



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 ►
Taking Sides - Election of 1828


Search forums

Forum 1

Taking Sides - Election of 1828

• [Subscribe](#)

Taking Sides - Election of 1828 ►

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 20, 2017, 11:35 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Taking Sides - Election of 1828 topic.

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: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Sum of ratings: -

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

Mere Numbers vs Sheer Domination: Which Evidence Suggests Revolution?



by Caleb Pruitt - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 3:38 PM

After reading through both arguments and assessing their main points and methods of articulating their opinion, I am inclined to side with Robert Remini's affirmation that the 1828 election was a democratic revolt of the people. I believe that he addressed the question at hand more thoroughly than Mr. McCormick and focused on more than one topic as well. Mr. McCormick, to me, seemed to devote the majority if not all of his essay simply to voter turnout, statistics, and dry numbers and theory. Albeit some points he made may be accurate, such as increasing population affecting percentages (210), focusing solely on how many people showed up to vote does not conclusively determine the mindset of the people.

I think it is important, however, to note the landslide of a victory that Jackson managed. While voter turnout in 1828 more than doubled, Jackson still received 56% of the entire vote, an achievement that goes down in history as the most one-sided election of the 19th century (206, textbook 380). This fact alone goes to show that even if a higher percentage of people voted in 1840 and elections thereafter, as McCormick chooses to focus on, the vast majority of people truly wanted Jackson the Democrat for office. (206,212)

To me, Jackson was essentially an idol of the times, or as Remini says it "a symbol of [men's] own ambitions...a living example of the self-made man" (204). They saw in him a change in politics and a character that they could relate with and believed that he had their best interests at heart. It is for these reasons that I side with Remini in saying that the 1828 election was a democratic revolt of the people.

Word Count: 286

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Mere Numbers vs Sheer Domination: Which Evidence Suggests Revolution?

by Covita Hughes - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 11:17 PM

When I think of the word "Revolt" I think of sudden attempt to overthrow government. Although you make a convincing argument in your agreement with Remini, I'm still not entirely convinced.

Political changes started happening before the election of 1828. As described in our text and from Mr. Escobar's lectures, Jackson had the most popular and electoral votes in the election of 1824, however because there were 4 candidates he did not have the majority of the electoral college.

Yes, the election of 1828 did mark the beginning of a new era - referred to as the Age of Common Man, however this does not constitute as a revolt in my mind. Yes, the political parties were more defined after that and voter turnout increased. But isn't part of the rise in voter turnout due to population growth?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Revolt?

by Morganne Roy - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 4:55 PM

The question is, was the election of 1828 a democratic revolt of the people. The 'yes' perspective asserts that Andrew Jackson was a hero to the people, a larger than life figure, that represented the people's aspirations that anyone could make something of themselves. Jackson entered the scene at a time of great change when the the Founding Fathers were beginning to fade into the nation's history. He was an outsider, the first president not to come from Virginia or Massachusetts. He was an uncouth and violent westerner from the backwoods.

While these are all valid points about him, I don't agree that they merit considering the election a revolt. I see the election as people being angry at the Corrupt Bargain, and retaliating with their vote-- more out of anger at big government corruption, than complete rejection of elitism and the ruling class. Calling it a revolt is too potent a description for me to fully agree with the 'yes' perspective.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Revolt?

by Emma Allen - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 12:08 PM

I really agree with what you're saying. I think I can see why people think it was a revolt, however I too believe that revolt would be too strong a word for this situation. Looking at McCormick's post, he approaches the number side of the revolt and reveals that while it looks it was an election of epic proportion, comparatively, it wasn't. He looks at before and after the election and makes the claim that the election of 1840 was indeed where people should look to to find the revolt.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Revolt?

by Timberly Thomas - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 8:36 PM

I also agree with you both, a revolt by definition is to break away from or rise against constituted authority (dictionary.com). Revolt is a to strong of a word to describe this election. Yes people wanted something different, but it wasn't in rebellion. Yes, I am sure they where mad about the corrupt bargain, but Jackson gave them hope. it is like a company putting out a new product, people want to try it see if its good, but they are not rebelling against the old product.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I agree with Mr. McCormick

by Covita Hughes - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 5:01 PM

After careful consideration, I lean toward agreeing with Richard McCormick that the Election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people.

