

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?](#)[Age of Jackson ▶](#)

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 Kerianne Guza - Saturday, January 20, 2018, 11:36 AM

The election of 1828 did not represent a Democratic revolt of the people. Andrew Jackson may have gotten a great amount of support, but I would not call what happened a Democratic revolt by any means. There may have been an increase in voting, but that may not have been just Jacksons doing, but also the increase in population over the years. McCormick points out that "in only a few instances" did the voter turnout "[match] or [exceed] the maximum levels that had been attained before" in previous elections (p.6).

Looking forward to the election of 1832, when Jackson was elected once again, we see that there were not more, but less voter participation than previous elections. It wasn't until 1840 when the "roaring flood of new democracy" came about bringing a much higher voter turnout (p.7). This didn't happen until Jackson had stepped down from the presidency. Though his election may have been a contributing factor, it most definitely did not represent a Democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Not A Democratic Revolt

by Raleigh Emerson - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 4:23 PM

I believe the reasoning behind the election being considered a democratic revolution is less about the voting statistics, and more about the perception held by the common people across the country. The result of the election was the pushing of stone that gave way to the larger voter turnout numbers we see in elections to come. This is shown in Reminis piece "The fact remains that no matter how statistics are analyzed or interpreted the people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge or popular support for the General."(pg. 3). The people of the nation knew what they were doing mattered and showed they wouldn't back down from their beliefs.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Yess to a Democratic revolt.

by Jordan Lopez - Saturday, January 20, 2018, 11:31 PM

I feel that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people but not everyone voting for Andrew Jackson exactly knew what was going on and I will be bringing up my reason why I believe this. First of all, looking back from today, the development of political parties was still evolving and none had matured like they have today. That being said, the Democratic Party was established by opposing the National Republican Party in Presidential elections just as the Democratic-Republic party was established by Thomas Jefferson to oppose the Federalist Party . Richard McCormick states that the "roaring flood of the new democracy" reached its crest in 1840 (pg. 7). So maybe Richard was right to state that in 1840 the democratic party had more recognition, but that doesnt mean the rise in the democratic party didnt take place in the 1828 election. On (pg. 1) we read that Van Buren wrote a letter to Thomas Ritchie that there needed to be a revival of a two-party system after the federalist party had failed to win any of the previous elections and disappeared. They recognized the political system had failed to change with the society. Many political men had mad efforts to restructure the system in the 1828 elections. This opposing party was the Democratic party. Now to directly see how this brought more people to the poll, the Democratic Party emphasized the rights to the states and people feared more power to the central government. Andrew Jackson wanted to appeal to the south when it came to slavery and appeal to the north by preserving the Union. The Democratic Party allowed for Jackson to satisfy the needs of the north and the south which possibly is why the rise in voters took place in the 1828 election. Four states had transferred the selection of electors to the people instead of the legislature which people liked because it emphasizes states rights which in turn is more power to the people and not the government . On page 378-379 of our textbook we see that " Van

Buren and like minded Republicans, switched their alliance to Jackson”. It also states that not because he was a popular hero but “ as head of a disciplined and committed Democratic Party that would continue the states’-rights, limited-government positions of the old Jeffersonian Republicans”. So there we have it. Maybe the Democratic Party wasn’t so well established in the publics eyes but in the political standpoint it was sure in development and people like Van Buren and John Calhoun as well as Andrew Jackson knew of this uprising which with many efforts have influenced the people to go to the polls with the idealism of the newly founded Democratic Party. Therefor the voters of Jackson may have caused a Democratic Revolt of the people indirtly since the establishment of the party to the voters eyes was unclear, however the political perspective of the Democratic Party was what brought voters to the polls and in Jackson favor. Andrew may not have won the 1824 election but there was more candidate to vote for, while the 1828 election there was only two candidates with opposing parties. Therefore, there was less obstruction in the way to clearly see the viewpoints of these two opposing parties and the best man won which was Andrew Jackson which brought the rising of the new Democratic Party.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Amount of Voters Equals a Revolt

by Rachel Gragg - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 7:37 PM

The definition of a revolt, according to Google, is a “rise in rebellion.” The definition of a rebellion, also according to Google, is an “act of resistance to an established government.”

The Presidential Election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 was absolutely a democratic revolt simply because of the sheer amount of people it drew in. People were excited to participate in democracy and excited to vote for Jackson, so they did so. According to our textbook, “Voter turnout was double what it had been in 1824... It was a clear triumph of democracy over genteel statesmanship, of limited government over expansive nationalism, and of the South and the West over New England” (Liberty, Equality, Power, Pg. 380). The total popular vote increased by over 800,000 people.

