

HST 202: US History W20 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 202 W20 \(Escobar Meta 30603 30604\)](#) / [Week 3 January 19 - January 25](#) / [Forum 1](#) / [A Democratic Revolt ?](#)



Search forums

Forum 1

A Democratic Revolt ?

[Subscribe](#) [Settings](#) ▼

◀ [Age of Jackson Videos](#)

[Age of Jackson Videos](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move



A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 7:53 AM

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 side of the issue, YES or NO, you have chosen to support or write about. Do NOT simply leave it RE: A Democratic Revolt ?

Sum of ratings: [-](#)

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Noah Francis](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 5:07 PM

The Democratic Revolt of 1828

I think the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt of the people for several reasons. Unlike many of the other presidents, Jackson was able to catch the attention of the people by reorganizing the old Republican Party and fighting for the common man. This not only won him the election, but also brought out more voters than the previous election of 1824. Along with this, after the victory of Andrew Jackson, the National Republicans also considered the election a "great revolution" for the American people based off the voter turnout. This may be part of the reason why historians are calling the election of 1828 the "rise of the common man" (Handout 3).

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

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Jarod Doerner](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 1:07 PM

I also agree that the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt. Like you said, "Jackson was able to catch the attention of the people by reorganizing the old Republican Party and fighting for the common man." The election began the era of the common man in which the mass of voters rose up and threw the elite leaders out of our nation's Capital. By doing this, Jackson's forceful personality, compounded with his use of strong executive authority, engendered constant controversy in his 8 years in office.

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

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



The Election of 1828 Represented a Democratic Revolt of the People

by [Melissa Johnson](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 9:42 PM

The Election of 1828 Represented a Democratic Revolt of the People
Election of 1828

Yes, I do believe that "The Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People. At this time people were changing. They started to believe that they could be something more than they actually were. This belief, this fire within them started because of Andrew Jackson. "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man." (pg.1 of Yes argument). Since the people had an interest their future and others sought for power in their future, Jackson won the election by a landslide. "Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292....56 per cent of the entire vote" (pg.2 of YES argument). With only two people running for president it was easy to for-tell that the group parties would soon change. The people in 1828 started to separate into a two-party system. Andrew Jackson's group was called democratic party. Adam-Clay's group was called National Republican party. The people were inspired by Andrew Jackson, him winning by a landslide, and then the people separating into a two-party system there is one more event that Represents that the year 1828 was a Democratic Revolt of the people. "Four states....changed their laws and transferred the selection of electors from the legislature to the people."(pg.2 of YES argument)

With all these life changing events that happened within this time period, I do believe that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people.

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

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [McKenna Wilson](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 1:08 PM

McKenna Wilson
January 19, 2020

Forum #1 Post

After reading both of the articles I feel that I agree more with the article written by Robert V. Remini and his view that Yes, the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. Although McCormick made many valid points in his argument I felt that Remini did a better job overall of conveying his points and providing evidence to support his opinion. In paragraph 5 on page 2 the document reads "In Pennsylvania alone, the numbers rose from forty-seven thousand to 152,000 four years later." For me these numbers really stuck with me and showed that the increase in voters had a lot to do with Jackson running and the election as a whole. I appreciated the numbers that Remini provided in his piece however, there were a few places I wish the quotes he used would have been cited. On page 3 in paragraph 4 he goes on to write that "Well.. signed one of them, "a great revolution has taken place...This is what I all along feared but to a much greater extent." Although the point he was making was clear all he said was National Republicans thought so too giving no name to whoever said what he used as a quote for evidence to make his case. I felt toward the end as well the image that he painted of Jackson's inauguration showed that his election truly was a time of change for the people and that even at the beginning of his presidency people were travelling hundreds of miles to see him with the belief that he "rescued" them.

