

HST 201: ONLINE History of U.S. F18 (Escobar Meta 20748 22964)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 ONLINE F18 \(Escobar Meta 20748 22964\)](#) / [Week 4](#) / [Forum 2](#) / [The Great Awakening](#)



Search forums

Forum 2 The Great Awakening

[Subscribe](#)

◀ [The Great Awakening](#)

Display replies in nested form



Move this discussion to ...



Move

Pin



The Great Awakening

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Sunday, October 14, 2018, 7:23 PM

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which side of the issue, YES or NO, you have chosen to support or write about. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Great Awakening

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



In agreement with Patricia Bonomi

by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Tuesday, October 16, 2018, 11:17 AM

I agree with Patricia Bonomi's position on the Great Awakening being a key to the American Revolution. The Great Awakening altered the way religion was practiced and this opened several possibilities and changed the course of history and the American Revolution. As there was an accelerating of pace of commercial growth, land shortages and land opportunities, diversity in immigration, a and rapid climb in population, these things promoted church separations and urging their followers to make choices. They had

to make political as well as religious implications, and it brought permanent changes in public practices and attitudes. "An episode known as the first great awakening coincided with the Pietistic movement in Europe by Gilbert Tennant, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and George Whitefield. They promoted religion of the heart and not the head" (Bonomi, 1). The Great Awakening contributed to a break down, as supporters of the revivalists known as New Lights and their opponents, known as Old Lights, established separate congregations, it also sent a powerful spiritual message: that God works directly through the people, rather than through churches or other public institutions. (Murrin,135)

Religion played a huge role within the Great Awakening and I have found some facts that influence my position. Over time the Awakeners began to weasel their way into every church. This would eventually lead to stability since everyone now practiced the same religion. This became a positive driving force for religious belief in general, it created complacency and spiritual drought among believers. Religion became a thing of the past, and during religious services without deeply-felt convictions of the heart and soul. Eventually the Great Awakening broke down social cohesion in America and elevated the individual" (Bonomi, 4). Bonomi stated in her summary that "religion has always been considered a likely agent of radicalism. There is no reason to doubt that the sir of the Great Awakening altered the social and political equilibrium of colonial life" (Bonomi, 3). Although, I side with Patricia it was amazing to find just how many historians don't agree with her.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: In agreement with Patricia Bonomi

by [Tehya Curley](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 8:49 AM

Religion has always been an important factor for people for what seems like forever. However, I can see how the revival as they say would help the structure of religion. Before the Great Awakening the church was like a congregation in which an individual would have to abide by the rules of the larger collectivity. Although during the great Awakening it opened a possibility for people to be individual "As the Great Awakening broke down social cohesion in America, it simultaneously elevated the individual. During the more communal seventeenth century, colonists had rarely conceived of themselves apart from a larger collectively- the family, the congregation, or the town" (Bonomi pg 4). This allowed people to make their own decisions whether it be in religion or not "In exhorting their followers to make personal decisions for god, and then to act on those decisions regardless of their effect on the larger society, the revivalists gave sanction to a new dynamic in human relationships"(Bonomi pg 4) which beforehand the colonists would again have to abide by the larger collectivity of the peoples' rules. Without the Great Awakening religion wouldn't have been as individualized or at least as early as it was.

I can see why you agreed that the Great Awakening was the key to the American revolution, and I agree also that it was the key. Although I can also agree that religion played a huge role during this movement. Without the changes in religion, the act of being individual when it comes to religion may have sped up the process of improving our religious system and without it we may not be as far as we are today when it comes to being an

individual “This last notion captures vividly the new spirit of defiant individualism that was one of the most radical manifestations of the awakening. No longer were consensual values to prevail over individual ones, at least in matters concerning the soul. Now private judgement and intuitive understanding had equal if not superior claim on the conscience. In a word, decision making had been internalized” (Bonomi pg 4 and 5). The Great Awakening may have been the key to the American revolution in my opinion, but religion may have been the major role in the Great Awakening.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Emily Gilman](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 11:57 AM

I couldn't decide which side I agreed with. I thought Jon made a little better argument since he had more facts to support his take on it. Thinking about it now though, religion was viewed a little differently 200 years ago compared to now days. Decisions were a little more life threatening and taken more serious. So I can see how religion had a lot to do with American Revolution, but I still don't see it as the key to it.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**My views**by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 6:36 PM

After watching the video and reading the additional information. I found that they only validated my view that Professor Patricia was correct in her findings. I had a difficult time trying to be persuaded by what Jon had presented.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: In agreement with Patricia Bonomi**by [Callista Wulff](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 7:43 PM

I thought the same thing as you did. Although the Great Awakening happen in certain colonies and not in all I still believe that the way to altered religion had a huge impact. Overtime this simultaneously elevated the awakeners like you said by weaseling their way into every church. This lead to great things and broke down social cohesion in America leading to the Great Awakening. I am not sure how people could think otherwise. Being able to go your own way and believe in your own religion was a great thing that still goes on today.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

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

**Localize happenings did not create the American Revolution**by [Ruth Hyde](#) - Tuesday, October 16, 2018, 8:10 PM

I tend to side with Professor Jon Butler's impression of the impact of the Protestant revivalism that occurred in US colonies of the 18th century. The argument that appeals to me most is, that although many were seen to embrace the ideals of personal and investigational faith as purported by the preachers of the time, the idea that these individual and localized happenings directly created the American Revolution is too broad and generalized an idea.

Professor Jon Butler discusses the prerevolutionary revivals of religion and rejects the single cause theory which links the "Great Awakening" with the American Revolution. In our reading, Professor Butler states "the expansion of the leading evangelical denominations, Presbyterians and Baptists, can be traced to many causes, not just revivalism or "the Great Awakening", which clarifies his dispute with the broad claim of cause and effect. He goes on to remark that prerevolutionary revivals "appeared too erratically in too few colonies under too many different auspices to make such generalizations appropriate." My understanding of the fledgling American colonies and how incongruent their establishment was, steers me towards believing Professor Butler's interpretation of events.

