

HST 201: History of the United States (Escobar Meta 21035 21036)

Home ► My courses ► Fall 2014 ► HST 201 (Escobar Meta 21035 21036) ► November 16 - November 22 ►

Forum 3 ► The American Revolution

Search forums

Forum 3

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (The American Revolution)

(The American Revolution) Next >



The American Revolution

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:28 AM

After studying the required materials, address the various questions. For purposes of encouraging discussion, you should break up your responses into SEPARATE posts.

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. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The American Revolution

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



A Radical Revolution

by Courtney Tullock - Saturday, November 15, 2014, 4:53 PM

Personally I don't think the degree of violence or social change that occurred should qualify an event as radical or non-radical. The United States broke away from the most powerful nation in Europe and began to create a society that had never been seen before. There were countless social, political, and economic changes that would transform America "into the most liberal, democratic, and modern nation in the world" (p. 145).

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The American Revolution

by James Pease - Saturday, November 15, 2014, 7:00 PM

From what I was able to grasp from the reading and the videos that were available, I feel that the american revolution was semi radical but also not in a few aspects. America was starting something all its own by creating such a democratic government. Parliament had too much power is the eyes of the people and they wanted to break away from that type

government. And it was that mind set of the people that really made the change which lead to the battles of Lexington and Concord.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Creating Something New

by Jordan Hadley - Sunday, November 16, 2014, 5:46 PM

After reading the articles and watching the web clips, I agree with professor Wood that the American Revolution was radical. The things that were created when the United States became a free country had never been seen before. In the first video clip, Jon Butler states that America was revolutionary in social context, economics, and politics; it was a modern society. In the article Wood writes "if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place - by transformations in the relationships that bound people to each other - then the American Revolution was not conservative at all (Wood 145)." I agree with this statement. After the Revolution people hardly acted like British people, they were their own new society unlike any other. They had their own democratic government and social aspects.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New

by Courtney Tullock - Monday, November 17, 2014, 10:50 AM

I couldn't agree more. Even Degler mentions social changes that took place because of the revolution. Women have slightly more power than before and some slaves are freed. I think that given the time it took for the new American government to form and start succeeding, the fact that a society like that had never existed and it completely changed the way society related to each other - no titles and upward mobility - than based on their definition of revolution i.e. producing significant and deep societal change/any resort to violence with political order to change constitution, rulers, and policies, the American Revolution was undoubtedly radical.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New

by Jordan Hadley - Wednesday, November 19, 2014, 7:58 PM

I agree! But after class on Tuesday I have decided that even though I am a whig and believe that the revolution was radical,I am starting to believe that the revolution was radical with conservative points. For instance the American

government has a president, the British have a King. America has Congress, Britain has Parliament. Is the American government really unique? Also even after the revolution, America still had unequal rights for women, and still had slavery. It took time for America to develop into the society it is today. I still stand on what I wrote but I believe there were some conservative parts to the revolution and it wasn't completely radical.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New



by Erin Gore - Monday, November 17, 2014, 10:16 PM

Exactly. A completely separate society was created free of their mother country..free to do what they want. Separating themselves from their country and declaring freedom was an extremely radical idea. Huge changes were made, and the fact that they might not have been done in as radical a fashion as some other revolutions, doesn't mean they weren't important.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New



by Sierra Howard - Tuesday, November 18, 2014, 10:02 PM

There is no question that the revolution was important! It definitely defined a turning point in not just American history, but World history as well. You figure that the first legislative assembly in this country was in 1619, and for about 140 years (give or take a few) the royal colonies were expected to remain loyal to a mother country that enacted all kinds of laws and taxes that didn't apply to their home land citizens, all the while navigating uncharted territory as settlers in the New World. It really came to a point where the generations of English that had never experienced life in England were being alienated in many ways. Taxation without representation, and the Stamp Act are supreme examples of this. I think that many events in our nation's history are indicators that independence from Great Britain was inevitable, and when you lay out the timeline of the events leading up to the revolution, it doesn't seem that the mindset of the colonists was radical in nature. Even after the battles at Lexington and Concord, the Second Continental Congress approved an Olive Branch Petition to George III "in the hope of ending the bloodshed" (p. 200, textbook).

