

HST 202: History of the United States W14 (Escobar Meta 31101 31100)

Home ► My courses ► Winter 2014 ► HST 202 W14 (Escobar Meta 31101 31100) ► January 20 -
January 26 ► Forum 1 ► Election of 1828

 Search forums

Forum 1

Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Election of 1828)

(Election of 1828) Next >



Election of 1828

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, January 18, 2014, 11:34 AM

After studying the required materials, address the various questions. For purposes of encouraging discussion, you should put your responses into SEPARATE posts.

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. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Election of 1828

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Emotions Involved

by Courtney Reeser - Saturday, January 18, 2014, 2:17 PM

I feel a revolt deals with an emotional influence, or change. The election of 1828 was kind of a revolt in the theory that people were starting to get emotionally involved with the parties they were choosing to vote for.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Emotions Involved

by Agina Hale - Saturday, January 18, 2014, 5:22 PM

I agree....I think that money was a big motivator, and people were worried that corruption was just around the corner.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Emotions Involved

by Brian Breedlove - Monday, January 20, 2014, 1:22 PM

I wonder if the people were truly becoming more emotionally involved or were the politicians simply listening more? I believe that the emotion still lingered from the Revolution, but along with the increase of correspondence through mail and newspapers and the beginnings of a sort of cooperate America, the peoples voices were only louder in volume not in numbers.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Many components to a revolt..

by Agina Hale - Saturday, January 18, 2014, 5:20 PM

Something that really stuck out for me was the statement that McCormick had seemed to have a biased tone. He used words like Jackson's "regime". He did spend a great deal of time going over the bare numbers to make a point as a fact, and while I can understand what he's saying, I think he is missing another component. The question isn't just an equation, it's also about a philosophical difference between the two candidates.

I think it's possible to think that the election of 1824 had something to do with the absolute reverence the people played towards Jackson winning the 1828 election. In 1824 Jackson received the most electoral votes as well as the popular votes, but didn't make the cut. Imagine how frustrating that would be to watch the vote split among very similar candidates (especially 3 southerners). So, when Jackson gets into office, they are elated. As Remini reminded us, this election was about farmers, workers and frontiersmen against the rich and well-born. This turns out to be a prophecy considering how much Jackson feared the speculators and bankers. He wanted the money to stay in the south, and keep the south flourishing instead of the north (and british) investors.

So, while McCormick looks over the numbers with little effect and other sources say the voting polls increased starting with the 1828 election. I think that the point is that the revolt did happen because he was praised and revered when he became president. But, with any president he is the fall guy.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: The common man

by Gary Smith - Saturday, January 18, 2014, 6:37 PM

The turnout for the 1828 Presidential election might have had something to do with the fact Jackson and his backers started to campaign for president almost as soon as Adams took office. The voters were reminded of how Adams won and were not going to let it happen again. Also only two candidates were running for office not four.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The common man



by Zachary Embree - Sunday, January 19, 2014, 6:49 PM

In addition to this the political mudslinging coming from both parties my have increased voter turnout. With Adams facing charges of corruption and backroom deals to gain the presidency, while Jackson was accused of being a uncivilized brute who allegedly romanced his wife away from her legitimate husband.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The common man



by Agina Hale - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 10:00 AM

I agree. There are a lot of factors, such as how dirty of a campaign it turned out to be. People could have felt like it was a tough battle to get their candidate elected, and felt a connection with the cause. Them vs. us.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



revolt



by Gary Smith - Sunday, January 19, 2014, 1:41 PM

More people,white males, were able to vote because of the removal of property ownership as a requirement to vote. I don't see a revolt, I see the voters using their new found right to vote as a way to identify themselves with Jackson as one of them,a common man, and distance themselves from the elite leaders in the Nations capitol.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: revolt



by Jessica Skidgel - Monday, January 20, 2014, 9:39 PM

I agree with this, meaning it's not so much a revolt then voters taking sides with a president they can relate to and see themselves in. It was people choosing Jackson because they agreed with him, not simply because they did not favor his opposer. If the people were only wanting to rebel against the opposer, would the amount of people who attended Jackson's inauguration been as immense?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: revolt

by Jesse Nichols - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:20 PM

I agree with the points you have made here as well. It wasn't so much of a revolt as it was the people seeing Jackson fit to lead them because he was a war hero during the revolution and because he represented the common man, not just the elite in society. These qualities of Jackson are what led to such a one sided election, as well as Adams campaign plan of badmouthing Jackson completely backfiring on him. Adams reputation of of making back room deals also did not help his cause.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Differences in Evidence

