



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](#)

◀ [Age of Jackson Videos](#)

[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](#)

Objectively, no



by Kyle Quinoveva - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 4:00 PM

I'm going to start this post with the caveat that since McCormick's sources for his statistics are not listed I am going to hereby assume that all data sources are credible, accurate and relatively consistent with other credible sources. With that in mind I agree with McCormick's argument that the Election of 1828 was not a "democratic revolt of the people" as Remini argues. McCormick asserts, among eligible voters, the relative turnouts of 1828 and 1832 were lower than those in the 1840s (Pg. 212) and while it represented an overall high it only broke turnout records in a handful of states (Pg. 211), which in turn were almost all broken in the later elections. To me this is the most convincing evidence that objectively the election of 1828 was not some roaring flood of new democracy but instead a rather moderate turnout.

I do feel that one could argue that, subjectively, from the perspective of most people at the time it was certainly viewed as a democratic revolt or that the aftermath of the election had a massive cultural or political impact. However in actuality as far as voting numbers and their implications go, this was a fairly insignificant or average event.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Objectively, no

by Katherine Fjordbeck - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 6:56 PM

I agree with what you stated in your argument. McCormick shows that there are clear statistics of what happen in the 1828 election and a flooding democratic revolt was not one of them. Like it says in Richard P. McCormick's piece "New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics" "In the years from the beginning of the government to 1824, a period for which we have no reliable election statistics, only small numbers of citizens seemed to have bothered to go to the polls." This shows that there's no legitimate proof that there was a revolt for democrats. No one even bothered to go to the polls in the first place, let alone care for who won. The only time people got mad was when Jackson didn't win the first time he ran because of a fraud that's when people argued but there wasn't a full on revolt it seems.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Objectively, no

by Micaela Willey - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 11:35 PM

I like that you continued to strengthen my initial argument. I would like to add to yours. You did a really good job at just looking at the numbers in the elections after the election of 1828 as well as what happened to the numbers of voter turnout in the 1828 election which really reminded me of the graph that Mr. Escobar showed the class on Monday. Moreover, I believe that Andrew Jackson was a well-liked guy at the time of his election as I think it is important to note how Jackson was liked across the board and won states in the East, West, North and South; and in the elections that followed that, the Presidents who he followed had similar turnouts and it wasn't until that split in the voter turnouts that the civil war began (Escobar). I believe all of this is evidence supporting that Jackson was not the start of a revolt but was the start of a new America to come, and his election was just one of the factors leading up to the actual revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Objectively, no

by Micaela Willey - Friday, January 27, 2017, 9:29 PM

Jackson was a well-liked guy and when he did not win the election of 1824 because of slander and tricky behavior (textbook) from the other two candidates, it angered the mass majority who wanted Jackson to win. However, with the help of print campaign ads as well as other political advancements and as Remini notes "this was an age of developing professionalism in all fields-- including politics" (Remini 204) which leads one to believe that the election of 1828 was not about a revolt but just Jackson finally being able to get the office of presidency that so many believed he should have won back in 1824, as well as changes in the the way the media and such worked to increase the amount of people going to the polls.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Objectively, no

by Bailey Koffler - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 6:15 PM

I agree with your stance on this issue. Looking at the data as whole I think the 1828, being a fairly insignificant or average event, could have been the starting point of the democratic revolution. There was a significant leap in voter turnout from the 1828 election, compared to the 1824 election. After looking at the table of Pre-Civil War Voter Turnout (In Class), that leap seemed lesser compared the leap of the 1840 election.

Because Jackson seemed to be a different type of presidential candidate, people were interested in him and his promotion of the "common man". I believe this could have sparked the interest of people who may not have participated in politics before.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Objectively, no

by Anthony Aviles - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 8:12 PM

For these arguments to be logically sound, I agree we must assume the evidence, facts and figures presented are accurate and correct. It is correct, a main point presented by McCormick is the sheer number of voters that vote during the 1840 election far surpasses the 1828 election (Pg 210) in terms of population and total voter count. However, the analyzing the chart presented to us by Mr. Escobar, we can observe an increase of around 25% to 55% in voter turnout for the 1828 election compared to the 55% to 75% in 1840 compared to the 1828. The 1828 election represented at least a 100% increase in total voter turnout compared to a 50% increase for the 1840 election.

