



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

Taking Sides - Election of 1828 ▶

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](#)



Common Man Revolution

by Brandi Paquette - Friday, January 27, 2017, 2:43 PM

I believe the historians in these videos support that there was a Democratic Revolt of the People in the Election of 1828.

Professor Foner from the first video, addresses that the public life in the age of Jackson was expanding because the white men could almost all nearly vote unlike before when there were property qualifications, but he also mentions the exclusiveness. He says that public life was exclusive no longer because of qualifications but because race. African Americans that were slaves couldn't vote of course but nor could the free. Women also were mainly out of the picture when it came to politics. I think that Foner realizes and tries to explain that in 1828 the white men were the majority and they were the "common man" in which expanded the democratic party.

The second video covered more on the topic of race and exclusion as well when it came to Indians for whom Jackson did not support. Yet, the different historians overall seemed to favor Jackson and his democratic goals and were just against his human rights record.

I still stand on the side of Professor Remini that the Election of 1828 represented a Democratic Revolt of the People and now after watching these two videos I understand more clearly how the "White men" or the "Common man" really took control and created the rise of the democratic party with the help of Jackson. In a 30-year span from 1800-1830 seven more states had no qualifications for voting (Universal White Manhood Suffrage Image, Lecture). Meaning the majority of "Common man" were able to vote freely.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Video - Electorate Diversity NO

by William Mc Mahon - Friday, January 27, 2017, 11:51 PM

The video reaffirmed my position by illuminating an aspect of the issue I had not previously considered.

It wasn't until watching the video that I realized the "democratic revolt" we are discussing is centered around an electorate of exclusively white men. This is an electorate that, by contemporary standards, would not just be narrow, but racist and sexist. Any discussion of whether or not the election of 1828 was a significant political shift has to be acknowledged as a shift amongst a proportion of a greater whole. There is a large emphasis on the idea that this was an uprising of the "common man", but this did not include women, black people (whether or not they were enslaved), or indigenous tribes.

This dampens the idea of any kind of revolt and begs a qualification for the entire discussion.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Video - Electorate Diversity NO

by Brandi Paquette - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 7:45 PM

The electorate was mostly white men but the overall rise in votes was still a sign that there was a revolt. The majority of the electorate consisting of white men is not by any means good and I'm glad that it changed in the future, but having the majority be white men shouldn't matter to the overall importance of the historical impact the 1828 election had on the future of US politics. The lower class were not able to vote in the 1824 election, once qualifications no longer existed for those in the lower class that increased the diversity of the electorate and it was enough to demonstrate a revolt in 1828. The new electorate made up of lower and middle class white men voted differently then the previous electorate of just elites, enough to elect a different party's candidate.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Reaffirming my belief explanation in the middle ground

by Eric Brackett - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 2:52 PM

After watching the video my opinion has still not changed. I believe the historians are leaving out a very important reason for the everyman's support of Jackson. I do not believe it was a true politician revolution, but rather a natural progression of American politics. Jackson was a military man, he fought and led, not only in the War of 1812, but in the Creek Wars, the first Seminole Wars and several other actions. This has a tendency to endear one to the American people. When one takes in to consideration that the vast majority of "natural" Americans that lived in the country had served in the American revolution, or their fathers had, and the amount who had fought along side Jackson in said "Indians wars" or the War of 1812, it is very easy to imagine why the everyman could see him as a close second to George Washington.

However also consider the second through sixth Presidents. These men were polar opposites of Jackson in the way they were raised. John Adams was a Boston Lawyer , Jefferson was plantation owner and considered by some to be an elitist , Madison had inherited wealth and land from his father and became a large plantation owner in his own right, Monroe had been a part of the Virginia ruling elite since age sixteen, and John Quincy Adams...well he was his fathers son. Under each of these Presidents only the "ruling elite" could vote. Now these same men who had fought along side Jackson (or had family members and friends do so) now had the power to voice their opinions. It is easy to see

how one could be inclined to vote for Old Hickory By this time America had become far more rural than it had previously. Now it was possible for the men settling the frontier to have their voices heard. Much like today those who live a rural life, are less inclined to have some big city "elitist" represent them than some "salt of the earth" type.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Foner against the revolt

by Christopher Cockman - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 10:23 PM

In my interpretation of what Foner discussed among "expansive and exclusive" (Foner video) fundamentals in the era of Jackson is that he is an advocate in agreeing that the time itself was a "thriving democratic political system" (Foner video) which would appeal to the Remini or 'YES' side of the discussion; however, he acknowledges that the limitation of race rather than property has become an issue in how many people and who are allowed to vote. This notion, in turn, plays towards the 'NO' or McCormick side of the discussion. Knowing that I cannot choose to place Foner on the fence in the discussion, I would say that the man is leaning moreover on the side of, yes, there was a democratic revolt in the Jacksonian time. I am confident in this answer because he gives the two points of property qualification not being the issue on who can vote, allowing virtually all white men to vote, and that there was a surge in rallies and more people wanting to partake in political matters. He says that this encompasses a vast majority of the voting population, which in terms of the all so powerful true definition we thrive on in this class, means that more people than not could vote, resulting in a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Democratic surge of the white male

by Christopher Cockman - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 10:50 PM

In this video, the notion that people in Jackson's times were becoming more skeptical of the federal government or even one's peers were going to take away their freedom by controlling them. Watson and Ellis play on this factor simultaneously. This is what led people towards not wanting to vote, because they would feel as if they were being controlled by the government. The government in Mandy's eyes was looking for votes to boost one elite party over the other, which was the main point of Ellis. Perdue, said that the vote found a surge in that white men could now vote freely but practically everyone else couldn't at the times I would say that these three historians lean towards the NO side of there being a democratic revolt for these reasons.

I find it interesting that all four of these historians make it a point to state that the demographic of voters at the time was all white male and practically a minority any other race voting at the time.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Standing firm. The revolt of 1828.

by Amy Aguilar - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:13 PM

Both videos that we watched on the age of Jackson emphasise the fact that the Jacksonian time period was a time you wanted to be a white man, and only a white man. Women did not have the right to vote and most negroes as well. Theda Perdue says it well when she states "This is a time that America became more democratic for white men, and less democratic for everyone else." We watch as Native Americans were removed from their land but the fact is, is that ethnic cleansing has never been unfamiliar territory to us Americans even to this day with many showing their support for the deportation of other races. After watching these videos I stand firm in my belief that the Democratic Revolt started in 1828. There is no question that the Revolt was bias in being led by the white man, but the question was not of who started it, who it affected, or who was able to vote. The topic is which we are debating is a matter of when and I believe that was in 1828.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



How the Videos have Affected My Opinion

by Howard Fuller - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:38 PM

Historian Eric Foner describes the reliance of the American political system in the 1820s on the extensive participation of white male voters. He further explains that racial and gender-based exclusion of important population groups took place and that the line of exclusion for men changed from being a matter of property to being a matter of race. Foner doesn't specifically address the election of 1828 as a matter of being a revolt of the people. Historians in the second video compare and contrast Jackson's negative characteristics, such as his policies on Native American westward removal and slavery, with his appeal to the political scene of the 1820s. They focus more extensively on the aspects of voter exclusion and less on the involvement and participation of the public politically. This is perhaps an indication that they are more of the opinion that a democratic revolt did not take place. The videos have helped to me to further visualize the political layout of the early 19th century, but haven't changed my opinion that the 1840 election was more of a democratic revolt than those of the 1820s.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

 Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)

