

HST 202: History of United States W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)

Home ► My courses ► HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897) ► Week 3 ► Forum 1 ►
A Democratic Revolt?

 Search forums

Forum 1

A Democratic Revolt?

[• Subscribe](#)

◀ A Democratic Revolt?

Display replies in nested form ▼

Move this discussion to ... ▼

Move

Pin



A Democratic Revolt?

by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 19, 2018, 6:25 PM

This thread is for discussions on the A Democratic Revolt? 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: A Democratic Revolt?

Sum of ratings: -

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



Not a Democratic Revolt

by Carley Kramer - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 12:14 PM

In regard to the question of whether or not the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people, I was more swayed by the “no” argument of Richard P. McCormick. In his essay, McCormick discusses many aspects of the 1828 election (and other elections of the era) and provides a great deal of comparative data, which I believed to be lacking in Robert V. Remini’s “yes” argument. Some of the arguments that I found particularly interesting were McCormick’s exploration of voter turnout before 1824, the idea of comparing state elections to presidential ones, and his mention of the 1840 election.

On voter turnout and state elections, McCormick 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. Among other things, this means that the 1828 election failed to bring to the polls the proportion of the electorate that had voted on occasion in previous elections. There was, in other words, a high potential vote that was frequently realized in state elections but which did not materialize in presidential elections. The unsupported assumption that the common man was either apathetic or debarred from voting by suffrage barriers before 1824 is untenable in light of this evidence." (page 7) Here, we see not only that a majority of states had had a higher voter turnout in previous elections, but also that voters were more motivated to participate in elections at the state level. As McCormick writes about voter turnout in state elections, he argues that if Jackson was truly central to a democratic revolt, his elections may receive a greater turnout than local elections in which he was not a factor and inspire new interest in presidential elections. However, as he states, "Actually the election returns show fairly conclusively that throughout the eight-year period [1824 - 1832] the electorate continued to participate more extensively in state elections than in those involving the presidency." (page 7)

As for the election of 1840, the comparisons seem definitive. McCormick writes, "In a surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any presidential election, four out of five (78.0 percent) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren. This new electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40 percent. In all but five states ... the peaks of voter participation reached before 1824 were passed. Fourteen of the twenty-five states involved set record highs for voting that were not to be broken throughout the remainder of the antebellum period. Now, at last, the common man - or at least the man who previously had not been sufficiently aroused to vote in presidential elections - cast his weight into the political balance." (page 7) This shows us that the election of 1840 brought in new voters that Jackson was unable to, and set voting records that one would associate with a democratic uprising.

Overall, a majority of states had surpassed 1828 voter turnout rates in pre-1824 elections, voters were still more motivated to participate in their state and local elections rather than presidential ones (in other words, voters still saw state and local elections as more relevant than presidential elections, which does not support the idea that the 1828 election and Andrew Jackson specifically were the key to a democratic revolt), and the 1828 election failed to draw voters to the record-breaking extent that the 1840 presidential election did.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



State Votes

by Camille Titus - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 7:43 PM

I appreciate you bringing up the states elections compared to the presidential elections, I had also been interested in those. One question I had was, back in the nineteenth century wouldn't it make more sense for people to want to vote that way? I mean, if the states had all the power, I know that I definitely would be more motivated to show up for my states polls. Do you think that more people voted for the state elections because that's how it was or that Jackson really didn't have a lot of voter turnout?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Representaion at all levels

by Sterling Gonzalez - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 11:27 AM

While the state vote was crucial in the 19th century I believe that that the people wanted someone to still represent what the people stood for at the presidential level. Andrew Jackson was a self made man who spoke his mind and said what everyone was keeping on the inside. He stood as a Democrat and that is what jump started the democratic revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: State Votes

by Carley Kramer - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:48 AM

I believe this was related to the point that McCormick was trying to make. State and local elections, and the issues they dealt with, were the elections that people of the time found relevant and important. He writes, "...presidential elections did not arouse voter interest as much as did those for governor, state legislators, or even members of Congress. In such elections at the state level the "common man" was stimulated by local factors to cast his vote, and he frequently responded in higher proportions than he did to later stimulus provided by Jackson." (page 6) The "common men" of the time had the motivation to vote in state and local elections, because, as you said, it made more sense at the time for people to want to vote that way. If Jackson had caused a democratic revolt, the people we would see "revolting" by voting for him would be these "common men".

However, state elections still garnered more participation than Jackson's presidential elections, meaning that they still did not see the presidential race as just as or more important than their state elections during Jackson's campaigns. This does not support the idea that Jackson was causing these common men to revolt democratically via the presidential election of 1828. It makes sense that people would vote this way and it wasn't out of the ordinary, it just contradicts the idea that the presidential election and Jackson were central to some great democratic revolt of the common man, as these common men were still focused on their state elections rather than the presidential elections that Jackson was actually involved in.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: State Votes

by Camille Titus - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:40 PM

Though, the fact that Jackson was so popular makes me think that his election was still a point for a revolt. Voting in states at that time is common sense and the fact that Jackson still got the numbers he did, and the faith of the people behind him leads me to believe that he was on to something. Because he got the attention of

everyone, everywhere, is amazing. The idea that people thought that the president wasn't a big deal, but wanted him in that position so much is what makes me think that this was a very big shifting period in our history.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Yes!

