

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](#)

[◀ Age of Jackson Videos](#) [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](#)



New Perspectives - Siding with McCormick
by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Sunday, January 20, 2019, 1:23 PM

After reading both opinions on whether or not the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people, I have to say that I found Richard P. McCormick’s argument for for the opposition more convincing. One of the main reasons I decided to side with him was in how he presented his statistics. It’s easy to just present relatable statistics that support your claims, without getting too specific about what you are comparing them to. However, McCormick does a great job at explaining how if the argument is about whether or not more people turned out for the presidential election of 1828 than for other elections, then we need to compare percentages of the voting population that voted in 1828 with those from previous presidential and state elections. McCormick highlights how prior to the election of 1824, “fifteen of the eighteen states [in which the electors were chosen by popular vote] had recorded votes in excess of 50 per cent of the adult white male population,” (New Perspectives, paragraph 9). However, he goes on to state that in the election of 1828, “only six of the twenty-two states involved [recorded] new highs in voter participation,” also, “Six states went over the 70 per cent mark, whereas ten had bettered that performance before 1824,” (New Perspectives, paragraph 10). By identifying the percentage of the voting population as the statistic that needs to analyzed, and comparing it with that of other recorded elections from that period, McCormick presents a strong argument for why the election of 1828 was not, in fact, a democratic revolt of the people.

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



Re: New Perspectives - Siding with McCormick
by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 9:09 AM

Another reason that I tend to side with McCormick’s argument is how he looks past the election of 1828, to the elections of 1836 through 1844, particularly the election of 1840. The information that McCormick presents on the 1840 election really seems to refute any argument that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the

people. McCormick highlights how in 1840, “four out of five (78.0%) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren,” (McCormick, paragraph 17). He goes on to point out that, “In all but five states... the peaks of voter participation reached before 1824 were passed,” and, “Fourteen of the twenty-five states involved set record highs for voting that were not to be broken throughout the remainder of the antebellum period,” (McCormick, paragraph 17). The reports of voter participation from the election of 1828 are blown away by those from 1840. Clearly it was the election of 1840 that showed a majority of the voter population participating.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)2

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Matt Baldwin-Joiner](#) - Sunday, January 20, 2019, 11:26 PM

Andrew Jackson rightfully won the election of 1828 for one main reason. His party had "superior party organization."-Robert V. Remini page 3. Due to this advantage, he was able to win 178 electoral votes. This blew Adams out of the water with is 83 barely being able to compete. Better run campaigns often lead to winning candidates. Just look to the 2016 election, where trump won. His campaign was run well, and he ridiculed the opponents with allegations and lies just like Jackson and Adams did.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)1

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



Common man election
by [Terry Monks](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 6:35 PM

It seems that although the numbers for the previous three elections were actually larger than the election of 1828. I feel that there was a build up leading to the election of 1828, of people who felt strongly to have a president that was a war hero, a victor at New Orleans, and so on. Jackson inspired confidence among the largest mass of voters. He was a "common man", and that gave him the popularity to the "common man", voters. I do agree the election 1828 represented a Democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)1

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



the side of yes with Robert V. Remini
by [Jaden Blansit](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 7:20 PM

I agree with Robert V. Remini. The 1828 election id bring back the two party system and brought together more voters than the years before and there are many factors that lead into this. Jackson himself for the time was a new type of president, he brought in new people and encouraged them to contribute to his cause. With his whole base being revolved around the common man. The people related with him and wanted him to be in power so that he will help with their needs because it was his needs before. There was also arguments made in Richard P. McCormicks piece that convinced me of this too. In his piece he had said that there were “the commonest explanations” to why people say Jackson's election brought the most voter turnout, the fact that again he was the common man, from the western frontier, magnetic personality, and appealed to a majority of the people at the time (page 5). He also said that there was an increase of voters in the 1828 election as well, even if there was a population difference the percent of voters was higher than the year before and continued at a steady pace. Even though he claims that the uprising started in 1844, the voters started to vote more in 1828.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)2

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



1828-The Revolt of the People
by [Amanda Francis](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 9:01 PM

Whether you agree with Andrew Jackson’s politics or not, I think you can at least agree that yes, the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. Jackson was originally described in our textbook as a “wildcard” and a “frontier hothead”, but his popularity couldn’t be denied. After a controversial election loss in 1824, “voter turnout doubled” in 1828, and for the first time, working class Americans felt represented by their president (textbook p.380). According to historian Robert Remini, “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.” (p. 3).

