

HST 201: History of United States ONLINE

F17 (Escobar 20886)

Home ► My courses ► HST 201 ONLINE F17 (Escobar 20886) ► Week 9 ► Week 9 Forum ►
The Revolution - Conservative or Radical



Week 9 Forum

The Revolution - Conservative or Radical

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Using the Historian and Video Materials

Display replies in nested form



Move this discussion to ...



Move

Pin



The Revolution - Conservative or Radical

by Joe Escobar - Sunday, November 19, 2017, 9:43 AM

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 Revolution

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Yes, the revolution was a conservative movement

by Peter Brasier - Tuesday, November 21, 2017, 11:05 AM

This question must be broken own into two parts: when time is the revolution, and what is your definition of the revolution.

Doing a quick pole at work I asked some of my fellow employees working night shift at the hospital when they thought the American revolution was. The majority answered from the point that the Declaration of Independence was formed to the point that the Treaty of Paris is signed. This sets the time from 1776-1783.

Now to understand the events that lead to 1776 we would have to look at key times like the taxes and laws that cause some of the grievances mentioned in the declaration of independence.

I like to follow the events that Deglar mentioned in his paper on the subject relating to the collapse of churches that lead to the separation of church and state, the economic and social class of the men who started the revolution, and finally the stance that each state had from before to during and finally after the revolution.

I feel the best support Deglar had was the following passage: "Though economic grievances seemed to have played a negligible role in bringing on the Revolution. {} The economic stimulus afforded by the war demands and the freedom from English mercantilistic restrictions which victory made permanent provided adventuresome American merchants and entrepreneurs with wide opportunities for gaining new markets and new sources of profit." (Carl N. Deglar Yes, pg 125)

This tells me that through the revolution great profit and money was had, this is supported in the view of the founding fathers after the revolution. One point that could be added to Deglar's paper is the few years after the revolution including the talk of how to consolidate money in the form of national debt, the formation of the federal bank and the response of the people to the first federal tax in the whiskey rebellion.

I feel that the whiskey rebellion shows the most of the separation of the beliefs of the founding fathers and the general public. According to the video "GW Government," the people believed that the revolution was fought for the right to be tax free, while George Washington countered stating that the revolution was fought for the right of taxation with representation".

In closing remarks, I feel that the revolution started as a group of rich men trying to keep their money secure and understand where the money is going and why, including having a voice in its use. This idea that these groups of men started planted the seed for the America of today. We see this progression happen as we get key presidents including Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Theodore Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, JFK, Ronald Reagan. As these people assume office and sign in laws they shape America. making it different but similar to the America that was won in 1783

Sincerely,

Peter Brasier

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

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



The Radical American Revolution

by Maribel Frickey - Tuesday, November 21, 2017, 2:17 PM

To be completely honest this has been the hardest forum question so far; I read the material provided and can see the reasoning with both stances. One stance doesn't stand out to me as more sound. However, with that said I had to pick a side and back it up with my reasoning for it. I think that I agree with Gordon S. Wood's stance that the American Revolution was not a conservative movement but instead a radical one. "We as Americans like to think of our revolution as not being radical; indeed, most of the time we consider it downright conservative." (Wood 130) Wood's goes on to state how this revolution was different from the others in how it doesn't resemble the other revolutions (French and Russian) in which property

was destroyed, people killed and everything was turned upside down. Another example given by Wood is how the revolution wasn't about a fight between rich and poor, the poor didn't overthrow the rich. However, the way people interacted with each other changed, social relationships changed. "The revolution did more than legally create the United States; it transformed American society." (Wood 132) The revolutionaries also wanted a society that prized merit over rank. A world where even the voice of the poorest person was heard, and they had the ability to rise above what they were born within. I will be adding on more later this week after watching the rest of the material and see if my opinion changes.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



That one line in the book

by Peter Brasier - Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 12:24 AM

I too had a difficult time deciding whether the American revolution was a change for the rich or a change for the whole. Looking at the pamphlet I think the decision comes down to the first definition. What is the definition of revolution? According to the pamphlet; revolution has two definitions: strict construction or loose construction. Strict perceive revolution as producing significant and deep societal change. Loose define the term as any resort to violence withing a political order to change its constitution, rulers, or policies. (Was the American revolution a conservative movement 120). The pamphlet goes on to state that the American Revolution was a loose revolution due to the war that was fought for freedom, if this is true than Degler is correct in stating Yes the American revolution was a conservative movement, because if it changed anything societal would be a strict construction of revolution.