by Jack Swisher - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 2:56 PM

Reading through both author's opinions and looking back on the first few lectures and chapters we have read, I think that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolution for a lot of reasons. People wanted a true self-made man especially after the all of the corruption and the "corrupt bargain". The first paragraph from the "Yes" paper by Robert V. Remini says that "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw him a living example of the self-made man." So surely people were inspired by Jackson and believed in what he could accomplish. Change was needed and on page 1 Remini writes that "many politicians of the day recognized that the political system of the 1820s failed to respond to a changing society and that unless something was done right away it was going to collapse." The country was made up of many farmers and hard workers who were big believers of a small government that supported states rights, This was the vision of the Democratic party and because of this view, that brought many people to the polls to vote for Jackson. Because of the large voting numbers in favor of Jackson, this obviously showed that the people wanted something new and didn't want the big central government anymore.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: He was loved

by Jack Swisher - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 3:09 PM

A big reason I believe that the election was a democratic revolt was because of the fact that so many people showed love to Jackson. Adams attacked Jackson in the election of 1828 and on page 379, it explains how Adams attacked Jackson as his attempt to win the election. The thing is, that back fired because "others criticized Adams for making Jackson's private life a public issue." (pg. 379) This didn't change the voter's minds because the voter turnout doubled at the polls. He was seen as somebody who battled enemies, and the Americans believed in that because tons of people showed up at the inauguration of Andrew Jackson.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The People For Jackson

by Camille Titus - Monday, January 22, 2018, 12:47 AM

The side I ended up on was the side of Mr. Remini and the idea that yes, this election was a emotional revolt by the people. I had quite a hard time deciding, I'm still trying to understand the world of the nineteenth century, though I think it's clear the people stood for Jackson. One of the first things I had to think about was the privilege to vote was not for all the people, but few, and how that changed when that small group opened up for more people. The growth of

new voters meant more voices. Jackson had been beneficial with this change in limitations, because more people that could vote for him. As the hope for the “common” man rose so did his popularity, the people admired Jackson and believed in him. “ These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man.” (Packet Pg.1) Accompanied by the new voices, came new political views, and new parties. In order to keep up with the turning tide, several politicians hitched onto Jackson and his popularity hoping to keep some of the old. “...Van Buren decided in the winter of 1826-27 to move into the Jackson camp and to bring with him as many of the Old Republicans as he could influence.” (Packet Pg. 1) The idea that political parties would switch to try and survive the wave of new people is very awespiring in how much power the people had. In my opinion, the real revolt is how the people responded by becoming awarded with the responsibility of being voting citizens . “...the ordinary citizen, the so-called ‘common man,’ who were farmers, workers, frontiersmen, and the like, had seized the opportunity to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson.” (Packet Pg. 3) The idea that the working class took this privilege we have so seriously is very hopeful because they wanted to change the elite political world they were in.“...saw the contest as one between ‘farmers & mechanics of the country’ on one hand and the ‘rich and well-born’ on the other...” (Packet Pg. 3) The pushback also seems logical when looking at what happened in the 1824 election. The people already didn’t trust the government and believed that the powers were corrupt. “Like hundreds of thousands of other Americans, Jackson sensed that something had gone wrong with the republic-- that selfishness and intrigue had corrupted the government.” (Textbook pg. 377) Many backed Jackson to keep the government small and the power in the states. “... as head of a disciplined and committed Democrat Party that would continue the states’-rights, limited-government positions of the old Jeffersonian Republicans.” (Textbook pg. 379) While Jackson had become successful, he had inspired the American people and in return the people elected him. “He had been elected ‘by the choice of a free people’ ... and he pledged ‘the zealous dedication of my humble abilities to their service and their good.’” (Textbook pg. 381)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: The People For Jackson

by Amila Shumate - Friday, January 26, 2018, 3:42 PM

I agree with you that the 1828 election sparked an emotional revolt, and I like how you used the word ‘emotional’. The nineteenth century was indeed a strange time (in comparison to today’s world) and you brought up a strong point I didn’t consider while addressing the topic - how the era allowed for only the qualified to vote, and few were qualified. You definitely brought a strong point into light. With such a high increase in voter allowance and population, more and more voices are striving to be heard. With more people being allowed to vote, the nation has found a new form of self expression and nationalism. I like how you brought it back to the point of a growing voter participation with the pride Andrew Jackson provided the people, who in turn, elected him to lead the nation away from the corruption the Americans had previously been suspicious.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Perception vs. Objectivity

by Miriel Orhai - Monday, January 22, 2018, 2:06 PM

I will admit that after reading Richard McCormick's detailed voter analysis, I found Robert Remini's essay rather lacking in comparison. Remini seems to focus primarily on Jackson's apparent celebrity among American citizens at the time of the 1828 election. He discusses politicians like Van Buren's desire to be associated with Jackson, regarding that association "crucial to their future position in politics, both nationally and locally" (Remini). He also partially attributes Jackson's apparent landslide victory in 1828 to some states newly allowing their electors to truly be selected by "the people" (so, the "common man" that Jackson catered to), implying that when "the people" were given power, they enthusiastically favored Jackson.

