

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

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

 Search forums

Forum 1

A Democratic Revolt?

[• Subscribe](#)[◀ Age of Jackson](#)[A Democratic Revolt? ▶](#) Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ...

A Democratic Revolt?

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

This thread is for discussions on the A Democratic Revolt? topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which question(s) you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: A Democratic Revolt?

Sum of ratings: -

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

Voter turnout (Not a revolt)

by Alex McCall - Saturday, January 20, 2018, 5:58 PM

Of the two Authors we were analyzing I agree with Richard P. McCormick over Robert V Remini, in that the election of 1828 was not a political revolution. Although Jackson blew Adams out of the water, I do not believe this was a political revolt of the people. Although Jackson was a great Icon, and had many loyal followers, If you put into account the pre-1824 election statistics, this hardly seems like a revolt. Not only that, but in 1840 was the real democratic revolt of the people with a surge of voter turnout to 78 percent. (Richard McCormick, p 7 of handout) Though the voting turnout doubled that of the 1824 election, only

six states set records. Three of which, Maryland, Virginia, and Louisiana, hold almost inconsiderable change. Only a few states actually matched or exceeded their previous voting highs.(Richard McCormick, p 7 of handout)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



I'm with McCormick

by Banyan Ryan - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 5:55 PM

I can tell why this is still a debate. It's got good arguments on both sides. But for me, I have to agree with McCormick and say that it wasn't. In order to call it a "revolt", we'd have no choice but to compare it to other elections. And when taking a look at the numbers compared to other elections, from the state governor elections creating bigger turnouts in most states than the presidential one to the 20% larger democratic turnout in 1840, it doesn't quite reach the level of "revolt". I won't deny that he had an impact on people and helped inspire that "common man" ideal that would carry on for decades, but if people really were that passionate about it, that passion should have acquainted to going to the polls.

And to make it so I'm not just repeating what McCormick said, I wanna give a retort to when Remini pointed out "Not only did the Democrats see the election as a victory..., but the National Republicans thought so too". That would seem like convincing evidence to say that it did have an impact worthy of being called a revolt, because it's straight from the words of the people who existed in that time period. But it's important to remember that people, ESPECIALLY within politics, will be tempted to overemphasize everything (I mean...look at how things are now).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



How to change Old Republicans in to Democrats

by Christopher Cormier - Sunday, January 21, 2018, 10:54 PM

Out of the two authors in the reading, I lean more towards the side of Robert V. Remini rather than Richard P. McCormick. I felt that it was a political revolution in the sense that Van Buren was trying to "rally the troops" if you will. He was trying to go back in to the days of the old republicans and make them feel at home. Van Buren says to one radical, "If Gen. Jackson and his friends will put his election on **old** party grounds, preserve the **old** systems, avoid if not condemn the practices of the **last** campaign, we can add his personal popularity to the yet remaining force of old party feeling, not only succeed in electing him, but our success when achieved will be worth something." (Robert V. Remini, p 1 of handout) I felt like this was where all the wheels started to turn in Van Buren's head as to how he could help get Jackson elected. He was thinking of the older generation, along with the new. Not only would he get Jackson elected, who was somebody who the younger generation admired and felt like they could look up to him and strive to be like. But also, if Jackson won, there was personal gain for him as well. He could feel like he was a part of why he won, which he would be if was able to get all of the votes like he said. So, yes, I do think that the election of 1828 represented a revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The Election of 1828 was NOT a Democratic Revolt

by Kathryn Fuller - Monday, January 22, 2018, 3:15 PM

I agree with the second article by Richard P. McCormick that the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt. I read Robert V. Remini's article first, and I thought that based just on that article alone, the election of 1828 represented the people's arrival to political responsibility, but after reading McCormick's article, my opinion did a full 180 and that shift was based on the data he provided. There is a common misconception that data on the voter behavior before 1824 is not available to us, however there is an abundant amount of data that indicates a higher rate of voting before 1824 than people are aware of. In the 1824 election, none of the states participating in the election succeeded in achieving the voter participation percentage it had in elections previous to 1824. In the 1828 election, the voting percentage increased from 1824, however only 6 of the 22 states involved in the election were new voter highs, whereas 10 states had better voter percentage performances before 1824. If there were to be an election that represented a democratic revolt of the people, it would have to be the 1840 election where 14 of the 25 states participating set record highs for voting turnout that hadn't been seen even before 1824. 78 percent of adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren, which is a greater electorate than achieved in the Jackson period by more than 40 percent.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The 1828 Election: Everything Short of a Democratic Revolt