Professor Butler concludes that the idea of a unique great awaking occurring in disparate American colonies "falsely homogenizes the heterogeneous", summing up, with succinct authority, the answer to our question - Was the Great Awakening a Key to the American Revolution?

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Localize happenings did not create the American Revolution**by [Hannah Cartwright](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 10:39 PM

I completely agree with you. I feel that Butler was not only influential but also makes great points especially when he brings up the point, as you stated, that the revivals happened erratically in too few colonies under too many different auspices. I think that when you dig deeper into the relation between the Great Awakening and the American Revolution, as Butler didm there are a lot of points that make me feel that the Great Awakening did not make as big of an impact on the American Revolution as it may seem. I feel that it may have had a small impact on the American Revolution, but not enough to be considered a key factor.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Localize happenings did not create the American Revolution**by [Tehya Curley](#) - Friday, October 19, 2018, 1:02 PM

I can see what you are getting at, the inconsistency in colonies would lead me to reconsider if the great awakening had such affect as Bonomi has stated. However, to consider the great awakening as the key or the main factor may be a little out there, but it effected the revolution. The level of effect is questionable, but the level is there. Whether the effect was good or not it had some sort of effect "The eighteenth century, and the latter part of seventeenth century, were of course punctuated with religious episodes that seemed to erupt without warning and draw entire communities into a vortex of religious conversions and agitations of soul. Yet those episodes tended not to spread beyond the individual churches or towns in which they originated. By the third decade of the eighteenth century however, a number of currents were converging to prepare the way for an unprecedented burst of religious fervor and controversy" (Bonomi pg 2) the Great Awakening did have effect during the time and may have had some effect on the future. During the time the Great awakening shaped the western beliefs in the eighteenth century "Two major streams of thought shaping western religious belief in the eighteenth century-" (Bonomi pg 2) the Great awakening not only shaped religion for certain regions, but it may have influenced more than we may think in the American Revolution.

I can see why you may think that way, and I cannot disagree, but I still view the great awakening as a factor to the American revolution. However, I don't see it as the key to the American revolution anymore. What do you think?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Re: Localize happenings did not create the American Revolution

by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 1:56 AM

I'm left wondering whether it could be a little of both. I wouldn't go so far as to say the Great Awakening caused the American Revolution, but I do think it's related. It doesn't exactly sound like a rehearsal to me, but some of the perspective shifts probably did make it easier to rebel against British rule.

I'm trying to understand history from the perspective of broad tendencies. For instance, it's hard to imagine that the colonies wouldn't eventually separate from British rule, simply because Atlantic Ocean was a significant barrier to effective rule, and American settlers had incentives to make their own rules. So I tend to think of the Great Awakening as itself caused by circumstance. Could we really expect anyone to adhere to the religious doctrines that were largely dictated from the other side of the ocean?

I think the circumstance of unprecedented isolation from Europe, with a continent full of resources, led to "the new spirit of defiant individualism" (Bonomi p. 4), at least as much as any preaching. As one might expect from an isolated group with access to seemingly limitless resources, colonists wanted to act independently. "Now private judgment and intuitive understanding had equal if not superior claim on the conscience. In a word, decision making had been internalized." (Bonomi p. 5)

In a nutshell, I think that the same forces that caused the Great Awakening also

caused the American Revolution. In this way, the Great Awakening was a significant foreshadowing of revolution, but not exactly a cause. "That 'dividing Spirit' would be manifested everywhere after mid-century in the proliferation of religious and political factions." (Bonomi p. 5) I would argue further that if one is to say that the Great Awakening had a degree of causality for the American Revolution, then one must ask what caused the Great Awakening.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

3



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



Re: Localize happenings did not create the American Revolution

by [Callista Wulff](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 7:47 PM

Although I do not agree with you, you do bring up valid points. But I disagree with your thought about the idea of being an independent person and believing in what you wish to believe in is not too broad of an idea. I think that is what's wrong in the first place. If you limit what people believe in that is not American Revolution. This time period was so great because it led people to believe in their own religion and not follow in their families footsteps. "As the Great Awakening broke down social cohesion in America, it simultaneously elevated the individual" and creating the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: The Great Awakening: the key to American revolution

by [Tehya Curley](#) - Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 9:02 AM

The great awakening was the revival of religion that spread across the protestant world in the 1700's. This movement destroyed some loyalties in the colonies and permitted Methodists and Baptists to move ahead of the protestant rivals. However, according to Patricia U. Bonomi the great awakening was much more than a religious revival; it was the key to American revolution, but do you agree? I agree I think without this movement the American revolution would have advanced the way it did. The great awakening opened advantages for the way of life not just by religion but for social and political attributes in their way of life. This can be seen in the pdf "The Great Awakening created conditions uniquely favorable to social and political, as well as religious, reform by piercing the façade of civility and deference that governed provincial life to usher in a new age of contentiousness. By promoting church separations and urging their followers to make choices that had political as well as religious implications, the awakeners wrought permanent changes in public practices and attitudes." ("the hosannas of the multitude" Patricia U. Bonomi) the awakening changed the way of life for the people. This led to a variety of changes. The total population continued to grow probably due to the immigration during the time. While it also led to land opportunities, but with land shortages. It also led to dense settlements, that wasn't there until the movement of the great awakening happened.