In Remini's article provided by Mr. Escobar on moodle, I did not find any statistical data proving the revolt. He does describe turning points, such as our country experience economic and political changes, however Jackson's appearance did not cause this, it was obviously in motion when he showed up. While reading his argument, I felt as if he was relying on his opinion rather than facts.

Richard McCormick's argument includes voting statistics that clearly demonstrate a revolution and he also refers to other historians' views to back up his claims.

Even though the election was not technically a revolt, major changes did take place concerning politics such as voting qualifications, mudslinging and the creation of the Whig Party. What convinces me is the rise in voter participation in the election of 1840.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Isaac Rossberg - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 7:36 PM

No, I do not believe that the election of Andrew Jackson was a democratic revolt. Some say it was because he was the first President to not be heavily involved in the Revolutionary War, but by that time many of the Founding Fathers were very old, or dead. It was over 50 years past the Declaration of Independence, so I would personally think that it would be no surprise that someone from a different time period would be elected. Andrew Jackson also didn't win by a very large margin. It was considered a landslide for back then, but he only won 56% of the popular vote. That doesn't seem like much of a revolt to me. It seems more like a common election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The Election of 1828: Effect not a Cause

by Amelia Salzman - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 9:05 PM

Between these two arguments I found both with many valid point. When I first read the textbook I did see the view of an uprising of common man. After reading all of the materials I feel that McCormick's argument altered my opinion. In particular the point made about voter turnout for elections within the state verses the Presidential election. (pg. 212 of The Election of 1828 reading) The voter increase was due to "Newly won political rights" (pg. 209) could have been reason enough for the increase of the common Men's involvement in politics. Because of these two fact I am inclined to think that a large part of Andrew Jackson's success in this election was based on timing. McCormick discusses the interest and increase in elections within states. The election of Jackson a Jacksonian Democrat who believed in more power for individual states would make sense. Also the rift between Free states and slave states may have led to the turnout for a Democrat in hopes to keep states power. I think the Presidential election took place during the rise of common people. Jackson was well liked by the people and won but I don't believe that he was the sole cause of this shift in voting but instead was a effect of a movement that was already happening.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



The Election of 1828 and why it was NOT a revolt

by Emma Allen - Monday, January 23, 2017, 12:54 PM

I agree most with McCormick and his side that the Election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt. He made very good points that were very logical to me. McCormick's main point was that the Election of 1828 "failed to bring the proportion of the electorate that had voted on occasion in previous elections" (McCormick 211). So, while it seemed that there had been a massive increase in voting, in previous years it had been surpassed proportionally. Before the year 1824, 15 of the 22 states had surpassed the average rate of 56.3% that was present in 1828.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Election of 1828 and why it was NOT a revolt

by Ryan Freire - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 6:41 PM

It did surpass it proportionally but its important to remember that before most of the

property requirements to voting were abolished in the years leading up to the 1828 election, only somewhere between 10 and 16% of the population of the U.S. had the right to vote. A higher percentage of a smaller subset of the country has less weight to it than a slightly smaller percentage of a much much larger percentage of the nation.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828, Define "Democratic Revolt of the People".

by Patrick Rugel - Monday, January 23, 2017, 7:06 PM

Good cases can be made both ways on the issue that the 1824 presidential election was/was not a “mighty democratic uprising” (a Democratic revolt of the people.) Based on the two cases given, I tend to sway to the case made by Richard P. McCormick. Elements given in both cases are persuasive and I agree that there are factors that played a significant role in the election, such as voter eligibility / behavior (McCormick) , population growth (McCormick), and the previous election result with the “Corrupt Bargain” (textbook) to name a few, that made the results much higher then the previous election. In the case of Robert V. Remini, I agree with the notion that Jackson could relate more to the “common man” and that him being a non-Virginian made it easier for voters to vote for him. Another element that I believed played a role in the higher election results was the previous election “Corrupt Bargain,” which gave voters more reason to vote.