With that being said I found one line in the text book that always caused me to pause, it is on page 149 talking about the Albany congress and Benjamin Franklin infomos Join, or Die. The last line of that chapter states "Despite the French threat, they were not ready to put aside their differences and unite. They did not yet see themselves as "Americans"."

The they that the book is referring to are the colonial representatives from the colonies; these are the people that make the decision for all the colonies, there were the people whose position would latter lead to the formation of America. These people, who would start the revolution 21 years latter, were not yet Americans. It made me question when was "America" America?

Sincerely,

Peter Brasier

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Picking sides

by Madelyn Ball - Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 11:35 AM

I like your point about the strict and loose constructionist. As I was reading I forgot about the difference in their definitions of a revolution. This may sway my opinion from siding with Gordon Wood to siding with Carl Degler. I agree this is a difficult forum. Hopefully the other materials will help me find my position better.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: That one line in the book

by Maribel Frickey - Thursday, November 23, 2017, 10:50 AM

You make a good point on how the colonists didn't consider themselves Americans quite yet. If I remember correctly one of the videos we watched in the past weeks talked about when colonists began to consider themselves Americans and no longer British. I'm sorry that I can't remember the exact video so that I can quote it.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: The Radical American Revolution

by Mason Peckels St.onge - Saturday, November 25, 2017, 9:42 PM

When I first read the material I was thinking the same thing. I couldn't decide on which position I would choose. However, I decided that Degler's analysis made the most sense. I think this because the revolution was brought on by the British. They pushed their colonies over the edge. After years of abuse in the forms of taxation without representation, lying about conflicts and especially impressment during the second revolution. They really had no choice in the long run. And the people who generally were loyalist were people who benefited financially from the British. So, with these things in mind I had to go with Degler and say that it was a yes it was a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Radical American Revolution

by Desiree Mantey - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 2:46 PM

Although you had a tough time picking a side I think you did a good job of picking the side with the best evidence to support its claim. It is important to look at the quote about how the revolution did more than legally create the United States because it did. The revolution ended Britain's at times tyrannical reign over the colonies. They no longer had to deal with unfair taxes and tariffs and became a country governed for the people, by the people. The birth of democracy.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Agreeing to disagree

by Madelyn Ball - Tuesday, November 21, 2017, 8:51 PM

The Revolution had always seemed very conservative to me. Yet, when I think of conservative I think of people extremely set in their conservative ways. This is not the case with the American Revolution, I am sure there were people out there wanting everything to stay how it traditionally was, but the revolution created a lot of changing. Therefore when talking about the

idea that the American Revolution was strictly conservative I would have to disagree with Carl Degler, but his point about the upper-middle class having more to do with the revolution than the working man I agree with. (Which had surprised me from reading in our textbook I had believed differently) In the end, I think Gordon Wood won me over. On page 132, "-Social relationships- the way people were connected one to another- were changed, and decisively so. By the early years of the nineteenth century the Revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth hundred." This to me shows how the Revolution was a radical movement even if it was ran by upper-middle class men.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: Agreeing to disagree

by Maribel Frickey - Thursday, November 23, 2017, 11:12 AM

You make some good points. When I first started reading the material provided I had the same thing in mind about how I had always thought of the revolution as a conservative movement and not truly radical. Because it my mind a Radical Revolution would look resemble the French Revolution and it didn't. But slowly I began to see that I may not have been exactly right. I believe with the evidence provided it kind of made me side with Wood's stance.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



No I do not believe that the revolution was not conservative

by Trevor Newton - Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 1:01 PM

I agree more with Gordon S. Wood's argument that the revolution was not a conservative movement but a radical one which was not really considered by most historians who just focused on the fact that America had just fought in the Revolutionary War where they successfully overthrew their British rulers and established a new government. This is all true but unfortunately the amount of social and political change that took place is overlooked. Gordon makes a great point right at the start that immediately got my attention. He stated that, "We Americans like to think of our revolutions as not being radical . . . It certainly does not appear to resemble the revolutions of other nations in which people were killed, property was destroyed, and everything was turned upside down (Issue 6, page 130). This is a very true statement in fact when I first read over the question of whether or not the Revolution was a conservative movement I immediately said yes, but given the way that Gordon worded his text makes me realize that I was doing exactly what he said overlooking the fact that the revolution was a radical event and much social change was brought about because of it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: No I do not believe that the revolution was not conservative

by Maribel Frickey - Friday, November 24, 2017, 7:32 PM

I did pretty much the same thing in thinking at first that the American Revolution wasn't radical since it didn't resemble other revolutions which I would consider radical. The quote which you used from Gordon also made me think and reconsider my view on the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: The Revolution - Conservative or Radical

by Joseph Maricle - Monday, December 4, 2017, 9:27 AM

Please read the PDF. I'm posting this via mobile.

