

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](#)



Conservative and Radical aspects of the Revolution

by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 11:32 AM

In considering whether or not the American Revolution was a conservative movement, I find that my assessment lands somewhere in the middle. I find certain aspects of the Revolution to be conservative, while others, to me, seem to be quite radical. For starters, I agree with Carl Degler when he points out that, "For the most part, the society of post-Revolutionary America was but the working out of social forces that were already evident in the colonial period (Degler, paragraph 13)." He goes on to point out that the

overwhelming majority of leading Revolutionaries were from the upper-middle class, and most of them that had, "Filled an office before the Revolution also occupied an office under one of the new state governments (Degler, paragraph 17)." The fact that many of the leaders who were responsible for motivating the patriots to rebel were wealthy, land-owning, gentlemen, and that most of them who enjoyed political power prior to the Revolution continued to enjoy that privilege after the war is, in my opinion, one of the more conservative qualities of the Revolution.

On that note, I find it hard to deny that there were also some very radical aspects to the Revolution as well. The most prominent of these probably being that Americans chose to establish a Republican government even though Republics have had very little historical success. I also find myself mostly agreeing with Gordon Wood when he states how post-Revolutionary Americans, "had become... the most liberal, the most democratic, the most commercially minded, and the most modern people in the world (Wood, paragraph 7)." While the American Revolution didn't necessarily give power to, or even create a new social class, it did bring about many radical social changes within American society.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

3



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



The American Revolution: Causing the already inevitable changes to happen within society.

by [Anthony Armenta Williams](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 2:08 PM

As you have come to a conclusion of an idea that certain aspects are conservative, as well as addressing that with that came radical aspects, I find myself coming to a similar conclusion. Degler discusses "that no major shift in leadership took place ... , as a result of the Revolution." As well as providing an explanation of how post-Revolutionary America's social forces were evident in the colonial period (Page 4). Although Degler explains how the Revolution itself didn't cause social social changes from colonial times immediately, Wood goes on to explain that it paved the way for changes in society in the future. "... In destroying monarchy and establishing republics they were changing their society as well as their governments. The broader social transformation that carried Americans from one century and one kind of society to another was "inevitable" (Page 10). My interpretation of this is that even though this change could have, or inevitably would have happened, the Revolution was a crucial, radical part in changes of society. As Wood states on page 11, "The American Revolution was integral to the changes occurring in American society, politics, and culture at the end of the eighteenth century." Wood goes on to further explain how the nineteenth century anti-slavery and women's rights movements were made possible because of the Revolution. Although radical social changes to American society may not have been apparent immediately as a result of the Revolution, it still created the possibility of the already inevitable radical social changes American society would undergo.

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

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

**Yes, No- the third option.**by [James Carr](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 9:10 PM

Let's rock the boat and presume it wasn't even a revolution. I see a revolution as a drastic change of paradigm in an existing social, economic, or political system. The time and magnitude of CHANGE determines whether it is a revolution. Key word is change. Completely transforming a government or overthrowing a dictator are good examples. An uprising of minorities- the civil rights movement- could be an example of a revolution. BUT, we are looking at two things happening simultaneously. First, the creation of a NEW government. Second, the declaration of independence from the British (not the document, but the whole movement). My point is that this wasn't necessarily a change in an existing government as much as a creation of a new government. If 10% of Eugene broke off and started a new city near Roseburg, gained independence, and refused to be part of Eugene's policies, would it be a revolution or standard process for creating a new nation state? Let's say it was a revolution. A conservative one? Maybe, depending on how far back you look at the conservative values. The conservation of individual liberties and freedom from taxation? Nope, not under British rule. It may be conservative in the sense that class structure was protected- however, then what would be the change? Conservative Revolution sounds like an oxymoron to me... conserving values but also creating a change in paradigm? It sounds more like a Libertarian Uprising. I digress... I wouldn't agree either that a revolution requires violence, it just so happens that violence finds its way in to a revolution because those in power are not easily pushed away. Governments are designed to withstand rebellion and threats, that is kind of their purpose- so when the revolutionaries don't get their way through bureaucratic methods (or peaceful protest?) they resort to violence (i.e. civil rights movement). It also wasn't only good for the middle class- women won dignity, blacks won freedom (pg 219), and Americans as a whole won popular sovereignty. Yes, the government gained separation of powers and state constitutions to limit those powers (225) but not because of a revolution but because that is how our government was progressively formed. As I said before, was it a revolution or was it just part of the creation of a NEW government. The NEW government allowed for the improved standard of living and social status for minorities and women, the ability for lower class laborers to become upper class business owners, and the ability to form a constitution that protected their rights as citizens.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Yes, No- the third option.**by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 7:43 PM