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

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



The idea that the election of 1828 was unusual

by [Brontae Sodeman](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 7:49 PM

I agree with Robert's take on the election of 1828. We are introduced to the idea that social and political reform were in motion prior to the election of 1828. The country was developing as a whole, in all fields. Robert begins by saying Andrew Jackson was a rising celebrity of the time, which we can agree upon. He even goes to say Van Buren and Jackson created a faction of "old republicans" that later lead to the revival of the two party system. Going into the results of the elections, Robert uses data to prove that Jackson's election was like nothing anyone had seen before. In the popular vote there was, "An increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824," (pg 2). I agree with Robert position, yes the election of 1828 was out of the ordinary. I'm not sure I would use the word "revolt" but there was definitely a change in political, social and economic systems.

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

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



Yes : The Election of 1828

by [Jahaziel Reyes](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 9:34 PM

I agree most with Robert V. Reminis thoughts on the election of 1828. While the sheer amount of technical evidence provided by Richard P. McCormicks side is valuable the number of corroborating information from various sources, from the results found on the [Wikipedia article](#) provided by the [Taking Sides](#) material on moodle, to our own History book on (pg.379-381). The material provided in support for the surge of people is too great.

In particular the prevalence of Andrew Jackson's personality and the reemergence of the two-party system were the most significant and talked about points that would lead to the interest of the public. The reading, textbook and the wikipedia article all cooborate the importance of Jackson's persona, in one statement by our textbook by John M. Murren, the Adams campaign was described trying to use Jackson's "passionate" character as a negative in an attempt to sway voters "The attempt to brand Jackson as a lawless man, in fact enhanced his image as a melodramatic hero who battled shrewd, unscrupulous legalistic enemies"(pgs. 379-380). I find the us versus them verbiage extremely important in explaining the voter turnout. In chapter 10 of our text Murren expressed the importance of print and its prevalence everywhere in the nation, how print was pennies to create and transport (pgs. 335-336). The establishment of this cult of personalities between the candidates and at the speed and thoroughness represented "-a great surge of popular support for the General" (pg. 3), as described by Remini in the handout. Further, "convinced (them) of the truth of their own propaganda."(pg. 3). That Jackson was fighting for the common people against the aristocracy spurring major movement in the population. The significance of this in my mind may just be because of recent events and seeing the power of a cult of personality, but it is something I believe would be enough to bring out the numbers described for both parties.

Secondly the two-party system encouraged by Van Buren Republicans sought to streamline the system of ballots for voters on the national stage. Many Americans at the time were apathetic to the national elections and instead focused on electing local government officials as their relevance was more tangible to them, McCormick in the handout himself states that "- and the early deterioration of the national two-part system that had seemed to be developing around 1800, presidential elections did not arouse the voter interest as much as did those for governor, state legislators or even members of congress" (pg6). The reestablishment of the two-part system in 1828 spurred the populouse to vote anew, alongside the propaganda apparatus of both parties creating two clear and distinct personalities to latch onto, however truthful they may have been, to vote.

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

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



The Common Man

by [Zach Trotter](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 9:58 PM

Yes - The election of 1828 did indeed represent a revolt of the people. I agree with Remini's take on the election of 1828 being a revolt of the people due to the statistics he brought up about the massive rise in votes compared to the 1824 election. The rise of the common man. The "common man" made up a large population and Jackson was the favored candidate for this group of people, and due to changes in voting rules these voters turned up nation-wide to vote for Jackson. "The popular vote increased nearly 800,000 from the previous election." (PG. 2 Paragraph 2) Andrew Jackson had 56% of the popular vote, this being called "an extraordinary achievement", "unequalled in *any* presidential election during the 19th century", and "his total represented support from all sections of the country" (PG. 2 Paragraph 3). Remini also states that the common man of the country, farmers, workers, frontiersmen seized the opportunity during the election year to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson. The votes in this election grew so much due to changes in voting rules allowing more people to vote, and Jackson "The man of the people" (PG 4.) had influenced many people who supported him to show up to vote and express their political opinions. "Generations of historians have interpreted the election of 1828 the beginning of the rise of the common man" (PG.3)

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

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



Re: The Common Man

by [Sophia Schlesinger](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 11:40 PM

It's definitely interesting to learn that this presidential election was considered the "beginning of the rise of the common man" like you said in your last sentence. It's weird to think of a time when people weren't allowed to be involved in the voting process because it's such an obvious thing to us now. It's important to see how this started and WHO started it. Andrew Jackson was definitely smart to have this strategy. It's a strategy literally all presidents do now because of him inspiring it hundreds and hundreds of years ago whether they realize it or not. It was an event that changed/shaped future president elections AND cause such a revolt of the people at that time!

