

HST 201: US History F19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 F19 \(Escobar Meta 20635 22256\)](#) / [Week 8 November 17 - November 23](#) / [Forum 3](#) / [The Discussion Continues](#)



Search forums

Forum 3

The Discussion Continues

[Subscribe](#)

◀ [The Discussion Continues](#)

[The Revolution](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



The Discussion Continues

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 9:43 PM

NEW MATERIALS, quotes from other historians and 2 short videoclips, are now available on the [Forum Materials and Questions](#) webpage.

To make your POSTS using these new materials, 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 specific historian or source you are using and whether they support the YES or NO position in the debate. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Discussion Continues

Sum of ratings: _

[Permalink](#)

[Edit](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



The radical American Revolution

by [Emily Fosnight](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 11:30 PM

I still agree with my original decision that the American revolution was not a conservative movement. One of the historians which made the most persuasive argument was John Richard Alden, "The example of republicanism successful over the vast territory of the United States constituted a threat to monarchism everywhere, and stimulated revolt against kings and emperors. The proclamation in the Declaration of Independence of the equality of men in the side of the Creator continues to serve as a battle cry for social

and political justice" (The Revolution-Historians document 1). He's saying that the Revolution was a political and social movement, and in history most politics and social movements are considered at least somewhat radical. It's quite radical to revolt against the kings and emperors of a region.

Another of the historians that made a rather persuasive argument was J. Franklin Jameson, who says, "The status in which the electoral franchise was left at the end of the revolutionary period fell far short of complete democracy. Yet during the years we are considering, that right to suffrage (vote) was much extended. The freeholder, or owner of real estate, was given special privileges in four of the new state constitutions, two others widened the suffrage to include all owners of either land or personal property to a certain limit, and to others conferred it upon all taxpayers" (The Revolution-Historians document 6). He's saying here that special voting privileges were extended to those who were not necessarily landowners. Which is most definitely a social movement.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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


Re: More fuel for the radical side

by [Clay Noteboom](#) - Thursday, November 21, 2019, 9:38 AM

The new materials add fuel to the argument that the revolution was radical.

John Richard Alden, in 1954, pointed out that this was the first real break to European Colonialism (Alden, 1954, from handout). After the American colonists revolted, other colonizers started losing footing. Spain started losing imperial power, Haiti was established as an independent state free from France, and India started to pull away from the grip of the British Empire (from Britannica.com). A conservative movement would not have had these far-reaching effects.

Gordon Wood also pointed out that ordinary folks now held positions in the government. He said, "Men of more humble and rural origins and less educated than those who had sat in colonial assemblies now became representatives" (Wood, 2002, from handout). When people get pissed, they get involved. Look at the "pink wave" of women, especially women of color, who are now running for office, many as a result of their dislike of President Trump. The same pattern that the American revolution kicked off is still happening today.

However, Linda DePauw does make a good point that 80% of the population, "negroes, servants, women, and minors" were not swept up in any type of reform (handout). They were left behind, and for them, perhaps, the revolution did not see so radical or life-changing. But again, that was then, the short view. It took us a while, but we did get busy adhering to the idea that "All men are created equal." Well. We are still trying, at least.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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


Stoking the fire of the radical American Revolution

by [Emily Fosnight](#) - Thursday, November 21, 2019, 4:35 PM

The American revolution was not a conservative movement. By a strict constructionist definition, a revolution is perceived as significant and deep societal change. In the American revolution video number one Gordon Wood states, "[the revolution caused] fundamental change in society and social relationships." It was not only a political overthrow of the British monarchy, but it also caused great change in the social aspects of daily life in America. The greatest example of this, would be the issue of slavery and the constitution saying all men are created equal, and the fact that all slaves were not freed at that time. Now, how do they explain that?