I do understand what Remini means when he writes that "what is believed by the electorate is frequently more important than the objective reality," and later that "what mattered was an expressed sense of participation in the electoral process experienced by ordinary citizens" (Remini). It's apparent that he puts a lot of value on Americans' perceptions at the time, essentially saying that if people believed that a Democratic Revolt was taking place, then indeed a huge change in how the common man approached national politics did occur, and that this change in mindset could be cited as that very Democratic Revolt.

However, when considering objectivity and information provided, McCormick's essay delivers much more of substance. Whereas Remini quickly skated over the claims that voter turnout was not actually particularly significant, McCormick actually supplies convincing evidence and statistics to back his claim that voters hardly flocked to the polls in 1828. He highlights the fact that in the election in question most states did not actually set new records in voter participation, as well as showing that there was still an overall higher turnout at the local level, a level more immediately relevant to the common man's interests, than at the presidential. Using these examples as well as other pieces of evidence, McCormick asserts that there was "a high potential vote that was frequently realized in state elections but which did not materialize in presidential elections" (McCormick).

He then continues by claiming that in fact, the election that marked a Democratic Revolt was not that of 1828, but of 1840, after Jackson was removed from the ballot. Citing a voter turnout higher by over 40% than that of Jackson's era, McCormick writes that "Now, at last, the common man...cast his weight into the political balance" (McCormick). Holding up the 1840 election as the true mark of revolution, determined by actual voter turnout rather than the perceived magnitude of Jackson's campaign, is a convincing argument that hinges on the most objective evidence possible.

(Sidenote: I assume that when Remini writes about "one historian" who questioned the actual turnout of Jackson's supporters, he's indirectly referring to McCormick himself, based on the fact that the date on McCormick's essay is a decade earlier than Remini's and that his statistical analysis matches Remini's description. Taking that into consideration, I think Remini's rebuttal fails to fully address McCormick's approach.)

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Dominate

by Jack Swisher - Monday, January 22, 2018, 5:49 PM

When asked the question: What specific examples or facts has the author (Remini) used that have had the most influence on your decision? Remini gives quite a bit of information that sways me to the answer, yes, this was a democratic revolt. The biggest reason I believe this is the pure raw numbers. You can debate over opinions and stories but not the numbers. On page 399 of the textbook, it reads that 1 in 4 white males voted in 1824. The excited

Americans in 1828 and brought an impressive 56.3 percent of voters to the polls. For the non-math wizards, the number of voters doubled. The textbook then goes on to say how the percentage ran up to 78 percent, so the numbers just kept increasing. "The total popular vote in the election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824." (Remini) Why? Because they wanted change! On page two, Remini talks about how Jackson really dominated the election of 1828. "Andrew Jackson won 647,292 or just a little better than 56 percent of the entire vote. This was an extraordinary achievement by Jackson, a veritable landslide." Remini also explains that substantial support for Jackson came from all over the nation including New England. So not just the south liked his views, but the entire country did. Another reason why I like Remini's argument is from page two when he gives a few reasons for the spectacular rise in votes. A reason he gives is the interest and excitement of the democratic party campaign. People were excited for this party to get into office and go to work. So, what I have concluded from this information is the fact Andrew Jackson dominated this election because people wanted the democratic party in charge.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Dominate

by Jonathen Gray - Friday, January 26, 2018, 3:37 PM

To me, this is a very good point as to why the Democratic revolt happened in 1928 and not later on. Jackson's victory established that the vote of the common man could realistically sway the presidential election. From there, of course the next election had a higher percentage of voters. Jackson created the passion that continued on.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



election of 1828 compared to the election of 1828

by Kara Longstreth - Monday, January 22, 2018, 6:53 PM

Everyone can agree that the election of 1828 was an important election compared to the previous election of 1824. Oddly enough, they were the same two candidates for both elections (John Q. Adams and Andrew Jackson) the election of 1824 had a total of 264,393 votes. The election of 1828 had 1,143,450. This spike in votes was caused by more inclusive voting laws that gave the vote to the common man, not just the rich and powerful. Aligned with the fall of the federalist party, this was a crucial time for American politics.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: election of 1828 compared to the election of 1828

by Jack Swisher - Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 6:32 PM

I like what you say about the voting rights given to the common man. If you take a look at Remini's four pages you will learn quite a bit about voters and how they stormed the polls in 1828. He will also talk about how much different the election of 1824 and 1828 was because of the doubling of people and so on. Richard McCormick disagrees with these statements and says on page five: "In the years from the beginning of the government to

1824, a period for which we have no reliable election statistics, only a small number of citizens seemed to have bothered to go to the polls.” He obviously doesn't think that the doubling in votes was a big thing because there isn't “enough statistics to prove the amount of voters in previous years.” Well, in 1824 264,393 total votes were casted and in 1828 87,393 total votes were casted. So the trend of total votes continued to grow each year but not as crazy as when the 1828 election came around.