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

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



Re: The Common Man

by [Zach Trotter](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 10:17 PM

After re-reading both YES and NO arguments, I came across a statement in the NO argument that really got me thinking. "In a surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any presidential election, four out of five (78.0 per cent) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren. This new electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40 per cent. In all but five states." (PG. 7 Paragraph 5) The statement says that the surge to the polls has never been exceeded in any presidential election. This and a few other parts of the NO argument makes good points that the 1840 election was actually a better turn out (or revolt).. but the claims that the NO argument makes, just leads me to believe that the 1828 election was the FIRST of many democratic revolts in our nation's history during elections. I believe the 1828 election was THE FIRST democratic revolt of the people. During the 2016 election I head talk (on numerous news stations) of candidates from different parties trying to gain the "common" (common man) vote, is the tactic that Andrew Jackson used during the 1828 election still a tactic that has echoed through out our nation's history all the way to present day elections? I'd love to hear anybody else's thoughts on this.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)

**Re: The Common Man**by [Beth Trower](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 3:09 PM

Zach, you brought up an interesting idea on how the "common man" tactic has continued to be used throughout many elections in our nation's history.

In the 1960 election, Kennedy was swept into office as the country fell in love with his young family and the Catholics and Irish lined up to vote for him as he became our first Irish Catholic candidate. (<https://www.jfklibrary.org/learn/about-jfk/jfk-in-history/john-f-kennedy-and-ireland>).

In the 2004 election, Bush v. Kerry, Bush was seen as the "Candidate People Most Wanted to Have a Beer With" and that was enough to win him a second term in the White House. "A recent Zogby/Williams Identity Poll reflected that. It found that 57% of undecided voters would rather have a beer with Bush than Kerry... Bush comes off as less pretentious and more down to earth". (https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/columnist/benedetto/2004-09-17-benedetto_x.htm).

The 2008 election was seen as a "Change Election" because there was not an incumbent running. Overall, 131 million people voted in 2008, a turnout increase of about 5 million people since 2004. (https://www.census.gov/history/pdf/2008presidential_election-32018.pdf) Looking at Obama v. McCain, Obama was seen as the "Common Man", the first black candidate who got his start in politics by being a community organizer. He was also seen as the "Change Candidate"; his message was simple: Hope, inspired from his book The Audacity of Hope. He was an inspiration not only to African Americans but also young voters everywhere. He was our first black president, and our nation was forever changed. According to Figure 2. Voting Rates by Race, The Black vote increased to 64.7 in 2008 from 60.0 in 2004. (https://www.census.gov/history/pdf/2008presidential_election-32018.pdf).

So statistics don't lie: the "common man" is a well-used marketing campaign in today's social media fueled audience. But not everyone has it. It's kind of like the X-factor, an invisible quality that some people can harness and ride all the way to the White House.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Jasmine Foster](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 10:08 PM

Research Shows Otherwise

According to Richard P. McCormick the influx in voter participation was largely unreliable for the 1828 election compared to the years before and after (Page 5, 1828 Handout). Professor McCormick then went on to show that though there was a higher percentage of voters, that the numbers showed not to as significant in comparison to the other election years based on the number of voters and their demographics, living in one of the six states, representing nearly 70% of the votes (Page 6, 1828 Handout).

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**

by [Brontae Sodeman](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 11:18 AM

McCormick's statistics are based on the idea that political participation started ramping up in 1824. Robert touches on this by saying, "In Pennsylvania alone, the number rose from forty-seven thousand to 152,000 four years later," (pg 2). A quick google search, we learn Pennsylvania had the most electoral votes, 28 for Andrew Jackson. On theme with the idea that a few popular states decide the fate of the election, this can be seen as early as 1828.