Also in video number one, John Butler states, "Before 1776, Americans had almost unwittingly, and without any planning, affected a revolution that transformed the nature of the old 17th century colonies." Previous to what we call the American Revolution, the American people were already revolutionary in the social aspect, in economics, and in their politics. When looking around at that time period, the social and cultural aspect looked nothing like Great Britain, or even that of colonial America. With the American politics, they effectively formed a legislature, and the American people were actively participating in their politics.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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


America Changing

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Thursday, November 21, 2019, 9:07 PM

"The Americans were fighting not so much to establish new rights as to preserve old ones." (Document #3 Was the American Revolution Revolutionary?). This statement is partly true. Alexander Hamilton is a good example for how the Americans kept relatively the same governmental system as the British. Hamilton was a brilliant man who was in charge of the treasury. He built the financial system to closely resemble Britain's. Although this is true, the Founding Fathers were interested in changing their country. They did not want to stay completely traditional. They wanted to free themselves from Britain's shadow. America is the first democratic modern country in the world according to brainly.in's website. This is not traditional! Most importantly on this point is that they were SUCCESSFULLY democratic. That had not happened previously. This changes how the operations of the country work. They were changing most things so this proves that the American Revolution was not a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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


Doc 1

by [alex Henshen](#) - Thursday, November 21, 2019, 9:59 PM

John Alden's view is towards the revolution not being a conservative movement. The patriots broke free from Europe inspiring others. This is a very one sided view and quite a positive outlook. He makes a convincing claim within a small paragraph. Making true statements like " the example of republicanism successful over the vast territory of the United States constituted a threat to monarchism everywhere,..."(doc 1) Which we were told about in class. The USA was the first to successfully use republicanism and others like France tried to follow with their own revolution. There's was just more violent.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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


Changes of America

by [alex Henshen](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 1:02 PM

According to document 3 of The Revolution colonist were not fighting for new rights yet one of the major crisis that led to the revolution was the idea of taxation without representation. when becoming its own country they create a different kind of government ruled by the people with constitutions and a bill of right. first in the colonies and then one for the nation. The founders did base some ideas off of Britain like, Hamilton's treasury, the language they spoke, and 90% of their trade came from Britain. on the other side they wanted to break away by having their own currency. this prove that the revolution was not a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)

The Revolution was, and still is, radical.

by [MariAnna Hinojosa](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 1:34 PM

After reading the opinions of the historians, I found that my original view of the Revolution being a radical movement was not changed. I liked John Alden's perspective that the American Revolution inspired other civilizations to challenge monarchies to this day. I found myself agreeing with Daniel Boorstin a little on his opinion that they fought to preserve old rights, not create new rights. The Americans had been given this relative "freedom" by Great Britain, but the challenge occurred when the British started trying to control what the Americans could do and started hindering their liberties they were accustomed to. I found myself disagreeing with him when he particularly mentioned the freedom of speech and the right to a fair trial, when we have seen specific examples of that not being customary under British control.

The first documentary video mentioned that Americans were proud to be English, but were unknowingly ready for a revolution. The English tradition of rights and revolution were instilled in the colonists but had different meaning to Americans, who could climb the social ladder, as explained in the second video. The ability to progress upwards through the social classes and being thought of as an equal individual is what was radical and unique about the colonies. That is what the American Revolution meant to protect.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)

Not Conservative

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 2:16 PM

Early Americans knew that equality was an important ideal. Since they understood that when they created new states, these new states prohibited slavery. This information can all be found in the Northeast Ordinance. Not allowing slavery of any kind was a new rule. This was not upholding tradition like a conservative would, this action broke their tradition. "it not only legally created the nation in 1776 but it infused into our culture all of our noblest ideals, our highest aspirations, our belief in equality, our belief in liberty" (0:36 Video #2). America wanted to break free from Britain's ideals and make their own, therefore the American Revolution was not a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)

Re: Not Conservative

by [Emilia Carpenter](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 8:11 PM

I agree with you, I think it is interesting to think about how they wanted to create these new states with all of these rules and "non rules" I believe everyone just wanted a country that they felt safe in and had a say in what would happen to them. Which I think was accomplished to some extent. I agree and think it wasn't a conservative movement, but did the revolution start out with all of these in mind? or were they just fed up with being taken advantage of? Really interesting take!

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


Video#1 Cites

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 3:19 PM

Video #1 gave several useful quotes to back up my stance on this debate. I firmly believe that the American Revolution was not a conservative movement, and this video is helping me prove it.

