

HST 202: History of United States W19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 202 W19 \(Escobar Meta 30767 30768\)](#) / [Week 3](#) / [Forum 1](#) / [Taking Sides - Election of 1828](#)

?

Search forums

Forum 1

Taking Sides - Election of 1828

 [Subscribe](#)

◀ [Taking Sides - Election of 1828](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, January 18, 2019, 9:06 PM

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 one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Sum of ratings: [_](#) [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



General Thoughts about the 1828 election
by [Trevor Myers](#) - Sunday, January 20, 2019, 6:59 PM

YES

After reading the essays provided I agree most with Robert V. Remini. The primary reason that I agree with his stance. I think that this was a democratic uprising of the people, though not in the way that Remini put it "'It was the raving howl of democracy'" (Page 3, 4th paragraph), mostly due to the large turnout from both sides of this election. It was a howl of democracy, but not only for Jackson, but against him as well. The most influential information to me was actually wikipedia's chart regarding the total numbers of votes for each candidate, with Jackson getting 647,286 votes versus Adam's 508,064. Despite the fact that I agree more with Remini, I think that McCormick had the best analytically. McCormick's essay seemed to me at least to get more facts from a neutral standpoint until the end of the essay, where they make their stance better known.

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



Re: General Thoughts about the 1828 election
by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 1:24 PM

I agree with your statement, McCormick had great stats to support his arguement, but I think Jackson's influence was to substantial. He created a national "identity" with the continuation of the two party system.

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



Re: General Thoughts about the 1828 election
by [Trevor Myers](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 7:21 PM

Although I have not changed my opinion from yes, I have had my views swayed a bit on this issue so far. On Tuesday of this week during class Professor Escobar showed us a graphic that really helped to put the question of whether or not this really was THE democratic uprising of the people. I believe it was this one <https://i.pinimg.com/736x/c0/13/fe/c013fecf510abd6a7104860845844a35.jpg>. This graph swayed me a bit on this issue because it puts McCormick's point about how the real democratic uprising could have been considered 1832 (page 5, paragraph 6). While I still think the bump in voting numbers is impressive, I personally am not sure if Jackson was the soul cause for the rates of voters, as they continued to grow in elections after 1828.

Sum of ratings:[1](#)

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



Re: General Thoughts about the 1828 election
by [Braidyn Bowden](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 7:57 PM

I completely agree with what you are saying. I was also thinking that it was not only a "howl" of democracy for Jackson but against him almost entirely. I had no idea on the voting numbers. I also was really hesitant about picking the yes side because I think McCormick had a really good point/argument.

Sum of ratings:[0](#)

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



Does statistics tell the whole story? (YES)
by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Sunday, January 20, 2019, 11:27 PM

In today's reality we have to be wary of the information that we absorb. A common vector for information is in the form of statistics. Richard P. McCormick main foundation of his argument is on statistics, and yes some of these arguments are compelling, but there has to be more than numbers. For example McCormick states that Jackson won the majority of voters in 1828, but not as much as a landslide as the history books make it out to seem. McCormick than states that out of the six highest states three went to Adams and Three favored Jackson. Suggesting it was a lot more close in reality. When Van Buren replaced Jackson 1836 it was slightly higher then the election of 1832 (Jackson's second term). Now all of this legitimate, but I see more to the story of Jackson's reign. Jackson is definitely controversial, but controversy attracts the american people. Jackson was considered a war hero of New Orleans, he was as Robert V. Remini stated a "self-made man". Didn't come from money he got where he wanted by his own abilities. I see this kind of attraction today. I think people tend to support others who "understand" the struggles and work ethics that we have to do in order to survive. We love to support people who have started from nothing. That's what I see with Jackson. He was the outcast war hero now in the grit and grime of politics. The american people see him as one of them, someone who "gets it". It gave the voice to the people who felt like they couldn't be heard. I am not one hundred percent certain if he brought this democratic revolt of the people. I can see a person like Jackson having the influence to do so.

Sum of ratings:[2](#)

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



Re: Does statistics tell the whole story? (YES)
by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 1:04 PM

Title seems a bit confusing YES is for Remini argument

Sum of ratings:[0](#)

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



Re: Does statistics tell the whole story? (YES)
by [Jamie Sumner](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 9:17 AM

I'm a little confused on where you stand on this topic. The yes side is Robert v Remini and no would be McCormick. I took it as in McCormick's article you noticed that he mentioned that a lot of historians focus on the "misconception regarding voter behavior before 1824" (5). While he mentions that there is a population increase between this election and the 1832 election he doesn't provide much information about how we misinterpret it. Although in the "yes" article he provides very clearly what the voter turn out rate was. It went from 26% to 54% (3). So I'm not really sure where you stand on this. You brought up both points but didn't make a stand on it. I do

agree with you partially that Jackson was the “common” man’s person and in my opinion that’s why voter turn out rate was higher than the previous election. Before this they mostly voter for local legislature (2). However, would you mind clearing up which side you’re on. Thank you!

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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

 **Re: Does statistics tell the whole story? (YES)**
by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 8:49 PM

As for right now I stand more on Remini (YES) side of the argument. These two historians bring up excellent points, but my biggest take away, stats aside, was how Jackson’s personality resonated with the “common working man.” I just wanted to be clear that I understood what McCormick was stating. Remini quotes “no matter how the statistics are analyzed or interpreted the people themselves who lived at the time believed Jackson’s represented a surge of popular support for the general.” (Page 3 Paragraph 3) He goes to say he gave a voice for masses, and that is why I’m leaning for Remini.