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

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt Yes**

by [alex Henshen](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 10:09 PM

The yes essay provides the most logical argument because it is based on the numbers of the polls. Robert uses several statistics from the election, even the electoral votes for each president which was "Jackson got 178 to 83 for Adam." The fact that Jackson won both the popular and electoral votes makes a strong point toward his argument.

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

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt Yes**

by [Melissa Johnson](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 2:22 PM

Hi, Alex

I liked how you shared evidence about the polls. I think the numbers strongly show that there was a democratic revolt in 1828. The Wikipedia definition of "democratic revolt" is "A democratic revolution is a political science term denoting a revolution in which a democracy is instituted, replacing a previous non-democratic government, or in which revolutionary change is brought about through democratic means, usually without violence." With this definition in mind we can take into account that there were other factors that went along with the numbers that made the election of 1828 a democratic revolt of the people. For example "four states, representing a considerable electorate, changed their laws and transferred the selection of electors from the legislator to the people." (Robert V. Remini p.2) With the numbers from the polls that you brought up and the four states changing, are two factors that weigh heavy on the Yes side.

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

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



The Common Man

by [Beth Trower](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 11:37 PM

I reviewed both arguments twice: the first time was skimming to get the basic idea of both articles down; the second was to take in the details supporting their idea. Here's a summary of both ideas, followed by a main quote to support them:

YES Argument: The 1828 election was a democratic revolt of the people due to the fervor of the political climate. This energy was reflected in the turnout of voter participation: "...in 1828 the common man flocked to the polls in unprecedented numbers, for the proportion of adult white males voting soared to 56.3 percent, more than double the 1824 figure" (6). The 1824 figure was 26.5% for comparison.

Now, what was the energy that induced this kind of turnout? As the author Robert V. Remini explains below,

"... the people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge of popular support for the General. They believed that the ordinary citizen, the so-called "common man," who were farmers, workers, frontiersmen, and the like, had seized the opportunity to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson" (3).

NO Argument: The 1828 election was not a democratic revolt of the people due to the less-than-significant turnout of voter participation, compared to turnout of the 1840 election. The data is as follows: "In a surge to the polls that has rarely, if ever, been exceeded in any presidential election, four out of five (78.0 per cent) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren. This new electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40 per cent" (7).

This trend followed into 1844: "The flood receded only slightly in 1844, when 74.9 per cent of the estimated potential electorate went to the polls. Indeed, nine states attained their record highs for the period" (7).

Having now laid out both arguments, along with their main supporting details, I am in full agreement with Dr. Remini's perspective of the 1828 election. He has a unique insight into the mindset of the 1828 voter and the political climate that led to the democratic revolt of the people.

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

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



Re: The Common Man

by [McKenna Wilson](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 6:22 PM

Hi Beth!

I like that you compared both of the essays in one post. I think it is important to pull from both sides to fully understand the point that both historians were trying to make! I agree with you on the yes being perspective being the one I agreed with more as well. The points that Historian McCormick was trying to make showed that the 1840 did have a bigger voter turnout but did not quite effect the people the way the election of 1828 did. The quote you included on the "common man" was also a quote that caught my attention while I was reading through the essays and persuaded me to come to the conclusion that I did on agreeing with Remini.

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

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

**I think no, there was no Democratic Revolt.**by [Eric Shoaf](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 11:54 PM

I think that because of how heated the election got, with the smear campaigns that went on against both candidates, that there was a higher voter turnout. However the fact that these numbers went down again indicates to me that the election of 1832 wasn't as divisive as the one in 1828, so there was a decrease, and an eventual return to the norm until 1840.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: I think no, there was no Democratic Revolt.**by [Jarod Doerner](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 1:12 PM

I would have to disagree that the election of 1828 created a democratic revolt of the people. There was a political and social retaliation from the election that helped reemergence the two-party system in American politics. The changes in politics during Jackson's presidency provided various social and economic changes. The election of Andrew Jackson as President in 1828 marked the beginning of an era known as Jacksonian Democracy or the Age of the Common Man.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: I think no, there was no Democratic Revolt.**by [Eric Shoaf](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 9:05 PM

