

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](#) [Age of Jackson Videos ▶](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, January 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](#)



Why the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt.
by [Maclain O'Leary](#) - Sunday, January 20, 2019, 4:18 PM

After reading both Remini and McCormick’s arguments, I agree more with Remini that the election of 1828 did represent a Democratic revolt. Starting off, as he states it the election of 1820 “called for a revival of the two part system” (Pg. 1) because “1820’s had failed to respond to a changing society and that unless something were done right away it might collapse altogether”. So much was going on socially in the country that one political party wasn’t enough. Half the country wanted a strong central government, half weak. Some valued states right, some valued national rights. There for, through this, the Democratic Party broke away and formed their own political party, the other half became known as the National-Republicans.

Now all the Democrats needed was a leader to look to and Andrew Jackson fit the bill. Jackson was considered the perfect candidate because “men saw in Jackson the symbol of their own ambitions and they saw him as a good example as a self made man” (Pg.1).

So when the election of 1828 came around, the Democratic Party was so ready to make their opinions heard and have a representative for them in office that the turn out for voters for the election was historical. Roughly 800,000 more people voted in 1828 than in 1824 (pg. 2). This was for a few reasons, again, because of the emergence of the two party system, but also because the campaign between the National Republicans and the Democratic Party was brutal. As we were told in class, it was very similar to that of the campaign of 2016. Therefore, the interest was driven and more people went to vote. With Jackson in the end winning 56% of the popular vote.

As it states on page 3 of Remini’s argument, “Jackson’s election was seen as the rise of the common man and peoples arrival to political responsibility”. While it may seem like there were a lot of factors going in to the election, as McCormick states, that resulted in the historical election, such as emergence of political parties and low turnout rates in previous elections, I believe that the Democratic Party truly drove these changes, which therefore, can be seen as a revolt.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#) [3](#) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Why the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt.

by [Colt Karam](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:08 PM

I think your argument is strong, but I believe the revolt we saw from that election was not one that bettered our system or drove for a nationally organized system. In Remini's article he states that people use violence to sway voters and forced people to take ballots printed by by individual parties(P.2). While I believe it was a revolt against changing times and for the smaller man to be heard. I don't think this was a revolution towards a more organized system, and to changed how people felt about contributing in future elections.

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

1

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



Re: Why the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt.

by [Margaret Batz](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 8:12 PM

I totally agree with what you are saying. I think Remini's argument is accurate and strong because he has lots of facts about the people and why Jackson was elected president. There was many quotes stating that he was a great leader and people saw the best in him. Remini said that "He inspired confidence among the largest mass of voters despite his lack of education and his reputation as an untamed westerner. In that sense Jackson himself was the essential issue in the campaign, just as he would be again in 1832, and the people in "vast numbers" crowded to his side."(p.3) People liked him for him and what he believed in. I liked what you said in the last paragraph because I think it really stands out and makes for a good argument. It also shows that Jackson was popular and the democratic party made changes so it is in fact a revolt.

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

1

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



Remini v McCormick

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Sunday, January 20, 2019, 8:15 PM

After reading the two articles and the chapter in the textbook dedicated to the Jacksonian age, I have to lean towards Remini's opinion. Remini explains how the election of 1828 is historically significant because it marked a spark in politics where ordinary citizens were showing up in double the numbers to the polls. Remini explains how Andrew Jackson was "larger than life" and a "symbol of their own ambitions" (yes he definitely had his questionable and controversial attributes as well), but I think that this definitely had an affect on the attitude of the voters, he also explains how the reestablishment of the two party system had a role in the uprising as well.I think when dealing with mass amounts of people you have to KISS. Keep It Simple Stupid. Be clear with the choices, chocolate or vanilla, democrat republican or national republican (Even though by todays standard these two parties opposing each other would get VERY confusing) . In years before such as the 1824 election, there had been too many candidates running at the same time, muddying up the waters and not as many people got out and voted.