I really like how you chose to argue that the Revolution wasn't so much of a revolution based on your definition. However, I think I have to disagree with you when you say that, "It also wasn't only good for the middle class- women won dignity, blacks won freedom (pg 219)." the quote from that page in the text reads, "Many slaves won freedom, and women struggled for greater dignity. Both succeeded only when their

goals proved compatible with the ambitions of white householders (textbook, p.219).” I interpret this quote as saying that women weren’t granted greater dignity as a result of the Revolution, but struggled to gain it in a new world that was supposed to grant them more opportunity (but did it?). And as for the slaves, were they awarded their freedom because America won the Revolution, or was it merely payment that was only given to those who were given the opportunity to fight in the war? Is being paid for a job that you performed the same as being granted freedom due to a changing society? Also the quote continues to say that both of these groups only succeeded once the white householders finally decided it aligned with their ambitions, which didn’t happen until quite a long time after the Revolution was over (Emancipation Proclamation, 1863; Women’s Suffrage 1920). I believe that the social changes that occurred after the Revolution were minor, and for the most part, only applied to the white, middle-class property holders. Most of the men who were in positions of power before the Revolution continued to hold power after the Revolution.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3


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


Revolution? Yes. Revolutionary? Yes. Conservative? ____

 by [Canaan Staley](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 8:51 PM

What is a revolution? A revolution can be a social, economical, political, etc change on a large scale that happens within a relatively short time frame. The impact from this change would have to affect the future of the nation (or the world) greatly. Now, what does conservatism mean? It means to hold to tradition, to hold to traditional values and attitudes, and to be wary of change. Was the Revolution a Conservative revolution? No, it was not conservative. The reason why it's not conservative, is because the government and the patriots embraced change. They hoped this change would be for the better, the Revolution was a big risks. Conservatives don't like taking risks, generally; they hold to what they know and they won't fix anything if it ain't broke. An example of taking a risk would be the fact that they created a republic and not so much a democracy. Republics, like Rome's Republic which we learned a little about in class, didn't turn out so well in the long-term. But, the founders still did it, to risk so much to hopefully better the lives of the people of North America. To change how the government works, from the Parliament's sovereign power to the new governments popular sovereignty as shown in pg. 225 in the textbook, influenced how the Constitution developed and changed. The founders mixed the new with the old for the better of the country. After reviewing it all, was it conservative? No.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2


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


No, The American Revolution was not a Conservative Movement

 by [Amanda Francis](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 9:24 PM

After reading both sides of the argument, I agree more with historian Gordon S. Wood that the American Revolution was a more radical event and less of a conservative movement as the author Carl N. Degler argues. Wood explains that it solely depends on how you measure it. If you measure it by “the number of people killed or manor houses burned” then the revolution is deemed more conservative, but if it’s measured by the amount of social change that took place, it’s much less of a conservative revolution (p. 9 of the handout). We can judge the radicalism of the American Revolution by the effects it had on the country not by judging the actual events themselves. Radicalism isn’t necessarily the amount of bloodshed, but, as the Webster’s Dictionary definition states, the “fundamental changes in the socioeconomic situation.”

Degler argues that a significant social change didn’t result from the American Revolution because “no new social class came to power”, but we can’t ignore the impact that the break away from the monarchy had on the newly formed United States in other significant ways. The most impactful result of the American Revolution is how government changed with popular sovereignty, “the theory that all power must be derived from the people”, being the major influence on the U.S. constitution. This idea radically contrasts with Britain’s way of ruling with Parliament having total control. The idea that “governments exist to promote happiness to the people.” (p.225) was an idea specific to the newly free United States. No more kings and queens. The founding fathers would create a constitution with the very intention of not letting any one person or group have too much power. A foundation was being laid that radically differed from their mother country in how to govern their people. So, no, the American Revolution was not a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3


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


Re: No, The American Revolution was not a Conservative Movement

by [James Carr](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:09 PM

It may not be conservative in the sense that the post revolution government is wildly different than British parliament, but what about the conservative values of Americans prior to the revolution? Don't forget, settlers started coming here almost 200 years prior to the revolution in hopes of independence and change. It wasn't until Britain started hammering down on those liberties (like with taxation, stamp tax, tea tax, monopolized trade, etc) that colonists felt threatened... they wanted to conserve those new American values of free trade, no taxation without representation, and freedom of religion. Perhaps it depends on how we view these "conservative" values.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


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


Yes, The Revolution was Conservative.

