



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

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](#)

Yes on the 1828 Election (voter turnout)



by Alexandra Flores - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 5:19 PM

I agree with the yes position of Rober V. Remini on the election of 1828. The biggest reason I chose this side was because of the voter turnout in the 1828 election. This large turnout can be explained by a few different reasons. One reason could be that the people were infuriated with the “corrupt bargain” of the 1824 election, where Andrew Jackson won the plurality vote but did not win presidency because of a bargain between two of the other candidates (textbook 375). Another reason for the large number of voters was because the 1828 election had two separate parties running against each other. The main conclusion I draw from this is that the common man came out in large force and used the 1828 election to revolt against the politicians running the nation’s capitol. Andrew Jackson was their ideal candidate because he was ‘a symbol of their own ambitions’ and a self-made man. (204). Both Robert V. Remini and Textbook Authors highlight the drastic amount of voters in 1828, the textbook even presents that the voter turnout was double than it had been. (textbook 380). When this many people stand up and demand change it can be concluded that the 1828 election represented a democratic revolt of the common people.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Concerns with focusing on Voter Participation

by William Mc Mahon - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 9:26 PM

How do you account for the fact that J.Q. Adams also received hundreds of thousands of additional votes in the election of 1828? (map 11.1 pg. 375 and map 11.2 pg. 378) There was a large increase in the number of votes compared to the election of 1824, but all of those votes didn't go to Jackson.

Also, Adams' nationalistic approach to his presidency was falling out of favor. (Textbook pg. 378) In addition to this, leading up to the election of 1828, Jackson had the benefit of Van Buren's genius and his developing political machinery. If you also consider the fact that Adams' campaign strategy during the 1828 election backfired, (Textbook pg. 379) it's surprising he didn't lose by more.

It's important to recognize that Jackson was a popular candidate. It's also important to look at all of the other pieces that played a role in the 1828 election. When you consider all the factors in the situation, his ascension to the presidency is not surprising.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Democratic Revolution

by Hannah Ward - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 10:17 PM

According to Wikipedia, a democratic revolution is defined as a political science term denoting a revolution in which a democracy is instituted, replacing a previous non-democratic government, or in which revolutionary change is brought about through democratic means, usually without violence. During this election, Jackson, who was part of the Democratic Republican party, was chosen over Adams, who was for the National Republican party. In the popular votes, Jackson received over 100,000 more votes than Adams did. I think based on that, the people were trying to replace the previous, National Republican ways of the government and tried to bring about change with Jackson's Democratic Republican views. Although Adams did receive more votes, even with his nationalistic way of thinking, Jackson won in what was considered a landslide victory because the people wanted a change. In my opinion, all this seems to line up with what a democratic revolt is.

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



Re: Concerns with focusing on Voter Participation

by Eric Brackett - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:35 PM

I agree with you. Adams did receive his fair share of votes based on expanded ability of the everyman to vote. For me Adams showing in the election is based on two things, firstly he was the incumbent, so there is a natural feeling not to rock the boat for most, but secondly that he was the son of a founding father. The later reason held sway with many in the north, while those out west and in the south were more prone to vote for a more recent hero who saved us from the British.

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



Re: Yes on the 1828 Election (voter turnout)

by Eric Brackett - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 3:14 PM

I completely understand where you are coming from with your opinion, however as I just stated in another post, the real reason for such a large turn out, could be the large number of Americans that had moved to a more rural life. Many had moved into the Ohio valley and away from the cluttered cities. Tennessee, Kentucky and the surrounding rural areas were the true changing landscape of America. This plays heavy into the way we vote. To this day those who live rural, tend to not vote for whom they see as "Fat Cats" or "Elitist". The only reason we talk about the other issues such as the 1824 tariffs and

what not, is because those were the issues of the cities, where foreign commerce was dealt with. For the man living out in the frontier, they had other concerns that were not being dealt with by the establishment. I feel like that is what really drove the political change. It basically became an election of Jackson agrarian vs Adams northern elites.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Voter Turnout and the election of 1828

by William Mc Mahon - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 2:38 PM

The election of 1828 does not represent a democratic revolt of the people.

