

HST 202: US History W20 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 202 W20 \(Escobar Meta 30603 30604\)](#) / [Week 3 January 19 - January 25](#) / [Forum 1](#)
/ [Age of Jackson Videos](#)



Search forums

Forum 1

Age of Jackson Videos

[Subscribe](#) [Settings](#) ▼

◀ [A Democratic Revolt ?](#)

[A Democratic Revolt ?](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move



Age of Jackson Videos

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 11:09 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, whether you support the YES or NO point of view and which of these new "video" historians agree with you. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Age of Jackson Videos

Sum of ratings: [-](#)

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



Still not a democratic revolt

by [Raleigh Reese](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 12:47 PM

After watching the new material provided and going back through the book chapter and hand out, I still don't see the 1828 election as a democratic revolt of the masses. The lack of voter diversity in the time period, coupled with my previous points in my last post about new legislative laws and population increase still lead me to believe that even with overwhelming support for Jackson as president it just shows a landslide. In class we were presented with the quote that voter turnout doubled, this is true but when you look at the statistics presented in the "no" portion of the handout the real reason for the spike in voter intrigue and turnout is explained as such. Legislative changes, establishment of more defined political groups, slander campaign of the previous election, population increase over the previous 4 years and Jackson's own charisma. In my opinion the defined political groups combined with the slander campaign gained interest from the masses and added to the fuel for voting, these things when looked at through the statistics we were provided show a one sided victory but not a revolt.

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

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



Yes, I still think it's a Revolt

by [Nathan Lee](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 5:07 PM

Eric Foner's explanation of expansion and exclusion during the Jacksonian era is exactly why I'm sticking to my guns and saying it was a revolt. The power shifted from wealthy property owners to all white men. This election was a revolt lead by the common white man in the 1820s. As Foner said, it was a thriving democratic political system. We get our first two-party competitive election and Jackson appeals greatly to the largest number of voters. This election was the common man's power grab. The discussion isn't whether Jackson was a 'good' president it's about whether the majority rose to the occasion to usher in a new era of politics and U.S. history, and the answer is yes. Was it ethical? No. Did Jackson appeal to the average voting participant in the 1820s? Yes. Let's take a look back at McCormick's argument for the 1840 election being the real democratic revolt. Call this reductionist if you want, but the reason the 1840 election was as significant as it was, is because it followed the panic of 1836. Who remembers President Harrison? I mean seriously? Yes, He died a month after being elected, but why wouldn't it be evident that he was the true representation of an era of politics if his election symbolized a democratic revolt? Harrison won in a landslide because of the Democrat's inability to manage the economy. Once you touch the common man's pockets, he'll turn against you.

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

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

**Re: Yes, I still think it's a Revolt**by [Nathan Lee](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 4:44 PM

I think the second video furthers my point that This was a democratic revolt. Richard Ellis mentions in the video "Politics becomes open and one of the ways this emerges is with someone like Andrew Jackson the first grassroots candidate for the presidency." When you look specifically at 1828, the removal of the property requirement allowed politics to be every white man's game. When you open a political race in such a hyper-competitive way with two well-organized campaigns, people get way more passionate about their candidate. Jackson being a grassroots candidate just furthers the common man's passion for him as a political figure and once again adds to the concept that he dominated the election due to mass appeal.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Age of Jackson Videos supporting Jackson as catalyst of Revolt in 1828**by [Cynara Onyemordi](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 9:18 PM

The other historians speaking video, supports the idea that Jackson caused a democratic revolt in 1828."This era also witnessed a dramatic transformation of american democracy itself". The historians in the video discuss how Jackson created a multitude of problematic policies and changed the political world. Never once do they refute what a large impact Jackson had on the people of 1828. In fact they embrace the idea of Jackson playing a component in the revolt of 1828.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**John Quincy Adams Had no Shot Regardless of Who Was Running Against Him**by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 11:08 PM

To me, Jackson was just the opposing candidate to a man (John Quincy Adams) who had no chance of winning even if the other candidate wasn't Andrew Jackson. The whispers turned out to be true about the 'corrupt bargain' between John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay in 1824 and JQA never heard the last of it during his short-lived presidency. There was no way JQA could have won the election of 1828 no matter who his opposing candidate was. As the emergence of the two-party system took place, Jackson was simply just the recipient of a landslide victory due to one man's greed four years before.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Re: John Quincy Adams Had no Shot Regardless of Who Was Running Against Him**by [Raleigh Reese](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 3:26 PM

I an against the idea that the 1828 election was a revolt however I disagree with the premise that JQA had no chance against whoever he ran against. In the 1824 election the corrupt bargain was struck do to Jacksons popularity and accumulation of electoral votes (as he was his party's sole canidate). We will never know but if Jackson wouldn't have been as popular as he was in the 1824 election or it had been a different canidate all together, the corrupt bargain may have never happened due to JQA having the most electoral votes behind Jackson.