According to McCormick, the number of people going to the polls in 1824 was more of an outlier, people were less interested in voting since they did not feel voting for the President or even Congressmen was going to help them. This changed when Andrew Jackson burst onto the scene, and got people interested in voting again. It was a return to the norm rather than a Democratic revolt of the people. It's understandable why this is believed to be the case, American politics went through a great deal of change during that election. However the numbers do not support this theory. They do support the theory of a Democratic revolt in 1840, when voting numbers jumped from ~50% of the people eligible to vote, to ~75%.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**YES: It was a Revolt!**by [Jarod Doerner](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 10:47 AM

I agree with Robert Remini that the election of 1828 created a democratic revolt of the people on the grounds that there was a political and social retaliation from the election. "The election of 1828 witnessed the reemergence of the two-party system in American politics" (Page 1). Jackson, along with Vice-President John Calhoun and Martin Van Buren, made up the Democratic Republican party or just simply the Democratic party, while the National Republican party was made up of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay. The changes in politics during Jackson's presidency provided various social and economic changes. However, political change began several years before Jackson became president. During the Election of 1824, Jackson won the most popular and electoral votes, but did not win the election.

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

**Re: YES: It was a Revolt!**by [Noah Francis](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 6:54 PM

Hi Jared,

I like how you mentioned that you agree with Remini on the grounds of there also being a political and social retaliation as well. I had never really thought of it like that. McCormick brings up some very interesting facts about the elections of 1824 and 1828 that Remini never noted. The people were ultimately looking for something different at the time and Andrew Jackson looked to be the answer. As you previously stated, the reemergence of the two-party system was extremely important for not only the election, but for the future of American politics.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: YES: It was a Revolt!**by [Jarod Doerner](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 7:32 PM

The future of American politics has always been on the mind of many. I will agree that Andrew Jackson was the guy for the right time. However, even without Jackson, there would still be a revolt of some sort. There is a correlation between the elections of 1828 and 1832 with higher turn-out rates. With the election of 1828 however, Jackson won the hearts of the people with over 56% of the population voting him in for office. The reemergence of the two-party system and Jackson's presidency created what we would call a Democratic Revolt.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: YES: It was a Revolt!**by [Jahaziel Reyes](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 6:40 PM

I'm glad you pointed out the importance of the two-party system as a revolt, Jarod. Richard P. McCormick's argument was that because of the relatively tame numbers for the era, 1840 should represent a more substantial revolution based on voter turnout. But, this ignores the new system as a bedrock for future American politics. I myself thought that this along with the perception of revolutionary change by newspapers at the time contributed to the eventual growth in turnout described by McCormick, as they "believed in their own propaganda"(pg 3 Handout). So at the least this in my eyes would become a stepping stone for more enthusiasm in politics.

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



Yes

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 8:35 PM

Andrew Jackson was confident, presidential looking, and confident. When people like their candidate on a personal level more people will come out, and vote. "The total popular vote in the election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous election in 1824." (page 2). You can see the same pattern in the 2008 election. Obama was charismatic, and confident too. There was an increase in voters that year.

There was a Democratic Revolt in 1828 because so many people went to the ballots. They voted for the person that embodied the persona they preferred. They wanted their President to be a common man.

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

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



Re: Yes

by [Melissa Johnson](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 7:39 AM

Hi Kaleah,

I liked how you brought out the fact of how the people wanted a "common man" for president. Along with this we should know that he did not win the election of 1824. In 1828 he did though. Times change, and people realized that who they needed was Andrew Jackson a "common man". Another factor that made 1828 a democratic revolt was the reemergence of the two-party. The party's names were "the Democratic party and National Republican party." (Remini p.2)

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

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



yes

by [alex Henshen](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 5:29 PM

There was a democratic revolt during the election of 1828 because Andrew Jackson was a charismatic and beloved president. As stated in Tuesdays in class video, "Jackson did a lot of good things within his presidency. Even though he did some bad things." Showing that he was loved nation wide.