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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

 **Re: Does statistics tell the whole story? (YES)**
by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 6:45 PM

Your views seem to lean more towards Remini, and the reading does say that “twenty thousand people from all parts of the country converged on Washington to witness the triumph of their candidate” (Election of 1828 p. 4) This implies people expressed their confidence in Jackson. Although this may be the case, the voter participate revealed through the statistics of McCormick suggest that the years following this election were greater than in Jacksons period. I believe the use of the statistics have a good credibility and show that 1840 started the “democratic uprising”.

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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

 **Re: Does statistics tell the whole story? (YES)**
by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 7:23 PM

Pablo Carrasco: I enjoyed reading your post. The main thing that stood out with me was that you said “That Jackson is definitely controversial, but controversy attracts the American people. Jackson was considered a war hero of New Orleans, he was as Roberts V. Remini stated a “self-made man”. Didn’t come from money he got where he wanted by his own abilities. I see this kind of attraction today. I think people tend to support others who “understand” the struggles and work ethics that we must do in order to survive”.

I couldn’t agree more with you especially when you stated: controversy attracts the American people. And you stated: I see this kind of attraction today. I also see this attraction in these times. People do tend to support other who “understand “the struggles and work ethics we must do. It is very appealing and attractive to people. I think that was diffidently the case with Jackson when he ran for president of the United States, people could easily relate to Him.

You said: I am not one hundred percent certain if he brought this democratic revolt of the people.

So, after reading other people post and you doing your own thinking on this topic, have you decided one way or the other?

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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

 **not a Democratic revolt**
by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 2:47 PM

After reading the articles I would agree with Richard P. McCormick that the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people, McCormick believes that the voting statistics can demonstrate that a revolution nor revolt took place. He believes a revolt did not occur till the Election of 1840, when balanced political parties had been organized in almost every state and the percentage rate of voter turnout was larger McCormick’s stance was more evident to me on how he presented his statistical data as evidence that supported his claim.

However even though I agree that the election was not technically a Democratic revolt, major changes did take place concerning politics, such as qualifications to vote, the use of insults and accusations, especially unjust ones, with the aim of damaging the reputation of an opponent, and the creation of the Whig party in the 1830's pg 393 in txt book, who originally formed in opposition to Jackson and his policies. pg 394 in txt states the leaders of the Whig party included Henry Clay, Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun who left Jackson and the democratic party due to Jackson treatment of the South Carolina nullifiers and the Biddle's Bank, and who distrusted his assurances on slavery

A mayor change that contributed to the election was the qualifications that allowed citizens to vote. In 1828, the requirement that only a male who owns property was dropped and changed, thus allowing any white male to vote. Also voting by voice was replaced with paper ballots. This allowed many people to vote for Jackson.

Many of the people that made up the Jacksonian democracy could vote. Giving him more votes and earning him the title "the common man's president". Jackson who was seen as common as you or I. He was from the Western frontier and was a self-made man. The first six presidents were all from Eastern establishments, all wealthy, all founding fathers (or the son of a founding father), and except for Washington, all educated in the best schools of their day. It was just a new time when political voting and forms of politics where changing. It was the first election in which parties and campaigns played a major role in the election of a president, more or less like you see currently in presidential campaigns today.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



The democratic revolt of 1828

by [Jamie Sumner](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 5:07 PM

The election of Andrew Jackson as president in 1828 created a democratic revolt of the people. This election marked the beginning of the "rise of the common man" (3). From the election of 1824 to the election of 1828 voter participation jumped from 26.5% to 56.3% (6). While you have to take into consideration the population increase between these two elections, you also have to take into account what and who these people were voting for. Andrew Jackson appealed to the common man, workers, farmers, etc. He stressed the importance of the ordinary citizen and emphasized states rights (2). In 1828 these "common people" finally felt they had the chance to express their political opinions, through Jackon. Before this election, presidential elections weren't of much interest to the "common man" voters. They mostly cared about local and state legislation (6). They went from mostly caring about local legislation to doubling the number of voters in the 1828 election, thus showing the democratic revolt of the common people to have their voices heard.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

1

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Robert Whitney](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:17 PM

In response to the topic at hand, I'd have to agree with Robert V. Remini. After being presented with all the information regarding the election of 1828, the argument in support of it being a democratic revolt makes more sense than the alternate theory. The textbook says that the response to the 1824 "Corrupt Bargain" election "created a rhetoric of intrigue and betrayal that nourished a rising democratic movement" (Textbook, 375,376). Americans after the 1824 election felt betrayed and that their politicians were more interested in winning seats rather than the well being of the nation.

The people of the early 1820's wanted a change in leadership and Jackson proved to be who they wanted. Voter turnout increased over eight hundred thousand over the previous election (Packet Page 2) and the harshness of John Quincy Adams' campaign towards Jackson "enhanced his image" (Textbook, 379). Americans were beginning to see through Adams' deeply personal attacks on Jackson, and proved it with both voter turnout and the outcome of the election.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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



Re: 1824 versus 1840 voter turnout

by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 8:50 PM

Robert Whitney: Hello

Yes, the (textbook 375 & 376) does say: "That the reaction to the alleged Corrupt Bargain dominated the Adams administration and created a rhetoric of intrigue and betrayal that nourished a rising democratic movement." In my own opinion and understanding. A democratic movement is not considered a democratic revolt. If it was a revolt, don't you think they would have used the words democratic revolt, instead of democratic movement, in the book.

I am just wondering what your opinion and or definition of what a democratic movement is, and what is your opinion and or definition of a democratic revolt would be.