Richard McCormick's analysis of statistics (forum materials) strongly supports his argument. Comparing the number of votes cast to the number of adult white males is a sound method to determine voter participation. Voter turnout is a more accurate factor in discerning a significant political shift than total votes cast, which have more factors to consider than a simple percentage.

If you examine the maps in the textbook (pg. 375 and 381) you will notice that John Quincy Adams won, roughly, the same states in 1828 that he did in 1824. Jackson's sweep of the nation in 1828 looks impressive, however, it's important to note that most of the new states he gained were states that had not voted for Adams in 1824.

There is no doubt that the election of 1828 was passionate, but it does not constitute a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Riley Stromvig - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 2:15 PM

I agree with you 100%. Richard's use of statistics is the best way to analyze the situation. I also like how you portrayed your thoughts on the idea that it was not a 'revolt' because of the number of voters compared to the number of white males in the population.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

**Re: Voter Turnout and the election of 1828**

by Hope Kelley - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 10:25 PM

I took a look at the maps on pages 375 and 381 in our book and you are completely right. The states Adam won in 1824 are roughly the same. On page 210 of the materials provided, McCormick states "Actually, abundant data on pre-1824 elections is available, and it indicates a far higher rate of voting than has been realized." He also brings up the point of needing to know the degree of potential voters before, during, and after Jackson's presidency. Only then can we measure the political changes that occurred. I agree that it wasn't a Democratic revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Voter Turnout and the election of 1828**

by Brandi Paquette - Friday, January 27, 2017, 5:12 PM

A "democratic" "revolt" only has to mean a vote to end or attempt to end the current authority's rule. In this case the National Republican-Democratic party ceased to exist into the 1828 election and was over thrown. Jackson felt he would be better suited in 1828 to make his own party for the people, the Democratic party "demo," in order to better represent the new voter demographic that emerged out of the repeal of some of the voter restrictions that existed at that time. He did a much better job capturing these new first time voters than his old party headed by Adams.

Jackson's old party showed it's true colors with the Clay "Corrupt Bargain" four years earlier and the American people saw the need for complete changing of the guard. It is true he was popular in both the 1824 and 1828 election but 68 % of the electoral votes he amassed in 1828 was due to the new voter laws and a disgust for the then current political landscape. The people had clearly spoken in the 1828 election and that's why every successful candidate since has been appealing to the "common man" in the same Jacksonian way to this day.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Voter Turnout and the election of 1828**

by William Mc Mahon - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 2:10 PM

If a democratic revolt means "a vote to end or attempt to end the current authority's rule," then every political contest is a democratic revolt.

My definition focuses on the democratic process. The physical act of casting a vote. What could be more democratic than that? And when 4 out of every 5 eligible voters is casting a vote, that says much more to me about the political landscape and the

value the common man has in their part of a democratic system regardless of the outcome of an election.

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



Re: Voter Turnout and the election of 1828

by Hannah Ward - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 8:46 PM

I agree with where you are coming from, Brandi. When choosing between the two opposing sides for this forum I focused more on what the term "democratic revolt" meant to me in regards to definitions and how this election turned out. I also agree with your reasoning for this being a revolt by stating that Jackson pretty much came up with his own party, which was a party for the people, to make a change in how the government was being run.

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



Re: Voter Turnout and the election of 1828

by Eric Brackett - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 3:23 PM

I have to agree with you here as well. The problem with both authors here, is that we are so limited in their view points, they aren't allowed to delve deeper in to the complexity of it all. The issue is no where black or white. I took a look at census records of the time of some of the "Northern" states , New York in particular. It is very easy to see why the state split its electoral vote during this election, the populace at that time was moving away from the larger cities and becoming more rural. Ironically by 1860 those rural areas (such as Buffalo and Albany) would become larger cities and begin voting much the same way as New York city.

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



Election of 1828 was an Example of a Democratic Revolt of the People

by Hannah Ward - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 8:22 PM

Out of the two arguments presented by the authors, I would have to say that I side more with Robert Remini's position on the subject. Remini made several good points as to why the election of 1828 did, in fact, represent a democratic revolt of the American people.