He also knew that the people didn't like bankers so he promised to get rid of them if he was re-elected. Where as the whigs weren't in tune with what the people wanted, giving them more incentive to vote for Jackson making this a democratic revolt.

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

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Sophia Schlesinger](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 9:02 PM

I started off pretty split on the issue, but after I gave it some thought and went back and forth between the textbook and the essays, I agree with the first essay (yes). The main question is also interesting because it asks if the 1828 election represented one (a Democratic Revolt), but not if it was the start of the first one of it's own kind.... The author of the second essay (no) is very stuck on the idea that the 1840 election was in fact the "mighty democratic uprising" and that this one didn't even come close to what that one had in store. But my interpretation of the question is not asking if it is the very beginning of one of it's kind- but instead simply just asking if it represents a Democratic Revolt of the people in general- which in my opinion, I believe it does.

Jackson's main strategy seemed to be to appeal to this supporters and to do his best to make them feel included and heard. Adam's strategy was to attack Jackson's character and try to trash his name and bring up old dirt from the past (and even some the present regarding his relationship with his wife). Adam's strategy ended up backfiring. While many voters agreed that it was best to have a president who followed the law himself, they disagreed with bringing someone's private life into public issues (pg. 427 of the textbook). When Adam's started to do this is when the Jackson supporters really started to criticize Adams and became even more protective over Jackson. Because of the support for Jackson, voter turnout doubled what it had been in 1824 and Jackson won by a landslide. (pg. 427 of the textbook) Another reason I believe this election, and what went on before and after it, represents a revolt of the people was their reaction to Jackson's inauguration. The people had a strong reaction to the defamation of Jackson's name by Adams, but they had an even bigger reaction to being able to see Jackson in person at the White House. The crowd was compared to the inundation of the northern barbarians into Rome. (pg. 428 of the textbook) That comparison alone paints a picture in my head of a revolt, uprising, riot or whatever you want to call it. I think the question is valid to multiple opinions on whether it was or not, but personally it represents a revolt to me. It might be a small revolt in comparison to what's to come in the future but the event fits a criteria of a Democratic Revolt nonetheless.

People were involved and thinking. They reacted to things they didn't agree with and didn't just let it be swept under the rug. Because Jackson called for less government involvement and needed votes from from states (slave holding and non-slave holding), the new Democratic Party came about (pg. 426 of the textbook), more people turned to Jackson for protection, and it turn protected him when the Election of 1828 came.

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

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



Democratic Revolt

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 10:11 PM

I believe that the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt. Andrew Jackson was a symbol of a better future. "He (*Andrew Jackson*) 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." (Handout Page 1). His successful life that he made for himself was inspirational to these people. He got people excited, and motivated. There were clear changes in the people, and in the political groups. The people became more ambitious, and they wanted to make a name for themself just like Andrew Jackson had done. People vote when they like the candidate. People didn't just "like" Andrew Jackson, they idolized him. Andrew Jackson became their symbol of hope.

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

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



Re: Democratic Revolt

by [Jasmine Foster](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 10:36 PM

Though your points are valid in that to many white men voters, Andrew Jackson was their symbol of hope. How then would he be perceived by the rest of those who were not represented in the government at that time? In the video clip we watched from class, there was a range of people who both supported and opposed Jackson (Andrew Jackson). By 1840, there was a much higher voter turnout, and the establishment of a democratic, using the definition of being of the people. (Slides, 1/21). So though he was popular when being elected and during his presidency, the South were not enamored with him nor did they idolize him.

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

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



A Calling Out

by [Beth Trower](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 10:30 PM

I wanted to point out a call out from Remini to McCormick, although McCormick is not mentioned by name. Remini writes: "Recently, however, some historians have questioned the vastness of the 1828 victory. Comparing the statistics of this election with previous state elections and future presidential elections, one historian has raised serious doubts as to whether the people poured out to the polls to express their confidence in Jackson" (3).

Looking at the dates of when the essays were published proves this: McCormick's essay was written in January of 1960, while Remini's essay was written and reprinted in 1972.

It's a direct jab at McCormick's essay and his method of using only statistics to argue that 1828 wasn't a democratic revolt of the people.

