

HST 201: US History F19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 F19 \(Escobar Meta 20635 22256\)](#) / [Week 8 November 17 - November 23](#) / [Forum 3](#) / [The Revolution](#)



Search forums

Forum 3 The Revolution

[Subscribe](#)

◀ [The Revolution](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



The Revolution

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, November 15, 2019, 5:12 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](#)



Re: The Revolution

by [Matthew Hendricks](#) - Friday, November 15, 2019, 10:35 PM

I Would personally have to agree with Carl N. Degler that the American revolution was in fact a conservative movement. If you were to define a progressive revolution then surely an important INTENTION (not result) it would need to have would be to change the current social structure. In the case of the American Revolution I would argue this was not the case, most of the evidence points to the conclusion that the American Revolution was led by the upper class to preserve their status from the perceived threat of Great Britain plotting to rob them of their rights as Englishmen. Degler wrote "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." He also wrote "Of those who held

an office under the state governments after the Revolution, 75 percent had occupied offices before 1774, proving, if need be, that service in the colonial governments before the Revolution was no obstacle to political preferment for a patriot afterward."

These two facts show clearly that the American Revolution did not instigate, or intend to instigate a change of the upper class, which in my understanding is a key feature of a progressive revolution. A counterargument could be that the American Revolution created a democratic government which was radical for the time, however the Government's of the colonies were already democratic, and the intention of the American Revolution was not to change but to preserve that. That is my conclusion of this post, thank you for reading.

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

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


Re: The Revolution

by [Brandon Gericke](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 3:42 PM

I disagree. I believe that the American Revolution did lead to major societal change in America. The independence gained individually and collectively was vast. Not only were individual colonists able to separate themselves from the societal limitations brought over from England, they were also able to practice or not practice religions as they saw fit. Poor people were not only limited to jobs that kept them poor, but could gain wealth and political office based off personal ambition. This sense of individuality would eventually lead to the protest of slavery and other major societal wrongs.

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

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


Re: The Revolution

by [Mark Alexander](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 1:55 PM

I would agree with you in saying that the Revolution did not intend to instigate a change for the upper class (Like you said the Revolution was led by the upper class). After reading what Degler wrote, I concluded like you that no new social class came to power, and most of the upper class that was in power, was holding office before and after the revolution. So I do agree in this one tiny example that the Revolution as a conservative movement indeed. Not to mention, I find it fascinating that Americans when redistributing land, didn't cause as much of an uproar regarding class and land rights like Degler stated was the case in France and Russia.

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

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


The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution

by [Curtis Nordquist](#) - Sunday, November 17, 2019, 5:44 PM

I most agree with Gordon Wood about the fact that the Revolution was indeed the "far-reaching radical event" that changed everything in American society. I'll begin with what I felt was Wood's most convincing list of changes that occurred. These come from page 11 of the paired readings ("Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement?"). Ultimately, it was not conservative at all; it had long reaching arms that changed every facet of American society. Wood points out that the "revolution made possible the anti-

slavery and women's rights movements," forever changing the aristocracy as we had known it at the time. Woods points out that it "brought respectability and even dominance to ordinary people... and gave dignity to their menial labor" that had not been accomplished anywhere in the world. It brought about a "new kind of popular politics and a new kind of democratic officeholder" when it "reconstituted what Americans meant by public or state power". Woods points to the fact that even societal things like "art, architecture, and iconography" had changed, due to the Revolution. The Revolution, according to Woods, "transformed the economic landscape". The Revolution also changed things like inheritance, where Degler (p 6) commented on "primogeniture" (1st born rights of succession) and "entail" (generational inheritance -an entire family holding property rights, locking sales of land) having "no significant alteration in the social landscape" proves to be untrue, because it unlocked all that land to be sold. Sure, land was "plentiful," as Degler states (p 6), but then post-revolutionary movements occurred, such as with (p 13-14) Jefferson proposing (1776) "that the new state of Virginia grant fifty acres of land to every man that did not have that many" --how can that NOT make significant changes to the societal landscape? Our book discusses (p 203; 7-1c & d) Hamilton heading the Department of the Treasury locating and paying back national debt not only to foreign countries that aided us in the Revolution, but also citizens that helped with food, guns, homes for soldiers, etc.; "businessmen and speculators" bought most of the debtors' notes and got rich when the government paid them back. The government got money from taxing imported goods like whiskey, which was yes, similar to British taxes, but this money went to paying off those that aided in our freedom, foreign and domestically. This sort of change cannot be taken lightly, as that sort of political movement and change was unprecedented. Post-Revolutionary America was making unheard-of moves, and indefinitely changed America in a way that just can't be considered "conservative".

