

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

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



More than just lost numbers but a leader to the common man.

by Kira Iantorno - Saturday, January 18, 2014, 11:24 PM

I myself will side with the Yes side of "Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?" I had already believed this before reading the article that had covered both sides, to be honest. The No opinion only offered the differences in numbers after the fact, telling us the difference may not have been as much as we thought, and how state government handled voting was different. The fact still stands that this new government had not come to terms on the balance of power. While the North was about being progressive many other Americans were quite content on where they were and did not appreciate the government telling them they were wrong. While one of these issues was slavery, many others like Marshall's constant stance on Federal dominance, were also causing fear in the individual states.

Jackson was the obvious choice when compared to Adams. The first part of the article mentions the Jackson Election in 1828 as the "Rise of the common man" pg 207. He was an out spoken "orphan boy from the backwoods" pg 204. That had made his way all the

way to being a candidate in the presidential election not to mention a war hero. Jackson was vocal about his stance on the federal government and how individual state's rights were important.

The No stance in the article states "Did Jackson, the popular hero, attract voters to the polls in unprecedented proportions? The comparisons that had already been made between the Jackson elections and other elections.... state and national before, during, and after his presidency would suggest a negative answer to the question." (pg 213). While despite the numbers the history has Jackson backed up. Daniel Webster is quoted saying "Persons have come five hundred miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger."pg 208.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: More than just lost numbers but a leader to the common man.



by Erik Long - Monday, January 20, 2014, 9:58 PM

I agree with this. In th articles we read it seemed like to me they were just giving us the difference in numbers. The government after the election had changed but they still had several things that needed to be assessed and one of those was the balance of power.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The Jackson Era



by Claire Steinbis - Sunday, January 19, 2014, 12:20 PM

This was a hard one for me. Although, I found myself tied on both ends of the argument I landed with the conclusion that I agree with the Election of 1828 as a democratic revolt. I took to both sides at first because, they both showed good arguments.. at first, but going deeper and reading into it more, the ones that were not for it only relied on the numbers instead of the voice. I agree with the election because as stated Jackson was, "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions". (204) To them Jackson was going to be the strong leader that they needed and were missing during this time.

Now as for the Age of Jackson, this is where I do not agree. I do not agree with the fact that Jackson was a sneaky man. When watching to two videos the one that had the bigger impact on my thoughts was the side that did not agree with him. For instance, when we talked in class about how Jackson encouraged certain mail carriers to destroy mail so that he wouldn't have to deal with certain things. Today Jackson would have been impeached in a heart beat for all of the things that he thought would make a better "state". Such as, The Trail of Tears and his connections as a slave holder. I agree that the election of 1828 was for Jackson he was seen as a good leader but like I said as the age of Jackson I don't agree that he made a good electoral person. I guess in the end I see both sides of the story.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



The Election of 1828 - An Election of the People

by Louis Gambee - Monday, January 20, 2014, 11:53 AM

After pondering both sides of this debate, I've concluded that the election of 1828 did indeed represent a Democratic revolt of the people. Although both of the arguments intrigued me, I find myself in support of Robert V. Remini. While McCormick essentially only uses numbers to support his argument, Remini not only provides numbers, but also hard facts and sentiments from people during this time period. In my opinion, I think the fact that voter turnout doubled is enough to justify this election as being a Democratic revolt. There was a 56 percent voter turnout rate, which is a ridiculously high number when compared to the voter turnout percentages from the prior elections (election of 1824). Jackson also won the election in a landslide, gaining 56 percent of the popular vote, which alone indicates the overwhelming animosity that Americans felt towards the National Government prior to the election. The Government to most Americans, was becoming too big and centralized. The American people for the most part wanted to return to the underlying principles of the old Jeffersonian Republican party that emphasized states rights instead of an enlarged federal Government. Once the two party system came into play, this gave Americans the opportunity to vote with Andrew Jackson's new democratic party, which emulated the ideals of the old Jeffersonian Republicans. This along with overwhelming frustration with the National Government were key components in this revolt. The frustration boiled over during the corrupt bargain of 1825, which saw the American people lose influence over the presidential election of 1824, even though the majority of the population had voted for Andrew Jackson. This not only angered American voters, but also played a huge role in prompting mass voter turnout. It probably angered them that their votes had no influence whatsoever in determining the presidency, which they felt was a fundamental right. In our textbook *Liberty, Equality, and Power*, the author of Chapter 11 on page 389, discusses that Jackson's campaign used the corrupt bargain to their advantage. Jackson once said in regards to the bargain that, "the rights of the people have been bartered for promises of office" (PG. 387, *Liberty, Equality, and Power*). This resentment most likely fueled Americans need to get out and vote. A lasting image that also reflects the Democratic revolt that took place in the Election of 1828 was Jackson's inauguration speech which is described by Remini during the end of his piece. He says that, "the notion of a popular "uprising" in Jackson's favor was strengthened by the scene that occurred during his inauguration as President on March 4, 1829. Some twenty thousand people from all parts of the country converged on Washington to witness the triumph of their candidate. (PG. 207, *Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?*)" While the election of 1828 didn't have the large numbers in voter turnout like the election of 1840, it was still a revolt by the American people in its own right.