The 1828 election is largely due to the fact that many voting legislation was loosened and now more able citizens (white males) could vote during the 1828 election which most importantly created a trend, more citizens were voting. Emigration also played a pivotal role in increased votes during 1840. During the 1840's-1850's, there was a large influx of Europeans specifically Jews, Irish and Italians who were now being classified as "white" and were able to vote.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



A Mighty Democratic Uprising

by Katherine Fjordbeck - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 10:52 PM

"Granted that a majority of the voters in 1828 favored Jackson, it is not evident his partisans stormed the polls any more enthusiastically than did the Adams men."(A New Perspective on Jacksonian Politics, Richard McCormick) I believe that there wasn't a democratic uprising when Jackson was elected for president, I believe that people may have been more involved in the act of voting. Yet, there's no proven evidence that he himself and his election started a "mighty democratic uprising".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: A Mighty Democratic Uprising

by Keenan Calhoun - Monday, January 23, 2017, 2:10 PM

That is a good point. However, couldn't a Democratic revolution be based on more than just the enthusiasm of voters? You are right, both sides of the election most likely went to the polls with the same levels of enthusiasm to elect their candidate, but look at the map of electoral votes of the previous election in 1824. There are four different colors on that map, 4 different populations who are all trying to get their man into office. Then if you look at the map for the election of 1828, there is only two. So, while there may not have been an uprising in the emotions or enthusiasm of the people, the election of 1828 was unprecedented in its black and white outcome of the electoral college. What do you think?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: A Mighty Democratic Uprising

by Katherine Fjordbeck - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:56 PM

I still am having troubles thinking that there was an uprising for a presidency. People voted on the man that they felt deserved it. Yet, I still have trouble believing that people would revolt in such a fashion, now it's much more common for such protests, but I feel people were more enthusiastic because they wanted their man to win but I don't believe there was a revolt. You have some really good points though and I really appreciate the maturity you're showing.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Voters use power to remove New England elite from capitol

by Keenan Calhoun - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 9:47 PM

I think the election of 1828 did represent a revolt in the people, because a majority of the American people rose up and cast the New England elites out of the capitol after the "corrupt bargain" in the election of 1824. The fact that Andrew Jackson was the first president to not come from New England is a testament to this political revolt. Even after John Adams attempted to alienate Jackson by revealing his personal life and identify Jackson as a wild and lawless frontiersman (which he was), the people still utilized their rights as voters to elect the candidate they believed in.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Election of 1828 was a "Democratic Revolt"

by Bailey Davis - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 10:40 PM

I agree with Robert V. Ramini, author of "Election of 1828," that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. After losing the election of 1824 because of what Andrew Jackson called a "Corrupt Bargain" between Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams, Jackson began campaigning for the common man. The scandal of the Corrupt Bargain, mixed with Jackson's charisma, attracted a lot of attention. Martin Van Buren saw this as an opportunity to revitalize the Old Republican party, and he convinced many other political figures to show support for Jackson in order to reel in votes. According to Richard P. McCormick, who wrote "New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics", only 26.5 percent of the eligible voting population cast votes during the 1824 election. However, in 1828, those numbers surged to 56.3 percent of the eligible voting population. This outpouring of men who wanted to express their voice and be involved in their politics could certainly be described as a "democratic revolt," especially considering that they believed they were electing a "self-made" man of the people, not another corrupt politician.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 was a "Democratic Revolt"

by Alec Beebe - Friday, January 27, 2017, 12:26 PM

You are correct with your data, but there is more behind that data that swayed my opinion toward McCormick. Yes there was an average voter turnout of 56.4% in 1824 but the majority of the states during the 1828 election was the same as the previous 1824 election (Taking sides page 211). There is also the argument that the democratic revolt of the people didn't occur till 1840 due to the fact that there was no incentive to vote during 1828 due to Andrew Jackson's clear popular choice of the people. People didn't feel the need to vote and therefore didn't. Also, a lot of Remini's arguments seem to be based more on the character of Andrew Jackson and the absence of significant numbers data makes McCormick's argument seem more complete.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 was a "Democratic Revolt"

by Bailey Davis - Friday, January 27, 2017, 2:11 PM

I definitely agree with you, McCormick's argument is incredibly well written and backed up compared with Ramini's. And yes, some states hadn't seen an incline in voter turnout between 1824 and 1828. However, the average percentage of active voters across the nation more than doubled in 1828(McCormick, 211), which means that there was indeed a spike in interest. Additionally, I can't argue with you, there was a rise in voters twelve years later, where 78 percent of people showed up to vote

in the 1840 election(McCormick, 212). This is impressive, and definitely could be considered a revolt or uprising, but does it make the booming interest in 1828 any less of one?

