HST 201: History of United States F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004)

Search forums

Forum 3

The Revolution

• Subscribe

The Revolution ▶

Display replies in nested form | Move this discussion to ... | Move | Pin

The Revolution
by Joe Escobar - Friday, November 10, 2017, 7:33 PM

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

A Radical Movement
by Alexxis Romo - Friday, November 10, 2017, 8:43 PM

Carl Degler makes some interesting points on why he thinks that the revolution was a conservative movement, however I can't say that I argue with him. I don't argue with him, because he doesn't provide much insight other than the separation of church and state and a little bit on land ownership and wealthy men finding ways of attaining their wealth. I feel like there isn't enough to justify his claim.

I don't like how Wood suggests that the American revolution was almost of n significance. Yes, he states 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" (133). However, he makes

comments like, “the American revolution wasn’t unique; it was only different” (133). He also states that, “America, it is said, would have emerged into the modern world as a liberal, democratic, and capitalistic society even without the revolution” (133). Wood makes interesting comments about the revolution but mostly just comes to the point that the American revolution really didn’t spark any social change, almost making it seem like it wasn’t really of great importance.

Wood confuses me with his claims, and I’m confused on whether he is using these points to illustrate and justify the fact that he thinks the revolution was more radical than a conservative movement. If this is his intention, I have to say that so far, I agree with Wood’s claim that it was more of a radicalization even though there are some things that really confuse me in his explanation.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

No, the revolution was far reaching
by Lloyd Higgins - Saturday, November 11, 2017, 8:04 PM

Due to the sheer amount of religious influence in American documents such as the Constitution and Bill of Rights, it should be no surprise that the American Revolution was inspired in a place where radical change and free thinking individuals could foster growth. Wood explains that there was a large amount of social influence that the early revolutionary leaders exerted over the colonists that filtered down into more social and religious changes that otherwise would not have taken place. This inspired many working class farmers to pick up arms against the British government, as well as start to question their own place in a society that started to change. Despite the fact that many leaders of the revolution were planters and wealthy plutocratic slave owners, ideas about abolitionism were put forth during and after the revolution. Events that undoubtedly were inspired by secession and later rebellion from England.

http://www.abolitionseminar.org/how-did-northern-states-gradually-abolish-slavery/

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Further insight into Wood thesis
by Lloyd Higgins - Monday, November 13, 2017, 1:12 PM

Upon further reading of Woods paragraph, he explains on page 132 how interconnected society was with government during the 18th century. Citizens did not necessarily exclude government power from social power, the two were intertwined, and social ills or successes were commonly held as consequence of government action, or inaction. He goes on to drive this point home in pages 133-134 as colonists became unnerved by the additional taxation put forth by the crown. It is through the government upheavals caused by the revolution that further social change trickled down through the years in the United States. This is why the revolution had such a profound affect on the world and changed many of the customs and rules not only held in government during the 18th-19th centuries, but also in society. Women's suffrage, abolitionism, equal rights and civil rights would eventually get their start in the United States. Even globally, many European nations started to change the way their societies and governments ran, as wood explains in page 133. Another note of importance with the change of American society, is the forward thinking speech by David

Ramsay in the beginning of page 137. He insists that; 'all offices lie open to men of merit, of whatever rank or condition'. This statement alone proves that the revolution would pave the way for more radical social change in the decades and centuries to come within the United States.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

The American Revolution as a Conservative Movement
by Carley Kramer - Sunday, November 12, 2017, 9:51 AM

Although I feel that the American Revolution did have some radical aspects, I was more swayed by Carl N. Degler's loose constructionist argument than by the strict constructionist argument of Gordon S. Wood. While it was radical to think that the American Colonists could hope to win a war against Britain and earn their freedom, the ideals behind the American Revolution were not new to America by the time the Revolution and events leading to the Revolution began. As Degler explains, "Like so much else in the Declaration, this sentence was actually the distillation of a cherished popular sentiment into a ringing phrase, allegiance to which stemmed from its prior acceptance rather than from its eloquence." (p. 124, pg. 2) In other words, the Revolution and Declaration of Independence didn't cause a deep and sudden societal change, but rather voiced the societal changes that had happened in America over time, making the Declaration was a less socially radical document than some would expect. American Colonists faced struggles vastly different than those faced by Europeans, and because of this, the societies, cultures, and ideals developed by the Colonists were also unique to them. In this way, the Colonists had been growing apart from Britain long before the events leading up to the Revolution. In his essay, Degler agrees, stating: "Instead of being an abrupt break, the Revolution was a natural and even expected event in the history of a colonial people who had come of age. It is true that social and political changes accompanied the Revolution, some of which were destined to work great influence upon the American institutions in the future, but these had been implicit in the pre-Revolutionary society." (p. 127, pg. 5)