After viewing the age of Jackson videos, my views on this Democratic revolt have been enforced to some point, but also altered. Historian Eric Foner talks about the inclusion of many more white American men into voting and politics during the Jackson era, but also speaks about the limits for those who weren't eligible white voting men (women, African Americans). My views are synonymous with his points in that we see a rise in political interest and participation, but how could the election of 1828 represent a true Democratic revolt when the majority of the people in this country weren't allowed to participate in politics and vote? The second video enforces the belief that Jackson's regime wasn't truly a democratic one that promoted equality for all. Jackson did pretty much hold true to his promise of promoting states rights, but in the end he didn't create a democratic society that emphasizedAfter pondering both sides of this debate, I've concluded that the election of 1828 did indeed represent a Democratic revolt of the people. Although both of the

arguments intrigued me, I find myself in support of Robert V. Remini. While McCormick essentially only uses numbers to support his argument, Remini not only provides numbers, but also hard facts and sentiments from people during this time period. In my opinion, I think the fact that voter turnout doubled is enough to justify this election as being a Democratic revolt. There was a 56 percent voter turnout rate, which is a ridiculously high number when compared to the voter turnout percentages from the prior elections (election of 1824). Jackson also won the election in a landslide, gaining 56 percent of the popular vote, which alone indicates the overwhelming animosity that Americans felt towards the National Government prior to the election. The Government to most Americans, was becoming too big and centralized. The American people for the most part wanted to return to the underlying principles of the old Jeffersonian Republican party that emphasized states rights instead of an enlarged federal Government. Once the two party system came into play, this gave Americans the opportunity to vote with Andrew Jackson's new democratic party, which emulated the ideals of the old Jeffersonian Republicans. This along with overwhelming frustration with the National Government were key components in this revolt. The frustration boiled over during the corrupt bargain of 1825, which saw the American people lose influence over the presidential election of 1824, even though the majority of the population had voted for Andrew Jackson. This not only angered American voters, but also played a huge role in prompting mass voter turnout. It probably angered them that their votes had no influence whatsoever in determining the presidency, which they felt was a fundamental right. In our textbook Liberty, Equality, and Power, the author of Chapter 11 on page 389, discusses that Jackson's campaign used the corrupt bargain to their advantage. Jackson once said in regards to the bargain that, "the rights of the people have been bartered for promises of office" (PG. 387, Liberty, Equality, and Power). This resentment most likely fueled Americans need to get out and vote. A lasting image that also reflects the Democratic revolt that took place in the Election of 1828 was Jackson's inauguration speech which is described by Remini during the end of his piece. He says that, "the notion of a popular "uprising" in Jackson's favor was strengthened by the scene that occurred during his inauguration as President on March 4, 1829. Some twenty thousand people from all parts of the country converged on Washington to witness the triumph of their candidate. (PG. 207, Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?)" While the election of 1828 didn't have the large numbers in voter turnout like the election of 1840, it was still a revolt by the American people in its own right.

After viewing the age of Jackson videos, my views on this Democratic revolt have been enforced to some point, but also altered. Historian Eric Foner talks about the inclusion of many more white American men into voting and politics during the Jackson era, but also speaks about the limits for those who weren't eligible white voting men (women, African Americans). My views are synonymous with his points in that we see a rise in political interest and participation, but how could the election of 1828 represent a true Democratic revolt when the majority of the people in this country weren't allowed to participate in politics and vote? The second video enforces the belief that Jackson's regime wasn't truly a democratic one that promoted equality for all. Jackson did pretty much hold true to his promise of promoting states rights, but in the end he didn't create a democratic society that emphasized equality for all.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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

Re: The Election of 1828 - An Election of the People



by Erik Long - Monday, January 20, 2014, 10:03 PM



I agree, Eric Froner talks about the Jacksonian era and points out that yes it was expansive in that almost all white Americans could now vote compared to only land owners. But also on the other hand there were still Americans that could not vote, now it was just based on race or sex of the American.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Election of 1828... The People's Election?



