

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](#) [Age of Jackson Videos ▶](#)

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](#)



Elections By the Numbers
by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:23 AM

After analyzing the essays of both Robert V. Remini and Richard P. McCormick, I agree with McCormick. It appears that the “Mighty Democratic Uprising” did not occur until 1840. This is not to say that Andrew Jackson did not have two landslide victories for the presidency, it simply means that the total voter turnout during the three elections in which Jackson took part were not high enough to constitute a “Democratic Uprising”.

It is easy to look at the results of the elections of 1828 and 1832 and see that Jackson was the obvious popular choice of the people. A lot of Remini’s argument centers around this fact. He reviews how Jackson was portrayed as a “man of the people” and argues that it was an increased interest in the “common people” which propelled Jackson to the white house. Remini also mentions the estimates 20,000 people who attended Jackson’s inauguration in 1829 (Page 4). While it does appear that this “man of the people” image helped secure the presidency for Jackson, this alone does not constitute a “Democratic Uprising” when we look at the overall number of voters who participated in the election.

McCormick has centered his argument around the number of total voters who participated in elections at both the state and federal level from the beginnings of our government through 1840. He does not give specific numbers for the voter turnout in the pre-1824 category, instead he simply states that “Actually, abundant data on pre-1824 elections is available, and it indicates a far higher rate of voting than has been realized. Only by taking this data into consideration can voting behavior after 1824 be placed in proper perspective,” (Page 5). I agree that the only way to truly decide if there was a “Democratic Uprising” is to look at the overall numbers, instead of simply relying on the percentage of participating voters who voted for a single candidate.

Robert V. Remini addresses the rise in the popular vote by comparing the elections of 1824 and 1828, but this only tells half of the story. Remini states that “The total popular vote in the election (of 1828) represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824,” (Page 2). While this obviously reflects more voters actively participating, it does not reflect the percentage of eligible voters who in fact participated. McCormick argues that comparing the total numbers of votes cast between two different elections means very little unless we account for the population increase over the time period (Page 5). While McCormick does not give specific numbers regarding the population increase during this time, he argues that “The shift from the legislative choice of electors to their election by popular vote, together with the steady population growth, obviously swelled the presidential vote,” (Page 5).

McCormick goes on to demonstrate that although this alleged “Democratic Uprising” had started in 1824, the percentage of actively participating voters in the election of 1828 had declined from the previous election. McCormick punctuates this point by stating that “Thus, after three Jackson elections, sixteen states had not achieved the proportions of voter participation that they had reached before 1824,” (Page 6).

All of this becomes important when we look at the election of 1840, when the actual “Democratic Uprising” took place. McCormick has been very effective at showing the percentage of eligible voters who participated in several elections, and the numbers from 1840 were significantly higher than they had been in the past. McCormick tells us that not only did 78% of adult white males vote, but the total electorate for the election exceeded that of the Jacksonian period by 40 percent (Page 7). These numbers represent a significant increase from previous presidential elections, and I would agree that 1840 is in fact the beginning of the “Democratic Uprising.”

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

3

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



Re: Elections By the Numbers

by [Emma Mather](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 1:08 PM

I agree with you and I like how you put this point into words when you said, “I agree that the only way to truly decide if there was a “Democratic Uprising” is to look at the overall numbers, instead of simply relying on the percentage of participating voters who voted for a single candidate.” However one thing I noticed was that McCormick never said where he got his information regarding the earlier votes. I was wondering if you happened to notice if he said that in his piece or if you happen to know where he may have gotten some of those records? That was one of the things that made me not want to side with him because more people including our textbook agree with Robert Remini’s essay.

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

1

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



Re: Elections By the Numbers

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 2:04 PM

I don't know where McCormick got his data and he does not mention where in his essay. This is an excellent point, and something that I had not noticed when I made my initial post. I don't know if McCormick was writing specifically to counter Remini's argument, but since he is directly disputing a claim which Remini makes about available data, this is an important issue. Good catch!

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

0

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



Re: Elections By the Numbers

by [Alvin Iskender](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 2:24 AM

I largely agree with your analysis on whether Jackson's decisive victories constituted a "Democratic Revolt". Aside from just the numbers, though, one must really ask what really constitutes such a revolt? What are the criteria? Remini first uses statistics to back up his point, but then seems to turn around and assert that the statistics aren't even relevant, as only public perception really matters in whether this was a revolt. He quotes various political figures' assessments on the election, but they don't really paint a picture of what the public was thinking, only how those figures decided to describe the election result.