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution**by [Glorianna Whiteman-Reyes](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 2:40 PM

While it is true that the long term effects of the war were significant, I don't think that I can agree that they were so dramatic that the whole ordeal constitutes being called a revolution. The institutions in place antebellum where of course changed, but over 69% of officeholders post-war were previously in office before the war (Documents pg 4) In this way, the revolution was very conservative as it kept in place at least some aspects of the previous society.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution**by [Logan Yetts](#) - Thursday, November 21, 2019, 10:01 PM

Although a majority of the officeholders in America post-war were previously in office before the war and there wasn't the total "changing of the guards" that is typical with many revolutions, the ones that were at the very top of the control hierarchy for the colonies, Parliament and the King of England, were removed from power in the Revolution and were (metaphorically) beheaded. In this way, along with the major social and policy changes that took place, I believe the American Revolution is not a conservative revolution.

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


Re: The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution

 by [Caleb Willis](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 9:42 PM

I agree the American Revolution cannot be considered a non-conservative change. As much as Carl N. Degler argues it was, his reasons are weak and in my opinion, not strong enough to be convincing. In regard to how Parliament and the King of England were simply removed from power giving social and policy changes due to it, I disagree. There was far more to how social and policy changes took place. Gordon S. Wood, points out, "...the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place by transformations...-then the American Revolution was not conservative at all..." (pg 9). It may have been different in some way from previous revolutions, it was not only different, but still radical. Radicalism simply means a political and social change. It is a progressive idea which is acted upon. This did change major social and policy changes which took place, but it was not immediate and certainly without strong and determined leaders. "...the American Revolution War was one of the least popular wars in British history." (textbook, pg 175) I believe that if it was a conservative revolution, it would not be considered the least popular war in Britain. "...fighting off crown power" (Wood pg 8), wouldn't have been so significant.

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

2

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

Re: The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution

 by [Caleb Willis](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 7:26 PM

I am going to continue my reason in regard to my previous post. There was no way Britain along with the King, could not be overthrown if it were actually a conservative movement. Wouldn't a conservative movement not just to seek a change of government when focusing on Britain, but would it be so easy and peaceful to simply request separation from England's political hold so to speak, on the colonists? It was quite the opposite. There was war! When the Revolutionary War began which was inevitable, it involved as mentioned previously, a reaction between colonial reactions to English acts, leading to a cause-and-effect progression to war. According to Gordon S. Wood, "...the American Revolution was not conservative at all: on the contrary; it was as radical and as revolutionary as any in history." (pg 9). The Monarchy was destroyed and republics were established which, "...changed society as well as their governments..." (pg 10). In conclusion, the Revolutionary War, American societies were not only transformed, but radically done so. Of course in order for change, the war affected a large area due to a radical necessity in order to break away from Britain.

 Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

0

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

Re: The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution

 by [Jason Stratis](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 11:08 AM

I personally think that another fact about our fight for independence that we are forgetting is the fact that we loved to be Englishman. (Shiela Skemp, American Revolution video 1) This is an important detail that really effects what goal we might've had going into this "revolution". With this fact in mind it seems as though we did mean for it to be a conservative movement with very little change involved. If you still are proud to be that nationality that you are then the amount of change from That society that you are attempting to have may be way more conservative compared to if you hated how things were and how they worked.

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

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


Re: The NON-conservative changes of the Revolution

by [Taylor Hunter-Rogers](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 6:18 PM

I agree, Gordon Wood said "if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change the actually took place by transformations in the relationship that bound people to each other--then the American Revolution was not conservative at all." He also quoted J. Franklin Jameson who says "The stream of revolution, once started, could not be confined within narrow banks, but spread abroad upon the land." I think that you cannot say it was a conservative movement with the substantial amount of change that occurred during this time.

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

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


The America Revolution

by [Tuyen Thanh Diep](#) - Sunday, November 17, 2019, 6:40 PM

I agree with the view of historian Gordon S. Wood that America Revolution is not conservative. However, the American Revolution has great historical significance. It was the first bourgeois revolution that raised the demand for national liberation. According to Wood, as I see that the American Revolution was a "republican" revolution, and that it was more of a community than a capitalist. Instead of materially rearranging society, it has changed the way people build and see their relationships with others. In this sense, it creates a social hierarchy that founders did not expect either.

Socially, to my own understanding that in any society, there are two rich-poor classes always appear, but in order to become a strong and developing country, the appearance of the rich is necessary, because they contribute more benefits to the country. But Gordon argued that "One class did not overthrow another; the poor did not supplant the rich "(Gordon S. Wood, page 10) Society is marked by a rigid divide between the elites and civilians and people often grapple with dependence due to a face-to-face personal political system rife with patronage. Wood argues that equality is the most important legacy of the Revolution, about people's ideas that they are equal to everyone else in terms of rank or wealth.