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

**Yes. I still believe that 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people.**

by [Yibo Zhang](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 9:59 PM

The videos from Foner and other historians provide more explanations about whether 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. I still believe Yes.

Similar with my first post. Although the 1828 election didn't reflect people's participation to politics entirely, it still could be considered as a democratic revolt of people. In Foner's video, he mentions that the two-party system enhanced the interests for people to join politics and policy making process because of the abolishment of property certification. In other words, the increasing competition between two parties made more people to stand with the position they believed. The second video critiques that only adult white men had more opportunities to vote, but women and some of Africa-Americans were still not be allowed to vote. Moreover, Jackson's policy about native Americans also reflected unfairness for everyone to participate in politics. Yes, it is true because the entire society 1828 was not such democratic than today. However, it was a good start for every American to struggle for their democracy in next many years. An reformation cannot be perfect at beginning, and we should admit that 1828 was the significant First- Step.

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

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

**A more neutral position**

by [Ailah Altemus](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 2:33 PM

After watching the two videos presented, I think I have changed my opinion on my previous stance. I still hold true to what I said before and I do not believe that it was a true democratic revolt given all the statistical evidence talked about in the "No" essay presented earlier this week. However, I now feel I have a better understanding of some of the factors that played into Jackson's election. As Eric Foner said in the first video "The line of exclusion, for men, has shifted," talking about non-property owning white men getting the right to vote. "Now it becomes race. People with property can vote, as long as they're white, but race becomes the line of division." Having a better understanding of the fact that race was now an even stronger "line of exclusion" than thought of before, I can better understand why a "common man" would vote for Jackson. I still do not think of the 1828 election as a democratic revolt because John Quincy Adams was not a very popular president and there was a great influx of voters in the 1828 election. Meaning if you were a new voter and you didn't like John Quincy Adams you would vote for Andrew Jackson. This is not a revolt, this is we don't like the last guy lets try something new; combined with a much larger voting population.

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

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



These Videos Hurt My Argument a Little More Than Help

by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 4:57 PM

Most of what these two videos are about is how only white men could vote and that "race" and sex "became the line of inclusion and exclusion" (Historian Eric Foner). I would argue that Jackson was not a true man of the people and no president was until women and people of color had the right to vote, however, I would most likely be committing the fallacy of presentism in that argument. Getting back to the videos, Harry Watson in the second video mentioned that after Jackson's election, "politicians had to appeal to the average person and had to organize their political appeals and policies...in order to attract that majority." This quote does hurt my argument a little bit due to the fact that ever since the election of 1828, politicians have had to factor in the 'common man' which slightly leans more toward a democratic revolt than not. However, Theda Perdue makes an interesting point towards the end of the second video where she mentions that we must "be honest about the past ([Trail of Tears](#) and Indian removal in this instance) if we are to plan a better future in which there is racial justice and **true** democracy." I believe she is slightly suggesting here that Jackson's election was not a democratic revolt in that like I was mentioning above, the whole U.S. population was not given the opportunity to choose their next president. However, this is not my argument and I still believe that with the statistics provided in my previous posts, there is enough evidence to suggest that the election of 1828 leaned more towards the side of not being a democratic revolt.

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

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



Yes, The Election of 1828 Was a Democratic Revolt

by [Phoebe Fergus](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 11:27 PM

After I reviewed the videos on this topic I noticed a change in my original decision. What I realized is the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt for some. Specifically, white men. This makes sense because at that time women and almost all black people did not have the right to vote.

These videos turned my opinion to feel as if the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt. "The jacksonian era was sometimes known as the age for the common man" (Foner Video - 0:16 second mark). During this time period the electorate was made up of white men. Laws were changed to allow white men, who didn't own property, the right to vote (Foner Video - 0:30 second mark), and politicians were expected to benefit the life of the common white man.