Weather Remini is right, or McCormick is right, you can't hide the fact that the Americans thought of Jackson as their “common man” and that is a big reason on why I believe this election was a Democratic Revolt. Exactly how Remini says it on page 3: “no matter how the statistics are analyzed or interpreted.” The people believed the common man were workers, frontiersman and farmers. (Farmers made up most of the population) These were the people that Jackson was out to protect from the banks and big governments. Not just working people from the north felt that Jackson was the right man, he had support from all over the country and that's why Remini states that the “Democrats saw the election as a victory produced by the people.”

Now, when 1832 and 1836 rolled around, the numbers raised a little and continued to raise when the 1840 election took place. Surely the start of high numbers at the polls started in 1828 and kept growing and growing. Going back to the last sentence of paragraph two, the 1828 election and on began seeing victories produced by the people.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Second chance

by Jack Swisher - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 7:10 PM

Yes, if you take a look at the election of 1824 and 1828 you will see the same candidates. This brings me to my next point on why I believe the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt. In the 1824 election Jackson was very popular just like he was the following election in 1828. In 1824 he carried support from all over the country “Jackson's support was not only larger but also more nearly national than that of his opponents.” (page 374) For example, in the textbook also on page 374, it explains that Jackson carried 84 percent of the votes in the Southwest, won some victories in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, North Carolina, Indiana and Illinois. So obviously the people of the United States were pulling for Jackson. He was clearly the nations choice from the numbers of the popular vote, but was short 32 votes of the electoral college. This is when the “Corrupt Bargain” began. On page 375 it says that “Jackson told a dinner guest that Clay had offered to support him in exchange for Clay's appointment for secretary of the state.” Jackson turns Clay down, Clay goes to Adams and Adams accepts. Adams was victorious by one vote. Jackson said “The rights of the people have been bartered for promises of office.” This brings me to my reasoning on why I believe this was a Democratic revolt. The voters must have been extremely mad at what had happened, especially considering that Jackson had won the popular vote. I think this was a huge reason that more and more people came out for the following election and doubled the number of voters. This making an obvious reason on why Jackson clearly dominated the election of 1828.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Second chance

by Brogan Cornish - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 6:56 PM

I feel the same way that Jackson was the nations leader in votes that helps support that Jackson and the 1824 election was the start to the democratic revolt. Nice text evidence to help support this controversial topic. Jackson was the popular vote and then lost because of the issue of the government. Also the reason he won the next election. Everything about the post jack I agree with. I totally agree that Jackson should of been the president in 1824.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



1928- Not a Democratic Revolt

by Decker Robinson - Monday, January 22, 2018, 7:01 PM

After reading both authors' opinions on whether or not the Election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people, I believe Richard P. McCormick's "NO" argument was more convincing. McCormick's argument was more compelling to me because he provided data that compared the 1928 presidential election voter statistics to prior & following elections of the era. I believe Richard V. Remini's "YES" argument lacked anything to compare the 1828 election to.

In McCormick's article, he uses data to highlight that voter numbers in 1824 (Jackson's first attempt at the presidency) were actually below the voter participation numbers of years prior. He goes on to explain that voter participation nearly doubled in 1828; but, he then highlights that "this outpouring shrinks in magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established. In three of these—Maryland, Virginia, and Louisiana—the recorded gain was inconsiderable, and in a fourth—New York—the bulk of the increase might be attributed to changes that had been made in suffrage qualifications as recently as 1821 and 1826. Six states went over the 70 per cent mark, whereas ten had bettered that performance before 1824" (page 7). This was very influential in my decision because I believe it debunked the theory that voters were participating in record numbers in 1828, when in reality the increase just looked huge in comparison to the very low turnout of 1824.

McCormick also showed that in the years of Andrew Jackson elections (1824-1832) the voter turnout in state elections actually surpassed voter turnout for presidential elections. McCormick revealed "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. In Rhode Island, Delaware, Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, and Georgia the vote for governor consistently exceeded that for President. Only in Connecticut was the reverse true" (page 7). In my opinion, this is substantial because if Andrew Jackson's popularity was as high as many have touted to have been then he should have gotten a bigger turnout in elections in which he was the main factor.

McCormick's final point was the main factor of my decision to pick "NO". In his final point, he gives his opinion in which he believes was the real "democratic revolt". McCormick proclaims that "It was in 1840, then, that the 'roaring flood of the new democracy' reached its crest and it engulfed the Jacksonians" (page 7). He backs up his argument by saying "In a surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any presidential election, four out of five (78.0 per cent) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren. This new electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40 per cent. In all but five states - Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Kentucky and Alabama— the peaks of voter participation reached before 1824 were passed. Fourteen of the twenty-five states involved set record highs for voting that were not to be broken throughout the remainder of the antebellum period. Now, at last, the common man -or at least the man who previously had not been sufficiently aroused to vote in presidential elections—cast his weight into the political balance" (page 7). This point swung me completely because this data showed that the so- called surge of voters from the Election of 1828 was small compared to the increase of 1840. The Election of 1840 succeeded in bringing voters that would normally not vote for president into the mix; those of which did not vote in the Jackson elections.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Amila Shumate - Monday, January 22, 2018, 8:23 PM

I agree with Robert V Remini in the belief that the presidential election of 1828 sparked the arrival of 'full political responsibility'. According to one of the slides shown in class, though between 1828 and 1832 the voter turnout dipped by about 5%, from 1832 to 1840 it raised by 30% (Escobar PowerPoint week2.083.jpeg #42/53). This turnout increase shows a rise in national civilian political voter participation. Though these years may not be considered the pinnacle of the political revolution, they were the initial actions towards the nation coming together to construct the 'well balanced parties' that followed the 1840 presidential election. Without the escalation of voter interest and turnout in the 1830s, the United States would be challenged with assembling and governing a mere 40% of it's political civilian participants (as at the start of 1828). Without the raising the voters awareness and turnout assistance, there would be nothing to reform throughout the 1840s.

