

HST 201: US History F19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 F19 \(Escobar Meta 20635 22256\)](#) / [Week 6 November 3 - November 9](#) / [Forum 2](#) / [The Great Awakening](#)



Search forums

Forum 2

The Great Awakening

[Subscribe](#)

◀ [The Debate Continues](#)

[The Debate Continues](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



The Great Awakening

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 12:29 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](#)



The lack of Cohesion

by [Eric Runes](#) - Sunday, October 20, 2019, 5:34 PM

Upon reading both essays on the topic of the Great awakening, both authors make well informed passionate cases for whether or not the Great Awakening was a key to the American Revolution. For me it came down to a lack of cohesion of belief systems, and no unified anti British sentiment that caused me to side with Jon Butlers essay taking the "No" stance. Mr. Butler points out the great awakening provided little focus for intercolonial unity, and that the revivals "appeared erratically, in too few colonies and under too many auspices" (top of pg. 9). He then goes on to make the case that the American colonial wars... specifically the French Indian War, are far better examples for creating a unified protest of the colonies against the crown. One of the fall outs from the French Indian wars were prolonged casualties within the colonies, significant legislative opposition, and a new sense of deep friction with England (middle of page. 9). Mr. Butler also

makes the case that the time frame of when the revivals in the colonies occurred was not as relevant to the Revolution. In some cases the revivals took place over a quarter century before in 1775-6. (pg.9). In comparison to the French Indian War which ultimately spilled into and merged with the Seven Years war (a global conflict) the fighting and turmoil lasted until the "Peace of Paris" ended the war in 1763 (textbook pg.157). I believe the lack of a unifying force such as the War, coupled with the absence of a cohesive religious stance, and a varying time frame of when the revivals occurred forms my opinion. While the persuasive context of the "Great Awakening" can not be denied, after reading the essays, and textbook I do not believe it was a key to the American Revolution.

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

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


No

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 11:30 AM

The Great Awakening is not that important. I have never heard of it before now. If it was so important, and influential I feel like I would have learned about it in high school history, or this event have at least popped up once in my classes. This event did not touch that many colonies in a big way. "revivals were only occasionally important in New York, Delaware, North Carolina, and South Carolina." (Jon Butler's essay). I must exaggerate his use of the word "occasionally". They were not fully important, just sometimes. Sometimes is not enough to make this event a key to the American Revolution.

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

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


Re: I stil don't think it is a Key

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Thursday, October 24, 2019, 9:39 PM

I would like to further prove my point that the Great Awakening is not a key to the American Revolution. "Historians also exaggerate the cohesion of leadership in the revivals. They have accomplished this, in part, by over stressing the importance of Whitefield and Edwards." (Jon Butler's essay page 2). To fully understand this quote you should know that the word Cohesion means "the action or fact of forming a united whole." (From the Oxford Dictionary). So, to clarify, the leaders were not connected. They were both doing relatively the same thing, but with little regard for each other. Imagine the impact they could have made if they had joined forces. Or, maybe, it doesn't matter because according to Jon Butler the two biggest leaders in the Great Awakening have been over stressed, and they are not as important as other people would like us to believe. What is an influential event without solid leaders who provides a united front? Nothing, that is why this event is not a key to the American Revolution.

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

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


Re: No

by [Kaylyn Hoff](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 3:05 PM

I agree that the Great Awakening wasn't key to the American Revolution, but the importance and significance it had in American history is present. "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" (Patricia U. Bonomi). Religious reformations

brought substantial change to the colonists' attitudes and helped shift their view of themselves more as individuals. So, while the Great Awakening may have not been a Key in the American Revolution it was important in bringing about changes and different views that were important to the colonists.