by Zachary Embree - Sunday, January 19, 2014, 6:38 PM

I cannot classify the election as a revolt. From my perspective there was an increased emotional investment in this election for a number of reasons. But this election comes across to me as concerned citizens trying to keep corruption out of the government, and insure economic and political stability, not the beginning of a revolt of the common man. When comparing the argument of both sides of issue in the source material only McCormick really gives us the relevant concrete facts of the election, such as voter turnout rates and how the compared in several ways to population and previous statistics on voter turnout. The arguments made by Remini to back up the idea that this was a revolution focus on quotes made by various important figures. These do not convince me of anything other than at the time these people thought that Jackson had a very successful election with popular support.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Revolt? Eh... by Brian Breedlove

by Brian Breedlove - Monday, January 20, 2014, 1:12 PM

Using titles like "New Democracy" and "New Coalition" immediately put some individuals on the defense, especially those who participated in elections pre-1828, I could only assume. There is no denying the fact that Jackson's popularity was unparalleled. The common-man factor, being a decorated Indian fighter, and simple overall presence as "Old Hickory", made Jackson sometimes seem larger than life. The real question I face is, was Jackson's aura, along with the inconsistent numbers provided by Remini, and an increase in voters due to property regulations being removed, enough to proclaim a "Revolt" by the people? I fail to be persuaded to agree.

I found that a majority of the statistics provided by Remini compared the elections of 1824 and 1828, in which the overall increase in voter turnout is substantial. Unfortunately in my mind, I need more information if I'm expected to make a statement like a democratic revolt transpired. According to McCormick, "we observe (1828) that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established". He goes on to state, "The average voter participation for all states in 1828 was 56.3 per cent. Before 1824 fifteen of the twenty-two states had surpassed that percentage".

I truly don't believe "Revolt" is the correct term to use in this instance. Did people come out in large numbers and vote nationally in a way that seemed to "make a statement"? Indeed, but these numbers in no way dwarfed the voting seen at a state level in previous election years, nor did it appear to start a voting trend on a national level that could be considered as a significant uprising...as in a revolt.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



People ready for something new

by Matt Blackshear - Monday, January 20, 2014, 5:18 PM

"...there was considerable interest in the election generated to a large extent by an exciting, if not scurrilous, campaign initiated by both the Democratic and National Republican parties."(pg. 206 Did the Election...) With this 1828 election so advertised had a lot to do with voter turnout. Adam's campaign didn't help with his popularity. His plan to bring up Jackson's personal life backfired and in return made Jackson more popular.

Along with Adams failed campaign plan his corrupt bargain didn't do well for his name. "Reaction to the alleged Corrupt Bargain dominated the Adams administration and created a rhetoric of intrigue and betrayal that nourished a rising democratic movement." (pg. 385 Liberty, Equality, Power)

Adams was showing poor signs in being a president and the people were seeing it and they wanted something new. With Adams past actions and Jackson's popularity it was clear that something was going to change.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: People ready for something new

by Zachary Embree - Monday, January 20, 2014, 11:01 PM

You make a good point about the idea that this election was not a revolt of the common man, but a desire to distance politics from perceived corruption. Adam's reputation from selling out the position of secretary of state painted him in an immoral light compared to Jackson's "traditional values" appeal. The election seems to me as more of a catalyst to the actual "revolt."

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: People ready for something new

by Agina Hale - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 10:19 AM

That is a good point there. Jackson wrote that a lavish government combined with contempt of the constituents could lead to despotism, if not checked by the "voice of the people."(Wikipedia) I stated earlier that the previous election had a lot to do with it, because there was so much at stake, morality.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: New Democracy

by Evan Lawrence - Monday, January 20, 2014, 7:23 PM

I agree with Richard McCormick, whose argument is that the "new democracy" didn't really take effect until 1840 where we can really see the percent of voters for the presidential contest has overshadowed the gubernatorial elections.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The "New Democracy"

by Jesse Nichols - Monday, January 20, 2014, 7:50 PM

I find myself agreeing with Richard McCormick and the idea that there wasn't a revolt of the people in 1828 and that a "New Democracy" did not take place until the election of 1840.

