

HST 201

Forum 1

Topic - The Study of History

Listen to this 6 minute audio file, a portion of a lecture by James Muller to a group of history teachers. Can you relate to Muller's own educational experience taking American History in public school (took it so often, kept going farther back in time, never got to the present)? More importantly, at the midway point (3 minutes onward) he criticizes the argument that you need to know ALL of the things about previous history in order to understand the specific history you are studying.

He explains that the philosophical arguments are either:

#1 everything is completely connected to everything else and continuous; or

#2 There are sharp breaks in history, that turn history in a completely new direction.

Do you personally tend to lean towards position #1 (continuous) or #2 (major breaks/turns). After having read chapters 1, 2, and 3 in your Liberty, Equality, and Power textbook, how effectively do you believe your textbook authors have dealt with this philosophical historical issue? Do they seem to support argument #1 or #2? What specific evidence (from your textbook, lecture, video) can you cite to support your position?

Your posts and replies:

Fate or Free Will? Continuous or Defining moments?

by Jesse Bowman - Saturday, October 18, 2014, 6:42 PM

I toyed with this question for hours on end trying to figure out the depths of it's existential nature, and what I've come to realize with the question of whether or not we believe in a continuous history or if we believe in defining moments or "sharp breaks".

I consider myself a person to understand that there are connections in the world causing certain actions but I would have to argue for free will and emotion. Again, this argument that free will exists or that it's just apart of fate is at a standstill between two good debaters, but here it goes: Free will, the heat of the moment, when passion or circumstance just so happens to along when a small decision could have changed the outcome of history forever, but it didn't (fate?

Possibly), this idea of free will allows me to believe that there are indeed "sharp breaks" in history. For example, what is Christopher Columbus was an honest man (just bear with me) in his letters when he wrote back to Luis De Sant Angel about the "discovery" of America and it's "riches", and instead explained the horrors they experienced there as well? The decision to lie, could have come from his historical context I do not know, but his choice could have changed the desire for conquest or expansion in the Americas all together! Consider the simple choices made by men that forever altered the course of our history here in America, John Rolfe, decided he needed to choose a crop to cultivate at a commercial scale in order to bring success to Jamestown, and lucky for Jamestown he chose tobacco,

and with his success, Rolfe revolutionized the tobacco industry, hell, even the American industry as its first profitable export.

I believe our textbook do a fairly good job at interpreting the large full scale affect and decisions that played a role in history as well as highlighting the smaller but potentially crucial moments that shaped American history.

Topic - Puritanism & Islam

Focus your attention on the early settlement of New England. Listen to this 6 minute audio file, an interview of Professor Scott Casper by the Journal of American History.

In class this past week, I emphasized the importance of the religious influence in the founding of the English colonies. I believe (and have hopefully proven to you) that these issues are still with us today. When I heard this interview about the experiences of Professor Patrick Q. Mason from Notre Dame (Indiana), as an instructor myself, I was concerned. According to Mason, Muslim students in Egypt understand and/or relate to English Puritans better than American students do? Yikes! Apparently, educators in this country have done a poor job revealing the significance of that group and its influence on the founding of the nation.

Are you concerned with this finding? Can you relate to and/or understand the Puritans and their experience and

influence in the New World, or do your “eyes glaze over”? How do the results of the Religion Poll in Moodle influence your analysis? If you feel so inclined to share, does your religion (or lack thereof) bias your study of these people?

Again, as with the first topic, be sure to include appropriate material from class, video, and your textbook as you attempt to explain what Casper states is a “wonderful insight”.

Your posts and replies:

Re: Puritanism & Islam

by Jesse Bowman - Monday, October 13, 2014, 10:13 PM

This finding does frighten me, the ability for Americans to denounce religion and simply ignore its past, current, and future implications has seemed to reach a new high. Looking at the Religion poll we took, it was pretty clear that a majority of the students where either atheist/non-affiliated or protestant/christian (In today's practice, the least demanding in Church participation or public religious commitments) and occurred to me that even though I do not claim a religion, I have great interest in the development of our culture through such great influences as history. Even though I can't empathize with the Divine Right that the puritans believed in, I can believe in the multitude of affects that they had on the culture we now live in today, whether it be through governmental procedure, communal growth or philosophical sermons. Even in today's society we still remain heavily influenced by religion as Escobar said in class, we

have 6 catholic supreme court justices on our current payroll and it would be ignorant to ignore the implications that could have whether positive or negative.