by Kylie Stiglbauer - Monday, January 20, 2014, 1:29 PM

When my attention was first brought to the question of whether or not the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people, I was unsure as to my exact stance on the issue. The Jackson election is one that is surrounded by controversy and very strong opinions from political figures of the times as well as historians. After reviewing the text, as well as our notes from class, I began to find that my stance on the election was one that sided with those that did believe this was in fact an election for the people. I found myself agreeing with Robert V. Remini, more so than Richard P. McCormick not only because of his stance, but also in the way that he presented it. McCormick took the approach of supporting his claims with statistics on the election itself. Remini on the other hand demonstrated how the Jackson election was one for the people. "Jackson was the first president who did not come from with Virginia or Massachusetts." This showed that the political emphasis was breaking away from the traditional and pulling more towards the people. By electing a more "common" man, the people then felt a stronger connection toward the presidency, making them believe that they had a say in their government. This election was the foundation for the many changes to come to the government, and the public's views on it. The following election showed another surge in involvement from the people thus showing that the election of 1828 was truly a democratic revolt for the people. Although Jackson may not have had the most positive affect on the nation in terms of what he did during his presidency(trail of tears..etc) he did bring a political appreciation to the people. The fact that the people were allowed into the White house after his election shows just how dramatic his acceptance of the presidency was in terms of its impact on the political climate. I believe that this was the people's chance to feel a stronger connection to a government that often times seems out of reach .

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828... The People's Election?



by Kira Iantorno - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 7:42 PM

"By electing a more "common" man, the people then felt a stronger connection toward the presidency, making them believe that they had a say in their government." I completely agree with you on this, the people were looking for a "Hero" and Jackson was more than able to stand in the spot light. Robert V. Remini presented his side by quoting the people of the time, despite what 100 years of muddled numbers will provide you, Remini sends the words from the people and draws a picture of how

people felt during the election. Remini himself make this point when he says “But in any event the fact remains 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.”(pg 207). He has convinced me that the people were looking for not just a president but for change and opportunity.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828... The People's Election?



by Melissa Moser - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 7:46 PM

I found myself in the same boat when we first started looking at the two perspectives on the election, feeling unsure of which side I most agreed with, and was swayed by the same things. While McCormick was firm in his facts and proper "data", I feel like it's the sentiment of the people that makes this a revolt, as opposed to just a landslide election. Remini really help to convey the idea that the general public was moved by Jackson's personality and goals, and that they felt (for once) that there was a candidate who was really interested in the same things as they were.

I also really like that you mentioned that while Jackson's actions may not have been acceptable by today's standards, his presidency had a huge impact on how people connected with their president and government. The new found appreciation for the power that our constitution gave the American public (so long as you were white, male, and probably a landowner) does seem largely attributable to Jackson's influence.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Election of 1828



by Joe Hoover - Monday, January 20, 2014, 6:03 PM

Although both sides make valid points, I have to say that I think that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people. I think that this election paved the way for democratic revolt. Andrew Jackson was the first president not from Virginia or Massachusetts, he was a self made man and I think this led to the “common man” having more of a voice in politics. “The total popular vote in the election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election on 1824.” This shows how many more people voted, which I believe kick started this “revolt” of the people. Another argument that I found effective was that this election had only two parties represented for the presidential office, which I think made it easier for citizens to decide on who to vote for, which in return came with a higher voter turn out.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828

by Yi Zhang - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:51 AM

I find joe's reply to be quite interesting, he mentions that there are valid points on both sides and tends to agree with remini. This emphasizes my point earlier that remini's arguments are much more transparent and may fulu the contest by default while mclormich, who may ultimately be correct will falu much more effect to understand let alone criticize.

Joe's answer also highlights the multifaceted nature or the question and how it could be interpreted as a revolt due to the accost being elected from outside mass almsetts or Virginia or a revolt due to the Democratic way in which he non office through votes from "common" men's newly gained voting rights. Joe also mentions the two purely system that emerge as argument in famous of remini's claim it might not be to make it simple, since many previous elections only retextured two candidates but rather gave votes a real choice in political ideologies

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828

by Louis Gambee - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 2:10 PM

While I agree with you that the election of 1828 did indeed represent a Democratic revolt, I think that one of the main factors that influenced voter turnout for this election was the Corrupt Bargain of 1825. There's no doubt in my mind that the new two party system as well as Jackson being seen as the "common man", played significant roles in the mass voter turnout that was seen in the election of 1828, but I feel like the people felt slighted and angered by the fact that their vote in the election of 1824 had no influence in determining who became president. This alone could've motivated them to vote and make a difference in the election of 1828. The fact that our textbook describes on pg. 389 of our textbook that the Jackson campaign "hammered away, at the Corrupt Bargain of 1825", further solidifies my view that Jackson was able to use this event to his advantage in prompting people to not only vote, but to vote for him in the election of 1828. Jackson winning 56 percent of the popular vote in the election, which up to that point was unheard of, is a clear indication in my opinion that this campaign tactic worked.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828