"They were proud to be Englishmen... they loved being English, but the conditions were there if the right things happened" (1:55). They did love their mother country. That is why so many things about their system remained the same as Britain's. They shared the same language, 90% of their trade, and their money system. Eventually though, Britain's grip on the colonies got too tight and they struggled to get free. Americans were not going to be controlled by a king any longer.

"Americans had developed a new political order, they effectively developed legislatures" (2:13). The Father of the Constitution (James Madison) changed how politics would work in America. Three branches were made so that no one person would acquire too much power. They were transforming into a very different looking, and modern government. One person is unable to control America because our Founding Fathers grew sick of monarchies.

"you had a society that looked utterly unlike old world society, this was a revolutionary society" (3:00). This quote nicely ties all of my other points together. The world would never be the same. America changed almost everything about itself, it demanded respect and freedom.

The creators of America refused to stay conservative, they changed the colonies into a country.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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


Revolution vs Revolution

by [Eric Shoaf](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 4:37 PM

In the second video clip, there is a quote at 2:15 that goes "What do we mean by the revolution, the war? That was no part of the revolution. It was only an effect and consequence of it. The revolution was in the minds of the people." What I took away from this is that there are two different revolutions going on here.

The first revolution is the war, the splitting of the colonies from Great Britain. Compared to other revolutions this can be seen as a conservative movement. It was less bloody than other revolutions, and they had more conservative ideas in mind, liberty, and self government.

The second revolution is the changing of ideals of the American colonists. We became more focused on our natural rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We also shifted towards the idea of everyone being created equal. This is a very liberal idea, and it is interwoven into the fabric of the social revolution that took place here.

So the real question of this forum should be, which revolution are we talking about here? Because if we're strictly limited to the Revolutionary War, then yes, it was a conservative revolution. But if we look at the broader social revolution that took place, then it was a more liberal revolution.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

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


Good point about different effects

by [Clay Noteboom](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 12:25 PM

I think you make a good point about the short-term effects of the revolution, Eric, versus the longterm effects. Not that much changed immediately, but even the war itself acted as the spark of a larger social movement and the creation of long-lasting American ideals.

The videos conform this. Jon Butler says that the war created a "revolutionary society," that is, one that was "marvelously participatory." Gordon Wood, a frequent contributor to this debate, also said in the video that it was the "most important event in American history." And even a respected contemporary leader, General John Galvin, former NATO Commander, believes that everything we do as a country is based on the ideals created by the revolution, thus adding to the idea that it was more radical than conservative.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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


The New World

by [alex Henshen](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 3:17 PM

Even though the American Revolution was not as violent as other revolutions like France. The American Revolution was not a conservative movement. The first video shares that the new world was revolutionary not in political stands but in other ways. Making it unlike other old world countries. So even if the revolution didn't start because of the 3 crisis, it would have happened from something else. The people in the new world were so different from their fathering country.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


NO, Doc. 6 J. Franklin Jameson

by [Emilia Carpenter](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 4:47 PM

In the first part of the forum I said that I think that the movement was more radical than conservative. I think that document 6 helps that case because of how J. Franklin Jameson talks about the rights that are given and what was changed. He talks about how the revolution gave more rights to the property owners and gave them special privileges. I still stand with the argument that the movement started out being conservative and really turned into radical.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: NO, Doc. 6 J. Franklin Jameson**by [Sidne Axtell](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 9:37 PM

I agree with your claims! I began looking deeper into the Revolution and after watching the video clips, my opinion on the forum has shifted. I opened up to the idea of the American Revolution may have started out being conservative, but eventually became radical. The video clips gave me a stronger idea to how the colonists wanted to gain their freedom, but yet they went back to some of the older English ways. After looking back at the previous readings, and viewpoints of historians, I now agree that the start of the American Revolution started out being extremely conservative driven. After awhile it was agreed that a change needed to take place, and the leaders then turned to the colonists for help, which made the system more radical than conservative.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Revolution**by [Patryce Miller](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 7:27 PM