In the McCormick's essay page seven paragraph five says: "The Tippecanoe canvas witnessed an extraordinary expansion of the size of the presidential electorate far beyond previous dimensions. It was 1840, then that the "roaring flood of the new democracy" reached its crest and it engulfed the Jacksonian's" This quote clearly states a mass flow of voters and common man that participated during this time.

Are you still for Remini? It sounds like I am trying to sway your opinion to McCormick views of no, maybe I am?

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: 1828 versus 1840 voter turnout
by [Robert Whitney](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 9:05 PM

I don't think that the revolt necessarily it has to be either election year. I think that both could be considered a revolt. Both times the general public decided against the previous presidents and both times the new elects experienced large blowouts in the electoral college. However, the popular vote raw vote margin was roughly the same for both candidates. The 1840 election experienced about twice as many voters as the 1828 election, but, Harrison only had a 6% popular advantage over Van Buren. Having 6% more of the public vote one way doesn't sound to me (personally) as a revolt, but more so as a solid victory. Jackson in his 1828 election experienced not only an electoral college blowout, but a 12% popular vote advantage over Adams; twice the advantage Harrison had. My opinion has changed a little in the ways that I realize that the 1840 election could have represented a revolt, but the 1828 still seems to me to be the true revolt.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Aaron Richards](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:38 PM

I agree with Robert Remini's position. Following the election of 1824 many Jackson supporters were outraged at the fact that Adams won the presidency. Jackson furthered this outrage by calling out Adams about the Corrupt Bargain. After Adams only term Jackson won the election by a large margin partly in due by the fact that only two candidates were running.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Jamie Sumner](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 12:46 PM

I do agree with you and think that one of the reasons Jackson won was because the people realized they didn't want Adams as their president anymore. Especially because this election seemed like it was less politics and more who could bash who more and it backfired on Adams, (textbook p. 379). But I was wondering if you thought that Jackson won solely because of all of this backlash on Adams or if you thought it was because he was the "common man's" vote? In the handout on page two and into three, Remini talks about how before this election the "common people" tended to care more about state legislature rather than national. Thoughts?

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 8:09 PM

To continue, Jackson not only spoke out about the corrupt bargain, but thought "a corrupt power once again threatened to snuff out liberty." (377) He spoke out against the current administration, raising contempt for Henry Clay and Adams. With Adams implements of Nationalism the common American disapproved of the connection "between federal public works projects and high taxes, intrusive government, the denial of

democratic majorities, and expanded opportunities for corruption, secret deals, and special favors." (378) With these points in mind, and the fact that many like minded "Republicans" supported Jackson over Adams, it is not surprising that many people voted for Jackson.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Taking Sides - Do I think the election of 1828 caused a revolt?

by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:47 PM

Nicolette D'Erazo

Richard P. McCormick opposed the idea that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt and I agree with him because it appeared that the participation of voters in Jackson’s election was less than great and showcased a political imbalance. “None of the Jackson elections involved a ‘mighty democratic uprising’ in the sense that voters were drawn to the polls in unprecedented proportions” (Taking Sides Notes p.8). Additionally, McCormick stated that the democratic uprising happened after Jackson’s presidency. “It was in 1840, then, that the ‘roaring flood of the new democracy’ reached its crest and it engulfed the Jacksonians” (Taking Sides Notes p.7). In 1844 74.9 percent of electorate went to the polls and although this percent was lower than 1840, the voter participation was still higher during that time than during Jackson’s candidacy.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Not Quite a Revolt

by [Benjamin Planck](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:53 PM

The Jacksonian Era should undoubtedly be looked upon as a turning point in American politics, from the reemergence of a two-party system to the newfound “power” of the common man. In term of the election of 1828 however, it would be erroneous to state that a “democratic uprising” took place. Andrew Jackson’s immense celebrity status and his undeniable representation of a self-made common man, paired with a generation of young men oozing with professionalism and ambition, makes him an easy target for those seeking an answer to the political shifts taking place during this time. When it comes to the election of 1828, no brighter picture can be painted for Jackson’s place in this political enigma, that is until you look at the statistics.

When it comes to analyzing whether or not Jackson played a role in the changes taking place during his time, voter participation and the conditions placed upon voter participation must be taken into account. Using the fact that in all states besides Rhode Island, Virginia and Louisiana, “the potential electorate after 1824 was roughly equivalent to the adult white male population”(Richard P. McCormick, “New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics” Paragraph 6), we can measure voter turnout in terms of the percentage of adult white males who actually voted. When we use this basis, it is found that the average percentage of voter turnout in the election of 1828(56.3%) bested that of 1824(26.5%), but not the elections that took place before 1824. Was this because of Jackson’s resurgence as a presidential candidate, destined in taking down the political elite? Hardly, there are a few factors that played into this increase in voter turnout. The first being the obvious increase in the total population of American Citizens. Another reason for the increase in voter turnout could be attributed to changes of laws regarding the voting process in certain states(New York made changes in suffrage qualifications). Both of these would suggest an increase in voter turnout not in relation to Jackson.

The sudden emergence of a second party system might have played a direct role in the difference of voter turnout between 1824 and 1828, but not because Jackson was at the forefront of the new party. Before the “Democratic Republican Party” came to fruition, there had really only been one party option, this lack of diversity likely deterred the “common man” from voting, simply because of disinterest. Take into account that in 1824 there were 4 candidates instead of 2, the feeling of a true contest was all but present. Thus, the emergence of another party system likely stimulated interest among the electorate. It it commonly believed that Jackson brought “the age of the common man,” this doesn’t necessarily hold up however when you take into account the fact that the “common man” had been very present and active when in regards to state and local elections. A reason for this may be because of a higher interest in elections that likely had more impact on their lives. “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.”(Richard P. McCormick, “New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics” Paragraph 14) So the narrative that the common man was either not inspired to vote or was unable to vote before the election of 1824 cannot be supported.