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

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


Re: The America Revolution

by [Curtis Nordquist](#) - Thursday, November 21, 2019, 4:26 PM

I think that Wood understood that usually in most cases of revolution, the people that were wealthy stay wealthy, even throughout the changes of revolution. On page 8, Wood poses the opinions alternative to his, stating that he understands how progressive historians (like Carl Becker) define a revolution as "a social struggle by deprived and underprivileged groups against entrenched elites," and replies to that theory by responding with the fact that those conditions weren't met by early Americans "because the social conditions that generally are supposed to lie behind all revolutions... were not present in colonial America," further stating that that "does not mean that colonial society was not susceptible to revolution." When I think of history and what I've learned, these "upper class" white colonists revolted against a king for his *benign neglect*, for his people made sure that they were collecting taxes on a LOT of things colonists were buying/selling/trading, but then not helping colonists when they needed it. The king was responsible for his people, and yet, was ignoring their needs, hence a revolution. These colonists, as Wood mentions "knew they were freer, more equal, more prosperous, and less burdened with cumbersome feudal and monarchical restraints than any other part of mankind," but they still needed actual leadership that could help, or (their idea ultimately) rule themselves, provide for themselves, and protect, buy, and sell for themselves. Turns out they were right.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution**by [Skylar Hoffman](#) - Sunday, November 17, 2019, 11:13 PM

I think yes it was a conservative movement I believe it was definitely based on religion and what those religious people believe in. I believe that it was also a religious thing do to who is stronger based on what the people believed in. Some might say they it wasn't a conservative movement and I see where they might think that. They might think that its all based on people wanting power and showing who is boss, but it isn't it's 100% based on religion. I see religion written all over it. There was one group that believed their God was bigger and better and the other group also thought that their God was bigger and better. So as far as I can say it is a conservative movement.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1) 0[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution**by [Brandon Gericke](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 3:29 PM

I do not agree that the American Revolution had much, if anything, to do with religion. I believe that the revolution was caused by a desire to be financially independent from England. Many colonists had made a living and even become more wealthy than they previously could have in England. The colonists were more worried about England affecting their financial stability, than they were worried about religious dominance.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1) 0[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution**by [Tuyen Thanh Diep](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 6:56 PM

As I know, the United States is a superpower with illustrious history pages based on many important factors. The American Revolution was no exception, and it had a great influence on the declaration of independence and the birth of the United States of America. But religion only accounts for a minority of other important causes. I still have not forgotten the prospect of religious persecution by the royal authorities and the British Church significantly promoted colonial efforts. Freedom of religion became a basic American principle, and many new movements emerged, many of which became denominations established in their own rightness. In my opinion, the Revolution brings the respect and equality of those who seek to live a life of freedom, prosperity and the pursuit of happiness.

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

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


Re: The Revolution

by [Sara Montiel](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 8:53 PM

I also can't say that I agree with you simply because it does not seem like religion played as big of a role to say if it was a conservative movement or not. Many historians who argued if the revolution was a conservative movement, or not, rarely connected it with religion. Instead they talked about the social relationships between the people, their political views and their social classes. To back up my statement, Gordon S Wood stated that "By the time the Revolution had run its course in the early nineteenth century, American society had been radically and thoroughly transformed. One class did not overthrow another; the poor did not supplant the rich. But social relationships—the way people were connected one to another—were changed, and decisively so. By the early years of the nineteenth century the Revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth century. It was in fact a new society unlike any that had ever existed anywhere in the World." Not saying I'm right, but this is simply my opinion.

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

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


American Revolution has accomplished more than we expected

by [Tuyen Thanh Diep](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 3:35 PM

That is also one of my points of view about the American Revolution. As Gordon Wood argued, "American Revolution did more than elaborate create the United States; it transformed American Society ... By the early years of the nineteenth century the Revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth century." (Was the American Revolution a Conservative Movement? Page 10 of 16). Since then, the principles of religious freedom, the movement against slavery, and the promotion of women's rights were created for equality. It also changes the face of the economy and politics, helping the US rise to be an independent and free nation.

