



Search forums

Forum 1

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Add a block

Add...

**A Democratic Revolt?**

by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 16, 2015, 9:30 PM

After studying the required materials, address the various questions in bold. For purposes of encouraging discussion, you should separate 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, such as "Historian Remini is Right", or "I Agree With McCormick". Do NOT simply leave it RE: A Democratic Revolt?

Sum of ratings: -

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Voter Revolution; Quality vs. Quantity**

by Stanley Cates - Saturday, January 17, 2015, 5:33 PM

In reviewing these differing opinions on the matter of this "democratic uprising", I've come to the conclusion that these two outcomes may be a simple matter of evaluating quantity or quality.

Rimini makes some valid points regarding the popularity of Andrew Jackson in the election of 1828 in particular to descriptions of the crowd attending his inauguration; "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".¹ Arguably this sheer sense of popularity portrayed in Remini's writing captures the emotion of the time to have had a quality "sense of revolution" induced by a large influx on voter turn out. I'm reminded of the recent elections in 2004 and 2008. According to a quick fact check these two recent elections show a surprisingly similar voter turn out as compared to the election of 1828; all being approximately 55-57%.² I in fact recall there being much talk about a "voter revolution". However the same fact check reveals that you need only go back as far as 1968 to see a higher voter rate than in 04' and 08'.²

Not wanting to dismiss that the people and leaders of the time may have felt revolutionary in their own right; in hind sight, considering a roughly 57% turn out in 1828 more revolutionary that an 80% turn out in 1840 seems silly. McCormick not only makes a case for the dramatic increase of 1840 dwarfing the poll numbers in 1828 but also points out that the increase in 1828 was sectional, and not a nation wide trend; "But this outpouring shrinks in magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established".³ He goes on to further this viewpoint by listing three states in particular whose increase was "inconsiderable".³ Furthermore this quantitative argument is carried by noting a drop in votes in some states. "Six states went over the 70 per cent mark, whereas ten had

bettered that performance before 1824".³ It is for this reason of comprehensive number evaluations over the general passions of the time that I am siding with McCormick on the issue and agree that a true revolution came later, in 1840.

¹ Remini, Robert V. "Election of 1828." 208.

²"Voter Turnout in the United States Presidential Elections." Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.

³McCormick, Richard P. "New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics." 211.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Voter Revolution; Quality vs. Quantity

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Sunday, January 18, 2015, 3:33 PM

I find your analysis of quality and quantity very interesting and relevant to this discussion. I also agree with your points made about Remini's argument. The ideas behind Remini's statements that portrayed a sense of popularity and quality because of the amount of people attending, and the distance they traveled to see Jackson. The people also believed that Jackson was the answer to their "dreadful danger." I believe these facts are the greatest contributor to whether or not the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt or not. This idea of quality supports Remini's ideas. I would like to add the idea that Jackson entered during a time when the country was in a major political and economic change. The people of the country were in desperate need of a change and a leader. Jackson portrayed the belief that he was a "common man" that understood and related to the men.

The quantity matter in McCormick's statements do in fact somewhat persuade me to agree with his argument. His claims that "the outpouring shrinks the magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two involved were new highs in voter participation established." (McCormick) While this makes me believe that the election and Jackson era may not be the cause democratic revolt I am still leaning towards Remini's argument, because of I believe the quality in this argument beats out the quantity in McCormick's argument.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Voter Revolution; Quality vs. Quantity

by [Stanley Cates](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 6:12 PM

I've decided to reply to you here instead of to your original post because I think it will provide a more direct context to what I have to say, but please note that for all intents and purposes this is also a response to your initial post.