In the other essay, McCormick disagrees with the claim that the election of 1828 was a pivotal moment and claims that the real uprisal did not begin until 1840. McCormick thinks that most textbooks and historians have too many "unchallenged facts" and that there has not been any effort to analyze the actual data of other influences that happened to be occurring at the same time. For example, a the raise in population. I admire the way he analyzes and explains all of his data however I don't think you can disregard the popularity of Andrew Jackson and the influence he had over the people. They saw him as a hero and once the people believe in you like that it becomes a machine. The people of the US are not so different from people today. It is much like the way people responded to Obama when they turned out to vote in 2008.

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

3

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



Re: Remini v McCormick. Maggie

by [Margaret Batz](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 9:30 PM

I am also leaning towards Remini's opinion. I agree with what you are saying and think you have a strong argument. I liked when you were talking about the election of Obama in 2008 because even though the election of Jackson was long ago, it is almost the same thing in a sense of people still voting because they voted for Obama because they liked what he stood for and supported him. So I think that it was the same with Jackson in a way. People saw him as a strong political leader and he had good beliefs and they stood by him because of that, not just for his money or status. Jackson encouraged everyone to vote and wanted to inspire confidence

throughout America which I think is a big part of his votes. I like when you said McCormick explains the data and everything but you can't disregard Jackson's popularity and impact on people. People saw him as a hero and that speaks volumes. Why else would they vote for him?

Sum of ratings:1(1)1

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



Re: Remini v McCormick

by [Colt Karam](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 9:53 PM

I agree with you that Jackson seemed like a superstar for his time and inspired a huge turnout at the polls, but I do not think it was a political revolution. There isn't much evidence to support the idea of political responsibility other than a rise in voting numbers, which McCormick disputes was as big as we think. Jackson's voters were looking to keep the country as they knew it and were fighting change. If people were thinking about voting as a responsibility then they would be fighting for suffrage for all citizens.

Sum of ratings:1(1)1

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



Re: Remini v McCormick

by [Nolan Hart](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 8:44 PM

While voter turnout was indeed much larger than it was in 1824, I would not call it a "rise of the common man" (p.3) as Remini states, and disagree with his opinion both based upon numbers and principle. In the beginning of the Remini document, he addresses exactly how the democrats and Jackson begin the political season. As the founder of the Democratic party, it was his task to keep it afloat coming into the 1828 election. As such, he shifted to the Jackson camp at the end of 1826. Van Buren also used his influence over the Richmond Junto (Virginia's political machine) and the editor of the Richmond Enquirer, to sway them to the side of Jackson. I would hardly call what appears to be Van Buren monopolizing information flow a "rise of the common man". Second, in 1824, there were four primary candidates, in 1828 there were two. I would hasten to call that a Democratic revolt. To conclude, Remini states that what made the difference was, "Superior party organization," (p.3). Wealthy elites organizing better winning the election? That sounds nothing like a victory for the common man.

Sum of ratings:3(1)3

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



Re: Remini v McCormick

by [Gerardo Morales-Martinez](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 11:39 AM

Hi Meri,

I like your point of view regarding the articles. While reading you do make some strong points, but I find myself disagreeing with Remini's opinion. While the voter turnout was significant, I don't believe its enough to call its a "revolt of the people". The population at the time was growing and to this day is growing as well. In a slideshow presented in class this past Thursday, there was a slide that could have potentially explained why the turnout was huge. In the 1830's, the number of states increased on allowing people to vote without qualifications. Now, this does say in the 30's and we're talking about the election of 1828, but we can potentially guess that the qualifications for people to vote might have been the same. As letting anyone vote. With that being said, anyone could have voted in the elections at that time.

Regarding the "voter turnout" for the election of 2008, it couldn't have been another example of a revolt. This is because of the many factors that surround our voting to this day. There are more qualifications to this day, then in the election of 1828. Now the turnout was pretty great in 2008, but the elections following were not, or the elections prior.

Sum of ratings:1(1)1

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



Re: Remini v McCormick

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 5:13 PM

Right, I agree! I might have been unclear in my comparison, I don't think the election of 2008 was a revolt in any way. More just reflecting on how there was a spike in voting participation in 2008. Because a lot of people were excited about Obama. In kind of the same sense that people were traveling far and wide to

support Jackson and it being one of the reasons supporting the theory of whether the election was an example of a revolt. Thank you!

