

HST 201: History of United States F18 (Escobar Meta 20749 22611)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 F18 \(Escobar Meta 20749 22611\)](#) / [Week 8](#) / [Forum 3](#)
/ [The Revolution](#)



Search forums

Forum 3 The Revolution

[Subscribe](#)

◀ [Continuing the Discussion](#)

[Continuing the Discussion](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form ▾

Move this discussion to ... ▾

Move

Pin



The Revolution

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, November 9, 2018, 6:28 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](#)



Radical Revolution

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 8:33 AM

I agree with Wood that the American revolution was a radical movement in its own right, just as radical as other revolutions. I see a revolution as a movement that overturns the current form of government for a new system usually of their own making. The government that was formed from the American revolution was unlike any government that had come before it. Just because it was not brought about by violent riots or decapitations of the perceived wrong doers does not mean it was not revolutionary. It brought about a

complete change in the country socially and governmentally. A change that endures today. Documents and policies written in that era still are quoted and prescribed to today. One cannot have a political conversation without eventually hearing about that persons constitutional rights and it has been over 200 years since the constitution was written. Despite the lack of social misery and economic deprivation there was social change and that change has echoed throughout the rest of our history as a country. As Wood said on pg. 9 "A momentous upheaval that not only fundamentally altered the character of American society but decisively affected the course of subsequent history."

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Social Class Structure did not Change

by [Daniel Oas](#) - Tuesday, November 13, 2018, 7:25 PM

While I agree with your valid points about the nature of a revolution and how our government was changed, I agree with the historian Carl Degler in the sense that the American Revolution was deeply conservative when you observe the minimal changes in social class structure prior to and after the revolution. Those who held power in colonial America before the revolution remained in power after it ended. When we compare this situation to the French and Russian revolutions, which created drastic changes in social mobility and class structure, we can see that this revolution pales in comparison. The lower, working classes of the Russian and French revolutions held power after their respective revolutions while in colonial America those who held power prior to the revolution remained in power. You make good points in stating that the constitution created social change that we still see to this day, but for the most part these social changes had little no no effect on class structure in colonial America and this is why myself and historian Carl Degler consider the revolution to be conservative in nature.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Not at all pale in comparison

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Thursday, November 15, 2018, 3:37 PM

I fail to see how the American Revolution pales in comparison to those of France and Russia. The French overthrew the monarchy. The Russians overthrew their emperor. The Americans had previously been governed by the British but obtained sovereignty and self-government. (It's true that the colonists had some self-government in place even before the revolution, but only to a certain extent.) The textbook states that "Under this new system (American federalism), sovereignty was removed from the government and bestowed on the people." (pg. 236) The fact that this was a new form of government in and of itself suggests a change.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

Referring to Changes in Social Class Structure



by [Daniel Oas](#) - Friday, November 16, 2018, 5:48 PM

When I say that the American Revolution pales in comparison to the French and Russian revolutions I am referring exclusively to changes in social mobility and class structure. While Americans overthrew a monarchy just as the French and Russians did, social classes in colonial America did not change. In France and Russia, the social heirarchy of these nations changed DRASTICALLY. The lower classes of these two nations led their respective revolutions and took power after victory was achieved. The American revolution was led by the wealthiest and highest ranking members of colonial American society. Here is a quote from Carl Degler on page 4, "It is significant that no new social class came to power through the door of the American Revolution. The men who engineered the revolt were largely part of the colonial ruling class." And note that when I say the American revolution pales in comparison, I am paraphrasing the historian Carl Degler in which he states that the changes in social structure were not to be equated with the French and Russian revolutions which had massive social changes.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

2



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



Re: Referring to Changes in Social Class Structure

by [Emma Powell](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 10:30 PM

Daniel, I completely agree with you on this point, a large part of why I take Deglers side is partly because of how he compares the American revolution to other. Throughout my schooling experience, we learned nothing about other revolutions, making The American revolution seem like a crazy radical event when truly people strayed from their main land to search for a new life, found it and successfully gained their freedom by defeating them in war. There was no large overthrow, rebellion, riots. Nothing of that capacity took place. I totally agree with you.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

1



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



Re: Social Class Structure did not Change

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 8:46 AM

Not only did the Revolution make political changes but it made a social atmosphere unlike any seen in developed world at that time. Everyman was equal, there was no nobility or royalty. Aristocracy became a foreign idea to the citizens of America. Working class people were no longer thought of as lower than others because they had to work for their living. Wood thought this as well he cited the same point in his argument. "The Revolution not only radically changed the personal and social

relationships of people, but also destroyed aristocracy as it had been understood in the western world for at least two 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."

