# **Abstract**

This case study will equip you with the skills to explore the history of revolutions. Taking the American Revolution as an example, it focuses on two sources taken from either side of the political debate; one is public, the other is private. While this example focuses on the American Revolution, the techniques used to analyse the texts can be applied to contemporary documents relating to other revolutions. By the end of this case study you will be able to navigate archival materials to identify a range of potential sources for studying revolutions.

There exists a rich and varied range of documents through which we can study periods of revolution. By studying the history of revolutions, we can not only better understand how revolutionary ideas emerge and spread in response to local political crises, but can begin to think more broadly about how the long-term impacts of major political upheavals continue to shape the modern world.

# **Learning Outcomes**

By the end of this case study, you should be able to:

* Define the qualities of a revolution, and to summarise why it is important that we learn about them.
* Identify and locate different types of historical sources that may be useful for studying revolutions.
* Ask effective questions to identify the creators/authors of primary sources, to consider how the author’s standpoint may have affected the document’s content and to evaluate the reliability of the source.
* Draw upon the material provided within historical sources to construct sound arguments that reveal more about the nature of revolutions.

# **Initial steps and questions**

1. There are many different types of sources that can be used to study revolutions, and the nature of a document and its intended audience can affect its content and reliability. Sources may be documents that were intended for public consumption; official documents, which were created by an organisation or government; or private documents, such as letters or journals, in which an individual shares their personal reflections. Your first task is to identify the type of document that you are working with, using the following questions:
	* Is this a printed source, or is it handwritten?
	* Is it a document intended for public examination, or is it intended for a more private audience?
	* Is this a written text, or a picture/image?
2. Who was the author/creator of this document? How might their viewpoint or personal circumstances affect the content of the document?
	* Was the author/creator of the source associated with a particular side or political party during the revolution?
	* Was the document created by a single person, a group of individuals, or a formal organisation?
	* How might we approach the document, given the author’s political viewpoint? Can we trust all that they say, or do we need to corroborate their evidence with additional material?
3. When and where was the document created? What was its purpose, and how might this impact its content and utility?
	* Familiarise yourself with some of the key dates of the revolution: what else was happening while this document was being created?
	* Was this document created in response to any specific events during the revolution?
	* If the source was written in the aftermath of the revolution, how reliable is this source? May their views be affected by hindsight or memory?
4. How was this document communicated, and why does it still survive?
	* Is it a printed text that was intended to be purchased, read, and discussed?
	* Is it a personal item that has been preserved in an archive?
	* Is it an official government or legal record?

# **Contextual information**

The history of revolutions is a particularly popular field of study amongst scholars of the humanities. Appealing to historians of political thought, military historians, as well as social and cultural historians, scholars continually pursue research to uncover the protagonists behind revolutionary movements, the spread of revolutionary ideas, and the crucial moments and turning points that shifted the balance of power during prolonged periods of political upheaval. This case study uses the American Revolution as an example through which we can think more widely about the history of revolutions.

The American Revolution continues to inspire an ever-expanding body of scholarly literature, which dates back to the late eighteenth century. The first ‘histories’ of the Revolution emerged in the immediate aftermath of the war, including those of David Ramsay in 1789 and Mercy Otis Warren (sister of James Otis Jr.) in 1805.[[1]](#footnote-1) During the nineteenth century, scholarship adopted a narrative of progress, neatly depicting the Revolution as a teleological series of events starting with the Stamp Act Crisis (1765) and culminating in the inevitable establishment of the United States. This continued into the early- to mid-twentieth century, as the Cold War and the concept of American exceptionalism shaped the narrative of the history of the nation’s origins.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The bicentenary of the American Revolution in 1976 marked a turning point. Responding to contemporary social issues of the day, scholarship since the 1970s and 1980s has increasingly incorporated practices from the fields of social history and anthropology to place a new emphasis on race, ethnicity and gender in colonial America and the early republic of the United States.[[3]](#footnote-3) Meanwhile, the emergence in popularity of loyalist studies in the early 2000s has bolstered the comprehensiveness of the scholarly conversation by exploring both sides of the revolutionary divide.[[4]](#footnote-4)

This study forms a close reading of two primary sources which discuss the origins of the American Revolution. The first is a Declaration made by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia in 1775. The Continental Congress was formed in response to imperial action taken against the American colonies and was comprised of representatives drawn from across the thirteen North American colonies that would subsequently form the United States. The text outlines Congress’s interpretation of the origins of the dispute with Britain and sets forth the necessity of taking up arms. As we shall consider, the Declaration by Congress was printed in the colonial newspapers and was intended for a public audience.