American ideals were not all that remained the same between the pre-Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary American societies. Unlike other revolutions, such as the French Revolution, the American Revolution did not introduce a new ruling class or vastly change the power structure within the colonies. In regards to those who signed the Declaration of Independence, Degler writes: "Most striking about the careers of these men is the fact that so many of them held office before and after the dividing line of the Revolution. Of those who held an office under the state governments after the Revolution, 75 percent had occupied offices before 1774, proving, if need be, that service in the colonial governments before the Revolution was no obstacle to political preferment for a patriot afterward." (p. 126, pg. 3) Degler also establishes that most leaders of the Revolution were well educated and upper-middle class citizens, and that many post-Revolutionary gains in land or power went to those who already held land or power, leaving the class system virtually unchanged. In short, the Revolution was not a fight to create new ideals and a new way of life for Americans, but a fight to maintain ideals and ways of life that were different from those of the British and that had already developed in America. Although revolutions are, at least in part, inherently radical, to me the American Revolution seems like a more conservative one that is notably different from the other, overtly radical Revolutions of the time.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The American Revolution as a Conservative Movement
by Jason Yeager - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 12:15 PM

I agree with your statement about revolutions being "inherently radical." I think that at a core level, this is one of the reasons why I chose to side with the "No" argument; that the American Revolution had to be a radical movement.

However, in an attempt to play "devil's advocate", I began to consider some of the events leading up to the Revolution. The main one that I kept coming back to was the issuance of the Olive Branch Petition to King George III by the Second Continental Congress.

This happened in 1775--only a year before the Declaration of Independence--and was primarily written by John Dickinson, but also was influenced by the likes of John Jay, John Rutledge, Benjamin Franklin, and other founding fathers. The majority of delegates of the Congress approved this document, although a minority, led by John Adams, did not agree with it.

A number of questions arose in my mind about this event. If these founding fathers were so radical in their thinking, why would they send this petition to the King of England, essentially swearing fealty in an attempt to continue life as "a contented and prosperous people under the British Crown....." (pg. 128, handout, Degler)

And obviously hypothetical, but what would have happened had the King accepted this petition and addressed all of the colonists grievances regarding trade and taxes in a manner that they would have found acceptable? Would these guys have continued in their cushy, prosperous existences, possibly forming the "United States of Great Britain"? I can see how this could have happened, leading me to think that maybe these revolutionaries were not so radical after all.

I am still of the "No" side of the argument, but as I continue to research the "Yes" side, I am slowly being swayed.....

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The American Revolution as a Conservative Movement
by Carley Kramer - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 11:06 AM

The Olive Branch Petition is an excellent thing to bring up. I had also thought briefly about the Olive Branch Petition and its role in this discussion, and I believe it supports the idea that The American Revolution was more conservative than radical. The petition shows us that the founding fathers were willing to consider options other than revolution, even if that meant remaining subjects of the crown. When I think of the Olive Branch Petition, the fact that many who held political positions in the colonies before the revolution kept those positions afterward, and that British trade accounted for 90% of the trade in the colonies after the revolution and 90% of import duties (as we learned in class), it's hard for me to see the revolution as a radical movement. When I then compare these aspects of the American Revolution to the overtly radical French Revolution, the difference seems clear. I believe that Americans were able to have a conservative revolution only because of the space between the colonies and the

monarchy. This space allowed colonists to develop their own ways of life, and then to defend those ways of life in the Revolution without toppling a monarchy and causing total social upheaval.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The American Revolution as a Conservative Movement
by Jason Yeager - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 8:54 PM

Excellent point about the distance, which I considered as well. Americans rebelled, and while there were some effects that reached the homeland and had an impact on the Great Britain's position in the world, the conflict did not spill across the Atlantic and destroy the monarchy. I am not well versed in the British political structure, but it seems to me that the monarchy and Parliament are still in existence to this day.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

YES
by Dylan Ganahl-Johll - Sunday, November 12, 2017, 12:48 PM

After reading both the yes and no reasonings for Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement I have to say yes. I agree with yes because the American Revolution was taken by people to lower taxes and overthrow a government in favor of a new one to change constitution, rulers, or policies.

During the American Revolution, laws passed guaranteeing religious freedom, separation of Church and State, the beginning to bring slavery to an end, and declaring all men are born free and equal. These laws including what William Binford along with another Virginian in freeing their slaves (pg 124) shows changing to policies and wanting a change with new opportunities.