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Yes the revolution was a conservative movement

by [Reed Battaglia](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 1:44 PM

After reading these two essays I agree with Degler stance on the revolution being a conservative movement. When Degler states, "revolutionaries who wanted nothing more than to be undisturbed in their accustomed ways" (pg6). This would fit today's standard of conservatives because conservatives tend to hold on to traditional ways, and do not like the government. When Degler uses the example of a capitalistic economy, that to me seems more of a conservative thing.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Revolution was Conservative with Minor Changes in Social Structure

by [Daniel Oas](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 5:36 PM

Carl Degler's article on the conservative nature of the American Revolution is loaded with evidence and reasoning that simply makes sense. He begins by stating that the revolution led to a newfound sense of religious freedom and equality of all colonial citizens. While this may seem like a massive change in social structure, the governing class of colonial America remained the same prior to the revolution. Degler is quoted as saying, "Of those who held an office under the state government after the revolution, 75% held office prior to 1774." Degler also discusses the nature and means of those who led the American Revolution such as George Washington and Benjamin Franklin. George Washington was considered to be one of if not the richest man in all the colonies while Benjamin Franklin was a wealthy renowned scientist and citizen of the British Empire. There is the argument that American merchants were freed of the restraints of British mercantilism after the revolution which created upward mobility for these citizens, but this upward mobility was simply not enough to be compared to the likes of the French and Russian revolutions. Overall, the American revolution was deeply conservative in nature due to the fact that the wealthy governing class of colonial American led the revolution and continued to govern the colonies after victory was ensured.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Re: Revolution was Conservative with Minor Changes in Social Structure

by [Gurpritam Sandhar](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 10:48 PM

Daniel, your reasoning for the Revolution being conservative left me kind of confused. Especially, your last sentence in your post, where you say that the "wealthy governing class of colonial American led the revolution and continued to govern the colonies after victory was ensured." I personally feel like the wealthy class that you speak of, were actually not that wealthy. I say this because in class we've heard professor Escobar say that each soldier only had about eight or so "bullets" to use while in battle. Its because of the help that the French gave us we won. Of course, the "wealthy governing class of colonial America" had a huge part in the war, and the way that I look at it, I don't feel like they had any other choice at the end of the war to govern because they were "best fit" for the job. Mainly because they were educated, had "we" thrown some random guy off the street to make decisions for the nation, I don't think we would be where we are today. I feel like the war was no at all conservative, and I say this because on page nine of our hadout Gordon Wood writes, " The revolutionary leaders, it is said, were peculiar eighteenth century radicals concerned, like the eighteenth century British radicals, not with the need to recast the social order nor with the problems of the economic inequality and the injustices of stratified societies but with the need to purify a corrupt constitution and fight off the apparent growth of prerogative power." They were working to dismantle an get rid of prerogative power, prerogative being a right or privilege exclusive to a particular individual or class. The "wealthy governing class of colonial America" may have ruled even after the war, but they only did to not be conservative, they wanted change and they achieved it by "Purify a corrupt constitution."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Wealthy in the Context of Colonial America**by [Daniel Oas](#) - Friday, November 16, 2018, 6:23 PM

When I describe the leaders of the American revolution as wealthy, I am stating the fact that they were part of the wealthiest social class in colonial American society. Thomas Jefferson for example, grew up on a very wealthy plantation in Virginia. You say my reasoning for why I believe the revolution was a conservative movement is confusing, but it is actually rather simple. The American revolution was a conservative movement due to the fact that it was led by the wealthiest, highest ranking members of American society who were already governing prior to the revolution and who continued to govern after the revolution. This is the primary reasoning in Carl Degler's argument. When we compare the American revolution to the French and Russian revolutions, which were led by lower ranking social classes in these societies, we see the drastic differences. The definition of conservative is, holding to traditional attitudes and values and cautious about change or innovation. While the founding fathers did change our form of government drastically, the social structure of colonial America remained the same. The American Revolution is unique in the sense that the original rulers of colonial America ruled from an entirely different continent. This meant that for the most part, American citizens were the ones actually governing and making decisions for the colonies. And after the revolution ended, those who were governing continued to govern. The

end of the revolution just meant Americans no longer had to pay Britain taxes or listen to their monarch's decrees. I feel that the American revolution was more of a liberation than a true revolution with significant changes in social structure.