The reason he persuaded me is because that he provided factual evidence that strengthens his argument while Remini selectively added quotes from people who share his same opinion, which seems biased from my perspective. McCormick states that "When compared with the peak participation recorded for each state before 1824, or with contemporaneous gubernatorial elections, or most particularly with the vast outpouring of the electorate in 1840, voter participation in the Jackson elections was unimpressive." (pg.214). The low voter participation can be connected to an extreme political imbalance between Jackson and his opponents due to the lack of development of political parties.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Election of 1828 not a revolt

by James Price - Monday, January 20, 2014, 8:37 PM

I agree more with the perspective that the 1828 election was not a democratic revolt. McCormick's point that only six of twenty-two states experienced a higher voter turnout than in the election of 1824 (reading material p.8) seemed to refute Remini's main point for the 1828 election being a democratic revolt. I view the 1828 election more as a desire to return to a previous political philosophy and less of a revolt. The textbook states that "Jacksonian Democrats cherished the simplicity of Jefferson's agrarian republic" (p. 400) and that the people looked to Jackson to "return to republican fundamentals" (p.393). While I believe the election of 1828 represented a shift in U.S. politics I don't see it as being a revolt in any real sense of the word.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Election of 1828 not a revolt  



by Spencer Phillipson - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 6:33 PM

I definitely agree that the election wasn't a revolt at all. It seems that Remini was basing most of his so called "evidence" off theory rather than fact. McCormick was better able to provide strong factual evidence to support his claims.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics



by Spencer Phillipson - Monday, January 20, 2014, 9:07 PM

After reading Robert V. Remini and Richard P. McCormick's arguments I have found myself more inclined to take McCormick's side. McCormick was able to provide a lot more thought provoking factual evidence to support his claim than Remini did. McCormick says "instead of a "mighty democratic uprising", there was in 1828 a voter turnout that approached-but in only a few instances exceeded the maximum levels that had been attained before the Jackson era. (pg.211)" McCormick argues that a democratic uprising did not take place but was somewhat made up through iffy facts with loopholes. McCormick also says that in 1828 white males voting soared to 56.3%(pg. 211). However, new highs were only established in six of the twenty two states involved. Remini on the other hand seems to back up his evidence with opinions rather than hard facts. He states that the "popularity of Andrew Jackson stemmed from rising classes" (pg. 204). Remini also goes on to say that people thought that Jackson "was a living, authentic legend, the victor of New Orleans, the man who won over the British, the greatest feat of arms in American history" (pg. 206). Remini refers to the idea of the "common man" throughout his argument and gives credit to these "common men" for boosting the votes for Jackson to get into office. However, Remini's claims seem to have little evidence compared to McCormick which makes it very hard for me to jump on his side.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics



by Michelle Coming - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 12:05 AM

Ramini uses a lot of words such as "stupendous victory" and "extraordinary achievement" which makes his exert read like an opinion piece. McCormick definitely gave more facts to back up his claim as apposed to Remini's. His use of fact rather than opinions made me agree more with McCormick and formulate an opinion similar to yours. I think that the Election of 1828 was a sort of stepping stone to a surge of eligible voters in the country as McCormick seems to suggest towards the end of his article. With the growing number of eligible voters, more and more individuals began getting involved in politics and becoming concerned with how their country was being run. McCormick states " In 1840....In a surge of polls...four out of five (78.0%) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren. This new electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40%." he goes on to say "Now, at last, the common man - or at least a man who previously had not been sufficiently aroused to vote in presidential elections - cast his weight into the political balance."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828



by Marcus Mcphaul - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:05 AM

I would have to say the election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt. I looked up the word revolt and the closest definition relating to the election that I got from Webster Dictionary was " To act in a way that shows that you do not accept the control or influence of someone or something," this is not the feeling I am getting reading about this election. Jackson ran a brutal campaign and had a humble background which made him very likable to the average white American male which still dominated the voting demographic.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Could be a revolt



by Matt Blackshear - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 12:16 PM

Regarding my earlier post, I think in a way people didn't want the control of Adams. People saw the corrupt bargain he made in 1824 and his bashing on Jackson during the 1828 election turned against him. People were starting to see that someone new needed to come into office and change things up.

Jackson's popularity did help a lot but I think people were intrigued by Jackson's commitment to states' rights and minimal government, causing somewhat of a revolt

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt



by Courtney Reeser - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 3:15 PM

I agree with this statement a lot because I feel that the people were unhappy with the actions of Adams and did want a change in office. Yes Jackson was a popular man and did campaign very well. I think the people wanted to see more from him. I also feel like influence of Western states played a great role because the population was

growing and Jackson was a Western figure. Jackson made an impact on the election because he was very charismatic.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt



by Marcus Mcphaul - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 10:30 PM

