

In this paper I will discuss a little about three different review sources on James McPherson's book *Battle Cry of Freedom*. 1.) New York Times book review, 2.) Not News Forum, 3.) Amazon reviews.

Starting with the New York Times review. When reading this review I had the feeling that McPherson's book was going to be knowledgeable, interesting, and maybe enjoyable to read. It points out one flaw, which is the grey on grey map. But gives the impression that the text is accurate and informative.

In the second review from the Not News Forum, it discusses how the first 275 pages McPherson "carefully establishes the political and social context of the time and his argument as the central cause of the war" than it gets into the actual war shots fired part. Which to me makes the book sound not as interesting as the first review but it also adds that it includes extensive military history, tactics and strategy of the war. Also it states "claims are supported by extensive citations and evidence, including many quotations from the personal papers of the principals involved". So from this review it makes the book sound accurate and informative.

As for the Amazon reviews, which were the lower reviews off of Amazon. They go the opposite of the other two reviews. Though I know that was the point in reading them, it seems that the main point most of them had in common was that McPherson was biased with his opinions and that it reads like a text book. Also that he left out a lot of details on other important events during, after and leading up to the war.

What issues related to historical accuracy worry me the most? I feel that after reading the reviews that this book seems like it pushes more towards the slavery being the biggest part of the war. And wonder how accurate it will be from both the south and north point of view or if it will be biased towards one. I also feel that there is probably so much other events, decisions, and agendas that were not well documented that could of led up to or helped cause or change the war one way or another or the way we look at it.

Out of the review sources that I read I'm leaning more towards the Amazon reviews. I feel that it comes from people that don't have anything to gain for speaking their mind. Also it seems most of them touch on the same points of issues.

What level of confidence do I have in this main source of historical information? I have confidence that what is written is for the most part accurate. But after reading the reviews I feel that there will be some important information left out.

I think that I will be approaching this book with hopes that it is more than what I'm expecting. A couple of the reviews spoke of how it drones on like a text book and some even said it was hard to get through. Since we are starting at chapter 8 I feel this will be less of an issue. I think that I will approach it with an open mind. Reviews are just others opinions whether they are getting paid or not for them and I will just have to see for my self to get my own opinion.