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

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


The Great Awakening was key to the Revolution

by [Riley McQueen](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 2:12 PM

The Great Awakening was a major religious and political movement in the 1730s and 1740s that promoted "church separations and urging their followers to make choices that had political as well as religious implications...[and] wrought permanent changes in public attitudes" (page 2). This movement was one of the very first national issues that all the colonies could relate to and act upon. That is why I agree with Professor Bonomi that this was a key part to the start of the revolution. It brought people together to fight a cause that they believed in and it changed the way the colonists looked at religion as a government. Bonomi said that "the institutional disruptions and church separations of the Great Awakening thus provided a kind of "practice model" which enabled the provincials to "rehearse" a number of situations, and their arguments appropriate to them" (page 3), it provided a framework that the colonists in favor of a revolution could follow. It also showed that something as major as a Revolution was possible because something similar had taken place before. She also wrote that "having taken part in the dismantling of old institutions and the shaping of new ones Americans... would find themselves less hesitant to do it again" (page 5) and she is correct, it didn't stop there. Throughout American history people have stood up and fought for what they believed in at almost any cost, it's one of the many recognizable traits that America has and the Great Awakening helped start that.

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

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


YES!

by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 2:26 PM

"As the Great Awakening broke down social cohesion in America, it simultaneously elevated the individual," (Patricia U. Bonomi article). As the awakeners began to take on this individualistic mind set the rest of the country started to feel the effects of this. Before the Great Awakening people "rarely conceived of themselves apart from a larger collectivity-the family, the congregation, or the town," (Patricia U. Bonomi article). As the Great Awakening began and started progressing the "revival penetrated and shattered that unitary cosmos by directing its message to the individual," (Patricia U. Bonomi article). These new individual views spread through the religious community, and after that they moved to the rest of the colonies. As the colonies began individualizing themselves the country as a whole began to lean this direction, eventually leading to the American Revolution and the break from Britain.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TFW4VYRuTY5loukaTcG5LAMWXnHutnPs/view> (Patricia U. Bonomi article)

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

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

**Re: YES!**by [Mark Alexander](#) - Thursday, October 24, 2019, 11:32 AM

The Great Awakening was certainly a key to the American Revolution. As you've quoted above the Great Awakening "elevated the individual" and "shattered that unitary cosmos". I certainly agree with you that these new individualistic views and mindsets helped the colonies eventually lean towards becoming independent and starting the American Revolution. I find it interesting thinking of the Great Awakening as almost a prequel or practice even for the American Revolution. The individual mindset that was established throughout the colonies during the Great Awakening was certainly needed for the Revolution to come.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Natalie Haffner's YES!**by [Austin Romine](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 11:24 AM

I took the side of Jon Butler, everything he says seems to make more sense, have more evidence, and paint a clearer picture. Patricia stated it greatly increased individuality and individualistic behaviour, which is entirely correct. It was just not as widespread and meaningful as she'd like you to believe. Jon Butler gives us real numbers and data to work with. "Edwards counted thirty-two towns caught up in revivals in 1734-1735." said Butler.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Was The Great Awakening A factor?**by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 2:49 PM

After reading both of the articles about the Great Awakening I would say that the Great Awakening was a key factor in the American Revolution. the Great Awakening influenced the idea of nationalism and individual rights. We can also see the influence of the Great Awakening based on what the leaders like Gorge Barkley were preaching about like the separation of church and planting the idea that people could act on their own accord. Because of this, the Great Awakening acted as Rehearsal for the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Was The Great Awakening A factor?**by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Thursday, October 24, 2019, 11:01 PM

I fully agree with you saying that the Great Awakening did influence and give the people a sense of nationalism and individualism, but I'm not sure if I would go as far to say it was a "rehearsal." I think that the Great Awakening gave us some ideas and background for the revolution, but I don't see it as a cause of the only strength we had.

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

**Weak Revivalist Connection to the War of Independence**by [Connor Eden](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 4:10 PM

I agree with Professor Burnomi's notion that the Revivals caused more people to think in a modern "enlightened" sense placing more weight on the individual in faith and bleeding over into the common man's worldview. The ways in which it acted as a precursor or rehearsal for the revolution of 1776 would be the rise of prominent dissenting figures publishing dissenting works or in the case of revivalists like whitefield (textbook) travelling to seek out the masses and spread their ideals. However the revival seemed to simply energize people on both sides of the spectrum with "friends" of the movement coming out in droves but people also moving to freemasonry and back to anti-revivalist denominations. What Butler says seems to ultimately ring true in regard to the revivals relationship to the revolutionary war. The revivalist movement was an erratic movement that appeared scattered throughout the colonies in too many different forms never being a fully unified movement. As opposed to colonial wars in the 18th century which were very costly to all colonists leading to great loss of life and stability. These rehearsals of dissent ultimately would play very little role in my mind.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**My view on The Great Awakening**by [Austin Romine](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 8:30 PM