I just feel like despite the slight distrust people had with Andrew Jackson most voting males already looked up to him because of his success against the British and his great charisma, he was already a hero.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt

by Jesse Nichols - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 4:29 PM

I'm going to have to respectfully disagree with your opinion. I don't see anything revolutionary about the "common man" electing the presidential candidate that best represents his concern and interests. During lecture in the afternoon class on Tuesday we discussed how the American Revolution should be known as the War for Independence because of its lack of revolutionary properties. A revolution requires radicalism and a violent overthrow of government, which the election of 1828 most certainly did not contain. It was simply just a shift in politics.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt

by Zachary Embree - Friday, January 24, 2014, 4:44 PM

I find your description "a shift in politics" very apt. This election while not a revolt in any sense of the word did represent a shift in several ways. From what I see in the text and source material it was considered the shift from genteel politicking to old American values. From big state protected industry to "the simplicity of Jefferson's agrarian republic." (p.400). And most importantly a shift from corrupt destabilizing politics to a upfront honest for the people's republic. Of course by, for the people, at that time meant white land owners.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt

by James Price - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 5:20 PM

I disagree with the statement that the "people were intrigued by Jackson's commitment to states' rights and minimal government" because these weren't new or novel concepts, but ideas that had been around since the founding of the republic and that were central concepts of the Jeffersonians. Further evidence of this can be seen in the textbook which states that "Jacksonian Democrats cherished the simplicity of Jefferson's agrarian republic" (p. 400).

Instead of being intrigued by Jackson's Jeffersonian ideals, I would say that the people were looking to restore the central concepts of Democratic Party that they

believed were being disregarded or replaced.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt

by Matt Blackshear - Friday, January 24, 2014, 7:09 PM

Good point James. I must have read some information wrong cause after rereading some of the article it clearly says on pg 205 of our reading material, "the democrats tended, when prodded, to restate the doctrines of Jefferson, particularly those emphasizing the rights of the states and the importance of the ordinary citizen."

Thank you for bringing that to my attention.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt

by Gary Smith - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 11:15 PM

I agree that the people did not want the control of Adams. The text states on (pg 390) " it was a clear triumph of democracy over genteel statesmanship..." The people wanted big government out.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Could be a revolt

by James Price - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 10:14 PM

I agree. Adams' nationalist domestic policy (textbook p.388-9), as well as his role in the "corrupt bargain," made him extremely unpopular, especially in the west and south. I believe that the populations view of Adams played a significant role in the election of 1828.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Impact of Jackson and 1828

by Bryan Sanders - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 2:52 AM

Before the readings and videos, I knew about the election of 1828 between Adams and Jackson and some of the effects it had, but these articles by Robert Remini and Richard McCormick have made me really think about this important event in history.

It's argued just how much of an effect the election, and Jackson himself, had on the landscape. There were a series of factors the historian's brought like state by state vote

counts and turnout to decide if Jackson and 1828 had an impact. Something bigger was at work, something that involved 1840 and its presidential election.

In the article that says 1828 was not a democratic revolution, it was argued that 1840 was the true revolt of the common man. It possessed a higher turnout than 1828 overall.

I couldn't help but notice that in the introductions Jackson is portrayed as the candidate for the common man, the man who started at the bottom and rose to the top. He was the first president not from Massachusetts or Virginia, and not a Founding Father. He also was the first president elected after Jefferson and John Adams died, thus he would be governing without the more influential founders physically alive. He would chart new territory, appropriate in an era of Manifest Destiny.

1828 itself could be called a people's revolt. John Quincy Adams was depicted as a corrupt man, dating back even before the 'corrupt bargain' between himself and Henry Clay. If it was an instance of a man outside the executive branch leading a charge against the insiders and incumbents, it was a revolt.

Jackson himself remained iconic even up to the civil war, and future presidential candidates would invoke some part of his legacy to their advantage. Martin Van Buren, William Henry Harrison, James Polk, and Zachary Taylor all ran using something related to Jackson to appeal to voters. Whether it be status as a war hero, the preserver of Jacksonian policies, or political outsider, all had their start with Jackson.

The historians in the readings and videos touched on most of these issues, and have helped me shape some of my views on this subject. Before I didn't have much of an idea of 1828's impact, but now I find myself agreeing more with Remini who argued 1828 was a democratic revolt. It was characterized not just for the elimination of property requirements for voting, increased attention to politics, and political machines, but also for shaping the way elections are held and candidates present themselves. This helped lay the groundwork for the future of the system.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



1828 Election Representing the The Working Man

by Robert Johnson - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 12:38 PM

So far I lean towards calling the election of 1828 a result of how majority rules, but not convinced of an actual revolt. To me it seems like like this election simply represented the the most popular choice of the majority. The majority of voters in this election were the common working class, and they felt like change needed to happen. This election represented the majority of voters. McCormick makes this clear with the mass of voters being the common man.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: 1828 Election Representing the The Working Man

by James Price - Friday, January 24, 2014, 1:29 PM

I agree that the election represented how the majority of white males felt and less of a revolt. The exclusion of women and, in the majority of states, free blacks makes the election feel less like a national democratic revolt and more like a stage in which to decide which white guy's social and political ideology was more popular.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: 1828 Election Representing the The Working Man

by Robert Johnson - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 2:44 PM

You make a good point there. I think the answer to the question here really depends on the individual and their own perspective. If a woman or a black person who was there at the time asked this same question, revolt or not ? , their answer would probably be different then how a poor free white man from that time would answer the same question.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Modern Definitions

by Zachary Embree - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 10:37 PM

After looking back on my initial response and reviewing the video portion of the discussion material several thoughts occurred to me.