No, the revolution wasn't a conservative movement. The first video prerevolution said " The Americans in the 1760s 1770s were right for revolution, though I don't believe they knew it at the time they would have been horrified. They were proud to be English men."(web video prerevolution 1:340-1:48) Making me wonder, to those you said yes to the conservative movement, why would they fight their ruler/government if it wasn't radical? There was also the "revolution in the minds of the people"(web video American revolution#2 2:27) means the change in the mind of the people. How can that be a conservative movement if the minds were changed? My answer it can't be a conservative movement is Nothing about this revolution is conservative.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**It is a Revolution**by [Patryce Miller](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 7:57 PM

Yes, there was a war of independence but that is not what the revolution is about. In video 2 of the American Revolution, they quoted John Adams "What do we mean by the Revolution, the war? That was no part of the revolution. It was only an effect and consequence of it. The revolution was in the mind of the people and this was effected from 1760 to 1775 in the course of fifteen years before a drop of blood was drawn at Lexington."(web video 2 American revolution 2:11-2:38). this a quote from our Second President saying that that it was a Revolution. It might have been one of mind not of social but it was long before the war of independence. There is also "...Americans almost unwittingly and without any planning, affected a revolution that transform the nature of the old 17-century colonies"(web video prerevolution 2:02-2:12) making this another example of the American revolution.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)

**a Radical Revolution**by [Patryce Miller](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 10:48 PM

After reading the informed opinion of the historians I have to say that I am still firm in my opinion. That the American Revolution is not a conservation movement but a radical one. Document 1 and 6 agrees with me and basically says that the American Revolution changed American lives while also the ones around.

Document 1 talks about how the "American revolution brought the first break in the European colonies system"(John Richard Alden American Revolution 1954).This wasn't traditional in fact it was the opposite of the time. It was also the first one of its kind making it radical. While Document 6 talks about how the American Revolution can be considered a Social movement. How "during the years we are the considering, the right to suffrage (vote) was much extended"(J. Franklin Jamesson, American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement, 1940) meaning It was just landowners who could vote allowing people with private property (to a certain extent) and people who pay taxes or "tax-payers". This American Revolution couldn't have been a conservative movement because of the suffrage was extended which wasn't traditional. So how can it be anything but a Radical Revolution?

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Discussion Continues**by [Sidney Axtell](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 7:40 PM

After reading the historians opinions, I am still sure of my original position in whether or not the American Revolution was a conservative movement. My answer is still a yes. The most persuasive argument came from the "Seedtime of the Republic" By Clinton Rossiter. He discusses how the colonist were respectful of their past, as well as explaining how "their goal was to simply consolidate, then expand by cautious stages, the large measure of liberty and prosperity that was part of their established way of life." (Doc #2 Rossiter) This statement fully backs up my original claim. It was also very similar to the information that was discussed in class.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Anti Conservative**by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 8:42 PM

"The American Revolution brought the first break in the European colonial system. It inspired and continues to inspire colonials of all colors to seek freedom from European domination." (Doc#1 by John Alden). The Americans knew they were changing everything. Revolutionizing America may not have been their initial goal, but that was the outcome. Conservatives are people who tend to stay close to what they grew up with. They prefer to remain the same instead of changing to become more modern. Americans wanted to modernize. They developed a new governmental system, what their money looked like, and several other things. Americans revolutionized America to free themselves from British control. They succeeded and, in that process, they completely changed how America looked.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)



still on the side of "no"

by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 8:49 PM

My first post was agreed with the side of "no the revolution was not a conservative movement," and after reading the short excerpts, on whether or not the revolution was revolutionary, I still stand on this side. In my first post I argued that the revolution should be measured in the amount of change that we saw rather than wins and loses. I still think this is an important measurement. Daniel Boorstin said, "the Americans were fighting not so much to establish *new* rights as to preserve old ones," and I think this is true. yes, they wanted their freedoms from Britain, but the outcomes didn't scream huge amounts of change. From the same article by Boorstin he then states, "the revolution itself had been a kind of affirmation of faith in ancient British institutions." The colonist wanted and gained their freedom, but resorted back to some of the old English ways. Linda Grant DePauw also talks about the idea that many of the people living in American didn't get to enjoy the freedoms of the new world. DePauw explains that four of the groups in America at the time made up about 80% of the population, and "the legal doctrine applied to these classes excluded them from the category of persons who should enjoy the 'inalienable rights' of which the Declaration speaks." The colonist all wanted the freedom from the king, they wanted their rights to vote and pick representatives, but over half of the population was deprived of this right. *How revolutionary is depriving over half the population of the desired change?*