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

1

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



Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Quinton Liebl](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 4:38 PM

I do not believe the election of 1828 represented a Democratic revolt of the people. The reason for my decision was decided by the reading of "New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics" by Richard P. McCormick. McCormick compares the election of 1828 with previous and later elections in this article. This comparison shows even though there may have been an increase of voters in the numbers of presidential elections, the numbers the gubernatorial elections were not surpassed. Meaning there may have been a significant turnout for the election of Jackson but no spike, change or increase of the state election voters. McCormick states that before the 1824 election, "fifteen of those eighteen states had recorded votes in excess of 50 percent of their adult white male population", though the election of 1824 had a significant amount less of high state voting percentage. A significant drop in the popular vote with 26.5 percent of voter participation in the 1824 election. McCormick makes the comparison of the election of 1828 Adams Vs. Jackson and the election of Harrison vs. Van Buren. He states that 55.2 percent of adult white males voted during the election of 1828, and 78 percent of white males voted during the Harrison Vs. Van Buren election. The significant increase in presidential election voters and that fact that many states had not surpassed their all-time highest percentage of voters shows that the Jacksonian era was not the origin of the Democratic revolt.

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

2

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



Re: Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Maclain O'Leary](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 5:21 PM

While I agree that as far as voting turnout is concerned that maybe there are other explainable reasons for the high percentage other than it being a democratic revolt, how do you explain the other factors that shows that it is? For example, the Democrats breaking away from the "Democratic-Republican" party and starting their own party with their own beliefs. This fact can also explain the reason that voting turnout in 1828 was so high, because the Democrats wanted their own representative elected. So while maybe voting turnout CAN be explained by other means as is McCormick's argument, it also can be explained by the fact this this was the first opportunity for those who now identified as Democrats, to be heard and represented.

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

1

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



Re: Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Katie Calkins](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 11:38 PM

You made some very appealing points defending McCormick's views on this debate. This post made me rethink my choice, and it makes me lean slightly more towards McCormick's side, but I am still choosing to side with Remini.

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

0

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



Re: Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Quinton Liebl](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 10:10 PM

In reply to Maclain, it states in our textbook "Liberty, Equality and Power", (Pg. 382) that Jackson was known for promising political posts for support from anyone, including old friends who were unfit for such position. From replacing about 1 of 10 appointees, bigwigs in office, down to even the postmasters in the smallest towns. This "spoil system" seems to be a ploy to get his word out and attempts to gain support. Whether the ways of gaining supporters were ethical or physical threats to harm those who don't support the candidate while handing out ballots which we read in one of the perspectives handouts in class, it seems that this could be evidence that it wasn't the people's choice for in the increase of voters, but the people in political power.

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

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



Re: Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 2:25 PM

To me, the fact that political party affiliates were shoving ballots down people’s throats tells me that the game had changed. In view of the removal of property and taxpaying requirements for voting in many states, all of a sudden there was a huge voter base of mostly “common men” that had the power and intent to swing elections. Successful politicians then understood that they had to appeal to the “common man” because of the importance of the popular vote. This change, in fact, corresponds with the fact that in the presidential election of 1828, the total number of popular votes cast tripled as compared with those of the presidential election of 1824.

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

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



Re: Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 12:00 PM

You make a good point that while the turnout for the presidential election increased in 1828, it wasn’t mirrored at the state level. With that in mind, it might be more precise to say that the *presidential* election of 1828 was a democratic revolt. Looking only at the numbers, Harrison’s turnout in 1840 was far better than that of Jackson’s in 1828. However, I think there are a few other factors to consider. Harrison beat Van Buren by only six points in the popular vote, whereas Jackson won by thirteen points over Adams, meaning that his victory was more convincing. Additionally, the rate of voter turnout for the presidency more than doubled from 1824 to 1828, whereas from 1828 to 1840 the increase was only about 40%. Harrison’s election in 1840 was a great victory, but I think that Jackson’s election in 1828 left a more lasting impression on the American people.