The Great Awakening was a sudden, erratic, and unpredictable religious revival that completely swept across all of England's mainland colonies, only their coastal colonies remained. But when I say it "swept" I don't mean it touched everyone; it left many in the middle completely none the wiser. John Butler stated "[The Great Awakening was] A Calvinist religious revival in which converts acknowledged their sinfulness without expecting salvation." I completely agree with this description, and only would like to point out how randomly it started and ended, It was extremely unique in how it's origins are shrouded in mystery.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Austin Romine's My view on The Great Awakening**by [Jackson Such](#) - Thursday, October 24, 2019, 12:13 PM

I totally see where you're coming from with this. In my reply to the thread from Monday, I quoted Butler as he spoke about how the link between the revivals and the American Revolution is virtually nonexistent. The relationship between prerevolutionary political change and the revivals is weak everywhere except in Virginia, where the Baptist revivals indeed shatters the exclusive, century-old Anglican hold on organized religious activity and politics in the colony; their importance to the revolution is weakened by the fact that so many members of Virginia's Anglican aristocracy also led the Revolution. In other colonies, the revivals furnished little revolutionary rhetoric, including even millennialist thought, that was not available from any other sources and provided no unique organizational mechanisms for ant-British protest activity.

In those short two quotes, which I've pooled into one for the sake of convenience, it a solid argument to the contrary of the revival being key in starting the revolution of America; it's not. Perhaps it laid the foundation, but it cannot reach the torch that lit the fires of revolution.

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

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


Yes, the Great Awakening led to the American Revolution

by [Ethan Dull](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 10:08 PM

The great awakening was a pivotal time in New England because it marked the change in mindset that led to the American Revolution. It embraced individuality and changed the pace of sermons that would also be used throughout the American Revolution. With the combination of individualism and sermon popularity, the Great Awakening shifted the mindset of New Englanders that would eventually lead to questioning the authority of England.

The emergence of individualism as a direct result of the Great Awakening was a key factor that influenced the colonists. As stated by Patricia U. Bonomi "The Great awakening broke down social cohesion in America" and "simultaneously elevated the individual." (text 4) Elevation of the individual changed the mindset amongst the colonies that coincides with the mindset of independence. Popular bible references of the time prove that individualism was on the rise, for example 2 Corinthians 6:14 "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers...wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate." (Text 4)

Lastly, along with the Great awakening and the rise of individualistic values, New England saw a surge of large scale preaching. Preachers who utilized the emotions of their listeners caused extremely large crowds of people who dramatized in response to the speeches. Men and women would cry, laugh, fall on the ground and exaggerate the performances. The use of pathos amongst preachers carried on throughout the American Revolution. Therefore, drawing the conclusion that emotionally charged public speakings had a significant influence on the rebellion against England.

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

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


Yes the Great Awakening was a key to the American Revolution

by [Sebastian Mertens](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 10:27 PM

I agree more so with Professor Patricia U. Bonomi. It may just be that I dont not have as good of an insight or know as much as the two professors about the Great awakening but from what I read I was more able to agrre with Patricia's views on it and how she thought that it established a sort of guideline for the colonists evetual assault on English rule. I strongly agree with her idea that the actions and influence the great awakening set up a path for the colonists to follow and it allowed them to be more willing and capable of once again getting rid of the old and forming the new. "Once having taken part in the dismantling of old institutions and ' the shaping of new ones, AMericans at, every social level would find themselves less hesitant to do it again." (In class handout page 5 first article) Almost all of the acts taken by those who were part of the great awakening seem as though they could have had a major influnce on breaking away from the norm and deciding to start fresh. "Since the Awakeners began as an insurgent minority in every church, they could advance their religious ideology only by overturing the orthodox majority, or, when that failed by withdrawing from or brining down the institutional structures that sheltered orthodoxy and fortified it

authority." (In class handout page 3 first article) One good example of how the Awakeners were somewhat setting up a path for the colonists later on and making it so they would have the keys and knowledge of how to change an old institution and alter it into a newer better one.