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

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


Revolution is based in intent

by [Glorianna Whiteman-Reyes](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 3:20 PM

While I can appreciate the effect the war for independence had on Americal society, I am inclined to disagree with calling it a true revolution. I tend to take the loose constructionist view and define a revolution as an, often violent, uprising intended to change political and/or social policies. And while it is clear that gaining independence, in the long run, did lead to vast change in the Americas, I see no evidence that the *intent* was to change America in any significant way. In fact, the argument could be made that the war was fought in order to prevent change in American society. Some of the major triggers in the war were increased taxation, increased British rule, and the threat of England taking away the representative governments that were in place in the colonies(Crisis 1-3 notes, in-class). And while these may have gone against British rule, the colonies were so vastly different from the homeland already, that the event presents itself as more conservative than radical.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: Revolution is based in intent

by [Mark Alexander](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 1:19 PM

I find it really interesting the way you view change regarding the American Revolution. I don't know if I have ever really viewed it with the intent of the Revolution being to maintain colonial values rather than invoke massive change through war. I have always found myself as a sort of Loose Constructionist too. I find it interesting after reading Article 1, that there really wasn't much change in society and politics at least regarding who was in office before and after the revolution, and even when redistributing land. There was enough land to go around that lower class Americans didn't get too upset when 40,000 acre properties were being divided amongst the weathier classes.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: Revolution is based in intent

by [Brandon Gericke](#) - Friday, November 22, 2019, 3:14 PM

I think you present some very solid points. I do think that the intention of the revolution, was to gain a sense of individuality, and to lessen the dependence on the English system. Doing this allowed for some very radical changes. States being able to govern themselves. Common folk being able to ascend above their station in life, based on ambition and personal qualification, instead of bloodline. I do not think that there has to be *intent* to radicalize a revolution, for it to be a true revolution.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: The Revolution

by [Jason Stratis](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 4:06 PM

I agree with Gordon S Wood

Who is to define what a revolution is other than what it is compared to. Sure compared to events such as the French revolution it seems fairly non radical with very little violence and that being less of a tactic of success, however similar ends were met but different means in the American revolution. New government, new leaders And even a way to chose them, and on to top that they physically got away from there king that they would not try to overthrow, but get away from. If you think about it in it's own sense in things it did more than Other revolutions then there should be no doubt that this revolution was radical in different ways than the norm.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Revolutions have Similar Characteristics**by [Abraham Millan](#) - Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 4:34 PM

Without being stiring away too far from the conversation, but this is exactly why I believe the revolution was a conservative momement. It wasn't a radical moment such like in France were violence and anarchy were part of their revolution. It was a revolution inspired by pamlets such as Common Sense and upper class citizens speaking out against the Crown. This type of the disscusion kinda reminds me of the Glorious Revolution we as a class disscussed in Chapter 3.

Glorious Revoltuion was a conservative movement from both Tory and Whig members of Parliament. It was a movement to presevere the Protestant line of kings in the country in fear that King James II would produce a line of Catholic kings. Though Glorious Revolution didn't consist of a war like the Revolution of 1776, it did contain conservative elements similar to our own.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Revolutions have Similar Characteristics**by [Mark Alexander](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 1:23 PM

Adding to your point regarding the differences between the American Revolution versus the French and Russian revolutions, I found it interesting that in Article 1, Carl states that when dividing up previously controlled Torry land, lower class American's weren't as negatively effected as those in France or Russia. He says that because there was so much land to grab, those who didn't already have land were on the way to get it. I guess in areas like France where land is more scarce, this was not the case.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**A Revolution by Class**by [Abraham Millan](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 5:42 PM

Without giving the class a webester dictionary defition of revolution which I know you hate, I rather want to talk about its dynamics. Go into depth of how conservatism principles were really part of the American Revoultion. One of bits of information that really caught my attention was Mr. Degler mention of Slavery. Even though it is completely correct that America did not empicate its slaves after the revolution and did not outlaw its pratice. However African-Americans were using revolutionary principles such as "all men are

created equal" to gain their freedom. In fact Mr. Delger talks about how in 1781, the Supreme Judicial Court Massachusetts declared slavery at an end in that state because it "is inconsistent with our own conduct and Consitution" which set out with declaring that all men are born free and equal.

The revolution was really a conservative movement also in the manner how people "revolted". The colonies did in fact have a war and sacrificed blood for liberation. However people were going to town to town to inspire "revolution", no. Instead men of upper class such as Thomas Paine and Benjamin Franklin were writing pamphlets and news columns to persuade colonists of the "evils" of the Empire. This revolution also did bring genesis of the conservative idea of "free trade". After breaking free from the English Empire's set of ways through mercantilistic restrictions, American merchants have the opportunity to trade with whomever. Setting forth a new way of profits from new markets with no restrictions.

