

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

Home ► My courses ► HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004) ► Week 8 ► Forum 3 ►
Using the New Materials



Forum 3

Using the New Materials

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ The Revolution

Display replies in nested form ▼

Move this discussion to ... ▼

Move

Pin



Using the New Materials

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 9:48 AM

Use this thread to incorporate the new materials into your discussions.

Sum of ratings: -

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



Should the American Revolution be called a Revolution?

by Hunter Coy - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 12:32 PM

I think the American Revolution should more accurately be called "The American Rebellion/War for Independence". While certainly, some of the ideas behind the Revolution were revolutionary (though the ideas were certainly not new, this was the first time, to my knowledge, of them being formalized in such a way), such as the idea of a written, formal constitution, separation of powers, enumerated powers, different branches of government, etc. but it was not a revolution. The root word of revolution is "revolve" which means that was once the bottom is now the top and used within the context of the social sciences, essentially means that society is upended. In most other "revolutions", the effect on society is much more noticeable. Take two of the "poster children" of revolutions, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, and the French Revolution in France. Both of these revolutions had bloodshed, a radical reordering of society, it's government, institutions, how those institutions interacted with citizens and the old social order being upended, to say the least. Compare this to the

American Revolution. True, the ideas were revolutionary, and true, the the door for political representation widened a bit for average people, society was not upended and a radical new order was not imposed.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



#7 Linda Grant DePauw

by Alexandra Miller - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 4:29 PM

I was very much persuaded by DePauw. This goes against my initial response that the Revolution was not a conservative movement. The four groups she addresses in her portion, women, people of color, servants and minors are almost forgotten about when our constitution was written. I don't recall which reading we read or watched but there was an argument about that even though "All men created equal" didn't apply to women and people of color at the time, but it opened the door to that being a possibility. This is why I feel that both conservative and liberal perspectives were used in the making of the Constitution. I think our founding fathers were liberal in the aspect of constructing these laws to prevent the government from being too involved with the people. But a flaw is they forgot about the rest of the 80% of the people, who weren't apart of it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: #7 Linda Grant DePauw

by Tuan Tran - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 11:28 PM

The Revolution has its strong radical aspect but our Founding Fathers changes the natural characteristic of Revolution by gaining their own government power and prevent the equality among classes and races. We still have the slave owning until the Union won and our beloved president Abraham Lincoln adjusts the true right for African American. Moreover, the impact of Constitution which mostly ignored by the American people who are truly represents for the radical factors devoting to help the USA strengthening its power.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



No

by Dylan Ganahl-Johll - Thursday, November 16, 2017, 5:02 PM

After doing more research I am starting to see how the American Revolution can be and is considered a radical movement. However, it is all based off what you believe to be the definition of radical and conservative. At first, I didn't realize all the other things happening around this time that played a major role in the plan to overthrow the government in favor of a new one.

I have to agree with Gordan Wood about the changing that occurred. Wood states that "Americans now recognized that slavery in a republic of workers was an aberration." They began to see it was a mistake and not right. Causing the people to change their ways they viewed politics. Some other changes that occurred are the beginning of Women rights

movement and the changing of society, allowing people to be individuals that can make their way and work up to something. Along with the ending of aristocracy. The setting up of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are also changes that occurred.

Although in the end, it comes down to what you define radical and conservative. At first, I believed this was a conservative movement because of the definition "holding to traditional attitudes and values and cautious about change or innovation, typically in relation to politics or religion" yes, that is what this was but when looking at all the other details in more depth you start to see it was much more than that. It was far-reaching, this is because all of these changes were major, with the ending of slaves, a dramatic change in government, the change in society, etc.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Revolution Pave Way for Abolishment of Slavery

by Rachel Gragg - Friday, November 17, 2017, 9:57 AM

The excerpts from historians only confirmed my analysis that the American Revolution was a radical movement. In the first document, John Richard Alden gives a compelling argument in order to confirm this claim as he explores the ideas that the Revolution inspired the freedom of slaves because of the whole premise of the Revolution being just generally seeking freedom.

He states that, "The proclamation in the Declaration of Independence of the equality of men in the sight of the Creator continues to serve as a battle cry for social and political justice. The patriots won independence; they also made a good start on the long road toward establishing and securing 'the rights of mankind'" (Document #1).