by Mariah Goodman - Monday, January 22, 2018, 5:45 PM

Historian and professor, Richard P. McCormick, is most correct in his stance that the American presidential election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people. This is particularly true in comparison to Historian Robert V. Remini's opposite view (which lacks validating statistical evidence) that the election of 1828 did indeed represent a democratic revolt of the people. While Remini provides that the voter turnout for the 1828 election was greater than that of the previous 1824 election, particularly among the working class "common man", it can be and has been argued by McCormick that prior elections did not elicit much interest due to cases in which political views among candidates did not differ or when it looked as though the House of Representatives would determine the winner. For comparison, the 1824 election involved four candidates, each of which belonged to the Democratic-Republican party (https://www.270towin.com/1824_Election/). This lack of variation leaves a great deal of the decision up to popularity rather than differing political viewpoints, so it can be inferred that many voters may have been indifferent toward which party member would be elected. The 1828 election, in contrast, involved a two-party system: Andrew Jackson, a part of the Democratic-Republican party, and John Quincy Adams of the National Republican Party. As parties among candidates increased in this election, so may have the interest of voters who may have felt like their votes would hold more importance in this election than in previous ones. That being said, the magnitude of voter turnout was not unlike anything witnessed before. The voter turnout had been greater once before, as "the average voter participation for all states in 1828 was 56.3 per cent. Before 1824 fifteen of the twenty-two states has surpassed that percentage" (Richard. P McCormick, pg.6). Fast-forwarding a few years to Jackson's reelection in 1832, McCormick notes that there was a decrease in voter turnout from that of the 1828 election (pg.6). This would indicate that 1828 election did not turn a tide large enough to be a revolt of the democratic people. Had it done so, people would have likely maintained an invested interest in the country's politics and continue to vote. This brings up

another valid point: American citizens, particularly the “common man” were exponentially more interested in voting in state elections that more directly impacted them than they were in presidential elections. Richard P. McCormick conveniently provides that “between 1824 and 1832 there were fifty regular [state] elections... [and] in only sixteen of the fifty instances did the vote for President surpass the corresponding vote for governor” (pg.7). It can be therefore be concluded that this presidential election did not maintain anywhere near the same level of importance as state elections, and thus, was certainly not a democratic revolt of the people. A final time frame of importance was that of the future election of 1840 between Martin Van Buren and William Henry Harrison. It was in this notable election that “78 per cent of adult white males cast their votes” which surpassed the Jackson election by more than 40 per cent (McCormick, pg.7). Remini’s assertion that Andrew Jackson’s charismatic manner gave him an edge in this election would certainly be valid for explaining some aspect of the surge in voting, but McCormick’s more statistically-backed approach once again surpasses Remini. It should be acknowledged that while it appears in Remini’s work that Jackson is the largely galvanizing aspect of the 1828 election, only three of the six most voting states voted for him (McCormick, pg.8). This meaning the other three went to Adams, proving that Jackson was not the democratic hero he has often been made out to be. Overall, it appears as though this election, while more interesting to voters than some others prior to it, did not inspire a democratic revolt of any kind among Americans.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



The Election of 1828 DID Represent a Democratic Revolt

by Maclain O'Leary - Monday, January 22, 2018, 6:26 PM

I lean more on the side of Robert Remini's view that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people. For one, as Mr.Remini points out at the start of his essay, 1828 was the time when a "new generation of young men" was coming forward to seize leadership from the older elite. This means that all these young men, this "new generation" were bringing forward all new ideas and political views that the older "Social Elite" had not thought about before. And who was at the head of all these new ideas? Andrew Jackson. Who embodied these new ideas and brought about a new age of political thinking. Many young Americans loved his political views so much, they went so far as to name a new growing political party after him, The Jacksonian Democrats.