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

1

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: No, it was a radical event

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 6:23 PM

Without defining Revolution which is obvious to most, it is important to seek answers and conclusions as to how the Revolution truly was imperative in regard to change. Of course it affected numerous areas such as leadership in government, but the truth is, reorganization within societies, and specifically how people within societies benefited. Keep in mind, without changes within society, a new government can't and won't be able to move toward a positive and successful change. According to Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, (pg 11), "...it made the interests and prosperity of ordinary people-their pursuits of happiness-the goal of society and government." Societies were finally able to succeed in the pursuit of change, by a system of a give and take relationship. People in societies, societies in states, states within the union, a union with a democratic government, was the reason for success in America. Without question, the American Revolution was considered the most radical and momentous event in the country. "The regular exchange of goods and services was crucial to the workings of rural neighborhoods." textbook (pg 233). Again, an example of a give and take relationship, and just one of many examples of how people in societies benefited toward the importance of every individual.

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

1

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



The Revolution was a far-reaching, radical movement/event

by [Gavin Zammiello](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 7:33 PM

Historian Gordon S. Wood explains how that we tend to think of the American Revolution in a different sense compared to other revolutions, past and present. "American revolutionary leaders do not fit our conventional image of revolutionaries - angry, passionate, reckless, maybe even bloodthirsty for the sake of the cause." We think of American revolutionaries in legislative halls, writing declarations and giving speeches. But our revolution was indeed a radical movement. It is common for us to measure the radicalism of a revolution on people killed, economic decline or deprivation, and a general sense of public depression or despair. Now if we measure radicalism on political and social change, a different picture is painted. Social distinctions and economic deprivations are the "consequence of class divisions, business exploitation, or various isms - capitalism, racism, etc." were seen to stem from an abusive government that held special privileges, monopolies, high/excessive wealth, etc. (See Monarchy definition). In abolishing a monarchy they changed

not only the government, but society as a whole. There were no peasant revolts or class revolutions, and colonial society was changed. The revolution "brought respectability and even dominance to ordinary people long held in contempt and gave dignity to their menial labor ... not equaled elsewhere in the world." The common man could now be self-governed and pursue what they wanted in life, i.e. the pursuit of happiness.

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

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


The revolution was not a conservative revolution...mostly

by [Brandon Gericke](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 9:51 PM

When it comes to the American revolution, both author Carl N Degler, and historian Gordon S Wood, put forth convincing arguments about whether the American Revolution was conservative or radical. Personally I am gonna say that some of the reasons for the Revolution, and the effect of the revolution, made it radical. In Gordon S Woods article, he makes the case that the Revolution was a necessity in order to end "dependence". Not just the dependence of the British and American governments on each other, but the dependence from social constructs that immigrants brought over from England. Gordon S Woods states that "Most important, it made the interests and prosperity of ordinary people, their pursuit of happiness, the goal of society on government" (page 11). Before the revolution, poor people and common people were delegated to menial and often manual labor tasks. Their concerns were not the concerns of the British government. Another example that Woods provides is of a farmer named Moses Cooper. Cooper was a common farmer who rose to wealth and political significance in his town in Rhode Island. Cooper was worried that "what had risen so high, could easily fall" (pg 12). These doubts, which were rooted in the possibility of British Mercantile restriction, caused Cooper to become a Patriot leader of his town. The need for societal dependence from the Matriarchal system of England was obvious. The revolution itself changed American societal values forever.

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

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


No, The Revolution was not a conservative movement

by [Taylor Hunter-Rogers](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 10:21 PM

As said in the text, "the revolution had no peasant uprisings, no jacqueries, no storming of prisons." "The American revolutionaries seem to belong in drawing rooms or legislative halls, not in cellars or in the streets. They made speeches, not bombs." and I believe all of these statements to be true, also stated in the text was "if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that took place by transformations in the relationships that bound people to each other-- then the American Revolution was not conservative at all." It wouldn't make sense to say that the Revolution was conservative if I was to also bring up the position change for women, the architectural changes, and the economic expansion that occurred as well. On page 10 of the text given in class it explains how "In 1760 America was only a collection of disparate colonies huddled along a narrow strip of the Atlantic coast. The less than two million subjects lived in these colonies..... Yet scarcely fifty years later these insignificant borderland provinces had become a giant, almost continent wide republic of nearly ten million citizens"

"The familial image of government now lost all its previous relevance, and the state in America emerged as something very different from what it had been." I believe that for us to say the revolution was in fact a conservative movement, we'd have to put aside all of the extreme changes in the economic growth and

pretend like it never happened, which to me doesn't sound quite right.