To me I view the great awakening as the pathway to the advantages that can be seen during this time. I would have to agree that the Great Awakening was the key to the American Revolution. What do you think?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Re: The Great Awakening: the key to American revolution

by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 7:28 PM

I think that there are nuances to the argument that need to be examined. In all of this discussion, a lot depends on how one views religion generally. In *Guns Germs and Steel*, Jared Diamond argues that religion, in its large scale form, is less about explaining natural phenomenon or relating to spirituality, and more about organizing large groups who otherwise would tend to quarrel. Christopher Hitchens is also outspoken (and admittedly biased) about religion being a way of controlling large groups, for instance in his book *God Is Not Great*. From these perspectives, the Great Awakening sounds a lot more political.

On the other hand, the people involved back then and many today, do sincerely experience religion as a spiritual enterprise. In one way or another, the church provides spiritual insights and context for a member's life. The question in this case might be "Why are people so receptive to the preachers' messages during the Great Awakening?" Earlier in our textbook, we read about Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams. Williams in particular seems to be saying things that would have been popular during the Great Awakening, for instance when he "refused to worship with anyone who did not explicitly repudiate the Church of England... [and] ...challenged the king's right as a Christian to grant Indian lands to anyone at all." (Murrin p. 64) In this case, "the colony banished him." How differently would it have gone if he'd been speaking a century later? What made the difference?

I think that the colonies were populated enough and industrious enough that people started to realize that they could stand independently from Britain, and maybe even in opposition to Britain. This realization would naturally lead people to desire more individuality, especially with respect to British rule and church mandates. So I see the Great Awakening more as the first major cracks that formed in the existing political structure that would soon collapse: not exactly the cause of the American Revolution but certainly related in a real way. It signaled that change was in the air, and started to establish some common identity among colonists.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

3



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



In agreement

by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 7:45 PM

Tehya- Have you watched the video that was posted yet that has been posted? I agree with you that the Great Awakening was the key to the American Revolution. After watching it from my perspective I believe that it just validated our thoughts. The awakening can be dated back to Johnathan Edwards parish where he became pastor in a church that he inherited. Edwards was often found preaching to unconverted people. His preaching's had ripple effects on people and he converted over 100 in a single Sunday. People would cry out and faint during worship. Great awakening was authenticating the working-class revivalists. Jonathan Edwards became known as one of the great philosophers and ministers of the colonies and one of the founders of the religious revival movement of the mid-1700s, known as the Great Awakening.

Then there was George Whitfield, a young feisty evangelist. Everyone came out to see him. He spoke with 20,000 people. He was so powerful he could make one weep. He often kept a folding pulpit so people could see him when he spoke since there was such a large crowd. He would eventually give 18,000 sermons on American soils. He was a person that everyone knew. He didn't plan sermons at all. Everyone came to see him, it didn't matter which denomination you were. Everyone, black, white, rich, and poor, would stand shoulder to shoulder listening to him. Everyone if they want to be seen the same by God then they all need to do it the same. With this also came the thought of individualism and independence. People would speak up and over throw. Religion was seen as an important role of the American revolution. I am having a difficult time thinking other wise.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Influence of Jon Butler

by [Hannah Cartwright](#) - Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 2:08 PM

As I read both Patricia U. Bonomi and Jon Butler's arguments on whether the Great Awakening was a key to the American Revolution, while both sides made valid points, I found myself more influenced by Jon Butler and siding more with him. Butler made many strong points supporting his argument that the Great Awakening was not a key to the American Revolution. He left me feeling that there may be some misunderstandings on specifics of the Great Awakening and some false claims which degrades some of the significance of the Great Awakening and its effect on the American Revolution. One being that Butler says, "historians exaggerate the cohesion of leadership in the revivals." He says historians overstressed the importance of Whitefield and Edwards. Butler says that Edwards did not carry much leadership. In addition, he says that Whitefield's charismatic influence faded, so his appearances in the 1750s and 1760s did not have a big impact on the society. In addition, his leadership even before 1750 was said to be "ethereal". It is also stated that Whitefield had wish to be a personal model for ministers wanting to promote their own revivals of religion, but he did not do enough organizing and planning, so he had failed to do so. With the way Butler describes Whitefield during this time, it does not seem that he would have much of an impact and make much of a change. With this, it makes me feel that there may have been multiple misunderstandings with the Great Awakening which may change the opinions of the Great Awakening being a key to the American Revolution. At the end of his argument, Butler says that religions lacked

significant experiential unity in the colonies, the revivals arose at different times in different places from the 1690s down to the time of the revolution, and that it "failed to change the timing, causes, or effects of the Revolution in any significant way.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Re: Influence of Jon Butler

by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 6:31 PM

Hannah- I can totally see why you sided with Jon Butler. As I am reading more on the topic beside the reading we were assigned to read there are so many conflicting ideas. I sided with Patricia, but I enjoyed reading your forum post because it opened my eyes and forced to find out more information going against Patricia. I found myself rereading the article that was posted and on page 7 it painted a different picture of Edwards and Whitefield. From everything that I have read and the video that was posted for us to watch it portrays them as playing a part in the Great Awakening to being a key to the American Revolution. Although, religion played a big part in colonial life. It is estimated that as much as 35% of the population didn't attend church and that attendance on divine services outside cities and large towns, was usually sporadic. That flew in the face of the reigning historical myth and this information discredits my perspective even though I still stand with my views. Have you watched the video that was posted yet? It sides with Patricia and is interesting.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



The Great Awakening was not a key factor in the American Revolution

by [Evan Brewer](#) - Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 6:44 PM

The historian that I personally agree with more on the topic of the Great Awakening is Jon Butler. Jon Butler believes that "the link between the revivals and the American Revolution is virtually nonexistent"(Great Awakening pg.10). After reading the article, Butler influenced me to believe the same as he gave me important information to re-evaluate my previous view. My previous view was that the revivals wanted separation from Britain and wanted to create a society of their own which would inevitably be similar to the society we live in now. As said by Jon Butler in the Great Awakening essay, "In other colonies the revivals furnished little revolutionary rhetoric, including millennialist thought, that was not available from other sources and provided no unique organizational mechanisms for anti-British protest activity"(10). After reading this, my view changed and I realized there wasn't any push to get away from Britain except for the Virginia colony. The Virginia colony had many Anglican members that lead the Revolution which Butler said it was the only colony to show any change in religious activities and politics. The history book, Liberty, Equality, Power, talks about the Virginia colony as well by stating, "evangelical Presbyterians made modest gains in the Virginia piedmont after 1740. Finally, in the 1760s, the Baptists began to win thousands of converts in Virginia, as did the Methodists after 1776"(134). After reading this quote, I still believe that the Great Awakening was not a key factor in the

American Revolution. Besides the Virginia colony, no other colonies changed their religious activities and politics to separate themselves from Britain before the American Revolution. What do you think?

