

HST 202: ONLINE U.S. History W19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 202 W19 \(Escobar Meta 30769 30800\)](#) / [Week 3](#) / [Forum 1](#) / [Age of Jackson Videos](#)

?

Search forums

Forum 1

Age of Jackson Videos

 [Subscribe](#)

[◀ Taking Sides - Election of 1828](#) [Age of Jackson Videos ▶](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Age of Jackson Videos
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 1:29 PM

New materials for the forum were made available to all students this past Wednesday.

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 one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Age of Jackson Videos

Sum of ratings: [_-](#) [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



A Truly Impeachable President
by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 6:06 AM

In reading chapter 11 last week, the thing that really stuck out to me about Andrew Jackson was the way in which he blatantly disregarded the Supreme Court on the issue of Indian removal. After the court had ruled in *Worcester v. Georgia* that the state of Georgia could not extend state law over Cherokee land, the text says that “President Jackson ignored the decision, reportedly telling a congressman. ‘John Marshall has made his decision: Now let him enforce it!’” (Murrin Textbook page 385). I find it incredible that the President could make such a decision, face no consequences for it, and still get reelected. The text is unclear as to the timing of all of this, simply saying that the *Worcester v. Georgia* decision was in 1832, the same year Jackson was reelected. According to Britannica.com, the decision was made on March 3, 1832, leaving several months before the election.

Although I initially wondered how such a decision by the President could go unchecked, after watching the second “Age of Jackson” video, it became clear. Theda Perdue of UNC Chapel Hill explains that “The effect of Indian removal for whites was that it was one more step toward making the United States a white man’s country,” (Age of Jackson video #2, 1:52 minute mark). With most voters being white men, of course they sided with Jackson on the issue of Indian removal. Perdue goes on to claim that “It is a period in which the United States becomes more democratic for adult white men but less democratic for everyone else,” (2:20 minute mark). In today’s society, it is hard to imagine such a decision being the majority rule, but that appears to have been the case. I think it is even harder to imagine a President ignoring the Supreme Court in such a way and avoiding impeachment.

Harry Watson of UNC Chapel Hill explains this issue very well by stating that “Politicians ever since Andrew Jackson have had to act, even if they didn’t always believe it, as if the ordinary American voter was absolutely the wisest and the best judge of public affairs who could ever be imagined,” (2:55 minute mark). Jackson was acting out of his own self-interest, simply trying to please his base. His experiences as an Indian fighter I’m sure played a role in his decision as well, but I believe it was more political than anything else. Theda Perdue summarizes this issue by saying “It (Indian removal) teaches us that the United States, in the name of majority rule, in the name of democracy, has sometimes done some terrible things. Indeed, Indian removal is America’s version of ethnic cleansing,” (4:32 minute mark). The issue of Indian removal demonstrates perhaps better than any other issue of the era, that Jackson was in fact a “man of the people.”

Sum of ratings:

3 (1)

3

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



Still Not Convinced

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 12:58 PM

In the first “Age of Jackson” video, Eric Foner seems to be arguing that there was a democratic revolution during the Jacksonian era. Foner argues that “The Jacksonian era was a time when participation in public life expanded enormously,” (22 second mark). He goes on to state that “You have two very well-organized political parties, the Democrats and the Whigs are competing nationally for votes and their competition brings people into politics and mobilizes large numbers of people in political rallies and gatherings,” (49 second mark). Foner unfortunately does not give us any specifics about these “large numbers” of people who have been rallied, or even if he is referring to the election of 1828 or 1832 or both. We have seen from Robert V. Remini’s essay that the popular vote increased in the 1828 election by almost 800,000 votes compared with the election of 1824 (Remini page 2). This leaves no doubt that there were more people voting, but still begs the question of how these numbers compare to the overall percentage of eligible voters, which Richard P. McCormick addressed. McCormick believes that the overall percentage of eligible voters who actively voted in 1828 and especially 1832 was down compared to the pre-1824 levels. McCormick argues that “Only by taking this data (pre-1824 voter levels) into consideration can voting behavior after 1824 be placed in proper perspective,” (McCormick page 5). Unfortunately, McCormick does not provide a source for this data, which makes it more difficult to take these numbers into consideration. So, there are more questions on both sides of the argument.

It is interesting how Eric Foner stated that “The line of exclusion for men has shifted. At the time of the Revolution it was property, people without property could not vote,” (Foner 1:29 minute mark). He goes on to explain “Race becomes the line of division, of exclusion and inclusion in American politics,” (Foner 1:44 minute mark). This idea is easier to accept as it seems that almost every aspect of American life during this time period was driven in some way by the issues of race and sex. I still am not persuaded that there was a democratic uprising before 1840, but it certainly appears that more people were becoming eligible to vote and consequently more votes were being cast. I can see the popularity that Andrew Jackson would have had as the hero of the Battle of New Orleans, as the first “grassroots” candidate, as the 1824 victim of a “Corrupt Bargain” by the political elites, and as a man who claims to stand up for the people against this political machine. The election of Jackson to the presidency certainly seems like a win for the common man, and the romantic notion of the common man flocking to the polls in order to help him secure the presidency is an attractive one, but I remain somehow unconvinced that the democratic uprising took place during this time.

