



HST 202: History of United States W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)

Home ► Winter 2017 ► HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938) ► Week 3 ► Forum 1 ►
Taking Sides - Election of 1828


Search forums

Forum 1

Taking Sides - Election of 1828

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Age of Jackson Videos ►

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 20, 2017, 11:35 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Taking Sides - Election of 1828 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: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Sum of ratings: -

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

1828 Democratic Revolt



by Dawn Taylor - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 10:20 AM

With the election of 1824, A. Jackson (D-R) won the electoral vote and J.Q. Adams (D-R) won the popular vote, leaving the decision to the House of Representatives who elected Adams. With the Federalist Party dissolved, the only party left were the Democrat-Republicans to run for office. With the election of 1828, known as the rematch of the 1824 election, voting turnout doubled.

In the election of 1824, since there were four nominees running for office, all from the Democrat-Republican Party, I see the election of 1828 as the Democratic Revolution of the People. The faction led by A. Jackson in his presidential campaign of 1828, would evolve into the Democratic Party, while the factions led by J.Q. Adams and Henry Clay would become the National Republican Party and later the Whig Party (Wikipedia).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: 1828 Democratic Revolt

by Alexander Salgado - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 9:46 PM

I agree with your statement of the election of 1828 being a Democratic Revolt, but in the election of 1824 Andrew Jackson had won both the popular vote as well as the electoral vote. "...He had received 42 percent of the popular vote to his nearest rival's 33 percent, and he was clearly the nation's choice, but his 99 electoral votes were 32 shy of the plurality demanded by the Constitution" (textbook 375). That is what made the election go to the decision of the House of Representatives and since Henry Clay was eliminated from the race and kept his spot as Speaker of the House he was able to make an offer to Adams that resulted in his win. Which was known as the "Corrupt Bargain."

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: 1828 Democratic Revolt

by Raya Aviani - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 8:35 AM

Of course. I agree that to the democratic people it was a revolt in ending the current "power in charge," but what I had a problem with the most in that decision was the fact the it could've been decided by electoral college and dirty politics alone, even if he didn't get the popular vote. Congress never acted on Adam's proposals as president (Textbook p. 378) because they knew they would give the federal government too much power, cost too much to carry out his plans for roads, schools and observatories, and would threaten slavery. Who's to say that corrupt bargaining wasn't a part of getting Jackson elected and ensuring the return of states'-rights and a limited federal government?

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



Re: 1828 Democratic Revolt

by Dawn Taylor - Friday, January 27, 2017, 8:54 AM

Seeing how popular Jackson was during his rise to presidency, it is interesting to watch the story told in the Biography of American history (series) Professor Escobar has so graciously attached to our Moodle page for our enjoyment. In the series, English Settlement, although I've only watched about an hour of the program, it documents a love/hate feeling citizens feel toward Jackson as he rose to leadership. He is raised fatherless and he grows up during the Revolutionary war, which deeply impacts him.

The documentary paints his story in a fascinating way and I highly recommend it in your "spare time."

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Jonathan Whittington - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 1:55 PM

I would say that yes this election was somewhat of a democratic revolt because of the social and political backlash. I really think that the main cause of this event though was the election that occurred four years earlier where Jackson won the popular vote and even had the most electoral college votes but still did not win the presidency because of what many people believe to be corruption from John Adams. I think a lot of the voters were upset which caused them to come out in full force for the 1828 election which as Robert Remini states in his article this election has nearly 3 times the amount of voters compared to the 1824 election.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Megan Martin - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 6:50 PM

With your response in mind, I'm wondering if you believe the people truly wanted to see Andrew Jackson as president or if they just wanted to see revenge occur after the corruption with John Adams?

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

Sum of ratings:0 (1)



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Jonathan Whittington - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 9:09 PM

Great question, I really do think that the majority of America really wanted him as president. I think this is proven by where he got his votes from in the election. He had votes from all over the country where as everyone else had one section that heavily supported them. I believe this shows that he most represented the majority of Americans political ideals. At the same time though I do believe the corruption had to factor in as well. I believe that Americans all knew and believed that Jackson should have been president in the previous election so those people who maybe didn't vote previously weren't going to make the same mistake of leaving it up to the house of representatives to decide. I will throw that same question back to you, curious to hear your thoughts about this.

