



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, 9:29 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 Has the Right Understanding**

by Jesse Bowman - Saturday, January 17, 2015, 7:31 PM

The election of 1828 marked a unique occasion in political history as it demonstrated the citizens' ability to rise up and with a single election make their voices heard and shift the political environment from the elite into the hands of the "Common Man"

My agreements fall in line with Professor Remini and in order to understand how the Election of 1828 was indeed a Democratic Revolt from the people, we need to compare and contrast past elections and future elections of the 19th century.

The election of 1824 started this metaphorical snowball effect of revolt. Infamously known as the "Corrupt Bargain" the election of 1824 betrayed the citizen's trust in democracy by ignoring the popular consensus of the nation who wanted Andrew Jackson as the sixth president of the United States over the lesser popular John Adams. Voter turnout for the election of 1824 was low but soon to rise as the Corrupt Bargain scandal consumed his term in office, "Reaction to the alleged Corrupt Bargain the Adams administration and created a rhetoric of intrigue and betrayal that nourished a rising democratic movement" (Liberty, Equality, Power, 385).

The result from Adams administration was the election of 1828 where the recently betrayed citizens flocked out in massive numbers to double the voter turnout and elect Andrew Jackson in a landslide victory of Adams.

Future elections show that although at points there were multiple candidates running for presidency, the people focused on the Two Party System that the election of 1828 greatly helped established.

I really enjoyed the quote used by Remini at the end of his article from Daniel Webster describing Jackson's inauguration, "Persons have come have traveled 500 miles to see

General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger."

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Remini Has the Right Understanding

by [Maggie Van Wey-Wells](#) - Saturday, January 17, 2015, 11:23 PM

I'm not sure if the corrupt bargain was actually why Andrew Jackson wasn't elected as president but the people seemed to believe so. I definitely think this had a huge impact in the formation of the two parties. People were outraged and became stronger then ever to gain justice. Perhaps they didn't even truly care if Andrew Jackson was elected the next term or just simply that they wanted to feel like they had the right to their chose. They didn't want to feel like their choice had been ignored just because Henry Clay knew the right people to get Adams elected.

"The total popular vote in election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824." People were out for revenge and wanted to be heard. "In the Electoral College, Jackson's victory was even more impressive. He won a total of 178 electoral votes to Adams." People saw it more important then ever to participate in the election of 1828 to make sure this time there was no chance of corruption in the congress.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Remini Has the Right Understanding

by [Adam Graves](#) - Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 11:00 AM

I agree with a lot the ideas you conveyed, I'm slightly convinced that the people came out in such large numbers to vote in the 1828 election was that they felt they were bamboozled by the "corrupt bargain" of the 1824 election. I also sort of feel like the idea of Jackson was sold to them like a product, that the "common man" was being sold on a man that was just like them. Joe showed a slide that was an election poster for Jackson that had statements on it like "The man of the People" and "The Hero of two Wars and of Orleans" To me these are great statements to persuade the "common man" that the patriotic chose is Jackson. Some of his votes could've been completely based on the idea of a better choice not for political reasons. It could've also been that that since the last election it was a topic that was being so published and talked about that maybe and hopefully the people felt more morally obligated to vote.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Remini Has the Right Understanding

by [Courtney Tullock](#) - Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 4:18 PM

That is an interesting perspective I hadn't thought about. But of course the campaigning had an effect on the people much like advertising does. He was portrayed as a "common man" that moved up the ladder so to speak using his charisma, military background, and his views as to how the country should be governed. I can definitely agree that propaganda had a big part to play in swaying the people's decision. It is interesting that it turned into a kind of farmer vs. aristocrat election and no surprise that Jackson won given at the time the country was made up of mostly farmers as we learned today.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Remini Has the Right Understanding

by [Jenefer Heredia](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 9:16 PM

