



HST 202: History of United States W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)

Home ► Winter 2017 ► HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938) ► Week 3 ► Forum 1 ►
Age of Jackson Videos


Search forums

Forum 1

Age of Jackson Videos

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Age of Jackson Videos ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Age of Jackson Videos

by Joe Escobar - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 5:08 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Age of Jackson Videos topic. (See the new "blue link" on the forum materials and questions page)

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, something that describes which question(s) you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: Age of Jackson Videos

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

**No this new information has not change my view.**

by Mat Forcum - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 8:15 PM

This new information has not changed my view that the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt. There were a lot of significant changes occurring during the time in which Andrew Jackson made his way to the center of national politics. As stated by the historian Harry Watson, the American voting right was extended, in all but a few places, the all white men. This would clearly relate to an increase in the number of eligible voter. The "corrupt bargain" (text book pg375) that lead to Adams winning the presidency over Jackson set the Jackson supporters on a mission to make sure Jackson would be elected. They began campaigning for the election of 1828 immediately. The 1828 election proved to be the begaining of a new kind of political arena in which personal life would take center stage. "The election of 1828 was an exercise in slander rather than a debate on public issue" (text book pg379) this slander would bring in public interest.

While all of these situation would prove to bring out larger numbers in the polls "... white male voting soured to 56.3 percent, more than double the 1824 figures"(Richard P. McCormics article New perspective on Jacsonian politics pg 211) it does not match the voter turnout generated by the 1849 elections, which Mcormic puts at 78% of eligible voters. It would seam that this "democratic revolutions" is not achieved until after Jackson leaves office. Jackson did affect the politics of his time in important ways, but I still stick with my no answer.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Age of Jackson Videos**

by Jarred Finn - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 1:42 PM

The election of 1828 wasn't a democratic revolt but as Professor Henry Watson put it, it was more of a battle for power because as he said, "it was a fear of other people having power over them." Even Professor Foner put it as it was just an increase in the more people that were allowed to vote. That being the property requirements were lifted and it came down to all white men being able to vote. That's not necessarily a revolt but a battle for power between the two biggest parties at the time, the Whigs and the Democrats.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Age of Jackson Videos**

by Michael Gray - Friday, January 27, 2017, 9:21 PM

After watching the two videos provided, I feel like it was very helpful to hear from some different people. I do think that these historians believe that the election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt. When I was first listening to Foner, I initially thought he was going to go with it being a revolt by his explanation of voting opening up. He explains that it was expansive because it was no longer just land owners who can vote, but all white men. Also, that the competition between the whigs and democrats brought peoples interest into politics. On the other hand he explains that it was exclusive because still, women, free blacks, and slaves could still not thus holding us from taking that next step.

The second video started the same way. They were explaining how it was a "dramatic change of democracy" and that people were becoming more interested into politics. One of the historians, Richard Ellis, elucidated that people started to realize that the government was making decisions that were not necessarily for the better of the people, but for their own interests. Politics became open in the sense that people had a better idea of what was going on and how things were happening. Another important factor was that Jackson was the first "grassroots" president.

After all that was said to incorporate the idea of a democratic revolt, the most substantial and diminishing example that it was not was from Theda Perdue. She said, the "United States became more democratic for white men, but less democratic for everyone else." Just because voting opened up for a group of people, there was still a huge amount of the population who could not. Women, free blacks, and slaves all had no mention into the direction of their country.

So no, my take on whether the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt has not changed. Although I still believe it was not, this has helped to explain the good things that happened along the way of making democracy better.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Democracy for Whom?

by Matthew Brownlee - Friday, January 27, 2017, 10:42 PM

For the most part, the historians agree that the election of 1828 wasn't exactly a democratic revolt. Though it did have an impact on American politics and contributed to the development of our two-party system, this election excluded the vast number of Americans that weren't white males. In fact, one could argue that it made the country even more exclusive and undemocratic, with Jackson's removal of Native Americans as an example.

