



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

Age of Jackson Videos ▶

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](#)

Voter turn-out and the roll it didn't play.



by Joshua Grigsby - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 2:57 PM

After reading the provided material, I found myself unsure of which stance to subscribe to. Both Remini and McCormick make compelling cases for their beliefs. Upon my evaluation, however, I am led to side with facts over opinion and Remini's article has almost exhausted my brain with the amount of facts he spews out onto the page. I have been compelled to believe that the election of 1828 did not, in fact, demonstrate political responsibility or an "organized" two party system. The facts just are not present. There is this claim that voter turn out for the election of 1828 significantly rose and that it was the "people" that elected Jackson. We are informed of this misconception in Remini's argument on page 211. When he elaborates on the statistics of the 1828 election in comparison to prior and latter elections. He states that only six of the twenty-two states involved reached voter highs. Furthermore within those six, three states shouldn't even be considered because the turn out wasn't that much more than in previous years and then the fourth (New York) had changed the legislation allowing more individuals to vote. He goes on to present his case stating that the voter increase was not that much higher than in the election of 1824. In conclusion, I am convinced that although there was an increase in the amount of people who showed up to the election of 1828. That increase is not significant enough to state that Andrew Jackson's first term in office was the beginning of this new, organized, responsible two party system. I mean come on, the mans success created a party so intense the white house has not seen one since. I can hardly deem that "responsible" behavior.

To refute, however, one could argue that because of the fact Jackson was elected alone and the statement that his success made to the nation proves that the election of 1828 marks the beginning of a peoples democracy. He was an "outsider" and he did appeal to the common man. Furthermore, the intensity of the riot that ensued after his election clearly states how much support he had from the people of this young nation. That argument would hold ground, had the debate been centered around his popularity to the average voter. It is based off this that I am obligated to side with Remini.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Voter turn-out and the roll it didn't play.

by Joshua Grigsby - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:29 PM

If you're confused after reading my book. I accidentally mixed the authors of the articles up in my head. my bad.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



No, Jackson elections didn't draw voters to polls

by Mat Forcum - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 8:45 PM

I agree with the opinion of the author of the article **New Perspective on Jacksonian politics**, by Richard P. McCormick, it is pointed out that “none of the Jackson elections involved a “mighty democratic uprising” in the sense that voters were drawn to the pool in unprecedented numbers.”(pg 214) The author points to the actual number of possible voters as I compares to the number of ballots cast. He compares the elections before, during and after the elections which involved Jackson. I agree with this opinion because it looks at the numbers and draws a conclusion based on the information available. The story of a successful Jackson as a people’s president accompanied with the unusual mannerisms of mellow the dramatic publicity of the 1824 election uncommon in U.S. politics. . This might give the impression that Jackson indeed brings in a wave of new voters, but there is not hard data to back such a claim. The McCormick states that “when compared to the peak participation recorded for each state before 1824.....particularly with the vast outpouring of electorate in 1840, voter participation in the Jackson elections was unimpressive.”(214) American politics clearly went through rapid change during the Jackson elections, but it is not clear the Jackson had a huge impact on voter turnout.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The election of 1828 is the beginning of the formation of the two party system.

by Luis Huidobro - Monday, January 23, 2017, 1:39 PM

After reading the selection provided, I agree with Robert V. Remini's view of the 1828 election as a sign of the people's arrival at political responsibility and the coming of age of the two party system. In pg 379 of the textbook it goes into detail on describing the election between Jackson and Adams. Adams launched a full political attack against Jackson's personal and military life This also can be seen during most elections after 19th century where political rivals attack one another on personal life issues and presented them to the American public. With federalist and democrats fighting for their candidate, its much like our modern two party system.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The election of 1828 is the beginning of the formation of the two party system.

by Michael Gray - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 3:23 PM

Wow. Your connection to elections after the 19th century was very thoughtful and I can totally understand why it could have been a revolt from your standpoint. This years election drives your example home with how much personal backlash was put out by both candidates. I like your example and how it coincides with today's two party system, but didn't parties always fight for their candidate?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: The election of 1828 is the beginning of the formation of the two party system.

by Joshua Grigsby - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 12:21 AM