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

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


The Rethinking of America

by [Isabella Welch](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 10:36 PM

Although the No argument makes some good arguments, I agree more with the Yes argument. If I understand right, the Yes argument is about a revival of religious ideology, one believing in the old way and the other believing in an enlightenment that goes deeper than the old way, which sparked religious revivals across the colonies. In the Yes argument it states, "The Pietists were vigorously asserting that religion was being corrupted by secular forces. In their view a conversion experience that touched the heart was the only road to salvation. The rationalist demurred, preferring a faith tempered by 'an enlightened mind, not raised affections.'" (Page 2, Yes article) This led to, and much the same way we see today, debates all across the colonies, in homes, churches, town halls, and papers. In other words, anywhere people would meet socially. The No argument, while they agreed there was a revival taking place in the churches, they don't believe that it was as widespread as the Yes argument does. They see it as a more isolated movement. I disagree with this premise, while I agree that today's social media has more of a reach, people all over the country know about the protests, specifically in Portland Oregon. I know this because I have recently went to Oklahoma and when Portland was brought up they knew all the details. With this knowledge, knowing the movement was vast, I could see how people would be influenced by basing an opinion on what they hear, generally in agreement or opposition. But nevertheless influenced. I believed the revivals caused people to think differently, to question their existence and ultimately created a gap between England and the colonies which I believe could have led to the revolutionary war.

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

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


The Great Awakening: Responsible for a Revolution?

by [Jackson Such](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 11:19 PM

In my first read-through, late at night on Monday, at 11:00 PM, fifty-five minutes before my first forum post for week 4 is due, my haphazard reading has come to a conclusion. The conclusion is to agree, for the time being, with Professor Jon Butler, who in his excerpt from the 1982 "Enthusiasm Described and Decried: The Great Awakening as Interpretive Fiction," who firmly states that this great awakening during the 1740s was hardly key to the American Revolution. Throughout the article, he goes on to say how the Awakening was not as wide-spread as many people say, as well as claiming that **"The link between the revivals and the American Revolution is virtually nonexistent. The relationship between prerevolutionary political change and the revivals is weak everywhere except in Virginia, where the Baptist revivals indeed shatters the exclusive, century-old Anglican hold on organized religious activity and politics in the colony."** He goes on to say, **"Their importance to the revolution is weakened by the fact that so many members of Virginia's Anglican aristocracy also led the Revolution. In other colonies, the revivals furnished little revolutionary rhetoric, including even millennialist thought, that was not available from any other sources and provided no unique organizational mechanisms for anti-British protest activity."** Here, you can clearly see the bottom line of it all. The short bursts of revival that were widespread in various

places in the colonies, garnered little affect on the future of the colonies that led to the Revolutionary War in America. In places where revival occurred, little to no support for the Revolution was given out, while in places, such as Virginia, support was massive and widespread and gave birth to many of the Revolutionary leaders. Perhaps I'm only looking at this at face value, and perhaps I have no idea what I'm talking about, but I'll be re-reading this article for my next post so that I may truly understand both sides in a clearer light and perhaps I might change my perspective on this. I look forward to it.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Jackson Such's The Great Awakening: Responsible for a Revolution?**by [Austin Romine](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 10:58 AM

In my first read-through, late at night on Monday, at 10:00 PM, one hour and fifty-five minutes before my first forum post for week 4 was due I also happened to agree with Jon Butler. His points were stronger, it made more sense, and if any of this were important I'd have heard of it before. "The Great Awakening's relationship between prerevolutionary political change and the revivals are weak everywhere except in Virginia." As Jon Butler stated. We have to be careful when we say "It swept the nation." Because were lying. It only hit parts here and there.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Robert Whitney](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 11:22 PM

After reading the articles, I am going to have to say that I take the side of Jon Butler that the Great Awakening did not cause or affect the American Revolution. What really swayed me was Butler's final page and a half. He outlines four key points showing why the Great Awakening was nothing more than regional blips of revivals. He points out first and foremost that the "regional events" only occurred in half of the colonies. Just before saying that, he wrote that the New Lights and the Presbyterians played "important roles in the colonial protests", however in the 1740s the groups didn't expand or sustain their membership because of the revivals (Handout, Page 9). This shows me that after the revivals occurred, nothing significant stuck with the people of that region.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Eric Runes](#) - Tuesday, October 22, 2019, 3:10 PM