Around this time as well, the new up and coming generation in America were beginning to run elections in new ways. They were devoted to organization in elections, and as Remini states, built all new machines to manage the popular vote. Due to this "reconstruction" of the election system, the 1828 election also saw the "reemergence" of the two-party election system.

At the end of the day, I believe revolt is a strong word. I think the election of 1828 wasn't a revolt so to speak, so much as an evolution of the election system. There were many changing pieces that election year that completely changed the way elections were viewed. These changes could be chalked up to a new generation of men coming into the political scene and bringing with them their new ideas and tactics. I don't necessarily see this as a revolt, or retaliation from the 1824 election, but more as a progression in the political system.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Election of 1828 DID Represent a Democratic Revolt

by Casandra Fountain - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 1:10 PM

I agree with you that the 1828 election wasn't so much a revolt than a evolution of the election. Remini quotes, "the country was undergoing profound economic and political changes... they [new generation] saw in him [A. Jackson] a living example of the self-made man." (p.1) The new generation of men were taking the positions of the older elite and changing the ways elections were run and viewed. Remini does acknowledge there were "party organization did not advance in every state with equal rapidity still in 1828 there was the beginning of a genuine, nationally organized, two-party system, a system that came of age in the 1830s.." (p.2) The election system was evolving and changing. The two-party system was back, people were becoming more interested in public politics, there was an arranged effort on part of many politician to vote, and states were starting to change their voting eligibilities. (p.2) The 1828 election did have an effect on how elections were run from then on out most certainly, but to say it was a democratic revolt is still a stretch to say still for me.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



YES!

by Kate Weiss - Monday, January 22, 2018, 9:58 PM

I agree with Professor Robert V. Remini's views that Andrew Jackson's election of 1828 symbolized the people's arrival of political responsibility, in the form of mass voting, and saw a revival of an organized two-party system. With Van Buren's support in the election of 1828, they campaigned for a reorganization of the Old Republican party, and called for a renewal of Jefferson's North-South alliance (packet pg 1). Jackson was an example of a self-made man, a military hero, and won the vote of many people who reacted to his public smearing campaign by defending his wife and his "honorable" duels and brawls. The campaign caught the eye of the public who viewed Jackson as a "man of the people" (packet pg 4), and cast their vote for a non-Virginian or Massachusettsian. According to the textbook, voter turnout was double what it was in 1828 (pg 380), and Wikipedia election turnout numbers show the election of 1828 as having over triple the voter turnout from the previous election. There is no doubt that this election saw an uprising in voter turnout in support of a "self-made" man of the people, it saw the beginning of a nationally organized two-party system, which came of age in the 1830s (packet pg 2), and witnessed the rowdiest inaugural party the White House has ever seen.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Look at the numbers

by Alex McCall - Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 2:51 PM

At first, I agreed with Remini as well. But the further I got into McCormick's argument I realized he had a lot of facts and statistics to back up his point. And yes the 1828 election tripled the 1824 election, but if you look pre-1824 and take into account the population, the 1828 voter turnout isn't necessarily anything special. (Packet p. 5) However this was a time where not a lot of reliable election statistics(hence the textbook differing from Wikipedia), making this an even more debatable topic. The real political revolt was when the Whigs took power in 1840 where 78 percent of people hit the polls.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Look at the numbers

by Christopher Cormier - Friday, January 26, 2018, 9:21 PM

In the beginning, I was the same as you Alex. At first, I agreed with Remini. But the more that I read what McCormick wrote, like you Alex, that he had good solid statistics and facts to back up what he was saying. The voter percentages had changed so drastically. After going back and reading both articles again, I think that the election of 1840, would be considered a revolt, whereas the 12828 election was not. When I originally read Remini's article, I think that I felt like relating to it because of how he talked about young people looking up to Jackson. So I looked at it as, the younger generation had a role model. After the second reading though, I realized that he had no statistical evidence to back up what he was saying. My opinion has completely changed and 100 percent agree with Alex.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