His political campaign definitely had a "theatrical" vibe to them. Much of the election posters and the use of word choices can definitely be seen as parallel to the tactics of individuals running for office. But like many of the political commercials and ads we see today, was it 100% factual?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



revolt for the lower classes

by [Evan Kossow](#) - Saturday, January 17, 2015, 11:08 PM

Of the two opinions to take on this subject I have to lean with Remini's Yes more. Jackson came back from the sketchy results of the 1824 election and gained voter popularity by the land slide. Helping Jackson at this time were the newly enacted voting requirement laws spreading the states and enabling more voices of common folk heard. This was a time when it was the party's responsibility to hand out ballots meaning Jackson had to have quite a bit of support to spread his ideals to the brand new voters. Reading about this I cant help but relate it a little to Obamas 2008 election where his own massive support staff spread across the nation visiting impoverished neighborhoods making promises to get them to vote. Jackson's political aspirations may have contained a slightly more honest voice then Obama but I believe there was an unfamiliar level of charisma laced in his campaign trail that guided strong in his landslide victory.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



I side with Remini

by [Hannah Donner](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:05 AM

I personally agree with historian Remini that the election of 1828 certainly represented a democratic revolt. The four reasons that he outlines are valid and explain the dramatic outcome of the 1828 election. Specifically, Remini states that because of the two-party system, high election interest, large voter turnout, and the shift from legislative to popular vote Andrew Jackson attained "a stupendous victory" (pg. 206).

While these aspects are the reasons for the democratic revolt, these four elements were significantly influenced by the Corrupt Bargain in 1825. In reaction to this political scheme, voters and the two parties prepared for a change in strategies and operational tactics. Moving away from cultural gentility to popular melodrama this campaign captured the public's attention. In the campaign of 1828, Jackson's henchmen "viciously personalized the campaign [and] hammered away at the Corrupt Bargain" while "the Adams forces attacked Jackson's character" (Textbook pg. 389).

This election ushered in a new age of truer democracy governed by the majority as oppose to the historical domination of the aristocracy. Overall, Remini declares it served the will of the common man. For all of us today this was a key turning point for America's history which we all benefit from.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



I'm on Remini's Side

by [Courtney Tullock](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:43 AM

Given our readings, I agree with Robert Remini. He and our textbook both emphasize the connection the "common man" felt with Jackson which among many other reasons resulted in a voter turnout that doubled that of the election of 1824. Remini's four explanations for the higher voter turnout makes complete sense to me but I also think the "Corrupt Bargain" played a big role. I think given the people's choice had been overturned they wanted to take a stand against the National Republicans and see their vision of a Democracy realized.

Remini says, "The common man seized the opportunity to express their political opinion...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". Our book states, "It was a clear triumph of democracy over genteel statesmanship, limited government over expansive nationalism..." (p. 390). I think the Election of 1828 most definitely represented a Democratic revolt of the people, granted it might have just been the beginning of one.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: I'm on Remini's Side

by [Trinidad Delgado](#) - Friday, January 23, 2015, 12:56 PM

As I reflect my statement, I do agree that the Corrupt Bargain of 1828 could of made a significant impact on the people. Whether they wanted to foresee a new democracy arising because of this, or they felt that choosing Jackson would be the right choice. People were pro-Jackson at this time because they felt that being more involved, they would get a fair vote, and there were more opportunities. In such a case, Andrew Jackson offered what the "Common Man" wanted---a new democracy that had no corrupt bargains. Also, it was the beginning of the growing parties that fully established in 1840. This could of been the start of a democratic revolt, but not a definite one.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



I have to side with Remini

by [Carson Raz](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 4:43 PM

After the "corrupt bargain" in 1824 the people's trust was lost and rightfully so. It was clear that the votes of the citizens were not at all the major factor in the selection of our nations leader. The people wanted a louder voice and fought for it. The new two party system made voters more eager to get their opinions out there and essentially get Jackson on the thrown. I think the key is that it served the good of the common man and put more power in the people while taking some out of the government. "Remini argues that 1828 presidential election symbolized the people full arrival at political responsibility." I think the less power the government has the better.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



In accordance to McCormick

by [Trinidad Delgado](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 5:46 PM

The election of 1828 did not represent a revolt of the people according to Robert V. Remini's argument. This campaign was the beginning of the up rise of the "common can," which was widely supported by male voters, who viewed him "fit to be president." Moreover, Remini states that the common man has been rising before Jackson, yet the election symbolized the people's hearsay in politics. It was a time where citizens participated in the voting process than they did before; whereas, Jackson was considerably the people's president. The estimated 30,000 people, who came to hear Jackson's inauguration speech, hoped that his promises for a new democratic government will be meaningful.