The reason that so many people decided to participate in this election is because they liked what Jackson represented. He represented the “common man,” the ordinary people. He didn’t only speak to the aristocrats and the wealthy population, people felt as though he represented the majority of the population. In the readings, Robert V. Remini states that, “[People] believed that the ordinary citizen, the so called ‘common man’... had seized the opportunity to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson” (Packet pg. 3). People wanted a change and so they “acted in resistance to [the] established government” which was a rebellion, therefore, a revolt. What do you guys think? Is the large quantity of people that voted in this election in comparison to other elections enough to consider it a revolt?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Amount of Voters Equals a Revolt

by Luis Estrada Rivas - Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:54 PM

I agree on the idea of the election of 1828 qualifying as a revolt due to the large amount of people relating to Jackson and feeling a sense of representation that was lacking in government. The increase in the voter turn out should be considered a show of rebellion by those allowed to vote beginning to exercise the power given to them.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Amount of Voters Equals a Revolt

by Riley Heath - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 5:27 PM

Hi Rachel,

I like that you included the google definition, and I as well said that it was a democratic revolt because he brought out so many voters, and they decided to participate because they truly agreed with Jackson's ideas and it finally gave the "common people" a way to express their political views. I went back and forth after reading both articles, and almost decided to go with no, but i think eve if it wasn't the crest of a revolt it definitely was a significant start to one.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Amount of Voters Equals a Revolt

by Lloyd Higgins - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 7:49 PM

Perhaps when the historians were discussing the idea of a 'revolt' in the Democratic party, they were speaking metaphorically. The same could be said for the 'revolution' of the United States. The language and context is key here. What some historians have called a 'genteel war for independence' many could consider a bloody revolution by the colonists against Great Britain. However I digress. I still stand by the idea that Jackson's election was a clear example of Democratic and political upheaval during the early part of the 19th century. For the simple fact that the voter turnout was either Republican. Or Democrat. This paved the way for our present two party system. The amount of people who voted isn't important, but which party they chose. The election clearly was going to go to one of two parties, rather than one of three, or one of four.

<https://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/national.php?year=1828>

I would even go so far as to say his 'revolt' was not necessarily a Democratic one, but a political revolt based off the binary traits of either party vying for control of Washington and of the country. This trend of left vs. right, red vs. blue continues to be extremely prevalent today. Jackson's campaign was a revolt for the simple matter that it kickstarted the left vs. right politics that have continued to define the American political experience.

<https://edsitement.neh.gov/lesson-plan/1828-campaign-andrew-jackson-changes-voting-participation>

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Amount of Voters Equals a Revolt

by Anna Chan - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 10:44 PM

I agree with what you are saying in your argument. I think that the election of 1828 really showed a democratic revolt. By your definitions, the increase in voter turnout alone is what makes this entire election a democratic revolt. The sheer number of voters that turned up had been groundbreaking: nearly 800,000 more voters had turned up than in the previous election. We can clearly see that the people weren't happy with how the previous presidency and they wanted to revolt against the possibility of John Quincy Adams getting a second term. They used the power of everyone going out and voting as their way of revolting against what had happened in the previous election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Democratic Revolt: A Frank Combatant

by Michael Baldwin - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 9:54 PM

There's no denying the primary viewpoint affirming the democratic revolution of 1828; the task, to breed an honest government, was a quick sell. After the "Corrupt Bargain" of 1825 (p.304), convincing the public of the government's corrupt nature was anything but difficult; a claim solidified by Jacksonian Democracy's firm presence in the socio-political climate entering the next generation. Jackson's claim to smash "King Caucus"(p.305) tactics is firmly supported by popular legends illustrating his heroic declination of a proposition in 1825, which would have landed him in the president's seat, while selling Secretary of State's position to Henry Clay.