Firstly that I was thinking of a revolt by my own personal 21st century view of the term. When I personally think of a revolt I am picturing scenes from the communist revolution and various conflicts in the Middle East. Mainly a violent uprising against the existing social order supported by the masses. However the reading and questions I feel concerns a democratic revolt of the people not a overthrow of the government. That said I find my position on the issue unchanged, this was not a revolt of the people, in part because of my second realization.

The first video by Eric Foner when talking about exclusion reminded me of the fact that if I was to consider anything a revolt of the common folk consideration must be payed to the percentage of the populace that could not vote. If anything this made my review the statistics presented in the reading in a new light as they only concerned the voting populace. Despite that I came to the conclusion the numbers are still valid, as they still show the difference in participation between the presidential election and other issues.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Election of 1828

by Michelle Coming - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 11:46 PM

After reviewing the provided material I find myself agreeing and disagreeing with both Remini and McCormick. They both make some valid points and I find a bit of bias in both of them. I do however, tend to agree slightly more with McCormick, he used facts and reason

in his argument, whereas Remini quotes other sources that seem to agree with him. The Election of 1826 doesn't seem to me to have been a full on revolt, although It may have been a contributing factor. I find that the truth may lie somewhere in the middle. After reading the handout I found that Remini made a point that stood out to me, he says "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." If this was truly the case and taking into account "Old Hickory's forceful personality, compounded with his use of strong executive authority..." (Forum 1 Topic Introduction) wouldn't one conclude that maybe these percentages weren't as accurate as we would hope? Jackson doesn't seem to be above bullying voters to win the presidency, not to mention the population growth between 1824 and 1828 as McCormick points out later on. The lack of proper documentation of the election of 1828 and subsequent elections makes me question Remini's argument.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Multiplicity: was it an issue?

by Bryan Sanders - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 2:34 AM

While reading the articles, I noticed both McCormick and Remini said that what contributed to a relatively low turnout in 1824 compared to 1828 was a multitude of candidates running. McCormick said regarding 1824,"popular interest was dampened by the confusion of choice presented by the multiplicity of candidates, by the disintegration of the old national parties, by the fact that in most states one or another of the candidates was so overwhelmingly popular as to forestall any semblance of a contest, and possibly by the realization that the election would ultimately be decided by the House of Representatives." Remini also stated that part of the reason for an increase in popular vote count was the reduction from 4 candidates in 1824 to 2 in 1828.

That's when I remembered the 1836 election. By this point, the Whigs had just emerged on the scene as a legit opposition to the Democrats. What was remarkable is that the Whigs ended up fielding four candidates to run for president. They hoped that by denying enough of the vote to Martin Van Buren, they could force a run off in the House of Representatives. This would have repeated 1824, which saw Jackson lose in the House.

The plan ultimately backfired and Van Buren won, but what's interesting is that voter turnout in this election was larger than turnout in 1824, at least according to Wikipedia and the American Presidency Project. It may be argued that the system had matured since 1824 and restrictions on voting had been removed. Also, the method for choosing electors had changed. However, it can't be denied that there was a multitude of candidates running, and the multiplicity doesn't seem to have deterred voting much.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



brith of a new party

by Matthew Rice - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 11:23 AM

i think part of the reason that Jackson won the election by such a landslide was

because the Demarcates made a very smart move by putting Jackson as there candidate. with the help of Thomas Jefferson they were able to bring in the Jeffersonian and double the size of there party. making it that Jackson won the demarcate south. something that presidents still today want to win, even though in recent years it hasn't been the sold south

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



the Mudslinging

by Matthew Rice - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 11:37 AM

i think with all honesty that the mudslinging help being the new voters in to the election, it drew there attention and allowed them to relate to the candidates better, i mean like Adams was said to have given a American servant girl to the Tsar of Russia. and that Jackson Marriage. what i think we have here was the begins to reality TV, back before we had TV and radio. it allowed the general public see that this two people are more of common people then the high class rich people, even though they were of the upper class and rich, they were portrayed more of the common man. Jackson also was more of what modern day palititions were like, he was the one the introduced walking in the pubic and kissing babies and doing the whole PR stunt. with all of this i am really not surprised the Jackson won the election. it also reminds me of the Kennedy election. He used more skill and knowledge to win because used what was at his ability to use.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Campaign

by Courtney Reeser - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 12:43 PM