Forum 2

Topic - The Great Awakening

CLICK HERE to download and read the handout Was the Great Awakening a Key to the American Revolution? The file is in .pdf format and is 19 pages long.

SPECIAL NOTE: I have significantly edited the length of these essays for readability and applicability. While it is true that my edits could be seen as a bias or manipulation of the information, that is NOT the purpose of this forum.

Read the introduction and the two articles by experts Patricia Bonomi and Jon Butler, who argue opposite sides of the issue. Be sure you fully understand the issue and have carefully read both points of view BEFORE you make your decision and write your post.

Overall, which historian's position do you most agree with and why? What specific historical example(s) or fact(s) has he or she used that have had the most influence on your decision?

This is a forum. A forum is NOT a place to post an essay. The Great Awakening was a very large and detailed event in U.S. history. Do not attempt to praise or critique a 5 page article in a single post. Since you are discussing this issue in an online forum, pick one of the author's most important points that you agree with and justify your decision. Write a separate post for another important point that he or she made. (Each author makes a number of good points, so you should have plenty of items to discuss throughout the week.) Your replies will involve agreeing or disagreeing with the positions and conclusions of the other members of your group. Remember, I am interested in your INFORMED opinions, backed by historical evidence.

Be sure to use material you have learned in this class (lecture/video), as well as the applicable information included in your textbook Liberty, Equality, and Power (see Chapter 4, page 138 and the entire section labeled The Great Awakening) to justify your claims. As always, cite your sources or quotes with page numbers.

IMPORTANT NOTE

Midway through this week, I will post two more required sources for you to consider which may or may not sway your initial decision. Of course, comments made by other students in your forum group may also influence your decision to stay with your initial position or to switch to the opposing view. You are allowed to reconsider your position if you are presented with data that suggests a change in your understanding of this period of history is necessary.

Topic - The Great Awakening

The Great Awakening Video - 7 minutes in length

This video exposes you to the “fire and brimstone” words of a sermon by Jonathan Edwards, an important figure during the period of the Great Awakening. Professor John Trickel also comments on the period.

What side of the issue does the historian from the video seem to support? What position do the historians of your textbook seem to be taking regarding the influence of the Great Awakening on the American Revolution? Which experts seem to be presenting the most historically truthful interpretation?

Topic - The Great Awakening

[CLICK HERE](#) for a Great Awakening Website

This website has a TON of information on the Great Awakening, but you are asked only to read this one page. After doing so, consider EVERYTHING that you now know about the Great Awakening, from your textbook, the 2 forum “yes/no” readings, the video clip, class lecture, and this website.

What side of the issue does this website seem to support? What highly informed position do YOU now take

regarding the influence of the Great Awakening on the American Revolution?

Your posts and replies:

Re: Interesting connection

by Jesse Bowman - Friday, October 24, 2014, 1:31 PM

I enjoyed this read, Evan, you offered some great insight with good example.

I have a question for you, do you believe that The Great Awakening was a key part to the American Revolution by promoting change of thought? Or that it was just progress of this thought that eventually led to The Great Awakening and eventually, the American revolution?

Bringing up John Brown and the fact that some interpret his "revolution" as a failure and but others pointing the significant long lasting impact from it was a nice touch to contrast the subjects.

Revolution w/o The Great Awakening?

by Jesse Bowman - Saturday, October 25, 2014, 7:39 PM

I absolutely agree that The Great Awakening played an important role, but I still believe that it affects did not determine the fruition of the American

Revolution, however, from continued reading I believe that those prolonged affects of religious mental change might have helped sway some of the colonies that were a little more adversed into joining the American

Revolution in the first place.