As true as the personal attacks on Jackson were, I fail to see how your point relates to a democratic revolt. I will agree with you, it is no small feat to dominate the popular vote after such things have been said. Based off that logic, however, it is clear that candidates can win elections regardless of which side says what. Thus, if anyone could do it, wouldn't Jackson's election be worth that much less? Furthermore, as great as a man as Jackson may have been, he proved to be an immature president. Ignoring the supreme court whenever it attempted to disagree with him is hardly responsible behavior. The leader of such a responsible revolt would never conduct himself in such a way. Wouldn't you agree? And although voter turnout did increase, and there was a pretty gnarly party the increase was hardly enough to be considered a revolt. What specific parts of the election of 1828 lead you to take your stance? I was and still am aware of where in the text book we can find the information. But I must have missed your personal opinion on the matter.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Ronald Graham - Monday, January 23, 2017, 6:39 PM

The article that I am agreeing with is Richard McCormick. American voters changed since the 1824 election, and the introduction of Jacksonian Democracy. McCormick takes a quote from a recent textbook that states that there is no reliable voter stats. McCormick disagrees with that, saying, "Abundant data is available, and it indicates a far higher rate of voting than has been realized.". McCormick goes into detail about the uprising of Jacksonian Democracy. He states that we cannot just look at the 1824 election, but prior elections, along with future. This will give us a more reliable statistic to work with. We wonder whether voter participation increased during the 1824 elections. The thought is, Andrew Jackson was a very popular candidate among the southern plantation owners, the

urban working man, and the average farmer. Having that as the majority of the voters at the time (since the minority was not allowed to vote: Women, African Americans) should most defiantly increase the voter turnout

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Ronald Graham - Friday, January 27, 2017, 9:09 PM

To further my point, the idea of voting was still relatively new to a lot of Americans. Andrew Jackson, being a candidate who appealed to much of the voting class (Urban farmers, southern plantation owners, etc.), not surprisingly saw an increase in voter turnout. The case being made for the other side is understandable. Coming off of the 1824 "corrupt" election, where John Quincy Adams made a pact with Henry Clay. Clay would assume the roll of Secretary of State if Adams won (the position of Secretary of State usually won the following presidential election). Adams took Clay's voters, and did indeed win. In result, the 1828 election could have been a revolt in order to avoid that exact situation. However, I believe Jackson was simply just the most popular candidate, and was voted as such.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Jackson Brings forth A Political Revolt

by William Barker - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:07 PM

Andrew Jackson, in the election of 1828, brought forth great political change and also an impressive voter turnout. Robert Remini, an American historian, argues that, "...Jackson had won a stupendous victory" (Schlesinger 206). In my eyes the election of 1828 reigned in the spirit of change and fostered a revolt against the political elite, which opened the doors for the common [white] man to have a say in government again.

I agree with Mr. Remini due to the evidence he provides in his essay *Election of 1828*. Remini brings up statistics about the election, which cast light on how tremendous this outpour of support for Jackson was. Remini says, "Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292," which was, "56 percent of the entire vote." (Schlesinger 206) I can back this up as well by cross referencing the numbers in our book *Liberty, Equality, Power: A History of the American People*. The book says, "Voter turnout was double what it had been in 1824, totaling 56.3 percent. Jackson won 56 percent of the popular vote." (381) Not to mention Jackson had won 178 electoral votes to Adams' 83, which was, "...unequalled in any presidential election during the nineteenth century" (Schlesinger 206).

With these numbers we can deduce that the spirit in people's hearts was that of a political overhaul and cleansing of the government. For too long had politicians used public office for their personal gains and cast aside the needs of the people. It's easy to see Jackson was a very popular presidential candidate who swept the electoral map and encouraged an increase of double the voters across the nation. Even if this election wasn't the culmination of the political revolution, it surely was a great start that eventually grew into a national movement.

Works Cited

Murrin, John M., et al. *Liberty Equality, Power: A History of the American People*. Seventh Edition, Cengage Advantage Books, 2008.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The coming to Power: Critical Presidential Elections in American History*. McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Jackson Brings forth A Political Revolt

by Joshua Grigsby - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 12:36 AM

I love how you brought up the defeat of the political elite. I hadn't thought of that. And I won't disagree with you either when you say that the election holds substantial weight.