If Jackson was the driving factor behind a “democratic uprising” then his retirement from politics should show a fairly dramatic decrease in political interest should it not? This does not happen with the 1836 election receiving a 55.2% average voter turnout. It is not until 1840 when the average percentage of eligible voters actually voting skyrocketed to 78%, a number that superseded that of the Jackson era by more than 40%. With 14 of the 25 states setting record highs for voting, is becomes apparent that while the election of 1828 did see the beginnings of a second political party, it wasn’t until that party fully developed in 1840 that we saw a true “democratic uprising”.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: Not Quite a Revolt

by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 8:02 PM

Great job on supporting your argument,I really appreciate that you bring on both sides to support your claim. I am on the side that Jackson did bring a democratic revolt to the american people. I was really on the fence at first because McCormick really locks down at every angle proving that Jackson era did not bring a democratic revolt. When McCormick states in 1840 that eligible voters risen 78% brings up some questions. We know that Immigration was on the rise around this time, could this be a big reason why the numbers exponentially rises? I'm not sure what was the voting restrictions on immigration but I would like to hear your opinion on this. As well as do you think that Jackson was the catalyst of the politics that we see today? The political attacks, Cartoons, scrutiny at one another?

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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



Re: Not Quite a Revolt

by [Benjamin Planck](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:15 PM

Thank you for responding to my post, I wasn't sure if anyone was going to. With regards to your insight into whether or not immigration played a part in the election of 1828, and whether it had any impact on the voting, I cannot say for sure but I do believe the major influx of immigrants(Particularly from Ireland) came after the 1840 election, around 1848-50. As to your other question regarding whether or not Jackson played a crucial role into how the campaigns today are rife with slander, I truly don't believe that to be the case. I believe the nature of the campaign was heading that direction regardless of Jacksons participation in it, it is also a good thing to note that Adams played just as much a role as AJ when it came to politically ambushing the opposing candidate.

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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



Re: Not Quite a Revolt

by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 12:23 PM

I joined this class because I know nothing on american history (especially in politics), I think we get so hung up on AJ because he was such a dynamic figure. He was hypocritical, he was assertive, and he definitely was controversial. I honestly agree with you that this type of politics was going to happen. During the week we also learned that state chartered banks wasn't a great idea causing people to see Jackson and of course Van Buren as the problem. These situations are the reason why I was on the fence, and really starting to think that AJ was not the cause of this so called "Democratic Revolt". If he was then definitely not in a positive manner

Sum of ratings:[1](#)(1)

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



Election of 1828. YES to Democratic party

by [Braidyn Bowden](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 10:13 PM

YES

I believe that the election of 1828 did represent a Democratic Revolt of the people. Andrew Jackson's victory in the election was revolutionary and encouraged the start of the Democratic party. The first Yes reply in the PDF on the topic states "The election of 1828 witnessed the reemergence of the two-party system,.." (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sJk9KmlDHotiCMuWWDu8CcXQQdjKpz5u/view>) supporting my yes choice by saying it was the beginning of a political split between Democrats and Republicans and the uprising of the Democratic party. This election was important because for the first time an average man had won the votes of America because of what he believed in and stood up for rather than his money or status. Before the election there was technically only one party, so from the beginning of the election Andrew Jackson calls himself and his voters Democrats starting the formation of the Democratic party. He was elected through a more Democratic process than presidents had been before.The party mostly consisted of the south, built on states rights and against northern

interest. Jackson was the leader of new democracy and encouraging the poor people of America to participate in the election which eventually lead to his victory. During his time as president changes in campaigns and rules made the country's beliefs more democratic than they had ever been before.

Sum of ratings:[1\(1\)](#)

1

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



Re: Election of 1828. YES to Democratic party
by [James Hebert](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 7:04 PM

First of all, I would like to say well put! I really appreciate it when I have a document well organized so that I can follow the writer’s train of thought.

So, in my first post I stated that I did not think that there was a revolution or even that much of a change based on the context of the times, when it came to voting and general morale. But, after reading your post and a couple other articles more thoroughly, I believe that an election did represent a democratic revolt, but only to a certain extent. Like is seen in the second essay in the handout mr. Escobar gave us, it came later. When the essay says, “It was in 1840, then, that the “roaring flood of the new democracy” reached its crest and it engulfed the Jacksonians”(page 7 of 8). This quote from the document clearly states this idea of a mass flow of voters and common man participation. This document and your response really helped to open my eyes to the idea that it is completely false to state that there was this revolt in the election of 1828. I hope that other people (or you) respond to this so as to further this discussion. Thanks!

Sum of ratings:[1\(1\)](#)

1

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



Re: Election of 1828. YES to Democratic party
by [Benjamin Planck](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:46 PM

While I agree that a shift occurred in the duration between 1824 and 1828, I disagree that this shift demonstrated a "revolt" of the democratic party. The election of 1824 had essentially the same party, yes. The election of 1824 also had 4 candidates running for the election representing the same party, this we can agree on. What we shouldn't forget however is that Jackson was a part of that election, and he lost. So what might've changed so much over the course of 4 years that brought Jackson to a landslide victory? I'd say there were a few factors. The first being the total increase in the U.S. population, thats a given. Another would be the fact that BECAUSE 1828 brought forth a second party and fewer candidates, the overall electorate found themselves more stimulated to vote simply because they found themselves in a position to do so, not with the intent to start a revolution. The two-party system brought forth a true sense of real competition and the electorate felt they had a newfound "responsibility" to vote after the Virginia dynasty had dwindled. Jackson just happened to be that man they looked at because he represented the complete opposite of the type of president the electorate had so frequently been subjected to. I don't believe 1828 was an example of a democratic revolution, I don't believe the common man set out to vote with the intent of inspiring change, I believe the common man set out to vote in a reaction to the change that had already transpired.

