

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

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 202 W19 \(Escobar Meta 30769 30800\)](#) / [Week 3](#) / [Forum 1](#) / [Taking Sides - Election of 1828](#)

?

Search forums

Forum 1

Taking Sides - Election of 1828

 [Subscribe](#)

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

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, January 19, 2019, 4:32 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 one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Anna Rodriguez](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 1:15 PM

Many people call the election of 1828 as a democratic uprising. Two historians wrote arguments over this fact, in which they proved their own sides of opposition. I stand with Richard P. McCormick, on his position that this election was no a democratic uprising. I believe that his use of facts, instead of opinions, makes his argument more credible. Instead of simply stating over and over that the people of this tie looked up to Jackson as a leader of the common man, like Remini argued, McCormick broke down the math and statistics of elections of the time period to prove his point. Remini argued that the numbers show that the increase of voting was due to change in suffrage laws and population growth. According to McCormick's essay, in 1812, 8 of the 17 states chose their candidates by Legislature, where as in 1832, all of the states, except South Carolina, chose their candidates by popular vote. He also stated that there was an obvious population growth beginning in the late 1700's, and lasting until the 1840's. Both of these trends are what caused the drastically different numbers of voting in the United States. It is evident that these were what caused the higher voting rates, and not the fact that Jackson represented the common man, because this trend of higher voting rates lasted for many elections to come, until the 1840's, when population trends began to decrease. We must also consider the change to Suffrage laws. " From 1792 (Kentucky) to 1856 (North Carolina)", (Timeline of voting rights in the United States, Wikimedia Foundation) the property-owning qualifications of voting rights changed immensely. The fact that more men could vote, is probably what caused the "Uprise of Democracy." All of these facts are points that cased me to lean more toward McCormick's position. When contemplating my own knowledge, I am aware that, throughout history, there have always been surges of democracy, where the common man becomes frustrated with "professional politicians" and swarms the ballot boxes, in order to vote in somebody that is more like them. The most recent example that comes to mind is the election of 2016, when "Middle America" rose up and elected somebody who they identify with, Donald Trump. Most common people nowadays, cannot afford to go to prestigious universities. For the past four presidencies, we have had ivy-league educated, expanded-vocabulary using professional politicians. Donald Trump, with his un-practiced speeches and common words, gave people the idea that he would make decisions that benefited them, as common people. I believe that the Jackson Election was also just another surge of Common People revival, not a Democratic Revolution.

Sum of ratings:

3 (1)

3

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



Why the Election of 1828 was not a Democratic Revolt

by [Madeleine Howard](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 3:46 PM

The broadest consensus historians seem to come to when speaking about Jacksonian Democracy is that the man is not easily placed into a specific box and commentary on him often requires you to examine your good opinions with the ad. Of course this is mostly true in studying anything in history, but Andrew Jackson seems especially captivating. Because his charming personality was often backed by an independent stubbornness, we are forced to examine our opinions about him closer. Additionally, this means you have to consider what Democratic Revolt means to you.

McCormick takes the approach of simply comparing voter turnout, saying "In the 1824 election not a single one of the eighteen states in which the electors were chosen by popular vote attained the percentage of voter participation that had been reached before 1824. Prior to that critical election, fifteen of those eighteen states had recorded votes in excess of 50 per cent of their adult white male population, but in 1824 only two states- Maryland and Alabama—exceeded this modest mark. The average rate of voter participation in the election was 26.5 per cent." If the only people allowed to vote were the common white men, and even then voter turnout was only 26.5%, I do not think this appeals for the Jackson election as a democratic revolt.

Although I believe Remini makes a solid point about the country's morale when he says "He inspired confidence among the largest mass of voters despite his lack of education and his reputation as an untamed westerner," I think it becomes clear in context with the previous quote from McCormick that Jackson's charm influenced the people who voted for him rather than inspired an internal revolt. Additionally, it seems that people weren't necessarily inspired so much as they expected Jackson to win, and did not make it a priority to vote. "

When compared with the peak participation recorded for each state before 1824, or with contemporaneous gubernatorial elections, or most partiality with the vast outpouring of the electorate in 1840, voter participation in the Jackson elections was unimpressive." People became complacent because they did not feel their vote would sway anything.