After writing about the statistics regarding the popular vote of this election, Remini wrote, "This was an extraordinary achievement by Jackson, a veritable landslide. In percentages it was unequalled in any presidential election during the nineteenth century." I believe that

this landslide came about due to a democratic revolt. Jackson was said to be seen as a very relatable candidate. According to Remini's article, Jackson winning the election of 1828 was the beginning of the rise of the common man. It seems as though working men decided to take over this election, seeing as Jackson, who was the working man's vote for the most part, won the popular vote by well over 100,000 votes. While these examples and facts had a lot of influence on my decision, there was one argument that I found to be the most logical and swayed my opinion towards Remini's side. The fact that there was a very obvious separation of parties, with Jackson being a representative for the "Democratic" Republican party, speaks volumes to this election being a democratic revolt of the American people. Towards the end of Remini's article he added a quote that I found quite intriguing. One of the National Republicans of that time had said, "Well, a great revolution has taken place... This is what I all along feared but to a much greater extent." This shows that people on both sides of this election saw it as a democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 was an Example of a Democratic Revolt of the People

by Hope Kelley - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 4:22 PM

I completely agree with your points about Remini. I think the increase in the common man theme is a completely legitimate concern of the people (then, and now). Specifically, he reminded us that this election was about farmers, workers and frontiersmen against the rich, and "well-bred". One of the things I've always liked about Jackson, is he was weary of speculators and bankers. The reason this has always stuck out for me, is that this sentiment says a lot about the advancement of our society. I think about this concern, when I look at the way our society relies on this (2008 housing crash). This us vs. them has been something that is a repeating cycle in human history, and with good reason. As soon as a society develops social stratification, these issues come about, and eventually erupt.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Rise of the "common people" - YES

by Christopher Cockman - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 8:24 PM

I find myself agreeing with Remini in his analysis that there was, in fact, a democratic uprising in the years of Jackson. My reason for this is that I find more correlation to recent events following this election of 2016 than the spew of statistical facts that was provided in the NO section of this topic.

The main point of the YES section is that Jackson was seen as the hero to the "common man", farmers and backwoods folk that prior to the election of 1824 did not show interest in voting. The common man was inclined to vote for Jackson as he was a war hero and "played to the ambitions" (Remini 204) of these folk. I correlate to what I have heard about Donald Trump playing to the white all-american males of the country in this recent election. I believe history definitely has patterns and it showed in both these accounts. Trump won off of this fact just like Jackson was said to in the elections of 1824 and 1828.

The NO section of this argument provided statistical facts stating that there was not a revolt because the numbers provided for the election of 1828 based on voter turnout weren't very different in terms of each state's popular vote percentage pre-1824. This may provide statistical evidence, however, it does not play to the fact that Jackson arose the voting desire in a whole culture of people that had not visited the polls beforehand. This is a truly powerful notion: catalyzing a whole people to vote. Despite what the statistics of McCormick accounted to, he does not attest to the relationship of Jackson and the "common man".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Rise of the "common people" Criticism

by William Mc Mahon - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 1:35 PM

I question of the notion of the "common man" and their interest in voting before and after 1824.

In McCormick's essay, he notes that in sixteen states there was no significant change in the proportion of voter participation. (McCormack pg. 211)

I have a hard time believing a flock of previously disenfranchised voters rushed to the polls given that the percentage of people participating didn't change significantly throughout the three elections involving Jackson.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Rise of the "common people" - YES

by Amy Aguilar - Friday, January 27, 2017, 3:13 PM

I agree that McCormick makes a strong argument that is backed by statistics but numbers can be translated to mean different things. He states that the voter turn out of the election of 1836 increases from the 1828 election and is a reason he believes the Democratic Revolt was not initiated in 1828. After reading both articles I find myself coming to the conclusion that the 1836 election was a continuation of the Revolt which started in 1828 and is why voter turnout was still increasing. I do believe that the revolt

was brought up by the "common man" as you have stated, and his perseverance to climb in social class and wealth. Jackson was a prime example to look up to and is why he lead the revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Further Discussion

by William Mc Mahon - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 1:39 PM

I will happily concede that the revolt started in 1828, but I still think the 78% voter participation in the 1840 election is a difficult number to argue against. (McCormick 212) When talking about the democratic process I see the percentage of people participating much more telling of how many people cared about and valued participating. Isn't that what democracy is fundamentally about? If Jackson brought the common man to the polls, who were the additional people that showed up in the 1840 election? And if they weren't the common man, who were they? Remini argues against criticism to his viewpoint by stating,

"But in any event the fact remains that no matter how the statistics are analyzed or interpreted the people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge of popular support for the General..."