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

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


Re: No, The Revolution was not a conservative movement

by [Gabe Waisanen](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 4:18 PM

I agree with Taylor, and I liked the quote she used from the textbook! People tend to think the Revolution was conservative, because it was a Revolution that was about speeches, and laws passed, not just about wars, weaponry, and armies. Viewing the war not only on how it affected the world, through violence, and financially, but also socially, provides a better reason to consider the war not being considered. Gordan S Wood makes a great points on this, and further argues why he thinks the Revolution was not conservative, but radical, when he wrote on page 9, "In fact, it was one of the greatest revolutions the world has known, a momentous upheaval that not only fundamentally altered the character of American society but decisively affected the course of subsequent history." He convinced myself, and hopefully others, that the revolution didn't just depend on the wars and fighting, smaller than most other revolutions, but also on social change, that supports the idea of the revolution being radical, not conservative.

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

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


The Revolutionary Argument: Conservative or Radical?

by [Jackson Such](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 10:33 PM

What even is a revolution? Well, simply put: It's an uprising against an established order in order to form a new, "better" one. The impact revolutions have on a province/country/state/etc is explosively visible, with altered economies, social spheres and governments, as we've established last week, about the American Revolution. Which, just so happens to be our argumentative forum for this week. Which is awesome! I'm excited to actually participate and get the ball rolling, or at the very least, add snow to the ball instead of watching from the sidelines- I digress with a poor analogy. The argument presented to us asks if we personally believe if the Revolution was a conservative or if we believe it to be a radical movement.

In my eyes, the American Revolution was a radical response to British reform on behalf of liberty, but there's a problem: the question of 'is the American Rev. even a real revolution?' is brought up a lot by historians because of the fact that in many ways, it IS conservative, as the reasoning behind the war in the first place was to preserve liberties, particularly the rights of (a) community(ies) within a centralized power or ruling government. This is the one of the major impulses of the revolution; it begins as a reaction of reform but it turns democratic due to the patriots desire to seek out this sort of broad political class system, where voting was the central system for appointing officials in any capacity, where these appointed officials would have the say in laws, how money is spent, who and where to tax- leadership of individual states within the grand scheme of the Republic of America. It was one of the massive hallmarks of the war and this, along with many other key conventions of the reason early United States citizens fought this war is steeped in democratic ideals and passions. So, my definitive answer is that the war, although beginning radically, became a **conservative movement**.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**No, The American Revolution was not a conservative movement**by [Sara Montiel](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 11:55 PM

After reading the articles and the two points of view, I agree the most with Gordon S. Wood and his opinion on how the American Revolution is not a conservative movement. In my own opinion without Wood's side, I already believed that it wouldn't be possible for the American Revolution to not have brought about significant social change. For America to have conserved their economic and societal status from before the American Revolution just does not seem like something that would be possible after such a crucial event in history. There are many things that changed after the Revolution, but to start off with one, Wood goes on to make some good points. I fully support when he stated that "if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place by transformations in the relationships that bound people to each other then the American Revolution was not conservative at all; on the contrary: it was as radical and as revolutionary as any in history" (Pg 9). This portion of his argument shows that there was a significant amount of change that actually took place. It shows that although the American Revolution was not so visibly radical, it brought about social change that affected even the very relationships between every member of society. Then he goes on to follow that statement with "By the time the Revolution had run its course in the early nineteenth century, American society had been radically and thoroughly transformed. One class did not overthrow another; the poor did not supplant the rich. But social relationships—the way people were connected one to another—were changed, and decisively so. By the early years of the nineteenth century the Revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth century. It was in fact a new society unlike any that had ever existed anywhere in the World" (pg 10). He clearly goes on to state how the Revolution had effects on the social relationship between people.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Why the American Revolution was NOT a conservative revolution**by [Gabe Waisanen](#) - Monday, November 18, 2019, 11:56 PM

The American Revolution was not a conservative movement, due to the radical societal change, produced from the effects of, as written by Gordon S. Wood, who disagrees with defining the American Revolution as conservative, he writes, "Social honors, social distinctions, perquisites of office, business contracts, privileges and monopolies, even excessive property and wealth of various sorts, all social evils and social deprivations." (Page 2, Par 2). The revolution changed the the way society perceived each other, the relationships between individuals, and the economic landscape of america! One way in which the American Revolution created was a radical movement within our society, as stated in our textbook, is when the author wrote, "With the men away fighting, many women were left in charge of the household, sometimes with interesting consequences." (Pg 186, Par 8). This changed how women were in America, the effects of having a certain view from society of women's duties.

I thank you for reading my post and hope you reply with any concerns/questions!