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



Re: Election of 1828 was a "Democratic Revolt"

by Alec Beebe - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:59 AM

I think of the 1828 election as a stepping stone towards 1840. Yes 1828 was significant, but the major change in which a bigger population voted is why i believe 1840 was the democratic revolt.

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



More voters became qualified!

by Andrew Erkert - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 2:01 PM

As we discussed in class, a few states removed the voter qualifications that required people to own a home or have specific tax-paying qualifications (Chart from Week 3 lecture images). This idea certainly supports McCormick's view of the election and it goes to show the numbers have inflated meaning. More people could vote in major areas and this election happened to have a candidate that was an outsider to typical candidates of the past so it had a refreshing tone to the American voters. I believe that the only convincing point Remini has is that Jackson was a very different candidate and people liked that. In total though, the numbers certainly overwhelm this point but it certainly established a base for a new era of voting.

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Alec Beebe - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:15 AM

Yes, I believe that the 1828 presidential election symbolized people becoming politically responsible along with the two party system coming of age in the 1830's. 1826 marked the end of the revolutionary generations' control over American politics meaning that a new generation of leaders were about to take their place. The election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 was the first time that the Democratic party has had its own voice. A picture from the lecture on Thursday showed the time of the creation of the Democratic party and the

Whigs, who would be later know as Republicans. During the 1830's, the idea of the current parties formed which is why I believe that the 1830's marked the coming of age for the two party system. People became politically responsible due to their overall involvement in politics. One great example for this is the voter turnout during the 1828 election. The number of people who voted had doubled since the last election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Election 1828- Not a Revolt

by Micaela Willey - Monday, January 23, 2017, 7:47 PM

No, the Election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people. Remini offers a weak argument in support of an 1828 democratic revolt. He acknowledges that Jackson was a national hero at the time and Martin Van Buren capitalized on this popularity by jumping on Jackson's bandwagon and using Jackson's popularity to help reestablish a two-party system that focused the populace on the election itself. In fact, party principles were not central in either party's rhetoric during the election, so this election was far from a revolt about anything (Remini 205). The parties were able to get out more votes by organizing in the states, printing more ballots and also having a very charismatic candidate in Jackson who also happened to look very "presidential" (Remini 206) So although it might look like a revolt externally because of the high voter turnout (textbook), it was more of a popular nod to Andrew Jackson instead and a result of the parties themselves getting organized enough to recruit more voters and get them to the polls. However, McCormack strengthens the idea that there was no democratic revolt further by refuting Remini's claim that the turnout was historically high in the first place by examining numerous historical records (McCormack 210-11). Either way, I believe that the election of 1828 was more historically significant in the emergence of professional, career politicians who chose to back a popular candidate that they felt would further their political causes rather than excite the people to back their causes.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Election 1828- Not a Revolt

by Anthony Aviles - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 8:49 PM

You are correct to assume that Remini did believe that the common populace of America during the 1820's viewed Jackson was a national hero and many Van Buren used him as a platform to establish a reformed republican party that focused on Jeffersonian principles. McCormick does refute the astronomical voter turnout by Andrew Jackson's (McCormick 210). He goes onto to describe the 1828 election. Although the vote by

general public was high, electorate voted more on state affairs than national affairs but why is that? This is true but the state had substantially more power to influence the public than the federal government had at the time. As Supreme court cases started ruling against the state, displaying the newfound power of the federal government, the general populace began to vote more often to protect their interests. For example Gibbons v. Ogden was a decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States stating that the power to control interstate commerce was to the jurisdiction of the federal government by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. Therefore, as federal government gained more control into the daily life of American citizens, citizens began to voice their opinion. And the largest increase based on percentage is during the 1828 election.