"...And what is believed by the electorate is frequently more important than the objective reality." (Remini 207)

I think this is where we disagree. I think a lot of sources, including the textbook, view the election of 1828 through a romantic perspective that has been accepted as fact. I believe that if we're talking about democracy and the democratic process it's undeniable that the 1840 election says much more than the 1828 election.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Further Discussion

by Hannah Ward - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 9:03 PM

Although you and I are taking different positions on this topic, I agree with where our disagreement is coming from. I also think that Remini and other sources that we have used have more of a romantic perspective in the sense that it's not all about the statistical facts. Like Amy said in her post above, people can take

different meanings from statistics and manipulate them to support their side of an argument. From what I've gathered in this forum, people who learn better from and stick more to "cold, hard facts", seem to agree with McCormick and the rest of us are leaning more towards Remini's perspective in his article.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Yes, Democratic Revolt of the People occurred in 1828

by Brandi Paquette - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:15 AM

Remini's position favoring that the Democratic Revolt of the People did occur in the 1828 election and not later in the 1840 election I find more agreeable. Although the 1840 election marked a great deal many things, such as the beginning of the end for the Whig party, the 1828 election effectively expanded the electorate and opened up the vote to the "common man." The presidential electorate body of 1828 was nearly triple the size of that of the previous election and the attitude of the nation had experienced a paradigm shift from the era of the founding fathers and that of a Revolutionary mindset to backing of a "common man's" agenda, also sometimes known as the age Jacksonian Democracy. (Kish, J.N. "U.S. Population 1776 to Present". February 10, 2015) Jackson also ran under a new political party banner than that he had in 1824 and lost. He moved away from the National Democratic-Republican party causing the party to split into two. This created the National Republican party and the new Democratic party which still persist to this day (The History of the Political Parties Image, Remini Reading). John Q. Adams and the old guard were not able to capture the newly non-elite electorate as Jackson could. Jackson manipulated the masses by understanding there fears which garnered wide zealous crowds. "Newspapers estimated that from 15,000 to 30,000 citizens came to Washington to witness Jackson's inauguration" (text, 380). "He promised 'proper respect' for states' rights, a reform of the civil service, and the retirement of the nation debt through 'a strict and faithful economy" (text, 381). Jackson and all following successful presidential candidates to present day seek to appeal to a broader "common man" base and run under increasingly populist values as opposed to the Founding Fathers and appealing to elitists and their interests and/or idealist values.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



The Democratic Revolt of 1828

by Amy Aguilar - Monday, January 23, 2017, 8:42 PM

I agree with Robert vs. Remini in saying that the 1828 election did represent the Democratic Revolt of the people. Jackson arose in a time the United States was changing in its political and economic ways. Men of the time looked to Jackson as a symbol of success, a rags to riches story and aspired to follow in his footsteps to rise in social class and wealth. It was

because of men who supported Jackson such as Calhoun and Van Buren that the two party political system resurfaced in the United States, the Republican party and the new Democratic party. It is true that Jackson had a charismatic charm. He fit the look of what a president should look like and this only helped in his campaign (Forum reading. Robert vs. Remini). I do not believe that his charisma is the main reason that he won the election of 1828, but because people believed in the democratic movement and the values of the party. The values of states rights and the attention and importance of individual citizens. Comparing the voter turnout of the 1828 election to the 1836 when Van Buren replaced Jackson we see a significant increase in voter turnout and it may be why some argue the new democracy came in 1840 after Van Buren took office rather than in 1828 (Forum reading. Robert vs. Remini). We may not forget that Van Buren was a supporter of Jackson in 1828 and together, they supported the Democratic Revolt as we also saw double the voter turnout from the 1824 election to the 1828 (Textbook pg 380).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Standing firm in the middle.

by Eric Brackett - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:31 PM

Remini states that the Election was a revolt, however, McCormick believes the exact opposite. I myself fall somewhere between the two. For me anytime you have a party who stands in stark contrast to the previous administration, that unto itself is a bit of a political revolution. With hot topic issues like the tariff of 1828, and Jackson making a strong push for presidency after his failed run in 1824, despite having the most electoral and popular vote, it could easily be seen as a revolution of political thought. The reality however, is this was only gateway to the actual revolution that would be paved by the actions set in motion by the upcoming Missouri compromise.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Standing firm in the middle.

by William Mc Mahon - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 2:20 PM

I agree.