The second text is a letter which was sent from Governor William Franklin of New Jersey to Lord Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth of the Declaration by Congress and the public response to it. Although the letter was private, Dartmouth was Secretary of State for the Colonies and First Lord of Trade; as such it was likely that any intelligence communicated by Franklin would have been shared amongst government ministers in London. Franklin enclosed a printed copy of the ‘Declaration to Take Up Arms’ within his correspondence to Dartmouth, while outlining the strength of the “Friends of Government”, or the American loyalists, who were opposed to the outbreak of rebellion.

There are several important contextual factors to consider when assessing these two texts. Both are dated from the summer of 1775 (July and August, respectively). The timing of their creation is important, as both sources were written in the immediate aftermath of the Battles of Lexington and Concord. During the late 1760s and 1770s, the British government had introduced a series of punitive measures against Massachusetts, which was considered to be in a state of rebellion. Tensions emerged between colonists and British soldiers stationed in Boston, leading to events such as the Boston Massacre of 1770, the Boston ‘Tea Party’ of 1773, and the Battles of Lexington and Concord in 1775. Contested between the Massachusetts militia and the British army, Lexington and Concord marked the first battles of the American Revolutionary War.

Conversely, both texts predate the Declaration of Independence of 4 July 1776. Thus, at this precarious stage of the American Revolution, American independence was not yet being formally pursued. Instead, the Declaration by Congress sits within a larger body of texts which protest against the measures taken by the British Government and call for political reform, but not necessarily independence. These texts include resolutions printed by revolutionary groups such as the Sons of Liberty,[[5]](#footnote-5) as well as political pamphlets such as Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense.*[[6]](#footnote-6)Bernard Bailyn’s influential study *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* considers the rhetoric used within such pamphlets and the development of American revolutionary political thought.[[7]](#footnote-7) It may be helpful to consider how the aims outlined within the Declaration compare with similar texts written during the period.

At the point when these sources were created, independence was not necessarily inevitable. As Franklin’s letter to Dartmouth indicates, there were substantial numbers of people who were opposed to independence. However, these ‘loyalists’, as they came to be remembered, were not united into a coherent party under clear local leadership, in the way that the revolutionaries were. These political feelings of loyalty to Britain were a consequence of the strong emotional, cultural and material ties that had developed between Britain and the American colonies and are the focus of Timothy Breen’s article ‘Baubles of Britain’ and Brendan McConville’s study *The King’s Three Faces*.[[8]](#footnote-8) Considering the American loyalists in more detail, Wallace Brown’s *The King’s Friends* provides a high-level analysis of the numbers of American loyalists who submitted post-war compensation claims to the British government. [[9]](#footnote-9) An examination of these claims in detail reveals that several persons, including some of the delegates to the Continental Congress, changed sides throughout the conflict.[[10]](#footnote-10) This issue is explored further in Ruma Chopra’s *Choosing Sides.*[[11]](#footnote-11)

There is a vast plethora of sources that exist through which we can study the history of revolutions. Many of these sources reveal the anxieties and aspirations held during the immediate context in which they were written, and are likely to have been produced by those on differing sides of the debate. By considering texts from the opposing factions in conjunction with each other, we can reveal a more comprehensive and balanced analysis of the events that occurred during periods of revolution, and how individuals responded to them.

# **Source analysis questions**

1. Who was (or were) the creator(s) of this document, and what were their intentions?
2. We know that this document was written during a period of revolution; in light of this, what can we learn of its creator(s)’s political stance during the revolution?
3. Who was the intended audience/recipient of this document? Was this document for public consumption or private use?
4. What can this source tell us about the political origins of the outbreak of the American Revolution?
5. What can this source tell us about those who were opposed to the American Revolution?
6. What are the limitations of this source – what can it not tell us?

# **Critical evaluation**

**Introduction: Familiarising Yourself with the Document**

Begin by identifying the type of source that you are working with. At the top of image 263, we can see that this document is “A Declaration by the Representatives of the United Colonies of North-America”. From the document’s full title, we learn that the Representatives are “now met in General Congress at Philadelphia”, and that the purpose of their Declaration is for “setting forth the Causes and Necessity of their taking up Arms.” A glance at the end of the text on image 264 reveals that the Declaration was signed on 6 July 1775, and that it was signed by John Hancock (who we learn was the President of the Congress) on behalf of the entire Congress.