The conflicting argument from Richard McCormick is that the poll data from the election of 1828 shows some inaccuracies that discredit the uprising of the people, but to only judge the 1828 by the number of votes and not consider how they were voting would be ignoring a major component in the revolt. As Professor Escobar has brought to our attention in class lectures, statistical flaws exist. In this case specifically, there may be debate over the exact numbers of voter turnout in the election of 1828, but Andrew Jackson beat the incumbent president John Quincy Adams in popular and electorate votes clearly indicating the country was ready for a political sea change. I would define this as a democratic revolt.

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

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



Re: 1828-The Revolt of the People
by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 6:46 AM

I'm curious about which inaccuracies you though Richard McCormick presented in his piece. I found his statistics to be more accurate as they compared the votes to the population of potential voters at the time (mostly just the white male population). Whereas Remini's argument focused mostly on personal accounts and description of masses of people turning out for the campaigns and voting. Remini did state the numbers for the results of the 1828 election, but just stating what the results were doesn't tell the reader if a greater percentage of the voting population turned out for this election compared to other elections.

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

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



Re: 1828-The Revolt of the People
by [Amanda Francis](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 9:17 PM

Tyler,

Thanks for bringing that up. To be completely honest, I was half asleep when I made my first post. After re-reading both articles, for me to say that there were "inaccuracies" in McCormick's poll data about the election of 1828 is just plain incorrect. It is clear to me now that McCormick's data was simply questioning the "mighty democratic uprising" by comparing significant statistics of voter turnout from 1824, 1832, and years after. In one example, McCormick discredits the theory of a democratic revolt by statistically comparing the "roaring flood" of 78% of white male voters in the election of 1840 vs. the 56% vote in 1828 (p.7). Although I do agree with you that McCormick's article presents more thorough and cohesive poll data, to judge the election of 1828 by voter turnout and numbers alone would be not seeing the real significance of Jackson's victory.

I still agree with Remini that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. The South and West were victorious in electing a president that was "a symbol of their own ambitions. If an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason why they too could not aspire to wealth and social status by relying on their own talents to get what they wanted" (p.1). The people were tired of aristocratic presidents and longed to return to Jeffersonian principles of small governmental powers. These needs were reflected in the results of the 1828 election. "It was a clear triumph of democracy" (p. 380).

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

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



Remini paints a nice picture, but McCormick got the point.
by [Tiffanie Chapman](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 9:55 PM

Robert V. Remini does a great job of writing about Andrew Jackson's character, and how he is a prime example as to how a "common man" can win a presidency. He sets the scene well in his writing, to a point where I even began to side with him. The "self-made" man who brought revival to the two-party system while preserving his "old-party" beliefs brought forward a mighty democratic revolt in the election of 1828. But do we have all the facts? Have we looked and compared this "uprising" to more than just the 1824 election? Richard P. McCormick would argue that historians have not looked at all the facts and if we did, the 1828 election would not look as impressive as we believe it to be.

McCormick states “authors of one of our most recent textbooks” says that we do not have all the information in regards to past elections to really compare between voter turnout and that is why it is viewed as a huge increase in votes. When in actuality, there is “abundant data on pre-1824 elections available, and it indicates a far higher rate of voting (in other elections) that has been realized” (pg. 5 of 8). Only when we begin to challenge what historians chose to believe, we start to see how this lack of gathering information can lead to false ideologies that we still use to describe Jackson today. McCormick position argues “big picture” and asks us to compare all of the elections leading up to 1840. While Remini only uses the four years between 1824 and 1828 to try and define this as a democratic revolt.

If we do compare the two elections, the best way to prove that the election wasn't an uprising is by looking at all the data for voter participation. The evidence showing that the 1828 voter turnout doubles in comparison to the 1824 election “shrinks in magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation” (McCormick pg. 6 of 8). He then adds that in three of those six- Maryland, Virginia, and Louisiana- the record gain was inconsiderable and in New York- the increase can be in relation to the changes that had been made in suffrage qualifications as recently as 1821 and 1826 (pg. 6 of 8). These examples show how the maximum level of voter participation for states was not met in this election. For all states in 1828 the voter participation was at a 56.3 percent, but before 1824 fifteen of the twenty-two states had already surpassed that percentage. If that percentage had already been surpassed, how are we able to define the 1828 election as a democratic revolution? McCormick suggests “the 1828 election failed to bring to the polls the proportion of the electorate that had voted on occasion in previous elections”(pg.7 of 8). Reading Remini’s view of Jackson and the election of 1828, I was at first a supporter of his opinion. Once I read McCormick’s position and seeing the evidence that this election was not represented by all the facts, I was convinced that the 1828 election was not a democratic revolt of the people.