The point being that although the outcome of the American Revolution was radical in many ways, it is not indicative of colonial objective. It is evident that many steps were taken (by Colonial Congress) to avoid the dissolution of Union between the two continents, which in my mind is a conservative approach.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New



by Erin Gore - Wednesday, November 19, 2014, 6:02 PM

That is actually a really excellent point, and reminds me of the Olive Branch Petition. They were trying to avoid full on war with Britain, and really were just trying to find a way to get everyone to agree and end things peacefully.. However, while I do agree that in this way it is conservative, I guess I see it as a radical movement just because the ideas themselves were very radical in their own right.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New



by Dalyn Stram - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 10:18 PM

The radical elements born out of the American Revolution were political in nature. Wood does state that "if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place - by transformations in the relationships that bound people to each other - then the American Revolution was not conservative at all", but he doesn't really bother to provide any examples. Can you think of any social examples? Women gained hardly any new freedoms or liberties. Some slaves in the northern colonies were freed, yes, but it would take another 100 years to free them altogether and another 150+ years for them to truly experience their civil rights. The Revolutionary Way produced some small changes in the relationship that bound people together, yes, but radical? Fundamental? Hardly. It was radical in only a political sense, not social.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Creating Something New



by Jordan Hadley - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 11:32 PM

I agree. I don't know if you saw but I changed my opinion on another post saying that there were some conservative points in the social aspect of the revolution. After the class lecture on Tuesday I do agree with you that the points like poor women rights and slavery were still occurring. Although I think the only social changes that occurred were the actions of the "founding fathers". They were gentlemen of high class, which isn't like the typical leaders of a revolution (most were violent, demanding, etc. like video 1 stated). Also another social point was the fact that the new Americans acted free and had positive attitudes. They were proud to be in America and looking forward to building a new country. No longer were they upset about British rule.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Imperial America: The Land of the Free?





by Sierra Howard - Monday, November 17, 2014, 4:24 PM

I can totally see how, at the time, the movement to liberate from England came from a conservative mind set. You have the convening of key colonial politicians, according to Carl N. Degler, "Over 69 percent of them held office under the colonial regimes, 29 percent alone holding some office of the executive branch" (p.5), speaking to the rights afforded them under Magna Carta. This was not a group of political and social defects, they were simply attempting to represent what should have been viewed as an important part of Britain's empire.

I don't completely disagree with Gordon S. Wood's argument that there were some very radical elements, and side effects to the American Revolution. For instance it is hard to argue that "The Revolution had created.....a society unlike any that had ever existed anywhere in the world" (p. 8). It certainly was uncharted territory at that time. In fact, much of what Wood states in his thesis is true, "Americans were not oppressed people; they had no crushing imperial chains to throw off" (p.7). He goes on to state the undisputable fact that "the colonists were freer..." than any other people in the world. My problem with this lies in the idea that the colonists were "equal" to their motherland counterparts, and created a rebellion for self-government and social-economic restructuring just because they could. The colonists had many incalculable barriers to navigate, perhaps the most "radical" being the lack of long term political fidelity from the mother country. As a result, over time and many embattled circumstances, structural changes were inevitable.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A Radical Revolution



by Samuel Black - Monday, November 17, 2014, 9:18 PM

I believe that the revolution was in fact a radical event, thus aligning myself with Professor Gordon Wood. I also find it very difficult to decide if I am a whig, progressive, conflict, or neo-whig, as I feel there is a view point that is missing, and that is a radical perspective. I am seeing an overlapping of view points that are closest to the truth, we had an already evolving social society and yet I don't think it really manifested and was greatly expanded upon until the Revolution. The Revolution must have been radical because of how greatly its effects are social thought process, which can be easily seen in this quote from Benjamin Franklin "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately." (<http://www.ushistory.org/franklin/quatable/quote71.htm>) said during the signing of the Declaration Of Independence. As a western culture we love to put things into neat boxes, however I propose that revolution, is complicated. After all, why else would historians be changing their mind every twenty years?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A Radical Revolution



by Daniel Leman - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 7:58 PM

In your post you mention that "the revolution must be radical due to the effect on the

social thought process". Benjamin Franklin's quote meaning that everyone must come together for this purpose. However I would think that the thought process was already coming into play. Even Mr. Wood mentions on page 9 that "the translation (social) was inevitable and would have been completed with or without the revolution". We saw this in the churches prior to the revolution. And in fact the gathering of the people probably would not have happened if people were not already on a common social ground.