by Kylie Stiglbauer - Friday, January 24, 2014, 10:39 PM

I really liked the point that you brought up about the corrupt bargain and how it was also influenced the voter turnout at the election of 1828. This incident in history was one that truly changed the way that people viewed their government. The corrupt bargain was one that showed the people that their government was not as perfect as it may try to appear to the public eye. It also gave Jackson an arguing point for his election. I also agree with your point that Jackson in fact had a large influence on voter turn out and the "revolt" that Remini discussed. Jackson's appeal and success showed a change in the relationship between the people and the government that determined what would happen to their daily lives. Although Jackson had appeal for the people, events such as the corrupt

bargain are what bring about significant change in people's view on the government as well as their desire to vote. Both Jackson and the corrupt bargain brought forth a change in government.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828



by Shane Escalera - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 2:55 PM

I agree in what Joes statement somewhat. It's about as much as a revolt as democrats voting for OBAMA in the 2008 election. People had a good feeling on Jackson considering what he represented. Much like people voting for Obama in 2008. It's no different in my opinion.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828



by Shane Escalera - Monday, January 20, 2014, 7:59 PM

I agree that Jackson played a roll in helping a democratic Revolt. The amount of votes not necessarily pointing to as evidence. But more so the fact people felt like they had a say so. I think the election before in 1824 played a major factor of the election of 1828. John Quincy Adams, being the son of a founding father represented an elitist. Though being a smart man, a graduate of Harvard, knowing seven different languages, he was not what the people wanted. The corruption of the 1924 election made made it inevitable for people to vote Jackson. It was a slander campaign and the Democrats thought Jackson would win. Much like in the obama years. america was ready for something different.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A rejection of intellectualism?



by Thomas Stevens - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 10:39 PM

Interesting thought, you seem to be suggesting that the electorate was rejecting the intellectualism that Adams represented. Perhaps a valid comparison could be made for Reagan, an actor, not a very good one, who was elected in 1980. Where he differed with Jackson was his lack of energy, frequently falling asleep during cabinet meetings and he was seen as very detached and relying on experts in his cabinet to make policy.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Jackson opening the door to the people to politics



by Danny Lopez - Monday, January 20, 2014, 8:20 PM

Reading both sides of the say of the election of 1828 if did represent a democratic revolt of the people. I didn't know much over the history of Jackson, and this election 1828 affect on the people take on politics, but I believe that the election did start the democratic revolt even though both sides did explained good arguments, but I was more in favor to Remini yes part. It did open the doors to people being connected to the government, and getting them more popular votes from the people that work to build this country, and Jackson was that man that people felt connected to the most. Th.at's why I believe yes this did start the democratic revolt

Jackson's not so good actions did hurt him, but he did play a role in the Democratic Revolt of the people as stated "Jackson's appearance on the national scene in larger-than-life-size was indeed fortuitous"(pg. 204) , and that is what people wanted a common man. The country was going through changes, and Jackson was part of that because he was a leader and self-made man. In the election he was sure surrounded by controversy, but as Robert V. Remini put, Jackson was the beginning of the "Rise of the Common man", and that got peoples attention into the election by getting a lot of the popular votes by farmers and workers around the states. This helped win the elections with big numbers of voters from the people. Democrats saw the Jackson victory result of high number of popular votes, and republicans saw that too. This sure built a stronger connection people to the government, and bring people to vote, and have a say to what the people want.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Revolution or Business as Usual?



by Melissa Moser - Monday, January 20, 2014, 8:39 PM

After reading both sides of the discussion as to whether or not the Election of 1828 constituted a Democratic Revolution, I would have to say that I agree that it did. Initially, I could have seen myself being swayed by the numbers and difference in data collection and sorting displayed by the neigh-sayers but, frankly, their argument was cold and without socially-founded persuasion. I found that it was hard to ignore the quotes that Remini cited in his piece, such as that of one National Republican who said "Well, a great revolution has taken place... This is what I all along feared but to a much greater extent." If the impression of a revolt was not only from the winning side, but from the opposition as well, surely this says something to its credit. Also, the statement cited from Edward Everett, a great supporter of Adams in Congress, explained that the degree of success found by Andrew Jackson was great enough to be "astounding to the friends of the Administration and unexpected by the General himself and his friends." This shows that it was not just a victory, or even a standard "landslide", for Jackson, but was demonstrative of a fantastic push for change among the voting majority.