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

2

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



Why McCormick's historical explanations are more influential in answering the question "Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?"

by [Alli Crank](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 12:36 PM

I would agree with Richard P. McCormick that no, the election of 1828 did not represent a Democratic Revolt of the People. Jacksons voters may have showed him favoritism more than his opponent, but his actual number of voters wasn’t significantly different than Adams. However, there were “six states that were the highest in voter participation in 1828, three of the states favorite items and three of the states favored Jackson”(McCormick page 8) which could also show that Adam’s voters were just as excited about him as Jackson’s voters were. An explanation of why there may have not been as many voters prior to 1828, could be that there was never a “real” contest like

McCormick mentioned. There were often multiple contestants and typically one contestant stood out in popularity compared to the other. Finally in 1828, both contestants Jackson and Adams “had substantial sectional backing”(McCormick page 7), meaning they were both equally qualified for president. With both Jackson and Adams being qualified, a contest between the two arose. Evidently, this contest was what captured voters and made them want to vote. McCormick shows that the “Democratic uprising” did not happen until after Jackson’s presidency “in 1856 to 1860.”(McCormick page 7) Prior to 1856, during “1842 to 1858...there was a downward trend in voter participation, but the level of voter activity still remained higher than that of the Jackson election.” (McCormick page 7)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Why McCormick's historical explanations are more influential in answering the question "Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?"

by [Alli Crank](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 1:38 PM

favorited Adams*

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Re: Why McCormick's historical explanations are more influential in answering the question "Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?"

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 7:12 PM

I agree with your point that both Adams and Jackson were qualified for the presidency in 1828, leading to a more exciting race which may have accounted for a rise in voter turnout. I do find this interesting though, coming off of the election of 1824 when Jackson clearly won the popular vote only to have that vote overruled by the House of Representatives. We know from the text that Jackson blamed the alleged "Corrupt Bargain" between John Q. Adams and Henry Clay (Murrin textbook pg. 375). I could see this as being extremely disheartening for the citizens who voted for Jackson in 1824, potentially making them feel as though their votes do not matter. With this in mind, I would not have been surprised if the total number of voters in the 1828 election was lower than that of 1824, but according to McCormick, the opposite was true. Perhaps the frustration from the 1824 election motivated more people to take to the polls in 1828, but this is just speculation. In any event, I like to stick with what the numbers say, and I think they point to a larger voter turnout in 1828, but not to a democratic revolution. The two party system was becoming re-established during this election, but I don't think that people were entirely sold on the idea yet. I keep going back to the "Corrupt Bargain" and thinking that the rivalry that was started between Adams and Jackson in 1824 probably was a big motivator for the people to get out and vote. We have all seen presidential elections between two people who can hardly stand to be in the same room as one another, and I think that it draws people in. A lot of people want to pick a side and dig their heels in and argue to their last breath that their side is the more righteous, the more educated, the better qualified to lead. While today this type of attitude may be rooted in party politics, I'm not convinced that the two party system had enough time to mature to this point by 1828. I do believe that the Adams-Jackson rivalry helped to solidify the two party system though, and send it on its way to what it became later.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Alli Crank](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 4:12 PM

We know from the text that Jackson blamed the alleged "Corrupt Bargain" between John Q. Adams and Henry Clay (Murrin textbook pg. 375). I could see this as being extremely disheartening for the citizens who voted for Jackson in 1824, potentially making them feel as though their votes do not matter.

I had not yet thought of this as a reason for less voters, great point!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Election of 1828- How democratic made a comeback

by [Jasmine Gutierrez](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 3:02 PM

Yes, this election of 1828 was a revolt of democracy from the people. The voters not only had a significant turn out in terms of numbers, but there was a unifying force in this election. By calling to reinstate two political parties, the voters were able to pick one clear side with a distinguishable line between the parties. The voters were given clear political responsibility which can be seen in the four states that changed selection of electors from the legislation to the actual voters. The voters were given more power in this election and they took it, presenting an enormous change in voters from the previous election year to that of 1828.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Alli Crank](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 4:06 PM

While there may have been a significant amount of voters that voted for Jackson, the actual total number of voters was not significant in comparison to other elections like the one in 1840. "The total popular vote in the election (of 1828) represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824," (Page 2). While this obviously reflects more voters actively participating, it does not reflect the percentage of eligible voters who in fact participated. McCormick argues that comparing the total numbers of votes cast between two different elections means very little unless we account for the population increase over the time period (Page 5)(Classmate Clifford Lyon)