Assuming that the people were already deeply socially intermingled before the revolution, would you still say that the revolution was a radical one?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A Radical Revolution



by Samuel Black - Friday, November 21, 2014, 9:19 AM

Yes, I would still say the American Revolution was radical and heres why. Yes I would agree that the social standing of the colonist had been changing for a period of time before the Revolution, that much is obvious when you hear that "America was the home of the freest people in the world" which we heard in class. Obviously this excludes slaves, indentured servants and women, but you understand what I am getting at, the minds of the colonist were definitely different then those of their English brothers. However, the American Revolution is a radical event because it allowed all of the new thoughts and ideas of a new country to be expressed and put into use. And while Joe makes a good point about how Massachusetts had already established a government very similar to the new American one, i would propose that is the scale that makes it radical. This kind of event had not occurred on a similar scale ever before.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Foundation of today:A Radical Revolution.



by Kaitlin Silva - Monday, November 17, 2014, 9:52 PM

I find myself leaning more towards the view point of Gordon Wood and categorizing myself as a Whig. I believe that the American Revolution falls straight in the category of being strict. It had various amounts of "societal change". As Wood puts it, "They did not kill one another; they did not devour themselves. There was no reign of terror in the American Revolution." (Wood page 7) Like he stated "If we measure radicalism of revolutions by the degree of social misery or economic depravation suffered, or by the number of people killed or manor houses burned, then this conventional emphasis on the conservatism of the American Revolution becomes true enough." I feel like an opinion on a subject like this is solely based on where you stand when it comes to what a revolution truly means and how you define it, which is why I see it so easy for historians to go back-and-forth on this topic, changing viewpoints often. Like I stated above I think that a revolution has an outcome of societal change. Before the revolution the New World was anglicized, and afterward it became the foundation we know, and have grown from today. Our roots as a nation, our morals as a country stem from the society prosperity that was gained from the separation from England. In my opinion this revolution was far from a conservative movement and

was extremely radical. "The revolution not only changed the culture of Americans... Most important it made the interests and prosperity of ordinary people-their pursuit of happiness-the goal of society and government."(Wood pg.9)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The American Revolution



by Erin Gore - Monday, November 17, 2014, 10:09 PM

I agree with Gordon Wood's argument the most. I don't think violence is what defines a revolution. Just because other revolutions may have been louder and bloodier, doesn't mean they were any more important or influential. Socially, there were extremely radical changes and things being done that years before people would have never thought of. The colonies were revolting against the mother country, which is not conservative in the slightest. "If we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place-by transformations in the relationships that bound people to each other-then the American Revolution was not conservative at all; on the contrary, it was as radical and as revolutionary as any other in history." (pg 144).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The American Revolution



by Dalyn Stram - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 10:25 PM

What social examples can you provide that support your claim that the the revolution was socially radical? I agree it was radical politically, but socially?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Conservative at heart, elements of radicalism



by Dalyn Stram - Monday, November 17, 2014, 10:17 PM

I find myself aligning with Degler in that the American Revolution was, in essence, a conservative movement. First off, I would describe myself as more of a loose constructionist. I don't believe a revolution has to produce significant or deep societal change to be considered important or revolutionary.

While I do believe the American Revolution was more of a conservative movement, I believe it had radical elements also, especially politically. I adhere to what Degler promotes in that the social structure of America remained largely the same after the Revolution as it was before. Degler provides a wealth of stats that show the people in power before were overwhelmingly the same people in power after. Power didn't change hands. The mentality of Americans prior to the revolution was already one of freedom and relative independence to rule themselves how they wished - to an extent. They already believed they were the freest people on Earth. Upward mobility was already present, and Americans enjoyed great freedoms and little, to no, oppression. I believe these mentalities and ideals were what made the revolution even possible at all. Wood mentions numerous times in his article that