On page 385 of our textbook, *Liberty, Equality, Power*, reference is made to the Corrupt Bargain, taking place in 1825. This unscrupulous practice and stab for power left the public with a bad taste in their mouths, still sour as bile by the time the following election came around. Regarding the act that had robbed him of his first chance at the presidency, Andrew Jackson is quoted as having said that the very rights of the people had been "bartered for promises of office". While General Jackson's name may have been dragged through the mud by his own doings in the past, the shame didn't hold a candle to the charges that would now follow Henry Clay, and more importantly, Jackson's returning rival,

Adams, until the end of their careers. This left the proverbial door wide open for Jackson to draw attention to more acts of corruption or misdoings by those who preceded him (pg. 387, *Liberty, Equality, Power, para 2-4*), and to then rally the public for change.

I find it persuasive, also, that Remini writes of how Andrew Jackson was, in his own right, a living legend (pg. 206, *Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic Revolt?*). The power of notoriety, especially when one is known for military victories or brash machismo during an era of growth and change in a nation, is undeniable. His take-charge demeanor and "Presidential appearance" may well have had just as much to do with his desirability as a leader among the voters, because it comes across that he was an inspiration or role model to a number of the voters. An orphan son of the Carolina backwoods, Andrew Jackson wasn't overly educated, nor was he unfamiliar with the plight of the common man, and so a new generation of men came to see him as "a symbol of their own ambitions". (pg. 204, *Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?*) The idea of having a man the public can relate to in office has long been a pretty good foundation for a revolution, albeit this time a peaceful one.

The voter turnout for the 1828 election are reflective of a public driven towards change. Having just completed a full-scale revolution less than half a century prior, the general populace clearly expressed both their pride in their electoral system and their distaste for the current government regime by driving up the total popular vote by over 800,000 counts, compared to the previous election. Of that, an alarming 56% was for Andrew Jackson, showing a victory percentages unrivaled by any other president during the nineteenth century (pg. 206, *Did the Election of 1828...*). Those kinds of results don't happen without a significant desire for change and feeling of uprising among those with the power to vote.

As for the videos, while I do understand the points that Eric Foner made regarding who did and didn't have the ability to vote, I can't honestly say that I would have expected the results to have played out much differently. While Jackson did claim that a factor in his invasion of Spanish Florida was that it was a sanctuary for runaway Georgia slaves (pg. 385, *Liberty, Equality, Power*), I've not found any record that he captured and returned slaves, nor that he killed any upon finding them, this leading me to believe that this fact would not have altered the vote among blacks, should their votes have been weighted more heavily at the time. As for women's votes, it is hard to say for whom they would have voted, but as the number of eligible female voters would have been fairly small, I feel that it is also safe to say that it would not have greatly affected the outcome. The allegations of Jackson being (or not being) a good electoral choice are, in my opinion, neither here nor there. I do not approve of some things he did during his time in office, nor some of the things he did leading up to that point, but I am seeing them through the eyes of hindsight, more or less. Our nation is in a much different place at this point in time, and trying to project where things would be, had he acted differently, is kind of playing fast and loose with what knowledge we do have of the situation. Suffice to say, I feel that, as in any other time in history, and likely any time in the future, the Election of 1828 was a choice between the lesser of two evils. John Quincy Adams had already shown himself to be prone to underhanded dealings regarding the choices of the general public, while Andrew Jackson just showed himself to be a reckless member thereof. Whatever our views of them now, I'd say it's safe to say that the voters of the time spoke loud, clear, and nearly en mass, that they were ready for a change.



Re: Revolution or Business as Usual?



by Melissa Moser - Wednesday, January 22, 2014, 10:03 AM

In an exhaustion-induced delirium, I kept typing "Revolution". It should have been Revolt. Apologies for being a dunce.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828- Voting Revolution



by Cameron Holliday - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 12:18 AM

I agree with Robert V. Remini on his statement that the election of 1828 was the starting point for a nationally organized two party system. I also believe that it was because the people simply liked Jackson. I kind of see it as his popularity took off like wild fire and it persuaded more people to vote for this particular election. After this election the people began to pay more attention to the following ones in the 1830's. I believe that my opinion is backed up by this quote here from Pg. (204) "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of there own ambitions." Finally the people became involved in their government and the masses could actually have a voice for their opinions. The Jacksonian Era definitely lead a Democratic Revolt.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828- Voting Revolution



by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 24, 2014, 5:22 PM

I agree with you too over Remini statement over the election of 1828, people did have a connection with Jackson, and was known as the common man for the people, and that is why he got many votes from the people that the National Republicans noticed too. I also agreed with that quote you used because I myself used that too in my forum which men did see him as a symbol, and a symbol to the start of the democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A rejection of the establishment but not a revolt



by Thomas Stevens - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:01 AM

There were several factors that led into the statement, "Democratic Revolt of the People", but none of which would constitute a "Revolt":

1. *The opening of the election to all white men. This would of course motivate the common man to participate in the franchise that he had been denied earlier, but it would also instill fear in those who had participated in previous elections; the property owners and tax payers. The idea that the common man could influence the outcome of an election would make it very uncertain and thus strongly encourage*

those earlier voters to take part and not let their voices be denied.