And although the American Revolution wasn't a bloodthirsty revolution such as Lenin and Mao (130) it still took a number of people to stand up for what they believe in, try to lower taxes, go to war, and fight for separation from Britain to overthrow their government in favor for a new one.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: YES
by Raleigh Emerson - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 5:19 PM

Reacting to the evidence you gave above, I would say that they play more to the argument that the revolution was not a conservative movement. Like you said the American Revolution was a platform to separate from the tyranny that was the British empire. The Revolution changed the system in which our country ran at the ground level. The large

systematical changes that came from it can only be seen as radical in my opinion. Had it been a conservative movement the changes to the system would have been much less impactful then they actually were.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

I agree with Gordon S. Wood
by Amber Leonard - Sunday, November 12, 2017, 6:49 PM

I agree with Gordon S. Wood that the American Revolution was a far reaching radical event. He says that it was a radical event because of the way it changed society.

On page 133 in the last paragraph he writes, “The Revolution not only radically changed the personal and social relationships of people, including the position of women, but also destroyed aristocracy as it had been understood in the western world for at least two millennia”.

I agree with him that after the revolution America changed its gears so that everyone had an opportunity to work their way up. No longer would a person be stuck in poverty or a certain class just because they were born into it, they had the opportunity to make their life better, and so did their children.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: I agree with Gordon S. Wood
by Tuan Tran - Tuesday, November 14, 2017, 4:48 PM

American Revolution brings people's hope to change the global surface of a new nation. They will protect and develop this great nation to the world's necessary factor. It helps American people to reclaim their own elite personalities and evolutes the American society.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

The American Revolution was not a a conservative movement
by Raleigh Emerson - Monday, November 13, 2017, 12:22 PM

This argument falls solely on ones own definition of conservative, Gordon Wood displays this perfectly in the second page of his piece. "If we judge 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."(NO 2). I see conservatism as the fight for keeping political structures alive. The American Revolution tore those structures down. This revolution was based on the goal to raise ourselves up as a whole and not to raise the gap. As Wood states "One class did not overthrow another; the poor did not supplant the rich. But social relationships and the way people were connected to one another-were changed."(NO 3). These are the changes we would not have seen if the American Revolution were conservative in nature.

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Re: The American Revolution was not a a conservative movement
by Tuan Tran - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 11:42 PM

Gordon Wood is a neo-progressive historian as he tries to prove the American Revolution influences more radical than conservative. One commentator Jackquiere states from Wood that " The Revolution not only radically changed the personal and social relationships of people, including the position of women but also destroyed aristocracy as it had been understood in the Western world for several millennia. The Revolution brought respectability and even dominance to ordinary people long held in contempt and gave dignity to their menial labor in a manner unprecedented in history and to a degree not equaled elsewhere in the world. The Revolution did not just eliminate monarchy and create republics; it actually reconstituted what Americans meant by public or state power and brought about an entirely new kind of popular politics and a new kind of democratic officeholder."(*The Radicalism Of the American Revolution, 13)*. Conservatism does not affect much to replace the new society of the USA and we can see how our current government applies radical steps to ensure people's right and encourage each of us to contribute to making America great again.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

American Revolution: A Perfect Racial Movement
by Tuan Tran - Monday, November 13, 2017, 12:46 PM

I totally approve the ideas of the progressive-conflict school of historical interpretation toward the American Revolution as it is claimed from historian Carl Becker that " he concluded in his study if colonial New York that an internal revolution had taken place. The American Revolution created a struggle not only for home rule but also one for who should rule at home"(*Was The American Revolution a Conservative Movement, 4)*. The main point is all about the American people decide to gain their own liberties from the British Empire- it's a People's War. Moreover, it leads to my new point to support the neo-progressive studies because these neo-progressive authors provide more analysis and accurate information to prove that American Revolution is a radical event as states from Gordon S. Wood: " Wood maintains that the American Revolution was a radical event because America was the first nation to hold democratic values, allowing ordinary people to make money, pursue happiness, and rule themselves."(*Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement, 8)*. Neo-progressive influences me due to " It is a philosophy that provides a better path to solving cultural and political problems. Neo-progressivism understands that issues evolve and that the approach to finding lasting solutions needs to be continuously revamped and improved, just as successful businesses adapt to changing market conditions" (*The Neo Pro, 2)*. Wood is an enthusiastic author to give us evidence about how revolution changes the society and the government system by " destroying monarchy and establishing republics"(*WTARaCM, page 132).* His logical ideas point out that American Revolution was not only the revolution to experience great social transformation and " democratic revolutions" but it is different from other same period revolutions in " Western-wide experience in democratization". The American Revolution is affecting to the 18th century later society, politics, and culture in American society- the author express these changes were " radical and extensive". The interesting points from

author Wood are " the great social antagonists of the American Revolution were not poor vs. rich, workers vs. employers, or even democrats vs aristocrats. They were patriots vs.courtiers" (*WTAaCM, page 135)*. It's not the competition between social classes but it's the real conflict between country patriots and these " royal" courtier who represent for Great Britain. Once again, American Revolution brings positive impacts to the new advanced world for American people:" It was the first successful war of national liberation against western imperialism. A people's war, waged by the majority of Americans have the courage and the zeal to rise up against constituted "legitimate" government, actually threw off their "sovereign." "(*Rothbard: Was The America Revolution Radical,3)*.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