Sum of ratings:

3 (1)

3

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



What were historians insinuating about the election of 1828 and how it has strengthened my stance.

by [Alli Crank](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 3:46 PM

Most of the historians speaking in both videos kept going back o the fact the “The Era of the Common Man” implied “white man”. They discussed how the majority of the elections voters were strictly white males. This is important because like one historian said this means that “for the white men it meant more democratic, but for the rest of the population it meant less democratic”. This shows me that Jackson’s voters were essentially all white men which does not account for the whole population. These historians only strengthened my position in that no, the election of 1828 did not bring a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Re: What were historians insinuating about the election of 1828 and how it has strengthened my stance.

by [Emma Mather](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 5:31 PM

I completely agree with you Alli. In my initial post for this topic I used a quote similar to yours that said “it is a period in which the United States becomes more democratic for adult, white men, and less democratic for everyone else.” and I think this quote helps strengthen both of our opinions on how the historians in this video are agreeing that this new era of voting was only new to white men.

Sum of ratings:

0 (1)

0

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



Re: What were historians insinuating about the election of 1828 and how it has strengthened my stance.

by [Brianna Shelley](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 9:36 PM

I agree, I think the seeing a rise in the numbers during the elections had a lot to do with all white men being allowed to vote now that the property ownership clause had been abolished. In historian Eric Foner's video (1:30) he states, “the line of exclusion for men has shifted. At the time of the revolution people without property could not vote now it becomes race. People with or without property can vote, if they are white.

Race becomes the line of division in inclusion and exclusion in American Politics." The political party system is thriving but the only voters within that system are white men. Which I believe is what made Andrew Jackson so popular.

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

1

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



The Era of the Common White Man
by [Brianna Shelley](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 11:09 PM

Historian Erik Foner speaks about this time period and it's expanding participation in public life. The right to vote had been given to all white males, eliminating the property ownership laws. The return of the two-party political system created interest and brought more and more people into politics. This time period can be known as "the era of the common man" but realistically it should be known as the "the era of the common white man." White men had all the say and power which is why I believe so many people were attracted to Andrew Jackson. He was morally indifferent. (Richard Ellis, SUNY Buffalo) He was committed to the political democracy of the Country but only democracy that would make America a white man's country. His abuse of power over the Cherokee Indian removal, his terrible record on slavery, all the political moves he made only helped one race and one gender. During the 1824 election Jackson had firm ideas of what had gone wrong with the republic and he made his views known in what he called "memorandums." (Liberty, Equality, Power page 376 Chapter 11) The memorandums appalled his educated eastern opponents but pleased everyone else. Much of the Union at the time was for the most part uneducated and agreed with old Jeffersonian views, less Federal Government control. Which I think all contributed to the Democratic revolt of the people in 1828.

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

2

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



Re: The Era of the Common White Man
by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 12:57 PM

I think that you made some important connections here, Brianna. I have spent a lot of time the last couple of weeks wondering why Jackson was so popular with the voters and you summarize it nicely here. Jackson only really had to worry about pleasing one race and one gender throughout the entire country in order to secure and retain the presidency, which he did effectively by victimizing many other groups, or simply refusing to confront issues like slavery. Professor Foner summarized it nicely when he said that "Race becomes the line of division, of exclusion and inclusion in American politics," (*Age of Jackson video 1*, 1:44 minute mark). Jackson became the "man of the people" simply because he only had to acquiesce to the wishes of one demographic in order to remain popular. I think that Jackson was simply a man made for his time because it would appear that his wishes for this country aligned with that of his voters, making him immensely popular. I have mentioned in previous posts that if a modern president were to do some of the things which Jackson did, they would almost certainly be impeached or worse, but this too represents a change in the dynamic of the American voter since the Jacksonian era. Unfortunately, as Theda Perdue mentions in the second *Age of Jackson* video, Jackson was acting in the name of democracy and majority rule when he decided to move forward with Indian removal. He was completely disregarding the Supreme Court in this action, but no eligible voters seemed to care. I still believe that Jackson's popularity with the adult white male voter do not constitute a democratic uprising, but I certainly understand his popularity and his almost legendary status as a "man of the people." It's just an unfortunate fact of history that the people do not always want what is good and right, and it takes time for us to learn those lessons.

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

2

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



Re: The Era of the Common White Man
by [Emma Mather](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 5:45 PM

I really liked what you said in this post. While learning about Jackson I never really understood why he was so popular and when I watched the video and when the historian said that quote of him being historically indifferent that you cited was when I finally understood. If I was in a still-developing country and wanted something to happen I would probably vote for him so that I could feel like I could make something happen in the government.