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

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



Re: Sided with McCormick-Numbers

by [Quinton Liebl](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 9:30 PM

Even though I am still leaning toward McCormick, I can see how Remini’s argument could be considered true. I believe the great numbers of the election in 1840 had a lot to do with the amount of immigration during that period. We were shown a slide in class, of how the quantities of people moving to America, and not to forget the extreme changes in suffrage for white males, and also immigrants. Nearly 50,000 Irishman made their way to America nearing 1840. The racial discrimination towards Irishman might have given them more of a need to place their vote.

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

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



My take on a politcal revolution

by [Colt Karam](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 7:16 PM

No, based on these two articles, I do not believe that a genuine political revolution took place until the election of 1840. After evaluating both arguments I am basing my opinion off if; voter participation truly rose and stayed at a high percentage, if voters voted out of sense of duty or out of fear and other emotions, and if the system was changed afterwards. During Jackson’s elections people feared change and were striving to protect their old ways of life. People went to great lengths to protect themselves and to force their ideas on others. Many voters were encouraged by neighbors to go vote, and once they arrived at the votes there were groups of men threatening voters with violence if they didn’t vote the “right” way. Remini states “ It was not unusual for a person to be accosted by several hawkers at once and threatened with bodily harm unless he accepted the proffered ballot”(2), in this statement we see that not only were people “encouraged” to vote a certain way but the ballot for the person they wanted voted for was free to hand out and push upon people. This was explained by Robert by stating “The states did not provide an official ballot; instead the parties printed their own ballots, distributing them to friends and employing high-pressure party hacks at the polls”. This is why I do not believe this was a true political revolution because people were not following or creating a new system to support voting but were abusing the old one to get their way. The parties would be unequal in many ways because of this system, which is why the system has changed since. This was more of people rising up to get what they wanted rather than creating a fair and equal system for voters to decide who they wanted to vote for without fearing their vote could get them killed.

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

2

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



Re: My take on a politcal revolution
by [Quinton Liebl](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:18 PM

I like how you stated that they were not using the “new democracy”, but abusing the old system. I completely agree with how both electors and their allies were using different strategies to try to undermine their opponent or do anything to win. The threats to voters, Jackson replacing many people of power with one’s he’s close with, and also the dozens of political cartoons that were downright absurd! There were many skeevy actions that were questionable in a fair and equal system, and I believe a lot of those tactics had influenced the voter turnout, not a democratic revolt.

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

1

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



The 1828 Election.
by [Michael Krobatsch](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:01 PM

In this debate, I agree with Richard P. McCormick and I do not believe that the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt of the people. His way of presenting facts was in his writing proved to me that the Jacksonians were being misled. They were misled by having a false hope of what they thought was going to happen and what was actually going to happen. Yes, the numbers of voter rates went up and that is only because it was very one-sided, boring and there was even a no contest, in past. Know they had something to vote on and get excited about. McCormick's use of facts proves that it was not an uprising at all but it just had a lot more people that could relate to Jackson as a backwoods hunter, the plain farmer, the urban working man, and the southern planter just like themselves. But also there was an increase in votes because of the suffrage qualification that had recently happened. It can also be contributed to the prior election that Jackson was in and lost.

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

1

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



Re: The 1828 Election.
by [Quinton Liebl](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 8:46 PM

I also agree with McCormick and his numbers. We also have to take into account the district system and the general system. With only Maryland, Maine, Illinois, Tennessee, and New York being the only ones using the district system has an effect on the total of the popular vote. In Remini’s article, he explains that those five states using the district system would split their electoral votes proportionally between candidates. With all the other nineteen states using the general ticket, which meant that ALL electoral votes will go towards the popular candidate. Remini says that 178 electoral votes for Jackson and only 83 for Adams could have been changed if most states had been using the district ticket. There were eight states that were relatively close in electoral votes, two of which were using the district system. New York is one of those states with the electoral vote outcome being 20 to 36.

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

2

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



The 1828 Election
by [Michael Krobatsch](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:20 PM

In my opinion, Richard P. McCormick did a much better job at presenting a logical and factual essay whereasRobertV. Remini wrote on how great and wonderful it was, but not as much factual content. Such as the numbers, McCormick proved his point in different ways and one of them was thru dates and percentages. In my opinion, Remini's essay was a lot easier to read compared to the other one. Remini's essay was very misleading but once I dug a little deeper it was clear that the McCormicks essay was argument was so much more logical. Also, McCormick's essay clearly states that the votes were not all that impressive and that it was not a Democratic Revolt.