Sum of ratings: **2 (1)**

2



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



Re: The Great Awakening was not a key factor in the American Revolution

by [Tehya Curley](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 1:32 PM

I can see your standpoint, but I'm still leaning towards Patricia U. Bonomi opinion on that the great awakening was the key to the American revolution. The great awakening was or can be considered the key to the American revolution. Although you state that it was only Virginia that changed their religious or other activities to separate from Britain, but it would be hard to believe that this movement didn't have any affect due to it happening during the American revolution. During the American revolution is when it peaked "The movement peaked during the American revolution and for a few decades after it" (Liberty, Equality, Power pg 134). The peak of the movement is when separate churches came to be "The revivals shattered the unity of New England's congregational church. Evangelicals seceded from dozens of congregations to form their own "separate" churches" (Liberty, Equality, Power pg 134). While you explain that no other colonies besides for Virginia changed their religious activities; what about New Jersey and Pennsylvania? Beforehand majority of the people had never joined a church until the revivals convinced them otherwise "In the 1730's, most people in the region, particularly in New Jersey and Pennsylvania ad never joined a church. The revivals prompted many of them to become new side Presbyterians." (Liberty, Equality, Power pg 134). Therefore, regions of New America during that time may have had religious activities.

I still believe that the Great Awakening was the key to the American revolution, but you still had good points that made me reconsider my standpoint.

Sum of ratings: **2 (1)**

2



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



Re: The Great Awakening was not a key factor in the American Revolution

by [Hannah Cartwright](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 10:31 PM

You bring up many valid points which I agree with. It really opened my eyes when I learned that the Virginia colony was the only place to change religious activities. I believe that everything has an effect on everything, which I know is a very broad statement, but I do believe that even the smallest things impacts everything, just as I believe the Great Awakening did have some effect on the American Revolution, however, to say it was a key factor seems like too big of a statement, especially after the points Butler brings up in his arguments. He brings up the points that a lot of things about the American Revolution was exaggerated, like the relations and importance between Whitefield and Edwards which causes me to second guess a lot of things about the American Revolution. Of course I am not one to say that everything Butler says is true, but his argumemt was so persuasive, it was hard for me not to side with him.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**yes debate**by [Callista Wulff](#) - Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 6:59 PM

Yes I do believe that the Great Awakening was a key to the American Revolution there for I agree with Professor Patricia Bonomi. The Great Awakening according to Bonomi "is one of the most arresting subjects of American history." The Revolution itself was not conceived during the revivals, but the Great Awakening did cause a shift that historians must take seriously. The revivals shattered the social order of church hierarchy, rejecting the existing power structures of the day and focusing on individuals. As Bonomi stated, "as the Great Awakening broke down social cohesion in America, it simultaneously elevated the individual." When expressing to colonists followers to make personal decisions for God then to act on those decisions, they did regardless of their effect on the society which gave a "new dynamic in human relationships." I believe that this had a big effect on the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: yes debate**by [Hannah Cartwright](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 10:32 PM

I see where you are coming from. After reading Butler and Bonomi's arguments, I was leading towards Butler a little more because of some of the points he brought up, such as some things being exaggerated, some things being misunderstood about the events, etc. however I do also see yours, and of course Bonomi's, point as well. It does also make sense to me that the Great Awakening could be a key to the American Revolution, for it did make many shifts in our history and made a big change. I find it hard to stick with only one side of this, for I feel that both sides have very valid arguments.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: yes debate**by [Jessica Eckley](#) - Friday, October 19, 2018, 9:26 PM

I understand that side of the agreement however, I still hold strong to Butler's stance. As Butler said in his argument, The Great Awakening happen in certain colonies, not in all. So, how could something that reached only some of the colonists, make such a drastic influence in American history? Although there was part of your statement that I do agree with and that is he Great Awakening did start making individuals start thinking about their own beliefs and own desires. That in turn made people start standing up in what they believe in more which is one of the most important things in America; being able to have freedom of speech and speaking out in what they believe in. A part of me wonders if the Great Awakening had anything to do with that becoming a right.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**I agree with Jon Butler!**by [Jessica Eckley](#) - Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 9:15 PM

Was the Great Awakening a Key to the American Revolution?

Going into this subject, I instantly thought I was more than likely going to get persuaded into thinking yes. However, after reading the article, I agree with Jon Butler; no, the Great Awakening was not a Key to the American Revolution. Butler, in my opinion, gave more facts and reasoning about his opinion. Only one opinion really stood out on Patricia J. Bonomi argument and that was it may have been the beginning of civil rights and standing up for what you believe is right. Other than that Butler had much more back up facts.