2. *The parties and their actors had changed. The elder revolutionaries were dying. Change was needed to refresh the tree of liberty. The new actors had not seen nor spilled blood that had earned their freedom from the monarchy and that represented a fundamental shift. However, Jackson was closer to representing the Founding Fathers with his military victories over the Native Americans.*
3. *That only two parties were in the running helped formulate a black and white slate or a right or wrong compendium that would also motivate the white male voters to choose.*

I see a "Revolt" as a rejection of core values and I do not see a rejection of those. Both the Democrats and the Whig parties had worked to organize their "machines" and they were determined cultivate the new energy brought forth by the new electorate. The rejection is of the old and dying candidates who spearheaded limited participation over the previous almost fifty years.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Election of 1828 - greater significance



by Haden Peterson - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:25 AM

I'll have to agree with Robert V. Remini and believe that the 1828 election was a big thing for America at the time. It was the end of the revolution generation and this election was going to determine what next big steps America needs to take to grow and remain a stable country. I believe that this was more significant just because it happened before the election of 1840 and was a great deal at the time. The 1840 election was also revolutionary but it kinda took off from the ideas and actions of the outcome of the 1828 election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 - greater significance



by Tamara Gould - Friday, January 24, 2014, 11:30 AM

I agree with what you are saying, with the exception of the major significance put upon the 1828 election. It seems to me that the Jacksonian era was significant but only as the foundation to what was ahead and not more significant than the 1840 election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 - greater significance



by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 24, 2014, 5:18 PM

I agree with you that the election of 1828 was important for America, and building a stronger country, and getting people involved in the election, and getting the workers of the country into it. " Not only did the Democrats see the election as a victory produced by "vast numbers" of American people, but the National Republicans thought so too." (pg. 207) this was important for the country, and started the

democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828 - greater significance



by Karlie Edwards - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 6:36 PM

I agree with the fact that the 1828 election was definitely a turning point for America, and a stepping stone to the upcoming changes leading into 1840, but I don't think that the 1828 election was any less significant than the election in 1840, where, "well balanced parties had been organized in virtually every state". (203)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



truly a revolt?



by Anthony Consolo - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:32 AM

from what I know about political power before reading this article and after reading the first few pages of this article, a question comes to mind: was this truly a revolt? What in the world did the democrats have to revolt against? I may be misinterpreting information but since Abraham Lincoln was the first real republican president, that must mean that the ones before him were of a democratic nature. Even if that's not what they called the party, they had the same core values and ideas. Why would they need to form a revolt against something that was already in their favor? I could be wrong, misunderstanding information, but this seems interesting to me.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: truly a revolt?



by Kira Iantorno - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 8:26 PM

"re-volt : To break away from or rise against constituted authority, as by open rebellion; cast off allegiance or subjection to those in authority; rebel; mutiny: to revolt against the present government." (dictionary.com). I am not trying to be facetious I am only giving something for us to stand on. While most of us will interpret revolt with some grand stand movie scene, I think that there are levels of a revolt. Allegiances were broken and I think many people voting for Jackson did feel they were rising against the norm of a presidential candidate. That they wanted a leader that gave common man a voice in government. Like I said in my original post the balance of power is what people were worry about from a strong central government.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

revolution over revolt



by Anthony Consolo - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:41 AM



maybe the correct term for this piece of history would be a revolution rather than revolt. obviously this was huge change to the process of electing the president. Perhaps people see it as a revolt because only one political party rose up to address the issue? Maybe if more parties had spoken up, it would not be viewed as a revolt rather than what it really was: a true revolution that greatly affected the history of our country as well as the present day.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: revolution over revolt



by Tamara Gould - Friday, January 24, 2014, 1:38 AM

I agree with you. I just don't see where the suppression was that American men would be revolting against. Many had been without the opportunity to vote, due to state restrictions, but that had mostly resolve by the 1828 election.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: revolution over revolt



by Louis Gambee - Friday, January 24, 2014, 12:53 PM

They voted in masses partly due to the fact that their votes were suppressed in the prior election of 1824. After seeing their votes wasted in 1824, I think American men voted in mass numbers to protest and revolt against the American voting system and the corrupt bargain of 1825. Other than that however, I don't think American men were revolting against any other sort of suppression, which makes one ask if this election did truly symbolize a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: revolution over revolt



by Kylie Stiglbauer - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 4:13 PM