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

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



Re: Election of 1828- How democratic made a comeback
by [Brianna Shelley](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 11:14 PM

I agree with your side of this debate. The reading states (Robert V. Remini page 2) in Pennsylvania alone the number of voters rose from 47,000 to 152,000 in just four years. It also states one of the main reasons for this was the reestablishment of the two-party system and the excitement brought on by the campaigns initiated by both the Democratic and National Republic Party. It seems the people had been awoken and more people were engaged and interested in the direction they wanted the Union to go in.

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

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



Does the people's perception matter?
by [Alvin Iskender](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 10:24 PM

With all of the material we've covered so far, it's not easy to make any single interpretation on Andrew Jackson's election or presidency. That being said, I find it difficult to see Jackson's electoral win as purely a "Democratic Revolt", and I see myself siding more with Richard P. McCormick's viewpoint than with Robert V. Remini. The fact that, as McCormick explains in his essay, the voter turnout increased much more in the years *after* Jackson's presidency is especially convincing; when you combine that with the rest of his analysis on the so-called voter insurgency, I'm made particularly skeptical.

However, there's one point that Remini makes that effectively "nullifies" the statistical argument: that the election was *perceived* as a revolt- which is the most important part of this whole equation, according to Remini. It's an interesting idea, and I would even agree that the perception at the time matters significantly. I don't think the argument by itself holds up, though. Similar things have been said about the 2008 and 2016 elections, and the data doesn't seem to show significant changes in voter turnout (from <http://www.electproject.org/national-1789-present>). The popular vote of the latter doesn't even agree. So even if we assume the turnout increased significantly in the election of 1828, many of those voters still would have voted for Adams- Jackson may have won a healthy majority at 56%, but the remaining 44% still voted for Adams, and that's far from being a low number. Thus, just because the election has been historically described as being some kind of wave of the people's will, that doesn't mean that everyone would have agreed or that it was widespread thought at the time. Page 380 of the textbook describes a highly attended inauguration of the president, but that can just as easily speak more to the fervency of Jackson's supporters than any widespread belief. I think it's more appropriate to characterize Jackson's electoral win as more of a rise in certain attitudes and ideas as opposed to an upheaval of the status quo.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Alli Crank](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 4:19 PM

You make a good point when you say “the election was *perceived* as a revolt- which is the most important part of this whole equation, according to Remini. It's an interesting idea, and I would even agree that the perception at the time matters significantly.” Often times I think most questions can be answered be a clean cut answer and don’t consider multiple perspectives. Even in my response I never considered the fact that everyone’s perception on scenarios are different. So had it been 1828 and I was asked this question, of course I would say yes! Because up until 1840, quite frankly it did bring up a “democratic revolt”.

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

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



Re: Does the people's perception matter?
by [Morissa Parliament](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 11:38 PM

I really enjoyed reading your opinion because you brought to light both perspectives of the essay's and didn't just focus solely on one side of the argument. You did a great job analyzing the text, using evidence, and making your own opinion clear. what your response did for me was gave me a new perspective that I didn't have before on the Remini essay.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Brianna Shelley](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 10:46 PM

The election of 1828 represented many momentous events in the American voting system. Prior to this time the two-party American system had dwindled but with the reemergence of the democratic party and Jeffersonian beliefs I believe that the “common man” turned to the polls to express by voting for Jackson they were tired of the National Republicans and their need for a strong central government. Rather they longed for a return of the Jeffersonian days when the rights of the states were emphasized, and it considered the lives of everyday people. I believe that yes, the 1828 election was the start of a political revolution that would carry on through many presidential elections after. In Robert V Remini (page 2) it shows that Jackson won 647,292 of the 1.155,022 popular vote. Which had risen nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election of 1824. His win in the electoral vote was even more astonishing, winning 178 electoral votes to 83 for Adams. (Robert V Remini page 2) It is hard to look back and judge based solely on analyzing statistics and numbers. We also need to consider what was written by both sides of the system. The Union had the time, including the National Republicans believed this was the start of the “rise of the common man.” Edward Everett of Massachusetts, one of Adams most dedicated supporters in congress told his brother that the General won “by a majority of more than two to one, an event astounding to the friends of the Administration and unexpected the General himself and his friends. (Robert V Remini page 3) Also notable was Jackson’s inauguration where over 20,000 people all over the country came together to watch him be sworn into the highest office of the Union. Many newspapers reported on the inauguration some describing the crowd “like the inundation of the northern barbarians into Rome.” (Robert V Remini page 4) Another Democratic Newspaper reported “General Jackson is their own president...He was greeted by them with an enthusiasm which bespoke him the hero of a popular triumph” (Liberty, Equality, Power textbook, Page382) Jackson's win of the 1828 election saw the breakthrough of everyday people taking part of the electoral process and ushering back in some of the old Jeffersonian principals.