One example was "the prerevolutionary revivals should be understood primarily as regional events that occurred in only half the colonies" I found this very surprising because obviously, the Revolution involved all of the colonies. As the article says "...the revivals of religion in prerevolutionary America seldom become proto-revolutionary, and they failed to change the timing, causes, or effects of the Revolution in any significant way" (pg.10). Therefore, how could something that didn't happen in all the colonies have any affect on an event that involved everybody? That just doesn't make logical sense to me.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Emily Gilman](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 11:40 AM

You make a great point. I couldn't decide which side I agreed with. Standing up for what you believe is right it a giant factor in everything, but it's not everything. I believe greatly that the revolution would have happened without it. I think it definitely played a part in the way things changed but I don't think it was the Key to it.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Agree to Disagree**by [Emily Gilman](#) - Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 10:34 PM

I'm torn on where I stand on this. I kinda don't agree with either point of view. Jon, in not so many words, feels like he doesn't acknowledge that The Great Awakening even existed and Patricia is very mater-of-fact about it. My reasoning on this is because I can see how the revolution could have had an influence by religion and America awoke from its previous state of leadership into a free land. But I also feel that no matter where religion was playing a role, Americans were going to overcome the hold from England and break free no matter what was circulating at the time. Since then, 200 years later, the Americans have been influenced and redirected by many other ideas and factors. It isn't not always

religion that flares up a war. To me, beliefs and religions are different. Beliefs are what you personally feel and think are right, and religion is an umbrella of rules you have to follow in order that serve the God or gods to give service to.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

**Re: Agree to Disagree**

by [Asa Telschow](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 9:43 AM

I think you're right to feel that both arguments are a little problematic. I also think both are partially correct. I just think a lot of people are saying it backward. "The major effect of the Awakening was a rebellion against authoritarian religious rule which spilled over into other areas of colonial life." (<http://www.great-awakening.com/roots-of-revolution/> , section 04) I would argue that people were becoming aware of themselves as capable of resisting outside control in general, and the noteworthy ways they asserted this feeling were religious and governmental.

When "charismatic personalities such as Whitefield and Tennent rolled through to deliver their messages" (Roots of Revolution section 04), I see them as sparks in dry tinder. Under other circumstances, their messages may not have been enough to have such impact, but at this time, they resonated with a population eager to follow along. Certainly they had their influence, but I think of it more like mob rule. Since the American colonies were growing more powerful and prosperous, they were capable of resisting or even overthrowing the authority that came from across the Atlantic (very far away, especially then).

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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

**Re: Agree to Disagree**

by [Hannah Cartwright](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 10:19 PM

I completely understand where you are coming from. It was very hard for me to choose which side to choose. It seems that for you, you do not agree with either side, and for me, I agreed with both sides. They both made valid arguments to me, but I can see where you can also just not agree with either side. They both were very one-sided about it, which they have to do if they want to make a strong argument, but being too one-sided and almost make them seem closed minded to the other side of the argument, which I feel like you noticed. I do also agree with you when you say "beliefs and religions are different" and I feel like that is hard for some people to understand and think about. Great post!

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

Re: Agree to Disagree - Hannah



by [Emily Gilman](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 11:03 PM

I think that's where I was struggling to pick a side, because when you are trying to make your own point it is good to add in a point from the opposing view as well. Both were very one sided and only stated their own opinions. That's the problem with most people today, they are very close minded and don't even want to try to see what someone else sees. It's sad really. And for someone to not see how beliefs and religion are different is beyond me! You can not have a religion you follow but still have a belief in what is right from wrong.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0



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



George Whitefield unified the people causing a Revolution

by [Evan Brewer](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 8:12 PM

The historians in the video support the thought of the Great Awakening being a key factor in the American Revolution. Every historian gave critical facts that supported this thought and I didn't hear anyone say anything that would go against that. Therefore, the specific historian that most influenced my decision in the video was Barry Hankins. Hankins claimed that people in the first Great Awakening thought of themselves as one person, or separate people from the motherland. As Hankins said in the video, "This was the first national event in American History"(6:01). Hankins said this because before the Great Awakening, many people had different thoughts and beliefs but when George Whitefield started to speak to thousands of people, it didn't matter if you were white, black, rich, poor, etc. everyone was on the same page. This was the first time America stood together and saw themselves as one instead of 13 different colonies made up of different cultures. Another historian that influenced me from the film, but was not named said, "People speak up, they get energized, they participate, they overthrow ministers they don't like, and in that deeper, more cultural or social way, religion can be seen as a backdrop or pre-cause of the American Revolution"(6:20). After reading this, my original decision about the Great Awakening changed. Before the video, I believed that the Great Awakening was not a key factor in the American Revolution but I changed my mind because I realized how many people took part in the revivals. It seemed like everyone in America at the time was changing and becoming more united. This would lead to the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: George Whitefield unified the people causing a Revolution

by [Daniel Urias](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 12:51 PM

"This was the first time America stood together and saw themselves as one instead of 13 different colonies made up of different cultures." While it is true that the colonists experienced the Great Awakening simultaneously, I don't think they suddenly stopped seeing each other as different cultures as a result of it. For starters there was conflict within the Presbyterian church itself as preachers like Gilbert Tennent "warned that those preachers were leading their people to hell." (Murrin pg.132) Even Ben Franklin

had a hard time uniting just the northern colonies after the Awakening when, “Newspapers ignored the Albany Plan [and] every colony rejected it.” (Murrin pg.148) I found myself leaning towards Professor Butler’s argument since he claims most historians are wrong about the event, he offers a solution stating, “The most important suggestion is the most drastic. Historians should abandon the term ‘the Great Awakening’” (Article pg.9) entirely. This to me stresses that most Historians tend to exaggerate the event as a whole, including those in the video. He also attempts to describe the event’s true significance, “the prerevolutionary revivals should be understood primarily as regional events that occurred in only half the colonies.” (Article pg.9)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Interesting perspective**by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 6:26 PM