Jackson spread his vision of Jacksonian Democracy; a just democracy. Through this, a democratic revolt of the people was manifested in the inauguration of President Andrew Jackson.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Yes

by Raleigh Emerson - Monday, January 22, 2018, 3:05 PM

The dictionary defines revolt as a "rise in rebellion". I maintain that the stance made by the common man during the 1828 election was a clear showing of separation or rebellion from the aristocratic regime that was established in the nation at the time. The people of the nation are the most important factor when determining whether or not this was a revolution; These marginalized workers felt as if their voice wasn't being heard so they chose to go against the norm and do something about it. "Many democratic politicians, of course saw this as a contest between "Farmers and mechanics" on one hand and the "Rich and well born" on the other. Jackson's landslide victory is a testament to the democratic revolution that took place through the coming together of the common man.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Not a "revolt" - more like a "shift"

by Jason Yeager - Monday, January 22, 2018, 7:13 PM

I was initially expecting to side with the "Yes" argument on this issue, based on lectures and readings, which seem to lend credence to the idea that there was a sizable political uprising and backlash against the aristocratic leadership of the time. As I've continued my readings, I feel like voter turnout and the results of the 1828 election stemmed from an expanding national consciousness--which could be partly attributed to increased literacy and newspaper circulation--instead of an actual "revolt."

There is a section of Remeni's "Yes" argument that actually swayed me to the "No" side. As he discusses the rising popularity of Andrew Jackson, he notes that "Van Buren decided in the winter of 1826-1827 to move into the Jackson camp and to bring with him as many of the Old Republicans as he could influence." (pg.1, handout) This seems to me to be nothing more than members of the aristocracy betting on the winning horse in the hopes of preserving their own political futures. So they put together an effective campaign, playing off of Jackson's popularity, which increased voter participation. Not really a revolt, but more like a shift in campaign and political strategy to align with an expanding national awareness.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Not a "revolt" - more like a "shift"

by Luis Estrada Rivas - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:10 PM

I disagree with Van Buren moving into the Jackson camp being a reason to take away from this being a revolt since it can be interpreted as Van Buren also seeing Jackson as the right man to lead the country. The internet now can also be considered as what newspapers were back then, a means to spread information to the masses. This can be used as part of a revolt since the increase in literacy meant more people didn't have to rely on word of mouth for news.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Not a "revolt" - more like a "shift"

by Jason Yeager - Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 8:51 PM

I agree that Van Buren probably would not have backed Jackson unless he felt entirely confident that Jackson was a capable and competent leader. However, as is also stated in Remeni's paper, "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 to their future position in politics, both nationally and locally." (pg.1, handout) I would think that a "revolt" would have led to a much larger upheaval of the power structure of the upper levels of politics. But this seems to be a bunch of established politicians riding the coattails of a popular candidate to further their own interests and to secure their own futures. Sounds an awful lot like the politics of today....

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Not a "revolt" - more like a "shift"

by Kerianne Guza - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 5:16 PM

I hadn't considered the increase in the literacy rate or in the newspapers. Those would be huge contributing factors in getting people more involved in the election. That combined with the increase in population was enough to increase the votes in any election. This is proven when we look at elections in following years when in most cases even more people participated.

In addition, that particular election "was an exercise in slander rather than a debate on public issues" or some big democratic rebellion (Textbook, pg.379). In a way, it reminds me of our 2016 election, in that there was a big focus on the candidates themselves and their behaviors rather than just politics.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



A Democratic Revolt?

by Luis Estrada Rivas - Monday, January 22, 2018, 7:15 PM

I agree with Robert V. Remini on the 1828 election representing the democratic revolt of the people. Even though the following elections of 1832 and 1836 stayed constant with that of the election of 1828 the increase from 1824 of thirty percent marked the change in how the american people interacted with their government and a sense of duty. The elections of 1840 and 1844 wouldn't have voter turnouts of seventy-eight and seventy-four percent without it having the substantial increases in the years prior.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



NO.

by Isaac Anderson - Monday, January 22, 2018, 8:21 PM

After reading the forum one materials I am definitely favoring Richard P. McCormik's side of the argument. No, the election of 1828 didn't represent a democratic revolt of the people. On page 380 of our textbook, the authors tell us us that voter turnout in the election of 1828 was double what it had been in 1824 (Liberty, Equality, Power. Pg. 380). In his article, Robert V. Remini goes on to tell us the same thing. "Andrew Jackson won 647,292 (56 percent) of the popular votes compared to John Quincy Adams' 507,730" (page 2, class handout). Based on those statistics alone it seems like the election of 1828 was indeed a democratic uprising, but I find Richard P. McCormik to have a much more convincing argument. He states, "In measuring the magnitude of the vote in the Jackson elections it is hardly significant to use the popular vote cast throughout the nation. The shift from the legislative choice of electors to their election by popular vote , together with the steady population growth, obviously swelled the presidential vote" (page 5, class handout). With the rising population and the country going through such extreme changes during this period the overall votes were obviously going to be much higher. Maybe after some discussion and further reading I will change my mind, but for now, I am going to agree with McCormiks's idea that the "mighty democratic uprising" didn't happen until 1840. (page 8, Class handout)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Landon Stevens - Monday, January 22, 2018, 9:55 PM

