

BORN BETWEEN 2 GENERALS

# How We Got Here

*Series and Research Companion*

Kristen Hall

A framework for the series and its evidence

Revised documentary edition

September 24, 2026

# Contents

|                                                             |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| The series promise                                          | 3  |
| Proposed volumes                                            | 3  |
| The repeated chapter structure                              | 4  |
| Evidence categories                                         | 5  |
| The source catalog                                          | 5  |
| Structured change records                                   | 6  |
| The first local reporting project                           | 7  |
| A protocol for influential books                            | 8  |
| Safeguarding and sensitive reporting                        | 8  |
| Editions and corrections                                    | 9  |
| Design and publishing specification                         | 9  |
| Editorial review                                            | 10 |
| Revision record                                             | 10 |
| A publication review that can close the remaining questions | 11 |

# The series promise

How We Got Here follows changes in American life through dated records. Each volume asks what changed, who promoted it, how it entered practice and what evidence establishes its effects. The initial common window is 1926 through September 24, 2026, with earlier foundations where the subject requires them.

The first volume is Education in America 1926 to 2026. It is a short documentary and analytical book with 20 chapters, five appendices and numbered source notes. The following volumes are planned subjects, not manuscripts represented as already written.

The series should preserve the author’s direct questions and willingness to examine institutional power. Its credibility depends on showing the reader the difference between an observed change and an explanation for that change. It should not preassign the same explanation to every volume.

# Proposed volumes

| Volume | Subject                   | Central investigation                                                  |
|--------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Education                 | Lessons, language, authority, access and accountability                |
| 2      | The telling of history    | Changes in textbooks, public memory and historical interpretation      |
| 3      | Everyday language         | Slang, euphemisms, professional vocabulary and semantic change         |
| 4      | Religion and public life  | Affiliation, observance, institutions and changing public roles        |
| 5      | Childhood and family life | Expectations, responsibilities, protection and institutional authority |

| Volume | Subject                           | Central investigation                                                        |
|--------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6      | Work and professional credentials | Skills, occupations, licenses, accreditation and economic independence       |
| 7      | News and public persuasion        | Editorial practices, distribution, ownership and audience incentives         |
| 8      | Technology and daily life         | Tools, infrastructure, dependence, access and control                        |
| 9      | Health and the language of care   | Professional knowledge, institutions, public claims and changing terminology |
| 10     | Civic life and public trust       | Associations, participation, local institutions and accountability           |

Working titles require a separate title and market review before commercial release. The sequence can change without changing the common method. Each volume should remain understandable on its own.

## The repeated chapter structure

Open with a documented artifact or event: a page from a manual, a dated advertisement, a course schedule, a public speech or a rule. Identify what the source is before interpreting it. Do not invent a scene around an archival fragment.

Explain the earlier condition and the later condition. Keep the place, population and institution visible. Show the actual change in a compact comparison when possible, then investigate its cause through separate records.

Close with a finding that states what the evidence establishes and what it leaves open. Include a contrary case where it materially tests the explanation. Do not add a formulaic controversy merely to manufacture balance.

Across the series, recurring elements should include a short timeline, terminology comparisons, documented influence pathways, human consequences and source notes. Their length should follow the evidence rather than a rigid page quota.

## Evidence categories

| Category                 | Use it when                                                         | Avoid                                                        |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Documented               | A cited record establishes a specific event, wording or action      | Expanding the finding beyond the source's scope              |
| Supported interpretation | Several relevant records support an explanation, with stated limits | Presenting interpretation as a quoted fact                   |
| Hypothesis               | A plausible explanation awaits necessary connecting evidence        | Using suggestive language to imply proof                     |
| Unresolved               | Evidence is missing, inconsistent or insufficient                   | Treating absence as proof of concealment                     |
| Contradicted             | Reliable evidence conflicts with the claim as stated                | Claiming that one correction disproves every related concern |

A status describes a particular claim. It does not certify a whole person, institution or political movement. Sources may establish different parts of the same story at different confidence levels.

## The source catalog

The package includes `sources.json`, a machine-readable catalog of the 47 distinct sources cited in the book. Entries retain the authoring body, title, date or historical event date, link, relevant section and source type. The main book's numbered notes identify sources at the point of use.

The catalog is a finding aid, not a claim that a copy of every source has been archived in this package. The package does not redistribute complete third-party books or reports. Links may change; future research should preserve lawfully obtained copies and record their provenance.

For a new source, record both its publication date and the date of the event or data it describes. For a webpage that changes, record the access date and the relevant version where possible. A scan's upload date should not replace the date printed on the original document.

An official source can be authoritative about its own action while still presenting that action favorably. Separate a statute, an agency's explanation of that statute and an independent evaluation of implementation. Similarly, separate an organization's stated purpose from measured effects.

## Structured change records

The file `change_records.json` contains eleven populated examples from this edition. Each retains a claim, status, date range, source identifiers, mechanism, limits and next evidence needed. They can be imported into a future local research system as reference records. This package does not install software, connect to the author's local Brain or verify an existing import.

The schema intentionally avoids a single numeric influence score. No validated weighting system has been established for combining publication, funding, adoption and outcomes. A numerical total could conceal a missing causal link. Separate fields make the reasoning easier to inspect.

The required fields are `claim_id`, `subject`, `claim`, `period`, `geography`, `status`, `source_ids`, `documented_change`, `proposed_mechanism`, `adoption_evidence`, `outcome_evidence`, `alternative_explanations`, `limits` and `next_evidence`. A field can explicitly state that evidence has not yet been collected.

# **The first local reporting project**

## **Scope and selection**

Use a defined sample of school systems to compare constitutional instruction, civics and social studies. Begin with accessible records in Florida, then select additional settings that vary in region, school type and institutional history. Write the selection rule before deciding which cases best fit the hypothesis.