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

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



Taking Sides - Election of 1828: Which argument provides the best analytical position?
by [Emma Mather](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 11:19 PM

I think that essay number two made a better argument for his circumstances. It seemed like the author of essay number two knew that he was fighting the popular argument but he made some very interesting points like bringing up the fact that voting actually was documented before the 1828 and what those statistics stated about previous voters really added to his argument. However the one thing that made me a little leary about essay number two was when the author used the quote talking about how there wasn’t any reliable records of voters prior to 1828 and when he tried to give a rebuttal to that statement he never stated where he got the information to prove that votes were documented and where he got his facts from.

Sum of ratings:

1(1)

1

[Permalink](#)

|

[Show parent](#)

|

[Edit](#)

|

[Split](#)

|

[Delete](#)

|

[Reply](#)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828: Which argument provides the best analytical position?

by [Morissa Parliament](#) - Sunday, January 27, 2019, 10:02 PM

I had the same initial response from reading this, on the surface level I just personally felt that the second argument was more well rounded. He

used specific examples throughout and made his opinion clear. The point that you brought up about counting votes was a good example of how well

he articulated his argument.

Sum of ratings:

1(1)

1

[Permalink](#)

|

[Show parent](#)

|

[Edit](#)

|

[Split](#)

|

[Delete](#)

|

[Reply](#)



No- Taking the Side of Richard P. McCormick

by [Morissa Parliament](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 11:59 PM

Richard P. McCormick portrayed a compelling argument, that made his points clear. I agreed with him overall, because he was coming from a factual place. He did this by bluntly stating that no Jackson did not create a "revolt in the people" in 1828. He commonly spoke about the voting rates and where the line were drawn when talking about Jackson's victory. Something that was very convincing to me was when he stated "And, as has been demonstrated, the real manifestation of the "new democracy" came not in 1828 but in 1840". I think this was a great way to support and strengthen his argument because he countered the idea with a new fact and era. Overall McCormick put up a strong argument that made it easy to see his side and agree with it.

Sum of ratings:

1(1)

1

[Permalink](#)

|

[Show parent](#)

|

[Edit](#)

|

[Split](#)

|

[Delete](#)

|

[Reply](#)



In agreement with Mr. McCormick

by [Isaiah Smith](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 2:05 PM

I agree with Mr. McCormicks view on the situation. Reading both sides side by side and analyzing both closely, McCormicks argument is convincing and logical. Firstly, I would like to discuss my thoughts on Mr. Remini's essay. Reading through his writing about Jackson's sweeping victory over Adams was interesting, factual and intriguing. The points he made abut public voting numbers changing so quickly via this "Jacksonian era," was quite astronomical. To see such little numbers of voters at the polls before 1828, to sky rocket to over 1,100,000 votes and also over 300 electoral votes as well is astonishing. However, reading through McCormicks essay about the overall vote and condition of each state drew me away from beleinvg that this had only to do with Jacksons public popularity. Of course, Jackson was publicly known and loved, but as McCormick stated in his essay, " If, indeed, this "new democracy" bore some special relationship to Andrew Jackson or to his polices, it might be anticipated that interest in the elections in which he was the central figure would stimulate greater voter participation than gubernatorial contests, in which he was at most a remote factor." So, to believe that this insane voter turnout was anything special according to one man is slightly untrue. Using data from voting before 1824, it seemed as though voting was the same, just not a great extent. McCormick stated in his essay several times that a majority of the states votes stayed relatively equal to past elections, besides a few major states where the votes were so one sided, either to Adams or Jackson.

I believe McCormicks argument to be the most convincing, making the best points and not arguing solely (mainly to an extent) on one man. The election and this "democratic revolt of the people," was only minor. especially, in comparison to the Tippecanoe Democracy after 1840.

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 \(hidden\)](#) ▶

 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