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



Re: Wealthy in the Context of Colonial America

by [Gurpritam Sandhar](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 1:20 PM

Daniel, when you say, "The American revolution was a conservative movement due to the fact that it was led by the wealthiest, highest ranking members of American society who were already governing prior to the revolution and who continued to govern after the revolution." I kindly disagree. I say this because like in my post before, I believe the only reason those "highest ranking" officials were governing before and after the war was because of their education and prior history of knowing how to make decisions for a nation. Yes, it may have been a conservative move, but was the outcome conservative? I say no, because after the war "these wealthy people" such as Thomas Jefferson, was the one to write the Declaration of Independence which declared that the American colonies were free from British authority and influence. On page 196 of our class textbook its written, " Jefferson claimed that the Declaration was intended to be an expression of the American mind. Rather than the product of any single philosophical tradition, it is a masterpiece of intellectual synthesis." They may have been wealthy, but they also wanted a change from how things were under British rule, this is not a conservative move in my opinion. Also, you stated that, The end of the revolution just meant Americans no longer had to pay Britain taxes or listen to their monarch's decrees." I agree with you when you say that Americans didn't have to listen to their Monarch's decrees, but when you say they didn't have to pay British taxes I disagree. I say this because like we talked in class, we may have gone away from the Tea Tax, but not to long after Americans had the Whiskey tax which was far more (percent wise) than the tea tax. Taxing the people you could say was a conservative move because it was something the British did, but you can't blame anyone for that because in order to run a nation, the money needs to come from somewhere.

I'm not disagreeing with you and your take on this topic, I just feel like the American Revolution was not conservative.

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



Re: The Revolution

by [Gurpritam Sandhar](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 6:52 PM

Having read through both sides of, "Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement", I have to go with Gordon S. Wood and say No, it was not. I say this because of two main reasons. If we look at the definition of the word conservative on google it

shows it as, "Holding to traditional attitudes and values and cautious about change or innovation, typically in relation to politics or religion." After thinking about it for a while and thinking about the Strict Constructionist definition of revolution being, "Producing significant and deep societal change", both definition in my opinion contradict each other. Conservative, trying to keep away from change while the strict constructionist definition of revolution is all about the change. The first reason that I went with the NO side was because of what Historian Gordon wrote on page Nine of the handout. He writes, "In our eyes the American revolutionaries appear to be absorbed in changing only their governments, not their society. But in destroying monarchy and establishing republics they were changing their society as well as their governments, and they knew it (9)." British colonization of the Americas began in 1607 and it lasted until the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1783, for over 176 years the British leaders had a say in each and everything that was going on. When the war ended the Monarchy ended with it, which meant no more leader(s). Had the Revolution been conservative, we still would have a leader running the show, but it wasn't. We were given a president that had rules he had to follow, who didn't have the power to keep the presidency "in the family" because it was the people (Americans) who decided that. This power that was given to the people of America was also something very different when compared to how the British ruled because they did not have a government that was set up like ours would turn out to be after the war. The second reason why I went with the NO side was because of another great point that Gordon Wood brought up. On Page 10 of the reading. He writes, "Americans had become almost overnight, the most liberal, the most democratic, the most commercially minded, and the most modern people in the world." In class on multiple occasions I have heard Professor Escobar say that The British empire had the biggest and strongest army the world had seen for its time and for George Washington and his army along with the help of French, for them to beat the British was astonishing. They literally took the head off the snake and became the leaders of not only the nation but the world in certain aspects. I believe because of this win over the British it put America's name out in the world, which sent a message along with it, "don't mess with us". The American Revolution changed everything about our nation and along with it changed how others (countries) looked at us after the war. I feel it was not conservative.

What do you guys think?

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

3



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



Conflicting visions, lots of change

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Thursday, November 15, 2018, 12:14 PM

I agree with you completely. To me, the words "conservative" and "revolution" just don't sit well together. The way you phrased it, it seems like the question becomes whether or not the American Revolution was a revolution.