the revolution "transformed American society" or "created a society fundamentally different" or "fundamentally altered social relationships." While these claims sound great, unfortunately, I found he didn't back them up with much evidence. Were the conditions of women fundamentally altered? No. There were slight improvements, yes, but fundamental? I don't think so. How about blacks and slaves? Again, no. It would take another 100 years for America to finally free the slaves. And when it comes to white men, upward mobility was already available. The average male already experienced a relatively large amount of freedom. Their lot didn't see a drastic change after the revolution. And when it came to power, it didn't change hands. To me, I see the colonies prior to the revolution and I see a relatively free place. Post revolution, I see more or less the same thing - at least from a social standpoint. There were slight social changes which occurred due to the revolution, but to call it "radical" is unwarranted in my opinion. However, I do believe that politically, the revolution was much more radical. A country and political system would arise out of the revolution that was largely unseen in the world. To me, what arose politically was radical, while socially, the revolution was much more conservative. I think it is important to be able to separate these two different aspects of the revolution, and recognize each one for its specific peculiarities.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Radical means to a radical end



by Alexander Taylor - Monday, November 17, 2014, 11:49 PM

The American Revolution was definitely radical. Widespread violence and sweeping social change led to the creation of a system of government that was anything but typical. There had never been a successful republic that had survived for any significant amount of time to base our new government on. Even a written constitution was quite an anomaly at that time. It's astounding to me that we were able to come up with a system that worked when we were essentially playing it by ear at the time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A Brand New Start



by Benjamin Kelly - Tuesday, November 18, 2014, 2:07 AM

After going over the materials, I tend to side with Professor Wood and agree that the American Revolution was radical. Separating themselves from their country and declaring freedom was a very radical idea that was not common back then. The drastic changes to a nation and culture after the revolution, shows how breaking free finally allowed the U.S. to be who they wanted to be. This single event helped shape the United States to be what it is today. What makes this such a difficult question, is how one views what a revolution is. I don't think that the amount of violence really defines a revolution and in my eyes it's more of how one government was overthrown, another was put in place, and how society changed because of it. Whether you think the American Revolution was conservative or radical, its clear how much of an impact the free thinking colonists had on what we call America today. If they had not been so radical at the time and taken more of a conservative approach who knows how far they would have gotten and how much of an impact it would have had.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The American Revolution



by Jackson Baker - Tuesday, November 18, 2014, 10:28 AM

Based on my understanding the revolution was radical. Gordon Wood discussed how w separated from England, created our own society and became the most liberal or free nation at that time. Our founding fathers created the blue print of what a federalist government needs to be in order to be successful.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The American Revolution



by Ronald Howard - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 11:00 PM

"Based on my understanding the revolution was radical."

If you think the American Revolution was radical you should look up information about the Reign of Terror during the French revolution. 16,594 executed by guillotine. That is what I call a radical revolution.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reign_of_Terror

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Radical and Conservative Idead Shaped America



by Shaun Tichenor - Tuesday, November 18, 2014, 12:01 PM

After watching the video clips i agree that the American revolution was radical from a political standpoint. Wanting to sepearate away from the most powerful contry in the world knowing it wouldnt be easy is completely a liberal and radical idea. so i guess you could say that america was radical through the revolutuion and it was eventually founded upon radical movements. But much of the country through this time period was conservative. if you look at america before the revolution and everyone was pretty much free in their own regards. and after the revolution, although slightly, womens and slaves rights didnt get much better either. so socially the nation was very conservative in my opinion.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Both sides have strong arguments



by Benjamin Kelly - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 3:40 AM

After considering the question a little more, I feel like not everything about the American Revolution was radical and some aspects were conservative. Although there were many drastic changes after the Revolution, there were also things that didn't change. In a social

view, blacks were treated the same and still remained in slavery even after the war. Also the way women were treated, was relatively the same. These are two major social aspects of the time period that for the most part were unchanged and stayed that way for quite a long time. When talking about the government the way things were ruled was also very similar. Kings have much in common with presidents and parliament has similarities to what congress is. Even though they are not the same thing at all, it's hard not to recognize there likeness. With all of that said, I still stand by my initial opinion that the American Revolution was radical but previously didn't acknowledge or really understand the other side of the argument. The fact that America broke free from British rule and became the country that they wanted to be is very bold idea that has to be considered as radical. Both sides have good points, but I think that the argument for the Revolution being radical is much stronger.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A strictly conservative revolution

by Daniel Leman - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 7:37 PM

After reading the articles I have determined the revolution was a conservative movement, based on a strict construction. On page 2 of the reading Carl Degler talks about the separation of church and state, which we still see evidence of into the 20th century. On page 3 he talks about the fact that over 75% of politicians post revolution, were holding various offices before 1774. Even on page 8, Mr. Wood mentions the fact that "white Americans were not an oppressed people." These are just some of the indications that show that the revolution was more of a small stepping stone towards actual progress. But as for actual change? I speculate that aside from a mere feeling of freedom from British oppression, things were virtually business as usual for the average citizen.