The involvement of Van Buren in the formation of the Democratic party, and the support he was able to muster from other politicians leading up to the election of 1828 gave Jackson the benefit of what would become a modern two-party political system.

(Textbook pg. 379)

It is also worth noting that Van Buren and a coalition of his colleagues supported Crawford in the 1824 election. Crawford suffered a stroke and was incapacitated for the 1828 election. (Textbook pg. 374 and 378) It was only then Van Buren put his weight behind Jackson. Within the Democratic party, despite their popular appeal, they were still playing politics. Politics that had as much to do with preserving the Union as it did with individual citizens. (Textbook pg. 379)

I would describe the election of 1828 as more of a political revolution than a democratic one. As the Whig Party formed it gained its own support from the United States electorate. This is what led to the truly democratic revolution we see in the election of 1840. The 70% voter participation shows an electorate that valued their political voice and wasn't afraid to use it.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: Standing firm in the middle.

by Hope Kelley - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 4:50 PM

I am on the line for which I agree with more, but as I read more of others posts I am leaning towards McCormick. As I said in one of my previous post, this isn't black and white. Both authors make good points but McCormick has more convincing points on the people who voted in 1828

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

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



The Election and Tariff of 1828

by Hope Kelley - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:39 PM

To be honest after reading the articles by both Remini and McCormick, I am still stuck in the middle about which side I agree with. Both authors make compelling points with their articles, however I do not feel that this topic is so black and white. I feel both authors bring in their own bias, and as we have learned in Mr. Escobar's class, you have to remain as unbiased as possible when deconstructing history. Having said that I do find myself leaning towards McCormick's view point, and I see a lot of Jacksonian politics playing out in this past current election cycle.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



The election of 1828

by Christopher Schapp - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:02 PM

The election of 1828 was a pivotal moment for the democratic revolt of the people because the people weren't given the president that they wanted in 1824 due to the House of Representatives decision of John Quincy Adams. During the election of 1824, Andrew Jackson had 150,000+ of the popular vote and had 99 electoral votes, but because he didn't have enough electoral votes he lost the election of 1824. After that election Jackson supporters believed that voters were told to vote for Adams and accused him of a "corrupt bargain". The election of 1828 showed that the voter population can expand after being cheated out of the president that they truly wanted.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Richard Knows What He Is Talking About

by Riley Stromvig - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:15 PM

When reading through the two sides to this argument, I was able to follow what Richard McCormick was saying much easier than I could Robert Remini. I am a fan of how many facts and statistics he uses to back up his argument; it makes it much easier to understand where he is coming from. He talks about how during the elections of the early 1800s, people did not feel like they needed to go to the polls to vote for president because, more than likely, someone from the "Virginia Dynasty" would run for the position and win whether you voted or not. That was how they felt. That is an explanation for why only 54.9% of people voted in the 23 participating states. People were much more stimulated to go and vote for local government positions within their state because they knew that their vote matters and knew they would see a difference once their candidate got into office.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Why I Think it was a Democratic Revolt

by Howard Fuller - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:56 PM

Based on my definition of a "democratic revolt of the people", the events of the 1828 election fit the bill. I think Robert Remini and Richard McCormick both make convincing arguments for their case. Remini seems to base his argument on Jackson's personal character, his role as a public figure, the statistics of the election, and how historians have interpreted it since. McCormick holds that the dimensions of the definition of democratic

uprising aren't clearly defined. His main argument is that the spark in democracy of 1828 seems less significant when you consider how much higher voter turnout before 1824 was than most people think. It seems to me the solid statistics and recounts of the time provided by Remini make concrete evidence that could be used to constitute using the term "democratic revolt".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



