

Forum 1

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Add a block

Add...

**A Democratic Revolt?**

by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 16, 2015, 9:29 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](#)**Remini in favor of Jackson**

by Kaelen Byrum - Sunday, January 18, 2015, 12:16 PM

I personally agree with Robert Remini's opinions of the election of 1828. His side seems to have more of a supportive outlook on Jackson and his run for presidency. He talks about the influences that he has of the people, Remini says "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."

This direct quote from the article shows a direct leadership and positive influence that Jackson had on the people, and that's why he won that Presidential election.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**I agree with Remini**

by Cori Ross - Sunday, January 18, 2015, 1:54 PM

After reading both sides I have to say that I agree with Remini that the Election of 1828 was a Democratic revolt. In Remini's argument he talks a lot about how Jackson's background helped show the common man that it doesn't matter if you're wealthy or not to become someone of great importance. Thus winning the election around 2:1.

The election also improved the way we vote for our presidential leaders. The race of 1828 was between 2 parties. We now have many parties but when it comes down to the elections we really only vote between two major parties the Democrats and the Republicans

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

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)



Yes, a Democratic Revolt of the People

by [Candice Oster](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 8:59 AM

I agree with Robert V. Remini, yes, the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. I can see what Remini says about the restructure of the two-party system. (pg. 205) The difference in the 1828 election compared to the 1824 with the four candidates all from the same party, Democratic-Republicans, and the issues that came with the "corrupt bargain"; in 1828 we see the shift of a two-party system. Even though the lines were not totally clear, Remini does bring up the fact that the people chose the candidate that had a more strict interpretation of the constitution and (pg. 205) "emphasizing the rights of the states and the importance of the ordinary citizen."

It seemed as though Americans felt that things were not right in 1824 and when given the chance in 1828 to speak up, they moved forward.

The "rise of the common man" has been used to describe the 1828 election. Why wouldn't these "common" men not want their vote counted? Remini says on page 207, "Whether or not this was objectively true hardly mattered; what mattered was an expressed sense of participation in the electoral process experienced by ordinary citizens and that because of it a true "man of the people" had at last been elected President of the United States."

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: Yes, a Democratic Revolt of the People

by [Harold Butler](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:42 AM

I feel like the slaves still don't and never will even to this day be apart of any of these affairs.. But ultimately only whites had say in who was common and whose votes counted and im only speaking from a slaves point of view.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Yes, a Democratic Revolt of the People

by [Candice Oster](#) - Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 9:25 AM

Harold, I agree with you. It is not OK that it was only the white males that were the voters at this time and counted as the common man. Historically speaking, we can only look at the information that we have from that time. We do see circumstances improve, but yes, "fairness" with race, class, and gender is still a focus for today as it was in 1824.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Yes, a Democratic Revolt of the People

by [Dalyn Stram](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 11:48 PM

"To this day"? What do you mean by that? Every person over 18 in America today has a vote that counts for one, regardless of gender, race, religion, etc.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Yes, a Democratic Revolt of the People

by [Cori Ross](#) - Friday, January 23, 2015, 12:20 PM

I'm with Dalyn on this can you please explain more on why you think that even today the "Slaves" won't be apart of the voting? We don't have slaves anymore.

And its not just the slaves back then that didn't get to vote women at that time didn't get to vote either.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



What public really wanted

by [Dongwook Lee](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:56 AM

As in my understanding, I would like to say that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the people.

Definition of the word "democracy", is that "a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised directly by them or by their elected agents under a free electoral system." (dictionary.reference.com/browse/democracy) As we all know, election of 1824 was nearly democratic, because citizens voted to choose who their own leader should be. However, there were some numbers of corrupted politicians, who betrayed people's belief in them, choosed to ignore people's choice.

In a democratic country, people have right to choose what they want, and voting is how people use their power. In the election of 1828, the number of vote doubled, and this clearly shows that public of the time wanted Andrew Jackson, the man of people. This fact shows that, if politicians ignore public, who gave them all of their power and rights, people will use their own right to correct it.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



I tend to agree more with McCormick

by [Erik Fischer](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 2:14 PM

It can't realistically be considered a revolt if there was not a significant increase in the percent of eligible voters when compared voting before, during, and after for state elections with only 6 of 50 state elections failing to beat the 1924 or 1928 presidential elections percentage of voter participation. Additionally the much higher turnout (78%) in the 1840 election indicates that the 54.9% turnout in 1824 or even the higher 56.3% in 1828 were not close to a maximum participation rate.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: I tend to agree more with McCormick

by [Nicklas Moyer](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 10:15 PM