I could not find a counter-argument from McCormick about this.

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

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



Re: A Calling Out

by [Sophia Schlesinger](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 11:05 PM

That was one thing I noticed as well! McCormick's argument was mostly statistic based. Which was a really poor way of addressing the issue in my opinion. It wasn't wrong or invalid by any means, it just seemed like a difficult way to try and persuade an audience when the question he is answering is so differently interpreted and doesn't directly ask about the statistics. I feel like most people are compelled to remember situations/events and emotions rather than statistics!

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

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Lauren Meyer](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 10:32 PM

So the first we question we are ourselves is which author's position do you most agree with and why? I'm going to go ahead and say Richard P. McCormick with the "New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics". This article gives you a better flow of whats going on. It provides a good balance of numbers. Giving us years to go off of, but not driving home vote numbers and statistics. I am immediately drawn to the quote: "They have sensed that a full understanding of the nature of that change might enable them to dissolve some of the mysteries that envelop the operation of the American democratic process". This gives me a good to start by clearly displaying how this author is feeling. To which I agree. He sees the cracks in this democracy and how it has failed the people of its time.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Yes, the people saw the 1828 election as a democratic revolution.**by [Justin Adcock](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 11:16 PM

To the people of the early 19th century America, the election of 1828 represented one of the first times Americans felt that their voice could be heard on a national scale. While in retrospect; many claim the the "record shattering voter turnout" may not have been as record shattering as the people of the time claim. To the people of 1828, this was seen as their democratic revolution. "The people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge of popular support for the General...And what is believed the electorate is frequently more important than the objective reality"(Essay p.3). Members of Jackson's campaign, such as Martin Van Buren, knew that playing up the "common man" vs. "rich and aristocratic" narrative would empower and motivate their supporters. So even if on paper it wasn't a landslide victory for Jacksonian revolutionaries, to the people of the time it certainly was a democratic revolution.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Re: Yes, the people saw the 1828 election as a democratic revolution.**by [Noah Francis](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 11:55 PM

Hi Justin, I really enjoyed the way you interpreted Remini's essay. I also agree with your points. Andrew Jackson was by know means a perfect man, but he knew what the American people wanted. As you already mentioned, he caught the the attention of the people by taking there side against the "rich and aristocratic" of society. Van Buren also helped Jackson's presidency by uniting the northern and southern agrarians to their cause, which would eventually lead to the Democratic Party. At the same time though, McCormick also brings in some excellent points. Yes in the 1828 election there was an influx of people voting, but McCormick also brings up that by 1840 there was an even higher voter turnout than years earlier. One could argue that Andrew Jackson helped pave the way for a Democratic revolt but didn't necessarily start it. Either way, I do believe there was a democratic revolt in 1828. It's just interesting to see two different sides of the same story and the way they interpret data.

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**

by [Jordan Stevens](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 10:46 AM

My answer is yes because I believe that the election of 1828 definitely created a democratic revolt of the people because of the social and political backlash that the election created. Political changes during the presidency of Jackson gave a few social and economic changes within the U.S. Jackson.

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

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**

by [Lauren Meyer](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 8:50 PM

I initially agree with your standing on the topic, what historical events and author points would you say contributed to making this decision?

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

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

**McCormick's Perspective**

by [Brontae Sodeman](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 4:37 PM

After what we discussed in class, I wonder if McCormick took immigration into consideration when comparing the 1828 election to the election of 1840. If 80% of white men in New York could vote by 1828, you can assume that statistic dropped when the Irish and Germans come over to America in the 1840s. In the 1830's, voting rights had changed in favor of universal white male suffrage, non-property-holding white males could vote in the vast majority of states. What I'm getting at here is that McCormick doesn't seem to take population into consideration. "New electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40 percent," We can say about the same about the population increasing by about 30% per decade (pg 7). Four states exceeded one million in population by the 1840s, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Virginia (<https://americasbesthistory.com/abhtimeline1840.html>). Naturally, the voter turnout would increase.