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Megan Martin - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 10:07 PM

I agree with your points made here. I feel that a lot of his support was from the hatred of the corruption that occurred in the previous election but considering he won the popular vote of the previous election, the majority of America wanted him as president before the corruption occurred.

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



Numbers

by Emily Phan - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 9:18 PM

After reading the first article by Prof. Remini I was convinced that he was correct because of the good logic. After reading the second article by McCormick I was convinced that he was correct because of the well thought out numbers and statistics. Now of course this was a problem because the guys have opposite opinions. So I turned to our textbook and Wikipedia for some more info.

Here are the popular vote turn outs for the elections (I have added up all the candidates popular votes and rounded to get an approximation of the number who actually voted) ("v" stands for votes)

1812 - 273,000v James Madison elected

1816 - 111,000v Monroe elected

1820 - 87,000v Monroe elected

1824 - 353,000v Adams is elected but Jackson ran and had the most votes in the popular vote and the electoral college but Adams was elected because of the "Corrupt Bargain"

1828 - 1,143,000v Jackson elected

I absolutely could not find what the number of eligible voters was during this time. However in 1810 there was a census and the population of the US was 7,239,881 according to Wikipedia. Then in 1830 there was another census and the population was 12,866,020.

So I did the math, in 1812 approximately 4% of the total population voted. (Most of the population wasn't allowed to vote then) Now in 1828 approximately 9% of the total population voted. By these numbers I can see that even though the population rose during this time the voter turnout rose even more. Hence I agree with Prof. Remini there was a rise and triumph against the establishment/lifelong politicians during this time and this rise took the form of Andrew Jackson.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Numbers

by Dawn Taylor - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 5:37 PM

I like your points and I am also a person who likes to see numbers. Here is an interesting fact from history that will help understand how the census was counted and why the Southern states dominated politically:

In 1787, during the US Constitutional Convention, a compromise was reached between the Southern and Northern states. The debate was about whether slaves could be counted when determining a states population for legislative representation and taxing purposes. It was called the Three Fifths Compromise and would be used to determine the number of seats the House of Representative would have for the next ten years.

This law allowed the Southern states to have a third more seats in Congress and a third more electoral votes giving them domination over government until 1861(Wikipedia).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Numbers

by Emily Phan - Monday, January 23, 2017, 10:26 AM

Very good point. I guess I didn't take the 3/5ths clause into account when doing my calculations. The 3/5ths clause was created in 1787 during the constitutional convention. (textbook pg. 233) and was used to determine population for taxation purposes and the number of seats in the House. This was way before the time I was speaking of but was still an effective legislation. However that doesn't change my point that there was a greater voter turnout during 1828.

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



Re: Numbers

by Emily Phan - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:00 AM

According to Professor McCormick, "The most practicable method for measuring the degree to which voters participated in the elections over a period of time is to relate the number of votes cast to the number of potential voters" (pg 210) I tried to do this in my earlier post because I felt there was so much contradictory information in the two articles. Doing some side research on my own seemed the best way to clear up the confusion. However McCormick offers some contrary information to my calculations.

"The average rate of voter participation in the election was 26.5%. This hardly fits the image of the 'roaring flood of the new democracy...foaming perilously near the crest...' (McCormick pg211)

Also, "In the 1824 election not a single one of the eighteen states in which the electors were chosen by popular vote attained the percentage of voter participation that had been reached before 1824" (McCormick pg210)

Perhaps some important fact is escaping me here.

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



Re: Numbers

by Emily Phan - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:00 AM

However in reply to this last quote in my earlier post I would like to point out, if McCormick is looking at the history of all voting in America up to the time he is writing about I think he is looking at the info in the wrong way. Yes there might have been a greater voter turnout forty, thirty years or so earlier but this fact wouldn't cancel the fact that there was a rise in the voter turnout in 1824 and 1828. Now if McCormick is speaking about the elections just prior to 1824 then there is some great error in my calculations.