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

3

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



My view about the Election of 1828
by [Sebastian Garcin](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 10:15 PM

It is my belief that the Election of 1828 did represent a Democratic revolt of the people. At the time of the 1828 election the new generation of leaders were beginning to seize leadership from the older generation. These new leaders saw Jackson as the living example of a self-made man and believed that there was no reason that they could reach the same heights through the use of their own talents. For the popular votes Jackson had won with a total of 647,292 to Adam’s 507,730, this presidential election went unequalled throughout the nineteenth century and in the Electoral College Jackson won with 178 votes to Adam’s 83. The people during this time expressed their political opinion by voting for Jackson. The best example of this was how around twenty thousand people from all over the country came to Washington to witness and celebrate the victory of their candidate, sweeping into the White House.

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

1

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Mitchell Bell](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:01 PM

I would most agree Robert V. Remini the examples he uses hit home with the common middle class of the time as you can see from this quote " surely if an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason they too could aspire to wealth and social status " [Robert Remini page 1 handout]. From this quote we can see Jacksons story hit home with everyone he was a self made man and there was no reason any ordinary citizen couldn't do the same. This author in my opinion provides me with the most convincing and best examples. Another example that resides with me is " he was presidential looking more so than any figure of the day"[Remini page 1 handout]. This quote showed he was a person people looked at and wanted to follow and buy into his message.

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

1

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



Why I agree with Remini
by [Ben Crawford](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:16 PM

I agree with Robert V. Remini’s take on this argument for a number of reasons. The first being that a monumental change did in fact occur. Stated in the handout, Remini presents that “Because of the efforts of many men to restructure the system, the election of 1828 witnessed the reemergence of the two-party system, in American politics”. With a major restructuring of the political parties taking place in the 1828 election that has more or less withstood the test of time, it is hard for me to think that what happened in this election was not monumental. Opposing author Richard P. McCormick’s take on the subject is not one opposing the main idea of a major political

revolution, but instead he argues about how it was in fact not a revolution because the numbers did not increase as much as people think. McCormick also states that “abundant data on pre-1824 elections is available, and it indicates a far higher rate of voting than has been realized. Only by taking this data into consideration can voting behavior after 1824 be placed in proper perspective”. In my opinion, using these grounds for an argument about how a revolution did not occur is not justifiable. This is mainly because numbers do not represent everything when talking about social change. Remini describes the base of the revolution as something much greater than voter turnout, it was in fact a large chain of events creating something much bigger than what was on the surface. This can be backed up by a quote from the handout stating “He arrived just as the country was undergoing profound economic and political changes, when a new generation of men was coming forward to seize leadership from an older social and political elite. These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man. Surely if an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason why they too could not aspire to wealth and social status by relying on their own talents to get what they wanted”. The American people were eager for change, and Andrew Jackson just so happened to fit the exact mold of what the people wanted in a leader.

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

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



Analyzing the Election of 1828
by [Arthur Vander Hoff](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:26 PM

Looking at these two essays, I more agree with the second argument, that the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people. The second essay points out that when you look at the percentage of eligible voters, “not a single one of the eighteen states in which the electors were chosen by popular vote attained the percentage of voter participation that had been reached before 1824.” (Election of 1828 handout, page 6, 1st and 2nd full paragraphs). It goes on to explain that the period during the elections in which Jackson was a candidate (1824-1832) was actually a low point for voter turnout, stating that voter participation both before and after this period were much higher than during.

The first essay does address the opposing essay (indirectly), saying that “no matter how the statistics are analyzed or interpreted, the people themselves who lived at the time believed that the Jackson’s election represented a great surge of popular support for the General,” and that the “common man” had “seized the opportunity to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson.” (page 3, 3rd full paragraph). My response to that would be that while the people of the time might’ve felt that way, the statistics still show that percentage wise, elections before and after Jackson’s had larger voter turnouts.