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

1

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



Democratic revolt- Yes
by [Alivia Garcia-Irwin](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:26 PM

I believe that the election of 1828 did in fact inspire a Democratic revolt of the people of sorts. The Jackson era was a new wave the people had not seen before. For them this time and new revolt was about the "common man" (pg.3) they saw Jackson as a regular man who was "self made" and did not come from wealth or had things handed to him as easily. They believed he as a regular man would understand the struggles and would advocate for the common people. They interpreted it in the way that they too could could aspire to be like him. (pg.1) Now the common man in this case white working class men and they were voting to who was going to help improve their over all lives and well being The Democrats came into their own in a sense and started "taking responsibility"(pg.4) for their actions and voting in favor of what change they wanted to start to see in the country through Jackson and I believe it was the start of the democratic uprising.

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

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



Re: Democratic revolt- Yes
by [Michael Krobatsch](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 9:11 PM

I do like your argument. I also agree that Jackson was inspirational to his followers and how easily they could relate to him. But, you said that it was a start of an uprising. And this may be true because on page 7 it says that "the conclusion to be drawn is that the "mighty Democratic uprising" came after the of Jackson's presidency..." Other then that good job.

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

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



A new and excited group of voters
by [Nolan Hart](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:45 PM

One of the core tenets of Jacksonian Democracy, as described by Wikipedia as, "Having expanded suffrage to most white men...". From 1800 to 1830, there was a movement sweeping the country to expand suffrage, not to African Americans, nor to women, but to white men. Prior to 1800, and the 20's especially, voting rights for even white males were lackluster. The voting class was primarily the wealthier Americans. For this discussion, the "Election by the Common Man," or the idea of a more proper democracy, is crucial. As suggested by McCormick, it was during the mid 1820s that property restrictions were alleviated such that the common man could vote, so long as he made it to the polls.

While there is an argument to be made, that the rise in the total number of voters has little to do with the percentage of the voting populous, I disagree. It is my opinion, that with increased enfranchisement, between the elections of 1824 and 1828, the voting pool increased, and as a result of increased enfranchisement, more new voters came to the polls. These voter, not unlike a child with a new toy, got excited upon first use, and became bored quickly, realizing that voting is actually quite boring, and more of a societal duty than a fun exercise.

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

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



First Time Voters
by [Colt Karam](#) - Thursday, January 24, 2019, 9:45 PM

I think you bring up a really good point about how more people were gaining the right to vote and because of this the percentage of voters rose for a period of time. This period also tends to last until all members of society gain suffrage and voting becomes the norm in society and shifts from a hard earned privilege to seeming like a chore to most Americans today.

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

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



I agree with Robert V. Remini.
by [Katie Calkins](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 8:59 PM

I agree most with Remini because he makes a lot of valid points in his article. One of his statements that really turned my mind towards his side was "Aside from the importance of party in producing Jackson's triumph there was also his own popularity and charisma. He was a living, authentic legend, the victor of New Orleans, the man who won over the British, the greatest feat or arms in American history." (Handout P.3)

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

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

1



Election of 1828: strikingly characteristic of a "democratic revolt"

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 10:20 PM

I thought it was interesting that Remini's essay seemed to focus on the ideological impact of Jackson's election whereas McCormick's essay dealt mostly with raw statistics of voter turnout during the antebellum reform. McCormick's evidence suggests that neither Jackson's election in 1828 nor his re-election in 1832 signified a "massive democratic uprising," but rather that such a description would be more accurately bestowed on William Henry Harrison's election in 1840.

However, I still find myself more inclined to agree with Remini on this issue. The idea of Jackson's election as "massive democratic uprising" is not limited to voter turnout and extends into means of campaigning and also the respective characters of the candidates. The textbook authors write that "Van Buren and like-minded Republicans... wanted Jackson elected, however, not only as 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." (p. 379) The textbook describes the election of 1828 as "an exercise in slander rather than a debate on public issues." (p. 379) In this, Jackson emerged the victor.