I was also influenced by Jon Butlers assertion that The Great Awakening boiled down to regional events, and did not lead to sustained anti British sentiment (pg. 9). Mr. Butler points out that many historians contribute the Great Awakening to creating a "spirit of Liberty" that prepared the colonists for the revolution. However, when you take into account when the revivals were taking place, and the subject matter of the preaching, it is difficult to make a direct correlation to the mindset that led to the American revolution (pg.9). I find it difficult to label something as a "key factor" when strong evidence can be made that it's influence was not geographically widespread, and that its influence waned, as time went on.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Isabella Welch](#) - Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 11:30 AM

It may have been "regional events" meaning this occurred in a smaller portion of the colonies however people from other colonies could've still heard about it through newspapers, their social media, as we hear about things happening in other states through today's social media. It was still brought to peoples attention and people's heads the events that were happening. The awakening movement changed the way people thought about their actions, see it as doing Gods work. Patricia U Bonomi states, "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..." (page 4 of handout) This shows that to the people that this movement reach out to they either wanting to join it or to stop what it was doing to the societal atmosphere.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Revivals had no effect of the Revolution**by [MariAnna Hinojosa](#) - Monday, October 21, 2019, 11:32 PM

Before I began reading the different sides of the debate I had started to form my own opinion on the matter, but I was interested to see if my notion would still be the same after reading the arguments and I was open to the possibility that my mind could be changed. I thought that a movement that challenged authority, beliefs, and tradition would definitely have an impact, directly or indirectly, on colonial society. This could perhaps spur a change in the way the colonists respond to contrasting beliefs and authority.

I can't say that I have a passionate stance on the subject after having read the debates, but I am now actually leaning more toward "no". After reading Patricia Bonomi's portion, I was disappointed to find that most of her supporting evidence were quotes from religious leaders that were in the middle of the revival and conclusions were drawn from their statements. Instead, I would have liked to see more quotes from other civilians, or dates and facts that line up and support her claims.

Jon Butler consistently pointed out the contradictions between claims and the actual dates of importance and focused on the actual isolation of events that occurred. He stated (page 9 of the online reading), "The political ramifications of extemporaneous sermons...were unclear at best and were delayed for as long as twenty-five years.", and followed with, "Nor is it possible to demonstrate that specific congregations and denominations associated with the revivals originated anti-British protest that became uniquely important to the Revolution." So what Bonomi and other historians have done is idealize the revivals and attempt to connect pieces that don't necessarily fit, to support their perception of the impact they may have had on the Revolution. Butler brought to perspective the actual impact (page 9 of the online reading), "the prerevolutionary revivals should be understood primarily as regional events that occurred in only half the colonies". He concluded with a strong statement (page 10 of the reading), "they failed to change the timing, causes, or effects of the Revolution in any significant way." My mind has been changed based on the information in the debate and I don't believe the revivals had as much of an impact on the Revolution as some historians are trying to make it seem.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Great Awakening**by [Patryce Miller](#) - Tuesday, October 22, 2019, 12:05 AM

I am leaning towards to Professor Patricia U. Bonomi because belief is how people decide when to fight or not. And if someone tries to change it by force there will be a fight. When she said, "Religion has always been considered a likely agent of radicalism"(article p.3). It reminds me that in the textbook on page 135 it said "Congregationalists into pro-revival New light and anti-revival Old light". How that is similar to our liberals and conservatives, the left-wing and right-wing, or Radicals and traditional. Fighting to become the majority of society. Then page 134 "The revivals had dramatic consequences." Meaning there was a drastic shift or change to society because of religion. A change to one another in large quantity that the power shifted from one group to another. And if someone tries to change it back without the permission of the majority there will be a fight for it.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**The Great Awakening website support**by [Patryce Miller](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 9:15 PM