It is for these reasons that I don't believe the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt, but rather a country moving forward with change as best it knew how.

Sum of ratings:

3 (1)

3

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



Re: Why the Election of 1828 was not a Democratic Revolt

by [Anna Rodriguez](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 4:24 PM

I like you point of determining what "democratic revolt" means to each of us. To me, a revolt is something you do that goes against the current and social norms. But, more people being inspired to vote is not doing the opposite of what's expected. In fact, it is promoting the current laws by actively participating in them. Since nothing was drastically changed in this election, I agree with you and would say it was an increased voting era, but not a revolt.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Re: Why the Election of 1828 was not a Democratic Revolt

by [Daniela Rosales Name](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 10:51 AM

I also like the how you highlight the fact that your belief on whether this was or was not a democratic revolt has to do with how you define a revolt. This was one of the main reasons I decided I did not believe it was a revolt. For me, a true revolt of the people has lasting consequences and creates change beyond that one instance. When McKormick points out that despite Jackson's all-time high popularity he lost the 1832 election. I take that as a sign that a true revolution didn't occur, but the results of the election were mostly due to the action of a country moving forward in with their democracy. There was a change in voting numbers but I believe it was a product of a group of factors — that Remini himself points out — rather than a revolt.

Sum of ratings:

0 (1)

0

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



Re: Why the Election of 1828 was not a Democratic Revolt

by [Katie Lauck](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 9:42 PM

I think a true revolt would mean that all participants had the same ideals and motives for participating in the revolt. In the case of the 1828 election, voters seemed to be voting for different reasons. McCormick mentions that this election simply matched the maximum voter turnout rates of elections previous to Jackson, not exceeding by large amounts (pg 6). This explains that most voters did not have additional reasons to vote and therefore did not produce numbers that would facilitate a revolt, that is until 1840 when numbers skyrocketed.

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

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



Re: Why the Election of 1828 was not a Democratic Revolt

by [Madeleine Howard](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 11:30 PM

I think your ideas of what a revolt is in terms of the Jackson elections applies well, especially when thinking about the different reasons for voter turnout. Factors for voting were perpetually changing with things like suffrage and population growth, surely affecting the numbers enough at the same time to maybe indicate revolt but ultimately existing outside of a revolt.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Christopher Kinney](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 5:56 PM

Christopher Kinney

I believe that the 1828 election did represent the democratic revolt of the people for a couple of reasons. One reason would be that the people wanted him to win this one and the previous one. He had won the popular vote the and the electorals but still lost in the 1824 election because it was decided by the government and not by the people. For the 1828 election the people voted for the people’s president and won. When Jackson became President he cleared out the old government that vote against him in the prior election. Another reason would be that his style of government has been used for over 150 years and is still being used today.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Anna Rodriguez](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 11:15 AM

I didn’t think about the fact that they weren’t able to elect him when they wanted to in 1824. That is a good point in supporting your argument. I am wondering though, if you could elaborate on the statement that Jackson’s style of government has been used since then? What is his style of government? And how has it been used for the last 150 years? In my opinion, I think some presidents that we have had have been very different from Jackson’s ideals of a state gov over national gov. For example, Barack Obama’s took the states rights or regulating health insurance and made it a federal project instead. I think this is something that goes against Jackson’s ideals and style, but that is my opinion. please, change my mind.

