. The videos cover enough factual materiel to reinforce what I have learned in the book and also provide that emotional edge to keep me interested. I like the comparison to a jigsaw puzzle, with the combination of all the materials used in the class this offers a nice visual to how the class works.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Puzzle Pieces

by Lauren Grant - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 2:43 PM

I really liked how you compared the three sources to being a jigsaw puzzle. The more that I think about it I do see that they fit together as if they were meant to be watched and read together. I agree that reading the book first does help watching the film bring into perspective what is important and helps being able to understand in greater detail what you are looking at. The fact that the puzzle will never really be complete is something that I really agree with. We will never be able to know everything that took place during the Civil War, like most time periods, so the best that we can do is take a look at the best resources we can find to gain the most accurate understanding possible.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Weaknesses

by Eryne Grant - Saturday, February 22, 2014, 8:04 PM

I think that the weaknesses of the three different sources when compared to one another were that they each left out facts that, as a student, seem important to the understanding of the events in which occurred. For example, the Ken's Burn's video, at least to me, didn't seem to rely on explaining their war tactics quite as much as McPherson. But, McPherson explained more of Grant's tactics than Lee's. The book also didn't focus on describing Lee's personality as it did with Grant's. Both McPherson and the Divided Union clip didn't go into much depth about the hospitals and healthcare at the time as in comparison with the Ken Burn's episode. The Divided Union video also mentioned Grant more than Lee. Overall, I think the strengths of the three sources pooled together heavily outweighed the cons.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



It All Works

by Eryne Grant - Saturday, February 22, 2014, 8:17 PM

Overall, I believe that all three sources complimented each other very well. All sources of any context will lack information, but when sources are paired together, a higher amount of learning can be achieved through the pros and cons of each source. For example, even though the Divided Union clip and the McPherson book didn't go into extreme detail about the hospitals on the battlefield, the Burn's video went into a great amount of detail for the learner. So, through learning with multiple sources, I feel like I can get a better sense of what I'm supposed to be learning and it helps me understand the topics better.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: It All Works

by Benjamin Trautman - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 9:50 PM

I enjoyed your point that when sources are paired together we end up seeing the full picture of what is taking place. That we need more than one perspective on history in order to give us a good chance at understanding an event. It was nice that the video

series talked about hospitals a little more than the book did because of the pictures Burns provided. This allowed me to grasp some of the emotions and the kind of anguish that were in these places.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Sources, Battles, and Hospitals

by Lauren Grant - Saturday, February 22, 2014, 11:23 PM

I think that when it comes to covering details about Civil War medical care and hospitals that the Ken Burn's film gave a more insight. Specific names, statistics, and descriptions were given about the hospitals and the people who created and ran them while McPherson and the clip from the Divided Union gave a basic understanding of what was going on at the time. Both gave the essential details while Burn's provided a deeper look.

When it came to the Battles of the Wilderness, Cold Harbor, and Kennesaw Mountain I think that McPherson does a better job of giving specific details and exact battle plans. Ken Burn's gives an overview of the battles with plenty of quotes and narratives while McPherson gives the facts. The short clip gave a basic understanding of the battles but was able to retain the most of the information that the Ken Burn's film did but in a shorter amount of time which is surprising.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Success with the source

by Bryan Sanders - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 12:19 AM

I realized something while considering these sources. McPherson's work was inspiration for Ken Burns, and it doesn't surprise me that Ken Burns didn't use as much detail as McPherson did. Books usually utilize more in depth information than films, and information like that would not have appealed to most TV watchers. Profit still factors in to this process, and Burns' approach certainly worked better than the Divided Union documentary.

Burns' documentary was also able to humanize the characters with his use of voice actors and actresses, coupled with the music. He was able to put personality into the characters without using reenactors, which I've noticed are used in many historical documentaries. The Divided Union didn't utilize this, opting instead to rely on a narrator and historian accounts to do most of the exposition. It also used reenactors, though Burns did have a narrator and historians in his work too. This could help explain why Burns' documentary did better than the Divided Union.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Medical history

by Christopher Plourde - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 12:16 PM

This is one area in which Burns' documentary, and the Divided Union documentary to a lesser degree, give a more complete history. In McPherson's book this subject is given only ten pages (from 477- 487) within which the sanitation commission, a similar efforts, are also covered. Burns' documentary has covered this topic several times and has given us far more detailed information on the characters, particularly the women involved. Clara Barton, Mary Bickerdyke ("she out ranks me") and Dorothea "Dragon" Dix were all given individualized treatment. We also were told about the number of hospitals (including the most famous in Richmond, Chimborazo), Walt Whitman's experiences etc...This flows from Burns' focus on the human experience of the war itself. You may, however, get an inflated idea about the successes of these efforts. The Divided Union documentary brings home the sobering reality with the fact that only 1 in 7 wounded soldiers survived their wounds (made even more stark when we are told that only 1 soldier in 278 died from their wounds in Vietnam....). What we see in both McPherson and Burns is how these two different focuses, call them academic and human experience, bring out different facts. As a result of using both I think we are getting a very well rounded view of the conflict.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Strengths and Weaknesses