It also helped that Jackson allowed himself to be interviewd on his views and get his opinion and information out there for the people. Which I am sure made him more of a people president. I feel it was a reform because he changed the way people started campaigning. As far as using flyers and giving out buttons and newspapers to get his message out there. Very smart of him and that's what helps shape the way presidents campaign today

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Upon Further Review.

by Jesse Nichols - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 5:19 PM

After reviewing my initial post as well as watching the video part of the discussion materials I realize that how you define the word revolt, plays a big factor on which position you side with on this topic. When I think of revolt, I think of revolutions like the French, Communist,

and others currently going on in the Middle East that all contain(ed) radicalism and a violent upheaval of an existing government, but the question is whether or not the election of 1828 was a Democratic revolt of the people. A good definition i found for revolt is "an attempt to put an end to the authority of a person or body by rebelling.". With that being said, my position remains unchanged. In my eyes this election does not denote the necessary properties of a revolt. Adams still had supporters who voted for him, so it's not like every single person wanted him out of office. Jackson won because he embodied the ideals of the common man, and because of Adams poor choices (i.e the "corrupt bargain" and his bashing of Jackson during his campaign). So if this election is considered a Democratic revolt, is every other election considered one as well?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Upon Further Review.

by Bryan Sanders - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 6:31 PM

Good that you pointed that out. I had forgotten that in this context it wasn't so much a revolt as it was a transition from one person to another. The founders had established the political system specifically so that violence would not be incited every time a new leader took office. There was fear at one point that the election of Jefferson would incite a revolt, but instead he was peacefully installed as the new president after John Adams.

Even if the 1828 election was not a revolt in that sense, it did mark an era of dominance primarily by the Democrats that lasted until the civil war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Fear is a powerful thing.

by Brian Breedlove - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 10:04 AM

I also agree. The people were very afraid of a revolt or even more a civil war. I think the possibility of war was on the fronts of everyone minds. The Fed gov't really tried to use this fear to any advantage they could...the people knew it...and they came together behind Jackson hoping he, who shared their roots, would swoop in and save the day. It wasn't a revolt as much as a society trying to prevent war. Of course now we know that war was inevitable and the people of the time probably knew that too.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Clarification

by Bryan Sanders - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 4:39 PM

I'm not sure if the government under John Quincy Adams threatened civil war, but the Federalists in the days of John Adams, his father, said there would be civil war if Thomas Jefferson was elected. Ultimately there wasn't.

I also know that after Jackson's election, there was a mob that stormed the White House and forced John Quincy Adams to flee. The National Republicans said it was a sign of things to come, but this warning came after the election. In retrospect, this combined with the story of Jackson's first inauguration could create the impression for some that the 1828 election was a revolt. For that time it may have seemed so, even if today it seems like nothing compared to what happens nowadays when a new person gets elected. I still lean more toward the election being a transition rather than revolt, but it certainly had aspects that seemed revolutionary.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Upon Further Review.



by Jesse Nichols - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 4:04 PM

Exactly. I think at times we can all be guilty of getting so caught up in the possibility of something being true, that we cloud our judgement to see it for what it really is. Obviously this opinion is not end all say all, but I truly believe it was just a transition in politics rather than a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



not so much a revolt



by Matthew Rice - Friday, January 24, 2014, 6:27 AM

i feel that it wasn't so much a revolt or a reformation. In my mind it was more of a revival. Van Buren helped bring back the two party system, because he felt, and i am sure many others did to that the current political part had failed to change with the change in socility. which is common for political partys. the mudslinging and the formation of a new political party i am not surprised that voter turnout was lower then the last election in 1824.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Upon Further Review.



by Agina Hale - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 10:26 AM

I started out feeling as though it was a revolt, but now I'm just on the fence. You have to at least admit this seemed like a different election, compared to the past elections. Not necessarily the mudslinging, but the pouring of relief and celebration.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Upon Further Review.



by Zachary Embree - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 1:49 PM



This election was different different then many of the one before it. But It was still just that, a election, not revolt against the government or a uprising of the "common man". Keeping in mind the actual numbers, Jackson won the election with around 56% of the votes, that is not the hallmark of a overwhelming victory. The out pour of relief I believe came from the people believing that for the fist time it was traditional American values versus corrupt politicking in a battle for the presidency, and corruption lost.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Remini's Yes vs I Dont Think So

by Robert Johnson - Friday, January 24, 2014, 9:45 AM

Remini claims a democratic revolt was represented by the election of 1828. So then I ask, do all the points he brings to the table on this question really add up to a revolt ?