In the original handout, Wood explores the idea of the colonists associating dependency with slavery, and in turn associating their dependency on England as them being slaves. He claims that, "In such simple division everyone who was not free was presumed to be a servant.

Anyone tied to someone else, who was someone's client or dependent, was servile. The American revolutionary movement now brought to the surface this latent logic in eighteenth-century radical whig thinking" (Wood, Handout page 136). After the Revolution, slavery began to diminish. Our textbook states that, "Within a generation, slavery was abolished in the emerging 'North'" (*Liberty, Equality, and Power*, Pg 220). Slavery was still prominent in the South, and in no way, shape, or form were African American's considered equal to White Americans at this time, however, it was the first step in trying to reach that equality. I think that since The Revolution made the colonists and slave-owners feel as though they were enslaved to England, it helped them see how their slaves might have felt and it helped them to understand that their slaves are human beings and not just property. The eventual abolishment of slavery was a radical movement of change and the Revolution helped pave the way for that to happen.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Still say yes

by Jennifer Reyes - Friday, November 17, 2017, 7:27 PM

I still feel that the American Revolution was conservative. I feel like the only part that was radical was the colonials trying to break free from European domination. Document one mentions this, he states that the colonials of all colors were trying to seek freedom from European domination (John Alden), However, I feel only white colonist were seeking freedom from European domination and the rest were fighting for their own f. Linda Depauw says, "the legal doctrine that applied to Negroes, servants, women, and minors, but excluded them from the category of persons who should enjoy the "inalienable rights" (all men are created equal) of which declaration speaks of." George Washington didn't want blacks to fight in the war and it wasn't until he had no choice. Who was going to do their labor for their farms or other jobs they had on their property? Why let go free or dirt-cheap labor?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Mr. Alden speaks to me

by Scott Fails - Friday, November 17, 2017, 9:55 PM

After reading the thoughts of the historians, My opinion remains the same. The historian that stuck with me was John Richard Alden. His approach to his explanation was one that spoke directly to my original opinion. A quote from his reading that stood out to me was "The American Revolution brought the first break in the European colonial system. It inspired and continues to inspire colonials of all colors to seek freedom from European domination. It also brought into existence for the first time in modern history a republican system of government in a large nation." I believe this speaks directly to the modernization of the American Revolution and the radical nature that ensued. Perhaps in reading the historians thoughts I was subconsciously looking for one of them to qualify my original opinion of the American Revolution being Neoprogressive in my modern day thoughts and if so, I got exactly that with Mr. Alden.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Video #1...I'm still a believer

by Scott Fails - Friday, November 17, 2017, 10:22 PM

"The American Revolution Video #1" I believe still speaks to the radical nature of not only the American Revolution, but of revolutions in general. However, there is one exception that made me stop and think and perhaps even persuaded a little bit of my opinion. When Sheila Skemp from the University of Mississippi said the words that "the Americans in the 1760's and 1770's were ripe for revolution", but brought to attention the fact that the Americans at the time were as she put it "proud to be Englishmen" and simply proud of their heritage. That to me takes some of my believed radical nature of the American Revolution away. The Americans at the time were proud to be who they were and proud of where they came from. That in itself leads me to believe that the Revolution at the time was conservative. However, taking into consideration Mr. Gordon Woods' from Brown University's statement in the same video that Revolutions in general force "A fundamental change in society and social relationships." That said, as proud of these Englishmen were to be where they were from, they were Americans now and that meant something different. It meant social change and a new way of life. This continues to force my opinion that the American Revolution was not a conservative movement, it was as radical as it could be.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Halminton and his contribution to radical movement**

by Tuan Tran - Friday, November 17, 2017, 10:50 PM

Hamilton helps the USA economy more beneficial by building the " National Bank" while other founding fathers determining the place to establish the capital of the United States in Virginia. Moreover, Hamilton has the future perspectives of America society and he wants the USA becoming later important economy industry of the world. According to the video " Hamilton's Plan" that Halminton has to compromise with Jefferson and Madison to achieve his own funding source leading to the National Bank establishment which solves the nation's debt in war(*Hamilton Plan*, 6:20-7:00). I can recognize that Halminton devotes his life to serve the USA not trying to gain power between parties and he is also Secretary Of Treasury. Hamilton Plan is opposing to the conservative movement idea which can be stated " The importance of Hamilton's speech is that it pushed the delegates, but much later on, to consider the true from the false definition of monarchy and aristocracy"(*What's the point of Halminton Plan*, 5).