No

by Alexandra Miller - Monday, November 13, 2017, 2:18 PM

Even though I can see how the conservative view did have some effect on the revolution, ultimately the revolution had both conservative AND liberal perspectives that played a role. Gordon S. Wood states "If we measure the radicalism of revolutions by the degree of social misery or economic deprivation 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. But if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place-by the 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 in history." (131) I agree that social change, and change of government was a major key to the revolution. Freedom of speech, religion was a very liberal movement. In conservative Great Britain you weren't allowed to have a voice. Which brings me to change in government. Typically liberal's want a strong government that is for the people. During the revolution when developing the government they wanted exactly that.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Considering the Revolution as a Conservative Movement
by Hunter Coy - Monday, November 13, 2017, 5:39 PM

I do not think the Revolution was a conservative movement. I found it mattered little that the wealthy, colonial elites were the ones that were mostly responsible for most revolutionary and republican ideological advancement, considering that at this time, these elites would be the only ones that would have had the time to concern themselves with such things. That is not to say that every revolutionary was wealthy per say, but it is to my understanding that the idea of a "salon" (not a hair place, but a gathering of educated, usually upper- class people to discuss art, philosophy, politics, etc., usually in a private residence) was very much in fashion at that time in the Western world and would have probably been emulated by the upper- class revolutionaries. That, and I think that their ideas that people should attain government/military positions based on merit and not birth, while certainly not triggering mass waves of egalitarian sentiment and policy, "opened the door", as it were, to these ideas spreading throughout all social classes in the America's, and, in my opinion, was a proto- American Dream ideal that we cherish so much to this day.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

The Revolution as a Radical Change
by Rachel Gragg - Monday, November 13, 2017, 6:10 PM

My interpretation of the Revolution and of these readings is influenced by the progressive standpoint. I believe that the Revolution caused drastic changes to the United States and that the Revolution was a radical movement, not a conservative one. Therefore, I agree with the author Gordon S. Wood.

The Revolution caused for many changes in this country. Though it may not have had all the typical things expected from wars, it was still a Revolution that brought about change and different ways of life for this country.

I googled the definition of “revolution” and came up with, “a forcible overthrow of a government or social order in favor of a new system.” That is exactly what the Revolution caused. An entirely new system was put into place following the American Revolution. Wood states that, “By the early years of the nineteenth century the Revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth century” (handouts, pg 132). This is clear in almost every aspect including the most obvious one, the way the government would operate. Our textbook states that, “Americans disagreed [with Parliament and sovereign power] and instead maintained that their individual colonial (and later state) assemblies were sovereign within their respective borders.” (*Liberty Equality and Power*, page 225). This theory would later have a huge influence on the Constitution and it changed the face of this country forever.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Conservative American Revolution
by Nathaniel McKinney - Monday, November 13, 2017, 7:51 PM

Forum 3 After reading the two papers, I agree more with what Carl N. Degler had to say with the American Revolution. The strict definition of revolution is defined in the beginning of the paper as producing significant and deep societal change. Degler argues that the war left the economic and social structure pretty much untouched. I agree with this statement because the United States were setup in which they had to provide for themselves by creating farms, businesses, for ways to provide for themselves in families since the birth of the country. From the fact that an ocean separated US from Britain. Parliament didn't have their nose under everything, to say yes or no, making as though they probably felt like their own country. Throughout their history they were deciding who they would trade with and what they want, Britain eventually said no to certain things, then "protecting" the colonists which lead to the interlobate acts then to the war. The United States all before this basically were their own country for a few hundred years which allowed them to create a functional society, like social, class structure, and basically a colonial government. In Degler article on pg 125 he talks about how the people who came up with the idea of the revolution were the ones in power. The men were the richer of the country, held office, were judges, part of the colonial army but obviously the people who disagreed left and wherever they felt was right. This shows from what I said before because the fact Britain was so hands off it help create the society in the US so the change in power didn't affect the country a whole lot. On pg 128 he talks about how the social and economic change was not surprising because unlike the France and Russia revolution it wasn't the "peasant" workers who disagreed with what is happening, it was from the higher-class people from the country.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Non-conservative Revolution
by David Garvin - Monday, November 13, 2017, 8:52 PM