Admittedly you make a strong case for the argument given by Remini. While I'm still convinced that the numbers win out in the end I'd like to delve in to some of the qualitative aspects first. In the 1824 election Jackson beats out his opponents in the electoral vote; this in itself suggests a certain level of popularity; however the plurality of the vote is not sufficient to grant him the president elect. This takes us to a decision in the house of representatives where the speaker; Henry Clay; rallies support for Jacksons opponent John Quincy Adams, and is later named his secretary of state. It's at this point I offer the disclaimer that the following is a postulation of my own thinking and opinions and I am not offering them to be interpreted as facts. This "corrupt bargain" as it would come to be known, does not sit well with many Americans; not a far fetched idea I don't think. I offer the idea that Jacksons popularity was not so much contributed to by his "common man" characteristics; but more so a manifestation of the dwindling popularity of John Quincy Adams. That is to say; that people may have voted for Jackson, because he

was not Adams. A theme I have witnessed time and again in my own lifetime... Sad as it may be. I wanted to throw that out there, and see what people thought of it.

Getting back to the quantitative element of the matter I've gone a little deeper and concluded that the bolstering numbers in 1828 might not have been so bolstering after all. In paraphrase, "Average voter participation for all states in 1828 was per cent. Before 1824 fifteen of the twenty-two state s had surpassed that... the 1828 election failed to bring to the polls the proportion of the electorate that had voted on occasion in previous elections... There was... a high potential vote that was frequently realized in state elections but which did not materialize..."¹ In other words, a significant amount of people saw fit to vote in state elections, but took no note of the presidential election. This idea is proposed again by McCormick in broader context showing it's consistency and not a "fluke", as it may otherwise be called. "Actually, the election returns show fairly conclusively throughout the eight-year period (1824-1832) the electorate continued to participate more extensively in state elections than in those involving the presidency."² The American people therefore consistently disregarded the presidency in favor of more localized elections. This theme seemingly continues to play out even beyond the election of 1828 representing a stagnation in voter turn out, "Thus after three Jackson elections, sixteen states had not achieved the proportions of voter participation that they had reached before 1824."² These things suggest to me, and I'll dare to say; that the election in 1824 was simply not a very tough act to follow. When we use these kinds of statistics in context with 1840 it is realized that the increase is dramatic in a much more fluid way than 1828. "In all but five states... The peaks of voter participation reached before 1824 were passed."² That is of course speaking to the turn out of 1840. This then, offers a much more fast paced change indicative of a revolt.

¹ McCormick, Richard P. "New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics." 211-212.

² McCormick, Richard P. "New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics." 212.

Sum of ratings: **3 (1)**

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



Re: Voter Revolution; Quality vs. Quantity

by [Kevin Humphries](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 9:24 PM

The high number of voter turnout in the 1840 election was a reflection of changes that took place earlier and likely due to the 1828 elections. It's actually cause and effect. The revolutionary changes eventually resulted in higher numbers at the polls, but it was a process that took time. You made several good points, but changes (especially in government) don't happen overnight.

Sum of ratings: **1 (1)**

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



Re: Voter Revolution; Quality vs. Quantity

by [Stanley Cates](#) - Thursday, January 22, 2015, 11:55 AM

Could you expand on that idea? What specific changes are you referring to?

Sum of ratings: **(1)**

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



Re: Voter Revolution; Quality vs. Quantity

by [Kevin Humphries](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 11:19 PM

The changes I'm referring to are listed in my first post. The reintroduction of a two

party system, the lifting of voter restrictions requiring property ownership, and Jackson, himself, being a common man and not a member of the "Virginia Dynasty".

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



I Agree With Robert Remini:

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Sunday, January 18, 2015, 3:02 PM

After reading both opinions on A Democratic Revolt, I have been convinced to agree with Robert Remini and believe that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people. To start, I agree with Remini's introduction statements that claim that "Jackson arrived just as the country was undergoing profound economic and political changes." (Remini) This statement is critical to the analysis of the democratic revolt. The fact that Jackson entered the national scene when there was such drastic changes contributes to the impact on the Democrats. Jackson portrayed a "common man" persona which attracted many men. Remini does admit the fact that "the common man had been rising for generations, and had made notable political advances long before Jackson appeared on the scene." Even though this was true the participation in the election was effected by this idea that Jackson represented.

Another main point that Remini makes that contributes to my agreement of his points is that about twenty-thousand people attended Washington to "witness the triumph of their candidate" (Remini) The amount of people that came to witness this makes me believe that the election represented a democratic revolt. The people believed that this was the turning point for their country and that Jackson was the answer to "save" the country.