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

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



Change can be good

by [Taylor Reid](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 3:07 PM

Personally, I think that just because he cleared out the government isn't necessarily because he was being malicious, but because he wanted to have a fresh start as president. This makes complete sense especially if it worked for the country. Speaking of working for the country, that would be why his style of government is still being used to this day. There is a reason our government works the way it does and it just happens that we found the right way to govern for our country under Jackson's leadership.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Daniela Rosales Name](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 3:59 PM

In my own post, I hadn't thought about how hw lost the election of 1824. However, I don't know if I would still factor that in making my decision. Part of the reason the number of people who voted for Jackson in the election of 1828 was significantly higher is because in this election America went back to a two-part system. I wonder if the result would be the same if the country hadn't gone back to this political system. Also, there i the election of 1828 most states had adopted a popular vote system –which wasn't the case in the election of 1824. Because of these two main reasons, I would say that not winning in the election of 1824 didn't play a high role. I think it for sure had an impact in his voter base but I don't think it was the reason the numbers shot up.

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

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



The Election of 1828 was not a Democratic revolt
by [Taylor Reid](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 6:40 PM

I agree with Richard P. McCormick, in the fact that the election of 1828 did not represent a Democratic revolt. McCormick states, “Voter participation in the 1836 election remained near the level that had been established in 1828 and 1832, with 55.2 percent of the adult white males voting.” (7/8). His whole argument is that there was no major increase of voters that could be seen in records and even in later elections there was not much of an increase or decrease in the number of men who voted. McCormick goes on to say, “Granted that a majority of the voters in 1828 favored Jackson, it is not evident that his partisans stormed the polls any more enthusiastically than did the Adams men.” (8/8). I think the case was just that not everyone that could vote did go vote. This is usually the case when people don’t feel strong feelings towards either party. This could have been due to Jackson being a well liked citizen so he just had a few more people care if he was president rather than Adams.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Miles Long](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 6:41 PM

The election of 1828 was the creation of the new Democratic Party. It was a “substantial reorganization of the Old Republican party.” (Remeni pg. 1) The democratic party emphasized the rights of the states and prioritized the importance of ordinary citizens. Because of this, some cared more about the election and people arrived at political responsibility.

The election of 1828 had a massive increase in the amount of voters from the previous election, a nearly eight hundred thousand rise over the previous election. According to Remini, some of the reasons for this increase include the return of the two-party system (only having to choose between two candidates opposed to multiple), an increased amount of interest from an exciting election with dirty tactics from both the Democratic and the National Republican party, a concerted effort from politicians for people to get out and vote, and a law change in which four states transferred selection of electors from the legislature to the people. These changes were massive for ordinary citizens and brought political responsibility to the forefront. The common-men had opportunity to express their opinions by voting. Jackson’s election is represented by a massive amount of popular support from these people, which is why it is known as “the rise of the common man.”

In the video “Political Parties” for our class, the professor describes Andrew Jackson’s party as a “Democratic age of politics, with mass meetings, conventions to nominate candidates, systemized and organized campaigns, and huge voter turnouts nearing 70%.” This was not like the parties before, who were generally not as involved or interested. Voting turnout at this time was as large as it ever had been. The Democrats believed and manifest destiny, expanding so the common-man could have a strong agricultural life with independent farmers.

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

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



Holes in Remini's Argument
by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:49 PM

I agree with you that Remini made good points in his portion of the article for the creation of a new two-party system. But he also makes a few points that seems to contradict his other statements. He gives conflicting dates and opinions. At one point on pg. 1 of the article he states that "the election of 1828 witnessed the reemergence of the two-party system." At another point on pg. 2 he says that "1828 was the beginning of a genuine nationally organized, two-party system that came of age in the 1830's." Which is it? At one point its reemerging another it's beginning and not actually coming of age till the 1830's. This definitely weakened his credibility for me.

Sum of ratings:1(1)

1

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



More Holes in Remini's Argument

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:50 PM

Another point where Remini contradicts himself is when he talks about voter turnout. On pg. 2 of his article he says that there was "an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election of 1824." But earlier on the same page he discusses how voting and ballots occurred for the 1828 election. He talks about the lack of official ballots. Parties would print their own and distribute them. In this same paragraph he also say's "It was not unusual for a person to be accosted by several hawkers at once and threatened with bodily harm unless he accepted the proffered ballot." With methods like this being used is it any wonder that voter turnout increased?