When common citizens descended upon the White House lawn, broke windows, and ravaged the refreshments on inauguration day in March of 1829, they weren't terrorists bent on assassinating the new President of the United States; they were actually frenzied supporters of the new president, who had to be whisked away to safety. It would be easy, then, to call this a Democratic Revolt, but I believe that goes too far. It should rather be called a natural expansion of the voting electorate, all male, of course. Between the first presidential election to that of 1828, male voter participation increased from about 2-10% of the total populace. That may not sound too impressive, but when we compare the average today of about 45% of the total population participate in the presidential election process, that 10% is really quite significant.

Other issues to consider: The nation was expanding economically as it expanded West, and there was much prospect in gaining government subsidies for what would eventually be Henry Clay's American System. Political parties were, therefore, poised to gather as many male voters as possible in order to expand their power. Both parties, the ever-increasing, new Democratic Party, and the lingering Democratic-Republican Party of Jefferson, vied for power, and the Party of Jackson was making great gains. Bandwagon voters were quick to cast their affections to the war hero, Jackson, but they would soon realize that Jackson, the rugged "American Son," was hardly revolutionary, for once in office, the "draining of the swamp" was more of a seepage of the most egregious corrupters of the federal posts, most others remaining fully employed. And Jackson, himself, was the King of Patronage, doling out "to the victor go the spoils" positions like no other before him and few since. This can hardly be considered a democratic revolt, especially in the light of the fact that far and wide portions of the American population were entirely, and purposely, disenfranchised by 1828, and would remain so through de facto and de jure practices for several decades to come.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



The Small Start

by Daryn Kleynhans - Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:15 PM

After reading the information and seeing the statistics of the elections, that preceded and followed the 1828 election, I find myself tending to agree with Professor Robert V. Remini because in the 1824 election roughly 260,000 people voted. In the 1828 election approximately 1.1 million people voted which is a 400% increase. The number of voters tended to hang around that 1.1-1.2 million mark until the 1840 election in which about 2.4 million people voted. Which is only a 200% increase. I know the numbers are much larger and therefore harder to increase by 400% but I believe the election of 1840 was a sort of second "revolt" that increased the numbers even more. But, as a final answer I say that the election of 1828 was the start of the "Democratic Revolt of the People".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Daniel Adams - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:59 PM

A democratic revolt?

After looking up the definition of what a democratic revolution is, I found that it is a term that denotes a previous institution and replaces it with a democratic institution. With that being said I do believe the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the people because after southerners were becoming upset with president Adams, a member of the "old republicans" suggested to the current (as of 1828) VP Calhoun, who had also began disagreeing with his own president he was serving under, was convinced to resign and run with Andrew Jackson to recreate a 2 party system. They would then call themselves the "democratic republicans" and by definition they caused a democratic revolution.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



A personal shift in attitude for 'Democratic Revolution': Yes.

by Lloyd Higgins - Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 4:23 PM

In the election of 1828, the landslide victory went to Jackson not necessarily because of sheer numbers, but because of the attitude of the people during the election of 1828. The election tapped into the raw emotions of the people, this led to what many consider the 'revolution' of the democratic party in the United States. My belief is that it was not his policy, or experience, or even political history that elected Jackson to office and started a new paradigm in politics, but his ability to tap into the feelings of the nation. Andrew Jackson chose to tap into the raw emotional power of political fervor that, to this day, is able to sway elections in landslide victories. His military victories in New Orleans and his humble upbringing as a member of the working class ignited the passion of the people, and soon a cult of personality would form to land his movement the decisive victory it needed. His workers drove this home by spreading vicious rumors about Adams, and stoking the fires of imagination to make Jackson a larger than life figure. This is pointed out on page 379 in the textbook. Oddly enough, when Adams attempted the same strategy, it quickly torpedoed his campaign when he drew up accusations regarding Jackson's wife Rachel as an 'adulteress' among other unsavory terms. Modern evidence of this sort of cult-like behavior could be drawn to the 2008 Democratic victory of Barack Obama. The 'Hope' campaign was inspirational and gave people a means to see the presidential victory of Barack Obama as a victory of the people and of the nation. His turnout numbers were not necessarily as high as previous democratic presidents, but it was his ability, along with Jackson's, to tap into the hearts of voters and ultimately land a political victory in Washington. Jackson's 'revolution' as it were, was not necessarily numerically superior than any other, but brought populism and charisma to the center stage of past and contemporary American politics.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/ben-arnon/how-the-obama-hope-poster_b_133874.html

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt?

by Matthew Johnson - Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 5:27 PM

revolt

VERB

- 1. To take violent action against an established government or ruler; rebel.