The one thing I'm trying to connect, and maybe you can help me, is how the push for individualism rather than communalism in the colonies helped excel independence from Britain in the form of unity in America.

I enjoy this topic discussion!

Overhype vs. Reality

by Jesse Bowman - Wednesday, October 22, 2014, 5:49 PM

Contrasting both of the articles to the question of whether or not The Great Awakening was key to the American revolution I find myself siding with Jon Butler's argument for "no". I can completely concur that The Great Awakening was a series of events that took place across the colonies but I do take issue, however, with the level of impact and rapidness that many people describe it occurring. Right from the beginning of his article, Butler explains the inaccurate use of adjectives describing The Great Awakening that can cause misinterpretations in its audience, the word "Swept" or "Boomed" across the colonies implying, at least when to me when I read it, implies that it occurred everywhere in the colonies for the brief time between 1739-1745 with excessive attendance by a majority of colonists. However, this is not the case, the 'revivals' occurred through a period of 40 years and only touched certain colonies, and only even certain dominations of a very diverse culture experienced such revivals, "...In Virginia, the site of the most sustained such events in the southern colonies, did not emerge in significant numbers until the 1750's and did not peak until the 1760's" (Butler).

Another issue I have with the labeling of The Great Awakening is the interpretation of it being the crucial sign of change in the mentality of the colonists as a key ingredient to the American Revolution. I firmly believe that salutary neglect had more of an impact on the mentality of the colonists than The Great Awakening simply because it reintroduced a lifestyle of servitude that the colonists already outgrew for the past 100 years (17th & 18th century).

Forum 3

These two clips provide you with a very broad, general overview of the American Revolution, or should it be more accurately called the War for Independence? Regardless, these historians make numerous different points that should help you begin your analysis of the debate contained in the forum "Yes No" readings for this week. Feel free to make or explain the connections you see between them and the topic Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement?

Topic - The Revolution - Conservative or Radical?

[CLICK HERE](#) to download and read the handout Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? The file

is in .pdf format and is 9 pages long. Be certain that your posts reveal your knowledge of the material contained in these readings, as justification for your informed opinion on the matter.

Read the introduction and the two articles by experts Carl Degler and Gordon Wood, who argue opposite sides of the issue. Be sure you fully understand the issue and have carefully read both points of view BEFORE you make your decision and write your post.

To begin this online discussion and debate with your group members, which author's opinion do you most agree with and why? What specific historical example(s) or fact(s) has he used that have had the most influence on your decision? Which examples can YOU bring to the discussion to support your choice?

Be certain to define the basis of your argument (defining "revolution" with strict or loose construction, as mentioned in page 1 of the pdf). You should also determine whether your own philosophical position makes you a Whig, progressive, conflict, or neo-Whig historian.

This subject requires a complex analysis on your part, and then, you must write your posts and replies to illustrate your analysis and support your conclusion. I want to avoid conversations and/or debates in which students are "not speaking the same language, aren't on the same level, or don't have a common foundation on which to base their discussions".

PLEASE use material you have learned in this class, as

well as any information included in your textbook Liberty, Equality, and Power to justify your claims. As always, cite your sources or quotes with page numbers and/or URLs.

You have read the article by Gordon Wood, who argues that American Revolution was not a conservative movement, but that it was a radical event. Here is the professor himself. Listen to him speak briefly about this subject (3 minutes). Does seeing and hearing from him aid your understanding and/or analysis of his article. Does it sway you to his support his argument or not?

Your posts and replies:

Forum Needs A Qualifier

by Jesse Bowman - Tuesday, November 18, 2014, 8:03 PM

I think that Degler had some very valid points as well. One of my main issues that I took with him, however, was that fact the he seemed to focus on the characteristics that did not change before and after the revolution, i.e., "These conservative, upper- class leaders who proclaimed the revolution suffered no repudiations in the course of the struggle; no mass from the bottom rose and seized control of the Revolutionary situation to direct the struggle into new channels." (Degler, 136) this statement is true, to some extent but I think it overshadows the risk the

founding fathers were taking when they signed the Declaration of Independence, albeit they were mostly wealthy of high class individuals but they were still virtually signing their own death warrant.