I think you bring up a good point in calling this a revolution rather than a revolt. A revolt has the connotation of being more negative or harsh, where as a revolution seems like it is beneficial in a more positive way. I liked that you explored both sides of your argument and gave points as to why someone would refer to this as a revolt. This made reading your post much easier to grasp and also made it more credible. I agree with what you have to say. I do see the election as a change, but I am not sure that revolt is the right word for it.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Waiting for Martin Van Buren to decide

by Yi Zhang - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 1:49 AM

To contemplate whether the 1828 election represented a Democratic revolt of the people, one cannot help but wonder what exactly the question means. For example do we suppose there was only one revolt and wonder whether it happened in 1828 or in 1840 also Martin van Buren become president as according to professor McCormick can we suppose that a significant enough change from previous elections qualify as a revolt? In which case we may examine the circumstances of the political scene right before the election. It might be interesting to note that the previous 1824 election featured the same two candidates and it was only with the extra "democratic" power of the non-property owner votes that made it so that 1828 was not repeat of 1824, which featured a controversial executive decision. The use of the word "democratic" also distracts us by playing on the name of Andrew Jackson's party, unless we are including the result of the election as unspent of this discussion and not was obtained "democratically" so interim of a significant change from tradition Romney's arguments are hard to fault and it would seem a democratic revolt occurred, pun or not, it should be mentioned that such non-specific arguments cannot carry too much weight either, especially as compared to the statistical analysis of McCormick whose assumptions and data collection we trust to his experience but ultimately learns something concrete that, we can scrutinize to decide whether we agree with him or not, one only has to decide whether something about 1840's election was so revolutionary that the significance of 1828 pales in comparison. It is an ambitious claim and we will naturally doubt it but a concrete scientifically analysis should be respected. In conclusion, while it may seem easy to agree with Romney, it may also have been a side effect of already applying one's common sense to the debate maybe line our classmate. Kira) and that McCormick's analysis future could really teach us something profound. Unfortunately it almost seems the first wins by default because the second argument with sufficient "frond democratic" seems to very much resemble the absence of a case.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Democratic Uprising

by Karlie Edwards - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 9:04 AM

After reading both sides of the issue at hand, I was swayed towards the Yes argument that the election of 1828 did indeed represent a democratic revolt of the people. It is stated that the "common man" had been rising for generations, and had made notable political advances long before Jackson appeared on the scene. (207) I think this election gave them the opportunity to put in their word for the people and take political responsibility. Although the no side of the argument shows that there were far less voters that participated in this election than those before 1828, there is no question in the democratic support when looking at the scene of "some twenty thousand people from all parts of the country" who gathered to witness Jackson's triumph. (207) When reading McCormick's argument against the revolt of democrats, and seeing the statistics presented, they didn't hit me as hard as the opposing argument that showed facts and emphasized that the people were tired of the same men and ideals running their country. Jackson came to power in time where the country was going through great changes, and it was clear that the people wanted something new and a different type of leader that they could relate to. Jackson was immensely popular among the public and very well liked. He inspired people to live up to their potential, even if they came from the backwoods, a background such as himself. For all of these reasons I stand with the yes side.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



by Thomas Stevens - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 10:40 PM

Could it be said that a younger Jackson represented the generation that was dealing with the vast changes of the early Industrial Revolution?

Remini, in his article, writes that "They built machines to manage the popular vote", but yet they wanted to "preserve the old systems". To me it just sounds as though they are trying to keep what power they had, while understanding that it could not be administered in the way that it had been, mainly that only a few could vote, and now all white men could. This had to represent a fundamental change in their thinking.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Democratic Uprising

by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 24, 2014, 5:09 PM

I agree with you too, when I read both sides I was more in favor with Remini yes answer that he was the common man, and also that men saw him as a leader, and a self made man that others wanted to follow. yes there was some questions in the elections voting, but besides that Jackson did show the people that he was the common man by letting the people come inside the white house which no has. He sure did gave people to go for more.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828 and the numbers that came with it

by Samuel Tapfer - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 9:38 AM

In the argument that the election of 1828 represented a Democratic revolt of the people I side with Robert Remini and his answer of yes. Remini talked about how the two party system really got started in the election of 1828, yet gained more ground in later elections. This is expected though because once we are introduced to the two party system in 1828 more people are able to realize in later elections that they do have a choice in the party they want to side with. I side with Remini because just by the numbers we are shown a huge increase in voters which has to do with the fact that more people have a party that they agree with. It is stated that there were nearly eight hundred thousand more popular votes submitted in the 1828 election compared to the 1824 election. This is a huge jump considering in 1828 only 1,155,022 popular votes were counted. This shows that more people, especially those of the non-wealthy, were given a voice by having a new party to vote for in the election.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Election of 1828 and the numbers that came with it

by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 24, 2014, 4:56 PM

I also agree with your forum, I went with Remini answer in how he explained in his answer how people also had more connection with Jackson, and how he was known as the common man for the people. He did get a lot of popular votes that helped him win the election because how he stood for the people. It was because of how he reached for those not so wealthy get their vote, and with said it did start the democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