In both cases, I feel that the authors are defining “Democratic revolt of the people” or “mighty democratic uprising” as the Democratic party rose to a new power through a majority of the voters (McCormick, Remini.) This is where I sway to Richard P. McCormick reasoning, in that the Democrats really did not rise to power but were established as powerful party in the government and that they established a presents in the presidency (McCormick.) I like the way that Richard P. McCormick uses statistics in past and future elections to justify his resoning. I belive that both authors use good logical reasoning to make their case, but if you define the words “Democratic revolt of the people” in terms of how the authors seem to define it, I still sway to Richard P McCormicks case.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828, Define "Democratic Revolt of the People".

by Caleb Pruitt - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 1:53 PM

You say that "Democrats really did not rise to power," but Dr. Escobar clearly pointed out in his Tuesday lecture that this election spurred the Democratic party to become the major party, a fact that stayed true all the way until 1860 and the rise of the Republican party. There is clearly something pivotal about this election and the changing mindset of

the people. I think it may be slightly shallow to simply acknowledge Jackson's character, the fact he's not the first President to be from not only being born outside of Virginia and Massachusetts or any of the original 13 colonies, let alone many other qualities already stated, and not relate this to the question at hand. You even point out Clay and Adams's Corrupt Bargain saying it "gave voters more reason to vote," but I think that the Corrupt Bargain gave voters incentive to vote for Jackson after seeing how their current dominant party had manipulated the previous election. Outrage at the 1824 election I think definitely had some impact on the 1828 election, spurring this Democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828, Define "Democratic Revolt of the People".

by Patrick Rugel - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 5:46 PM

I defiantly agree that the election of 1828 was point that gave that Democratic party momentum and was the point in history that made democrats a nationally favored party (tue. lecture.) However, I see "Democratic Revolt of the People" being defined two ways ; 1) The Democratic party rising to power, where yes the Democratic party was favored nationally ;2) Eligible voters exercising their right of democracy (the power of voting), Which is were McCormick places his argument that the potential in numbers of voters was there in previous elections and in fact the "new democracy" happened in 1840 (McCormick 212.) Based on the second definition, I agree with McCormick that in-fact the "Democratic Revolt of the People" came later in the election of 1840 (McCormick 214.) However, I do agree that the election of 1828 was a pivotal point for the Democratic party and for the way eligible voters started voting.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828, Define "Democratic Revolt of the People".

by Ryan Freire - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 6:38 PM

The big difference to me is in the definition of eligible voters. The 15 years leading up to the 1828 election was the time period where the bulk of the removal of property ownership and religious requirements on whether you were allowed to vote were removed.

Most of that change had already happened by 1840, the electorate had basically been solidified to include wage workers and the poor.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828, Define "Democratic Revolt of the People".

by Patrick Rugel - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 4:21 PM

I see what you are saying but looking at it from McCormick's point of view; although voting rights had mobilized voters in six states to over 70% participation, prior elections show ten states bettering 70% participation in the presidential election. So I agree it did allow for easier voting but statistically show the effect could have been greater then it was. Good point to bring up though.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



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

by Morgan Brown - Monday, January 23, 2017, 7:40 PM

Although there may not have been a "new democracy," as fairly well proven by Richard P. McCormick, one could still call it a democratic revolt of sorts, largely due to the fact that Jackson was something totally new from any president before him. Jackson was not involved in the revolution, he was not from any of the original colonies, and had started his career as a soldier. Essentially he was, in the eyes of the people, a true outsider to the political system. This alone shaped the form of the democracy in the U.S. to come, proving to the masses that the power was truly under the control of the people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



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

by Isaac Rossberg - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 7:05 PM

These things don't seem much like a revolt. A revolt to me seems like a group of people rising up and overthrowing an existing government. The very fact that the people used the regular voting system to peacefully vote in a candidate seems as if it was just a normal election. Just because he wasn't from the 13 original colonies doesn't make this election anything special. It was just time for that to happen and it just happened to be Andrew Jackson who was the one to be first. While the Jacksonian era did shape the political party system we have today, it was him that was special, not the election.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Timberly Thomas - Monday, January 23, 2017, 9:52 PM