The Federalists and the Anti-Federalists both had strong visions for America and both parties strived to push through their agenda. The textbook states that "The fight between Federalists and Democratic-Republicans echoed the revolutionary contest between liberty and power... Only when this Age of Democratic Revolution ended in

1815 could Americans survey the kind of society and government that their own revolution had made.” The American Revolution changed America in and of itself, but the Federalists and Anti-Federalists both sought to make further changes according to their respective visions.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Revolution :An America Change

by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Thursday, November 15, 2018, 10:02 PM

I found it interesting how you analyzed this article. I must admit that Gordon has very good points in saying that the Revolution helped to change the government system, making it more democratic. This helped people to be more liberal and end the monarchy. According to Gordon, the Revolution transformed American society, making it different from other revolutions. Another factor Gordon mentions is that the Revolution made anti-slavery and women's rights possible.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: The Revolution

by [Emma Powell](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 6:45 PM

Gurpritam, I totally agree with you, I also chose the side of no, being that the revolution wasn't truly revolutionary your quote from page 9 of the handout from Gordons essay, “ In our eyes the American revolutionaries appear to be absorbed in changing only their governments, not their society. But in destroying monarchy and establishing republics they were changing their society as well as their governments, and they knew it (9).” stuck out to me. I know this choice heavily depends on how a person interprets revolutionary but this exactly lays out the definition perfectly in my eyes, as well as yours. I also agree with your point about how the Americans were put into the world as a force to be reckoned with because they had not only separated from but defeated the British. Overall I completely agree with your points.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: The Revolution

by [Emma Powell](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 7:29 PM

The American Revolution shaped the History of the United States of America, but does that mean it was revolutionary? Gordon S. Wood makes a great argument for why it wasn't revolutionary, he first explains that typically revolutions were very destructive which is true, typically property was destroyed, people were killed, and most revolutionaries were angry and ready to risk it all. Truly thinking back to the American Revolution people weren't risking a lot. They has already made to voyage over and had their battles out this seemed to be a lesser risk than they had already taken. Wood also makes a point to say that yes

the american revolution had “radically and thoroughly transformed” America. Pointing out that that doesn’t necessarily make it revolutionary, stating “ there was no mass poverty, no no seething social discontent, and no grinding oppression. These are the things that usually lead to some kind of revolution, sparked by anger and depression, these people however just wanted recognition. I believe Wood is correct in his findings and explanation of what is revolutionary and what the American Revolution actually was. I too don’t think it was revolutionary, what do you think?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


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


America Revolution a new point of view

 by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Thursday, November 15, 2018, 10:18 PM

I agree with the concept that Gordon uses to refer to the Revolution. Since in other revolutions like Gordon mentions you can see bloody combats. According to Gordon and what you argue, is that the American Revolution was a change within society. That is, society changed its way of thinking politically. As Gordon says "The Revolution did not just eliminate monarchy and create republics: it actually reconstituted what America meant by public or state power".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


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


Re: America Revolution a new point of view

 by [Emma Powell](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 10:47 PM

Yes Maria, exactly. He makes many points of all the things that happened surrounding the “revolution”, and how it wasn’t as far reaching as others. There wasn’t an over through of power, there wasn’t crazy riots, or things like that, more than anything it was the gain of independence that shaped history and yes the events leading up to it were impactful but not radical.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0


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


The American Revolution was a Radical event.

 by [Carlos Alvarez](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 7:38 PM

After reading both articles, i'm more on Gordon S. Wood's side that the American Revolution was a far-reaching radical event that produced a different type of democratic society, that allowed people to make money and be self governing. The American Revolution was different in the way that it didn't have leaders who were bloodthirsty. Washington, Jefferson, and Adams were not like other revolutionaries where others often had bloodshed, and they wouldn't make manifestos in cellars or in the streets, they would make pamphlets in drawing or legislative rooms (P.1) As Gordon says on (p.2) ,The

Revolution did not portray the goals of rioting due to economic failure nor did it threaten mass population, poverty and the economy were not present, that's usually how "revolutions" are triggered, the American Revolution had no evidence of occurrences like that. The Revolution was as radical and social as any revolution in history, by the time the revolution had run its course in the early 19th century, American society had been radically and thoroughly transformed, one class did not overthrow another and the poor did not supplant the rich.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**A positive change in Americans life.**by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 7:55 PM