'the Iceni revolted and had to be suppressed'

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/revolt>

So, in essence, a revolt is the people trying to significantly change the government. A democratic revolt, one would presume is the same as the above definition, but without violence. So, is that what the voters had in mind when they elected Jackson in 1828? Since the common man didn't often write down his (or her) reasons for voting a particular way, lets take a look at Jackson's electoral campaign.

I would like to start with a paragraph from an article about Jackson's political career: "In the 1824 presidential contest, Jackson did not publicly advocate for his own election, in keeping with the tradition of the day. However Jackson did make it clear he was determined to cleanse government of corruption and return it to its earlier values." <https://thehermitage.com/learn/andrew-jackson/president/candidacy/>

He lost that election, but that is certainly a decent piece of evidence for the 1828 election. I would now like to cite another paragraph from the same article: "In the fall of 1828, the decision fell to the voters and they overwhelmingly elected Jackson. His victory was seen as a complete repudiation of Adams and his vision for America. Furthermore, it revealed that some believed the United States government was run by a small group of aristocrats unresponsive to the demands of the voters." It goes on to talk of him as the "common man." Considering, also, that all of the presidents before him WERE of the rich elite, mostly from the wealthy states of Massachusetts and Virginia, including his competition for the 1828 election, I would say that this points towards this being a democratic revolution. The people, at least the ones who voted, which for the purpose of this argument are the only ones who matter, were tired of the rich elite ruling over them.

But what about the 1840 election?

In 1836, Martin Van Buren succeeded Jackson, to the presidency. The timing for Van Buren was disastrous. One of Jackson's acts in his second term was to "forget" to renew the BUS charter. The effects of this action weren't fully felt until Martin Van "Ruin" took office. When the 1840 election came around, Van Buren tried to run for office again, but the damage was done. Harrison won. The voters thought that Van Buren was a terrible president (whether they were right or not is a whole other issue), so they "overthrew" him the first chance they got. In that sense, The 1840 election could also be considered a democratic revolt.

Which one would I chose, if I HAD to choose, which one to call a democratic revolution? Probably Jackson's 1828 election, simply because he was so different than any of the previous presidents, and that's why he got elected. Well, that and Adams screwed up. Which I suppose could be a flaw in my argument. But quite frankly, I would classify both elections a democratic revolutions.



Yes A Democratic Revolt (or at least the beginning of one)

by Riley Heath - Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 10:29 PM

Yes, I do think that the election of 1828 was in fact a democratic revolt, or at least the start of one. Although I don't think that it peaked in the 1828 election. There were many "firsts" that came with this election. Since Jackson believed in rights of the states and and importance of the ordinary citizen or "common people", citizens were passionate and involved than they had ever been before which is why the popular vote increased nearly eight hundred thousand from the previous 1824 election. The articles states that there is a couple different reasons for this, first, there was only two parties rather than several. Second, a large amount of interest had been generated by the scandalous and exciting campaign by both parties. Third, effort by politicians to get people to vote, and lastly, four states who represented a large amount of electoral votes had changed their laws and transferred the selection of electors from the legislature to the people (pg 3). Jackson gave the ordinary citizen or "common man" a chance to express their political opinions and they seized the opportunity by voting for him. This included farmers, workers, frontiersmen, and anybody alike. The democrats were not the only ones who saw the election as a victory by mass numbers, but the Nationals Republicans did as well. One of them even stated, " a great revolution has taken place.. this is what I all along feared but to a much greater extent" and another wrote, " It was the howl of raving democracy" (pg3). The ratio of democrats to republicans was 2:1. For generations historians have seen the election of 1828 as the beginning of the "rise of the common man". Although the "common man" had been rising for generations, I do agree that this election symbolized the peoples arrival to political responsibility even if it was not THE democratic revolt. It was no doubt the emergence of one. I believe the true peak of the democratic revolt was in the election of 1840 when the polls exceeded beyond any previous election, even Jackson's in 1828.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Not a democratic revolt

by Mackenzi Knoll - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 12:50 AM