Based on this I believe I come from a Progressive viewpoint. I think the basis for the actual revolution was due to simple political differences, for which revolution was the only solution. The fact is that there was not huge economical disorder, or genocide, and that "white Americans were not an oppressed people" (Gordon page 8). The need, and causes were comparatively small to both previous and future revolutions.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A strictly conservative revolution

by Jordan Hadley - Thursday, November 20, 2014, 8:56 PM

Separation of church and state is a radical movement isn't it? In England, Catholics and Protestants were killed based on the ruler at the time. Some of the first settlers in America were made up of the Separatists from the Church of England. Of course not all of the settlers left England because of the church, but this has to be a radical point doesn't it?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A strictly consertive revolution



by Sierra Howard - Friday, November 21, 2014, 10:06 PM

You are talking about a generation of English settlers that never stepped foot on their "homeland". They were born into a country that was a melting pot of cultures and religion and naturally evolved into a society that acknowledged the fundamental differences in their beliefs. Back in England, there was religious dictatorship that floundered back and forth. I believe that being completely removed from that chaos, they were better able to see what wasn't working. That sounds like an evolutionary process to me, and although radical through the eyes of a society that has not yet evolved (Great Britain), it seems like the natural next step, and certainly not the basis of the war.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A strictly consertive revolution



by Sierra Howard - Friday, November 21, 2014, 10:33 PM

I just want to clarify that there are definitely radical concepts that emerged as a result of our country's independence, but given the two hundred year scope of time that we are assessing didn't just go from A to Z, it evolved. Anything can seem radical in hindsight, but with regard to the American Revolution, how many generations had passed since the original settlers?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A strictly consertive revolution



by Samuel Black - Friday, November 21, 2014, 9:52 AM

"business as usual" and "not a huge economic disorder" as grounds for the Revolution not being radical I find to be rather weak and not correct. I was pretty sure there was an crisis but I decided to do a little more research on the topic. Remember that the colonial dollars were becoming steadily worthless, which did no favors for the economy. Also the British raided our ships, crushing our trade and British law prohibited the sugar colonies in the Caribbean from trading with the new country greatly depleting America's options for a successful trade route. "A flood of cheap British manufactured imports that sold cheaper than comparable American-made goods made the post-war economic slump worse."
(<http://www.ushistory.org/us/14d.asp>) Therefore, I would say that there was a economic crisis.

I also propose that something can be radical without needing an "economic disorder, or genocide".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Radical and Conservative



by Courtney Tullock - Friday, November 21, 2014, 10:48 AM

In light of class discussions I think- small picture- the revolution was radical. There were numerous changes that took place socially, economically, and politically. However, big picture wise- it was more conservative. It was radical for colonials to break away from their mother country and attempt to start a new government that could satisfy its people. However, the final product shows how conservative the people truly were. As Joe said, they went from a king to a president, parliament to congress, etc. So, I think the revolution was a conservative movement in the end.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Radical and Conservative



by Ronald Howard - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 10:52 PM

"As Joe said, they went from a king to a president, parliament to congress, etc. So, I think the revolution was a conservative movement in the end."