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Why the American Revolution was NOT a conservative revolution**by [Grant Winters](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 12:19 PM

I like the example you used from the book this is very easy to follow and according to the article and with the example from the book i would say you are right. This was not a movement that had any ulterior motives other than breaking away from the crown which resulted in violence.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: The Revolution**by [Mark Alexander](#) - Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 12:22 PM

Yes, I agree that the Revolution was a conservative movement that in many ways left prewar social and economic values untouched. I would like to first focus on a key point Carl brings up that is you can study the governing class and social changes throughout America by evaluating and analyzing the lives of our Founding Fathers and those that signed the Declaration of Independence. Carl notes it's striking to see that majority of these signers held office before and after the Revolution and most importantly these upper-classes leaders "shifted" their already important and favored status in the colonies to improved positions after the War. Carl notes that with this continuity, political and social stability was maintained in the newly created nation. He further notes that this political and social stability brought to America is "rarely associated with the word Revolution." It is also noted that social change was left untouched in many ways after the war regarding the redistribution of previously controlled Torry and Loyalist land. Carl states that unlike in France and Russia the land distribution in America "hardly constitutes a social revolution". He states this is because land in America was just "too plentiful" and "most men who wanted it already possessed it." I would agree with Carl's conclusion that in many ways the Revolution was "a natural and even expected event in the history of a colonial people" and that the social and political change typically accompanies a Revolution had been "implicit in the pre-Revolutionary society".

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**A Conservative and Partly Cultural Revolution**by [Connor Eden](#) - Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 7:09 PM

I defined revolution as any drastic change from or attempt to subvert the current status quo, usually using propaganda or violence as a means. Carl N Deglers case for the movement being a conservative movement led by the colonial ruling class, lacking the great social and economic upheaval of the European revolutions to follow. The data he provides on signers of the Declaration of Independence paints a clear picture "Fully 40 percent of them attended college or one of the Inns of Court in England at a time when such a privilege was a rarity" he goes on to say "21 percent of them came from important families of their respective colonies" (men of inherited wealth). He continues to pile on evidence with saying "69 percent of them held office under the colonial regimes, 29 percent alone holding some office within the executive branch;". Lastly he gives us a figure which best illustrates his point "75 percent had occupied offices before 1774 ``.(Deglers) This evidence he provides I believe illustrates well the idea that the Revolution was born of politics and

principal against encroaching external rule where we see no major shift in societal hierarchies. Joyce Applebee states in the web video in regard to Hamilton a similar ideal stated in our textbook(pg 116), Colonial Americans knew and believed that under British laws and practices they were the most free people in the world and as Ms. Applebee puts it "Hamilton wanted America to become a purer Great Britain, he accepted a world of hierarchy, status and central control." (hamilton video)

Although Delgers makes the more compelling argument of the two many of Woods points are valid. Woods describes a more cultural revolution into a sort of purist republican state where class and forebearers should mean absolutely nothing in matters of holding public office as stated by David Ramsay "all offices lie open to men of merit, of whatever rank or condition ...that "even the reins of state may be held by the son of the poorest men, if possessed of abilities equal to the important station." He also talks about the fervent individualism born of these republican ideals especially around property. Basically stating that if one cant provide for himself independently he is dependent upon his masters will just as a chattel slave would be. Jefferson was so keen on this ideal he proposed land be distributed at 50 acres a piece in Virginia to those without to bring them up to a state of independence. I think these ideals are still very prevalent in our current culture and I was not previously aware of their connections to The War of Independence or Republicanism.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

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


How The Revolution was radical instead on conservative

by [Sebastian Mertens](#) - Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 7:13 PM

After reading both Degler and Woods articles I came to find myself siding more with Gordon S. Wood's article more and agreeing that the American Revolution was more radical than it was a Conservative movement. Gordon makes several good points throughout the reading pointing as to how the American Revolution was far more radical than conservative "if we measure the radicalism by the amount of social change that actually took place by transformations in the relationships that bound people to each other - then the American Revolution was not conservative at all" (Article two page 9 of 16). If the American Revolution was conservative it would then it would have not have had such a big change on American society and its people but as Gordon said in his article "American society had been radically and thoroughly transformed. One class did not overthrow the other the poor did not supplant the rich. But social relationships- the way people were connected to one another - were changed and decisively so." (Article 2 page 10 of 16). I also agreed with Woods when he brought up how Jefferson had "proposed in 1776 that the new state of Virginia grant fifty acres of land to every man that did not have that many. Without having property and a will of his own- without having independence- a man could have no public spirt; and there could be no republic." (Article 2 page 13 of 16) He went on to say that granting this independent behavior "In a monarchical world of numerous patron-client relations and multiple degrees of dependency..." (Article 2 page 13 of 16) was an extremely radical move and nothing could be more radical. I think a good argument can be made for both sides and it is a difficult topic to address but I felt that the idea of America being changed as a whole and breaking away from its traditional values it had originally used was a better way to actually describe effects and aftermath of the American Revolution.