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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


Re: The Discussion Continues- Video Clips

by [Sidney Axtell](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 9:00 PM

After watching both video clips, my viewpoints both broadened and strengthened. I personally agree with the statement claiming that the name should be changed to The War Of Independence, considering the video clips talk about how "they knew about the magna carta, as well as the John Locke's notion that we all had certain natural rights to, Life Liberty and property. That we had the right to revolution." (2:33 Video clip #1)

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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


The Narrower definition of Revolution is still the only one that applies to the American Revolution.

by [Warren Pavlat](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 10:37 PM

When Gordon Wood asserts that "The Revolution had radically democratized the new state legislatures" (Wood, *The American Revolution*, 2002) I feel that word 'radically' is perhaps being stretched. He pulls further numbers to explain his meaning, pointing to the growth of some state legislatures and the addition of the "moderately wealthy" to those who could legislate. However, while this is indicative of change, it isn't an earth-shattering shift that you would look for in a revolution of the stricter definition. To the contrary, Carl Degler in "Out of the Past", points out that those who signed the Declaration of Independence were largely already politically powerful or influential or wealthy before the revolution, and remained so after the revolution. Furthermore, while there were these minor expansions of democracy and enlightenment ideals in post revolution America, they were only extended for the 20% of the population who were white, land holding, males, who were of age (DePauw, *The Revolution and the Unfree*).

Similarly, although the actual laws and structure of the government were "new" and at the time among the most progressive in the world, they were mostly just laws that already existed to protect the liberty of British citizens such as trial by a jury or Habeus Corpus (Boorstin, The Genius of American Politics). Thus, Americans were fighting for the rights they were supposed to already have, not to create brand new ones.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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


Societal Changes Made Possible by the American Revolution

by [Emily Fosnight](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 11:24 PM

After reading the articles by Wood and Degler, reading the paragraphs from many different historians, watching the videos, as well as class lecture and the readings of chapters six and seven from the textbook, the American Revolution was not a conservative movement. It was a radical one. It may not have been as radical in comparison to other revolutions; however, that was not the question.

In the American Revolution video #2, "the American Revolution was the most important event in American history," (0:20). Not only did Americans successfully break away from the monarchy of Great Britain, but they revolutionized their society, economy, and politics as well, and they did it successfully.

Americans were the most free people in the world at that point in time, and they knew it. "The Revolution was in the minds of the people," (2:25). The American people, rich and poor, fought the American Revolution. They were concerned with old rights and with certain natural rights, such as life, liberty, and happiness. It may have been conservative to begin with, but in the grand scheme of it all, it was quite radical with the major societal changes caused by the Revolution.

The revolutionary society included religious transformations with the "disestablishment of the Anglican Church in every southern state," and also with Virginia passing Jefferson's Statute for Religious Freedom (book p.185). It also included the first emancipation, which declared children born to slaves after a certain date would become free at age 28 (book p.186). Revolutionary society altered the relations between sexes. Some women acquired more authority, and nearly all had to work harder to maintain their households while the men were away at war (book p.186). In the northeast, husbands and wives were beginning to appear to be equal (book p.187). More women became educated and the idea of the "republican wife/mother" became a big deal, when their role became educational as well (book p.187).

Again, not only was the American Revolution a political movement, it also had great societal changes, whether they were intended by the founding fathers or not.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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

◀ [The Discussion Continues](#)

[The Revolution](#) ▶

◀ [Web Video - Hamilton's Plan \(alternat](#)

[Jump to...](#)

[CLICK HERE](#) for Forum 3 Materials & Questions ▶

 [Moodle Docs](#) for this page

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))

HST 201 F19 (Escobar Meta 20635 22256)

[Get the mobile app](#)

[Policies](#)