I agree with you that the American Revolution was not the same as other wars. As Gordon mentions, this was a change in society. In other words, it was a change in people's minds. This change helped to form new systems in society, an example would be the new political system for Americans.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The American revolution conservative or not?**by [Brayden Lane](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 7:55 PM

I believe that the American revolution was a conservative movement and that it was in fact a radicalized movement. "the revolution did more than legally create the United states, it transformed American society." (Pg 14 Gordon S wood). To me this quote seems simple but also is the base of the argument on why I believe it wasn't conservative. The transformation of the American society is the basis of a radical non conservative movement. The key part for me to believe it wasn't a conservative movement was the drastic change of society from before the revolution to after.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Perspective**by [Devin Brown](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 9:03 PM

In order to determine if a revolution is conservative or not, there are a few things that we need to decide on beforehand: what makes a revolution a revolution, and what makes it conservative--or conversely, radical.

Merriam-Webster defines a revolution as "2 b: a fundamental change in political organization. *especially*: the overthrow or renunciation of one government or ruler and the substitution of another by the governed." I see it as basically the same way, putting it as "an armed conflict resulting from the citizens of a land fighting to overthrow the individual(s) ruling them," although I suppose it doesn't *have* to be armed.

The way I see a revolution being conservative or not is simple: a radical revolution is one where the people's lives change drastically from before to after said revolution, so a conservative revolution is one where the people's lives don't change *that* much after the revolution. In other words, to determine if a revolution is conservative or radical, we have to ask if the citizen's day-to-day lives changed enough to consider it a radical revolution, else their lives didn't change enough, and so the revolution would be considered a conservative one.

One big change that happened as a result of the American Revolution as mentioned in Carl N. Degler's paper on why the American Revolution was a *conservative* movement, titled *A New Kind of Revolution Conservatives can be Innovators*, stating "the ratification of the federal Constitution in 1788 constituted the first step in the acceptance of the principle that a man's religion was irrelevant to government, for the Constitution forbade all religious tests for officeholding" (pg. 1). Even though Mr. Degler was arguing that the American Revolution was a conservative movement, he himself agreed that this change was important, showing off its importance, so that no man was beholden to practice his land's religion, else be ostracized.

In Gordon S. Wood's paper, titled *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, he mentions that "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" (pg. 11). Now it didn't matter so much who you were born to, as even though it might have given you an innate advantage in life if you were born in wealth, you were no longer capped on your social mobility, with society focusing more on merit (ability) than cronyism (connections).

With just these two examples, I already have to agree with Mr. Wood's argument that the American Revolution wasn't conservative, but instead radical. Sure not all aspects of American's lives were changed, slavery was still a thing, and there were still poor people, and rich people still had the most land, but *enough* change had occurred to warrant calling the American Revolution a radical event.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: The Revolution a revolution

by [Brenden Nesbitt](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 9:33 PM

Strict constructionists would define a revolution as a "significant and deep societal change." I believe the revolution was carrying on already the ideas and values of those who initially came to the Americas. After reading both articles, I come to agree with Gordon S. Wood as in the revolution was not a conservative movement. I feel as the revolution gave new beginnings to those who believed in the fundamental idea of America, not only physically with land and compensation, but with freedom, religious freedom, and the true ability to pursue themselves. "Patriots, on the other hand, were those who not only loved their country, but were free of dependent connections and influence; their position or rank came naturally from their talent and from below, from recognition by the people." - John Adams page 12. That sounds like the "American Dream". Page 10

"Americans had become almost overnight, the most liberal, the most democratic, the most commercially minded, and the most modern people in the world." "It was the revolution that was crucial to this transformation." There seems to be nothing conservative about the outcome of the revolution, the aftermath was what Americans hoped a revolution would bring solidifying the building blocks and base of what our nation would later become.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



A revolutionary society?

by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:05 PM

Reading and analyzing the information provided about the American Revolution, I decide to be on the side of Carl N. Degler in saying that the Revolution is a Conservative Movement. One of the first points of which Degler speaks is the vulnerability of the Anglican Church. The majority of Anglicans supported the Revolution, had a great effect on it, especially in the southern states. According to the book, "They deprived it of its tax support and other privileges, such as the right to perform marriages" (p.219) Degler continues explaining that they did not decide to set up another church, on the contrary they decided to separate the Church from the State, emphasizing that the religion of man was irrelevant to the government. Of course it also tells us that religion is not entirely separate from religion since the federal government continues to encourage religion through taxes. Another important point that is addressed in this article is slavery. In states like Massachusetts they ended slavery. Although in some places the end of slavery had to wait a little longer. According to the book, people "the south" still suffered from slavery. Although in the north great part of the slaves obtained their freedom, but they were not treated with equality. "Pennsylvania led the way in 1778 with the modern world's first "gradual emancipation" statute. Rather than emancipate, or free, slaves immediately. it declared that children born to slave after date would become free at age 28" (p.220)