P.S. Also McCormick is the author not McCormack, not trying to be rude!

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Andrew Erkert - Monday, January 23, 2017, 8:52 PM

After reading these two points of view on the matter, I found myself leaning towards McCormick's view on it. I do not think it was a Democratic Revolt of the people. I see it as an overvalued set of results that is far too heavily based on Jackson being "charismatic" and "common." Remini seemed to rely on these ideas and the large voter turnout, relative to the election of 1824 for most of his points. I do agree that people saw it as an opportunity to reset Washington's continuing process of electing from specific regions by adding an outsider from the west. I think Remini is right in that regard that after the Corrupt Bargain, people were motivated to get their vote out but McCormick's statistical analysis certainly has a well-proposed argument. It does a disservice to elections of the past when you analyze the major percentages of votes versus number of eligible voters. I agree with McCormick that this was not a Democratic revolt of the people and that it only set the stage for the Two Party establishment of U.S. politics.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People? NO!

by Bailey Koffler - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:22 PM

I don't believe the 1828 election represented a democratic revolt because there is not sufficient evidence to support that more voters participated in the 1828 election than ever before.

In the article it states that "abundant data on pre-1832 elections is available, and it indicates a far higher rate of voting than has been realized." (McCormick 210) In order to determine whether or not there was a significant increase in voter turnout in the 1828 election, turnout from pre and post-1828 election needed to be analyzed. This was done by determining the percentage of eligible voters (most likely adult white males, at the time) who casted a vote. After determining this figure, it was found that voter participation doubled in 1828 from the previous election. "But this outpouring shrinks in magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new high in voter participation established...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." (McCormick 211)

It was determined that an average of 56.3 percent of eligible voters participated for all states in the 1828 election, however, fifteen of the twenty two states exceeded that percentage in the pre-1824 elections. Therefore, the Jacksonian era did not attract a higher voter turnout than previous elections.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People? NO!

by Keenan Calhoun - Friday, January 27, 2017, 9:24 PM

You make really good points, but you're only looking at one aspect of the election. The election could have been a revolt based more on just the number of voters. The map of electoral college votes for the election of 1828 shows that there were two clear parties in the election which was one of the first representations of the two-party system we know today. Andrew Jackson himself was an unprecedented historical figure, having been the first elected president to come from outside of New England. Not only did he win, he was a national candidate, receiving electoral votes from the north, west, and south. While the election of 1828 may not have been a revolt based in sheer numbers of voters, I think it was a revolt because of the political organization of the Democratic party to get electoral voters for Jackson from all over the country. What are your thoughts?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People? NO!

by Bailey Koffler - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 6:06 PM

I agree that due to the beginning of the two party system and Jackson receiving votes from across the country many changes were happening during this election. Those are both very important and valid claims. However, I still wouldn't consider the 1828 election a Democratic Revolt of the people, more so I might go as far to say it

was the starting point of the revolution. "It was in 1840, then, that the "roaring flood of the new democracy" reached its crest. And it engulfed the Jacksonians."

(McCormick pg. 213) I think the 1828 was the beginning of the democratic revolution, but the peak didn't happen, in my opinion, until 1840. I think Andrew Jackson was a huge figure in the revolution because voter turnout increased significantly during his election time. In 1828, the voter turnout was under 60% and in 1840 it was around 80%. (Pre Civil War Voter Turnout Slide) I focused solely on the numbers of this election because Democratic Revolution, as defined by Wikipedia is "a political science term denoting a revolution in which a democracy is instituted." and democracy, also defined by Wikipedia, "is a system of government in which the citizens exercise power directly or elect representatives from among themselves to form a governing body.". I felt it was appropriate to focus on the numbers of this election because citizens elect representatives in a democracy and its important to know how many of the citizens helped make this decision.