The election was a form of revolt

by Austin McQuaw - Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 12:45 PM

I believe that the election of 1828 was a form of revolt. If a revolt is a rise in rebellion, and rebellion is an act of open resistance to an established government, then I'd say that the actions surrounding the election of 1828 was a revolt. Looking back from a time when few people have faith in their power to vote, those who voted in 1828 are inspiring. In the previous election, the people clearly communicated what they wanted but still failed to assign the president they had hoped for. In reaction to this election and in parallel to what they still wanted, there was an overwhelming response to the 1828 election. Perseverance and growth in numbers brought the change that they had wanted. To combat the way they had been "robbed" before, they had reacted loudly enough to bring forth the change that they wanted. So yes, they did revolt and resist the governmental powers that were put in place.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: The election was a form of revolt

by Tamara Gould - Friday, January 24, 2014, 1:32 AM

I guess I don't see the connection between men exercising their right to vote and a Democratic Revolt. It seems to me that there was indeed an outpouring of voters, but isn't it possible that that was just because for the first time, America's common men, were voting for someone they related to?

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: The election was a form of revolt

by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 24, 2014, 4:30 PM

I agree with forum over how this election of 1828 did led the democratic revolt for the people. I feel like if we would of kept going through failure of every president, and not taking risk or hard choices then this country would of never grown. Jackson had to make bad choices, but still was a common man for the people, in which those people believed in his leadership.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Second statement

by Claire Steinbis - Thursday, January 23, 2014, 9:30 AM

After going back through my notes and what I have re-read I don't agree with Jacksons Election Yes he had a land slide but what he did after he was elected was horrifying.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Comparison is key

by Tamara Gould - Friday, January 24, 2014, 1:24 AM

I find Richard P. McCormick's position on the topic, "Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic Revolt of the People" to be the most agreeable between the two authors. I think it's important to compare the elections before and after the Jacksonian era when considering whether or not an uprising of voters, or "revolt of the people," did in fact occur in 1828 and I feel that McCormick illustrated his points well by doing that.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Comparison is key

by Tamara Gould - Friday, January 24, 2014, 1:48 AM

"But in 1840 the "new democracy" made its appearance with explosive suddenness. In a surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any Presidential election, four out of five (78.0 per cent) 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 per cent." (McCormick p.212)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828

by kazu Inaba - Friday, January 24, 2014, 1:13 PM

This is really difficult to choose for me. I don't agree with what he did, but I actually agree with the election. If John Q Adams had been elected by this election, the United States would have gone different way. It seemed that Andrew Jackson was really good leader, but once he got elected, he had done whatever he wanted. So I feel like he is a dictator. However, this is the truth that everyone voted to him including the south states. This is indicated how people relied on him. And he also made some great decisions which are education and not to allow corruptions. Overall, I would rather agree with him.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828

by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 24, 2014, 4:23 PM

I also had a difficult time looking at both sides. I agree with you over he was sure a good leader, and to add to that he one that got peoples attention like farmers that work around to be interested in the election. He was the people voice, and had that connection. Yes if Quincy would of won, who knows in what direction he would of led this country, and what could he of done differently from Jackson. I don't think Jackson was dictator, he was trying to led the country to the right path even if there was bad choices he made. Jackson did start the democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828

by Louis Gambee - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 2:33 PM

I agree with this. Jackson no doubt made some terrible unethical choices, but it seems he always did what he thought was best for the country. His removal of the indian tribes from their land (Cherokees - trail of tears) is an example of this, but he did this to satisfy American's need for land and territory. Jackson was the first true president of the people, which also signified the start of a democratic revolution.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828

by Kylie Stiglbauer - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 9:39 PM

I completely understand your stance as far as Jackson and what he did during his presidency. Although the things he did are some that I can not agree with, I still see how much of an impact he had on the people. The fact that you called him a dictator was interesting to me. I understand the points you are using to back this up, but I am curious as to how you got to this decision. To me calling someone a dictator is a very bold term and given to someone who is not trying to govern for the good of his people. Did you see Jackson in this light throughout his presidency, or more so as time went on?

Sum of ratings: (1)

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

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

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