Degler also argues that there was an inequality during the Revolution. According to Degler, "the revolution in Virginia was made and led by the great class, and its member remained to reap the benefits". This point is supported by the book by saying that at the end of the war the speculators and absentees were ready to claim the best lands for them. (P.222). It is also mentioned that during the War of the Revolution, Americans recruited many soldiers with the promise of giving them land at the end of the war. The problem at the end of the war is that there was not enough land to fulfill this promise, now they needed the lands of the Indians to fulfill their promise.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: A revolutionary society?

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Tuesday, November 13, 2018, 3:54 AM

You make several great points but I have to disagree with you on religion being a conservative part of the revolution. The American revolution brought around a government where a man's religion was irrelevant to government and politics. No matter a man's religion he was free and had a chance to serve in office. Governments had

always been closely associated with religions usually having national religions for countries. Degler even supports this in his part of the article. "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. Since Emperor Theodosius in the fourth century of the Christian era, religious orthodoxy had been considered necessary for good citizenship and for service to state. All this weighty precedence was boldly overthrown by American's in 1789-91 when they erected a government wherein a man's religious tenets will not forfeit the protection of the laws nor deprive him of the right of attaining and holding the highest offices that are known in the United States." He says that the American's **boldly** overthrew a precedence that had been around since the fourth century. I believe that to be that bold is radical for that time.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3


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


A country unlike any other

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 11:09 PM

I agree with the stance taken by Wood. The revolution may have been intended as a conservative movement, but its short-term and long-term effects brought about tremendous changes.

Some of the major changes were political; the colonies severed themselves from Britain to form a republic. The states adopted written constitutions, some of which inspired the constitution of the newly formed United States of America. Power was delegated to the people. While it's true that some people weren't seriously affected by the shift in power, in a broader sense this transition was of great significance. As was pointed out in class, prior republics were seldom stable and strong. They often ceded power to the same kind of monarch or dictator that they had tried to avoid. (Later, Washington stepped down from power to try to ensure that his new country wouldn't also succumb to this trend.) The Americans formed a country on the basis of equal rights for all. Of course at the time this only applied to free property-owning men, but as Wood pointed out it set a precedent for the gradual extension of universal rights to other groups of people.

What Degler seems to be arguing is that the social structure of the colonies remained unchanged before and after the war. On the contrary, Americans became a self-governing people and were related to each other differently than they had been as fellow British subjects. The arguments for liberty and equality also indirectly led to the eventual abolition of slavery in the North. Additionally, the United States became a country that guaranteed freedom of religion. A government that wasn't intertwined with religion hadn't been seen before. These changes formed a country unlike any other, one that has endured, expanded, and prospered for centuries.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3


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


Yes, The revolution was Conservative

by [Kenzie Hodges](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 11:40 PM

I find it hard to set myself firmly on one side of this discussion. When we first talked about the definitions of revolution on the 6th I saw a lot of weight in the point that those who held power before the revolution weren't replaced at the end. Something Carl Degler also brought up in the fourth page of our handout. Even our textbook has to qualify it as "in it's own way, truly revolutionary." (pg 232) Not simply revolutionary, not quite. The strict definition of revolution is significant and deep social change. One of the biggest pieces of colonial social dynamic was there loyalty to each colony, and that didn't change after the war. It is still a part of the modern American social dynamic. West coast vs East coast, Californian vs Oregonian, North vs South. The actual system of government did change, but the change to society wasn't revolutionary.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