Yeah I agree with you, I believe the 1828 election witnessed a rise in voter turnout because of a multitude of reasons including the fact that people were outraged by how the election of 1824 turned out and because the election was the first to have a two party system. I believe because of the statistics that McCormick displayed in his writings that the true democratic revolt occurred in 1840.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Statistics; an impact

by [Haley Anderson](#) - Thursday, January 22, 2015, 10:12 PM

I didn't really take into consideration the statistics and how much that really shows how the population was impacted by the "revolt." I think when taking the numbers into consideration, a whole new element is added that I didn't think about. If it were a revolutionary revolt of the people. Lots of people would have wanted to have a say in what the future held and the lack of change in the voter turn out really shows that. Thanks for writing this because I hadn't really thought about it. The statistics

are a good point but I still stand by my point of the election of 1828 be a democratic revolution due to the increasingly new ideals and the cry for change by the people. Another point to take into consideration is the fact that only white men were allowed to vote at the time. Many other people in the United States could have also fueled this revolution who weren't permitted to vote, making the statistics a little less valid.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Statistics; an impact

by [Candice Oster](#) - Friday, January 23, 2015, 4:56 PM

Haley,

I agree with you. I did find the numbers that McCormick stated in his argument fascinating, however I found my focus on the history that we had going into the election of 1828. He talks about the election of 1840 being a "surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any presidential election..." (pg.212) Wouldn't we expect each election to change and have the goal be to increase voters? And to agree with you again, in the second video the historians use the word "people", not just white men, to discuss the changes in politics during this time. So yes, even if the law did not allow them to vote, others played a part in the revolution.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: I tend to agree more with McCormick

by [Erik Fischer](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 6:31 PM

After listening to the historians in the videos I still think that the true "democratic revolt" took place in the 1840's. I feel like the increased ability to vote by more people and the end of the "Virginia Dynasty" may have created more interest in politics and some increased participation in voting but the true revolt didn't reach fruition until 1840 when peak voting numbers were reached, especially considering Jackson's appeal causing him to win both his later elections by large margins. Where there was much higher turnout in the 1840 election probably to ensure that an unpopular Van Buren was removed from office, and a high turnout in 1844 to decide a more closely contested election.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Let's vote for a change!

by [Cody Garrison](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 4:05 PM

I am going to have to go with Remini on this one and say, "yes" to the 1828 election representing a Democratic revolt. I feel like people saw Jackson as a new beginning to a new era. As Remini states "They believed that the ordinary citizen, the so-called "common man," who were farmers, workers, frontiers men, and the like, had seized the opportunity to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson." not only did people look up to Jackson but they saw their selves within him. I also think that the election created a revolt because of the political and social backlash this created.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



I agree with Robert V remini

by [Christopher McCay](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 4:52 PM

The development of the two party system, it gave more power to the people when it came to popular and electoral votes. This power led to the two party system. Having two candidates from separate parties instead of multiple candidates from a single party. This drove voter turn out to a very high point in the 1828 election. The separate parties led to the revolt of the political system. Jackson's background was also talked about and with his simple and "average uneducated" past he became a symbol for the average US citizen.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



I'm with Remini

by [Rachelle Diffenderfer](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 6:19 PM

I feel that the voters came out in support of Jackson if not only for what he "stood for" but because of who he himself was "a man of the people". Many people were able to see themselves in Jackson. He was a common man, an orphan even, a man who was aware of what hard work and dedication was and he was not afraid to stand for it. The voters wanted someone like them. They wanted to believe that if he could rise to the top of the Government after starting out as an orphan then they too could possibly do the same. Also I feel as if the resurrection of the two party campaign had a small amount to do with the increased voting turn out. Due to the fact that the voters were only able to vote for one or the other, not one out of the five or six, it equated to less people on the fence and more people making a direct impact on the outcome of the presidency.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Not a "mighty democratic uprising"

by [Dalyn Stram](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 8:18 PM

I'm with McCormick. The election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt of the people. Remini's main points seemed to reside with the fact that the voter turnout of 1828 was a significant increase over 1824, and the fact that since people felt and observed it was a "mighty democratic uprising", it was. Yes, people's observations and feelings can often become self-fulfilling prophecies. However, this doesn't make an event something it isn't, and it can't extend a local or individual observation to the nation as a whole. McCormick does a good job of digging much deeper into the numbers and stats. Like McCormick, I believe 1840 was a truer representation of a "mighty democratic uprising". For example, McCormick points out that the voter turnout in 1828 was only around 56%. McCormick states "Instead of a 'mighty democratic uprising' there was in 1828 a voter turnout that approached-but in only a few instances matched or exceeded-the maximum levels that had been attained before the Jackson era." So he points out that the numbers simply don't support the claim that 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. Many states had actually had higher voter turnout before 1828. But there was, in fact, an overall increase in the presidential elections between 1824 and 1828. This increase can be explained by the fact that interest in presidential elections had dwindled during Virginia dynasty, and when the Virginia succession was terminated in 1824, more voters took interest in such elections - rather than just their local elections. And so when 1828 rolled around, there were simply more voters interested in participating in the presidential election. It had less to do with Jackson and his politics. So I believe that while 1828 marked a change of sorts - the common man taking a more vested interest in presidential and national elections - it was certainly not a "mighty democratic uprising". The elections of 1840 better fulfill that title.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