Choose comparable grade bands and record any changes in school organization. Where exact centennial documents do not survive, use the nearest defensible dates and state the substitution. Do not silently compare a college-preparatory course from one era with a general course from another.

## **Records to collect**

Collect course catalogs, graduation requirements, adopted textbooks, teacher guides, timetables, examinations, adoption minutes and purchasing records. Add teacher-training materials where a claim concerns professional influence. Student work can help establish practice when its selection and context are understood.

For each document, preserve an identifier, the institution, date, edition, pages examined and the reason it belongs in the sample. Record incomplete scans and missing pages. When material is unavailable, document the search rather than filling the gap from memory.

## **Coding the comparison**

Separate course labels from instructional content. Code constitutional structure, rights, federalism, amendments and historical development separately from general civic participation. Record whether tasks ask for recall, explanation, interpretation or application.

Compare allocated time, required status and placement in the course sequence. Content moved to another grade should not be counted

automatically as deletion. A required course should not be treated as equivalent to an elective without describing participation.

Use an independent second review of a sample before publishing quantified coding results. Resolve disagreements and retain the coding rules. No such independent coding study has been completed for this revised edition.

## **A protocol for influential books**

Maintain four distinct collections: educational philosophy, teacher preparation, classroom materials and home reading. A work can appear in more than one collection, but its evidence of influence should be specified separately for each.

For classroom materials, seek adoption and purchase evidence. For teacher preparation, seek syllabi, examination lists and training records. For home reading, seek appropriately scoped circulation, sales, diaries, letters or survey evidence. Do not infer nationwide household reading from one family's collection.

Record editions carefully. A long-lived series can change authors, publishers, content and intended audiences. The same title on two covers does not guarantee the same book inside. Conversely, a new title can conceal substantial continuity in content.

## **Safeguarding and sensitive reporting**

Keep allegations, administrative determinations, charges and convictions in separate fields, each with its own date and source. Verify case status near publication. Do not identify a person as a perpetrator solely because a complaint exists.

For survivor interviews, explain the project and intended use, avoid unnecessary graphic detail and agree on identification and quotation arrangements before publication. Do not diagnose the participant from an interview or use emotional presentation as a test of truthfulness. Corroborate factual claims where possible while treating the person with dignity.

Ask institutions what they knew, when they knew it and what action they took. Give a named institution a fair opportunity to respond to material adverse findings. Preserve the response and document any specific question left unanswered. These are reporting standards for later original investigations; this package does not claim such outreach has occurred.

## **Editions and corrections**

The manuscript uses a fixed cutoff date. A later development should enter a change log with the affected claim, new source and reason for revision. Distinguish a factual correction from a new event, an expanded interpretation and a copy edit.

Keep a stable identifier for each claim even when its wording changes. Preserve prior wording in the editorial record. This allows a future companion to show how the inquiry developed without making old editions appear to contain knowledge they did not have.

For a public edition, retain source notes and meaningful uncertainty. An author's private research edition may contain additional leads and questions, but those leads should not become unsupported accusations in a public narrative. The division is an editorial choice about readiness and privacy, not a reason to conceal a material qualification.

## **Design and publishing specification**

The supplied editions use large body type, generous line spacing, black headings and readable tables. The editable review format is US Letter. A commercial print edition can later be adapted to an appropriate trim size; this review PDF is not represented as an uploaded or approved print-on-demand interior.

Use the series title consistently and identify the subject and date range clearly. Do not add unverified endorsements, award claims, author experiences or institutional affiliations. BB2G appears as the project imprint in this working edition; no third-party organization is represented as endorsing the book.

The first-person introduction is proposed author copy for Kristen Hall’s review. The package makes no claim that she personally conducted interviews or visited the institutions described. Before commercial release, complete the author’s substantive review, an independent historical fact check and any needed permissions review for additional third-party excerpts or images.

## Editorial review

The revised documentary edition contains 20 chapters, five appendices and 47 distinct cited sources. It adds an original comparison of two administered New York examinations, a clearer account of four mechanisms of influence, a practical sequence for following change and a more developed closing synthesis. Eleven structured change records accompany it.

The examination comparison strengthens the book in two ways. It demonstrates a concrete change under a stable subject title and preserves the constitutional content visible in both records. It is a two-document case study, not a representative national curriculum survey. Its evidence can support the narrower finding immediately while guiding further research into the reasons for redesign.

Quality is tracked through the work itself: readable argument, specific comparisons, accurately scoped claims, traceable notes and usable navigation. A self-assigned numeric rating would not add evidence to these checks. The author can assess the book’s impact while a historical reviewer independently examines its central interpretations.

## Revision record

| Area            | Substantive change                         | Reader benefit                                           |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Opening         | Begins with actual examination artifacts   | Gives the investigation a concrete point of entry        |
| History chapter | Compares the 1998 and 2025 New York papers | Shows continuity and change within one assessment system |

| Area                  | Substantive change                                          | Reader benefit                                          |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Ideological influence | Separates persuasion, authority, dependence and concealment | Identifies the records each causal claim requires       |
| Recurring method      | Adds a five-stage reader sequence                           | Makes the living algorithm usable throughout the series |
| Conclusion            | Connects access, decisions and accountability               | Explains what the subject chapters establish together   |
| Evidence package      | Adds two original sources and an eleventh change record     | Preserves the new comparison and its limits             |

## A publication review that can close the remaining questions

The author's substantive review should confirm voice, scope and conclusions. A historical specialist should check the relation between the central claims and the cited records, with particular attention to ideological influence and changes in classroom practice. A copy editor should confirm consistent terminology, source-note treatment and the final index and production requirements chosen for the commercial edition.