Sum of ratings:1(1)

1

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



Re: Holes in Remini's Argument

by [Miles Long](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 10:42 AM

These are some good points that I feel like I can clear up. When Remini says "1828 was the beginning of a genuine nationally organized, two-party system" he refers to the fact that these parties were organized and well-founded. In the past elections when there was an opposition (the federalists) they were not organized like the Democratic-Republican party with a described outbursts= of "mass meetings, conventions to nominate candidates, systemized and organized campaigns, and huge voter turnouts nearing 70%." Ergo, I would still consider the actions of this party and the people a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1(1)

1

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



The Years Before

by [Katie Lauck](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 7:06 PM

Though the Election of 1828 saw higher percentage of voter turnout than that of 1824, the race between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson could not be described as a "revolt". Richard P. McCormick states that a "mighty democratic uprising" took place in 1840 ("New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics", pg 8) but McCormick relays many other ways that factored in with the rise of voter participation.

During the time of the Jackson campaign, many things were changing. Although people might think the higher number in voters stemmed from a revolt, factors such as population growth, the switch from legislative choice to popular vote, and suffrage changes had large impacts on the numbers. When looking closely at the statistics of voter participation in the 1824 election and previous, it is clear that the percentages are not as low as we thought. In fact, the elections before 1824 reached higher voter participation by the popular vote than any of the eighteen states during the 1824 election. Still, the election of 1824 only reached 26.5% in total voter participation, and the 1828 election climbed to 56.3%, but the number lowers when we find out that only six of the twenty-two states reached new highs in voter participation. To add even more, three of these states considered the gain inconsiderable ("New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics, pg 6).

Although voting after 1824 produced larger numbers, the circumstances in which the parties were set up was completely different than in 1816-1820. At the forefront of the difference was the disinterest of the common man when it came time for an election. During this time, there were multiple candidates who occupied the same party, making it confusing for regular citizens to decipher a difference. This changed by 1828, presenting only two candidates who both had different beliefs and "substantial sectional backing". When describing a democratic revolt, the election of 1840 and onward can be put in the category. The race between Harrison and Van Buren hit a record high in voter participation in 1840, exceeding any other presidential election. 78 percent of males in the United States flocked to the polls, besting the Jackson election by 40%. Fourteen states set records that would not be

passed through the rest of this time period. One reason for this influx of higher participation might have been the solidification of the two parties during this time. Most commoners had ‘picked’ what party they most related to, spurring them to have their voice be heard by voting (“New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics, pg 7). These factors show us that a democratic uprising is in fact present, although not in 1828 as we thought, but rather much later in 1840.

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

3

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt of the People: The Election of 1828

by [Emilie Ormsby](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 11:01 PM

After reading both essays, though each of them provide a compelling argument and commentary, I personally agree more with the author Robert V. Remini and believe the election of 1828 did in fact represent a democratic revolt of the people. This era marked a time of the common man rising up towards their full potential as citizens of the United States and taking back power and leadership from the older and politically elite. The people began to exercise their power as citizens to achieve a more ideal government and Andrew Jackson, being a “self-made man” as described in the essays, was the perfect political symbol for these times. Jackson’s strong character raised his popularity among the people and arguably helped inspire citizens to take a stand. And as far as I’m concerned, more power to the people is quite democratic.

Jackson won with election by a landslide, as described in Remini’s essay, while the opposing essay seems to refute with statements illustrating that there were virtually no efforts made to describe the dimensions of the democratic uprising simply because of the “universally agreed upon image of mighty democratic uprising”, and undermine the fact that politics during this time provided significant democratic, social, and economic changes.