The textbook also affirms that in the election of 1828, "voter turnout was double what it had been in 1824, totaling 56.3%." (p. 380) McCormick provides the same figure, but he claims that the increase bears less significance given that the "voter turnout approached--but in only a few instances matched or exceeded--the maximum levels that had been attained before the Jackson era." (p. 6) However, Remini offers a different perspective. He notes that Jackson won the popular vote with 56% (a number that is also given in the textbook), defeating Adams by a tremendous margin. Furthermore, he states that "the total popular vote in the election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824." (p. 2) He also cites that 1,155,022 popular votes were cast in the election of 1828. When I saw this, I was suspicious because it would mean that the total number of popular votes cast would have roughly tripled in four years. I referred to the textbook to check the numbers. Map 11.1 (p. 375) of the textbook provides a breakdown of the election of 1824, and the total number of popular votes comes to 361,120. Map 11.2 (p. 381) similarly digests the election results of 1828, with the total number of popular votes cast weighing in at 1,155,340. This is close enough to Remini's number, and it affirms the tremendous increase that he mentioned.

Remini attributes this "spectacular rise" to the re-emergence of the two-party system (which wasn't present in 1824), the fact that two candidates from different parties were running for president (rather than four from the same party in 1824), and the way that the candidates operated their campaigns, particularly with emphasis on appealing to the "common man." To me, all of the above factors contribute to a paradigm depiction of a "massive democratic uprising."

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

3

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



Election of 1828. YES to Democratic party

by [Margaret Batz](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 10:26 PM

Maggie Batz

Forum 1

YES

I do believe that the election of 1828 represented a Democratic revolt of the people. In the yes PDF, it was said that Jackson was a leader and the men looked up to him and saw him as a "self-made" man. He was just a random boy from the backwoods who had a plan to make good so that gave them the confidence to do the same. Jackson had substantially more votes which was said to be very impressive. His victory against Adams had a lot of controversy which made a lot of people wonder about him and his win but it was stated that "in any event, the fact remains that no matter how the statistics are analyzed or interpreted the people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge of popular support for the General." I think that this is important because it shows that the people supported him and wanted him to win and if not then they wouldn't have voted for him. That simple. He encouraged and inspired confidence among the voters and he was also very organized. This

election was so important because he was the first man who won the votes of America. He stood up for what he believed in and it wasn't just about money or his political status. Jackson was a leader that people looked up to and encouraged people of America which I think lead to his victory. Also in the PDF on the YES side, it was stated that, "Not only did the Democrats see the election as a victory produced by the "vast numbers" of American people, but the National Republicans thought so too." This shows that he inspired and effected people not only from the Democratic party, but from the Republicans.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Gerardo Morales-Martinez](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:37 PM

While reading both sides of the argument, I found myself leaning more on the side Richard. P McCormick, the "No" side. This is because of the explanation into how the Election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt of the people. This is because of the evidence he talks about how the voter turnout was no different the levels that previous eras had. Instead, he described how these numbers were nothing new. He claims that the "mighty democratic uprising" occured, but it was well after the Jackson's presidency.

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

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



head over heart

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 12:42 PM

Further comparing the two articles I found myself having an easier time understanding the article written by Remini over McCormick, perhaps it is because Remini focused more of the ideology of the 1828 election and what it meant to the people. Whereas the McCormick article devised his argument using more raw facts and numbers.The emotionality of the first one appealed to me probably because that is more my personality optimistic and hopeful of a person who stands for change, but I have to say the McCormick's analysis was more thorough and concrete than Remini's. I think the way he takes out the adoring connotation surrounding Jackson and just looks at the numbers, gives you a more accurate understanding of what was really happening and, For example at the top of page 8 this really made me think--

"of the six highest states in voter participation in 1828, three favord Adams and three were for Jackson, which could be interpreted to mean that the convinced Adams supporters turned out no less zealously for their man than did the ardent of Jacksonians"

But these numbers are overlooked with the popularity of Andrew Jackson and the fascination of the "new democracy". I think there is truth to both. But even reading the textbook you could tell that the authors would agree more with Remini's article. They discuss how the election was more about airing each others dirty laundry rather than actual issues. Adams attacked Jackson's past in the military, bar brawls, and even his marriage. But despite all of that the textbook states that "The Campaign caught the public imagination." It describes the election of 1828's popular vote as a "landslide" that has been unmatched until the 20th century.