Though the 1840s may have been considered

According to Google Define: revolution is defined as "a forcible overthrow of a government or social order in favor of a new system," which may better define the political actions within the 1840s, but that does not accredit the 1830s for its success in building up nationalism and a strong belief in one's social and political identity (Murrin 403). By associating so powerfully with religion and political positioning, americans began wanting involvement and control as the United States developed. This uprising desire to be involved throughout the 1830s allowed for political parties to be set with various chosen and admired advocates from and for each political standpoint. The 1830s were a direct segway into the political revolution of 1840, for without the uprise in civilian participation there may not be a government as constructed as it became.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Elliot Rooy - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 2:57 PM

I appreciate that you included religion in your explanation and I definitely feel that you're on to something. It would be an injustice to forget the religious reform that was taking place during this time period when evaluating the election of 1828! The second great awakening was reimagining what people felt was their role in the world. Charles Finney preached that "God has made man a moral free agent." (Murrin, 338) This message lead the middle class to the belief that they could shape their environment by choosing right over wrong. It placed value in the decisions of the individual and undoubtedly impacted election turnout greatly.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Amila Shumate - Friday, January 26, 2018, 4:03 PM

I agree with you completely. With people holding so close to their social identity, it was definitive for their opinions and preferences to be based off the idea of personal morals and following through with what is right. But I wonder if, because people cared so highly about being morally correct and their personal identification, people made their decisions based off those around them rather than their own personal opinions. It could be interesting to think of how voting may have been swayed if people only followed and voted for particular people because they didn't want to break from the social norm and what is popularly considered to be right. That idea makes me question how closely people followed their own personal beliefs and/or if people choice their personal preference based off others.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Elliot Rooy - Friday, January 26, 2018, 5:20 PM

Absolutely, and that applies even to this day as the 2 party system lives on. Do people chose a candidate based on their personal beliefs or are they adopting the values of whatever political party they feel that they should belong to? Red team or blue team? Personally I think that this system hurts the independence of voters who are forced into a prearranged package of values and beliefs. Getting back on topic, however, while this system might not lend itself well to accurately representing the values of the people, it gives massive incentive for people to vote just based on its competitive nature and I think that this was shown in the substantial uptick in voter turnout in 1828. The rhetoric of the Jackson campaign appealed to his democratic voting base by presenting him as a common, self made man and a war hero who was standing up to the elites in society and in government. This put him in a very favorable light with the majority of Americans at the time and demonstrated the effectiveness of these tactics for future campaigns which, I believe, made it a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Not a Democratic Revolt, but a change in focus

by Walter Bender - Monday, January 22, 2018, 8:33 PM

After my initial reading of the documents regarding the election of 1828, I have come to the conclusion that the "democratic revolt" of Jackson's election was significant as a marker of renewed interest in presidential elections, but not as a fundamental change in our democracy.

Voter participation had already reached the levels of the 1828 election in the earlier years of our country; "In only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established." (McCormick, Pg 7)

McCormick, author of the "No" side, primarily focuses on the percentage of the electorate who voted. The average during the election "...for all states in 1828 was 56.3%." (McCormick, Pg 7) Remini, on the other hand, considers only the raw numbers, pointing out the increase of "nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election..." (Remini, Pg 2) Despite the increased size of the electorate, still only a little more than half the possible voters are voting, and that remains true for the next two elections, at 55.4% turnout and 57.8% turnout, respectively (Wikipedia Elections). The real democratic revolt comes in 1840, with record high voter participation in almost every state. Overall voter turnout of around 80% (McCormick has it at 78%, Wikipedia at 80.2%) seems to me to be a much wider outpouring of democratic feeling than the Jacksonian election, and I side with McCormick in saying no. The 1828 election is significant, but the real sea change comes later in the 1800s.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: Not a Democratic Revolt, but a change in focus

by Jonathen Gray - Friday, January 26, 2018, 3:16 PM

This is some really great insight into the numbers. However, I believe raw percentages matter but an enthused base matters more. Without the passionate base getting him elected Jackson would not have had as many successes as he did. Those successes kept support high throughout his presidency and allowed for the rare instances of being well-supported through his successor.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Not a Democratic Revolt, but a change in focus

by Miriel Orhai - Friday, January 26, 2018, 7:19 PM

I think it's clear that Jackson had a gigantic support base, but that support base was still a sectional one (South and West) (class image from week 2: Election of 1828), whereas the election of 1840 was determined by truly national support, winning over the Northeast as well as the South and the West (class image from week 3: Election of 1840). Jackson's strength was in the fact that he appealed to the working class majority, but he didn't appeal to people *everywhere*, which is very nearly what Harrison's election shows. Perhaps Jackson triggered a democratic revolt in that he motivated working-class Democrats to get involved in order to show their support for him, but he didn't trigger a revolt of the entire country, as McCormick's statistics show-- overall voter turnout in 1828 was largely unremarkable.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