Sum of ratings:[2\(1\)](#)

2

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



Looking Into The Context of Information Given
by [James Hebert](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 10:40 PM

When looking at these two essays from different points of view, I found myself being stuck trying to find out which side I can logically and fully side with. On the side of the first essay it made me feel as if yes there was a democratic revolt represented by the election of 1828! Especially when he started the essay off by telling us how respected and admired Jackson was, and how he was seen as “a living example of the self-made man” (Page 1 of 8.) He then continued later on speaking on the counting of the ballots on page 2 of 8, where he says, “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 percent of the entire vote.” This fact made me see this as a great victory and an uproar of votes coming in. He then continues speaking on the dramatic rise of the ballot number in several different states (but I don’t want to have to quote the entire essay). This again makes it seems as if there was this democratic revolt in 1828, but if you look at the next essay by Richard McCormick, you see that is not the case.

It is very easy to look at the data out of context and come to certain conclusions that weren't meant to be made, which is why a lot of people believe that there was this great uproar took place back then. McCormick writes, "The average voter participation for all the states in 1828 was 56.3 per cent. Before 1824 fifteen of the twenty-two states has 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." (As you can notice, their numbers of who voted match, hopefully then confirming their credibility) These facts can be seen as shocking. There were not as many people in that election of 1828 as there were in 1824. So, in conclusion, no I do not believe that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people.

I really hope to get some good discussions out of this post, so please give me your input! Thanks!

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Looking Into The Context of Information Given

by [Benjamin Planck](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 9:35 PM

I really appreciate the way you analyzed both sides of the argument with both essays. To me, Richard P. McCormick took the cake when it came to persuading his audience regarding not only the elections of 1824 and 1828, but those before and after. I loved the way he used his conclusion on the great question and took that conclusion through every possible avenue of perspective. In essence, people were unamused in the election of 1824, an election Jackson was a part of and lost. I think McCormick did a great job at separating Jackson's presence from the equation that was the increase in voter turnout, furthering his point and strengthening his conclusion that Jackson played no part in the democratic "movement". The addition of the "Republican-Democratic" party amused voters as now there seemed to be an actual competition. I look at this similar to betting on a horse race, if the same horse always wins, why bet on it? Now if another horse enters the race, a horse with unknown potential,I'd be more likely to vote for that horse. Anyway, I appreciate your analysis of both sides, and I support your conclusion!

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Looking Into The Context of Information Given

by [James Hebert](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 10:35 PM

I never thought of it that way! I really like your analogy of betting on a race horse. Without competition it is really easy to win an election. Would you say that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt? I, as my second post claims, believe that it didn't and that it came a few years later.

To be sure of the authenticity of your nominees, I believe that you have to look at their track record and what they generally come from as a person. For example, Andrew Jackson was a man who wasn't exactly orthodox when it came to other men running for office. The people saw him as a "man's man" who was able to get stuff done, which I can appreciate.

As I was saying before, I don't think it represents a revolt, simply based on the poll numbers of the times. Sure you had a new political party which brings forth new competition, but I believe it is an unwise choice to forget about the context of the voter turnout within a radius of about 20-50 years.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



forum 1 my idea of the electionof 1828

by [Ha Neul Lee](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 10:48 PM

The election of 1828 was a very controversial election. Is it a success of the democratic party? Or is the election itself just a fresh turn of the people of America who have been tired of the Democratic-Republican party? The term Democratic revolt (or revolution) means of a democratic movement where the rights of the people (common normal people) were elevated of the result of the action. (marrian webster dictionary) The action of the American revolution

or the French revolution is a good example of a democratic revolt. However, how do we justify the results of a single election in the year 1828 as a ‘Democratic Revolt’? I personally think this is a question that we need to be careful about answering.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: forum 1 my idea of the electionof 1828
by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 8:12 PM

You bring a really good point about asking if a single term could be considered a “revolt”. Are you more on the side of McCormick? That it had to take several elections until 1840 that we start to see this “revolt”?

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

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



Taking sides with McCormick
by [Maximillian Prentice](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:57 PM

The arguments presented in both the essay by Robert Remini, and the essay by Richard McCormick, are presented well and accompanied by a lot of information. Whether or not you believe the 1828 election represented a “democratic revolt” of the people of the U.S., it was still a time of much change in the United States. Some folks felt misrepresented, some felt left out, and some were worried their ways of life could be challenged.

While I do feel like there was extra support from the population around the election of Andrew Jackson, I do not feel as though it represented any kind of revolt. The essay by McCormick details of the voting trends of years before, and after, the election of 1828 and the numbers are just too up and down to feel like this election was the beginning of a “new wave” of democracy.