"It was a clear triumph of democracy over genteel statesmanship, of limited government over expansive nationalism and of the South and the West over old forms of cultural gentility, it was a victory of popular melodrama over old forms of cultural gentility"

I am thankful for cross examination of the same event in history from different perspectives. Its interesting to read something that challenges the popular truth that is so commonly accepted, just because the textbook says it doesn't always mean its 100% true and one sided. I think that is a good way to research and that we should be practicing today as well, concerning the crazy times we are in.

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

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



Re: head over heart

by [Owen McCoy](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 11:38 AM

So far, I've seen the same statistics manipulated every which way to support both sides of this issue. (Therein lies the problem with statistics.) But I think it's exactly like you said; the numbers aren't everything, and all other evidence would suggest that the election of 1828 did away with the previous political norms. I actually went in expecting myself to agree more with Remini but I was surprised by the strong arguments that McCormick made. Nevertheless, I still agree with Remini for a lot of the same reasons that you mentioned.

Furthermore, I think it's interesting how at various times Jackson's various opponents tried to keep him from power but how his popular support base would make their attempts backfire. The textbook mentions that as early as 1824, Jackson did much better than Adams in the election but didn't become president due to the "corrupt bargain." (p. 375) Four years later, Jackson's opponents tried to attack his personality in "an exercise in slander" (p. 379) but voters rallied to his cause anyway. "The attempt to brand Jackson as a lawless man, in fact, enhanced his image as a melodramatic hero who battled shrewd, unscrupulous, legalistic enemies by drawing on his natural nobility and force of will." (p. 379-380) From this perspective, it seems (and probably did seem at the time) like a victory of American democracy and the "common man" over government bureaucracy.

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

2

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



Re: head over heart
by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 5:04 PM

That is interesting! I like what you added in the second paragraph about how Adam's attempts to ruin his reputation back fired, the people were still on Jackson's side. Further evidence I found in the textbook is where the authors discuss Jackson's inauguration. " 15,000 to 30,000 people came to Washington DC to watch. Some people had travelled 500 miles! The way the citizens were behaving certainly reflected as some kind of revolt or the result of overcoming something.

"They really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger" (p380)

Also some thing that stuck out to me that MIGHT be off topic but it still baffled me was the fact that the crowd was able to follow Jackson from the capital INTO the White House to continue the celebration of victory. As if storming the stadium after a monumental win. Could you imagine if anyone tried to get close to doing that these days?!

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

1

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



Becoming more democratic (well, sort of)
by [Owen McCoy](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 1:11 PM

In class, Joe showed us the charts for voting requirements and how white male suffrage was greatly extended leading up to the "Age of Jackson." Eric Foner describes this phenomenon with the term "expansive." He also explains that there was increased competition between the two major political parties. Additionally, Richard Ellis from the other video explains how people started to realize that the government could make decisions that would impact their lives and thus tried to influence those decisions by voting. However, Foner also notes that while rights were expanded for white men, these ideas blatantly excluded women, African-Americans, and Native Americans. Foner calls this the "exclusive" aspect of the time. I think he does a good job showing both sides of the issue, how America became more democratic but also less democratic at the same time.

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

1

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



Out of the maelstrom emerges the Age of Jackson
by [Owen McCoy](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 1:50 PM

Both of the mid-week videos pointed out that American democracy underwent major changes in the 1820s. For the first time in a while, there was a direct political (but not regional) split between the Democrats and the National Republicans. At the same time, property and taxpaying requirements for voting were being lifted in many states, greatly expanding voting rights for white men. Harry Watson comments that "Some people saw the opportunity to increase their liberty in enormous numbers of ways, but at the same time, they also feared that the new opportunities were going to create a situation which other people would have power over them." White men took their new-found suffrage to influence democracy as they saw fit. Many wanted a "common man" to defend their liberties and so in 1828, they elected... Andrew Jackson.