Evan- I can really appreciate your first post. I feel like I read Butlers portion over and over and I still couldn’t get a grasp on it. Not so much a grasp, but the answer isn’t as black and white. Your post helped me see things from a different perspective. I do find it interesting that you changed your mind after watching the video. I felt as though Professor Bonomi’s ideas were similar to the video. If the video had been written instead of presented as a video do you think you would have sided with the debate that the Great Awakening was key to the American Revolution? I do find it interesting that you changed your mind after watching the video.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**America's independence from England derived from more than the Great Awakening**by [Ruth Hyde](#) - Thursday, October 18, 2018, 9:36 PM

This week’s video and midweek reading supports Patricia Bonomi’s idea that the Great Awakening shaped the colonies of America to the extent that it caused the American Revolution. Bonomi stated “By promoting church separations and urging their follower's to make choices that had political as well as religious implications, the Awakeners wrought permanent changes in public practices and attitudes.” She believed in the course of revivalist religion spread exhaustively to the point that it instigated the following revolutionary war. Although I take seriously the effect of this part of history, I remain unmoved to the extent that it was the lone cause, or main feature promoting independent American values.

Reviewing my limited understanding of the American Revolution – given that we haven’t studied this era in our current course as yet – I’m assuming our calculations of the cause of the Revolution is sought from our general knowledge, alongside the prior text coverage of establishing communities within the “New World” (pg. 103-107), I consider the diversity of each person’s experience and the similarities, as well as the differences in each colony, as described in our text. I am still of the opinion that the Great Awakening was an element, but not the cause, of the American Revolution. The name itself conveys the importance that those who believe it was significant want you to know – they believe it was “Great” and an “Awakening” which is vibrant language for an era in history where many reports are derived from oral history and compiled years after the occurrences (Butler –prescribed reading). Imagine, for interest’s sake, if this period was called, “The religious upheaval period”, or, “Era of organized structural church dissent”? Both I think describe the time, and limit the biased eloquence of “Great Awakening”.

Our text describes another movement - the American Enlightenment - which is noted in having a significant impact on the young country. The academic ideas “which rejected a wrathful God and exalted man’s capacity for knowledge and social improvement” (Murrin 128) were celebrated by well-known historical figures such as Benjamin Franklin. These concepts could also be considered a cause of independent mind-set which drove progress for separation from England. Although it is mentioned that Whitefield, prominent Protestant revivalist preacher, and Franklin shared a comfortable relationship (page 133) it is stated that they didn’t align with religious views but instead respected each-other’s strengths. This in itself may serve as another clue to parsing the complicated factors that led to the American Revolution.

I could support the idea that this period of time, and these events, were the precursor to the dichotomy that is Americas liberalism and conservatism, but to see this series of happenings as creation of the American Revolution is to take too many disparate factions of religious movement and tie them to a new country’s exploration of identity and eventual independence.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



GA and AR not the same

by [Daniel Urias](#) - Friday, October 19, 2018, 3:01 PM

When I first read the prompt my answer was “No, I highly doubt the Great Awakening had much, if anything, to do with the American Revolution.” I am already been wary of crediting religion since we now know the first settlers here didn’t come here solely for such a simple reason, so I wasn’t ready to give the Great Awakening much, if any, credit for sparking the American Revolution. After reading the essays, I can see some connections but I still feel the two are almost entirely separate entities in American history. Professor Bonomi draws several parallels between the mindset of the colonial public during the Great Awakening and the American Revolution. She states that, “the revivalists found their allies among the people. Together they launched a mass movement that made bold assaults on established

forms of church government... and social order.” (pg-3,paragraph-2) The public gathering behind a rally cry of critique and reform does strike a resemblance to the American Revolution. However, I would consider the risks behind each struggle before considering them related.

There seems to be no great intolerance of the Great Awakening as much as there was relative disagreement. Those who participated in the Great Awakening did not risk their lives, they simply may have just risked their reputation, considering the “Enlightenment rationalism” (pg-2,p-2) stream of thought Professor Bonomi mentions. Those who participated in the American Revolution risked much more, including their lives and possibly the lives of their loved ones.

Bonomi also discusses how the Awakening “created conditions uniquely favorable... to usher in a new age of contentiousness.” I find it hard to imagine that people who attended church between “1739 to 1745” (pg-2,p-1) whom were old enough to participate in politics were highly involved in the American Revolution twenty years later as life expectancy was not very favorable (except maybe in New England). I still have quite a bit to learn on the subject, but I can’t imagine that fighting for separation of local churches and a more spiritually diligent public encouraged individuals to fight for independence and separation from their homeland.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Unity and Pluralism. Why did TGA divide and unite as it did?

by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 10:29 AM

I found it intriguing that The Great Awakening seemed to simultaneously promote division, and unity. (Division in the form of "splinter groups," when "believers broke away from larger churches" (<http://www.great-awakening.com/roots-of-revolution/> under 'Government as Contract' heading), and unity in the form of general anti-Catholicism; "one common understanding shared by all was an opposition to Roman Catholicism" (same article, 'Shared Goals' heading))

As a non-religious individual, I see these effects as revealing the underlying purpose of religion: To define in-groups and out-groups. In this light, The Great Awakening was a fundamental step toward creating a national identity separate from England. I imagine it being as much escaping from religion as it was about re-awakening a religious element of life. It was escape in the sense that the Great Awakening defined the out-group as Roman Catholicism, even going so far as to think of the pope as the "anti-christ." "...When questions arose about the Antichrist they turned to the Catholics." (Roots of Revolution "Shared Goals" heading).