The American Revolution was not a conservative revolution. It's was not just a violent over throw of their current government. Instead is was a revolution that sought to gain freedom from a government they felt was oppressing their freedoms. The colonists ended up forming a completely new government. This change was a huge social change during it's time. Gordon Wood reinforces this by writing, "... most people in that very different distant world could not as of yet conceive of society apart from government" (Pg 132). I am more neoprogrssive in my approach for studying the American Revolution and it's aftermath. I pay more attention to the changes that occurred in society at that time and what the ideas of government we're at that time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Non-conservative Revolution

by Tuan Tran - Tuesday, November 14, 2017, 4:27 PM

The American Revolution belongs to the radical side. Moreover , it has been proved in the " The American Revolution: Radical Or Conservative?" article that" The Declaration of Independence asserted the high and radical aims of the American Revolution: the Enlightenment principles of consent of the governed and natural rights. But forces of conservatism kept many from enjoying those rights until later generations of radicals led movements for political change. "*(9)*. It is not just ordinary revolution but it's a call to create a new country between colonists. All Americans want to involve in achieving the natural benefits and rights from their own government not the British Crown Power.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The Revolution - Radical

by Jason Yeager - Monday, November 13, 2017, 9:30 PM

After reading the introductory page, I had the feeling that I would lean towards Degler's argument that the Revolution was conservative in nature and motivation. I had the belief that centuries of monarchical existence would almost necessarily carry over to the thoughts and actions of revolutionary figures. That much ingrained doctrine would be difficult to shake in just a few generations. As I read his essay, remarks such as "social values are not created so deliberately or so easily" (pg. 124) seemed to reinforce my beliefs.

I found Wood's essay to be a bit rambling and at times off-target, but his discussion about Jefferson suggesting that fifty acres of Virginia land be given to every man with less than that really resonated with me. Unless a man owns property, he "could have no public spirit; and there could be no republic." (pg. 136) Wood's assertion that "nothing could be more radical than this attempt to make every man independent" (pg. 136) is the one statement that changed my mind. This would have been a very radical departure from the monarchical way of thinking at the time.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The Revolution

by Peyton Hobie - Monday, November 13, 2017, 10:28 PM

The American Revolution aligned more with the Whigs than with the Tories. That aligns them with constitutional monarchy and the "bourgeoisie" over monarchical absolutism and the nobility. Conservative means "believing in the value of established and traditional practices in politics and society : relating to or supporting political conservatism" at first it may seem like the Revolution was a liberal movement, since the beliefs of the Founding Fathers are best classified as "classical liberalism," in context the Revolution did nothing but preserve the colonists' current society. The political, social, and economic conditions of the colonies at the time were based off of Age of Enlightenment thought: republicanism, liberty, and tolerance. When the authoritarian rule of the English crown and Parliament attempted to strengthen its control over the colonies, they became enraged and began to resist British rule. The main figures of the American Revolution were not bringing forth anything new for their country; they were merely conserving the colonial order that had been in place for more than a century. In that sense, the Revolution was actually conservative in that it was resistance against change.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The Revolution
by Garrett Warner - Monday, November 13, 2017, 10:30 PM

I think it wasn't a conservative movement because of the way the founding fathers tried to limit government control. In our studies we have discussed how the constitution was built understanding people cannot be controlled and rules will be broken. I'm still curious to see what different opinions we all have because I am back and forth with the different reasons.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The Revolution
by Tuan Tran - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 10:45 PM

American Revolution is a new way to create a new USA society and people who are from all social classes stand together to claim the liberty and right to trade products not rely on British Empire. As we all know from our current government working system, it is not the conservative one. Our power never be perished but continue to expand to the world and our nation is the world's supreme manager.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Causes and Effects of the American Revolution: A Balanced Approach
by Landon Stevens - Monday, November 13, 2017, 10:57 PM

The American Revolution cannot possibly be interpreted from one particular school of thought, so I do not think it possible to attempt to take an interpretive side. Few can argue against the fact that the Revolution was indeed a Whig movement, a patriot movement, and, yes, many of these Patriots were wealthy landowners who, if they could succeed in this revolution, stood a lot more to gain than to lose. But if they lost, then Benjamin Franklin said it best when he proclaimed that if the colonial leaders couldn't achieve unanimity and strength against the world's foremost power, they would, "...all hang separately." And hang together they did. Even within a divided colonial population, with one-third being for, neutral, and opposed to independence, respectively, they achieved the unthinkable, and this was a truly revolutionary event. They even convinced France to help in the situation, no easy task.

Looking at it from a Whig, pro-American approach, the revolution was really worthy of being the hailed event the "shot heard round the world triggered." Consider that in one fell swoop, Divine Right of Kings, Virtual Representation in Parliament, and Taxation without Representation, were dead. And the Constitution that followed the war has become a model for hundreds of other democratic-seeking nations, a truly revolutionary reality - ordinary people governing themselves through a system of written laws and limited government, even though our founders were still unclear about the term "ordinary," considering the voting qualifications of the time being attached to landholders...but old habits would change as time progressed, and fairly quickly, too.