I still agree with Remini that it was a democratic revolt because it demonstrated the effects of what was essentially democratic majority rule. (Or rather rule by the majority of white men.) The voters took it upon themselves to change politics, the effects of which are shown by the starkly different character of elections in 1828 and after. Watson explains how the election of Jackson ushered in a time period in which politicians had to be aware of the opinions of the voters and had to “appeal to the average person” because that was where most of the votes were coming from.

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

2

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by [Maclain O'Leary](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 2:57 PM

As I was searching for more evidence that the election of 1828 was indeed a democratic revolt I found in our class notes. As we learned, Democrats valued states rights more than rights of the national government. During 1928 when the election happens, and in the years prior, when the Democrats were establishing their own party, the Supreme Court justice as the time was John Marshall. Now, we learned from class, that in a majority of his cases, John Marshall voted against the states, trying to keep their power as limited as possible. So, I believe this is another example why it can be seen as a Democratic revolt. I believe that the Democrats wanted more states powers, so they created their own party, and elected an official (Andrew Jackson) who could potentially give them that.

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

1

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



Re: Different thinking involved

by [Alivia Garcia-Irwin](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:51 PM

I agree completely! I believe this was the start of something new to the people. Different to what they had seen before and wanted to establish something that would benefit the general people and not just specific people in power. McCormick mentions on pg.8 (on the opposing)there might have been a confusion of choice or that the people got excited by the "disintegration of of old national parties" and how the voting was different. But still in my opinion this still once again shows me the people were ready to get rid of the old and ready to start something new even if it was just the start of their progression of thought towards different politics.

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

1

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



Why the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt

by [Margaret Batz](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 4:52 PM

I’ve done a lot of thinking about each sides and I still think I am leaning towards Remini’s point of view. As I’ve mentioned before, Jackson was a leader and people saw the best in him. He had a victorious win and won the people over. I believe that regardless of people not liking Jackson or not agreeing with him, he won. He made statements and arguments that people liked and he stood up for what he believed in. McCormick had good points and what he said made up for a good argument and debate but, in the end Jackson was elected and had high voting numbers. I don’t think you can disregard this fact. The Democratic party wanted to make changes to better the system so that could definitely be seen and viewed as a revolt.

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

0

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



Jackson Videos

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 5:07 PM

From the information gathered in the videos provided, they both share themes of what Remini was saying and how this election was a democratic revolt. In the first video the historian explains how the age of Jackson was "a time where participation in public life expanded". People were concerned about the federal government and what it meant if it got bigger. What could they control? So the voters decided to side with Andrew Jackson who appealed to the "common man" or the "working man" to defend their rights. also lines up with what McCormick wrote in his essay "the democratic influences that arose out of the western frontier, or the magnetic attractiveness of Jackson as a candidate capable of appealing with singular effectiveness to the backwoods hunter, the plain farmer the urban working man, and the southern planter". (pg 5) In the 1820's there were many pressing issues concerning the public slavery, expansion, tariffs...the historian in the second video, Richard Ellis, explains that the people were realizing the government makes economic decisions and the people want to control these decisions. Andrew Jackson favored states rights so the people put their trust in him to defend their rights.

3/14/2019

HST 202 W19 (Escobar Meta 30767 30768): Taking Sides - Election of 1828

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

1

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



Re: Andrew Jackson video NO side

by [Margaret Batz](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 7:55 PM

I believe that the historian eric forner was on the no side so he didn't think that the election of 1828 was a revolt. He said that the voting at that time was very limited meaning only white men could. African Americans could not vote even if they were free blacks And no women could vote at that time either. So I think Eric was saying that since the voting was so limited and only white men could vote, therefore it could be seen as a revolt. In the second video, it was also said that women lost all of their politcal rights. The historian goes on to say that it was more democratic for white men and less democratic for everyone else. I think this is saying that it wasn't a revolt but maybe a revolt for adult white men.

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

1

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

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

[Age of Jackson Videos](#) ▶

◀ [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](#)