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

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



Arguing Gordon Wood's side of the Argument(I agree with Degler)

by [Matthew Hendricks](#) - Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 9:35 PM

While the American Revolution did not seek to upset the societal order or bring equality for all it did coincide with a movement toward individuality and privatization that was Revolutionary for the time. Many of the Revolutionary constitutions did away with primogeniture and hereditary advantages, however they did not prevent a father from giving his wealth to his offspring, and did not make women more independent. It is also clear that the Revolution made way for the abolition of slavery in all states by uniting the colonies into the United States, where after the ratification constitution they would be bound to the laws of the Federal Government, who generations later would abolish slavery. Without the Influence of the crown Americans would be free to create a Confederacy, and later a Federal Republic and secure the most Liberal society on the globe at the time.

However I still believe that the primary motivation of the Revolution was to remove hurdles for the privileged to manifest and to fight against perceived threat of British terminating their liberties. I Still agree with Carl Degler.

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

1

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: Change in government with foreign control looming

by [Grant Winters](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 10:05 AM

My main argument comes with the sons of liberty influencing a god less population. They tried making order during a chaos and helped the American population. This article states the a pro-american view-point says that they were able to over turn the british rule with the help of god but just before that seemed to have a strong lack of god. Somewhere along the line the british gave the rebels the ammunition needed to govern themselves. This point alone places british officials in poor standing with the crown and caused a flare up drawing clear lines on who was being supported by the crown and who was not. In this sense a real revolution happened because of the two sides fighting and social change to the new found land of the free called America.

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

1

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: The Revolution

by [Logan Yetts](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 7:43 PM

I believe the American Revolution was not a conservative revolution and was actually one of the most progressive movements at least up to that point if not of all time. As Gordon Wood argues, the American Revolution "did more than legally create the United States; it transformed American Society... By the early years of the nineteenth century the Revolution had created a society fundamentally different from the colonial society of the eighteenth century." (pg 10) The Revolution was so transformative, not only politically, but also socially, that it "made America into the most liberal, democratic, and modern nation in the world." (pg. 10) Although some of the changes might not have come right away, the fundamental principles established in the Revolution laid the groundwork for and "made possible the anti-slavery and women's

rights movements of the nineteenth century and in fact all our current egalitarian thinking." (pg. 11) Although on the surface the American Revolution may not look like many other revolutions of the time, I think it is clear when looking at the radical social changes that resulted from the principles laid out in the revolution such as freedom of religion we can see that the American Revolution was not a conservative revolution and was in fact possibly "the most radical and most far-reaching event in American History." (pg. 11)

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

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


Re: Radicalism equaled independence

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Wednesday, November 20, 2019, 7:44 PM

The events leading up to the Revolutionary War was inevitable. Colonial reactions to specific English acts and vice versa, led to a progression of events, specifically a radical movement in an attempt for colonists who were willing to do what was necessary to gain independence from the King and Parliament. Hostilities had begun long before the revolution. The inability of colonists and the English who could not really understand the other's views or concerns, nor the actions or reactions of other, escalated until the war finally broke out. In the pursuit of life, liberty and property, the war was not a conservative movement. Gordon S. Wood states, "These changes were radical and they were extensive" (pg 11). The revolution may not have been similar to other revolutions where leaders were, ".....angry, passionate, reckless, maybe even bloodthirsty for the sake of a cause." (pg 8), but were able to speak or spread the need for immediate change made by giving attention to the need of transformation within American societies. This was only possible by colonists gaining independence from Great Britain. Again, I agree with Gordon S. Wood. The revolution was a radical movement simply for the fact, there were changes as to how America was affected and was done so by taking ideas and making them a reality.

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

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


Re: The Revolution

by [Nathan Mattox](#) - Saturday, November 23, 2019, 11:43 PM

I honestly feel that both sides make compelling arguments, and that ultimately this is somewhat of a moot distinction, at this point. I'd have to say that I do believe that the American war for independence was a true revolution in the strict constructionist sense, but only just. I believe that the war itself was an obvious and inevitable eruption of changing social attitudes and structures which could no longer exist within the monarchical framework of feudal Europe. To ask whether the war was in itself a social movement is to ignore the larger socially revolutionary framework whose conflict with older monarchical society resulted ultimately with a war for independence on purely political and ideological grounds. The points that I find most compelling on the other side of the argument, however, are the numbers and percentages relating to officeholders before and after '76. This is because, irrespective of a certain amount of interpretive margin in the expression of the numbers, these claims are backed by incontrovertible hard evidence, ie wide public recognition and well-preserved records.

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

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

◀ [The Revolution](#)

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

[Jump to...](#)

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))

[HST 201 F19 \(Escobar Meta 20635 22256\)](#)

[Get the mobile app](#)

[Policies](#)