

#flo #ret #disorganized #hw

title: prompt

American Revolution Historiography Essay

In a paper approximately 4 pages in length, write a synthesis essay using at least two of the American :

Synthesis writing is not that much different from what you did in 10th grade where you incorporated mul-

Your synthesis might take one of two general tracks (though I am open to discussing additional ideas as

1. Historiography: How might the sources help us to think about how histories of the revolution are to

2. Historical synthesis: Using the evidence and insights from the authors, what kinds of conclusions m

To assemble the material for your essay, you should feel free to utilize your notes from the presentati

what was the cause of the american revolution?

thinking:

historians that we read think about causality wrong

proximal and distal causality?

infinite chain of causality

cause -> cause -> effect

multiple causes can lead to multiple effects which in turn have effects

there is no single cause! it fits into this graph-network of causes and effects

essay: fit the causes of the american revolution into this graph framework of cause -> effect

for example, being able to unite over shared rejection of goods might be a proximal cause, but it is not *the* cause of the revolution.

big idea: **NEW MODEL OF CAUSALITY** this is, historiography.

- summaries of the readings:

- Holton: forced founders

- * economic situations!

- each chapter about how lack of independence has negative economic impacts

- * elites had to do stuff because of their debt?

- Wood: The Radicalism of the American Revolution

- * united by values

- * popular belief shaped by lived experience

- this is what drove the revolution

- Bailyn: The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution

- * british political radicals?

- * enslaving america via taxes?

- Breen: The Marketplace of Revolution

- * social resources allowed people to unite across colonies
 - shared rejection of goods!
- Linebaugh and Rediker: Many Headed Hydra
 - * Not about great men, it's really about
 - sailors, slaves, mobs
 - * marxist! rise of the proletariat!

[forced founders + ->

bailyn -> [wood, holton] ->

linebaugh: breen: [wood, holton] : bailyn <- time

- many different people united.
 - how did they unite?
- people could unite their ideals through shared rejection of goods
 - why did they have the ideals?
- shared lived experience – in debt
 - why did they have that lived experience – why were they in debt?
- taxes!
 - why did they have taxes?

the complex nature of causality

outline: - thesis - causality is complex and historians pick a small piece that matches a ideological agenda -
with this updated model, the "cause" of the revolution becomes multifactorial {graph}

proximal - distal

given complexity, how do we think about causality? exponential reweighting

$C \rightarrow c \rightarrow c \rightarrow c \rightarrow E \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \wedge$ this c

them: [c, c, c] -> me: c -> c -> c

luck:

inp -> [] -> oup

[] = (divine) luck = [god*random]

A

$A \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow B \ e = c$

$e \neq 0$

primary cause is flawed

history = [] -> oup [] ??

{ }

() {}

models: god random (luck) primary cause too interdependent

theology -> modernism -> postmodernism!

groups:

- theological
 - by god
- modernism
 - by cause
- postmodernism
 - no cause
- transcendent-modernism
 - graph

objective truth != exist useful truth = exist postmodern -> useful truth != exist

0.1 | Thesis!

models of causality are based on

historians look for causes.

causes historians find

the concept of the cause of the american revolution has evolved

perceived cause has co-evolved with changes in the view of causality itself – it has gone from theological causality, to modernistic causality, postmodernistic

the frameworks in which we situate causes have evolved just as the assigned causes themselves have changed. we can understand these frameworks – how they have shifted, and even where they should go – by looking at them from a higher level of abstraction: the evolving view of causality itself.

0.2 | Outlining

- intro: models of causality
 - the frameworks in which we situate causes have evolved just as the assigned causes themselves have changed.
 - we can understand these frameworks – how they have shifted, and even where they should go – by looking at them from a higher level of abstraction: the evolving view of causality itself.
- theological causality
 - the american revolution was caused by god / divine intervention, and we can't hope to understand it
- modernistic causality
 - the american revolution was caused by this cause, and this lets us understand it
- postmodernistic causality
 - the american revolution had no cause, and we cannot understand it
- transcendent-modernism

- the american revolution had a graph of causes, and while we may not be able to understand it, we can still learn from it
- conclusion

0.3 | Evidencing

- theological
 - breen, end of page 7.
 - * "divine luck defying close analysis"
 - declaration of independence!
 - * natures god
 - * <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/07/05/the-declaration-of-ind>
- modernism
 - breen!
 - holton!
 - bailyn!
 - rettiker!
- postmodernistic
 - the existence of all these different interpretations?
- transcendent-modernism
 - my thing! with the graph!

0.4 | finer

- intro: models of causality
 - the frameworks in which we situate causes have evolved just as the assigned causes themselves have changed.
 - we can understand these frameworks – how they have shifted, and even where they should go
 - by looking at them from a higher level of abstraction: the evolving view of causality itself.
- theological causality
 - the american revolution was caused by god / divine intervention, and we shouldn't try to understand it
 - * breen, constitution
 - * also includes just luck that we shouldn't try to understand
 - 13 clocks striking at the same time
 - asks: how do we please god?
- modernistic causality
 - the american revolution was caused by this cause, and this lets us understand it

- * while the actual causes vary, this model is the most prominent
 - causes vary from x to y
 - from holton to rediker
- * distinction from theological with god being the cause, is that modernism claims to be able to understand from their cause
- asks: what were the true causes?
- postmodernistic causality
 - the american revolution had no cause, and we cannot understand it
 - this is the next logical step, from such a wide pool of perspectives
 - posits that no lessons can be learned; where transcendent-modernism differs
 - asks: nothing.
- transcendent-modernism
 - the american revolution had a graph of causes, and while we may not be able to understand it, we can still learn from it
 - while modernism argues that there is a solution to the problem of history, postmodernism argues there isn't,
 - * transcendent modernism argues we don't need one.
 - model causality as a graph with infinitesimal granularity
 - * the graph!
 - how did the factors interact, and what can we learn from them?
- conclusion
 - ?? maybe,
 - * all models of dealing with a "black wall" (instead of black box)
 - * don't worry
 - * here's the solution
 - * there isn't a solution
 - * there doesn't need to be a solution

0.5 | Quote bin

0.6 | fridge

as the very framework in which we situate causes has evolved just as the assigned causes themselves have changed.

1 | Writing. Begin.

Grappling with causality is inherent in the historical analysis process. This process is predicated on the concept of cause and effect; constructed histories take an effect, assign a cause, then explain the connection between them. Even with a single effect, say, the American revolution, these histories take many different forms and evolve as time goes on. They have shifted from arguments involving divine right, through the "great men" narrative, and into economic and cultural explanations. These are all assigned causes to the American revolution, the evolution of which is a history in and of itself. However, just as these assigned causes evolve over time, the frameworks these causes reside in have coevolved. The very way we think about causality has changed, allowing us to ask and consider new questions which are only allowed to emerge in certain frameworks of causality. We can understand these frameworks – how they have shifted, what their limits are, and even where they should go – by looking at them from a higher level of abstraction: the evolving view of causality itself.

One of the first frameworks took the form of theological causality, a framework which most modern historians reject. This framework's causes stem from the divine: god caused the American revolution to happen, and we shouldn't try to understand it. The modern historian Breen points to this framework as something that should be avoided in his 2004 book *The Marketplace of Revolution*. He calls the histories emerging from this framework

"a kind of divine blessing defying close analysis"

Causes in this framework stem from the divine, and thus, we should not try to understand

When applied to the American revolution,