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

1

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt of the People: The Election of 1828

by [Katie Lauck](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 8:47 PM

I believe your argument is valid, but I think we must take into account the many different reasons why the voter participation percentage went up between 1824 and 1828. Although the standing up of the common man and taking charge against the politically elite may be one of the factors for the rise of voters, it is certainly not the only. Remini states that “generations of historians, therefore, have interpreted Jackson's election in 1828 as the beginning of the “rise of the common man” in American history.” (pg 3), but McCormick argues back saying “...the image of "mighty democratic uprising" has been so universally agreed upon, there has been virtually no effort made to describe precisely the dimensions of the "uprising."” (pg 5). He then describes that the rise in the polls was most likely caused by population increase and the switch from legislative choice to popular vote rather than the sudden surge to the polls in response to the Jackson campaign (McCormick pg 5). I do believe many citizens during the 1828 election voted because of their love for Jackson, but I don’t think the numbers are high enough that it can be classified as a revolt until a few years later in 1840 when the voting percentage surpassed the Jackson election by 40% (McCormick pg 7).

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

2

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt of the People: The Election of 1828

by [Emilie Ormsby](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 10:15 PM

I agree that there are various different reasons why the voter participation increased during the years of 1824 and 1828; however, I don’t agree that the numbers accounted for is enough of an argument to undermine a democratic revolt of the people. I believe that McCormick makes a valid argument with the use of vote counts and when he states “Only by taking this data into consideration can voting behavior after 1824 be placed in proper perspective.” However, Remini’s essay counters with the information of the total popular vote stating “Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647, 292 or just a little better than 56 percent of the entire vote.” Regardless of the reason or how the statistics were analyzed, the election represented a “surge for the popular support for the General.” Remini pg 3.

Both Remini and McCormick make valid arguments in their essays, but I find it difficult to deny the fact that that Jackson’s goal was to open opportunities for the ordinary man and that because of this, the people raised their voices and elected Jackson with a clear victory. A clear democratic uprising, in my opinion. Not to mention, voters and politicians nominated candidates, instead of the party leaders of congress which gave a significant amount of power to the people. 22 of the 24 states used the popular election to choose their electors, and the use of the two-party system was put into place.

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

2

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



More factors to voter turnout

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:51 PM

Love for the common man is used as one of Remini’s biggest arguments for why voter turnout was so large for Jackson. That he inspired them to be political. On pg. 4 of the article Remini says “What mattered was an expressed sense of participation in the electoral process experienced by ordinary citizens and that because of it a true man of the people had at last been elected President of the United States.” Remini believes that the common people finally felt that there was a candidate worthy of their votes. But what we learned in chapter 10 about the change in voter rights has me believing that it had more to do with the fact that the common man was actually finally allowed to vote. Pg. 361 of our textbook states “suffrage reform gave political rights to propertyless men, and thus took a long step away from the Founders republic and toward mass democracy.” All this happened years before the Jackson campaigns.

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

2

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



Not quite a full revolt.

by [Daniela Rosales Name](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 11:06 PM

While I do believe the election of 1828 presented a significant shift in voter turnout and a time where great strides were made towards a democratic revolt, I don’t believe it is to the extent that it commonly associated with the Jackson era. One of Robert Remini’s main arguments as to why the democratic revolt occurs is the raise in voter turnout. I agree with Remini in that the rise in voter turnout was significant especially when compared to the results of the election of 1824. Remini does explain the four causes that brought that number up: the return of the two-party system, the excitement generated by the campaign, more states adopted the popular vote, and, there was an effort made by politicians to encourage people to vote (Remini, 2).

I think, that there are too many factors that influenced the rise in voter turnout to make this a causing factor in a democratic revolt. I also argue that these reasons influenced the —admittedly big — difference in the electoral votes. Yes, Jackson’s 178 electoral votes vs. Adams’ 83 is impressive, but we cannot simply say it was a sweeping victory without looking at the factors that influenced it. Remini states that no matter how the “statistics are analyzed or interpreted the people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge of popular support for the General” (3). I would argue that while there is great validity and importance to the views of the people that lived at the time through these moments in history, we have to take them with a grain of salt. Where the people at the time taking into account all the changes Remini himself mentioned in page 2 of the reading (paraphrased above)? Most likely not, we are able to see this perspective because we have the ability to look back and critically analyze the political landscape of the time.