He was a poor b but now is a rich b

by Tessa Holstein - Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:34 PM

I agree with Robert V. Remini that it was a Democraic Revolt. Jackson wasnt very educated which wasnt that normal. "Surely if an oprhan boy from the backwoods could make it good." Robert V, Remini, pg 1) Jackson won the popular vote by a landslide, having more than 56%. He also had 178 while Adam only had 83 which is a big deal. "His total represented substantial support from all sections of this country, including New England." (Robert V. Remini, pg 2) Jackson is pretty blunt and said whatever came to his mind which is pretty rare coming from a president, he just didnt care what people think of him. But I agree more with Robert V. Remini because he said made more sense and was more facts. While the other side was full of stats and wasnt that information I would say.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



It Was a Democratic Revolt

by Jennafer McCoy - Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:34 PM

The possession I most agree with is the first, by Robert V. Remini, claiming that the election of 1828 represented a Democratic revolt among the people. Remini added lots of pieces of information people of the century had wrote, aiding in the claim of a revolt. I think it would have been more helpful, had he put the writers names. "Edward Everett of Massachusetts, one of Adams' most dedicated supporters in Congress, explained to his brother that the General won "by a majority of more than two to one, an event astounding to the friends of the Administration and unexpected the General himself and his friends.../They/are embarrassed with the vastness of their triumph and the numbers of their party." This quote from Remini's paper is one of the better ones, since it says who wrote it, and really helps convey that even the losing side thought this election was a huge feat.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



Re: It Was a Democratic Revolt

by Tessa Holstein - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 9:00 PM

I do agree with you. It would have been more helpful if he had the writers name. Both sides should have went into more detail but Remini was more decriptive than the other guy (forgot his name).

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



In favor of a Democratic Revolt

by David Garvin - Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:39 PM

After reading both points about the election of 1828 I agree that is was more of a Democratic Revolt. The amount of added voter turnout compared to the prior election is huge. Even though McCormick points out that there was a huge surge in voter turnout that had significantly more voters in the 1840 election, the 1828 election still saw big changes that impacted future elections. It was the beginning of the common man getting more involved in presidential elections and not just local elections. The election saw the reemergence of the two party system and the beginning of the two party system that continues today.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Numbers don't lie

by Casandra Fountain - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:02 PM

I was very torn when trying to decide of side I agreed with for the reading. I initially sided with Robert Remini, agreeing that “Jackson’s election in 1828 has been interpreted as the beginning of the ‘rise of the common man’ in American history” (handout p.3). But once I read Richard McMormick’s argument it was hard to ignore the facts and hard statistics he provided. One of his main points was that the 1828 election did not have outstanding statistics compared to the 1824 election and the 1832 election. On page 8 of the handout McCormick quotes “1828 the situation had altered. There were but two candidates in the field, each of whom had substantial sectional backing. A clear-cut contest impended, and the voters became sufficiently aroused to go to the polls in moderate numbers.” He goes on to say that Jackson’s election did not involve a “mighty democratic uprising” due to the fact when compared to “peak participation recorded for each state before 1824, or with contemporaneous gubernatorial elections, or most partiality with the vast outpouring of the electorate in 1840, voter participation in the Jackson elections was unimpressive.” When you look at the numbers, it’s hard to say the Jackson election started a democratic revolt in 1828, it’s simply not there.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

Voters during the election of 1828



by McKenna Wilson - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:10 PM

After reading the arguments of both sides, I agree with Robert V. Remini. His point about Jackson's party being able to relate to everyday ordinary people is why I think so many people voted for him. "Aside from the importance of party in producing Jackson's triumph there was also his own popularity and charisma" (Remini page 3). People saw Jackson for who he really was as he was honest with the voters. "He inspired confidence among the largest mass of voters despite his lack of education and his reputation as an untamed westerner" (Remini page 3). People saw Jackson as a reflection of themselves and a representative of what they could achieve in life. This made people like Jackson and want to vote for him to be their leader. Ultimately I believe that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: Voters during the election of 1828