On the contrary, McCormick claims that "the outpouring shrinks in magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established." (McCormick) While this opposes Remini's belief that Jackson contributed to a democratic revolt, it is also said that "the proportion of adult white male voting soared to 56.3 percent, more than double the 1824 figure" (McCormick) This quote is by far more influential to my beliefs, because it shows that the voting participation increased greatly in the 1828 election. This was because of the fact that Jackson represented a "common man" and had the men convinced that he was the solution to their danger.

Remini, Robert. "Election of 1828." in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., ed., *The Coming to Power: Critical Presidential Elections in American History* (McGraw-Hill, 1972)

McCormick, Richard. "New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics," *American Historical Review*. (January 1960)

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Remini is Right

by [Jonathan Emerald](#) - Sunday, January 18, 2015, 8:16 PM

The election in 1828 started a new two partyed system. This election not only helped our politics it helped the people get more evolved with the political system. When the people elected Jackson they elected a man that was different from the first six presidents. He was not from Massachusetts nor Virginia. He was an icon on the battle field becoming an "Indian fighter" and a "military hero" (Forum #1). Jackson fought for his country and the people idealized him as their executive leader. Robert Remini says "began a genuine, nationally organized two-party system that came in of age in the 1830's" (Remini). Agreeing with Remini's statement the people were privilege to be a big part of the election, and showed them that making their choice in electing Jackson made a big impact on them and their country. The people were promised "proper respect" and "spirit of equity, caution, and compromise" (Murrin). These bold statements were promised to

the people and which started Jackson's career as President. There were many as 15,000 people at the inaugural when he promised the people this. McCormick's statement is not true because it says "well balanced parties had been organized in virtually every state" (McCormick). Jackson lead his country and people to a well organized political system that everyone could agree on. Forum #1 Paragraph 3, Line 22 Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. Ed. The coming to Power: Critical Presidential Elections in American History. (McGraw-Hill, 1972). Richard P. McCormick. "New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics". The American Historical Review. (January 1960). John M. Murrin. Liberty, Equality, Power. 6th Ed. (Wadsworth 2008, 2012)

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



Why McCormick is wrong

by [Jordan Towe](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:16 AM

The election of 1828 was where we started to get the government that we have today of having two different parties. When we switched to this new system the people of America had more of a saying in who they wanted to be in charge of their country. In 1828 when the people elected president Jackson they were getting someone who they believed in and they felt like they knew. He wasn't the same as the first six and he was deemed a hero of war from the people of America. He fought for the country and people loved and believed in him that he was the best hope for them. Remini said that Jackson was a "Presidential Looking Man" (Remini) He meant that when the people of America visioned their president and how he would look that is what they imagined. I agree with Remini when he said that people were proud to be apart of the election and to chose a person which they believed in and the person they wanted. McCormick is wrong because well balanced parties were not in every state. The election was heavily in Jackson's favor making the parties unbalanced. Jackson ended up making the country balanced with a well organized system which people believed would be the best for the country. So with all of that being said Remini is clearly right and McCormick is wrong as many people believe.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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



Re: Remini is Right

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 12:54 PM

While I originally come to the same conclusions as you in deciding that Jackson was different from the first six presidents and that he was idealized and look at as a "common man" that was just like any other person voting for him, after our lecture and discussion in class today my beliefs and ideas behind this have been somewhat altered. I realized today that Jackson was looked at as an every day kind of person, but when he gained power he then used that power to take control and make his own decisions that were not necessarily similar to those of a "common man." Jackson vetoed the recharter of the bank in 1832 and essentially destroyed the Bank of the United States. He also gave congressional permission to lead a federal army in South Carolina to threaten the people, which was the Force Bill of 1833. These acts stood out to me today in class as they made me realize that while Jackson was portrayed as this common man that could relate to the men of the nation, once he was elected and gained power he took advantage of it and essentially became not such power figure rather than an every day type of person.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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



I Agree With Remini

by [Kevin Humphries](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 2:31 PM