This, I believe, would depend on one’s definition of a “democratic revolt of the people” I suppose. The first essay talks more about the election of 1828 itself and the events surrounding it, while the second essay focuses more on voter turnout and comparing the election of 1828 to both future and past elections. Again, I believe that while the election of 1828 saw the return of the “two-party system” and the voters felt like there was some sort of resurgence in democracy, the numbers show that actual voter turnout was still higher both before and after the period from 1824-1832.

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

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



Re: Analyzing the Election of 1828
by [Jaden Blansit](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 3:51 PM

I see what you say when the second essay brings in more statistics and that it says the voter turnout was better the year after and the year before but the “democratic revolt” can be described in different ways and I believe the way that it was being described isn't that there were more voters in the elections before and after but its the fact that he influenced it like what I mean is he was the influencer of a wider variety of people. He was the leader of not just the common man but the variety of common men, the northern worker, western farmer, and the southern slave owner. He brought them together to vote for a singular person and to bring hope. And also not to mention the two party system was introduced during that election it is the beginning of the revolt and it shouldn't be the election with the most voters it should be the election with the lowest and to start growing in voter popularity. Everything that starts something isn't the most popular thing to start off it just grows from that point. If that makes sense if that doesn't I can elaborate more.

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

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828
by [Chase Prosser](#) - Monday, January 21, 2019, 11:55 PM

I'm going to side with Remini on this topic. As he states in his initial paragraph of his essay, "these men (the people) saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man. Surely if an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason why they too could not aspire to wealth and social status. " (Page 1) The common population of the US were common folk and Jackson grew up as such. With that, citizens could relate to him more than those who were born into a high social status. This would have inspired people to work strive for greater achievements in life.

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

1

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



A Candidate of the People
by [Zane Hiam](#) - Tuesday, January 22, 2019, 10:26 AM

After reading both sides of the issue, I find myself agreeing more with Robert Remini. Let's take a moment to examine Andrew Jackson's life story. Remini puts it best when he describes Jackson as "an orphan boy from the backwoods..."(1). Unlike most politicians, he did not come from a background of wealth, but achieved his success through his own drive and ambition. This really exemplifies the industrious spirit that dominates American culture, then as well as today. Jackson was clearly more relatable to the American people, it seems to me. Remini also points out the newly reorganized Democratic party's emphasis on "the importance of the ordinary citizen."(2) The final piece of evidence I'll cite for this first post is just how much of the vote Jackson received. 56% may not seem like a landslide victory, but as Remini points out, "In percentages it was unequal to any election during the nineteenth century."(2) It's clear that the love of the people was on Jackson's side, and that this was likely due to his humble origins and his party's emphasis on the rights of the average citizen.

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

2

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



Why Remini has better quotes and sources
by [Ben Crawford](#) - Wednesday, January 23, 2019, 7:29 PM

When it comes to the historical examples used in the handout, there are many great sources for both sides. However, I believe that Robert V. Remini makes some of the better points and has better data to back it up. While discussing the topic of how the Election of 1828 was in fact a democratic revolt of the people, Remini takes the extra steps to include an eyewitness account of President Jackson’s inauguration. Remini gets a quote that states the scene was “like the inundation of the northern barbarians into Rome,” and “that the tumultuous tide came in from a different point of the compass”. Hearing these accounts from people who were present on the day really puts the events size into perspective. Daniel Webster was quoted saying “I never saw such a crowd here before”. “Persons have come five hundred miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger.” It is difficult to read these statements made by people present at the inauguration and view what happened as anything less than a democratic revolt.

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

1

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



Video Historians Agree
by [Amanda Francis](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 11:08 AM

Harry Watson, a historian from the Jackson video, further proves Remini’s article that the election of 1828 and Jackson’s presidency had a profound effect on American Democracy. Since Jackson, “Politicians have had to appeal to the average person and to organize their political appeals and policies in order to attract that majority” (minute 3:20). This statement coincides with Remini’s quote from his article that the “election seemed to symbolize the people’s arrival to political responsibility” (p.4). With the election of 1828, the people finally had a voice in politics which I think quantifies as a democratic revolt. Like historian Richard Ellis says, “Politics become open” (minute 1:36).