The website supports the Great awakening as a key to the American Revolution. "SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GREAT AWAKENING: ROOTS OF REVOLUTION"(The Great Awakening website). Right there that the title of a topic on the website tells us the person is supporting it. Then there is "The chain of authority no longer ran from God to [a] ruler to people, but from God to people to ruler. **The children of revivalism later echoed this radicalism and popular self-righteousness in the American Revolution**, when self-assertion turned against the tyrannical ways of George III"(Great Awakening website paragraph Towards an American Identity) which tells us who start the revolution. "The religious revival of the Great Awakening melded the colonists in a way that would not have been possible otherwise"(Great Awakening website paragraph Shared Goals) meaning it helps us change our culture. Which moves us towards the direction of the revolution. With this information added to my knowledge, I stand on what I said at the beginning that the Great Awakening was a key to the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**YES the Great Awakening was a Key to the American Revolution.**by [Mark Alexander](#) - Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 1:35 PM

The Great Awakening was definently a key to the American Revolution. With the Great Awakening came a split from traditional seventeenth century colonial values of the family, the congregation, and the town. As the text states, the "Awakeners began as an insurgent minority" and to advance their religious ideology they need to overturn the orthodox majority. To do this they gathered allies and launched a mass movement that condemned and church that followed those traditional seventeenth century values. With this mass movement traditional seventeenth century colonial churches were factionalized and the idea of the individual was

elevated. If the Great Awakening never happening, the idea of the rights of minorities against majorities and individuals against the whole that it brought may have never spread throughout the colonies, and the American Revolution may have played out differently. We could've be under British rule today, who knows?

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

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


Re: YES the Great Awakening was a Key to the American Revolution.

by [Ethan Dull](#) - Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 9:16 PM

I too wrote my entry agreeing that the Great Awakening was the key to the American Revolution. I focused mine on the concept of individualism and how that linked to the idea of becoming an independent nation. It possibly had less to do with unity of the colonies and more to do with the individualistic thoughts that New Englanders shared. I particularly liked how you talked about the idea of minority versus majority. It strengthens the argument that the Great Awakening was, in fact, the key to the American Revolution. It was the shift in cultural and religious mindset that may have resulted in the outcome of America becoming an independent nation.

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

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


The Great Awakening influence

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 3:09 PM

While the article by Jon Butler made some good arguments for the Great Awakening not being a key factor in the American revolution I still disagree. The Great Awakening may not have been a direct factor in the American Revolution it did have some influence on the people who did revolt against England. As people started to take on the idea of being the individualistic mindset which then slowly made its way into religious communities and soon after the colonies. While the Great Awakening may not have been a direct factor in the American Revolution however The influence of the Great Awakening did.

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

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


Re: The Great Awakening influence

by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 11:16 PM

I agree with you saying that the Great Awakening did have an influence on the Revolution, but I don't think it was a large enough influence to say it was a key. Yes, this may have been the start for much of the individualistic mind set, but like Butler said not all of the colonies experienced the awakening. I think that the awakening was important for the minds of the colonists, but I don't think that it was the only lead.

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

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


No

by [Kaylyn Hoff](#) - Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 5:43 PM

While the Great Awakening brought about significant reformations in America it was not a key to the American Revolution. The individualism and ideology that came from church separations and religious choices may have influenced some colonists' judgments in the American Revolution, but they were not the only ones who made these same judgments. "The revivals furnished little revolutionary rhetoric, including even millennialist thought, that was not available from other sources and provided no unique organizational mechanisms for anti-British protest activity" (Jon Butler). Accordingly, the Great Awakening wasn't the colonist's reasoning and motive for their actions in the American Revolution nor does it directly relate to the outcome of the war.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: No**by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Thursday, October 24, 2019, 11:11 PM

I liked your last sentence about the colonist's reasoning and motive. When I first responded on this forum I was leaning more toward the side of "yes, the Great Awakening was a key factor," but as I have read and re-read the articles and other peoples post I can see my views changing. I still think, like you said, the ideas from the awakening may have influenced the decisions made during the war, but there were so many other factors leading to the revolution. yes, the awakening may have shaped some of the mindsets, but the awakening was not the only event or biggest "turning point" leading to the revolution.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Influence of "The Great Awakening**by [Connor Eden](#) - Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 8:25 PM

The ideals expressed by revivalists had a revolutionary tone as expressed by Patricia Bunomi. She states that the awakeners were a "insurgent" minority standing up to a "Corporate" church orthodoxy, which I think can be better described as legalistic. In the places where revivalists sprung up they were described as "'disorderly Walking, Contrary to the Gospel" and church covenant.'" (pg 2 reading). Bunomi notes that this came at a time in history where the majority still exercised its will on the minority and factionalism was frowned upon as it inherently created civil unrest. She also says that the Presbyterian and Congregationalist