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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

by Carley Kramer - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 10:33 AM

After reading the opinions of various other historians, I still believe that the American Revolution was more conservative than radical. As Clinton Rossiter wrote in in Document #2 in our new materials, "However radical the principles of the Revolution may have seemed to the rest of the world, in the minds of the colonists they were thoroughly preservative and respectful of the past The world - at least the American corner of it - had already been made over as thoroughly as any sensible man could imagine." This reaffirms my former opinion that the Revolution was intended to maintain American life rather than to change it. Americans had already developed their own cultures and ideals separately from the British, and when the British began to enforce their control of the colonies, it was these established ideas that Americans fought for.

In Document #3, Daniel Boorstin takes this idea even further. He writes, "The Americans were fighting not so much to establish new rights as to preserve old ones... The Revolution itself had been a kind of affirmation of faith in ancient British institutions... trial by jury, due process of law, representation before taxation, habeas corpus, freedom from attainder, independence of the judiciary, and the rights of free speech, free petition, and free assembly." Americans did not want new rights; they wanted these rights to be guaranteed to the colonies and under their own jurisdiction rather than that of the Monarchy across the Atlantic. Because the American Revolution was about preserving traditions and established ideals, it was more of a conservative revolution than a radical one.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Less sure

by Jason Yeager - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 11:34 AM

In fact, I've changed my position to the what seems to be the less popular "Yes" side of the argument.

I initially sided with Wood in that on a very basic level, any revolution, by its very nature, has to be radical.

I don't know that any one of the historians in the new materials influenced my change of position, but a couple of them reinforced it. I have been looking into the events surrounding the First and Second Continental Congresses. As noted on Wikipedia, the delegates' "ultimate goal was to develop a reasonable solution to the difficulties and bring about reconciliation between the Colonies and Great Britain." (Wikipedia.com) I was specifically interested in the Olive Branch Petition, which pledged loyalty to the Crown only a year before the Declaration of Independence. These events don't seem to be the actions of extreme radicals, but of content men of power who just wanted to change a few British policies. One of the contributors included in the new materials, Clinton Rossiter, seems to support this when he states that "Their goal therefore was simply to consolidate, then expand by cautious stages, the large measure of liberty and prosperity that was part of their established way of life." (Rossiter, *Seedtime of the Republic*)

One problem I have with the "No" argument is that some of the historians of this persuasion seem to point out the far-reaching effects of the Revolution. Wood states in his essay that "the Revolution made possible the anti-slavery and women's rights movements of the nineteenth century and in fact all our current egalitarian thinking." (pg. 133, handout, Wood) He further states that the "Revolution.....radically changed the personal and social relationships of people, including the position of women....." (pg. 133, handout, Wood) While I agree that the Revolution did have these effects, the changes were not evident until decades or even more than a century after the war, and had no influence on the decisions of the revolutionaries at the time. Perhaps this is most evident in the argument by Linda Grant DePauw in the new materials, in that she identifies four groups of people that made up the vast majority (80%) of the population that were not included in "the category of persons who should enjoy the "inalienable rights" of which the Declaration speaks" (DePauw, *The Revolution and the Unfree*), and a fifth group--non-property owning white males--that was not allowed to vote.

I feel like there was a radical element to this movement, as declaring independence from, and choosing to go to war with, the mother country would have been an extreme measure. But I also feel that much of the motivation leading to these events had more to do with men of wealth and power looking to maintain and expand that wealth and power. These are constant motivators in modern society, and can't really be considered as radical.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

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



American Revolution Still Not Conservative

by David Garvin - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 7:57 PM

After reviewing the additional material I the American revolution is still not a conservative movement in my eyes. Although people living in America under British rule still had more freedoms than people of other countries breaking free from Britain by force was still a radical and unheard of movement for the European colonial system. As John Richard Alden said, "It inspired and continues and continues to inspires colonials of all color to seek freedom from European domination." John also adds that, "It also brought into existence for the first time in modern history a republican system of government in a large nation." This was a revolutionary movement not frequently seen in European colonies.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: American Revolution Still Not Conservative

by Dylan Ganahl-Johll - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 8:57 PM