by Lauren Grant - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 12:21 PM

The strengths of the Ken's Burns film is that Burns included the emotions of a variety of people during the Civil War which helps create a deeper understanding and a sense of connection with the people who are generally considered to be people that we can not relate to. However, Burns does not go into great detail about the battles and only seems to cover the more prominent ones while skipping over or giving a basic description of other battles. In comparison, McPherson does the exact opposite. McPherson goes into great detail about the battles and does not seem to leave out a single battle. The weaknesses of McPherson is that we don't seem to get a deeper understanding of Lee and Grant and other important people during the Civil War because the emotions, background, and overall thoughts of these people are not included. The short clip is surprisingly able to include all of the information that Burns does but in a very short period of time. In comparison to McPherson, it definitely does not go into as much detail overall about the Civil War in general such as the strategies used in the battles.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Wilderness and Cold Harbor.

by Christopher Plourde - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 12:51 PM

In both cases McPherson's book gave us the most detail on the conduct of the battles. In the Battle of the Wilderness the Burns' documentary didn't give us the details of Longstreet's flanking maneuver or his wounding, nor did it mention Gordon's flanking maneuver at night (going over Ewell's head to get permission...seeing an opportunity and not willing to see it squandered as Culp's Hill was at Gettysburg by Ewell....). The only thing that Burns' video did mention that the book did not was the story where Lee said "Texan's always move them" about Gregg's Brigade. (which also had Arkansas troops as well). Cold

Harbor was given surprisingly sparse treatment in McPherson's book and so did not convey much more information than Burns' video. It did, however, talk more about how the fatigue of the campaign had impacted soldiers and commanders alike and is one of the few times the book exceeded Burns' documentary in giving us the "human" side of a particular battle or campaign.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Complimentary Sources

by Lauren Grant - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 2:44 PM

I definitely think that the three sources worked well together. They felt like that they were meant to be watched and read together to complete and fill in the missing information that they other ones didn't include. The book gave a detailed overview of the battles and what was going on in both the Confederate and the Union at the time. This gives the reader the background information needed to fully understand what the Ken Burns film is showing with photographs and narrations. The Burns film gives a visual as well as the personalities and thoughts of people during the time. The short clip then gives an overall look in a condensed amount of time what both McPherson and Burns were describing as well as give more details that were overlooked. Overall, I think that they all really complimented each other and together give the audience a deeper understanding of the Civil War.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Native Americans and the civil war

by Bryan Sanders - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 8:13 PM

There is one weakness of all these sources that sticks out to me. None of them really bother to talk about Native Americans in the war. Granted this isn't a Native American history course, but they still played a role in the American Civil War on both sides of the conflict. The only reason I can think of that Native Americans would not be discussed by most civil war historians is that it doesn't add to the idea that the war became a crusade to free black slaves from white masters. Slavery was just as much of an issue for the tribes as it was for the Union and Confederacy. It is important to know all aspects of a pivotal event in history like this.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Native Americans and the civil war

by Tiffani Brizendine Schnetzer - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 9:03 PM

You've spiked my curiosity, I hadn't given much thought to the Native American's part in the war. I know nothing about how they impacted things and will have to research it.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Native Americans and the civil war

by Eryne Grant - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 10:11 PM

You made a really great point! I hadn't really thought about Native American's involvement in the war, and they were definitely present. I remember learning a bit about their involvement while I was learning in high school, but it seems crazy that none of the sources have really touched on the subject. It's not like slavery was gone where it mattered, it definitely was still lingering (and is still lingering) in places people wouldn't have guessed.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Native Americans and the civil war

by Bryan Sanders - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 11:44 PM

Very true. I do know the Confederates made an effort to reach out to Native American tribes during the war. They appointed Albert Pike to be the Confederate envoy to the tribes. His efforts reaped interesting results.

Many of the tribes were engaged in slavery, including the Cherokee. During the civil war, the tribe had its own share of issues that caused division. I have two links here that can provide more information, but don't hesitate to look for more details.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Pike

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cherokee_Freedmen_Controversy#The_Cherokee_Fre

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



medical care and overland campaign

by Benjamin Trautman - Sunday, February 23, 2014, 9:41 PM

The book and both video's seem to compliment each other very well in the subjects of medical care during the war and the overland campaign. The book goes into great detail about the kind of medical care that was offered toward soldiers. How the Union and South learned from their mistakes of not providing a solid system of caring for the wounded. The books talks about a lot of the figures that led the advancement of medical care in the war. The video series does not seem to talk about as many figures as the book does. Though both videos gave some great descriptions of how the hospitals worked and what they looked like through photographs. I feel as if the videos talk more about the kind of demeanor or atmosphere these hospitals had, "warehouses for the dead." The overland campaign was talked about in great detail in the book. The tactics each general used, the attitudes during the battle, and the results. Ken Burn's video seemed to talk about the wilderness in good detail, but the rest of the campaign was lacking information. The video series did a great job in showing the viewers the kind of environment the wilderness battle

was fought in, how it effected the armies, and how the bones from previous battles effected some men. The videos and book did a nice job in providing us with different kinds of information about the campaign, giving us different perspectives on what went on.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Comparing Sources\)](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Logout](#))

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