The video does also bring into focus, however, the fact that although Jackson was the president of the “common man”, this meant only for common white men. His presidency excluded women, Native Americans, and slaves which does make me question whether or not it actually was a democratic revolt of the people if so many people were excluded from Jackson’s politics. Richard Ellis describes Jackson’s conflicting presidency in the video as “On one hand he’s so committed to political democracy and equality, on the other hand he has such a terrible record on the Indians and slavery that he’s just basically morally indifferent” (minute 4:00). Although I personally don’t agree with Jackson’s politics, I think it’s still important to note his “commitment to political democracy and equality” even if it did only apply to the white males of the time. It was politically significant.

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

3

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



Time Period & Perspective

by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Friday, January 25, 2019, 6:48 PM

The more I look at this issue from both sides, the more I am able to see that it depends on from what point in time I chose to analyze it from. If I chose to attempt to look at the issue from the perspective of someone living at the time, then there is no denying that the election of 1828 demonstrated voting trends that hadn't been seen before. Much of this could be attributed to the fact that voting eligibility requirements had been lessened throughout much of the country to include all white adult males, as Professor Eric Foner states in his short video (Foner's Answer, 0:30). However there is no denying that Jackson himself had a profound effect on the people who came out to vote for him, as our textbook authors illustrated for us when they described Jackson's inauguration. The passage describes how the crowd of thousands followed Jackson from the Capitol to the Whitehouse and forced their way in (textbook, pg 381). The people came out in thousands and celebrated because they had picked a president that was one of them. This was a president that would represent the will of the people who voted for him.

All of this seems a little less significant though if I look at it from our current point in time and look at the results of the elections that followed 1828 as well. As I've stated in a previous post of mine, if you look at the election of 1840, many more voting records were broken in many more states. With this perspective, the election of 1840 appears to have had a greater impact on a larger percentage of the voting population, making it difficult to call the election of 1828 a democratic revolt of the people.

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

2

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



Re: Time Period & Perspective

by [Tiffanie Chapman](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 4:46 PM

Tyler,

I agree with your statements about how it depends on what point in time you look at the election to define it as a democratic revolt. Between 1824 and 1828 there really is no denying that Jackson was popular among the people and obviously won due to that. But even in Remini's writing there is a statement made that makes me believe that even just focusing on that time I still believe it to not be a democratic revolt. Remini says, "states did not provide an official ballot; instead the parties printed their own ballots, distributing them to friends and employing high-pressured party hacks at the polls to get the voter to accept the ticket"(2 of 8). If Jackson had created an election where there was this huge new wave of voters then why were they employing "high-pressured" tactics to get people to vote? This doesn't seem like the kind of actions you would need to take to get people to vote for a party. "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 of 8). I would think that during this revolt there would be no "violent" pressures given from a party and the voters would be accepting of a ballot with no hesitations.

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

2

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



New Perspective on the Election of 1828

by [Sebastian Garcin](#) - Saturday, January 26, 2019, 6:12 AM

In my first post I argued one the side of Remini, on how the Election of 1828 was a representation of a Democratic revolt of the people. After reading over the two essays again I have come see the election in a new perspective. I want to make it clear that I am in no way taking a neutral middle ground and that I still think the Election of 1828 was representation of a Democratic revolt.

In the essays Remini agrues that the Election of 1828 was a representation of a Democratic revolt and McCormick argues not that there wasn't a Democratic revolt but rather that instead of the Election of 1828, it was the Election of 1840 that was the representation of a Democratic revolt. I believe that both authors are in a sense "right" and that while the Election of 1828 was a Democratic revolt, so was the Election of 1840. There were two waves of this Democratic revolt, the first was in 1828 and the second much larger wave in 1840.

3/14/2019

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

The best support for this argument is the voters statistics, shown to us in a line graph in class. For the 1828 election there was a increase in the number of voters, the popular vote in favor of a Democratic candidate, and the electoral vote for the same candidate. However, in the 1840 election there was a dramatic increase in all these areas.

I can elaborate more if anyone has any questions.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

Permalink

 |

Show parent

 |

Edit

 |

Split

 |

Delete

 |

Reply

◀ [Age of Jackson Videos](#)

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

◀ [Chapter 12 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

CLICK HERE for Forum 1 Materials & Questions (hidden)

▶ [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](#)