"No!"...it's a conspiracy.

by Scott Fails - Monday, January 22, 2018, 9:50 PM

I would have to say that after reviewing both perspectives, that I would side "Yes" with Robert V. Remini. I find the sheer number of increase in voter turn out to be most important in this particular argument. You can look at this on a broad scale in the paragraph second from the bottom of page 2 of the Rimini writing that it was an 800,000 voter increase over the previous election and you can also look even individually State by state such is the case for Pennsylvania that rose voter turnout from 47,000 to 152,000 in this particular election alone as can be found in the same paragraph referenced above. Certainly there are indicating factors for such increases, predominantly I believe Remini does a great job referencing that the presentation of only two candidates vice several candidates in the previous elections as a driving force to get people to the poles. Remini made his argument very clear and made this a fairly easy decision for me.

In regards to the writing of Richard P. McCormick, I found his perspective to be a bit on the side of conspiracy. Almost as if you believe in the Remini side of opinion, then you don't have all the information. I liken his perspective to that of conspiracy theorists who question the validity of a myriad of "government" involved issues and present their beliefs of "truth" in an elitist fashion.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: "No!"...it's a conspiracy.

by Amila Shumate - Friday, January 26, 2018, 3:53 PM

I agree with you in the fact that numbers provide their own evidence of an increase in voter participation, however for this particular situation, I think you have to take in account the amount of people available to vote for each election. Though you touched on the subject of how important it was for the voting numbers to increase so immensely to lead to the revolution, you don't talk much about how many of the new votes obtained were previously unattainable. I think it would have been effective to use a percentage of the participation of those who were able to vote for each election and who actually did. Over all, I agree with you and Remini and even more so agree with the importance of raising voter numbers. The raising numbers show participant interest which allows segway for the country to bound together for the up and coming revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The election of 1828 was a revolt!

by Elliot Rooy - Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:36 PM

I believe that the election of 1828 represented a Democratic revolt of the people. Remini's article introduced a range of convincing information and McCormick's simply reinforced my stance. The reestablishment of the 2 party system played a major roll in the revolt as was noted on page 2 of Remini's work. It set the framework for Presidential elections leading up to today. The 2 party system excited the public enough to ramp up voter turnout across the

states and even built a culture of party specific values to which it's members could both identify with, and proudly represent as they went to the polls. Another convincing piece of information was the level at which strong rhetoric was being used. More so than in the past, the election of 1828 painted a picture of "farmers and mechanics vs. the rich and well born" even extending that view point to "aristocracy vs. democracy" (Remini pg3) in support of Jackson's campaign.

In response to a point that McCormick raised, I don't think that using state election turnouts to undermine the high polling numbers in the 1828 election is a valid strategy as these people would be more stimulated by local factors to vote and is not an accurate comparison. Additionally, the fact that more people voted in the elections between 1836 and 1844 enforces the argument that 1828 was a revolt in that it changed the political game from that point on. It would be expected that elections after that point in time would continue to build upon the radical changes that took place in 1828 and, thus, experience an even greater percentage of voter participation.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: The election of 1828 was a revolt!

by Camille Titus - Friday, January 26, 2018, 11:58 PM

I am happy you brought up the two party system that came from this election, and how it has continued. I was wondering if you think the system came from the class difference at the time? "Because of the efforts of many men to restructure the system, the election of 1828 witnessed the reemergence of the two-party system." (Packet pg. 1) Politicians seemed to be scrambling for a way to keep up with the new voices, I think this shift is really interesting because I think it really shows just how much power the people had back then.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: The election of 1828 was a revolt!

by Elliot Rooy - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 7:17 PM

It absolutely did and, in fact, Jackson's Presidential campaign came together with the support of his political allies only when they realized that he would appeal to the rising classes of Americans; not only did Jackson use his support from this broad class of citizens, he was actually selected to run because of it. "As sharp-nosed professionals, like Van Buren, they were quick to sense the response the General's popularity produced among the "rising" classes of Americans and to realize that association with Jackson might be crucial the their position in politics.." (Remini P.1) Politicians during this time of "developing professionalism" began attempting to "perfect the techniques of winning elections." (Remini P.1) and formed their campaign grounds on winning votes from the electorate. So both the Democratic candidate, and the positions that they took on social/political issues were engineered to appeal the their voting base which signaled a change in the way that people ran for office which is what made it a revolution. Ultimately, the change was that politicians stopped simply running for office with the morals that they stood for the the hope to inspire support, and instead, formed party platforms from the ground up and selected their candidates to engineer support from the largest demographics of Americans possible.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The Vote of Jackson