As we now consider the progressive side, we see great examples early on where very common people, even slaves, as well as women, were claiming their place among the newly enfranchised winners of the war. And even before, Abigail Adams, hardly a colonial commoner, expressed to her husband, "Remember the Ladies." And Mum Bett, a Massachusetts female slave, sued for her freedom and won. In reasonable fashion, northern states abolished slavery outright, difficult for Puritan holdovers to justify in light of revolutionary liberty. But to claim that these were the eclipsing movements over the Whig/Patriot movement, is to claim too much. All facets worked together to create, mold, change, go forward, step back, and modify a still-ever-changing nation.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Church and State

by Jennifer Reyes - Monday, November 13, 2017, 11:11 PM

In the article, Bailyn (Harvard)talks about colonist taking on British thinking because they wanted their independence. It was Britain who generated the idea for slaves, indentured servants and rebels to have the opportunity to become free. (Web Video) It was that mentality that ignited the colonist and to achieve their independence. I would consider myself and neoconservative in this situation because I feel that there had to be establish the separation of church and state. People can believe in whatever they want, but your belief system should not interfere with the laws of the land. People need a government, otherwise, it would be anarchy.

I would agree with Degler. In the beginning Degler talks about how in Virginia a law passed regarding religious freedom, he says, “prepared the ground for the ultimate triumph of the American doctrine of separation of Church and State.” (Degler) We have been reading about how churches have involved themselves politically and murdered millions for not believing. I liked how Degler states, “For Millennia a man’s religion had been either a passport or a barrier to his freedom and the opportunity to serve his State; it had always mattered how a man worshipped God.” (Degler) Those in Congress make claims of being religious, but I feel it’s a cover up or tradition. People live by tradition, but to many it holds no real value. How could anyone be religious and be a part of corruption?

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Church and State

by Landon Stevens - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 10:09 PM

Jennifer, I appreciate your thought about separation of church and state. I can't help believing today, however, that it sometimes feels like religion is under attack from secular society because it feels like some of the views held by the devout are not only not tolerated by those who hold secular or even atheistic beliefs, but targeted for expulsion, altogether. The age of disagreement based upon one's religious views seems almost not acceptable as social change continues to take place. Also, the concept of separation of church and state was originally explained by one of our founders as being a "wall of separation" around the church in order to protect it from the government. Consider, Maryland. Was it not founded as a haven for Catholics in a land of fairly hostile Protestants, under the Act of Toleration as a buffer against Anti-Popery Acts? Or the fact the religious oaths are not allowed by the Constitution in order to be a public servant? I do agree with this separation

of church and state as long as it is truly equal, as long as people are allowed to hold their views, views that do not physically harm others, without being legally forced to change these views contrary to their religious tenets. Do we really have that today? I would venture to claim that we do not, and the most recent presidential election, as well as the extremely close ones in the past 20 years, give very strong evidence that we are in a cultural war, part of it centered around protecting religious traditions, which cannot merely be legislated away without a blowback.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2 Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Mr. Woods seems more factual
by Scott Fails - Monday, November 13, 2017, 11:34 PM

I tend to side more with the progressive-conflict school of thought. This school of thought is more entrepreneurial and strategic in its goal achievement and a philosophy that provides a better way to solve cultural and political problems in my opinion. It personifies the idea of constantly making things better than they were before and truly living free in the American Revolution. In modern day view, I suppose I align more with the Neoprogressive side of the house in my view of the American war for independence for the same reasons discussed above.
Moving to the discussion of which author I agree more and align with, I would definitely say Gordon Wood. My decision in itself was a bit of a surprise to me before reading the handout and really getting to the root of my belief in comparison the the authors. Amongst many other standout quotes from Woods “The radicalism of the American Revolution”, the one that stuck with me the most is found in the last paragraph of page 131 and states “If we measure the radicalism of revolutions by the degree of social misery or economic deprivation suffered, or by the number of people killed or manor houses burned, then this emphasis on the conservatism of the American Revolution becomes true enough. But 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 revolutionary as any in history.” Wow, what a qualifying statement in support of his radicalism theory. His continued discussion of the Americans at the time becoming “the most liberal, the most democratic, the most commercially minded and the most modern people in the world” at the pace they did (almost overnight) makes the radical nature of the American Revolution very apparent in my opinion. Mr. Woods creates a view and stance that is undeniable and in my opinion more factual than just mere personal opinion based as I found with Deglers writing.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2 Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Mr. Woods seems more factual
by Landon Stevens - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 9:46 PM