The American revolution is and was perhaps the most debated of our country's military actions. Just who drove it? The rich or the poor? Author Carl N Degler believes it was the upper class. I tend to agree. According to Degler, 21 percent of the fighting militia came from important and influential families of the time. Not to mention it was merchant traders and landowners who funded the war. The military training came at the cost of volunteers with military experience, who most of which had risen through social ranks due to achievements in the line of duty. That is not however the whole as the lower class made the majority of the militia and defence forces. However this too is not the whole as the members of Congress and state had been comprised upper class or otherwise wealthy men. These same men put forth into effect the government that would become the one we know today. In this one's opinion the revolution could indeed be called a conservative one. In fact the first president George Washington had allied himself with Hamilton, who helped found the Republican party that know is called conservative. The rest as they say is history.

(Edited by Joe Escobar - original submission Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 1:43 PM)



American Revolution.pdf

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Revolution - Conservative or Radical

by Mason Peckels St.onge - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 9:20 PM

I really agree with you on this one. Degler does a great analysis of this. He describes how the war was started, who drove it and who created the government after the war. The reasons you stated are the reasons why I too believe the revolution was a conservative movement. I also think that if the majority of Americans didnt want a revolution, it wouldnt of succeeded. Thus, making me believe even more that it was conservative.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Deglers analysis

by Mason Peckels St.onge - Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 6:48 PM

After being this far into the term, I have thought a lot about the beginning of America and the people that built it. After observing several conflicting stories about events of the revolution in our text and videos; I find myself wondering if some of these things are even true. Nontheless, we are historians, and right now our job is to analyze our texts and readings.

I was really interested in Deglers analysis. In fact, he discussed many things I was wondering. I especially liked his analysis of the pre and post revolution political party members. He says that practically all of the members that held office before the war, held office after the war, and that many of them were well educated and wealthy men. These were not the peasants, farmers or shop owners that they were representing. I also liked his point of how the land was distributed after the loyalists left America. He says that thousands to millions of acres were distributed to not the working class, but to people who already owned land, and the very wealthy. This just shows how different of a revolution this was.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: Deglers analysis

by Peter Brasier - Thursday, November 23, 2017, 11:28 AM

I also found this line of thought to be interesting. It seemed to me that the group that benefited the most out of the change were the people that help start the revolution. I found a few things in the text that seemed to support this concept that I have mentioned in other post. On thing that I wanted to look at is who started the son's of libirty and what people performed the boston tea party; because, one of our videos mentioned that during the war against britan, in the american revolution, Geroge Washington used spies and espinoge to discover and weaken the british troops. Do you thing that out book has any information that helps support Deglars case?

Sincerely,

Peter Brasier

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: Deglers analysis

by Mason Peckels St.onge - Saturday, November 25, 2017, 9:30 PM

Yes, in Deglers analysis he says "surely these 55 men are important patriot leaders and presumably the chief beneficiares of the Revolution they advocated."(pg. 126) and in our text they include that President Washington "Filled posts in his cabinet with familiar faces"(pg. 141). I found this interesting, and I also thinks it makes sense. Most of these men already had the upper hand by being born into wealth or getting a formal education at a college. So the fact that they were part of the workings of the revolution and benefited from being apart of it dosnt surprise me. They came together and fought for what they believed would be a truly great America. They worked tirelessly to defend themselves and defeat the British; however, many lives were lost due to their actions. Do you think it can be said that they benefited to much financially due to the revolution because they put so many lives in danger?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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

Re: Deglers analysis



by Marla Rogers - Friday, November 24, 2017, 1:47 PM

Though not really relating to this particular topic, I completely agree with your sentiment that it is hard to truly know what is fact and what has been embellished. I find myself constantly thinking that while watching videos and reading the text. Can we really trust that the records kept in the past are from an unbiased view? Somehow I feel like the only way we would ever know what is truly fact is to hop in a time machine and watch the events unfold for ourselves 😊