Professor Remini seems to agree with my calculations though, "The total popular vote in the election represented an increase of nearly eight hundred thousand over the previous elections in 1824." (pg 206) I would need to do a lot more research to do proper duty to this topic.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Why the Election of 1828 Was an Accurate Representation

by Megan Martin - Saturday, January 21, 2017, 11:52 PM

I agree most with Robert V Remini's essay arguing that yes, the election of 1828 was an accurate representation of democratic revolt of the people. One statistic that stuck out to me the most was the fact that Jackson got votes from all sections of the country, not just one area, where he was from. The essay states "the common man had seized the opportunity to express their political opinion by voting for Jackson"(207). This quote goes to show that the average working man used their vote to put Jackson into office. Another fact that stood out to me to show that Jackson was who the people wanted was on March 4th, 1829, the day of Jackson's inauguration speech, 20,000 people showed up to see Jackson into the White House. Some of these people traveled 500 miles just to do so. After reading Remini's response I am definitely persuaded that the answer to the question at hand is yes.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Why the Election of 1828 Was an Accurate Representation

by Dawn Taylor - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 8:44 AM

As I read from History.com about Jacksonian Democracy, the uprising of the Whig Party during this time in history shows that people are not happy about Jackson's politics and want to break away to a new party. Jackson was a white supremacist who favored slavery which was becoming more of a hot topic by the day.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Yes- Robert V. Remini

by Alexander Salgado - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 5:40 PM

After reading the two sides of this debate I found myself agreeing with Robert V. Remini on how this election created a Democratic Revolt because Jackson was able to reestablish the two-party system. "The Jackson-Calhoun-Van Buren coalition eventually became known as the "Democratic" Republican party, or simply the Democratic party, while the Adams-Clay combination was called the "National" Republican party"(pg. 205). Despite being a General, Jackson's support of individual states rights rather than having a nationalistic view, in my opinion, is what fueled his victory.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Yes- Robert V. Remini

by Megan Martin - Sunday, January 22, 2017, 7:02 PM

I agree that Jackson's support of states rights is one of his key points that won him the presidency, but how do you think he was able to win majority votes in states that were majority Whigs who liked the idea of a strong federal government?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Yes- Robert V. Remini

by Alexander Salgado - Monday, January 23, 2017, 8:42 PM

I believe he was able to get these votes because of the increase in voters from around the nation. I also believe the "Corrupt Bargain" played a key role in fueling the fire for his election in 1828 because after it was all said and done he still lost the election even though he had won the popular vote as well as the electoral vote.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Yes- Robert V. Remini

by Dawn Taylor - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 6:19 PM

At this time period, most citizens were firmly identified with either the Whig or Democratic Party, so much so that party affiliation was a big part of personal identity (textbook p. 428). We can see this very much in today's society as well. I see the revolution as one that is desiring the fundamental beliefs of the party, such as the right to own slaves. The people are making their voices heard.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

**Re: Yes- Robert V. Remini**

by Raya Aviani - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 8:49 AM

I agree with your point, I just wanted to clarify that the Whig party was after 1828 and the Jackson election. At that time I believe it was mainly the Jacksonian Democrats, formed after the ideals of the Jeffersonian Republicans (Textbook p.379) and the Federalists. The Whig party formed in 1834 as a result of the opposition for Jackson's policies as president (Textbook p.391).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)
[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Yes- Robert V. Remini**

by Dawn Taylor - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 3:30 PM

Yes, thank you for the clarification, Raya!