I think you can argue that these changes were radical for the time period. Going from a parliament government to a democratic republic is certainly huge risk that many people would consider radical for the times. Especially because there was nobody else on the planet that had attempted this style of democratic government before.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The american revolution with radical Ideals



by Jackson Baker - Friday, November 21, 2014, 4:36 PM

After revisiting the information i need to make a slight modification to my prior claim that the american revolution was a radical revolution. It was radical ideologically and in its start. The American revolution was radical in its start due to the fact that it was the first colony to break away from mother country. They separated and formed a society that was more free and diverse than any where else in the world at this point in history. So in some senses yes the american revolution was radical.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Politically non radical Revolution



by Jackson Baker - Friday, November 21, 2014, 4:50 PM

The american was not radical in the way that our founding fathers set up the central government. They picked and chose pieces of preexisting governments and combined them to form the United States federal Government. For example look at the President, a clear take away from the kings and queens in Europe granted he has far less power and term limits. The first issue in congress that came up was what to call him, names Like his holiness were thrown around during this debate. Also Look at congress, Congress is a

bicameral system with the departments named The house and senate. The house is based off Population and the senate has two representatives from each state. This is painfully similar to the preexisting House of Lords and commons found in Great Britain.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Politically non radical Revolution



by Benjamin Kelly - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 11:25 PM

You have some good points and I definitely agree with you about the government's differences, but I tend to think the Revolution was a radical movement. Events like the Boston Tea Party were acts of civil disobedience. The Americans were trying to show the British that they did not own them and in the end, they broke free. But I do agree there were some conservative aspects.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Peaceful Revolution



by Jackson Baker - Friday, November 21, 2014, 5:02 PM

The American was radical Radical from the stand point that is set up a system in which a non violent shift of political power could occur unlike our European counterparts.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Fighting For a Cause



by Benjamin Kelly - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 8:13 PM

The Revolution was the beginning of when America really became the USA we know today. The America that is built on freedom and strives for equality and fairness. Although you can see that, that has not always been the case, it's what our founding fathers attempted to instill in our people. Professor Woods even said that "It was the Revolution, more than any other single event, that made America into the most liberal, democratic, and modern nation in the world." You can even say that the Revolution relied on the radicalism of some groups, particularly to inspire the continental soldiers. The U.S. was out-manned, out-equipped, and faced horrible conditions the entire time, but never gave up because they were fighting for an important cause. To inspire that many people to keep going and keep fighting is an incredible feat and in my eyes can only be explained as radical soldiers fighting for their freedom.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

A revolution that changed everything - YES





by Ronald Howard - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 9:03 PM

Before the American revolution, I believe Americans had an adopted opinion of the definition of freedom based on their country of origin. The events that took place during the American revolution forged the future of what freedom meant in America. The declaration of independence for example, was the first time the idea that "all men are created equal" was set on a stage to be taken seriously. That simple statement that we take for granted today, I believe, sparked the idea that slavery is unacceptable, as well as implanted the idea that needing "royal blood" to have influence in your state is a bunch of crap. Therefore, the American revolution was a lot more than just a battle of politics and power allocation. It redefined Americans understanding of freedom and pushed forward the ongoing theme of individualism.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A free peoples revolution



by Ronald Howard - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 10:42 PM

When describing a revolution, one typically assumes unbearable oppression and disdain for the current state of events which would lead to radical action taken by the oppressed people. In the case of the American Revolution, there was limited bloodshed and Americans during that time were arguably the most free peoples on earth. "There should no longer be no doubt about it: the white American colonists were not an oppressed people; they had no crushing imperial chains to throw off. In fact, the colonists knew they were freer, more equal, more prosperous, and less burdened... than any part of mankind in the eighteenth century."(Gordon S. Wood p143) With that said, I believe the American revolution was not radical. Although you could argue America came out vastly different after the revolution, compared to other revolutions that have taken place around the world, America's was conservative.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Conservative radical event?



by Kaitlin Silva - Saturday, November 22, 2014, 11:49 PM

The more I read on and take a look at others opinions I notice myself looking at the revolution in a different matter. It's radical in a sense that yes, it was an extreme change to break away from England, but did we really get that far? Most of our government systems are similar to other countries but with a little twist. Like Jackson Baker stated before "For example look at the president, a clear take away from the Kings and Queens of England...". There was a lack of social change for minorities; Women and African Americans. The question to me is, is this change of government and lack of social change really a good enough reason to claim the American Revolution as a radical event? As of now, I believe that the American Revolution was more conservative than I thought due to Americas heavy rooting in the government norms of England. Revising another countries political system is not a radical change, it's a conservative one.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

[< Previous \(The American Revolution\)](#)

[\(The American Revolution\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

 Moodle Docs for this page