On Second Thought... Not Such a Revolt

by Howard Fuller - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 10:48 PM

I'm replying here because further research on this subject has led me to believe that McCormick's statistics may have been more groundbreaking than I previously thought. McCormick shows that only five out of 22 states had a higher voter turnout in the 1828 election than in pre-1824 elections. He proceeds to state that "new democracy" didn't truly surface until the 1840 election, at which time three quarters of the adult white males voted for Harrison or Van Buren. This was 40% more than in the 1828 election, so it would seem pretty concrete that it was more of a democratic revolt. While it could perhaps be argued that the Jacksonian era represented a democratic revolt to some extent simply because of the mass attention garnered by Jackson's persona, the overwhelming significance of the 1840 statistic somewhat overshadows the status of the 1828 election as a "democratic revolt". So I am changing my mind to reflect my new opinion that the no side of the argument is more correct in this case.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Alec Ebert - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 4:56 PM

In regards to this particular historical political issue, I think that both sides can be argued well but I feel that it's easier to relate to the yes side due to contemporary issues. President Trump is currently making us feel like the common mans uneducated and often ignorant opinion is more important in the world of politics rather than doing what's best for everyone. He's lied and said vulgar, brash things to get people to vote for him. He's taken a radical approach to getting elected into office, that was not typical of the normal presidential campaigns that we know of. I think that president Jackson did a relatively similar thing. He saw the frustrations the common people of our emerging country was facing and took advantage of them. He gave people a voice, not the electorals. Trump did a similar thing. He played on issues in our country that seem to bother a lot of people. Unaddressed issues that no one wants to talk about and resolve but in the end need to be resolved. Like Jackson he is rather uneducated in the world of politics and is also a bit of a wildcard. Jackson and his party proved that developing a new system of winning elections in an age

where political professionalism was emerging, could work. Donald Trump made similar moves. Furthermore our country was expanding, developing new cultures, new lifestyles, and new interests for the country that the Whigs did not share. "As sharp nosed professionals like Van Buren, they were quick to sense the response to the Generals popularity among the rising classes and realized that association with Jackson could be crucial to their future positions in politics" Yes Robert Remini. This quote highlights the point that if a candidate can gain just a little bit of radical momentum and it influences the common people in the right way, it can win an election. A lot like this year with president Trump.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Election of 1828 and "mudslinging"

by Daniel Huffer - Friday, January 27, 2017, 1:00 AM

I'm arriving late to the party but excited to read what everyone's written so far.

In our first forum I find myself agreeing with professor Remini over McCormick.

Despite the election of 1840 and it's very large voter turnout, I think the high passions of the voting public inflamed by Adams notorious "corrupt bargain" 4 years prior and more prominently the defamatory campaign that was being run by both sides.

Not to mention the reestablished two party system influencing a strong "us vs. them" mentality amongst voters, coupled with the sizable voting public at the time, unrestricted by land ownership requirements, ultimately makes it's easy for me to see how the election could represent a political revolt by the common man.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Election of 1828 and "mudslinging"

by Riley Stromvig - Friday, January 27, 2017, 6:55 PM

How can you justify that it was a 'political revolt' when the data suggest otherwise? McCormick explains that in the election of 1812, 8 of the 17 state electors were chosen by legislatures, not popular vote. He goes on to describe the idea that with the rapid increase in population and the states shifting from legislature voting to a overall popular vote (page 210 in article), it would more than explain the sudden increase in people going to the polls in the presidential election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Gubernatorial Contests

by William Mc Mahon - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 12:35 AM

McCormick's point about voter participation in gubernatorial contests comes into play as well. "Between 1824 and 1832 there were fifty regular gubernatorial elections in the states that chose their electors by popular vote. In only sixteen of these fifty instances did the vote for President surpass the corresponding vote for governor." (McCormick 212)

There was no disenfranchised voting demographic. There wasn't a new class of people heading to the polls. Despite Jackson's appeal to the common man, it looks like most people were more interested in who was their governor than who was their President.

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



Re: Gubernatorial Contests

by Riley Stromvig - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 1:12 PM

Very true. I did not even go as far as to include that in my explanation, but it definitely comes into play.

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



Re: Gubernatorial Contests

by Hope Kelley - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 11:34 PM

McCormick points out that you would need to take more information about the voters to get an accurate read. I still don't believe that this was a democratic revolution but you bring up some really good points about Remini.

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



You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)
HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)