Remini mentioned a Van Buren letter expressing concern for the political scene. The letter urged radicals to join his coalition against Adams.

Radicals and coalition, well ok but did these democrats all rise up in rebellion, and fight with violence trying to overthrow government authority ? Well we know they voted, and so does Remini. He points out an assortment of items to support his side of the debate. I think some basic and yet key items here are, a two-party system, each side with a presidential candidate and a mass number of voters, voting on one side or the other to elect their new President.

So the citizens voted, the election ended and Jackson was elected the new President by more than half of the voters. But can a revolt be accomplished by voting in an election? And if so then how one sided would the results of an election have to be ?

According to Remini's own numbers, Andrew Jackson won the election with a little over 56 percent of votes. Clearly a comfortable margin of victory for the majority, ok i agree with that. But I wouldn't quite call 56% to 44% a stupendous victory much less a revolt.

I think maybe when he read some of the quotes the put towards the end of his argument, Remini got all excited...which party does he favor the most ?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Revolt, maybe not

by Courtney Reeser - Friday, January 24, 2014, 8:24 PM

Towards the end of this, with all the information that has been brought forward, I feel like revolt is the wrong word. I am not sure if it was a revolt. I think it the election of 1828 set in motion the series of events that lead to the systematic revocation of the rights our forefathers fought and died for, and the digression of a free peoples into a

police state. Revolt maybe not so much. I think that is just the wrong word. Yes the people acted out but at the same time I feel as if they just wanted to make a change and stood up for themselves

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Revolt, maybe not

by Robert Johnson - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 1:08 AM

I can agree with people wanting change. In this case of the election of 1828, many stood up for themselves in a way they could not before just by voting. I bet all those who voted for change such as the democrat's, could have felt like they won victory in what may have resembled a revolt to them when this election was over. They had brought about change in the government by electing their new President. So sort of like the end result of a successful revolt, they didn't exactly overthrow Adams, they did get him out of office.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Revolt, maybe not

by Bart Golden - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 1:59 PM

I absolutely agree, to me it seems the only real democratic uprising was the revolt against England, and can hardly be compared to the election of 1828. Let McCormick crunch those numbers and there will be little room for debate. Sadly, a New Democracy or a Democracy of any sort never has been achieved at least not in the New World. Our founding fathers fought and died, true, but for a dream of something much greater than this! One must wonder what they would think of us now.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



McCormick Does the Math. But do the numbers Really Tell us All

by Robert Johnson - Friday, January 24, 2014, 10:57 PM

McCormick makes his argument with numbers and comparisons. With several comparisons of the number of voters participating in elections before and after 1828, McCormick makes his point that the election of 1828 did not see as much voter participation. In one example

on page 211 in the last paragraph, McCormick shows us the numbers that he claims mean the election of 1828 failed to bring to the polls the proportion of the electorate that voted on occasion in previous elections. He goes on to conclude that political dimensions as they relate to the behavior of the electorate, None of the Jackson elections involved a "mighty democratic uprising". And maybe numbers don't lie, but sometimes those numbers can hide things too. McCormick is all about his numbers on this issue, and the more I consider all the possibility's, the more I start to reconsider my original opinion about the election of 1828.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I say niether

by Bart Golden - Friday, January 24, 2014, 11:57 PM

Obviously, there is no right or wrong answer; this is a debate of opinion. What it comes down to for me is really how you define revolt. As far as who do I agree with I say neither but if I am forced to choose one for the assignment then I have to say Mc Cormick merely because I don't find a bunch of white guys voting for someone who's not from Massachusetts or Virginia a revolt. Had it been because Jackson campaigned on the removal of Central banking and the National debt (both of which he did accomplish and for the only time in American history) then I might see it differently

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I say niether

by Evan Lawrence - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 9:24 AM

I agree that this whole topic boils down to how you define a revolt. But looking at McCormicks arguments, he's saying that in 1840 more people were voting for the president than in gubernatorial elections. In the election of 1840 "four out of five of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren"; and prior to the 1840 election "between 1824 and 1832 there were fifty gubernatorial elections ... in only sixteen of these fifty instances did the vote for President surpass the vote for governors". It wasn't the fact that they weren't from Massachusetts or Virginia, it was the fact that more people cared about the president than their own local leaders.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I say niether

by Bart Golden - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 2:30 PM

I understand your point, And when i said a bunch of "white males" or "from Massachusetts or Virginia" what i am saying is that we don't know how "the People really felt " because they weren't all allowed to participate. And when I watched the videos and heard that guy talking about how the average American wasn't the best judge of how the country should be run it just infuriates me that they try and convince us, even today, that they know whats best for us??

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I say niether

by Evan Lawrence - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 6:03 PM

Okay, I understand. But I think the guy in the video does have a somewhat valid point.