Although McCormick made good points and had good statistics to back up his claim, I think the issue is not about numbers. I agree with Remini based on several points. First and foremost, certain voter restrictions were lifted allowing the common man to vote, not

just proper owners. Secondly, a two party system was once again coming into play which hadn't been around in over 20 years, simplifying the situation. Also, for the first time the winning president, Andrew Jackson, was not a part of the Virginia Dynasty. That was a change that brought people out since he was seen as more of a man of the people rather than part of the Virginia aristocracy. All this led to the democratic revolt, although the numbers did not truly reflect this yet. These were the changes that fueled this new direction in American politics. Therefore, the answer is: Yes, the 1828 election did represent a democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt? disagree

by [Brody Wasson](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 6:58 PM

The election of 1828 started what we now have today two centralized party. Many of us the people of the Americas wanted a stronger vote in who ran our country. When president Jackson was elected into office the people thought they got a president that they knew and could believe in. Jackson fought for the people and their rights. The people of America envisioned their president in a way he would look and act for the rights of the people. I agree with Remini when he said that people were proud to be apart of the election and to chose a person which they believed in and the person they wanted. McCormick is wrong because well balanced parties were not in every state. The election was heavily in Jackson's favor making the parties unbalanced. With all do respect Remini is clearly right and McCormick is wrong because Jackson had the popular vote in this election.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



I Agree With McCormick

by [Cody Trimble](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 8:14 PM

Remini made a very strong argument as to why this was a Democratic revolt, but I believe that if it were indeed a revolt, then the results would have spiraled over into the following elections. McCormick makes a valid point that fifteen out of twenty-two states had a higher voter turnout before the 1824 election than in the 1828 election. I think the biggest trait needed for the to have been considered a revolt was to have a continuous growth in voter turnout, which didn't happen, and the voter turnout stayed around 55%. Although the 1840 election had an explosive turnout (78%), they previous elections had stagnant numbers and therefore did not result in a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



I Agree with Remini

by [Tanner Olson](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 10:01 PM

After reading the article I agreed with Robert Remini on the side that the election of 1828 did represent a Democratic revolt of the people. I feel that this was a turning point in politics that may have been influenced by the previous election that was surrounded by scandal. This may have influenced the people to start caring more and to become increasingly active toward voting and political parties. This election gave a feel of a true outline and sense of political parties and their boundaries. Andrew Jackson was a perfect figure for this turning point because of the figure he had already established and for his reputation of being an outlaw and doing things his way. This showed strength in character along with being a war hero, which showed he could be a leader in the highest categories. With the scandal that took place during the 1824 election and the figure of Andrew Jackson, the people really saw a need to care and be involved in politics. With such emphasis on voting and the Presidential campaign, the political parties were outlined heavily into a 2-party system that came about from this election of 1828.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: I Agree with Remini

by [Tanner Olson](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 10:41 PM

After being in class on Tuesday and seeing more numbers towards the different elections surrounding the 1830's and 1840's it helped shift my point of view from my previous forum post. I found it very interesting with the percentages of voter turnout between the 2 elections; the 25%-56% change in 1828 and the 56%-78% change in 1840. This made me question if the election of 1828 may have just been a stepping block towards the building and true structure of the 2 solid political parties. I find it tricky being able to look at those percentages in different ways, because the 1828 percentage was the largest growth in percentage for voter turnout while the 1840 was the actual peak. Another topic that caught my eye and made me double think my first response was the spread of political parties throughout the states as an outcome of the 1840 election. The states were scattered and diverse in the way that there was no pattern of political parties in certain areas of the US for the most part. States were very spread and independent on the decision towards the presidential candidates. These examples have shifted direction towards the statement of my previous post, but I think the election of 1828 was a huge contributing factor and really helped outline the structure and the way of political parties for 1840. Therefore I am going against my previous post and am now going against Remini.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: I Agree with Remini

by [Cody Trimble](#) - Thursday, January 22, 2015, 7:10 PM

I agree with you on the 1828 election being a "stepping stone" for the 1840 election, and believe that the 1840 election was the actual Revolt, I feel that people in 1828 were only getting introduced to the idea of the two-party system and therefore were not fully capable or aware of the voting system put in place. For the 1840 election, people have had the opportunity to "practice" how to vote with the new system and knew what to expect when voting season came around; they had knowledge of what to do and how to choose between people. The new system of voting allowed for more informed voters; which created a more populous turnout, a Democratic Revolt.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Yes: I Agree With Remini