Additionally, when we compare the 1828 election to the 1832 election, we see that although Jackson’s popularity was at an all-time high. According to Richard McCormick “Jackson was probably at the peak of his personal popularity [and] he was engaged in a campaign that was presumably to decide issues of great magnitude” (6). Despite all of this, there was a small decline in voter turnout. Yes, each election should be viewed individually and seen within its own social, political and economic landscape; however, what people argue is that the 1828 election presented a democratic revolt. If so, wouldn’t the revolt effect — especially considering Jackson’s popularity didn’t decline — be seen beyond this one election. What I argue is that the 1828 election is a start but the “true” revolt wasn’t seen until later on.

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

3

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



Research Pays

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 11:29 PM

After reading both sides of the argument. As well as reading chpt. 11 I agree with Richard McCormick that the election of 1828 was did not represent a democratic revolt of the people. A democratic revolt being described as revolutionary change that is brought about through democratic means. I believe you would need a large sample of data from time before and after that election to be able to adequately say whether or not revolutionary change had happened. McCormick looks many years into the past and future from that election, while Remini mostly focuses on the years where Jackson was running for office. When McCormick looks farther into the past and future from that election he documents that voter turn out was higher in previous and post elections than the 1828 elections. In fact his dates indicate that the record for voter turn-out was over ten years after this election in 1840. On page 7 of the article McCormick states "The flood receded only slightly in 1844, when 74.9 per cent of the estimated potential electorate went to the poles. Indeed, nine states attained their record highs for the period. In 1848 and 1852 there was a general downward trend in voter participation, followed by a modest upswing in 1856 and 1860. But the level of voter activity remained well above that of the Jackson elections. The conclusion to be drawn is that the "mighty democratic uprising" came after the period of Jackson's presidency."

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

2

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



Some research of my own

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:52 PM

Another reason that I side with McCormick that no the election was not a democratic revolt is from what our textbook has to say about that election. The very first sentence in the section on the election of 1828. On pg. 379 it states that from the beginning this election was "an exercise in slander" instead of a "debate on public issues". If this was an election that was supposed to be the cause of a democratic revolt you would figure politics would of played more of a part in it. As the book also says on pg. 380 "That the campaign caught public imagination" because of this the public felt sympathy for the slander Jackson had to put up with coming to the conclusion that it was a "victory of popular melodrama."

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

1

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



Re: Research Pays

by [Taylor Reid](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 11:58 AM

I definitely agree with this. To me, it seems clear that voters did not turn out for this election as much as others. This would seem to be an indication that it wasn't a revolt. One would think if it was a revolt there would be floods of people voting for Jackson. seeing as people were still going to the polls it would point to the fact that there was not really a revolt at all because if people were upset and passionate about what they thought they would go and vote for who they wanted.

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

1

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Haylee Stevens](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 7:39 PM

Was Andrew Jackson's presidency the rise of the "common-man"? After carefully reading an argument that says yes, Jackson's presidency was the rise, and an essay that said no, it was not the rise, I have formed an opinion of my own. I side with the argument that no, it was not the rise of the common man or the democratic party because there is not enough evidence to say yes in my opinion. The essay that sides with the yes argument goes off the pure fact that there were way more voters that voted in this election and therefore it is the rise, but this essay didn't go much deeper than the fact that more people had voted. The no essay explains that we don't have quiet enough information to argue that it was the upcoming but that there are things that point to the fact that it was not an uprising. In the essay, it says "In all but five states- Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Kentucky, and Alabama, the peaks for voter participation peaked before 1824 passed." (Revolt of the People- yes or no). This quote proves that it was not a rise if there was not many more voters participating.

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

1

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



Yes: Professor Robert V Remini
by [Faith Cook](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 9:20 PM

I most agree with Robert V Remini because the 1828 election is when I feel like they really began to separate into parties, it may have been more organized and set in stone during the 1840 election but it had already been done in 1828. In the 1828 election, they already had two parties going against each other which were the whigs and the democrats. The two party system started in 1828 and grew into the 1830's and into the 1840 election.

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

1

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

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

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

◀ [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