Revivalists "stressed the rights of minorities against majorities, and of individuals against the whole, in matters of conscience". (pg 3 reading) Lastly she concludes with a statement that best describes her sentiments "from the viewpoint of radicalism the essential thing is that they did so only after breaking sharply from a tradition of fraternity and consensus that had governed church life for generations." (pg 5 reading)

Jon Butler gives some more concrete details that paint a much different picture, first on page six he states "Edwards counted thirty-two towns caught up in revivals in 1734-1735" this makes the movement hardly seem like something that "swept" the colonies. These revivals occurred during a population boom in the colonies where population changed from three hundred thousand in 1700 to over two million in 1770. (page 7 reading)

He goes on to state that the revivals did not support unity among the colonies "They appeared too erratically in too few colonies under too many different Auspices" (reading pg 8). He directly contrasts Burnomi in saying that "they were never radical... revivals reinforced ministerial rather than lay authority" (pg 9 reading)

After hearing both sides, I have to say I agree more with Jon Butler. Although Bunomi ideas are interesting and exciting they seem to have some sort of idealistic bend from her own personal views, where Jon Butler seems to just illustrate over and over to a point of redundancy why these claims don't substantiate in what I feel was a more objective and detailed paper.

(I wanted to revisit this reading because my first post on it was very rushed)

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



My take on the Great Awakening

by [Skylar Hoffman](#) - Friday, October 25, 2019, 11:47 AM

I believe the Great Awakening was a good thing. It was something that made Christians known more about Jesus. They read and preached the Bible, they lived and died for the bible. George Wentfield thought he had been one to proclaim repentance before God and faith in Jesus Christ. He was the "first American star". He was the preacher of Pennsylvania. He carried around a "step stole" so he could be seen in big crowds. He was a good preacher. he helped save the damned from going to hell and he preached for the God.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Patrick

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, October 25, 2019, 12:04 PM

The Patrick Henry video seemed to believe that the Great Awakening was an important event in American history. This event had an interesting influence on Patrick Henry. His father was more old fashioned with religion, while his mother was modern. This turned him into an intermediate between them. "On the way home, Patricks mother asked him to repeat the sermons to her which i'm sure he did with a great deal of enthusiasm" (Patrick Henry video 2:14). I am so glad my mother does not have me repeat long lectures like that to her because there is no way I could recite all of it back. I don't remember things as well as Henry could. That also shows how moving these sermons were though. I have heard things that influence me, and I remember those things quite clearly. Normally those things are small quotes instead of long lectures. This sermon however was so touching, and mesmerizing that Patrick Henry could recite it all back to his mom! That amazes me. To be so involved, and influenced by words that you can remember it all afterwards is incredible. I am slowly being swayed to think that the Great Awakening is more important than I previously thought.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)

How the Great Awakening helped the Revolution.



by [Riley McQueen](#) - Friday, October 25, 2019, 3:38 PM

Professor Bonomi says that the Great Awakening “provided a kind of “practice model” which enabled the provincials to “rehearse”” (text 3) for events that would surface in the 1760s and 1770s. I agree with this statement because the movement provided an outline and some structure for the colonists who wanted to start a revolution. They had the ability to look back at a similar event that happened and see what worked and what they could do better next time. Obviously these two events aren’t exactly the same, but having that ability to look back and be able to make stronger strategies to further their cause was very helpful and helped gain a victory to those colonists during the Revolution.

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

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


Religion Transformed

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, October 25, 2019, 8:39 PM

The historian speaking in the Beyond Theology video gave evidence to how the Great Awakening was an important event, but maybe not as significant as the first two videos believed. This video explicitly noted that the Great Awakening was when people stopped being so afraid of God. Their God figure became their friend Jesus. "You get a new idea that Christianity's really about relationship, it's not about doctrine, it's not about fear before God, it's not about community as much, it's about the individual's relationship with God" (1:25 Beyond Theology video). This is interesting to me because this is the point in time when God stops being such a fear factor. This is a key point of religion. It really changed into something beautiful. This video does not support my claim that the Great Awakening is not a key to the American Revolution. Religion, while being important, is not why we had a Revolution.