In contrast to McCormick, he stressed that the voting participation stayed relatively the same between the elections of 1824 and 1828. He felt there was no revolt among the people. The election of 1840 is where he believes there was a rise of a democratic revolution. The Whig and Democrat parties were stable in 1840 than in 1828. In addition, if the western states engaged in the election, there could be a greater voter turn out. I believed that Andrew Jackson was chosen by the choice of the free people in 1828. I do not believe there was a revolt in 1828. It was about justness and fairness; a contest

between aristocracy and democracy. There were more ideas and opportunities for citizens. None of Jackson's elections involved a significant democratic uprising in the sense that voters were drawn to an ideal president.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



Re: In accordance to McCormick

by [Jesse Bowman](#) - Thursday, January 22, 2015, 9:50 PM

I think one of the most important things that should have been done in either case of these articles or all of our posts is to define what "revolt" really means in this cause. A revolt is **not** the same thing as a revolution (which is what I think you mean when you say it was not a revolt); whereas a revolution is a "forceable overthrow of a government or social order in favor of a new system." and a revolt is "an attempt to put an end to the authority of a person or body by rebelling.". This may seem like splitting hairs, but the distinction is important. There was **no** "forceable overthrow" of any government like during the American Revolution. There **no** new system or social order established. Andrew Jackson's election may have excelled the two party system into fruition but in no means did he completely change the power of the government and give it into the hands of the common man. In fact, on many as many occasions protested the abuse of government power he mirrored the hunger for power that the old federalist used to express by extending his Executive power i.e., "Indian Removal Act" in direct defiance of the ruling of Supreme Court.

As for a *revolt*, an attempt **was** made by the people to to end the authority of the aristocrats who previously abused their powers and betrayed the people mainly noted by the "Corrupt Bargain". They did this by transferring the power to a man who was not born into wealth and was in fact a good representative of the "Common Man" ideals by achieving success regardless of those "obstacles"

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



Remind by a veritable landslide

by [Adam Graves](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 6:31 PM

I found myself leaning toward the yes side in this discussion, in which I think Robert V. Remini did a good job describing how Jackson won the election. After reading the Wikipedia page on Remini to check his credentials I realized he has wrote several other papers on Jackson and maybe has a basis on the subject but didn't let it effect my decision.

It seemed clear to me that the people liked Jackson because he related to the "common man" which was a phrase used through out the article. I'm sure that if I was living during the 1828 election I would've voted for him as well. I think that the common people, farmers, wageworkers or the middle class liked everything that he stood for. The man was a war hero, and had the reputation of being for lack of a better phrase a bad ass.

This is why I think he was able to get the amount of votes that he did. People wanted him to be president and the statistics that Remini uses seem to prove his case. Jackson got 56% of the entire vote and nearly 800,000 more voted in the election compared to the 1824. I'd like to think that Old Hickory won the election not because he was the most "presidential looking" but cause the people knew he was a good old boy who would do them some justice.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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

Not a revolt, but a wake up call

by [Michael Leopold](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 6:32 PM



I dont think that the election of 1828 should be considered an all out revolt, but it definitely served as a turning point for voters to realize their voice and to utilize the power of it. The 1824 election, and the back-room deals that went on that led to it's outcome, made many realize that if they remained lethargic on election days, those in power would continue to do whatever necessary to achieve or maintain power. Remini concedes in his essay that "the 'common man' had been rising for generations, and had made notable political advances long before Jackson appeared." He was right, though, when he added that "this election seemed to symbolize the people's arrival to political responsibility." Jackson's popularity and the whirlwind of publicity surrounding him and his robbed election in 1824, not to mention his continued popularity over the next four years made this era in American politics memorable and a large turning point. The two-party system had returned and so had the American voter. Partner this with an increased population and a burgeoning middle-class of merchants and land owners that now had more reason than ever to care about politics, and you have a political landscape of folks with many new opinions and concerns. McCormick points out that the voter turnout in 1840 far exceeds that of 1828 or any election in between. At 78%, compared to the 55-56% voter turnout of the three elections prior show that though America was clearly on the path of election participation, they were not quite as explosive in 1828 as in subsequent years. Jackson may have been popular and began an upward trend, but he did not instill nor encourage a "revolt" of the American voter.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Not a revolt, but a wake up call