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

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

**Re: McCormick's Perspective**

by [Jasmine Foster](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 6:59 PM

Though McCormick talks about the higher voter turnout, the focus is to ask that if there was a democratic revolt, McCormick is arguing that the revolt did not happen during 1824 rather in 1840. This would make more sense with the influx of immigrants because the Irish and German were immigrating because of the reputation the United States was building promoting the rights of its citizens (Video Clip, 1/23). Therefore I would argue that McCormick was right, in that the democratic revolt happened in 1840, with the higher diversity of voters, rather than the single party votes during 1824 for Andrew Jackson.

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

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

**Re: McCormick's Perspective**

by [Beth Trower](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 9:00 PM

Based on statistics of voter turnout alone, I agree that there was a democratic revolt in 1840. However, why can there only be one democratic revolt? We're comparing elections that are 16 years apart. Because of the increased immigration, there's obviously going to be more of a voter turnout, as Brontae stated. But what does that have to do with a possible revolt in 1824?

Compare the 2004 election to the 2008 election. The 2004 election had the highest turnout since 1992 (<https://www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/p20-556.pdf>), but people largely viewed the 2008 election as a rebuke of George W. Bush's policies and actions (https://www.thestar.com/opinion/2008/11/05/barack_obamas_triumph_of_hope.html), even though the turnout was not as significant as 2004 (https://www.census.gov/history/pdf/2008presidential_election-32018.pdf).

I agree with Remini on 1824 being a democratic revolt. As shown above in the modern-day example, it isn't all about statistics. Emotions play a powerful role in it as well.

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

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: McCormick's Perspective**

by [Noah Francis](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 6:43 PM

Hi Jasmine, Initially I thought that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt, but after rereading the articles, and also taking into consideration the videos that were showed in class, I'm starting to think McCormick was right. As you mentioned, the article wasn't on the voter turnout, but rather the case of a democratic revolt. McCormick never argued that there was never a democratic revolt, but rather that it started 12 years later in 1840. In Remini's essay, he never mentioned the mass inflow of immigrants coming from Ireland and Germany which would ultimately affect the voter turnout for years to come. As I stated before in my previous post, Andrew Jackson could perhaps be seen as leading the way for a democratic revolt after his presidency, not during it. The massive inflow of Irish coming into America would also prove that this is the case.

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

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: McCormick's Perspective**

by [Lauren Meyer](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 8:55 PM

Good point. I agree and would like to know the statistics of the people who voted and what brought them to vote.

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

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



New Age Contribution

by [Lauren Meyer](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 9:38 PM

Richard P. McCormick makes it a point in the beginning of his article to mention Jackson's magnetic attractiveness. Yet he may not be insinuating his looks but his appeal, "...the backwoods hunter, the plain farmer, the urban working-man, and the southern planter" (McCormick 5). Then he proceeds to say this it's the "mighty democratic uprising". The idea of attractiveness and appeal has been seen not through only through history but in new age elections. We look at someone's appearance before we look at who they are. Is he relating this idea back to our time on purpose to get the effectiveness across. It's well put and makes you think and in some ways relate, I like that he writes this way.

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

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



Revolt

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 10:53 PM

The Jacksonian era was a time of change. I agree with McCormick's essay that other elections are worth noting also when talking about political change, but I still think that the election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolt. "there is no way of calculating precisely how many eligible voters there were in any state at a given time" (page 6) was given by McCormick as evidence that you can't really know how many votes were given to the General. I believe this to an extent. We have seen proof of this in class. Escobar showed two different sets of statistics on this election with different numbers of votes. We are not able to know an exact number of votes Andrew Jackson received, but we have a fairly good idea. This election has a lot of proof of how supported, and beloved Andrew Jackson was. This election changed for the people, they got excited, involved, and included. The majority of Americans felt that Andrew Jackson was representing their needs. The people got excited in this election which caused a Democratic Revolt.

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

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

[◀ Age of Jackson Videos](#)

[Age of Jackson Videos ▶](#)

[◀ Chapter 12 Quiz](#)

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))

HST 202 W20 (Escobar Meta 30603 30604)

[Get the mobile app](#)

[Policies](#)