

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](#)

◀ [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](#)



Democratic Revolt of the People or Democratic Revolt of the White Men?
by [Brianna Caridio](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 9:23 PM

Professor Fonner seems to be supporting that the Age of Jackson was representative of a democratic revolt of the people, as long as they were white men. He brings up that the line of exclusion had changed for men, property being no longer something that restricts men from voting in most places and that it had shifted to an issue of race and gender. I don't see this as a democratic revolt, rather only a shift in how democracy worked. Fonner also supports that there were "two very organized parties" (Fonner 0:32) which enhanced interest in politics. However, he does recognize that women and African Americans were mostly excluded from politics. With such a short video clip it is hard to determine his actual stance, he puts emphasis on how voting changed drastically for white men, but also recognizes that these changes didn't apply to anyone else.

The second video of multiple historians refers to this era and a time of "dramatic transformation of American democracy" (OHS 0:33), Henry Watson addresses how since the Jackson era, politicians have had to appeal to the "common man" which had a large impact on democracy. I think that this video could be interpreted to either support the Democratic Revolt of the People or not. Theda Perdue addresses how the Indian Removal Act of 1830 was an example of American ethnic cleansing that coincided with stricter racial codes toward African Americans, limited the rights of free blacks and that "Women actually lose political rights" (OHS 2:17). It seems that American Democracy changed for the better only for white men, and as addressed early in the video by Henry Watson, many of these men feared that the opportunity could have dire consequences later on.

Neither video swayed my opinion on the matter drastically. When considering that the initial question is phrased "Did the Election of 1828 represent a democratic revolt of the people?" I needed a definition of the word revolt to aid in my decision making. Revolt: v. Take violent action against an established government or ruler; rebel (<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>). Assuming this is representative of the intended definition, I do not think that these videos displayed violent action against established government. It would be hard to deny that there were not very important and significant changes occurring in American Democracy, but not what I would consider a revolt.

Sum of ratings:

2

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



What sides are the historians taking and my opinion.

by [Breanna Lindsey](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 11:01 PM

I personally believe the historians are agreeing with McCormick's side more. In the first video Professor Foner talks about how the discrimination in politics and how there is a huge amount of exclusion. He goes on to speak that virtually all white men can vote and that property qualifications have been eliminated, except for one or two spaces. Foner speaks how the democratic system has its limitations and goes on to mention women and how their part in politics is very limited. A huge part of politics is woman were not aloud to vote. He also says African-Americans are largely excluded from politics minus a few states. Foner speaks about how the line of exclusion has shifted from only white men with property could vote, to now any white male can vote. The exclusion now becomes race. I thought this video was very interesting because I think it leans towards McCormick's side. The way Foner describes the specifics of who could vote in 1828 really shows the lack of voter participation. The way I see it is America in 1828 was completely ran by mostly wealthy white men. There were no votes casted that took into consideration the women of america, African-Americans, Indians, the poor etc. Although I do believe Jackson deserved to be president, I think it is hard to really understand if all the people of America wanted him as president or not. Only white men voted and I don't think their votes should have spoke for the people who couldn't vote. An interesting point that was made in the second video by the female historian was, "it is a period in which the United States become more democratic for adult white men, but less democratic for everyone else." I think this is interesting and shows that the government and political system is in more favor towards white men. After viewing this new information my view still stands the same. I agree with a lot of what the historians said, I think the lack of women's votes did not help and I think if many woman could have voted along with African-Americans the polls would have been different. Richard Ellis said, "Jackson was morally indifferent" because he supported a lot of inhumane things such as slavery. Of course many woman were not opposed to slavery but there were also many woman that were opposed. Jackson had an advantage in his election by having elite men and all white men vote and it worked out in his favor.

Sum of ratings:

2

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



The uncommitted

by [Letitia Hadix](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 11:53 PM

After listening to the videos, I think I'm still uncommitted. I think both sides have merit and this is probably why the debate continues on through our time today. People back then enjoyed the new opportunities but also sought the old ways since it was safe. Once the citizens realized that the government was responsible for so many decisions, especially those decisions pertaining to the economy at that time they paid more attention to the public government affairs. The political events drew more attention and when Jackson stepped onto the scene, he was akin to a hero in the public's eyes. Andrew Jackson's life as a general and senator provided a lot of interest which I believe led to the influx in voting in the later years in addition to the more pronounced political race in presidency.

Sum of ratings:

1

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

◀ [Age of Jackson Videos](#)

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

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for 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