I certainly do not have enough knowledge of international politics and affairs to decide what is best for the nation. There are certain things that are absolutely unacceptable in my opinion; like the NSA, big bankers not being jailed for causing the financial crisis and the state of our wealth distribution. If I were put in charge and had my way I would be jailing the big bankers, dissolving the NSA and making the wealth distribution more even, there could be untold consequences.

So I'm fine with having a representative that I believe in in DC making decisions for me, just as long as those decisions are representing Oregon, or the 4th district. If not, I won't vote for that person next time around.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I say niether

by Agina Hale - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 10:30 AM

This makes sense to me, but I'm still trying to figure out why it was such an emotional win, in comparison. But yes, if he had run on those campaigns, it would have been obvious.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I say niether

by Bart Golden - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 2:50 PM

He did campaign on those issues and Adams tried to distract people by mud slinging. Its unfortunate that the answer to your question "why the emotional win" is off topic. Jackson's popularity was because he was fearless in his defense of freedom and the people that the founding fathers sought to protect with the constitution. He saw that the single greatest threat to freedom was to allow foreign elitists control of our currency and he set his sights on eliminating those corrupt central banks and the debt that they breed. This is why he was so popular. That is why we are in so much trouble today

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I say niether

by Brian Breedlove - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 6:39 PM

I certainly wouldn't feel comfortable saying Jackson fought for freedom, unless your definition of freedom is "whatever is best for the white man". Jackson supported whatever provided him with the most power. Agreeably, Jackson stood for the common man, but unfortunately the common man was also racially and capitalistically inclined. If our "freedom" meant the genocide and total oppression of other races, then as a fledgling society we were in. Jackson was certainly popular but (at least in today's society) for all the wrong reasons.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: I say niether

by Michelle Coming - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 9:18 PM

I definitely agree that the whole debate comes down to how you define revolt. If a different word or phrase in place of revolt there would have been a better argument to be made. In the second video they refer to it as a "dramatic transformation of American Democracy". This seems to be a more accurate description. People were becoming much more involved with politics and the people appointed to office to represent them. With the property requirement lifted from most states, more citizens were able to vote, thus making a greater change. I don't think Jackson alone instilled this change or "revolt" so to speak.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Either Way, or Neither

by Robert Johnson - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 3:44 PM

Yes I think it has become obvious that the correct answer to the question here is relative to how any individual feels about it. We all have our own reasons for feeling the way we do about anything, and our own priority's. To each their own I say. Does there always have to be just one correct answer ? I have went back and fourth on this depending on how i look at it, its been a bit like a game of mental ping pong. After going through our class material, all the posts on this forum, I think understanding is the most important thing. So to me Mccomick with his numbers makes a good point on one side, but so does Remini on another level. My conclusion here is that both historians could be correct. I can see it either way, But which one is more correct than the other ? I say Neither one.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



1828: A big step but not a revolt



by Dylan Ornas - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 6:04 PM

I must start off by saying that both authors make good points. In my mind there is no clear Yes Revolt or No Revolt.

I believe that we are looking at the midpoint of a new countries political system working out its kinks and falling into place. Remini makes a large point of the huge turnout for the 1828 election. While this is a valid point, I believe using it to prove that the election was a revolt is somewhat unfounded.

Ever since elections began using popular vote we see more and more electorate showing in presidential as well as state elections, McCormick goes out of his way to point out that this swell in polling is a natural occurrence. The election of 1840 blew the 1828 election out of the water polling numbers wise.

Andrew Jackson was the common mans man; Indian fighter, self made etc. He gave the electorate someone to want to vote for. Adams was not a popular figure at this point. It seems to me not much of a surprise. The people saw the opportunity to replace a corrupt adams with everymans Jackson.

I can hardly consider this a revolt. If anything I would call it a shining example of democracy working.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: 1828: A big step but not a revolt



by Robert Johnson - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 7:49 PM

Very well put I would say. When I look deeper than the surface, I don't see a clear yes or no either. What has become clear to me here is that, a fuller understanding can change people, and their opinions. I think trying to consider a different opinion opens the mind.

Not very surprising Jackson won at all, I have to agree with that too. I think its a great point to consider. And on the flip, considering that a corrupt Adams actually got more than a half million votes is some what of a surprise to me, and even a little alarming.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: 1828: A big step but not a revolt



by Robert Johnson - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 8:53 PM

I agree with the democracy statement too. With out debate, at this point, I would have to say that democracy fits my picture of the 1828 election better than revolt does.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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

[< Previous \(Election of 1828\)](#)

[\(Election of 1828\) Next >](#)

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

[i](#) Moodle Docs for this page