I would have to agree with you. Not only did it inspire the seeking of freedom and the start of a government, it also helped set up women rights And other major events that changed the way the United States would become.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Re: American Revolution Still Not Conservative

by Tuan Tran - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 11:43 PM

If the USA follows the conservative movement, it is still the shadow of Great Britain. However, some people like Hamilton prefer bringing the new life for the USA by supporting its economy. Moreover, the USA cannot be the recent powerful America right now without the radical steps to interfere the disadvantage movements which are caused by the conservative side in the government especially Thomas Jefferson who only addicts to the ultimate command of the White House.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Videos Prove Radical Movement

by Rachel Gragg - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 8:12 PM

The videos prove even further that the American Revolution was a radical movement. The historians in the first video talk a lot about the governmental changes following the Revolution.

Those changes were very prominent thus implying that the Revolution would be radical. In the first video, Jon Butler states that, "when you add together a new kind of political order, and American materialism and the development of a widely broadcast new world economy and add to that different nationalities... [America] looked utterly different than the Old World." He is stating that the Revolution was radical in the way that it combined all of these changed and new ideas and ways of thinking and influenced the country as a whole.

Following the American Revolution, the idea of government in this country changed forever.

The colonists were finally feeling as though they could break from the way of Britain's government and channel new ways of running the country than any American had ever experienced thus far. The textbook states that, "...the idea that Parliament held sovereign power... over Britain... Americans disagreed and instead maintained that their individual

colonial (and later state) assemblies were sovereign within their respective orders.” (*Liberty, Equality, and Power* pg 225). The entire change of a government is a very radical change that resulted from the radical Revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



A revolution not as radical

by Lloyd Higgins - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 8:36 PM

Since reading the new material, I have changed my original opinion that the revolution was as far reaching as I had previously thought. While there is no doubt that the founding fathers upset the British aristocracy by causing an armed conflict, which then led to other nations feeling inspired to start revolts of their own. The positive consequences of the revolution were not felt towards 'lower' class citizens in the colonies for many decades, or centuries even. One such argument that proves this point is in document 7, by Linda Grant Dupauw. She states that many citizens, over 80% of the colonial population at the time, did not have the right to vote. This group included women, minorities, men who did not own much land, or had no property whatsoever, and children. While children could certainly be excused from that list, it is no coincidence that policy favoring other classes of people, such as emancipation (which was not ratified until 1865) and womens suffrage (not put into law until 1920) did not occur or take place until much later in the life span of the United States. While the revolt of the colonists may have had far reaching economic consequences for the newly formed United States and the British. As far as positive social change goes, it occurred at a much slower rate than Wood proposed. The revolution, more or less, solidified and consolidated power that would then trickle down throughout the decades, but at a rate which many who were alive during the revolution, would not see in their lifetimes.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Videos

by Jennifer Reyes - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 9:08 PM

After viewing these two videos and reflecting on my previous posts, I still stand by my decision on the movement being conservative. Video two mentions that about 80% of Americans (before the war) were European male Colonists (they obviously weren't counting the rest of the people that lived there) that enjoyed standards of freedom and prosperity, they wanted to take the continent or capitalize it. This mentality has been one tradition that has never left America. These proud Englishmen wanted to their own freedom and prosperity and had a taste of it before the war (Skemp) I say its conservative because they had every intention on creating a world very similar to the one they were trying to flee. I feel there were some like Thomas Jefferson and John Locke etc., (<https://www.monticello.org/site/plantation-and-slavery/thomas-jefferson-and-slavery>) who truly were for all people, and that could have been influenced by their spiritual beliefs, but the rest were looking only for wealth and greed.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Using the New Materials

by Peyton Hobie - Saturday, November 18, 2017, 10:31 PM

The American Revolution sought to preserve the colonial lifestyle. According to Merriam-Webster, conservative means ": believing in the value of established and traditional practices in politics and society: relating to or supporting political conservatism" and while 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:1 (1)

[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)