After watching my video, I maintain my original view that the election of 1828 didn't represent a democratic revolt. However, my original view was mainly influenced by the voting numbers. The video added another wrinkle to this position--the fact that so many groups were barred from fully participating in the political system.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Democracy for Whom?

by Megan Spencer - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 8:33 PM

In the first video, Professor Foner says that the line of exclusion, is now no longer drawn by property ownership, but by race. I would agree with you, that the election of 1828 made the country more exclusive, simply because all white men could actively vote, while everyone else, women, and African Americans, could not.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Historians position one Democratic changes of 1828

by Mat Forcum - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 3:10 PM

After viewing the two video clips I would say that all of the historians agree that the election did not represent a democratic revolution. Professor Fone states that the election was both “expansive and exclusive”. Expansive due to the properties requirements being almost entirely removed from the nation, and the development two national political parties, but exclusive because this is expansive only to adult white men and excludes the rest of the population. He doesn’t mention this election being a democratic revolt and would seem to suggest more of a drastic change.

The group of historians in the second video clip would seem to echo the answer of no; the election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt of the people. I think that the historian Theda Perdu puts it best by pointing out that the political arena in fact became more democratic for white men and would in fact “...become less democratic for everyone else though strict racial codes in the south...”. The national political arena infract became more of a grab for power by white men under Jackson and a continued commitment to white democracy for the south.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Still say no

by Megan Spencer - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 3:14 PM

I still agree with McCormick, that the Election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt. The historians seemed to agree that Andrew Jackson made a lot of changes, however they were not always good ones. During his presidency, he excluded a lot of people from politics, that had been at least a little bit involved before he became president. The only people that were allowed to participate were white men. Everyone else, women, free

blacks, Native Americans, were excluded from the political sphere. In my own opinion, to have a democratic revolt, there needs to be a large number of people turn out to vote. Which he didn't have, because the voter turnout for 1840 was greater than the turn out for 1828. And by excluding everyone who wasn't a white man, makes for a very small revolt. So i stick with my decision, that the election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Theda Perdue provides logical position,

by Mat Forcum - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 3:30 PM

I fell like the argument that the most logical position was provided by Theda Perdue in her statement, "Indian removal coincides with the development of very strict racial codes in the south which limits the rights of free blacks, it coincides with a period in which women actually lose political rights..." This seems to be a clear indication that a democrat revolution would not be taking place if large portions of the population are losing their political rights. I think the more accurate term for the Period of Jacksonian democracy would be that Jackson made a left a mark on politics, as stated by Harry Watson. It would also be accurate to state that it involves a huge shift in politics from a few white land owning men, as stated by professor Fone, to a more expansive population of white men.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Theda Perdue provides logical position,

by Megan Spencer - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 6:16 PM

I agree with you. I think that to have a democrat revolt, at the very least a successful one, the majority of the population needs to be involved. So since Jackson excluded many groups from politics, a democratic revolt couldn't happen. However, that is not to deny what you also said, that he did shift the politics and power from white men owning land, to white men in general, regardless of property ownership.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



The Jacksonian revolution updated

by William Barker - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 6:18 PM

I still believe there was a political revolution during the election of 1828. I do however understand that it wasn't all because of Andrew Jackson running for president.

During the 1820's there was a huge explosion in the way people thought about politics. Richard Ellis explains that most of the common man was beginning to understand that politicians were making economic decisions that would affect them directly. Also Harry Watson tells us that people were starting to become afraid that those people in high places were potentially drafting laws to decide which white man got to vote or not.

Unfortunately, as Professor Foner says, there was a limit to this revolution. Only white men were getting more voting rights, while women and (most) African Americans still remained out of politics.

To top it off, Andrew Jackson left an indelible mark on American politicians. Harry Watson says that after Andrew Jackson's presidency, politicians had to incorporate the common man into all their policies and views. Since Jackson, politicians had to make an effort to reaffirm that the common American was the best judge of what was right and wrong.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

◀ Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Age of Jackson Videos ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

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

HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)