Even though I do not feel like the 1828 election was any sort of revolution, I do feel as though it was significant. Jackson was a candidate that normal working-class people could get behind and I feel like those types of people only come around every so often, and it is exciting for the citizens of the country when those types of people do come around. I feel like what sets some presidential candidates apart from others is the support they get from all people, and Jackson pretty much had that. I feel like the people of the country really did love him, but the data and voter rates mentioned in McCormick’s essay do not reflect a revolution.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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



Switching sides
by [Jamie Sumner](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 8:03 PM

When I made my original post I decided that yes, I did agree that this was a democratic revolt. I looked at both sides and even though some of the reasons that there was a big change in the amount of votes was because of population increase, I still thought yes. However in class today I think I changed my mind. Joe showed us the “Universal White Manhood Suffrage Map,” and it showed the different qualifications for being able to vote in the year 1800 and in 1830. I think it really opened my eyes that the reason more people were voting wasn’t because of a “democratic revolt,” it was because they were given the right to vote. All the states aside from Virginia, made their voting laws less strict allowing more and more people to vote. This is why I’ll be switching from my original yes, to a no.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Switching sides
by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 4:00 PM

You bring up a very good point that I overlooked. The election of 1828 did bring in votes, which from Remini’s views suggested that “people went to the pulls to express their confidence in Jackson.” (Election of 1828 p.3) However, they were simply expressing political responsibility of their new freedom and ability to vote. This election does hold significance, for these reasons, rather than for the reason of being an overwhelming Democratic uprising.

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

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)



Re: Switching sides

by [Jamie Sumner](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 5:30 PM

I completely agree! The election is very significant. I'm not sure if you saw my original post, but I mentioned how I thought the "common" people really felt like they were heard because of Jackson. However, I definitely think the restrictions played a pretty big role in the amount of votes in this election.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

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



A movement is not a revolt

by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 8:54 PM

As I said before, no it wasn't a revolt. Jackson won the election of 1828 mostly because the allegedly corrupt bargain by his opponent in the 1824 election. Yes, the (textbook 375 & 376) does say: "That the reaction to the alleged Corrupt Bargain dominated the Adams administration and created a rhetoric of intrigue and betrayal that nourished a rising democratic movement." In my opinion a democratic movement is not considered a democratic revolt. As far as the text book goes, If it was a revolt, they would have used the words democratic revolt, and they did not.

Most of the people did not like the American System that Adams was all for. Soon after Jefferson defeat in 1824 he began planning for his 1828 run, contacting and marshalling political allies. Jackson had many political machines rallying behind him, where he set up newspaper stands that went against Adams beliefs. This provided publicity and allowed Adams to be put down with criticism. And yes, the mudslinging went both ways.

All this help Jefferson win the election, because of the opposition that occurred in 1828 over the election. Soon after the Democratic Party was founded by Jackson and Martin Van Buren, which makes it the oldest political party in the United States.

Again, as I stated before it was just a new time when political voting and forms of politics where changing. It was the first election in which parties and campaigns played a major role in the election of a president.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: A movement is not a revolt

by [Pablo Carrasco](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 12:36 PM

I'm starting to see a theme where the argument is that one term is not enough for a revolt. This was more of a movement, and to be fair I sort of agree with these statements. What do you think started a democratic revolt? If Jackson didn't then who and what did? We learned in class that the United States went through a movement of evangelical protestants wanting to make this country a kingdom of god. Protestants are more inspired to vote for someone or something (ie. party) that share the same vision. We also talked about reforms could this be the reason why we see a surge of votes? These are of course getting these "drunks" off the streets, women rights, and of course slavery, that are also getting people more active in voting. Would love to hear people's opinions on this!

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: A movement is not a revolt

by [Braidyn Bowden](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 8:25 PM

I think after reading this and a few other posts I agree with you and am considering switching sides. As I've been reading the book and looking over the articles we were given I'm starting to agree more with the No stance and also with your opinion that a movement is not exactly a revolt. Also, I did not see the words Revolt in the textbook and I specifically looked for it while reading. On page 8 of the article McCormick "Associated with this imbalance was the immature development of national parties in connection with the Jackson elections. " I think this is saying that this so-called "revolt" that people thought was happening was only a result of an underdeveloped understanding of political parties.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: A movement is not a revolt

by [Maximillian Prentice](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 7:47 PM

You bring up a good point here, referencing the immature development of national parties. I think it is important to take into account just how much the US as a whole was changing and developing at this point. McCormick references the "population increase during the interval" between the 1824 election and 1832 (Pg 5, McCormick). Other things were changing drastically at the time like who could vote, among other things.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: A movement is not a revolt

by [Trevor Myers](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 9:08 PM

I have to say that I disagree here about not calling it a revolt. Google's definition of Revolt is as follows "To attempt to overthrow the authority of the state; rebel". I think that this can correctly be called a revolt because of the fact that at the time Adams represented the authority of the state that the people backing Jackson were attempting to overthrow. Albeit in a non-violent way through channels of democracy. I don't think that lack of violence is a strong enough case to not call this a revolt.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: A movement is not a revolt

by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 3:45 PM

Trevor, Thanks for your response.

While at the time Adams did represent the authority of the state and most of the people did not like the American System that Adams was for. I believe there is a lot more going on here than just people not liking Adams and the System, and so therefore will just call it a revolt because of Google's definition of a revolt ("states to attempt to overthrow the authority of the state".) Says so.

Because of the opposition that occurred in the 1828 over the election, there were different qualifications for being able to vote during the 1800 to 1830s, they were given this right to vote that they didn't have before. Maybe it was the reforms and that could be another reason why there was a surge in vote. It was a new time when political voting and forms of politics were changing, and an election where parties and campaigns played major role in the election of 1828. They simply were expressing their political responsibility of their new freedom and ability to vote.