I must say I agree more with Robert V. Remini than I do with Richard McCormick. I believe so many people voted that year because of the same thing that happened with Obama. Everyone wanted something new and different. As the handout says, "Although there continued to be personal factions and cliques operating within the system, and while party organization did not advance in every state with equal rapidity, still in 1828 there was the beginning of a genuine, nationally organized, two-party system..." (handout 2). Not only was there a new part, but Jackson was just a nobody who brought himself up. People voted for him because he gave them hope, if a nobody can become the president then they can become whoever they want to be. I do not believe that so many people voted for him because of his believes, they voted for his accomplishments.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Timberly Thomas - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 11:38 AM

I apologize, I have seem to have mixed up the names. I agree with Richard McCormick, not Robert V. Remini. I do not believe this election was a revolt. Like I said before the people where not rebelling, they where voting because Jackson was something new.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Caleb Pruitt - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 7:00 PM

"They were voting because Jackson was 'something new.'" Isn't that precisely what a revolution is? Oddly enough I just happen to have a republished copy of the 1828 edition of Noah Webster's "American Dictionary of the Language" (published April 14, 1828). Under the word "revolt" the first description it gives is: "Desertion; change of sides". Is that not what voting for Jackson as "something new" is? The 1828 people were undoubtedly deserting from their hitherto political practices? I shall refrain from superfluous description of the differences from his preceding politicians; however, he was neither Federalist nor Democratic-Republican unlike all his predecessors. If this is not a "change of sides," than I know not what is.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Caleb Pruitt - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 8:10 PM

Excuse me, I should say "American Dictionary of the English Language" rather.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Timberly Thomas - Friday, January 27, 2017, 10:53 AM

I understand where you are coming from, but I still stand by what i say. I have this believe because I am am putting my self back into that time and thinking what would I have done. Now on I diffrent note I ask if you want to reply please change your tone becouse I was affended. I respect your opinion and I expect you to do the same for me.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Morganne Roy - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 5:33 PM

The discussion we're having on this forum is our modern assessment of a historical event. If we're getting into dictionary definitions, I believe a contemporary definition of revolt is more relevant. We have not been asked to decipher their understanding of the events, rather ours.

The definition of revolt is currently, a "rise in rebellion". Rebellion being defined as, "an act of violent or open resistance to an established government or ruler."

Seeing as how 1828 didn't culminate in political violence, I think it's safe to say that-- by the definition-- McCormick's position is readily verified.

However, I don't think the answer should be as simple as that. The heart of this debate doesn't boil down so easily to a misunderstanding of dictionary definitions. Remini qualifies his use of the word revolt with "democratic"-- possibly anticipating the counter-arguments and misrepresentations of his view. I think when Remini looks at this event he sees an uprising of the common man that changed the political discourse in an enduring way.

I see this as an appropriate, but unsatisfactory view. When one considers the election of 1828 in light of 1824, the Corrupt Bargain, and the fact that voting restrictions had been steadily disappearing, I find it much more reasonable to

agree with McCormick. Andrew Jackson's presidency had been a long time coming, and it wasn't simply because the American people felt like changing things up capriciously. There was deep seated anger and resentment from the Corrupt Bargain, where people felt they had been cheated out of the president they voted for; as well as a steady income of voters who valued the fact that Jackson had accomplishments behind his name, not just more names like Adams.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



The election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people

by James Jennings - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:02 PM

The election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people by starting the two-party system which established a way for the common voter to find representation in politics. While there are success and shortcomings of a two-party system it has aloud for political discourse to change and evolve as time has passed, making sure that the wishes of the voters is the primary purpose for attaining any political office. With the right to vote rapidly expanding to include almost all white men it more than doubled voter turnout from 3.4% in 1824 to 9.5% in 1828. This increase in the number of people able to vote and the election of the first president not from either Massachusetts or Virginia represented a change in political discourse equatable to a democratic revolution of the people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people

by Morgan Brown - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 11:51 PM

As you yourself said, the right to vote was increased to encompass more voters than ever before, so therefore the increase in voting rate is due to this fact. Would you still call this a democratic revolution, as the increase in voting, the massive change in politics, was not due to a change in mentality or politics, but instead due to the lighter voting laws? Is this a true "revolution," in your mind? To me, a revolution would need to be an attempt by the people to overthrow an existing government, but yet the voting increase is clearly not due to excitement over Jackson. To me, this is not a revolution, although I would agree with your point on the importance of a president not from Massachusetts or Virginia.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