by [Hannah Donner](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 2:12 PM

Regardless of 1828 or 1840 being the actual democratic revolt, I believe that Andrew Jackson did at least encourage a revolt in 1828. By promoting a revolt he accumulated most of his voters which lead to his winning. He made it a part of his campaign in order to arouse the people. Jackson believed that "the republic was safe only when governed by the will of the majority" (Textbook pg. 387). Using the Corrupt Bargain of 1825 as an example, Jackson stated that either "people or political schemers would rule" (Textbook pg. 387). A revolt is a movement of strong dissent. Personally, I believe these declarations clearly show that he was supporting a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



A Right to Revolt

by [Ryan Helmericks](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 9:19 PM

After the corrupt bargain of 1824, a lot of the United States people felt cheated. After losing, Andrew Jackson and his followers were extremely unhappy with John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay joining votes. With the cheated citizens coming back in the masses for the 1828 election and the popular ally Martin Van Buren, Andrew Jackson won against his opponent, John Quincy Adams, by a land side. In 1828 the voters turn out was double that of 1824. This marked the first time a two-party political system was used. During the election the "common man" first felt that he was able to express and share his political view. Negative campaigning played a big role in the election. I feel that the election of 1828 was a revolt in the Democratic party and the people of the United States because it was the first time you see only two parties against eachother. Citizens formed with a side and expressed themselves like never before.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

I agree with Remini but...



by [Morgan Steinmetz](#) - Monday, January 19, 2015, 11:35 PM

After reading both sides I found myself leaning more towards Remini's point of view. With that being said, I don't think the term "revolt" is the appropriate term for what the election of 1828 really was. The election of 1828 was more of an election that changed the path and the ways of voters. Jackson became the candidate that the "Common Man" could relate to which therefor lead to a increased voter turnout. The election almost essentially became a race between lower/middle class and the upper class. With an opportunity to speak their opinions, the common man did exactly that by voting in favor of Jackson. Jackson made it easy for himself to get the votes of the common man, because the people agreed with Jackson and liked what he brought to the table as a presidential candidate. Bandwagon is the term that comes into my mind when I think of this election because it had a lot of people following each other when it came to their votes. In this specific time period, Jackson became the "popular vote" and all of the "Common Man" had to jump on the wagon and vote for him.

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

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by [Zack Caldwell](#) - Wednesday, January 21, 2015, 8:41 PM

I agree with Ramini.

With the new generation trying to seize power from the older social elite Jackson and his people saw the importance of having the common man identify themselves with him.

"They were quick to sense the response the General's popularity produced amount the "rising" classes of Americans and to realize that association with Jackson might be crucial to their future positions in politics."

The amount of voters from 1824 to 1828 increased by a huge amount as well which I believe is an important sign of revolt.

"Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Q. Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 or just a little better than 56% of the entire vote."

"The popular vote in the election represented an increaseI OC nearly 800,000 over the previous election in 1824."

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

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



Remini says Dem. Revolt; I agree (to an extent)

by [Jenefer Heredia](#) - Friday, January 23, 2015, 9:06 PM

Jackson won 51% of the popular vote and 178 electoral votes; a complete landslide compared to Adams numbers. Jackson's campaign and target was focused around the rights of states and importance of the hardworking "common man". I believe that ordinary citizen wanted to make an appearance in the social and economic arena of the late 19th century, and in their eyes, Andrew Jackson would make it possible to obtain more liberties.