by [Kristal Tardiff](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:16 PM

I agree with Carl N. Degler's viewpoint the most because, he believes that colonists were conservative and paved the innovative way. He states "Virginia in 1786, in deestablishing the Anglican church, put no other church in its place and instead passed a law

guaranteeing religious freedom." This fact influences my viewpoint because, I believe that this helped paved the way for the religious freedom and practices that we have today. Back in the colonial days, there were fewer churches and religions than there are today. The innovations that the colonists made helped evolve society as a whole.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Yes, The Revolution was Conservative.

by [Canaan Staley](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 8:38 PM

In response to "The innovations that the colonists made helped evolve society as a whole", the terms "innovation" and "evolve" indicate change. The term "conservative" is to hold onto tradition and to be wary to change. When you say "Yes, The Revolution was Conservative", your paragraph would say that there was an embrace of change and implementing religious freedom is a part of that change, contrary to conservatism. Even on pg 225 of the textbook it says, "Adams was already **moving away** from the British notion of a "mixed and balanced" constitution..." and later on pg 227 it says, "other states **adopted variations** of the Virginia model." Adams, and many other patriots wanted to get away from any British influence. The states wanted **change**. If it were conservative, they states would want to keep the British model of government in large ways.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Not a "conservative" movement

by [Ryan Monett](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:30 PM

Was the American Revolution a Conservative movement?

Carl Degler makes the presumption that due to the breakup of the Anglican Church, which he states lead to religious freedom, along with the freedoms gained by the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" made the Revolution a Conservative moment in history. However, the term conservative is taken out of context. Yes, adherence to the Crown and monarchical rule broke down with the Revolution. However, I tend to agree with Gordon S. Wood that the the Revolution was not a conservative movement. Certainly, things DID change. However, given the nature of how dominoes fell because of the Revolution, "to portray the origins and goals of the Revolution as in some significant measure expressions of a peculiar economic malaise or of the social protests and aspirations of an impoverished or threatened mass population – have not been fulfilled." The huge swing of the pendulum from what could be considered present-day central Africa to a modernistic society of a major American city would have been a movement of proportion to dignify the Revolution as a huge event. It was conservative in the aspect that one would ascribe it adhering to the rules and stratification of England exclusively. This was not the case in the American

Revolution. A lot of things changed, but as noted by Mr. Wood, "It was as radical and social as any revolution in history." Also, slavery can be closely defined to whom one's master is. As it has been noted in the Good Book, "One cannot serve two Masters." Slavery, as noted by Wood, can be ascribed to living without Liberty. One quote that stuck out was of Burroughs, that the revolutionaries believed they were so far republican that they considered "a man's merit to rest entirely with himself, without any regard to family, blood or connection." In this way, a man's merit and virtue are defining characteristics not simply the family lineage or "those you know" to place one in a position of strength or power. Character matters and in that way it was not simply a conservative movement. We did not come to keep all things of the Crown in place.

It was Revolutionary but conservative? No.



Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Fight for independence

by [Selina Scott](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:28 PM

Based on my definition of revolutionary the war for independence was in fact revolutionary a "smaller" group rises up against a "larger" group and for the revolutionary war changes were made for the better and the colonies fought for what they wanted and won.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0



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



No, the American Revolution was radical

by [Christopher Bischoff](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:36 PM

I most agree with Gordon Wood, that the American Revolution was not conservative, and that it was radical. "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 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.” (pg. 9)

There were a lot of social changes that took place during the revolution that were unlike the social changes in other revolutions at the time. One of them was the way that individuals gathered and discussed how to best govern the thirteen colonies and newly formed states. There were several plans put forth such as the New Jersey Plan which made all states equal with one vote, or the Virginia Plan in which each person got one vote, meaning that larger states had more power. The result that everyone agreed on was the Connecticut Compromise, which included both plans with the House of Representatives representing the populations of each state and the Senate representing each state equally.

“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.11) These breakthroughs were possible because of the Three-Fifths compromise, that counted slaves as three fifths of a person, and not separately as a slave. The distinction between slave, and fellow human being became smaller.

The other big factor to social breakthrough was the statement “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness..”(Declaration of Independence) This statement is in the beginning of the Declaration of Independence, and served as a legal foundation to end slavery, and to promote equal rights among different genders, races, and social classes.

“Americans had become almost overnight, the most liberal, the most democratic, the most commercially minded, and the most modern people the world.” (pg.10) The American Revolution caused a huge social change that I think, was truly revolutionary.