The Whig Party was beginning to form but didn't establish itself as a formal party until 1834. The Whigs' most prominent leader was Henry Clay, a huge Jackson rival. The individuals who made up the party were united in their antagonism of Jackson's war on the second BUS and his high-handed measures in waging that war and ignoring Supreme Court decisions, the Constitution, and Indian rights embodied in Federal treaties.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)
[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Changing Sides**

by Megan Martin - Monday, January 23, 2017, 1:33 PM

After re-reading the articles a few times, I have changed my opinion on whether the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the people to no. McCormick states that in the 1828 election only a few states exceeded or even matched the voter turnout highs of previous elections, pre Jackson era(211). In the 1828 election, about 54% of eligible voters participated. In 1840, when the true "new democracy" occurred, "four out of five (78.0 percent) of the adult white males cast their votes for Harrison or Van Buren"(212). Lastly, McCormick states that the reason for higher voter turnout in 1824 and 1828 as "simple and obvious." He talks about how during the reign of the Virginia dynasty, there was no contest. From the multiple candidates and the fact that in the end the House of Representatives would ultimately pick the president, people saw no reason to get excited over the election. That is until 1828 when a "clear-cut contest impended"(213).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Changing Sides

by Jordan Selker - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 7:57 PM

Could the "real" revolt of 1840 not just be the later period of a revolution started 12 years earlier? I understand how you could view that election, with a much larger voter turnout to be more important, but looking at the numbers and graphs it seems to be the end of an upward trend started in 1828. While the voter turnout was increasing, it was at a lesser rate than in 1828, when it more than doubled. And while the reasons for increased turnout may be "simple and obvious", is it not a meaningful increase all the same? Would a more discrete and complex driving force be a better support for the case of a revolt?

It is intriguing that the voter turnout in many states remained similar to 1824, but again I don't think that does much to weaken the argument of a revolt. Perhaps the concentration of change in certain states even supports the idea more strongly. Localized movements and severe changes seem to be signs of revolution to me, and with the continuing pattern into the 1840's I would repeat myself in saying this was a revolution that started after the election of 1824, but didn't end until well over a decade later.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The Election of 1828 - A Democratic Revolt of the people!

by Noah Cramer - Monday, January 23, 2017, 1:38 PM

The election of Andrew Jackson brought a democratic revolt along with a political backlash that this election sparked. When Jackson began his 8 years in office, he created what is now known as, "The Era of the Common Man." This Era brought forth a mass amount of voters who demanded to take the elite leaders of the nation out of office. The election of 1828 was the spark that set the already smoking revolt up in flames.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Election of 1828 - A Democratic Revolt of the people!

by Dawn Taylor - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 3:19 PM

I agree with you Noah, that the election of 1828 was the "spark" that set it all on fire toward a revolution. The presidential campaign of 1828 was an exercise in slander rather than on public issues (textbook p.379). This is the beginning of slinging dirt that we see now when people run for office.

This new "Era of the Common Man" marked by a distrust of the nations wealthy elite and their presumed tool, the Bank of the United States (USHistory.com).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Strong turnout

by Megan Martin - Monday, January 23, 2017, 1:49 PM

One of Remini's points in his article is that Jackson had a strong voter turnout, beings how he won the election by a great majority. McCormick argues that "Of the six highest states in voter participation in 1828, three favored Adams and three were for Jackson,"(213). This goes to say that voters of Adams showed up just as strongly as voters for Jackson.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Strong turnout

by Alexander Salgado - Monday, January 23, 2017, 8:46 PM

They may have shown up strongly but the way Jackson swept the South and the West made it a no contest for Adams. I think in the other states Adams lost some of his voters because of the "Corrupt Bargain."

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Strong turnout, but what was missing?

by Noah Cramer - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 4:20 PM

Voters of Adams did, in fact, show up just as much as Jackson voters did, but what was the defining edge that was important in every one of these states? As Robert V. Remini states, "What made the difference in virtually every one of these states was superior party organization." (206) This goes to say that the organization and tactics used by Jackson's party of voters paved the way to Jackson's victory.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Strong turnout, but what was missing?

by Alexander Salgado - Friday, January 27, 2017, 4:13 PM

I definitely agree with you about Jackson's victory but another major key in my opinion was the anger his supporters felt of him not winning the election before and the corruption that occurred. The numbers of the 1828 election portray that as well. Yes voter turnout was 76% in 1832, but I feel that the 1828 election which had a 56% voter turnout was the beginning of the Democratic revolt. It was the rise of the new party.