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

0

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

Re: Age of Jackson Videos: Do these historians agree with the yes or no essay?



by [Emma Mather](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 3:25 PM

I think these historians agree with the no essay. Both videos make a point of saying that while voting was changing in America it was only changing for white men. In the second video the historian who was a woman (her name wasn't in the video that I could find) she said, "it is a period in which the United States becomes more democratic for adult, white men, and less democratic for everyone else." These historians were not saying that voting was just overall better like the yes essay but it was only better for white men.

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

1

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



Re: Age of Jackson Videos: Did this "new info" change my view?

by [Emma Mather](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 5:37 PM

Since watching these videos this new information makes me want to lean more on the side of the no essay. In my initial post I said that I agreed with the yes essay because it seemed to be more credible in its facts. Now that I have learned a little bit more on the subject I agree that the new era of voting wasn't exactly new. There were simply more white men that were able to vote rather than more people in the population of the country who voted.

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

0

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



A Democratic Uptick

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 6:15 PM

In the second *Age of Jackson* video, Richard Ellis of SUNY Buffalo argues that during the Jacksonian era, more people were drawn to politics as a way of controlling their own destiny. He argues that "People begin to look upon the government and realize that the government makes economic decisions, and they want to control these decisions because these decisions often might benefit one group of elites, you know, as opposed to the other, or the elites as opposed to the public. So politics becomes open," (1:15 minute mark). Ellis is arguing that the "common man" was attracted to politics as a way to be a part of the decision making process, a belief that attracts many people today. He continues by saying that "One of the ways this emerges is with someone like Andrew Jackson, who in 1824 becomes the first 'grassroots candidate' for the presidency," (1:36 minute mark). I think this is a fair analysis of one of the reasons for Jackson's popularity, especially during the election of 1828. We know from the textbook that Jackson won the popular vote in 1824, only to have the presidency decided in favor of John Q. Adams in the House of Representatives (Murrin textbook page 375). I think that Jackson's vocal objections to this decision and the alleged "Corrupt Bargain" may have propelled more people to vote in 1828 in support of this "grassroots candidate." As we have thoroughly explored in this forum, the vote at this time was extended primarily to white adult men, meaning that these are the people which Jackson appealed to. I think that the fact that he won the presidency in 1828 points to the fact that so many of these "common men" were infuriated by the corrupt bargain and Jackson's having lost the presidency apparently as a result of some back room deal. I do not think that the election of 1828 represented a democratic uprising, I think it simply a group of voters who were pissed off an felt they had been robbed, and they were going to make sure that the election of 1828 did not end up in the hands of the House of Representatives. I've heard it said that "history doesn't repeat itself, but it often rhymes." I think this statement could apply to the elections of 1828 and 2016. Although the election of 2016 was not decided in the House, there was one candidate who took the popular vote and was extremely vocal about having lost despite this. I don't want to start a discussion on current politics, but I find the parallels interesting and I have thought of them a lot the past couple of weeks. In the end though, I still side with Richard P. McCormick. I think that if there was truly a democratic uprising in 1828, these numbers would have carried over into 1832 and beyond, and McCormick explains on page 6 that this simply was not the case. I maintain that the election of 1828 was simply a frustrated and organized group of voters who wanted to ensure that the "right" man won this time.

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

3

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



Re: Age of Jackson Videos

by [Alvin Iskender](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 11:51 PM

Watching the videos mostly reaffirmed the difficulty of making any single judgement. There is a new angle introduced here, and that's on the exclusion that Eric Foner as well as the historians in the second video highlight. Racial minorities and women were still excluded from voting and a lot of Jackson's rhetoric and the rising political attitudes of the time strengthened this exclusion. It gives me yet another reason to doubt the characterization of a "Democratic Revolt"- how democratic could a revolt be if such huge exclusions were still in full force? While it's hard to ignore Jackson's championing of individual voting rights, I still have my doubts that his election alone

3/14/2019

HST 202 W19 (Escobar Meta 30769 30800): Age of Jackson Videos

represented a revolt, even if he was a major influence. It's a semantic argument in some ways, but when the argument is already based on somewhat arbitrary standards, it's difficult not to tread in that direction. And of course, as the videos make very clear, Jackson's bad record on race certainly make him less of a true champion of "equality".

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

2

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

◀ [Taking Sides - Election of 1828](#)

[Age of Jackson Videos](#) ▶

◀ [Introduction to Political Cartoons \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for Forum 1 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#)

▶ [Forum 1 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#) ▶

 Moodle Docs for this page

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)
HST 202 W19 (Escobar Meta 30769 30800)
[Get the mobile app](#)

https://classes.lanecc.edu/mod/forum/discuss.php?d=480184

5/5