by Daniel Vuong - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 8:50 PM

Although I agree with you that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt because it changed a lot of views on voting, the man behind the charge, Andrew Jackson, was a very controversial man because of his personal views. Because of this, it questioned the validity of whether or not this election was the election that started a *real* democratic revolt for the common people. Moreover, a lot of the current population views the election of 1828 as a democratic revolt because Andrew Jackson was elected and he was the "champion of the common man". What people typically disregard though is the fact that Andrew Jackson was more for the 'common man' for a white man's country. He led the charge on the Trail of Tears, the forceful removal of Indian Tribes to Indian territory. Furthermore, he disregarded the issue of slavery. Andrew Jackson had slaves himself, making him a very contradicting man. He supported racial, economic, and gender inequity. Because of all this information provided on the President, it is easy to conclude that despite what is said, President Jackson might have been for the *white* common man, but he definitely was not the overall best role model for the common man.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Voters during the election of 1828

by McKenna Wilson - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 9:37 PM

I agree 100% with this after watching the Age of Jackson videos! While reading the article it seemed to me that he was a great candidate for the common man but I then realized that the common man was typically a white male back then when it came to voting. It wasn't until watching the video where it seemed to me that he wasn't so common for women or slaves since they weren't able to vote.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



The Future of Politics and Presidency

by Jordan Hibbard - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:10 PM

The election of 1828 was a democratic revolt. Previous to this election things were very precise and professional, candidates spent a lot less time slandering one another and focused on their jobs. This is not entirely true because some candidates did attempt to slander each others' names and some openly campaigned, but the election of 1828 was the switch from the old to the new. Politicians began to bribe and sway other significant members of society to vote for their candidate. Jackson was the perfect candidate for such a change because he was seen as "the american man" he was a rags to riches story built on hard work, and many commoners and politicians related to this image which made him a very desirable candidate. if Jackson had not run in 1828 it is likely that the revolt and change to he strict two party system would not have happened that year. However, this switch that occurred from old to new was a revolt and a victorious one at that. because on Jackson's win.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Votes speak louder than words.

by Abigail Gierut - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:13 PM

I have to agree with Remini's view on the 1828 election as being the beginning of a democratic revolt in the U.S. In Robert V. Remini's essay, he mentions how much the country needed a political system that could evolve alongside our quickly changing society. "For Van Buren, like many other politicians of the day recognized that the political system of the 1820s had failed to respond to a changing society and that unless something were done right away it might collapse all together" (page 1, paragraph 4). There was was obviously a need for change based on most politicians at the time and the people proved that they agreed through where they placed their votes.

The strongest piece of evidence that stood out to me in this essay was the actual numbers of votes in the election. Jackson won by a landslide compared to any election in the 1800's. "Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 or just a little better than 56 per cent of the entire vote. This was an extraordinary achievement by Jackson, a veritable landslide. In percentages it was unequalled in any presidential election during the nineteenth century" (page 2, paragraph 4). Not only did we see that the majority of the people supported this change, but also that our representatives fully backed it as well with even an even bigger win for Jackson with electoral votes.

"Jackson's victory was even more impressive. He won a total of 178 electoral votes to 83 for Adams" (page 2, paragraph 6).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Votes speak louder than words.

by Banyan Ryan - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 2:57 PM

Nobody can deny that Jackson's percentage win was impressive, but the amount of people that allowed that to happen is an important factor. When talking about that same election, McCormick explains that "only six of the twenty-two states involved were highs in voter participation established". This election may have gotten him the biggest win, but he did not draw in the most people. It's hard for me to call something a revolt when the number of people participating is just average.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Votes Aren't the Only Factor

by Jordan Hibbard - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:34 AM

The number of voters, while important, is not all there is to consider when deciding whether or not the election of 1828 was truly a democratic revolt. While the election of 1840 had more voters a more important thing to consider is who voted. In the 1828 election many of the Old Republicans decided (or were coerced) to Jackson's side which in many ways made Jackson's win in 1828 much more of a revolt than the large amounts of voters who came to the polls in other election years.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



The Election of 1828 Showed Signs Of A Democratic Revolt

by Aidan Jewett - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:44 PM

I think that the election of 1828 showed signs of a democratic revolt. Andrew Jackson won by one of the largest landslide victory at the time. This happened for a few reasons. Jackson was immensely popular with the people, and I think that people refused to trust the Republicans after the election of 1824 and the "corrupt bargain". I also think that the two-party system is convenient for people. These factors helped to contribute to a much larger voter turnout than the previous election, with in increase of nearly 800,000 voters. Jackson gave the common man inspiration. He saw support from almost every region in the country besides New England. Jackson won 93 more electoral votes than Adams' 83. People wanted to vote, and they wanted to vote for Andrew Jackson