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0



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



Re: Deglers analysis

by Trevor Newton - Friday, November 24, 2017, 11:42 PM

I definitely agree with you, like I said before, we tend to overlook some of the facts being presented and sometimes in history classes some of the history presented to us growing up isn't always accurate. It's hard to tell what's real and what isn't, but I agree with the fact that we have this image of poor, peasant, farmers. Deglers points opened my eyes to that as well which ultimately changed my mind about radical vs conservative.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



The Radical Revolution

by Marla Rogers - Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 8:29 PM

I believe that in many ways, the American Revolution was a radical one. It may not have seemed particularly liberal at the time, but their values were all rooted in radical ideas. As Gordon Wood said, "far from remaining monarchical, hierarchy-ridden subjects on the margin of civilization, Americans had become, almost overnight, the most liberal, the most democratic, the most commercially minded, and the most modern people in the world."

In the introduction, they describe a liberal revolution as consisting of a prominent social change. If the colonists moved from a monarchical society, fought a war to completely remove themselves from the crown, and created a fully egalitarian society--how could that possibly not be interpreted as a radical revolution?

Americans changed everything about what was previously known in British life. They were creating a place where everyone has the potential to succeed. Even the nation's third president, Thomas Jefferson, reduced the number of formal balls and dinners. He didn't wear a wig and wore old, home-spun clothes in an attempt to not create the appearance of being in an upper class (Liberty, Equality, Power pg. 263).

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: The Radical Revolution

by Maribel Frickey - Thursday, November 23, 2017, 11:02 AM

I completely agree with your post. Their actions were in fact radical since they(Patriots) created a new form of government and the fact that they did separated themselves from the British crown. In a sense, they were now completely different people from the British

even from the first colonists, who in their time were fully subjects of the crown and wouldn't have dreamed of having it any other way.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Re: The Radical Revolution

by Marla Rogers - Friday, November 24, 2017, 1:52 PM

Exactly! As another student Peter Brassier said in a post above, when Franklin was attempting to introduce the Albany Congress, the colonists didn't agree with it because they didn't see themselves as Americans. But as time went on, they slowly started to separate from the crown and truly became Americans. This was a very radical societal change in every sense of the term!

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Re: The Radical Revolution

by Madelyn Ball - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 12:59 PM

I love the way this was said, but after reading the perspectives of other historians I began to think. They did go through a lot of change, but who was to say this was a radical change. These may have been concepts some of the colonists had already been pursuing, and the revolution gave them the chance to make these concepts into a reality. Do either of you feel the same? Or do you still see this as radical?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Re: The Radical Revolution

by Mason Peckels St.onge - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 12:55 PM

I think the points you are making are very true. I find myself going back and forth on the question. I find their to be both good points for both sides. In leaning more to that it was not radical, but your points are very true. Their are many radical aspects of the revolution. Now that I think about it, its difficult to say that a reolution couldnt be radical. You have to be radical to revolt.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



The Revolution: radical by definition

by Desiree Mantey - Wednesday, November 22, 2017, 9:30 PM

The strict construction definition of the term revolution is; producing significant and deep societal change (Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? Pg.120).

Conservative: holding to traditional attitudes and values and cautious about change or innovation (www.meriam-webster.com).

After reading the title knowing these definitions the first question that came to my mind was; how can a revolution by definition be conservative? Even by using the other definition of revolution, "any resort to violence within a political order to change it's constitution, rulers, or policies (Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? Pg.120) It would appear that a revolution is not in any way conservative. Without using any evidence outside of the actual definitions this appears to be a red flag for me.

Carl N. Degler said, "Like fabled genii grown too big to be imprisoned in their bottles, wars and revolutions frequently take on a life of their own irrespective of their first purposes." (Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? YES Pg.122) Just because some of the changes brought about by the revolution weren't foreseen that does not mean that it was a conservative revolution. It still brought about radical change.