However, could this Democratic "revolt" be solely relied on the passions and dreams of the common man"? I think that the scandalous campaign slanders and drama between the two parties is what drove voters to the polls - characteristic to the "hands-on" approach to much of the social struggles that were affecting large groups in 19th c. America.

Sum of ratings: **2** (1)

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

Re: Remini says Dem. Revolt; I agree (to an extent)

by [Hannah Donner](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 6:37 PM



I also agree that the campaign drama between Jackson and Adams definitely stimulated the voters to use their right to vote. During the presidential campaign of 1828, Adams' henchmen attacked Jackson's character and spread many rumors about him. In the end, this strategy failed because many people "criticized Adams for making Jackson's private life a public issue" and "the attempt to brand Jackson as a lawless man, in fact, enhanced his image" (Textbook pg. 390). This obviously urged even more voters to the polls and, therefore, played a huge role in the voter turnout being double compared to 1824.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Video 2

by [Adam Graves](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 7:36 PM

The historians in video two seem to support the yes argument. Some of the evidence that they seem to use is that during that time period with the increase of the economy because of the market and growth of infrastructure and the expanding into the west. People's idea of liberty was broadening and they became increasingly weary over the government's control of economics and the ability to have things lean in favor upper class versus middle class. It in turn resulted in mass people getting involved politically to ensure their freedom and liberty.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Video 2

by [Evan Kossow](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 10:57 PM

When researching this idea of a "democratic revolt" I found that most historians and sources refer to it as such. It seems quite commonly accepted that there was a large revolt with opposition to federalist policies at the time of Jackson's election. They embraced Jackson's ideas as supporting an American dream that included their own personal and economic freedoms. Jackson was a boisterous character and I think that helped his message get heard.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by [Zack Caldwell](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 9:36 PM

I believe that Remini is correct after reading the "New material" because, "Remini argues that the 1828 presidential election symbolized the people's arrival at political responsibility and began a genuine, nationally organized, two party system that came of age in the 1830's."

Now "The people's" are subjective. It was white males that made up the majority of the voters this is why I want to stress "Began a genuine, nationally organized, two party system that came of age in the 1830's."

Even though the popular vote in the 24 states of the 25 that had it was skewed by 4,000 or more it still supports the beginning of a nationally organized two party system. In Louisiana, Maryland, and New Jersey the popular votes was 500 difference or closer.

Let's remember the voting totals for American in the election of 1824 and 1828. The American people mostly working class contributed to the 800,000 votes jump from the election in 1824 to 1828 attributed to the new generation of working class American that wanted to take America back from the banking class of the revolutionary war period. Jackson and his people saw how important the working class really was at that time in

relation to their political presence both nationally and locally.

This was the begging because there were still groups of people left out because of social views but it's hard to argue with the popular vote difference totals from 1824 to 1828.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Video response

by [Courtney Tullock](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 10:48 PM

I think both videos mostly side with Remini. Erick Foner talks about how there were two major parties- the Whigs & the Democrats- which contributed to "participation in public life expanding enormously". Aside from the fact that only adult white males were allowed to vote depending on specific property qualification from varying states, the election of 1828 still had a vast majority of voters placing their ballots with Jackson.

The second video seemed to emphasize how the Jacksonian age was a "transformation of Democracy". Given the growing market economy and the expansion of the country people were scared that the "new opportunities" would equal more government control over the economy. Since the majority of citizens were farmers at that time it comes as no surprise that they would vote for the "grassroots candidate" who stood for states' rights and the common man.

These videos only affirmed my belief that a Democratic revolt did take place at that time starting with Andrew Jackson.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Revolt for certain

by [Evan Kossow](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 11:02 PM

If you were a white farming male or a small time entrepreneur in 1828, Jackson was your man. the federalist party just didn't cater to these populations which held so much of the vote. The people spoke, and spoke loud propelling Jackson to victory.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Question..

by [Jenefer Heredia](#) - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 11:05 PM

I was wondering if someone could help me by clarifying what exactly the "revolt" was up against..(assuming you agree with Remini).

Against corrupt government officials? The small poup. of the wealthy class that held significant influence?

I'm a bit unclear. Your replies would be great!

Sum of ratings: (1)

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

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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