by [Sarah Wood](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:15 PM

I agree with Remini that the election of 1828 represented a Democratic Revolt of the people. While McCormick makes some good points and gives many statistics to back them up I found myself disagreeing with him while reading his article. While statistics do help make a good point I found that in this article they weren't the most important thing. From what I gathered in Remini's article Jackson was a symbol of the "common-man" during that time: "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man. Surely if an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason why they too could not aspire to wealth and social status by relying on their own talents to get what they wanted." (Remini) In a time of "profound economic and political changes" a man that represented the people would feel very important to them and cause many people to feel a political responsibility to vote.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

Re: A Democratic Revolt?



Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?

I believe the Election of 1828 represented a Democratic Revolt of the people of because of there was one democratic hero they all clearly rallied behind. Andrew Jackson won the Election of 1828 by the sheer fact that people respected and tried to model themselves after Jackson. Many people like Jackson because, stated by Robert V. Remini, they "saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man" (204). People couldn't help but flock to Jackson because he gave the people hope to maybe use their own talents and skills to make something of their lives; if a lowly orphan boy could one day become president (aka Jackson), then maybe they (the people) could do something great with their lives. Tying that into my next point, politicians back in the 1820's would stop at nothing to secure positions and win elections within the Senate. Van Buren caught on quick to this, and gathered as many politics as he could to Jackson's cause, because he knew Jackson was the country's favorite (Remini 204). And with the help of Van Buren after the election of 1824, Jackson rapidly spread propaganda and Jacksonian reform back into the states. Bringing back all their old Republican faction members along with the help of Thomas Richie, editor of the Richmond Enquirer and leader of Junto. Reviving the Jefferson's North-South Alliance, "planters of the South and the plain Republicans of the North" as said by Van Buren (Remini 205). Jackson and his new found party, The "Democratic" Republican Party, would push the majority of the vote (plus extra) in their favor. So it just proves more that this election was completely swayed by Jackson and all his cohorts. By spreading propaganda, hiring only supporters of Andrew Jackson, who would in turn be secured a job in Jackson's governmental committee (cabinet, congress, etc.) Because of this "Democratic revolt" we see the people of the U.S. tired of the "corrupt bargain" that John Quincy Adams pulled. Because in the election of 1824, Andrew Jackson allegedly told one of his dinner guests that Henry Clay offered Jackson a sway in votes on his side in exchange for Secretary of State if he was elected. Jackson declined him, so with John Quincy getting the electoral votes swung his way without any warning, Jackson knew it was the work of Clay. Especially when Henry Clay was elected by Adams to be his Secretary of State. So word spread through Adams term of presidency of an alleged "corrupt bargain", which I'm sure did nothing but promote Jacksonian favor in the next election. Another interesting tactic that sparked a democratic revolt among the states was ballots. States never made their own ballots, voting would sometimes last days because of this. The parties themselves had to make their own, so it wouldn't be a shock to see tons of pro-Jacksonians pressuring, sometimes threatening/harassing citizens to vote for Jackson (Remini 205). Jackson ended up winning the election of 1828 by a considerable amount, too much to not think twice that there had to be some type of big push by his party to really kick his votes up. There was a total of 1,55,022 popular votes, Adams received 507,730, and Jackson received 647,292 or about 56% of the entire vote, he creamed Adams (Remini 206). To put all this up-rise of the Democratic Party in perspective, "the total popular vote in the election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824" (Remini 206). Remini gives three reasons why there were so many more voters. First was the two party system was reestablished, in 1824 they had a plethora of different party candidates run, there were only two this election. Second, both parties spent a lot of their time promoting this campaign more than previous ones, exciting the people to vote more. And finally, many politicians stressed to get the vote out on time, and four states just gave their voting rights to the people instead of the legislature (Remini 206). "He 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" (Remini 206). Jackson was a modern day hero in that time, liked by an array of different people all around America. Mainly the "common man" – farmers, workers, frontiersmen had used this as a chance to vote for Jackson, because they saw a better man they wanted to be in Jackson (Remini 207). One person could write an entire essay on how Jackson was a good president, but also a whole other essay to say the exact opposite. Regardless, I agree Jackson and his reinstated party of Jeffersonians (now Democrats) had a significant role in his election in 1828, showing more evidence than not that his party aggressively revolted to get him the presidency.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