The next point that Carl Degler made that interested me was about the separation of church and state. "Although doctrine repudiates any connection between the state and the church, the American version has little in common with the practice in countries like revolutionary France, Mexico, and atheistic Soviet Russia." (Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? YES Pg. 123) Although informational, what the separation of church and state looks like in other nations isn't applicable to this situation. The United States did not win their freedom from France, Mexico, or Soviet Russia. The only country that the United States constitution should be compared to is that of Britain. And in comparison to Britain the United States laws on separation of church and state were radical and once again by definition, not conservative.

The last point I'm going to make looks at the phrase, "all men are created equal". Carl Degler said that "it is wrong to assume, however, that they mere inclusion of that phrase in the declaration worked the mighty influence implied in the foregoing examples" (Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? YES Pg.124). I vehemently disagree with this statement. This statement became something that was used for centuries and is still used today in this country to defend the treatment of all people fairly. Although American's may have been more free than any other nation before the revolution, that doesn't mean that this statement didn't promote equality in a more radical way during and after the revolution. As a person of color I respect this statement almost more than any other in the entire Constitution because it states clearly that no matter the color of my skin we are all equal. It helped move towards fairer treatment of slaves and former slaves and eventually the Emancipation Proclamation. Without this statement in the Constitution people of color could have much more easily been denied equal treatment. In my mind, that makes it anything but conservative.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: The Revolution: radical by definition

by Marla Rogers - Friday, November 24, 2017, 1:56 PM

Absolutely. Even though some arguments claim that people of color and women still were not created equal directly following the revolution, it still set the stage for that to come in the future. Revolutions don't happen overnight.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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

Re: The Revolution: radical by definition



by Maribel Frickey - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 2:13 PM

I agree with what you have stated and even though not everyone wasn't free in the beginning it didn't mean that that wouldn't eventually happen following the radical ideology of the revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Revolution: radical by definition

by Trevor Newton - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 10:04 PM

I absolutely agree with your statement. You providing a definition of conservative confirmed my stand in that the revolution was a radical movement because in all reality we didn't want to stay in tradition. That was the point of breaking free from the British rule and wanting to create our own system of faith and practice. Even with the statement "all men were created equal", ended up bringing a social change in the lives of African Americans and women. So that within itself proves that the revolution was radical.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



The American revolution was a radical event

by Trevor Newton - Friday, November 24, 2017, 11:29 PM

As I stated in my previous post the American revolution is often considered to be conservative because we usually measure the amount of radicalism in an event by the amount of social misery or by the number of people killed or houses burned but the revolution wasn't like that. We have to measure the amount of radicalism by the amount of social change that place (issue 6, page 131).

The American revolution was definitely different then other revolutions but it was no less radical and no less social than the others. Most people in the 18th century couldn't conceive society apart from government. So when Anglo-American radicals talked in what seemed to be only political terms purifying a corrupt constitution, eliminating couriers, fighting off crown power, and most important becoming republicans (issue 6, page 132).

Americans revolutionaries appear to be absorbed in changing only governments and not societies but in destroying monarchy and establishing republics they were changing their society as well as their governments which resulted in widespread radical, social change.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The American revolution: Breaking the mold

by Desiree Mantey - Sunday, November 26, 2017, 2:29 PM

Who decides what the "appropriate" circumstances are for a revolution? People tend to constantly compare the American revolution to that of revolutions that had occurred before it. "The social conditions that generically are supposed to lie behind all revolutions- poverty and economic deprivation- were not present in colonial America." (Pg 131 The Radicalism of the American Revolution) But America was different. Isn't that the point? It didn't follow the reasons for revolution that others in the past have- it was a new country, with new thinking,

with new government. Wasn't this the reason for breaking away from Britain in the first place? Colonials were tired of others telling them how to think and act and even who to worship. So why should it be a surprise that they would follow their own rules when it came to starting a revolution? It was time for American's to set their own laws and regulations for how things were done and this included what they were willing to deal with from Britain and what they weren't. The American revolution also set the bar for what future revolutions could look like. Another quote from Gordon Wood was, "Colonists knew they were freer, more equal, more prosperous, and less burdened with cumbersome feudal and monarchical restraints than any other part of mankind in the 18th century" (Pg 131 The Radicalism of the American Revolution). However, knowing this and still going forward with the revolution broke the mold for what a revolution could look like. As said by Gordon Wood, this "does not mean that colonial society was not susceptible to revolution" (Pg 131 The Radicalism of the American Revolution).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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

◀ [Using the Historian and Video Materials](#)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

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

HST 201 ONLINE F17 (Escobar 20886)