The Congress held at Philadelphia in 1775 was the second Continental Congress, the first having been called in 1774 in response to the British blockade of Boston harbour. In 1775, Congress met in response to the Battles of Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts. It was attended by representatives from across the thirteen North American colonies which would later form the United States. A year later, the same Congress would call for independence from Great Britain with the Declaration of Independence on 4 July 1776. An appreciation of the timing of the source’s creation is important for our interpretation of the document: although we know with hindsight that the American colonial leadership would eventually pursue the aim of political independence, at this stage of the Revolution this was not yet guaranteed. In 1775, colonists were seeking a resolution to the perceived wrongdoings of the British Parliament; this was to be achieved from within the British Empire, not as an independent American state.

If we look more broadly at the remainder of image 264, we can see that the Declaration is published alongside a series of various advertisements. This tells us that the Declaration was printed in a newspaper and, as such, was likely to have been available to a broad public audience. While the advertisements themselves are not of interest for our study of the American Revolution, if we briefly take a closer look at them we notice that they relate to New York and New Jersey, even though we have just learned that the Congress was held in Philadelphia. For instance, there are references to Thomas Bridgen Atwood’s store near Coenties Market and to a pocketbook lost by John Lewis of Beekman’s Slip, both at New York’s harbour; an advertisement for James Wallace’s luxury textiles for sale near to the New York coffee-house; a notification that apprentice John McLean has run away from his master in Springfield, East New Jersey; and a public notice addressed to the residents of Somerset County, New Jersey. From these advertisements, we can presume that the Declaration was likely to have been published in newspapers in several colonies beyond Pennsylvania.

Thus, we know that inhabitants of colonial America could access the Declaration via the newspaper. However, the source gives us further clues as to how this text may have been shared elsewhere. Turning back to image 263, there is an annotation in the bottom right corner of the document that reads “Inclosed Franklin’s (No 26) of 2nd August 1775”. Let us turn to the second source in this collection, which is a letter sent by the Governor of New Jersey, William Franklin to Lord Dartmouth. Although Franklin’s father was the well-known Patriot Benjamin Franklin, William Franklin would later become a Loyalist (a term used to describe those who were opposed to the American Revolution). Dartmouth, meanwhile, was Secretary of State for the Colonies and First Lord of Trade. Consequently, although this letter was private, it is likely that its contents would have been shared amongst government ministers in London.

Within this letter, on image 256, we learn that Franklin sent a copy of the Declaration to his correspondent in London. Note the number 26 in the top left corner of the letter: in the eighteenth-century, it was common practice to number letters in sequence, as they were likely to go astray or be delayed. Importantly for us, this suggests that there was an ongoing correspondence between Franklin and Dartmouth; potentially on the subject of the American Revolution. A closer examination of image 256 confirms this to be true, as Franklin writes in paragraph two that “the same Disposition & the same Measures as mentioned in my last.”

This initial examination of the source material, although brief, helps us to prepare for a more detailed and rigorous analysis of its content. We have encountered the two opposing factions in the American Revolution: the patriots who formed the Continental Congress and published the Declaration, and the loyalists such as Franklin. We have learned how the source was disseminated, both formally and informally, and reflected upon who its target audience was. Similar questioning techniques can be used when assessing alternative sources to study other historic revolutions. Using the source questions outlined above, we can now turn to conducting an in-depth analysis of the source.

**The Pre-Revolutionary Relationship Between Britain and America**

Having familiarised ourselves with the authors and intended recipients of the sources (as well as their respective political stances), let us now turn to consider what the sources reveal about the political origins and outbreak of the American Revolution. From its outset, the Declaration made by Congress clearly outlines what it perceives to be the tyrannical overreach of the British Parliament and the duty of the American colonies to resist it. In order to do this, Congress begins by outlining what it describes as the “harmonious intercourse” (image 263) that had existed between Britain and America prior to the American Revolution, before outlining the offensive measures taken by Parliament. Think carefully about the rhetorical devices used, and why the narrative is constructed in this way. In this particular example, blame is clearly and decidedly placed upon the British Government. For alternative sources that you may encounter, similar techniques may be used to portray a particular series of events.