In fact, I think that because they were and could have entertained wealthy & healthy lives and chose not to in order to risk it all for a transformation of government should add to the radicalism of the revolution, not discount it purely because those men who started the course for change maintained power.

Overall, I think that the Revolution was a radical one that contained conservative elements, but those elements shouldn't take away from the radical feat the colonists were attempting.

Re: A new light shone on the definition of the RADICAL Revolution?

by Jesse Bowman - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 11:35 PM

First off, great post!

I completely disagreed with that comment that Woods made as well, to simply describe any event as a "Most radical, and most far reaching event..." is bold and very subjective.

Both Woods and Delger seem to take all-or-nothing stances on whether or not the American Revolution was a conservative movement or not, and I think therein lies the problem, as you and many of the other students on this forum have pointed out the Revolution did not change EVERYTHING but it most certainly did radically change SOMETHINGS.

Not a Revolution? Come on...

by Jesse Bowman - Saturday, November 15, 2014, 7:40 PM

This debate almost seems nonsensical. The American Revolution is, at least in my opinion, fairly obviously a "Revolution" that I feel had great affect on the European psyche and helped prove that the enlighteners were more than just verbal rubbish.

More importantly, the definitions I've come to use for the terms "Revolution" and "Conservative Movement" are pretty much summed up by a google search of the two:

"Revolution, a forceable overthrow of a government or social order in the favor of a new system."

"Conservative Movement,

a political philosophy or attitude emphasizing respect for traditional institutions, distrust of go I also

believe more along the lines of "strict

constructionists" belief of a deep rooted change in the social system.

Degler somehow interprets little impact on the social impacts of the American Revolution, "...It is quickly apparent that the social consequences were meager

indeed. In both purpose and implementation they were

not to be equated with the social changes that shock

Russia & France in later years." (Delger, 137). Now,

before I attempt protesting this argument I want to

make it clear that my knowledge in area of the French

Revolution and Russian Revolution is very minimal. I

completely disagree the social consequences of the

American Revolution were "meager", this is a time

(1760-1783) when the ideology of the common man and men

of wealth started to align more than ever in the spirit

of belief in every mans divine right to life, liberty

and the pursuit of happiness, on which they acted upon

by overthrowing their ruling monarchy, following Wood's argument that radicalism from the revolution had a major social impact on the transformation of relationships among colonists (Woods, 145). I believe that this ideology started to flourish and implement a deep social change in America the even carried over and could arguably be a fundamental element to the rise of the French Revolution eventually consumed most of Europe.

As to the statement about "not equating" the American Revolution to the French and Russian Revolutions? As I mentioned early, I do not know too much detail about these events, however, I do know that the French Revolution was depicted as a bloody revolution in which the own French revolutionaries beheaded King Louis XVI (Liberty, Equality, Power, 252), but an attempt to compare and scale the level of "social change" based on the PHYSICAL capabilities of the Frenchmen to overthrow their ruling king in their own territory to the American colonies' extensive battle over-throwing a ruling monarch fought from thousands of miles away across an ocean is just silly, there are just too many variables and differences involved to do so.

Among this argument of radical vs. conservative I will argue that an attempt to establish such a largely diversely populated democratic-republic with given history of such experiments would more than likely be considered bold... if not one of the most radical revolutions and most certainly not conservative.

Forum 4

Sometimes what we see can be just as important as what we read or hear. You've heard the phrase "a picture is worth a thousand words"? Visual images can often have a significant impact on our understanding of a complex issue, or help lead us to a deeper, better analysis of the topic.

View the following recent political cartoons. To get the conversation started, pick one and share what you believe is its significance for or relationship to the Constitution and Early Republic period of U.S. History we've been studying in class these past weeks. To truly understand and analyze these cartoons well, you actually have to know quite a bit about our nation's history to do so.

How does the cartoon accurately reflect historical events we've been studying or does it differ from them? Assuming you, the viewer, is knowledgeable about our nation's history, do you think the cartoonist does and/or is correctly interpreting that history in his drawing? Do you agree or disagree with the overall message of the cartoon?