I agree with Remini

by [Amanda Hagstrom](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:56 PM

I never like to choose sides especially during events that I was not present for but some how the election of 1828 was a power land mark in our American political history. As it is pointed out the masses have a realization that "voting by property requirements" no longer exist. The public feeling at lost from the elections results of 1824 seem to have come out to vote as far to get their revenge against the elite always running the show. The masses were determined to appoint a "common man" as their president which spiked the voters turn out rate in 1828.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: I agree with Remini

by [Kevin Humphries](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 12:49 AM

I find your assertion that the public may have been out to get revenge against the elite as a motivation to go to the polls really interesting. The election of Jackson would definitely signal a change in the in the public opinion and a desire to be governed by someone who was more like the common citizens of the time. What better way to get even with the "Virginia Dynasty"?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Why Remini is wrong about the Revolt

by [Timothy Vigil](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 10:00 PM

Remini refers to the election of 1828 as a "Democratic Revolt". He quickly dives into many fancy sounding statistics in order to make his case. What he fails to realize however is that he lays a smoking gun in the midst of his argument. He states "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" (205). It seems to me that the very fact that he would bring this up loses him credibility in his argument. If people are being forced to vote is this truly an uprising of the masses, or is it simply a few men exerting their will onto others?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Why Remini is wrong about the Revolt

by [Stanley Cates](#) - Thursday, January 22, 2015, 11:59 AM

That's a very intriguing point you make; speculative and difficult to support or refute; but intriguing none the less.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Video Analysis: Change of opinion

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Thursday, January 22, 2015, 12:27 PM

After watching the two videos relating to Jackson and the democratic revolt, my views and opinions on the topic have been altered. I originally agreed with Remini, that yes, this was a democratic revolt and the statistics he used to confirm this idea made me convinced of that. But, after listening to the historians on the videos points of view I have come to believe that this was a democratic revolt for white men in America, but resulted in a less democratic society for everyone else. The thriving democratic political system

enhanced interest in politics and the competition between the Democrats and Whigs increased the participation of the people, but women were restricted with their participation and African-Americans were completely excluded, as historian Eric Foner states. He also claimed that a line of exclusion was shifted from if you owned property or not, to if you were a White male or not.

Another idea that came about in the second video clip that caught my attention was the idea that people saw this as an opportunity to increase their liberty, but they also feared that it would create power for others around them, which they did not want to happen.

These ideas that this democratic political system had expanded, but was also exclusive has led me to shift my ideas that this resulted in a democratic revolt. While I still do agree with Remini's comments and statistics behind his analysis, I also believe that these videos have proven that this may not have been as much of a democratic revolt as I originally thought. I have come to the conclusion that this was a democratic revolt for all white males in America, but for females and other races this was not a democratic revolt, but more of an exclusion of politics.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by [Jacob Brown](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 10:42 PM

Quincy and his political party.

Now I did indeed forget to mention the other party in my long statement about how I thought the Democratic party had the signs (so to speak) in the Election of 1828. But Quincy was never really short of campaigning as much as Jackson, Jackson just did it a little better. This election would not have been half of what it was if the Whig party didn't put in at least some effort so we can't disregard the Whig's whole part in Jackson's scheme. Now Quincy had a big disadvantage, with a "corrupt bargain" on his plate and Jackson having a lot of popularity, Quincy had to gather all the party members he could muster to fight this giant Democratic movement. Now we have to remember not all people voted and if one party cared and the other gave up statistically you'd know there would be less of a voter turnout. So to say that Jackson led the Election in campaigning completely, in my opinion, is false.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[HST 202 W15 \(Escobar Meta 31045 31046\)](#)