Scott, I really appreciate your thoughts here. The American Revolution was indeed one of the most revolutionary events in the history of humanity. I'm not sure how you would respond to this thought: I have read literature and listened to responses from people who claim the revolution was an attempt to simply maintain the wealth and status of the Eastern elite, those landed white men, most of whom had their roots in England. But if we dig deeper, there is a profound moral sense to this revolution. John Adams spoke of a republic

of laws that would allow the new nation to grow large and strong, absent of the ties to tyranny. Yes, the revolution *was* radical. No group of people - and I can say with certainty that by the time of the revolution, there was significant diversity within the colonies, quite polyglot - heretofore, had come together to create their own government and live to speak of it into their old age. And here we are today, a nation still. But here's an omen: will we be a nation fifty or even 100 years hence? Will there be some cataclysmic event that brings us to ruin? Will it be technology? Will it be an outside force? Moral degradation? Or will we overcome some of our current moral pitfalls that face us today to live for another millennia?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Siding with the Revolution being a conservative move
by Jordan Lopez - Monday, November 13, 2017, 11:45 PM

I do believe it was a conservative movement because they were trying to conserve the rights they previously had as colonials. The British weren't so involved with the colonies until after the french and Indian war where they started to impose taxes on the colonies to pay for the war that had been fought. Carl Degler states that the Revolution was a natural and even expected event in history. He says that even though there were social and political changes accompanied by the Revolution, these influences have been implicit in the pre-Revolutionary society.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Siding with the Revolution being a conservative move
by Tuan Tran - Tuesday, November 14, 2017, 4:18 PM

It cannot be a conservative movement because it states from the " How Radical Was the American Revolution" animation that "The American Revolution was very radical because of the complete shift in who held power in government. The American Constitution left the new government responsible to the will of the people, instead of in the hands of “superiors.”(*page 2/12*). Moreover, author Murray strongly pointed out that " Nothing in all of this picture of the American Revolution could have been more radical, more truly revolutionary"(*Was the American revolution Radical, 8*).The colonists not conserve their rights but changing their basic rights into the advance ones to form a modern society which is separated from the Britain Empire world.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Siding with the Revolution being a conservative move
by Alexxis Romo - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 7:08 PM

I see where you're coming from, however i think Degler exaggerates his statements that the revolution was expected, as i stated in my first post. Social and political influences were prominent before the Revolution and they were prominent after the Revolution. However, I think the revolution enforced new reforms

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

The Politics of the Revolution and How They Shaped It
by Lorenzo Arreola - Monday, November 13, 2017, 11:51 PM

In the modern US society we have the privilege to look back at history and see all the effects of the choices our ancestors, and through this we see the mindsets that were created to create great moments or events. One of the best example of this is seen in the way we view the American revolution and its political aspects. At its base we, in a modern society, see it as a progressive and radical movement that was necessary to push our nation free of oppressors and create a free land for the people to dwell, yet if we look at the thoughts of the people of that day and age we see a very different view as they see themselves as collected and orderly with a plan and working to preserve the nation they are living in whether it be ruled by the British or the people of the colonies themselves. With these points being displayed its hard to not see the easy way that you can be chosing either side as a valid opinion and how these views are necessary to this revolution. For this writing i will be following the opinion that the revolution is in fact conservative in its foundation, with a touch of progressive for flair.

First off we can see the way the word conservative is applied in a political aspects as it is used to talk of a mindset of preserving the way things are and making the country adapt slowly to changes but still create a stable consistent environment. The Revolution changes all of this as it forces the people of the US to act radically from the norm, but for a just and fair reason of maintaining order and happiness within the US as they saw with the harsh changes in the economy and society through acts like the Embargo act, the Tea act, and the intolerable acts.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Radical Revolution Paved Way for Women's Rights
by Rachel Gragg - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 9:52 AM

Upon further investigation, I stand by my earlier post in that the Revolution was a radical movement and that I agree with Gordon S. Wood. The Revolution promoted change in the way the people in this country thought and the way they perceived politics and accepted social change. It paved the way for major political movements and especially women's rights. Wood states in his essay that, "...if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place… then the American Revolution was not conservative at all; on the contrary: it was as radical and as revolutionary as any in history" (handout pg. 131) and I completely agree.

The American Revolution made the women's rights movement possible. It paved the way for women to begin understanding what it meant to have rights and that they are more than just wives and mothers. When their husbands went to war, they were forced to be the heads of their households. Wood states that, "The Revolution made possible the anti-slavery and women's rights movements" (handout pg. 133) and that statement is backed up by our textbook. In the textbook, it discusses the roles of women throughout the war and how they formed women's societies and it presented women with voting rights for one of the first times in American history. The textbook states that, "The New Jersey Constitution of 1776 let [women] vote if they headed a household (usually as a widow) and paid taxes" (*Liberty, Equality, and Power*, pg. 221). If that is not considered radical for those times, I'm not sure

what is. Women beginning to get to take charge of their household and to vote on important matters is almost unheard of to the colonists before this time, therefore furthering the argument that the Revolution was a radical movement.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Radical Revolution Paved Way for Women's Rights
by Dylan Ganahl-Johll - Friday, November 17, 2017, 11:26 AM

I don't think you can say that the American Revolution wasn't conservative at all because when just thinking about the term conservative you think about holding values, typically in relation to politics or religion. And that was in a sense what the American Revolution was, a turning point due to people wanting to be free to choose their own religion and be free of Britain to gain independence. So I don't believe you can say it wasn't at all conservative.