From image 263, we learn that the colonist’s forefathers had left Britain seeking civil and religious freedoms and how, through their own risk and hard labour, these early settlers had “erected settlements in the distant and inhospitable wilds of America.” By the mid-eighteenth century, these early settlements had become fully formed societies “vested with perfect legislatures” or local systems of government. According to Congress, “the mutual benefits of this union” between Britain and its American colonies were “so extraordinary as to excite astonishment.” (image 263) At this point, it would be helpful to refer to relevant secondary sources, or historical theory, to assess whether Congress’ depiction of the pre-Revolutionary relationship that existed between Britain and America is accurate.

The source also reveals that the American colonists had provided support to Britain during periods of war. The Declaration makes specific reference to the Seven-Years-War, which was contested primarily between Britain and France between 1756 and 1763, with parts of the conflict occurring in North America. According to Congress, we learn from image 263 that the colonists provided “dutiful, zealous and useful services during the war”, which are alleged to have “enabled her [Britain] to triumph over her enemies.” Think carefully about the level of detail provided here, as the Declaration does not elaborate upon what these “services” were. You may wish to refer to the historical theory to evaluate this claim.

**The Origins of the American Revolution**

Turning our focus to the formal outbreak of the American Revolution, we learn from the Declaration that the conclusion of the Seven-Years-War formed a turning point in the relationship between Britain and its American colonies. From 1764 onwards, Congress accuses the British Government of seeing the colonies as little more than “statutable plunder.” (image 263) “In the course of eleven years”, they claim, Parliament has adopted a “pernicious project” to enforce its power over the colonies. This includes Parliament’s decision to “give and grant our money without our consent, though we have ever exercised an exclusive right to dispose of our own property”. The use of secondary literature will help you to contextualise such claims made in similar sources. For instance, here, Congress is alluding to the Stamp Act of 1765, the Sugar Act of 1765 and the Townshend Acts of 1766. Each of these Acts authorised a tax on imports of specific goods to the colonies.

The above-mentioned Acts were introduced by Parliament as a measure to reduce the national debt which Britain had accrued as a result of the Seven-Years-War, including its defence of the American colonies; a point that Congress fails to mention in its Declaration to take up arms. Think carefully about why Congress may have chosen not to acknowledge the reasons behind this taxation; for instance, justifying the reasons for taxation might have undermined their argument for taking up arms against Britain. Instead, as we can see on image 263, Congress attributes this change in approach to a personnel change in government. Prior to the Seven-Years-War, ministers had permitted the American colonists to govern themselves, however at the conclusion of the war we are told that “it pleased our sovereign to make a change in his counsels.” From this, we can conclude that Congress blames specific ministers (who, presumably, did not understand the “harmonious intercourse” referred to in image 263 that existed between Britain and her American colonies) for the encroachments of Parliament, rather than the King himself.

 Having considered the political origins of the outbreak of the Revolution, what can sources such as these tell us about the practical measures taken by revolutionary leaders? In this particular example, we learn that the American colonists adopted diplomatic measures to attempt to resolve the political schism that had emerged between themselves and Parliament. For instance, on image 263 we learn that a “Congress of Delegates” from each colony was assembled, who met at Philadelphia in September 1774. Claiming to have “pursued every temperate, every respectful measure”, Congress “resolved again to offer an humble and dutiful petition to the King.” Thinking more broadly about alternative sources, think carefully about what statements such as these reveal about the aims of the revolutionaries; here, in contrast to the scholarly narrative (outlined in the contextual information section) that suggests the inevitability of the American independence, the suggestion is that Congress is calling for reform as British subjects, rather than independence.

We also learn from image 263 that such diplomatic measures had precedent in the American context: referring to the broader period of 1765-1775, we learn that “we [American colonists] for ten years incessantly and ineffectually besieged the throne as supplicants.” Referring to the long-established practice of submitting petitions to Parliament, we learn that the Americans “reasoned” and “remonstrated with parliament in the most mild and decent language.” Use of historical literature will confirm that such petitions were, in part, successful: while the Stamp Act, Sugar Act, and Townshend Acts were largely repealed in 1766 in response to colonial resistance, Parliament maintained a tax upon tea imports.