<http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/document/>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: No, the American Revolution was radical

by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 7:41 PM

I find it interesting how you point out the changes that the Revolution led to later on in the country. However it did not happen during the Revolution. The 3/5 compromise did count slaves as part of a person, but they were not recognized as humans for all. Slave states wanted additional voting power, but didn't want to pay taxes for them. This shows more of a selfish mindset than recognizing their humanity. It also shows the division still within the states. America won a war, but it was certainly not unified yet. Most of the lasting change on this country followed the civil war, where the country was almost torn in two but unified.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The Revolution was a Conservative movement**by [Justin Oljace](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:55 PM

I agree with Degler because I believe that the American Revolution was a conservative movement. It was a conservative movement because after the war America didn't totally change its ideals, it just became a nation free of Britain. One example would be how the very people who began the revolution remained in power after, like presidents Washington and Jefferson. On page 4 Degler says, "It is significant, for example, that no new social class came to power through the door of the American Revolution. The men who engineered the revolt were largely members of the colonial ruling class." Another thing that remained in America after the war was slavery, and it would stick around in this country for 82 more years. Merriam-webster.com defines revolution as: a sudden, radical, or complete change, and I don't think that's what happened during the American Revolution.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution was a Conservative movement**by [James Carr](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 7:40 PM

If you follow that definition you are saying it wasn't even a revolution rather than a conservative revolution. Right? Which one?

Maybe that is rhetorical and I am actually in agreement. Like I said in my post, I don't even think it was a revolution and the very concept of conservatism contradicts a revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution was a Conservative movement**by [Gerardo Morales-Martinez](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 9:59 PM

Hi Justin,

I like your post about you siding with Degler. I really like how you say that the revolution did not cause America to change its ideals. The example you use is similar to the one I used in another post, to highlight the fact that those who had power before the revolution occurred, stayed and maintained power, if not got more power. The part that I find interesting is how we decided to lash back at Britain with not wanting to pay Britain on taxes, almost feeling "oppressed". Then deciding to take action against them is almost ironical and kind of hypocritical. This is because of how America continued to practice slavery even after revolting against the crown. Yet, this is a pattern of continual history in our nation. Defending other countries against fascists and racists only to return back home to a segregated population.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution**by [Aaron Richards](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 10:57 PM

My initial thoughts on the question is that the Revolution was a conservative movement. During their time as colonies of England, their social interactions and norms diverged from those across the pond. This was seen during the 7 Years War when colonial militia and English troops did not get along. Years of being separated causes colonial society to change and form the basis of what America would be like.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution**by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, November 17, 2018, 7:30 PM

After reading more of the handout, I still stick with my first assessment. The American Revolution was a conservative movement. This can be seen by the struggles that follow the end of the war. The first system of government put in place, The Articles of Confederation, which was too weak to run the country. This was caused by the need for a unanimous decision to pass any laws and the inability to tax. The inability to tax was caused by the negative feelings towards tax which helped start the war. After realizing the shortcomings of this government system, they created the Constitution, which needed to be amended more than once to satisfy all of the individual states. This leads to my main point. The revolution may have won American independence, but the social status did not change much during the time period. Americans were still more loyal to their individual states than to the country as a whole. The only possible radical thing was the new government put in place.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The signee's careers before and after "the dividing line of Revolution."(YES)**by [Anthony Armenta Williams](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 11:15 PM

The American Revolution was a conservative movement. Degler explains this in the career's of the Declaration's signee's. He makes the connection of these individuals under the state governments after the Revolution to individuals who occupied office before 1774. Seventy-five percent of individuals had occupied before 1774. But if those who didn't hold office before 1774 and also those who were considered too young to hold office prior to 1774 are not taken for account then the continuity shows up bright as day. "Eighty-nine percent of those who filled an office before the Revolution also occupied an office under one of the new state governments" (Page 5). This leads to a conclusion of that an upper-middle-class leadership affair resulted of the Revolution. Further on page five of Degler's explanation he states that no mass from the bottom of colonial society rose to seize control of the Revolutionary situation. The status of men were merely shifted. From their

statuses prior to the Revolution, to new positions after that were comparable, if not improved. Nothing radical changed about the offices before and after the revolution, supporting indeed that it was a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Re: The signee's careers before and after "the dividing line of Revolution."(YES)

by [Austin Anderson](#) - Friday, November 16, 2018, 11:28 AM

The idea that it was more of a conservative movement seems to be the general consensus of the class, including myself. I do wonder if the reason why it's seen as a movement more than a revolution is because it's being viewed through our American lenses to where we don't consider it a revolution, or if it really was just a movement. Most people who consider it a revolution view the definition of revolution as the use of violence, big or small, to change something in the nation. I wonder if that definition is what does lead people to think about it as a true revolution. As what was seen after the American Revolution, most of the way politics worked in the colonies went almost unchanged, other than a president instead of king, but people's ability to move west was greatly helped after the United States became its own country. A lot of the evidence that I've picked up points to the American Revolution being a revolution in name only.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