Re: The election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people



by Covita Hughes - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 11:10 PM

After reading all of these posts and arguments for both sides, the compromising centrist in me is coming out. I really can see how each side has a valid definition or at least perspective of a form of revolt. I'm wondering if I am getting "stuck on a word" or the phrasing of the word and if that is leading me to side with McCormick. Can it be though that there may not be a "right" answer? I am looking forward to viewing the supplemental videos on the subject so that I may further evaluate my first instinct to choose McCormick's side.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Political responsibility

by Ryan Freire - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 4:54 PM

I fall more in line with the thoughts of Remini as regards when the people assumed political responsibility. For one, the election of 1828 was the closest election to the removal of property ownership in the majority of the country and an influx of new voters will always rock the political boat, especially when the concerns of those voters are different than those of the previous selection of those able to vote. Non property owners being given suffrage basically amounts to allowing the poor to have a voice in government at that time. You can see its effects by Jackson winning the election, someone popular with the common man, unassociated with the American aristocracy of Virginia and the northeast.

The fact that he was such a national candidate, winning states from all over the nation emphasizes this. People were finally willing to put aside regional loyalties.

McCormick's take has some good points, but I would argue that the election of 1840's massive turnout was simply a continuation of the growth in voter turnout that began in 1828. I also dispute the idea that well established political parties are a necessary sign of political responsibility. They are a powerful tool for organization and turnout, but it's easy for people to fall into voting party line down the line without knowledge of the issues, or even the candidate. That doesn't speak to me of responsibility, but efficiency.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



1828 and 2016

by Morganne Roy - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 7:39 AM

One thing I've been thinking about while learning about Andrew Jackson has been the parallels between him and the now President Trump. Both had/have uncouth personalities and were/are divisive political figures who represent the "common man". I've also heard a

lot of commentary about how this past election was a 'revolt' against the ruling and corrupt political class. This sounds similar to Remini's argument that the 1828 election was the people rising up to change the established order.

Yet I think neither 1828 nor 2016 were revolts. Republicans have been gaining political ground all across the country for the last 4+ years. There are only a handful states (Oregon being one of them) that still have both a Democratic governor and legislature. This election result was a long time coming. I think the dramatic increase in voter turnout for 1828 was similar, in the sense that people had wanted a Jackson presidency for years.

I think the word revolt tends to describe an event whose nature is spontaneous and often violent. In the same way, I think the word revolution can be accurately applied to the French Revolution, but doesn't quite capture the spirit of the American War for Independence.

Both 1828 and 2016 are the culmination of events that were sown long before the flower bloomed. It wasn't a random revolt that came in the heat of passion, but rather a slow boiling anger that had been festering for a long time, which finally gave way to a figurehead who could channel that anger.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: 1828 and 2016

by Covita Hughes - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 11:14 PM

Yes!!!

The similarities between Jackson and Trump are uncanny!

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828- Age of Jackson Videos

by Patrick Rugel - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 3:46 PM

Both videos were interesting and seem to sway to the idea that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the people based on what was talked about. However, after watching both videos I still sway to McCormick's side that the election was not a democratic revolt of the people, based on the fact that potential vote that was seen in state election level was not there in the presidential election of 1828 (McCormick 211-212.)

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



by Amelia Salzman - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 5:46 PM

I think Morganne raised an interesting point about Jackson and Trump and the 2016 election. I agree with you that neither 1828 nor 2016 were revolts by the American people. Although Adams and Jackson were very different, I wonder if election of 1828 held the same impact for Americans with it passing from one Democrat to the other. I feel that we are too early into the trump presidency to really say how their presidencies are different or similar. However in terms of comparing elections, I wonder whether you could compare 2016 to the election of 1824. I think an argument could be made for the election of 1824 because of the debate of the Electoral College. Although Andrew Jackson won the popular vote he didn't win the presidency. Either way it's impossible to not see that both election hold relevance today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

Taking Sides - Election of 1828 ►

 Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)

