

Battle Cry of Freedom, a Pulitzer prize-winning book by historian James McPherson is a text book of great merit, but reading critical analysis and customer analysis of the book leads to several conclusion that can be made about the book. These conclusions will directly affect how the book will be approached. The New York Times review states a dislike for the titles to chapter 7 and 8. The word revolution being used the author of the article felt that this word was being over used, in the context of it describing the rise of the republican party, and that he should not have understated their gradual growth in american politics. This mirror an idea that is represented in the other review article from the forum post. In this article the author states that Mcpherson may have understated facts in regards to the north's industrial power, and population. So when reading this book I must understand that at times Mcpherson may understate the facts of some parts of history to give more power to other ideas he has in his book.

The source review I trust the most would have to be the New York Times review. This being a reputable newspaper, and its credential and merits it has received. In an analytical sense this was the most in depth review, providing the most critical analysis. It summarizes its strong points, while at the same time eloquently describing the way in which Mcpherson goes about describing the war from the republic in mid century, to after Lincolns assassination.

I believe this will be a good source for its historical depth, and its ability to delve into all aspects of the war. I believe that the book has value in describing what happened in the events that proceed the first shot fire at fort Sumter. The book also provides many illustrations, and in depth looks into the battles that the war composed of. The book is reviewed very well both by customers, and Critical review thus increasing its credentials.