No Radicalism in the American Revolution

by [Gerardo Morales-Martinez](#) - Monday, November 12, 2018, 11:43 PM

After reading the articles and both sides of the argument, i found myself more in favor with Gordon S. Wood. The reason I like his argument is because from the beginning he makes it clear that "The American revolutionary leaders do not fit out conventional image of revolutionaries...". He further discusses the difference between the ones we picture when we think of revolution, and then our founding fathers. He argues that this idea of "Revolution" is not the one we think of. He writes that "the white people were not an oppressed people", that they didn't know exactly what it was to revolt.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



No, not a conventional revolution

by [Selina Scott](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 2:00 PM

I agree with Gordon Wood when he says "the American revolutionary leaders did not fit the conventional image of a revolutionary - angry, passionate, reckless, and maybe bloodthirsty for the sake of he cause." (pg. 8 wood) I think revolutionaries like George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were way to intelligent to put in jeopardy what was at stake, however I do think they were passionate about the revolution but not in

a way that made them reckless. The cause of the American revolution is different then many revolutions. My favorite thing that Woods says "the white American colonist were not an oppressed people; no crushing imperial chains to throw off." (pg. 8 wood) Meaning the American were actually really free, it wasn't until Britain started making them pay for that freedom that they felt "attacked"

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Revolution

by [Hunter Ignatius](#) - Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 2:29 PM

Before I had read these articles I assumed that I would have had difficulty deciding what side I would agree with, however I would like to say that after reviewing the pieces I began to side with the Revolution most definitely not a conservative movement. "There should no longer be any doubt about it; the white American Colonists were not an oppressed people; they had no crushing imperial chains to throw off." I am understanding this as, the rich white slave owners that would congregate to help form our country weren't doing it as a revolutionary force fighting for our freedom, but instead viewing it that they were searching for the only way to help liberate the rest of the people that had tried to make a new life in the promised land just like themselves.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: The Revolution

by [Austin Anderson](#) - Thursday, November 15, 2018, 4:07 PM

After reading the assignment on both sides of the argument, my view on whether it was a conservative movement or not is that it was a conservative movement and not an attempt at a radical power dynamic shift. A lot of what caused the Revolution was the way colony taxation affected jobs and income, along with Britain forbidding the colonists to continue moving westward. Most events such as the Boston Massacre was due to taxes that effected all colonists, not just specific groups of people within the colonies, such as the Three Crisis' that were talked about in class. One interesting thing that Carl Degler mentions in his argument is "Of those who held an office under the state governments after the Revolution, 75 percent had occupied offices before 1774," (page 5) Most Revolutions would see a major change in who's in power even on a smaller scale in the country, but the majority of those who had a position in the colonies resumed power after the Revolution ended.

Something interesting that Gordon Wood said in his opposing side was that it was less social and more politically radical. "If we measure the radicalism of revolutions by the degree of social misery or economic deprivation suffered, or number of people killed . . . then 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 . . . then the American revolution was not conservative at all" (page 9). While I do agree that there was a lot of the social standings that changed for the country as a whole, such as changing rulers from kings to presidents, which places it

under the definition of a revolution, there wasn't enough of a power change within the colonies themselves for me to consider it a very radical movement. Not only were the power dynamics changed, but the United States started trading with the very people it had fought a war with to make itself independent. Hardly any other country that went through a revolution would willingly trade with who were seen as the enemy during the war.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



How we measure a Revolution

by [Selina Scott](#) - Thursday, November 15, 2018, 8:10 PM

I think separating from the monarchy of Britain was a huge social change and lead to even bigger change. When Wood describes that "If we measure the radicalism of a revolution by the degree of social misery or economic deprivation...people killed, houses burned...then the conservatism of the American revolution becomes true enough" "But if we measure the radicalism by the amount of change that actually took place...the american revolution was not conservative at all." (Wood pg. 9) When you think of the changes that did occur, the separation for Britain might not mean all that much in the large scheme of thing but when you think of the changes made to make our government what is is today then the revolution was extremely radical. The political changes, for American to say they can govern themselves that set government up for what is is today.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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

◀ [Continuing the Discussion](#)

[Continuing the Discussion](#) ▶

◀ [Web Video - Hamilton's Plan \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for Forum 3 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#) ▶

[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](#)