Originally, I did not believe it was a democratic revolt but I ended up changing my mind. The main reason for this is because in 1828, the practices of the white man were seen as normal. Being born and growing up in a world where slavery was a common practice, natives were driven from their land (Other Historians Speak Video - 4:20 minute mark), or where women didn't have the rights we have today would not be questioned the way it is now. These things were seen as completely normal at the time and because of this, I do feel that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt.

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

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



Agree: Yes, The Election of 1828 Was a Democratic Revolt

by [Yibo Zhang](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 9:26 PM

Hi Phoebe, I agree with your idea about the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt. Since the two videos demonstrate different opinions about the situation around 1828, I do get some understanding which is different than before.

1. The democratic revolt of white. Yes, it is true because the unfair treatment to women and colored people has still exists even after 100 years. So the society at that time couldn't achieve that goal that all humans equal in a very short time.
2. The treatment to native Americans. Yes, it is another reason to against the authenticity of people's democratic revolt which was mentioned by second video. For this point, we should know that it was hard for people at 1828 to admit that native Americans as a part of American citizens. So it was not possible to give native American an equal treatment and right to vote, even survive.

However, just like you said about the video, "Being born and growing up in a world where slavery was a common practice, natives were driven from their land" (quote from Other Historians Speak Video - 4:20 minute mark). Some of social conditions and situations were not able to be changed by people at that time. In other words, the level of democracy was still low and nobody could realize about these situation. In this case, I think we could say that 1828 was the democratic revolt and it is not excessive idea.

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

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



Re: Eric Foner's Perspective

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 7:13 PM

In the video clips, Eric Foner tends to be more towards on the side of there not being a democratic revolt of 1828. Foner brings two points to the table to show factors of the Jackson era, in that the fact Whigs and Democrats competing against each other brought in voters, enhancing interest in politics and was a large part of the overall population. There was also the elimination of property qualifications to vote. (Foner :32). However, he states that women can't vote, hold office, or attend political conventions and be outside the political realm. (Foner :57). African Americans are largely excluded, even though there's a few states in New England where blacks are 1-2% of the population that could vote. Free blacks can't vote in the majority of Northern states and most blacks were slaves who could not vote, he adds. Although property qualifications were eliminated, it was still only white adult males who could vote, leaving out a vast amount of the overall population, even though the qualification elimination made eligible a large amount of white adult males to vote.

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

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



Re: Eric Foner's Perspective

by [Phoebe Fergus](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 8:15 PM

In my opinion, I was a bit confused as to what side Foner was on. I wanted to know what made you feel that he felt like it was not a democratic revolt? While I read through your post, there were some points that I felt pointed in the other direction. He talks about how laws were changed to allow men without property the ability to vote (Foner Video - 30 second mark), as well as laws allowing some black men in northern states the right to vote (even though they make up a very small amount of the population). He also talks about how "the Jacksonian era was sometimes known as the age for the common man" (Foner Video - 16 second mark). To me, these few points he mentions in the beginning of the video would lead me to feel like he was leaning a bit closer to the idea that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt, but I am curious what made you feel the opposite.

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

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



A Different Perspective

by [Ryan Peel](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 8:22 PM

After watching both videos, there is one of these historians that I really want to highlight, Ms. Theda Perdue. From what I can see, her perspective was that it was a Democratic Revolt for the white male populace only. I resonate with her viewpoint almost exclusively in the second video. Her points were that the Indian Removal act was one more step in making the United States a white man's country, she also said this coincided with the development of "very strict racial codes" in the South, which limited the rights of free blacks, and women beginning to lose political rights. During this video, another point which I saw was that while the white men began to gain ground in politics and other day-to-day affairs, everyone else was losing rights. This was corrected later on for the black populace with the Civil Rights bill under Lyndon Johnson I believe, and even later for women with the 19th Amendment. It is unfortunate that it took so long to right these wrongs, but it was done. Before, I would have said, without a doubt, that yes, Andrew Jackson's election was a catalyst for a Democratic Revolt, but only if you were a white male. No one gained anything from him becoming President, in fact, many minorities actually lost rights upon his election. Huh, this really gave me a new outlook. Another point she made was later on in the video where she said the Indian Removal act was a way of "ethnic cleansing" for the early US. Another step to further expansion efforts. That yes, history is not all sunshine and rainbows, the past is bloodied and dirty. It's not all that clean. But, here we are now, the biggest world power to date. We're in everyone's business now!

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

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

[◀ A Democratic Revolt ?](#)

[A Democratic Revolt ? ▶](#)

[◀ 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](#)