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

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


Re: Religion Transformed

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Friday, October 25, 2019, 11:37 PM

I agree with you. When we first started this forum I was on the yes side. But the more that I have learned and the more post that I have seen I have started to change my view. While the Great Awakening was a good thing that happened and was important in American history it did not play a key role in the American revolution. While the Ideas of the Great Awakening Influenced some people’s decisions during the revolution thats about all it did in terms of the American Revolution.

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

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


From "yes" to "no"

by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 12:52 AM

My original post was on the side of “yes,” but after reading through the articles more and looking at the other sources I have seen stronger arguments from the “no” side. Yes, the Great Awakening may have helped with the individualistic mindset, but that was not the “key.” The “revivals ‘swept’ only some of the mainland colonies” (Jon Butler). If all of the colonies had experienced the revivals then the Great Awakening could have been a bigger lead into the American Revolution, but since this was not a nation wide event not

everyone felt the same effects. Even the revivals that took place, many times, did not have a large resounding effect on the colonists. "The revivals reinforced ministerial rather than lay authority even as they altered some clergymen's perceptions of tasks and methods. They also stimulated the demand for organization, order, and authority in the evangelical denominations," (Jon Butler). Yes the colonists were learning about the individualistic mind set, but as Butler said they still demanded the authority. The need for a governing body was still intact, even if that body was England and the King. The last point that Butler makes is about how disconnected both situations are. The only colony where there is any sort of connection was in Virginia, and that was because "the Baptist revivals indeed shattered the exclusive, century-old Anglican hold on organized religious activity and politics in the colony," (Jon Butler). If only one colony has a tie like this to the revolution it is a long shot to say that the Great Awakening was key to the Revolution, but that is even more profound when you think about how little this tie actually is. Butler goes on to say in the next sentence, "But, their importance to the Revolution is weakened by the fact that so many members of Virginia's Anglican aristocracy also led the Revolution," (Jon Butler). So to say the individualistic mindset came out of the Great Awakening would be accurate, but to then place the Revolution in direct relation to the Awakening, I feel, would be a long shot.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TFW4VYRuTY5loukaTcG5LAMWXnHutnPs/view> (Jon Butler article)

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Exaggeration

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 2:28 PM

All of the videos I have watched for this forum seem to present truthful information. I do think that The Great Awakening Video exaggerates the importance of the Great Awakening. I think they are putting more stress on the leaders than what they deserve. For example The Great Awakening video talks about how George Whitefield was an American star that everyone had heard of, and that "Benjamin Franklin was amazed when he came to Philadelphia, he estimated that he (George Whitefield) spoke to 20,000 people, and he did it without amplification" (3:44). How?? I was in Theater at my high school, and I struggled with being loud enough for the audience (around 100 people) to hear me. That is why I believe this is an extreme exaggeration. There has to be people in the crowd who had no idea what he was saying, they were simply happy to be included

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Definitely Not

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 2:45 PM

I stated earlier that I was being swayed to think that the Great Awakening could be a key to the American Revolution. I have decided that I definitely don't think it is. I feel this way because of my belief that some of the videos we were given for this forum exaggerated information. In The Great Awakening Video they claim George Whitefield could speak to 20,000 people without any amplification. I do not believe it. This video also includes calling George Whitefield a star who everyone knew of. "Since most of his (George Whitefield) major works were not printed in his lifetime, even his intellectual leadership and American theology occurred in the century after his death." (Jon Butler's essay page 2). The majority of people found George Whitefield more influencing after his death, than when he was alive. I also think that historians believe that he is an important, and impressive man. This does not mean that he was such a success during his life.

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

1

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Definitely Not**by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Saturday, October 26, 2019, 9:37 PM

You make a really good point. It would be nearly impossible for everyone to hear what he was saying. especially if it's true that he was speaking to 20,000 people I don't believe that they would all be able to hear him, it makes me wonder if a lot of what was said about Whitefield was he said she said. It also makes me wonder if Whitefield gets over credited for some of his contributions.

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

0

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)[◀ The Debate Continues](#)[The Debate Continues ▶](#)[◀ Week 6 Lecture Images](#)

Jump to...

[Forum 3 Introduction and Worksheet ▶](#)

Mobile 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](#)