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



The Democratic Revolution of 1828

by Anthony Aviles - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:36 PM

I would agree with Robert V. Remini that the Election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people. Jackson's ordinary upbringing and fruitfulness as a military leader portrayed to the citizens of America that any individual can change their nation and their surroundings. This lead to an establishment of the two-party system, a dramatic increase in people voting, and actively engaged citizens. In a letter to Ritchie, Van buren urged Radicals to join his coalition and create a two-party system (Pg. 2). It was evident that Americans viewed the United States as different sectors (west,south,north) and the majority of the general population shared a common viewpoint on the direction in which they intended the country to advance. Parties were established by 1828 as the National Republicans faced the Democratic Republicans.

A pivotal example of the voting power that is displayed in the essay as well as our textbook is the areas in which Jackson won. He won in all sectors of the United States, including New England (Pg.3) in which a majority of the population was "National Republican". The population was also more active in voting in 1828. In Pennsylvania alone, participation in voting rose from 47,000 to 152,000 (Pg.3). The large increase in voting is due in part for a multitude of reasons. The two established parties enabled two people to voted for versus the plethora of parties in the election of 1824. Another reason is the use of the advancement of the printing press. The steam press which was first sold to the Tlmes in 1814 help to begin the long process of making newspapers available to a mass audience. This as a result was used by both parties to spread the information about each party. Lastly, "four states, representing a considerable electorate, changed their laws and transferred the election of electors from the legislator to the people" (Pg,3).

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Sum of ratings:3 (1)



Re: The Democratic Revolution of 1828

by Alec Beebe - Friday, January 27, 2017, 12:41 PM

Some of the arguments against your point of view is that Pennsylvania's votes did triple, but McCormick stated that the majority of the states had the same voter turnout as the previous presidential election in 1824. Only in 1840 did the majority of the states break previous voting records (Taking sides page 214). The printing press also had an effect on the election but I believe that it could have kept people more informed of the clear popular choice during the election. On page 213 of the 'Taking Sides' document, it states that people had almost no incentive to vote on the election due to information that Andrew Jackson would be the clear victor. Why vote when you know who is going to win?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Election of 1828 was a Democratic revolt of the people.

by Tanner Bull - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:53 PM

In the election of 1828 a change in politics emerged. The typical Democrat and Republican party that we are familiar with today was showcased with the Jackson-Calhoun-Van Buren coalition as the democrats and the republicans by Adams-Clay. These parties demonstrated a more formal agenda where democrats were for state power, while republicans were for federal power.

The election of 1828 did represent a Democratic Revolt of the People due the great showing of the American people in favor for Andrew Jackson as the new president from the democrat party with a 56% popular vote win against John Quincy Adams. Comparing the elections of 1824 to 1828 the total popular vote increased by nearly 800,000 deliberately presenting the voter outcome was tremendous and the people of America wanted change with their newly elected Democratic president, Andrew Jackson. (Remini, 206)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 was a Democratic revolt of the people.

by Tanner Bull - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:30 PM

Continuing my earlier argument that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt by the people by looking at the opposing side. In Richard P. McCormick's well detailed analysis it seems to me some of the numbers don't hold validity. For instance, on page 211 of McCormick's argument he states, "The average voter participation for all states in 1828 was 56.3 percent. Before 1824 fifteen of the twenty-two states had surpassed that percentage." While this seems like a great feat, he fails to mention in which each state had met that mark and in which election prior. By simply implying that all had been made in one election is not correct. Looking at the numbers including the 1824 election, McCormick is saying that only one of the fifteen states would have had to surpass the 56.3 percentage in the ten prior elections to qualify to better the average voter turnout of the 1828 election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Alec Beebe - Friday, January 27, 2017, 12:13 PM

After further reading and research, I change my mind on the debate regarding the election of 1828. I agree with McCormick with the belief that the democratic revolt didn't occur till 1840. The facts supporting this argument far outweigh Remini and his idea that the democratic revolt occurred in 1828. McCormick stated, on page 211, that the majority of states had roughly the same voter turnout as in the 1824 presidential election. From 1824-1832, there was also evidence stating that voter turnout for governors was greater than that of the presidential election (Taking sides page 212). Page 213 says that voter turnout was lower due to the fact that the clear winner for the election was Andrew Jackson which led to an incentive to actually go and vote. Only in 1840 did voter turnout increase to the point in which there were new voting turnout records for the majority of the states (Taking sides page 214). This evidence is why, now, I believe that a democratic revolt of the people didn't occur till 1840.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