However, like my 2nd post, I do tend to believe now after more research that it was more radical when viewing all other key points and events that occurred to happen during this time such as beggining of women's rights, anti-slavery, and more.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The Revolution
by Jennifer Reyes - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 4:56 PM

In addition, (to my previous post) I feel like Degler is trying to point out that there were many people that didn't abide by Declaration of Independence. In fact, it took time for people to climb on board and some of these laws and ideas weren't being enforced. For example, he talks about how Reverend Samuel Hopkins told Continental Congress that it was illogical to holds slaves, that it went against how all men are born free and created equal. (Degler pg.124) Why did he have to remind them of this? Also, he talks about a Virginian man releasing his slaves' years after the Declaration of Independence. (Degler) Congress didn't even pass the 15 Amendment until 1869. Where is this Radicalism?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Hamilton's Plan
by Alexxis Romo - Wednesday, November 15, 2017, 7:00 PM

In watching the video "Hamilton's Plan", I saw how people can get the idea that the revolution was a conservative movement. In the video, they state that Hamilton, "wanted to see America be a pure Great Britain and accepted a world of status and hierarchy and central control." the video also stated that Hamilton wanted to increase the debt that the country already had from the revolution. This caused a sort of divide, especially because Thomas Jefferson wanted something new and wanted to get rid of hierarchy. I can see how people can interpret this information as the revolution being a conservative movement. However, i think with the

opposing views that leaders like Jefferson had it made it not a conservative movement. I think there might've been some conservative views from some of the leaders of the colonies, but i still stand by my statement that the revolution was more radical.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Hamilton's Plan

by Tuan Tran - Friday, November 17, 2017, 11:03 PM

As I see from " Hamilton's Plan", Thomas Jefferson always try to control his power whereas Hamilton exchanged the capital benefits to establish the National Bank to save the Americans from debt. His future achievements are known " Hamilton's debt program was a remarkable success. By demonstrating Americans' willingness to repay their debts, he made the United States attractive to foreign investors. European investment capital poured into the new nation in large amounts. Hamilton's next objective was to create a Bank of the United States, modeled after the Bank of England. A national bank would collect taxes, hold government funds, and make loans to the government and borrowers. One criticism directed against the bank was "unrepublican"--it would encourage speculation and corruption. The bank was also opposed on constitutional grounds. Adopting a position known as "strict constructionism," Thomas Jefferson and James Madison charged that a national bank was unconstitutional since the Constitution did not specifically give Congress the power to create a bank."(*Alexander Hamilton's Financial Plan, 6-7).* Although he would like to change America to pure Britain which means he wants to exploit the potential economic plan of Britain and edits it to apply to a new country so we can differentiate between the USA and the UK remarkable trade recently

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

The Revolution as a Conservative Movement

by Hunter Coy - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 5:07 PM

I am inclined to believe that the American Revolution was not a conservative movement, and had far-reaching social consequences. The two documents that most affirm my belief of this, are documents number four and six, respectively. Mr. Wood's argument in #4 is pretty telling of the effects of the War of Independence, particularly in the state of New Hampshire. Sure, many people that held office before the War of Independence also held office after the fact, but the fact that there were any people considered to be "layman" or not of high birth in any lawmaking body, at this period in history, is quite astounding. It is to my understanding that even in the late 1700's, before Napoleon's many wars and legal reformations, while there had been great philosophical progress in regards to political science over the past two centuries, the world was still very feudal and the idea that nobility, or in the American case, wealthy landowners, were the ones to hold any legislative power was still very much alive in the world. To that extent, even in places where republican sentiment did exist at the time, such as was the case in the minor merchant republics of Italy or the semi-independent city-states of the Holy Roman Empire in what is now Germany, positions of power were held by the wealthy or great oligarchs. The fact that the "average Joe" of the day, or even someone simply of lesser means than a wealthy landowner even had a say in anything is quite astounding, With document number six, I simply believe that with the rapidly expanded electorate in the post-Independence War era, shows exactly how radical the movement was, for reasons listed

above. Even though women were not given the right to vote until ~100 years later, the fact that the electorate expanded so quickly and in such a short amount of time is telling of the democratic sentiment of the country. Or at least, what was considered democratic at that time.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

The Revolution ►

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane
You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)
HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004)