On the other hand, there was a paradoxical effect of uniting people, even though there was a plurality of religions and other characteristics. "You've got slave and free, black and white, educated, uneducated, you've got high-born or commoners... ...all these different kinds of people standing shoulder to shoulder in the same crowd." (First Great Awakening video 5:50). "This was the first national event in American history." (6:05) This made it

important to develop values about religious tolerance, which may have been possible because of the "flipping" of the chain of authority, toward "God to people to ruler." (Roots of Revolution "Toward an American Identity" heading)

This strange mixture of tolerance and revolt is something that I'm very interested in. Why should some distinctions be overlooked (such as denominations or racial divides), while others are nearly universally reinforced, specifically anti-Catholic sentiment? I can't help imagining that it's simply political convenience, but perhaps a more religious person could offer me different insights.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



The Great Awakening: reconsideration of my standpoint

by [Tehya Curley](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 10:48 AM

After reading everyone's standpoint on this subject it has led me to reconsider my own. Before than I saw the Great Awakening as the key to the American revolution due to information provided by the book Liberty, Equality, Power by Murrin and the article by Bonomi. However, when I started to read the standpoint of others I started thinking otherwise. Was the Great Awakening the key to the American Revolution? In my opinion I doubt the Great Awakening was the key to the American Revolution. Although if you consider it if people were not to push the great awakening would we even know about it. In reality, if no one was to ask about the great awakening would anyone know of it's existence; according to Jon Butler we wouldn't "No one would seriously question the existence of "The Great Awakening" if historians only described it as a short-lived Calvinist revival in New England during the early 1740's" (Butler pg 6). This made me question how Bonomi was making the Great Awakening seem like a major event in our history, but when you learn about the possibility that the Great Awakening is questionable it makes you reconsider your standpoint. Furthermore, another point Butler pointed out was the fact that they can't really date it. If the Great Awakening was as major for the revolution wouldn't we be able to date when it started and when it ended? Instead we only know of the main years of when this movement strived and when it ended, but the rest is a guessing game. Jon Butler states "The Great Awakening" also is difficult to date. Seldom has an "event" of such magnitude had such amorphous beginnings and endings. In New England, historians agree, the revivals flourished principally between 1740 and 1743 and largely ended by 1745, although a few scattered outbreaks of revivalism occurred there in the next decades. Establishing the beginning of the revivals has proved more difficult, however." (Butler pg 6). Jon Butler has various amounts of information that made me reconsider my opinion on if the Great Awakening can be considered the key to the American Revolution. Although other opinions on this subject also influenced on why I reconsidered my standpoint.

What do you think?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Awake

by [Christian Jakobsen](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 10:58 AM

I believe that Patricia U. Bonomi made great points and I agree with them. It was a intense time in America and it was about to burst with religious fever and controversy. Two thoughts that were shaping western religious belief at the time were Enlightenment rationalism and Continental pietism. It was easy to spread when there are printing press. By promoting church separations and urging followers to makes choices that had religious and political ideas, the people brought permanent change to the public and attitudes. The awaking unsettled many lives in America and disrupted many more institutions than any other event in colonial experience.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Large Crowds, Super Famous**by [Daniel Urias](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 1:00 PM

What side of the “Was the Great Awakening a Key to the American Revolution?” debate do these historians from the video seem to support? Which specific historian and quote/claim they made most influenced your decision?

It seems the historians in the video support Professor Patricia J. Bonomi. What stood out to me the most was the idea of Whitefield attracted crowds across all denominations. While reading the subchapter in the book I had a basic idea of the size of the crowds, “he sometimes attracted as many as 30,000 people” (Murrin pg.133 p.2) Honestly, I imagined a crowd that size ocured on only one or two occasions, I didn’t take it to mean that he regularly had large crowds exceeding tens of thousands. The audience, I assumed, was composed almost entirely of the standard colonist: white, free, and unwealthy. I didn’t consider that slaves or rich or educated colonists attended, especially since the Enlightenment was such a recent event. But the video made me realize what a superstar Whitefield really was and that crowds of twenty thousand or more were a common occurrence. The most influential line in the film was Peter Marshall stating, “he preached over eighteen thousand sermons on american soil.” (4:28). At that point it had sunk in just how popular Whitefield was and the influence he had in British North America.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Whitefield**by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 6:28 PM

Daniel- I also felt that the historians in the video did support Professor Bonomi. If you dig deeper into Whitefield there is so much more than what is presented in the video. They paint him as an amazing man, but his work was much bigger than what it expressed in the writing. In

1739, Whitefield set out for a preaching tour of the American colonies. Whitefield selected Philadelphia as his first American stop. As he traveled about he found himself in a predicament as the largest churches he preached at could not hold the 8,000 who came to see him. He found himself preaching to them outdoors. Every stop along Whitefield's trip he would preach to record amount of audiences, often exceeding the population of the towns in which he preached. Whitefield was often surprised at how the crowds were so aggressive. His gatherings became known for the crowds to be elbowed, shoved, and trampled over themselves to hear of the word. Once Whitefield started speaking, the mobs were spellbound. Whitefield set his own theological course. He never pleaded with people to convert, but only announced, and dramatized, his message

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Large Crowds, Super Famous**by [Jessica Eckley](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 9:46 PM

I agree with you. I really didn't think the crowds would be that many people. I just assumed it would have been small crowds of unwealthy white people. But when I was watching the video one of the men speaking said "You got slave and free, black and white, educated, and uneducated, rich or poor, all these different kinds people standing shoulder to shoulder..." (around 5:10). When he said that it really shocked me of how much support the sermons got. Even though according to the video, he didn't really prepare for them. Side note, that really show how much passion and compassion he had for this Awakening. Amazes me how much change it caused within the colonies.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The video provoked me to rethink my previous agreement with Butler**by [Jessica Eckley](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 6:21 PM