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: The Election of 1828 Showed Signs Of A Democratic Revolt

by Alex McCall - Friday, January 26, 2018, 11:53 AM

I agree with you, Jackson was loved by a majority of the population at the time. He also won in a landslide victory, however I do not think a democratic revolt of the people had not taken place yet. The reasons I think this is if you put it into percentages it was only 56.3 percent of eligible voters voted, which isn't a revolt at all compared to the pre-1824 elections. I believe the real political revolt was in 1840, when the Whigs showed up.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



A Different Way Of Looking

by Aidan Jewett - Friday, January 26, 2018, 5:15 PM

You bring up a good point in the fact that the pre-1824 elections and 1840 elections attracted more voters. That definitely means something. However, I think that a differently way of looking at the election is by comparing it to the election of 1824. Jackson was the most popular in both elections, and people felt angry and cheated by

the "corrupt bargain" between Adams and Henry Clay. Although the overall voter turnout in 1828 might have not been that impressive I don't think that we can ignore how Jackson won by. According to Wikipedia, the only other elections during the nineteenth century with a larger win percentage were elections involving the Founding Fathers or the election of 1820, in which James Monroe had no major opponent. I believe that this shows signs of a revolt.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Truth to Both Sides: Cementing an Outline

by Daniel Vuong - Monday, January 22, 2018, 11:50 PM

While reading both articles, it was hard to pick a clear side. Both historians brought up great points and both also stated real facts that actually happened. It is hard for me to pick a side because I can see both points of the historians. With this said, I'll start off with why Remini made some great points. Although it can be seen that "None of the Jackson elections involved a "might democratic uprising" in the sense that voters were drawn to the polls in unprecedented proportions" (McCormick 4), this is a rather rash statement. Though McCormick makes a great comparison of previous and future years of voter participation in the presidency and state votes, it is hard to deny that there are certain 'outlines' during the Jacksonian era, that did not exist in the previous years, that would last till this day. Whether or not this was a coincidence that it all happened during the beginning of Jackson's presidency, it cannot be denied that it did not happen until he came into office. One of these outlines were that, "the election of 1828 witnessed the reemergence of the two-party system, in American politics" (Remini 1). In previous elections, there were no voting within the same system, and choosing one candidate. This made for a very 'unorganized' system in which multiple candidates from different parties would arise. Because of this, it is hard to deny that the election of 1828 was the beginning of a nationally organized, two party system. A system till this day, that we use.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Remini's Best Evidence that the 1828 election was a democratic revolt of the people

by Mariah Goodman - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 10:14 PM

I previously argued that Richard McCormick was correct in asserting his point of view that the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the American people due to his use of abundant statistical evidence. I still find this evidence to be superior, but for the sake of acknowledging the validity of Robert Remini's claims and not totally discounting his informed knowledge, I would now argue that the 1828 election did indeed symbolize a democratic revolt of the people.

Though I do not find Andrew Jackson to be the "man of the people" Remini credits him to be - nor do I agree that Jackson was the reason that such substantial voter turnout arose during the election of 1828- I will credit the country's current political state of the time to be such an impetus. According to Remini, Van Buren can be credited for the advocating for a two-party

system revival, a successful feat indeed. I believe that this is a major contributor to the 1828 election's astounding voter turnout (this in comparison to several elections prior). This emergence of two competitors coming from parties of different ideals would have greatly inspired people who wanted a specific form of politics present in the country to vote for their preferred side. I think that this galvanized the so called "common man" of the working class to protect his interests now that there lied a greater opportunity for politics to change based on their vote. This, I believe could very well indicate that the election of 1828 was a sort of democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Remini's Best Evidence that the 1828 election was a democratic revolt of the people

by McKenna Wilson - Friday, January 26, 2018, 4:45 PM

I agree Mariah! I definitely think that having a two-party system encouraged voters to go to the polls. I would have done the same because if I wanted a certain candidate to win I would go vote for them. This wouldn't necessarily mean they will win but it has an impact overall. It is interesting that this system is still in place today. It makes me think of the point discussed in class that if all voters actually voted, would the outcomes be a lot different?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