2



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



States vs. States Mindset

by [Devin Brown](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 4:11 PM

To be a bit blunt, I don't quite understand your argument for why the Revolution was conservative. Is it just because we still identify ourselves as citizens of our state, as they did citizens of their respective colonies? It seems a bit unreasonable to demand for the revolution to be considered radical, that we don't identify with our neighbors in our own state. Else if your argument is that we devote ourselves to purely our own state, and don't look to other states for help, or give other states help, that would be false. A quick google search brings up the disaster involving Texas and Hurricane Harvey, and how "at least 21 states had sent emergency response teams and equipment to help" (<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2017/09/06/in-natural-disasters-states-lend-each-other-a-hand>, 1st paragraph). Sure we may identify ourselves as Oregonians (or whatever state someone is from), or as West coasters, but that's for several reasons, one being the sheer size of our country, another being that's just how countries go when they have multiple different sub cultures.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

2



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



No, the revolution was not very conservative.

by [Stevie Escobedo](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 11:54 PM

The American revolution was interesting in a sense that America tried to create a new ideal of how a country should be ran, rather than just adopting how another country does it. it did this in many ways but one way especially was the independent nature of it that Gordon S. Wood mentioned in his article. Wood said something along the lines of America did not just want independence from Great Britain they wanted independence in general. Because independence was an important factor in the making of this new country it made obstacles that stood in the way of success that came with a lack of independence go away. One of these obstacles being eliminated with the separation of church and state. Under Britain rule and also in many other countries, at this time religion played a gigantic role in

determining ones success, if a man was driven and had resources as well as a strong work ethic it almost didn't matter if he wasn't an active member in the church because he did not have to support of others. Because of the emphasis of independence everybody took a chance of success (obviously excluding those of color and women) and the hierarchy was deluded between social classes. people that were no body could now be somebody and for many it worked that way

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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


No The Revolution Was Not A Conservative Movement

by [Sharon Osicho](#) - Tuesday, November 13, 2018, 10:20 PM

I agree with Gordon S. Wood that the Revolution was not a conservative movement. He begins his article by speaking about the differences between Washington, Jefferson, and Adams they were "too cautious" "too much the gentleman" (pg8 first paragraph) Like we learned in class Gross states "iif 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." (pg. 9 paragraph 2)

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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


No it was not conservative.

by [Brayden Lane](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 10:21 PM

"By the early years of the nineteenth century the revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth century".(Pg10) To me when a society changes in a drastic way over a short period of time that is a revolution. The fact that from the 18th century to the 19th century society changed as much as it did tells me that it wasn't a conservative movement. The American revolution was a radical event that involved all people not just some. Society is a different classes and groups of people so when an entire society changes it is considered a radical movement.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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


Radical Revolution

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 8:50 AM

Another point Wood discusses is the change in economic status he states that the Revolution "released powerful entrepreneurial and commercial energies that few realized existed and transformed the economic landscape of the country." This idea has endured till today. You always hear about the American dream. People have been coming to America to chase that dream ever since the Revolution. The dream that a nobody that has nothing could come to this country. With hard work, dedication, and a little luck they could become wealthy prominent members of society.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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

**Radical Revolution**by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 8:50 AM

The idea of freedom and all men being created equal started a chain of events that would eventually help bring down slavery. Shortly after the Revolution when the Northwest Ordinance added five new states to the union it was stated that slavery was to be prohibited in these new states. This was years before other countries put in any efforts towards ending slavery. Joe stated in class that Britain did not end slavery until 1833. While it would still be years before the full abolishment of slavery these events helped set it in motion. Wood also noticed these connections. "The Revolution in effect set in motion ideological and social forces that doomed the institution of slavery in the North and led inexorably to the Civil War."

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Radical Revolution**by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 8:51 AM

The government created from the Revolution changed the idea of politics. Men no matter their social standing could run for office. They followed the precedent set by Washington and had set term limits. Men were allowed to vote no matter their religion. Wood said "The revolutionaries wanted to create a new republican world in which all offices lie open to men of merit, of whatever rank or condition." This had never been the case before. But now we take it for granted and this started in the Revolution.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)[◀ Continuing the Discussion](#)[Continuing the Discussion ▶](#)[◀ Web Video - Hamilton's Plan \(hidden\)](#)[CLICK HERE for Forum 3 Materials & Questions \(hidden\) ▶](#)[i Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Log out](#))
[HST 201 F18 \(Escobar Meta 20749 22611\)](#)

[? GET HELP](#)[SHED \(Student Help Desk\)](#)[ATC \(Instructor Help Desk\)](#)[How to use Moodle \(Basics for Students\)](#)[IT Services](#)[Computer Labs](#)

[Tutoring Services](#)

[Library](#)

[Get the mobile app](#)