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Abstract
There is not one program given on any Civil War battle landscape that cannot, somewhere in it's natural flow and using resource-specific elements and tangibles, discuss the cause and context of the war in a meaningful and thematically-integrated way. Period. Full Stop.

Furthermore and because of this, there is no reason or excuse not to cover the cause and context of the war in a meaningful, thematically-integrated and site-specific way in every personal services program in some manner or fashion. Period. Full Stop. [excerpt]
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In Response to Kevin: Truncated and Sliced

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2012

I was reading Kevin's latest post over at Civil War Memory and found myself strongly agreeing and wanting to respond. So I began writing this post.

And this post used to be longer. Much longer. Scads longer.

But I'm cutting it out of abundance of caution. Criticism of interpretive product is something that people too often take too personally for some reason.

I've never understood that. I likely never will. This is a world of ideas; a free marketplace is the best marketplace. Let the opinions rain down. If you have different ideas, I want you on my team. I don't reject you.

So, here's what's left of the post...

-----

I will state my belief here in strong, bold letters:

There is not one program given on any Civil War battle landscape that cannot, somewhere in it's natural flow and using resource-specific elements and tangibles, discuss the cause and context of the war in a meaningful and thematically-integrated way. Period. Full Stop.

Furthermore and because of this, there is no reason or excuse not to cover the cause and context of the war in a meaningful, thematically-integrated and site-specific way in every personal services program in some manner or fashion. Period. Full Stop.

If an historian ever chose a hill to die on, that’s a worthy one.

(Using "an" before "historian" would be another worthy hill to die on as well, by the way.)

-----

Maybe someday I'll post the whole thing.