However, in the instance of a successful revolt (the election of Jackson over Adams) there usually follows direct/significant change. I just have a hard time seeing what real changes lasted passed Jackson's terms in office. I mean the last revolt before the one we're currently talking about has long outlasted its founders. When the death of the Jacksonian democracy died at the latest when the south lost the civil war and the federal government took away their "private" property it's clear this revolution was not as revolutionizing as people had initially thought. I guess my stance is based off what followed the election and not just the election itself so that could be where we miss each other.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Jackson Brings forth A Political Revolt

by William Barker - Friday, January 27, 2017, 5:30 PM

I cannot deny the fact that voter turnout didn't stay in high numbers after Jackson's victory in 1828. But still, a non career politician won over the establishment in an election cycle. I believe we're all too reliant on numbers when looking at this particular issue, I think we need to go to the first hand accounts and listen to what the people of the time were saying, because revolutions aren't based on numbers but the spirit of the people who are participating in them.

"...Edward Everett of Massachusetts, one of Adams' most dedicated supporters in Congress, explained to his brother that the General won 'by a majority of more than *two* to *one*, an event astounding to the friends of the Administration and unexpected by the General himself and his friends... /They/ are embarrassed with the vastness of their triumph and the numbers of their party.'" (Schlesinger 207)

"'All our efforts,' said one of Clay's friends, 'have not withstood the Torrent.'" (Schlesinger 207)

Again I agree with you that the revolt didn't last after the election of 1828, but it was none the less a fantastic feat that left everyone stunned or very excited.

Works Cited

Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The coming to Power: Critical Presidential Elections in American History*. McGraw-Hill, 1972.

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Jarred Finn - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:09 PM

I'd say no because even though Jackson won the election there was no sort of revolt because at the time there was already two established political parties in which both were powerful parties. So there wasn't what i would call a revolt because there were two different types of people out voting to get there desired party in office.

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



No-Voting Turnout

by Megan Spencer - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:25 PM

I don't think that the election of 1828 represented a revolt of the people, because voting turnout for Jackson in 1828 was low. McCormick states that the "voter participation for all states in 1828 was 56.3 percent" (McCormick 8). While in the election of 1840, there was an increase in the amount of white males that voted, which was 78.0 percent. That's a 40

percent increase in the amount of voters (McCormick 9). I would think that to have a successful democratic revolt, there would have to be a large number of people, which according to the numbers, the election of 1828 was small, compared to the election of 1840.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: No-Voting Turnout

by Joshua Grigsby - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 12:47 AM

you're absolutely right. The number following the election drastically increase. But with those numbers did you consider potential population growth? I mean obviously as the years go on (especially 12 years) the amount of voter participation is going to increase.

Our population wasn't decreasing. Anyone would expect the numbers to rise through the years. Furthermore, Jackson won 56 percent of the popular vote and the vast majority of the electoral votes available. That was unheard of at his time. I think its also important to note that Jackson broke a chain of federalist/whig presidents where the political elite were favored. This election sent a huge message that things must change.

The people said it, rather loudly in the white house actually. If anything the numbers only prove how great that change was. The common man had found his voice and would continue to use it going into the rest of the century.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: No-Voting Turnout

by Matthew Brownlee - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:40 PM

I agree with your point. It's difficult to set parameters and concretely define a "democratic revolt," but the fact that the voting numbers didn't show a drastic shift indicates any significant revolt of the people. Jackson may very well have had a strong "brand" or identity with his supporters, but the democratic revolt doesn't seem like much more than the lines of discrimination shifting from class to race and, as Foner pointed out.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Devyn McCloud - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 12:02 AM

i would say no, professor of history Robert V Remini's argument was right on spot. He s

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Why the Election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt.

by Michael Gray - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 4:29 PM

The Author I most agree with was McCormick's piece disagreeing that the election of 1828 was a "democratic revolt of the people." Although I do agree with the points about the obvious change of the common man view of their participation in the elections and voter increase, I believe that better factors lie in that a real revolt would happen after the election of 1828 and Jackson's presidency.