The Two-Party System: The Lasting Impact of the Election of 1828

by Mariah Goodman - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:49 AM

I like your point about how interesting it is that the two-party system is still in place today, McKenna! I think that its revival certainly speaks to the success of the 1828 election as a democratic revolt of the people. This may suggest that politics holds more of an interest to people when they feel their ideals are under threat rather than when they find there is nothing they can change or better (this being in the case that all candidates represent a single political party, particularly when discussing the 1828 election). Based on the statistical evidence that McCormick provided, I had felt as though his argument was much stronger. I still do not find that of Remini to be very strong at all but your point definitely provides that the election of 1828 did have a huge impact on American politics. Thus, this election could very well have signified a democratic revolt of the people to some extent.

As for your question regarding whether if the voter turnout rate today consisted of 100% of the population, "would the outcomes be different?", I would have to assume yes, but to an extent. When taking into account the electoral college, and the areas in which voter turnout is not present, and thus, would increase, it would then have to be evaluated whether these number at all impact the number of votes a state is allotted. This is no impossible task, we would simply have to observe where exactly a vote really counts based on whether state will inevitably lean one way or another (for instance, California, which always votes democrat).

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

Sum of ratings:2 (1)



Re: The Two-Party System: The Lasting Impact of the Election of 1828

by McKenna Wilson - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 6:58 PM

Mariah,

After reading the article again, I also think that more people voted for Jackson in 1828, resulting in an increase in voter turnout because there were only two parties to choose from rather than 4 or so. Although I first thought this was a democratic revolt, I think I have changed my mind. After reading McCormick's statistics and side to this topic, I think his side makes more sense. After Jackson's presidency, there were more voters because the common man realized their vote actually mattered, then leading to an increase in voters post-Jackson (page 7).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The Democratic Revolt of 1828

by Stephen Sorber - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 12:25 PM

I agree with author Robert V. Remini in the sense that the democratic revolt was due to the fact that "General" Jackson, during his campaign, argued in favor of state power and the "importance of the ordinary citizen". While John Quincy Adams argued that the federal government would surely attain all the power. The people during the 19th century were not fans of this idea and sure argued with it profusely.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: 1828 vs 1840, voter percentage

by Daniel Vuong - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 9:18 PM

Although I can see that the election of 1828 of being a democratic revolt, I can also see why McCormick argued that it was not. He provides strong statistical evidence in order to contrast the previous and future elections. And because of this, he feels that the election of 1840 was more of a democratic revolt. He provides evidence in a statement he said, "Voter participation in the 1838 election remained near the level that had been established in 1828 and 1832, with 55.2 per cent of the adult white males voting. Only five states registered percentages in excess of their pre-1824 highs. But in 1840 the "new democracy" made its appearance with explosive suddenness" (McCormick 3). Furthermore, one of the main reasons why the election of 1828 was seen as a democratic revolt is because Jackson won by a landslide, and got a lot of people to come out to vote, this can be argued because the percentage of more people came out during the election of 1840. "In a surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any president election, four out of five (78.0 per cent) of the

adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren” (McCormick 3). If the election of 1828 was seen as a democratic revolt because of voter percentage, if the election of 1840 had more voter percentage this puts the argument in a different perspective.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: 1828 vs 1840, voter percentage

by Aidan Jewett - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:35 PM

Both you and McCormick are correct that the election of 1828 did not attract a very large voter turn-out compared to other elections, specifically the election of 1840. However, I don't think that we should ignore Jackson's landslide. Although an average amount of people voted in the election, Jackson won by the biggest landslide of every election that didn't involve Founding Fathers in the 19th century, according to Wikipedia's data on presidential elections. Jackson won by 56% of the total vote. I believe that it's possible that the election of 1828, if not a "democratic revolt" itself, could have signaled what future elections were going to bring.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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

◀ Age of Jackson

A Democratic Revolt? ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)