When studying periods of revolution, it can be helpful to think carefully about the reasons why particular sources were created. Sources written by revolutionary leaders for a public audience are often composed to generate an emotional response, or to gain support for their cause. Note the emotive language used throughout the Declaration. Multiple references are made to Britain’s attempts to “enslave” the American colonies, demanding “absolute property in and an unbounded power over” them (image 263). On image 264, Britain is described as “despotic”, inflicting “humiliating” and “rigid” terms upon the American colonists. At one point on the same image, Britain is described as violating the obligation of its treaties; an act which, according to Congress, “even savage nations deem sacred.” The use of ‘savage’ is particularly evocative, suggesting that Britain was uncivilised. This highly inflammatory language suggests that Congress is trying to provoke an emotional response from the readers of the Declaration, attempting to persuade the American public to agree to their cause and the necessity of taking up arms against Britain.

Turning to image 264, we are now brought to the crux of the Declaration. This second Congress, meeting in response to the Battles at Lexington and Concord, outlines the two choices faced by colonists: “choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers [Britain], or resistance by force.” Failure to resist would not only be an insult to their “gallant ancestors” who secured them such freedoms as they currently enjoy; they would also be guilty of “resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them.” Thus, Congress declares that “we have taken up arms. We shall lay them down when hostilities shall cease on the part of the aggressors.” In this statement, Congress firmly outlines their stance and invites Britain to respond.

While the Declaration by Congress provided colonists with a clear choice between submission and resistance, we should be cautious about reducing all political options to two discrete choices. Consider whether there were any other options available to settle the dispute with Britain. Furthermore, we should think carefully about the ultimate aims of the Congress in taking up arms. They declare that they shall lay down their arms “when hostilities shall cease on the part of the aggressors”, but it is unclear what this means in practice. The Congress is keen to state that this is not a call for independence, stating on image 264 that “We have not raised arms with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent states – We fight not for glory, or for conquest.” Consider what this means for the American Revolution; rather than being a radical overthrow of a tyrannical regime, perhaps the American Revolution can be described as a conservative revolution that simply aimed to restore metropolitan-colonial relations to their pre-1763 state. However, the stated aims of Congress are conflicted, having declared in the paragraph above that “if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable.” Consider what this foreign assistance might be, and who from. Furthermore, with hindsight, we know that the Declaration of Independence occurs less than a year later in July 1776.

Just as the stated aims of the Congress are conflicted, so too is the language and terminology that is used throughout their Declaration. For instance, on image 263 the Declaration begins by first calling upon “men, who exercise their reason”; this refers to popular contemporary ideas surrounding the Enlightenment and rational, rather than superstitious, thought. However, the Declaration quickly follows this sentiment by declaring rebellion to be in “reverence for our great Creator.” There are several subsequent references to God in justification of taking up arms and preventing Parliamentary tyranny. Remember that the Congress was composed of delegates drawn from across the thirteen North American colonies. Whilst the delegates to Congress may have been united in their disapproval of British measures, they formed a heterogenous group with their own local priorities and political interests. There were several conflicting viewpoints to take into account, including those who sought to remain within the British Empire.

**Opposition to the Declaration: The Other Side of the Argument**

So far, we have considered what the sources can tell us about the aims and political beliefs of revolutionaries. However, revolutions were often contested between two (or more) competing factions; what, then, can such sources tell us about those who held opposing political beliefs? Turn now to image 256 and consider William Franklin’s letter to Lord Dartmouth, dated August 1775. As we have already considered, Franklin was a colonial official and would remain loyal to Britain, while Dartmouth was a British minister; both were on the side of Government. Within the letter we learn that the Declaration had been printed in “all” of the newspapers and that Congress’s cause had been taken up with popular enthusiasm. Thinking more widely about the ways in which we study revolutions, by taking primary sources from opposing political factions, we can both verify and disprove particular statements made by either party. In this instance, thinking back to the conflicted aims of the Congress discussed above, Franklin confirms that their aim is understood to be independence. According to Franklin, from image 256 we learn that there has been “every Preparation made for carrying on a War which is in their Power.” He continues to explain in image 257 that there is “a Dread in the minds of many people here that some of the Leaders of the People are aiming to establish a Republic.” Franklin informs Dartmouth of the “critical situation” faced by colonial officials, who were representatives of Great Britain, who have “no kind of Protection” against the leaders of the popular rebellion.