I do not believe that the 1828 election was a democratic revolt of the people. Although Jackson did win the election over John Quincy Adams, the people were fed up with the system and much of the election simply relied on slander on the personal lives of the two candidates. People were upset with not only politics but social issues as well. Jacksonian democrats stood with Jackson and although it seems as if there was a major voter turnout during the 1828 election, the population and interest in politics became much larger and of greater interest to the people of the United States at the time. Jackson was a controversial president who many liked and many disliked, therefore showing us that there was no revolt or rebellion going on as he won presidency, since he was not very well liked to begin with. Jackson was for slavery and also for the Indian Removal Act. I think that Jackson had to push his way through to presidency. Some would suggest that Jackson won the election by quite a bit of electoral and popular votes, but he was also strongly disliked, was inconsistent, and confusing to the people. I believe that although the voter turnout seemed a lot higher during the 1828 election and the fact that Jackson swept Adams and won do not represent a democratic revolt of the people, as the population increased immensely a couple years prior and during 1828, resulting in many being pulled in as a Jacksonian democrat and wanting to vote due to the many political, social, and dramatic issues between Jackson and Adams. We see proof of this in our textbook *Liberty, Equality, Power A History of the American People*.

"The presidential election campaign of 1828 was an exercise in slander rather than a debate on public issues" (pg 379). We also see proof of this in our textbook as it discusses how voters felt about Jackson, since as we know many disliked him as well. "Many voters did agree that only a man who strictly obeyed the law was fit to be president and that Jackson's "passionate" nature disqualified him" (pg 379). Here, we see proof that people did not feel as if Jackson was fit to be president as he was not a man of his word, had made unlawful decisions and actions, and also was often confusing and contradicting to himself and what he had said he believed in. Therefore, I do not believe that this election was a democratic revolt of the people, as the population just grew immensely and Jackson was somehow able to pull voters in and take the win over Adams, even though he was not very well liked and to this day is still a controversial person and president.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Both Elections Causes

by Rachel Gragg - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 4:16 PM

In Richard P. McCormick's essay, he addresses that the election of 1828 was not a cause of a democratic revolt because the election of 1840 was more of a cause. I would argue that they both could have been causes for a democratic revolt. The election of 1840 did have a more significant turnout, making it arguable that it was a cause, however, until that time, the election of 1828 had one of the largest voter turnouts yet. According to McCormick, in the election of 1840, "...four out of five (78.0 per cent) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren" (Handout page 7). In the election of 1828, 56% of people voted. That clearly shows that the election of 1840 had a much more significant turnout, however, until that time, it was still a large amount of voters for the election of 1828.

So many people were excited about the election of Andrew Jackson that it has to be considered a cause. When he was inaugurated, "15,000-30,000 citizens came to Washington to witness... Many traveled as much as 500 miles" (*Liberty Equality and Power* Pg 380).

Jackson had supporters from all over the country and large and vast amounts of them. Up until his election this amount of voters had never been seen before. The election of 1840 was definitely significant and could be considered a cause for a democratic revolt, but it is important to not discount the impact the election of 1828 had as well.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Yes to a Democratic Revolt

by Anna Chan - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 4:22 PM

I think that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people. I think that it represented a democratic revolt because we can see the overwhelming support that the people presented for Jackson was unprecedented. A fair amount of people looked at Jackson and saw that he was a relatable candidate that they could get behind. He was this "self-made man" and became this living example to others. Out of the total amount of votes that had been cast, Andrew Jackson had received 56% of the votes which was still a significant amount over his opponent John Quincy Adams.

One of the biggest reasons why I think that this was a democratic revolt of the people was that there was an increase of 800,000 people who came out to vote for their respective candidates.

There were a few reasons for this increase in number of voters. A lot of it had to do with the changes to the political system since the previous election. Apart from the new separation of the political parties, there was a lot of thrilling campaigning between both parties that drew in a fair amount of interest from the public. A few states also gained more voters because they moved the selection of the electors to the people from the legislation.

We can also see that this was a democratic revolt of the people by looking at the electoral college votes that were awarded to each of the candidates. If you look at the previous election there wasn't one candidate that had received the necessary votes to become president but in this election Andrew Jackson had won 178 electoral votes where as John Quincy Adams had only 83 votes. There is a clear difference between the two elections as we can see. Overall, Jackson and the change in the political system is what really made this election a democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

◀ A Democratic Revolt?

Age of Jackson ▶

 Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)