I originally agreed with Butler with the article. However, the video made me reconsider if the Great Awakening was key to the Revolution. The video really made me start to think that maybe it was a key to the Revolution. When the Great Awakening happened, it brought a lot of people together all in one common thing and that was religion and converting into what you want to be not what others wanted. As the video states "You got slave and free, black and white, educated, ad uneducated, rich or poor, all these different kinds people standing shoulder to shoulder..." (around 5:10). One of the main reasonings behind the American Revolution was to e freed from the English which is similar to what

was happening in the Great Awakening. As the video states “The first Great Awakening, it’s important to remember, was a cross denominational event for Americans.” (around 5:05). The great awakening was just the beginning of people finding their own voices and questioning how things were “suppose” to be. That could have very well lead to them fighting the English for freedom in the Revolution.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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



Re: The video provoked me to rethink my previous agreement with Butler

by [Ruth Hyde](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 10:45 AM

I was moved by the information in the video and website as well, but I also noticed that the folks who feature, with strong feelings about the Great Awakening being most significant were predominantly religiously affiliated. It appeared that many of those featured were employed by religious schools or organizations and perhaps have an ulterior motive for promoting the idea of evangelism as the reason for Americas separation from England. Our text notes that “Partly in reaction to the revivals, thousands of men became Freemasons, often instead of joining a church” (Murrin pg. 134) and I think this indicates the wide distribution of ideals and influence. Some were meaningfully changed by the religious revivals, but my guess is that many were not. I remain sided with Jon Butler that the resistance to English rule and eventually independence from England was not a direct result of the Great Awakening.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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



Rethinking

by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 6:30 PM

Jessica- I think your forum post is interesting. I have chosen to side with Patricia, but I wonder if Jon’s article was first if it would have changed my opinion. I see that you originally sided with yes then upon further reading went with no. I agree with you that Butler presented a lot more facts, but out side of this article the facts point in the other direction. I found in many out-side sources that it has said that the Great Awakening, was the most important event in American religion during the eighteenth century, was a series of emotional religious revivals that spread across the American colonies in the late 1730s and 1740s. Religion did play a huge part. I did see where you posted another time and made a comment on the video. I am glad to see that I’m not the only one that interpreted as you did. I originally sided with Patricia and I felt the video validated what she was saying. I felt it was different reading the paper then actually hear someone stating the same facts.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



Re: The Great Awakening

by [Nargis Safi](#) - Saturday, October 20, 2018, 10:36 PM

I believe that great awaking brought about a climate which made the american revolution possible because people were not following old cliches any more. According to professor of American history Patricia "Great Awakening encouraged people to act on individual conscience". Once people were allowed to express their emotions and greater intimacy with God, split between different religious groups and eventually American revolution was born.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Nargis Safi](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 5:24 PM

A lot of the historian from the movie, from our text, and the website seems to agree with the idea that great awaking was a key to the American revolution. I was convinced that awaking was behind the revolution just by reading the article but after reading of the text book, website and watching the movie i became fully sure that awaking played a major role in the process of the American revolution. The points made be convinced was the claim of the historian Stephen Stookey from the movie, that in awaking period people for the first time were actually able to stand beside each other without any racial, gender, and other barriers. So i believe this freedom of self expression and feeling of equality for sure encourage people to stand for things they want and are excited about. The other point that convinced me is from the text book by Murrin, that great awaking created several more colleges and unlike the older colleges, it drew students from all 13 colonies and send it 's graduates throughout America(page 112). Therefor, i think More colleges means more opportunities, more educated and well informed people. Education opens mind , encourage search for the truth and develop a mind that can engaged critically with many different ideas so this sounds to me a perfect recipe for a revolution. In all of the provided sources i think professor Patricia J. Bonomi presented the most historically truthful interpretation and i agree with her points. such as explanation of two major thoughts shaping western religious beliefs , an accelerating peace of commercial growth , existence of combative and charismatic personalities, revivalism and characteristics related to awakeners.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Critical Analysis**by [Daniel Urias](#) - Sunday, October 21, 2018, 9:02 PM

What position do the historians of your textbook seem to be taking regarding the influence of the Great Awakening on the American Revolution? In your critical analysis of the sources, which experts seem to be presenting the most historically truthful interpretation? Cite your reasons and sources.

The book hardly seems to draw any parallels, at least not as ademently as the film or Professor Bonomi. Regarding the article, I find myself leaning towards the word of Professor Butler, only because while they are both Professors of History, Professor Butler specializes in American history, so I imagine he has had more experience analyzing life in the colonies.

It seems most of the information in the video comes from unnamed sources and the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. J. Stanley Lemons, Professor of History at Rhode Island College seems to be among the more credible sources, but he only attests to the Great Awakening, “[stimulating] religious fervor and also tend to authenticate the kind of religious practices of the working class” (2:59). Barry Hankins (Baylor University) and George Marsden (University of Notre Dame) also appear credible, but only Hankins claimed the Great Awakening to having an unifying effect on the colonies, “began many people on the path to thinking of themselves as a separate people, as a people for the first time because this was the first national event in American history.” (5:57)

I do not mean to say that the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary is an incredible source, only that as Professor Butler said, “Historians should abandon the term ‘the Great Awakening’...” (Article pg.9 p.3) and that, “the prerevolutionary revivals should be understood primarily as regional events that occurred in only half the colonies.” (Article pg.9 p.4). I imagine it likely for those in the video to exaggerate the Great Awakening because the entire “event” is exaggerated by many historians according to Professor Butler’s argument. I also imagine it more a Seminary would, according to its duty, focus more heavily on the effects religion played on society in their pursuit of historical knowledge.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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

◀ [The Great Awakening](#)

◀ [Web Video - The Puritans \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...



[CLICK HERE for Week 4 Forum Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#) ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Log out](#))
[HST 201 ONLINE F18 \(Escobar Meta 20748 22964\)](#)

? GET HELP

[SHED \(Student Help Desk\)](#)

[ATC \(Instructor Help Desk\)](#)

[How to use Moodle \(Basics for Students\)](#)

[IT Services](#)

[Computer Labs](#)

[Tutoring Services](#)

[Library](#)

[Get the mobile app](#)