I agree with McCormick

by [Justin Robertson](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 8:17 PM

I do not believe the election of 1828 can be considered a democratic revolt with only a

56.3% voter participation. Although Jackson was "a man of the people" and encouraged the common people to stand up for what they believe in, the election still did not get the turnout that the election of 1840 had, which was 78.0%.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



I agree with McCormick

by [Nicklas Moyer](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 10:00 PM

After reading over both historians articles I have come to the conclusion that I agree that the 1828 election was not a "rise of democracy". For me I was convinced through McCormick's readings that the election of 1828 was blown out of proportion by the people of that day and that it was more or less a matter of different circumstances colliding that resulted in the voter turnout in the 1828 election, most notably the voter reforms that took place in most the states that reformed from legislators electing candidates to popular vote of the "common man". Also another key change was the rebirth of a two party election in 1828 that in my opinion made a key difference in the turnout of votes for the two men running for president in 1828.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



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

by [Cesar Rodriguez](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 10:04 PM

Yes, the 1828 election was a democratic revolt. There were many "firsts" in this election; citizens were more passionate and involved, the newspapers took sides, there was campaigning, and Jackson wrote publications for newspapers and parties. No election before this one got the people so involved. Wilentz gives a better argument, because that's what he does in his essay, he argues. McCormick just throws out a bunch of statistics but doesn't give as strong of arguments. A true revolt is about the arguments, not about the stats, there's some things in a revolt that can't be put into stats, which McCormick doesn't realize.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?

by [Erik Fischer](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 11:09 PM

I feel that an argument is only good if you can support it with good statistics. I feel that a revolt should have stronger voter turnout for the leader of the country than for local politicians, which was not the case according to McCormick, who points out that the 1824 and 1828 elections only had higher voter turnout than 6 out of the 50 local elections held at that time. That means that 88% of the held drew bigger crowds which in my opinion shows a lack of interest in the presidential race. Although in 1840 the presidential election far surpassed any previous turnouts.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Remini

by [Danielle Shanno](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 10:15 PM

I agree with Remini because it was it was a democratic revolt. It may be a little one based on statistics and other historical examples but it's still a revolt. The people really wanted Jackson in the house in '24 but was highly upset when Adams won. So when the '28 election came around the people were fuming angry and felt betrayed so more people showed up to vote and more people voted for Jackson because of the anger from the previous election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Robert Remini for the Win!

by [Haley Anderson](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:50 PM

I tend to agree with Robert Remini's. According to Webster's dictionary the absolute definition of a "revolt" is; "a rise in rebellion" or "an attempt to put an end to of a person or body by rebelling." As Remini describes the revolution of the Election of 1828, he describes a population of people coming together to improve everything about their society, from machines, to the way that they treated politics. I think that this obvious revolution proves the point that Andrew Jackson encouraged this sort of change and helped these new bright-minded men to see the potential of the United States. As Remini states, this new generation was coming to seize power from an older elite and really succeeding in doing so hereby encouraging this revolution.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Revolt: Bad terminology

by [Dalyn Stram](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 8:55 PM

There were indeed some firsts in the presidential election of 1828. However, "revolt" is probably a poor choice of words to define the election. It was less an uprising of the people and more a simple resurrection of interest due to the fact that the Virginia dynasty had ended. Most states had a long history of much higher voter participation in local/state issues - which were what the people were most interested in. A national election seemed too far off to matter as much as local or state elections. If any presidential election should be considered a "revolt", it would be the 1840 election. At least that election had the truly abnormally high numbers to support a term like "revolt".

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Still agreeing with Remini

by [Candice Oster](#) - Friday, January 23, 2015, 4:37 PM

I found the videos interesting. They gave us a closer look at how Jacksonian Democracy paved a way in our nation's government and the style of voting.

After listening to the first video where Historian Eric Foner answers the question about American public life in the Jacksonian period being both expansive and exclusive, I still hold my original thought of agreeing with Remini. American Democracy was changing. As Eric Foner says, "the line of exclusion for men had shifted, at the time of the Revolution it was property, people without property could not vote. Now it becomes race, people with property can vote as long as they are white, but race becomes the line of division of exclusion and inclusion in American politics." It opened the door for many more white men to get their say in the political world which expanded the participation. It showed an obvious increase in voters because many could now vote, but also because they wanted to. The other video discusses that more by saying, "some people saw the opportunity to increase their liberty in enormous numbers of ways." (Harry Watson) We learn from Richard Ellis that, "people begin to look at the government and see that the government makes economic decisions and they want to control the decisions." Ellis goes on to say that "politics becomes open" and the kind of man that Andrew Jackson was, brought out more of the public along with the elite to cast their votes.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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