Make sure you include the cartoon number in the subject line of your post, not only to organize the conversation, but so students may reply and comment on the correct cartoon. And as always, please remember to link and support your claims to actual events in United States History, including the formation of political parties, loose and strict interpretations of the

Constitution, federal vs. state issues, and governmental power versus Bill of Rights protections. Cite your sources and include specific historical examples from your textbook, class lecture notes, and videos in your posts and replies.

You may have seen a political cartoon or image yourself, which is related to this time period in history. If it is appropriate to this topic of Constitutional history, political parties, and the Early Republic, you are encouraged to include a cartoon/image and your analysis of it in a forum post this week.

See the help videos in Moodle to learn how to add an image to your post if you've never done it before.

Your posts and replies:

Votes are costly nowadays

by Jesse Bowman - Tuesday, November 25, 2014, 8:40 AM

I agree with your points made about the #2 cartoon, corporations lately have vast amount of power and wealth able and are to manipulate the outcomes of politics more than the average middle income citizen. During the early foundation of Democratic Republican party, Madison and Jefferson (and others) warned of the dangers of powers given to the government - that it could stifle the people if not carefully regulated, but they seemed to leave corporations were left out of the

discussion when it came to creating limiting legislative documents (many efforts were made in the Bill of Rights to address governmental power and possible oppression, but not corporations). Jefferson had a distrust for concentrated and consolidated power and even directed that distrust toward corporations, "I hope we shall crush... in its birth the aristocracy of our moneyed corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country." - Thomas Jefferson, but as we currently see today, those ideas failed to flourish into legislative documents that limit corporations, which unfortunately are able to influence the role of politics in a major ways with the power of their monetary value.

Re: Votes are costly nowadays

by Jesse Bowman - Tuesday, November 25, 2014, 8:46 AM

Here is a quick example of corporations power in todays government. Below is a bill that was voted on in Oregon "Measre 92" which had to do with the labeling of GMO's. Take a gander for yourself at the corporations involvement. (chart image included here)

"#7 Who Doesn't Like Free Stuff?"

by Jesse Bowman - Friday, November 28, 2014, 4:42 PM

The very last cartoon shown on the list may not have many words, but it does say a lot. Obama, is depicted dressed in a suit is holding the hand of a little girl

with a Mikey Mouse ears hat who is labeled 'America' with the following phrases exchanged from Obama to America, "Government will fix everything and it won't cost a dime"... "I love free stuff!" replied America.

Dialogue: President Obama's statement about the Government paying for everything could be an indication of a strong belief in a powerful central government to assume debts and pay for them all, which goes along the lines of what Hamilton purposed in his attempts at a larger stronger central government (Liberty, Equality, Power, 248-249).

Noticing how this cartoon is also titled "the State of the Union" and is dated in 2013 must reference his state of the union address in that year which he started out by quoting John F Kennedy's opener at the 1962 State of the Union message "Members of Congress, the Constitution does not make us rivals for power but partners for progress" and like Kennedy, Obama attempted to sway the belief of congress to assume the role for providing health, education, and opportunity for a good job(s) and home. These ideals seem to support the belief of a strong central government and a loose-constructionist interpretation much of which Madison and Hamilton believed during the early foundation of the central government (Liberty, Equality, Power, 246-250) (before Madison switched sides).

The little girl labeled as America responds with enthusiasm towards the idea but with a simple response such as "I love free stuff" implies that the young girl doesn't fully comprehend what Obama is saying when he declares the government will fix everything and it won't cost her anything hinting at the idea that America is naive (childlike) and will simply follow the

government where it leads her. I feel this may be more accurate today than what we've been learning about in the early Republican Era, although the ideals of a strong central government with massive power were in play, it seems as if the new Americans at the time were more alert and distrusting of the formation of a new strong government.

While America is depicted in full view for the reader not much can be seen by a seemly mysterious Obama (government) possibly hinting at the distant or unfamiliar relationship between America and the government implying a clear separation of the two entities