There is, according to Franklin, some hope for the British cause. Turning back to image 256 we learn that “there are many Friends of Government” within the American colonies. Note that Congress does not make any mention of these “Friends”, who would later be known as Loyalists, and think about the reasons for their absence from the Declaration. Might an acknowledgement of the strength of popular support for Britain undermine Congress’s cause in taking up arms? However, Franklin claims that these “Friends of Government” are “too scattered to venture forming themselves into a body, especially as they have no places of strength or security to resort to.” (image 256) Reflect upon why Franklin might make such an statement to a Government Minister. Is he calling upon Dartmouth to mobilise support?

Nevertheless, despite his desire to remain within the British Empire, we learn that Franklin – like the Congress – is equally opposed to Parliament’s continued taxation upon the American colonies. While he claims in image 257 that “we have thousands who would risk the loss of their lives in Defence of the old Constitution”, he makes it clear to Dartmouth that reform is necessary to harness popular support and that “some constitution should be formed for America”. As he explains, “Not that I believe there are any of the Gentlemen of the Country who would draw their swords in support of taxation by Parliament.” Thus, in contrast to Congress’s clearly articulated options – “submission to … tyranny” or “resistance by force” – there was a third option: reform from within the British Empire.

**Limitations of the Sources**

Having considered how contemporary sources can aid our understanding of the history of revolutions, it is important to briefly consider what the sources cannot tell us. These sources solely relate the experiences of white males; furthermore, as elected representatives (Congress) and colonial officials (Franklin), these men enjoyed a level of status not shared by all colonists. Conversely, these sources do not reveal any indication as to how women, black Americans (free or enslaved), indigenous peoples, labouring men, or rural families experienced the Revolution. For instance, the Declaration makes several references to the American colonists being “enslaved” by Britain, but makes no connection to enforced slave labour within the American colonies. When studying periods of revolution, therefore, it is crucial to refer to historical theory to fully familiarise yourself with the broader social and cultural contexts of the societies in which such events take place.

**Conclusion**

Using the Source Questions outlined above, these two historical documents demonstrate how contemporary texts can help us to study periods of revolution. Taking the American Revolution as an example, the sources introduce many of the key political themes and circumstances underpinning the origins of the Revolution, as well as the key protagonists and their respective stances. They also reveal how revolutionary ideas and information was spread using a variety of methods: the first, through printed material made available to a public audience; the second via private correspondence. It is important to remember that both texts were written during a period of political upheaval and uncertainty; as such the biases of the author are reflected in each source, and important details may not always be included if they were to undermine the political goal. However, when these two sources are read together, they provide a fuller and more balanced picture than if we had read them alone. While further reading is necessary to situate both texts within the broader historical context, they provide an excellent starting point for understanding how the leaders of both sides felt as the American Revolution developed. Although these sources refer specifically to the American Revolution, we can use similar questioning techniques to approach historical texts relating to other revolutions.

# **Post-evaluation questions**

1. Thinking about the questions that have been asked of the sources above, how might you apply them to other sources concerning periods of revolution?
2. Some revolutions are relatively conservative, invoking the etymological definition of the word as ‘turning’ or ‘cyclical’. Other revolutions, meanwhile, involve the (often violent) removal of a political and/or social regime. Which definition do you think is most appropriate here?
3. What can the sources tell us about the different methods used by revolutionary movements? Which of these do you think are most and least effective?
4. What are the limitations of these sources? What can they not tell us?
5. What additional sources might we need to consider before we can fully analyse the origins of a political Revolution?

**Next research steps**

1. We have used these sources to consider the outbreak of the American Revolution. What other uses could these sources have for telling us about the past? For instance, what might they tell us about early-American political culture, Anglo-American relations during the eighteenth century, colonial American cultural history, early modern transatlantic correspondence, or questions relating to the development of local colonial identities?
2. The source analysis focused directly on the American Revolution. If we were to consider these sources alongside historical texts pertaining to other revolutions, how might we link the American Revolution to other periods of revolution? Do all revolutions have the same aims?

# **Further resources**

* Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2017), 50th Anniversary edition.
* Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
* Colin Bonwick ‘The American Revolution as a Social Movement Revisited,’ *Journal of American Studies,* 20, no. 3 (1986): 355-373.
* Ruma Chopra, *Choosing Sides: Loyalists in Revolutionary America* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, Publishers, 2013).
* Timothy H. Breen, “‘Baubles of Britain’: The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century”, *Past and Present*, 119 (1988): 73-104
* “Resolves of the New York Sons of Liberty, December 15, 1773”, digitized at <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/resolves-of-the-new-york-sons-of-liberty/>.
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