by Brogan Cornish - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:12 PM

I agree with Robert V. Remini because the people of America choose to stand behind Andrew Jackson to help change the politics within America. "Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 or just a little better than 56 per cent of the entire vote." He controlled the popular vote with the people standing behind him it started to change the democratic election for the better. Also I believe that Jackson was very relatable to the average American. People looked up to him as a role model, which I feel had a great role within. "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man. Surely if an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason why they too could not aspire to wealth and social status by relying on their own talents to get what they wanted." The political change and government began to change rapidly. Jackson and the 1828 election created a big revolt for the people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Vote of Jackson

by Amila Shumate - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 3:35 PM

I definitely agree with you in that the American population favored Andrew Jackson and his notions throughout his presidency, but I would argue that the revolt didn't begin until the late 1830s. Jackson created pride in Americans and was able to gain supporters throughout growing territories, such as New York and New England (Murrin 393). By gaining support through the early '30s, Jackson was able to set up his Democratic successor, Martin Van Buren, for an easy victory in the presidential election of 1836. Though Buren had much support from the Democratic party, 1837 brought the "deepest, most widespread, and longest economic depression" (Murrin 396) that America has ever seen, complicating things for the Democrats. History tends to speak for itself when it comes to a switch in political powers. Typically after an economic devastation, the nation converts to the opposing party, blaming the previous one for the financial ruin and economic chaos. In my opinion, the destruction in the end of 1830 was what brought a national revolt and the availability for the Whig party to come into power in the presidential election of 1840.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Vote of Jackson

by Jonathen Gray - Friday, January 26, 2018, 3:08 PM

Where the revolt hit a flashpoint is hard to narrow down. Without the passionate electorate in 1828 you can't have all the subsequent events. I think it could even be argued that the spark of the democratic revolt started after the events of the previous election. Jackson used his loss to stoke the flames of a stolen election and used a

motivated electorate to win in 1928. Jackson was certainly able to domino his success into future wins but I would argue without the voting populous already in revolt he could not move on to future wins .

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Andrew Jackson's strange election

by Delaney Mack - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:23 PM

Andrew Jackson's election of 1828 was an interesting turn of events. The election of 1828 was the first election to have the two-party system, this is one of the main reasons why I believe this is considered a Democratic revolution. The two-party system really divided the nation, it was split in half one side being the common man and the other side being aristocratic America. The common man candidate was Andrew Jackson. This is considered a revolution because the common man overthrew the government. The government was mostly run by the rich working men. This was shown by the long line of presidents from Massachusetts and Virginia. Jackson not being from either of those states automatically makes this an issue for the common man.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Democracy of the people

by Gavin Lambert - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:52 PM

In response to the opposed question of "Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?" I believe that the difference in opinions is vastly different. In agreement to the "No" argument of Richard McCormick, his representation of issues on the subject of 1828 and beforehand as well, His facts are more clearly brought out on the tide turning chapter of the 1828 election. His writings of pre-1824 voting behaviour has increased and has "only just been realized" The voters determined voting toward the Jacksonian diplomacy, the sudden uprising of voting segued to the apparent "Revolt" to which the three time presidential candidate Jackson. The average turnout of votes from 1824 only settled to be a 26.5 percentage of male voters. This hardly seems to be a "revolt" as a little more than 1/4th of the population voted in timely manor. Before the Jacksonian era, such turnout reveled to only 6 states exceeding the 70 percent mark in 1828, as prior to 10 states exceeding 70 percent before 1824.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Not a Democratic Revolt

by Jacob Spriggs - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:56 PM

I agree with expert Richard McCormick on the subject that the 1828 election was not a Democratic revolt. McCormick takes a look at the numbers of adult white males voting, as that is the most accurate way to collect data on voter turnout, and discovers that this number was actually less than the number in 1824 and much less than it was in 1840 and 1844. Remini

didn't look at the numbers as much in his essay, doesn't mention future elections, and mentions that voters were threatened at the polls, which makes me think that his argument should lose some of its value.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Not a Democratic Revolt?

by Camille Titus - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 11:25 PM

While you are right that McCormick does go deeper into the number side of the two elections, I still feel like he could expand. I like what our professor brought up today in class by asking what is a revolt. Do you really think it's only about the numbers? While the voting polls do bring up good stats, I don't think that is where we should end the conversation. Instead, we should consider all that was happening at the time and how the people of America respond.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Not a Democratic Revolt?

by Elliot Rooy - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 7:32 PM

Exactly, its less about numbers and more about what was happening in society at that point, and how it affected and manifested itself in the 1828 election. The second Great Awakening, the rising middle class, and the age of professionalism all gave way to profound changes in the way that Presidential elections were conducted. Things such as increased rhetoric, the use of propaganda, and superior party organization determined the outcome of the election and paved the way for elections up to present day.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt? Yes it did

by Sterling Gonzalez - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 11:24 AM

The election of 1828 was huge for the United states not only for democrats but the entirety of the young nation at the time. Specifically for Democrats, it was huge because Andrew Jackson was an outsider to the political "norm". He brought a fresh air to an already stale system, but he also like many Americans at the time was a "self-made man"(pg. 1). This was also a time period where people were becoming very open about there opinion. Andrew Jackson gave the men at this time a reason to speak out and be proud of what they stood for.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Americans Wanted Change After "Panic of 1837"

by Decker Robinson - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 7:04 PM