As reiterated by McCormick many times, nothing had happened in the way of how we proceeded to elect that would make this election a revolt of democracy. The best arguments were that the privileges of the common man and the amount of votes casted by them, was a new factor that would change our democracy. As McCormick says on page 210, we need to take in consideration the amount of voters during the election, but most importantly before and after Jackson's presidency to see the effects of the entire situation. He also states that we would need to know what influence the election had in pulling in voters and support.

A definite reason for an increase in voters would constitute the idea of a democratic revolt besides voter increase. What I got from our textbook chapter, a democratic revolt is much easier justified when we have a much simpler two party system, with an even bigger voter increase. In the election of 1828, the participation percentage was around 50% of white males which was still a very healthy increase. As explained on page 211 however, only six of the 22 states were at new voting highs which made that jump in percentage from previous elections less of a big deal.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



NO

by Anthony Williams - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 2:01 PM

No, during the 1828 election there wasn't a revolt just a voter increase, many Common men believed that if Andrew Jackson was able to get to where he was at they could too, So many got behind his ideas and went to the voting booths, but 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 voter participation before, during, and after Jackson's presidency. Jackson's election also failed to bring to the polls the proportion of the electorate that had voted on occasion in previous election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Maclain O'Leary - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 9:57 PM

I agree that while the election of 1828 was a significant election in the fact that it brought significant change to the election, it was not a "revolution" so to speak. There were many factors that went into the changes that occurred in the 1828 election. For starters, it was one of the first elections that broadened the voting platform from exclusively being male, white, adult, landowners. So that in itself brought more people out to the voting platform than ever before as stated by Richard P. McCormick. And following the 1828 election, in the election of 1832, the advance did not carry on but stayed steady despite the fact that Jackson's popularity was at it's high. All these facts point to while there was much social change going on, there was no "Democratic uprising", and the upscale in voter turnout was due to the social changes that were going on in the time period.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Remini's Numbers Make a More Convincing Case

by Matthew Brownlee - Friday, January 27, 2017, 1:28 AM

Though both historians make compelling cases, I tend to agree with Remini more. He shows that the voting rates seldom increased significantly on a state-by-state basis, and in New York's case, the new rate could be attributed to fewer voting restrictions. This challenges the notion that Jackson's supporters flooded the polls. Remini also shows that state elections still generated higher turnout, as only 16 out of 50 gubernatorial elections between 1824 and 1832 had higher voting numbers for president than for governor (New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics). The narrative of Jackson's election being a democratic revolt in which the "common man" led an uprising is a nice narrative, but I feel that it's very difficult to provide solid evidence for such a narrative, especially when the actual statistics tell a different story.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



McCormic has a more logical argument

by Mat Forcum - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 4:27 PM

The argument that offers the most logical position would seem to be that of Richard P. McCormick, who focuses more on the numbers of electorates who turn out to vote as a measurement of the "democratic revolt of the people." His argument is

simply, no this is not a revolt because the voter turnout is not as high in the 1828 election(56.3 for all states pg 211) as compared to the election of 1840(78% pg 212) and goes on further to state that "...in 1840 the "new democracy" made its appearance with explosive suddenness. It would seem to me that McCormic is basing his opinion on data of voting records in the time before, during and after the Jackson elections and Robert V. Remini is basing his on the image commonly presented of the heroic Jackson and the people's revolt.

Remini states that "the total popular vote in the election (1828) represented an increase of eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824" (remini pg 206). This increase does show that more white men are becoming involved in the political press during the first Jackson election, but it would seem that the Jackson elections are really setting the stage for an even greater increase of voter turnout.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Maclain O'Leary - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 6:32 PM

After rereading both articles as well as watching the Age of Jackson videos, I still believe in my original statement, and that McCormick was right in saying there was no revolt. Jackson may have tried to lead some form of democratic revolt, and establish an organized two party system, but there is not enough evidence to say that this was successful. There was such a large out turn in voters to the polls, that it is difficult to determine what was actually an attempt at some form of revolution, or just pure numbers from the new citizens able to vote. Could the new out pour of people to the polls be caused by some form of revolt led by the Jacksonian Democrats? Perhaps so. But in my opinion, the social aspects in the world had a much larger and greater role in that the changes were allowing more voters to enter the polls, played a much larger role in what was going on in the 1828 election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

◀ Age of Jackson Videos

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)