I think of the American Revolution or the French Revolution would be in my opinion a better example of what a democratic revolt would look like.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: A movement is not a revolt

by [Benjamin Planck](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 9:53 PM

Taking the definition of revolt as you have stated into consideration, I could see how it may seem to look like one. I disagree in that while the common man may have been very interested in a change of authority, the driving force behind their participation was not with that intent. Remember Van Buren was a very crafty man, he went around spreading the word to many influential people, and in an era where "high pressure" tactics were used to persuade voters (occasionally through actual violence), it wouldn't be outrageous to suggest those tactics may have played a huge role in that vote being cast to Jackson. McCormick also stated on pg. 8 of his essay that "Of the six highest states in voter participation in 1828, three favored Adams and three favored Jackson" This doesn't (to me) illustrate that of a revolt, but simply a high amount of political stimulation thrust upon the electorate in the aftermath of the fall of the Virginia dynasty.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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

Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828



by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 5:06 PM

After watching the Age of Jackson videos, it seems to me that historian, Eric Foner was supporting the idea that the election of 1828 was not a revolt. He stated that “participation in public life expanded” (Age of Jackson Video #1) And that because of the competition between the two major parties, Democrats and Whigs, people were influenced and drawn to politics and rallies. But then Foner added that “race drew the line of exclusion in politics ” (Age of Jackson Video #1). He went on to say that voting at the time was very “limited”. It seems as though Foner was suggesting that it wasn’t a revolt because the only people participating in politics, although very intrigued and influenced, were white males and because the majority of voter participation was so select, it was not a revolution. I don’t know how others interpreted the first Age of Jackson video, thoughts?

Sum of ratings:[1](#)([1](#))

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



A Rising of the Common People

by [Trevor Myers](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 7:09 PM

Over the course of the week I have been thinking more and more about the implication of the increased numbers of voter turn out. In my pondering so far I have come to re-affirm my original stance that yes it was a democratic milestone. Even if you put the numbers from the years following elections next to the numbers from this year, I still think that this was a milestone. Not quite to the extreme that Remini romantasizes it as "a veritable landslide" (page 2, paragraph 4). I think that one of the things that make McCormick seem to view this election negativly is the poor political practices that were utilized, however I for one don't think that matters in the long haul. I think this because irregardless of what happened before it or after it, this election got the people involved in the political process in a way that hadn't been seen before, I blew life into the stagnating pool that was American politics at this time in history.

Sum of ratings:[1](#)([1](#))

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



Re: A Rising of the Common People

by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 3:18 PM

The fact that this was an election where two major political parties were at play, Democrats and Whigs, got people excited for it and the period influenced a thriving system. “Participation in public life expanded” (Eric Foner, Age of Jackson Video). This can be seen as a very positive step forward in American politics, as you said. It is interesting that you bring up McCormick’s views of the negative political practices as a reason why it wasn’t a revolt. During the reading, I was interpreting that his arguement was based off the statistics of 1840 and onward, rather than because of the poor moral politics and because of that I was thinking that even though this election sparked some voter interest with those who were exercising their new political freedoms, as stated by Remini, wouldn’t the enthusiasm that was sparked during the election of 1828 have continued on grander levels in 1840 when the there wasn’t an “extreme political imbalance that existed in most states as between Jacksonians and their opponents” (Election of 1828 p. 8)?

Sum of ratings:[2](#)([1](#))

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



Re: Populace, Participation, Change

by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 1:35 PM

The text book (page 361) First paragraph say “between 1790 and 1820, citizenship grounded in fatherhood and proprietorship gave way to a democratic insistence on equal right for all white men. Also, it says “Even the aging Thomas Jefferson had come to believe, by 1824, that the property restrictions violated the “the principal of equal rights.”

Text book (page 362) 2nd paragraph say: “In 1790, the citizenship had belonged to men who were fathers and farm owners. Forty years later, the citizenry was made up of those who were (the phrase came into use at this time) “free, white, and twenty-one.” Much more explicitly and completely than had been the case at the founding, America in the 1830 was a white man’s republic.

In the WIKIPEDIA I was looking at the Timeline of voting rights in the United States from 1789 to 2013 and the voting rights in 1828 it said the presidential election was the first in which non-property holding white males could vote in the vast majority of states. By the end of the 1820s, attitudes and state laws had shifted in favor of universal white male suffrage.

Understanding this period and the people’s right to vote or not. Depending on the year it was, or at in what year did states changed their laws, along with so many other factors, whether it be on the political scene, or how people were living at that time. This period was changing and people were excited for it and so desperate for change that express it during that time because of the laws.

I thought this was interesting

Google states “1830 that 12,866,121 people lives in the United States, 2,009,043 were slaves. The U.S population increased by 33.5 percent from 1820 census to the 1830”. And in the 1828 election there was only 57.6 voter participation. A lot of change made a lot of difference in participation of the populace.

Google stats: “325.7 million people live in the United states as of 2017 In 2016 138 million voted in the presidential election. However, of those Americans only make up 58.1 of our voting-eligible population”. It just makes me wonder why some people don’t cast their vote.

I've Just been looking up more information on this era and whether were yes, or no with it being a democratic revolt. I am still with my first answer, no it wasn’t a revolt. There was just a lot going on. And it was the first election in which parties and campaigns played a major role in the election of a president, along with so many factors that I have already mentioned in my previous posts.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Populace, Participation, Change
by [Braidyn Bowden](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 5:34 PM

I love seeing all these statistics it's really helpful when analyzing both sides!