The state of the country at the time is another factor I take into consideration when deciding that the 1840 presidential election was the real democratic revolt. At the time, the country had never been in a depression as devastating as the one in 1837. Of course this all happened while Democrat Martin Van Buren was in office. As a result, the election of 1840 finally gave the voters the chance to demonstrate their displeasure of the current system. Their attempt was successful when Whig party candidate, William H. Harrison, was elected into office. This marked the first time a non Democrat was elected into office. I believe this symbolized that the country was ready to make changes and “revolt” against the system that was in place when their country was facing such difficult times.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Winning among the Uncommonly Common Man

by Jonathon Gray - Friday, January 26, 2018, 2:26 PM

Richard P McCormick makes an interesting (yet unintentional point) favoring the side of a popular uprising in the election of 1828. He breaks down in elections of 1816 and 1820 there had been “no contest” resulting in little interest in voting. McCormick uses this as reasoning to dissuade the idea of a democratic revolt. For better or worse any person who can provoke the electorate into voting causes insurrection in the electorate. Passion is one of the hardest things to motivate in presidential elections and tends to mean the difference between a win and loss. The qualifications and reputation of Andrew Jackson resulted in voters who would otherwise see the election as “no contest” voting. A “mighty democratic uprising” might be a bridge too far but Jackson certainly had a passionate base who would be the backing he would need to create the Jacksonian Democracy or the Age of the Common Man.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



William Henry Harrison

by Miriel Orhai - Friday, January 26, 2018, 8:09 PM

Jackson prided himself on being a man of the common folk, but I feel it’s important to take into account the winner of the 1840 election as well. Harrison is noted as being a “westerner whose Virginia origins made him palatable in the South” (text 397)-- this is backed up by the fact that Harrison was elected by national, rather than sectional, voter results, in all major areas of the country. He’s further described as being “folksy”-- this was a man whose campaign also took great care to cater to the general public.

The 1840 election was extremely important in that it engaged Whig voters as well as Jacksonian voters. As the textbook says, neither party “could take any state in the Union for granted. (In 1828, winning candidates carried individual states by an average of 36 percent; by 1840, that figure had dropped to 11 percent.)” (text 398). It’s inarguable that overall voter turnout was higher in 1840 (the text, on page 399, provides that 78% of eligible voters voted in the 1840 election, while only 56.3% voted in 1828).

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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

Context of the 1828 Election



by Carley Kramer - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 12:29 PM

I appreciated how Richard P. McCormick explored the context for this election by discussing the political parties and candidates of past elections, as their influence seems significant. As he explains how the election of 1828 differed from elections before it, he writes: "But popular interest was dampened by the confusion of choice presented by the multiplicity of candidates, by the disintegration of the old national parties, by the fact that in most states one or another of the candidates was so overwhelmingly popular as to forestall any semblance of a contest, and possibly by the realization that the election would ultimately be decided by the House of Representatives. By 1828 the situation had altered. There were but two candidates in the field, each of whom had a substantial sectional backing. A clear-cut contest impended, and the voters became sufficiently aroused to go to the polls in moderate numbers."

McCormick also discusses how the past elections had been dominated by what he refers to as the "Virginia dynasty." These are the men we think of as the founding fathers (Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe). Of the Virginia dynasty, McCormick states: "During the long reign of the Virginia Dynasty, interest in presidential elections dwindled. In 1816 and 1820 there had been no contest." Until 1824, the same men who had built the country had been leading it. 1824 was the first election where none of these men ran. I believe it is safe to say that after this point, how people thought of presidential elections was going to change.

With a clear-cut contest between two candidates of two different parties and the recent end of the Virginia dynasty, it seems to me that heightened voter turnout could, at least partially, be attributed to the changes in the how presidential elections had been functioning.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: White man revolt

by Jack Swisher - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 3:39 PM

As the week and forum comes to an end, I think about my opinion on this topic. I defended yes the whole week because there was some good information and some great numbers to back it up. But reading more in depth to McCormick's view and some comments made by the historians in the videos provided mid-week. I think that this election was a democrat revolt of the white male, and not the country as a whole. For instance, it was said in the video that it was a democratic revolt of the white male and not the black male or female whites of the country. For it to be a revolt shouldn't there be more than one group involved? Women had no rights to vote as well as black males with the exception of a few small northeastern states. So looking at the question now, I think that the election was a revolt of the white male, but not the country as a whole.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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

1828 Election Not a Revolt but a Spark



by Decker Robinson - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 9:56 PM

In my opinion the 1828 election wasn't significant of a change to call a "democratic revolt"; however, I think that it gave the voters that there voice was heard when they all voted together. This set the groundworks for the real democratic revolt in my mind of 1828.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Brogan Cornish - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:45 PM

After going through class this week I feel like the election of 1828 was the democratic revolt and not the 1824 election. Its been made clear to me that once Jackson started to serve as president in 1828 politics began to change. Jackson had been the voters favorite for two straight elections. With him being a favorite in these elections it created a backlash in which helped him get support for his presidency of 1828.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

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

◀ [A Democratic Revolt?](#)

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))

HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)