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

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



election of 1828 was not revolutionary
by [Levi Savage](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 2:33 PM

Why the election of 1828 was not the radical revolution of the people but a lack of interest by the people. In this election, we see Andrew Jackson and John Quincy Adams. Running for the presidency and Jackson won with a landslide of 178 electoral votes to Adams 83 vote. why this election was not groundbreaking when we compare it to previous presidential elections we see that fewer people actually showed up to the polls to vote as Richard P. McCormick puts it “in most states either Jackson or his opponent had such a one-sided advantage that the result was a foregone conclusion. Consequently there was little incentive for the voters to go to the polls”. From this, we can take that the election was decided before it was ever held if you were from the Jackson state and you wanted to vote for Adams your vote would probably not make a difference so people did not even bother to vote if they lived in the opponent's state.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Final thoughts on Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Braidyn Bowden](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 6:28 PM

After reading what everyone else had posted I was very conflicted on what author to side with. I was leaning more towards Richard P. Mcckormicks "NO" side of the argument until I read another students response using the google definition of Revolt as support for there choice. I decided after re-reading both articles I am continuing to side with Robert V. Remini's "YES" and I agree that the election of 1828 did indeed represent a Democratic Revolt of the people. Jacksons win marked the beginning of a new era known as Jacksonian democracy. This resulted in a social and economic change, After Jackson took office he began awarding government jobs to regular people who had campaigned for the democratic party and anyone who was not a Democrat in the office was replaced. This process was known as the spoils system which we read about on page 382 in our book. The spoils system process helped build a strong two-party system. In the ending paragraph of the spoils system section, the author writes " Jackson had made the federal civil service an arm of the Democratic Party and of despotic executive power"(383) meaning that Jackson was creating a sort of army supporting and created by and for the "Democrats" at the time. Collins Dictionary online states "When people revolt, they make an illegal and often violent attempt to change their country's political system." From this, I would agree with Remini that there was a Democratic Revolt because Jackson and the people were doing things such as the spils system to change and split the system into two parties.

Sum of ratings:

2 (1)

2

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



Re: Jackson Video supporting the NO side

by [Braidyn Bowden](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 7:54 PM

I think Historian Eric Forner is on the No side of the spectrum meaning he thought the election was not a Revolt. In the Jackson video 1, he talks about how voting was limited to only white males who could vote at the time and how it excluded most African Americans even if they were free and all women. I think he's saying that since the voting was so limited to the white males that is why it's not a Democratic Revolt. In the second video, a woman also talks about how moving the Indians were just making for a more white man's world and how the woman was losing more political rights. She then says "more democratic for white men but less democratic for everyone else," I think this supports the idea that maybe this wasn't a Democratic revolt but instead a Revolt of white males for there well being.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Wrapping Up the 1828 Election

by [Maximillian Prentice](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 8:21 PM

After reviewing everyone’s posts and going back through the forum material, I have to stick with my original opinion that the 1828 election was not a revolt of the people. “[Andrew] Jackson was a symbol of [the American people’s] own ambitions” and he was someone the American people could rally behind (Pg. 1, Remini). Just because he was a candidate that brought people to the poles, it does not signify a revolt. There was too much change happening in America at that time to pinpoint a change in the country’s politics to one event.

Sum of ratings:

0 (1)

0

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



Re: Taking Sides - Not A Revolt...But Not To Be Overlooked

by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 8:43 PM

My stance on if the election of 1828 represented a Democratic revolt, has not changed and I still feel that it did not influence a great revolution. After watching the Age of Jackson videos, hearing Professor Foner discuss how the voting population was “limited” because of who was able to vote at the time and the fact that “race was the greatest restricting factor” (Jackson Video #1) for voters, continued to encourage me to believe that there wasn’t enough overwhelming participation of the election to spark a revolt. However after hearing what others have said and how they have interpreted the election, the idea that it excited and influenced the small amount of voters has become more prominent. Although I do not believe that the “mighty democratic uprising” occurred during this election, it wasn’t an empty event in the sense that the political battle between Whigs and Democrats influenced a new political intrigue of the small percent of voters.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Final Thoughts

by [Robert Whitney](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 9:39 PM

It hadn't occurred to me until today that both the 1828 and 1840 elections could both represent a revolt of the people. The fact that both authors could provide information to show that the election they represented was a revolt proves that either one could be a revolt. Both authors had convincing arguments and just because one was a revolt doesn't mean the other couldn't be. I know that the original prompt was asking whether or not the election of 1828 was a revolt, my answer to that remains thee same (yes it was), but what makes most sense to me is that both elections were a revolt. Both times the citizens of the United States voted to change parties in thee white house due to unfavorable actions of the previous presidents. While the election of 1840 in my opinion was more of a domination of the game we call the electoral college, I still believe it was a revolt of the people due to the outing of Van Buren after one unsuccessful term.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



My side with the election of 1828

by [Ha Neul Lee](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 11:53 PM

I agree to Richard McCormick's idea about the Jacksonian politics.

Yes, there are many reason why Jackson would have been the obvious choice for president. He was a war hero of the American Revolutionary war, he was pro-slavery, he seemed to be a person who would value the state rights more than the federal government power. Since he was the first president who was elected outside of the first 13 states I would have also agreed at that time to say yay for Andrew Jackson.

And he did, he passed laws that weaken the central bank and ultimately made it go into bankrupt. He opposed the Indian lands and called for the expansion to the west. He forged the United States into a state strong government. McCormick expresses that "The most satisfactory explanation for the increase in voter participation between 1824 and 1828 is a simple and obvious one. During the long reign of the Virginia dynasty, interesrest in presidential elections dwindled." (pg.8 McCormick) There were no contest in the previous elections, there were only confusion because of the multiple candidates.

This concludes that there was no other choice for the people of the US to vote either the corrupted John Adams or the Old Hickery Andre Jackson. In spite of being a hot tempered man, he would have been the only logical choice. However that does not justify that the election of 1828 was a democratic Revolt.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

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

◀ [Taking Sides - Election of 1828](#)

◀ [Chapter 12 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for Forum 1 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#)

▶

 Moodle Docs for this page

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)
HST 202 W19 (Escobar Meta 30767 30768)
[Get the mobile app](#)