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



Jackson's election was a revolution

by Dylan Mandoli - Monday, January 23, 2017, 8:02 PM

I found Robert Ramini's arguments to be quite compelling, and am convinced that the election of 1928 constituted a political revolution of the people, albeit a small one. A single party government of the sort America had for many elections before Jackson cannot truly be said to be a government of the people, as one option is essentially the same as no option at all. Compound that with the fact that landholding or taxpaying was a prerequisite for suffrage in many states, and you find that post-colonial America was not really a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" at all. America's earliest presidents were largely philosophers, statesmen, and businessmen, the very definition of aristocracy. These things changed in 1928. Suffrage expanded dramatically into the lower class across many states, electors were selected by the electorate rather than the assemblies, and one of the candidates was a red-blooded westerner who had *earned* his success in the most American way possible: by shedding the blood of Englishmen.

Ramini uses a significant amount of statistics to support his argument. He goes so far as to break down both the popular and electoral college vote in every state, and even makes some specific arguments about why certain states aligned certain ways. While these statistics are fairly compelling, I find a simple throwaway sentence to be his most salient point: "what is believed by the electorate is frequently more important than the objective reality." Who could possibly be a more reliable source on whether or not there was a people's revolution than the people themselves? If they think they had a revolution, I think that necessarily means there was one, even if explicit numbers might disagree.

As a non-sequitur, I would also like to point out that that quote is of alarming relevance to the current political climate. Throughout the 2016 election, facts, evidence, and well corroborated sources were nowhere near as relevant as meticulously constructed but ultimately false narratives on both sides.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Yes to the democratic revolt of 1828

by Raya Aviani - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:00 PM

To the public, I believe that the election of 1828 was an example of a democratic revolt. The use of "corrupt bargaining" that awarded John Q. Adams the presidency in 1824, instead of Andrew Jackson, though Jackson had won the popular vote, "captured the rhetoric of the revolutionary republic" (Textbook p. 379). It started a powerful conversation of returning the country to a democratic system committed to states rights' and a limited government. Even well known Republicans, like Van Buren, switched sides to elect Jackson after it became apparent that Adam's presidency encouraged "more federal public projects and high taxes, intrusive government, the denial of democratic majorities, and expanded opportunities for corruption, secret deals, and special favors" (Textbook p. 378). As a Democratic newspaper in 1828 reported, "General Jackson is their own president" (Textbook p. 382). A president believed by the democratic majority to be capable of curbing the evermore controlling and intrusive government.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Jordan Selker - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:32 PM

I believe that the 1828 Election represented more of a democratic revolution than a revolt. 41.4% of the voters felt cheated out of their president. The resilience after unfair defeat only added a stronger pathos connection to the voters with Jackson's "Rags to Riches" heartwarming history. The Election of 1824 motivated huge voter turnout to give Jackson a landslide victory. Merriam Webster defines Revolt, "To renounce allegiance or subjection (as to a government)." While this election was fueled with discontent towards the government, the people we're able to create change whilst voting, not by way of conflict. It highlighted the power of a motivated population following a charismatic leader in order to influence change in a democratic republic.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Emily Phan - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 4:02 PM

According to McCormick "The elections in which Jackson figured brought to the polls only those men who were accustomed to voting in state or national elections, except in a very few states." (pg 212) He goes on to point out that if you compare the election in 1828 (Jackson's election) to the 1840 election (Harrison) the 1828 election was really not as big a deal as it first might seem. Voter participation in the 1840 election was much higher than during Jackson's election.

1828 – ~1,143,000 total votes

1840 – ~2,404,00 total votes

So question is not whether there was a voter "revolution" but **when** this "revolution" happened. In the 1828 election pretty much only people who always voted participated in this election, but in the 1840 election they "witnessed an extraordinary expansion of the size of the presidential electorate far beyond previous dimensions." (212-213 McCormick). In other words this movement for the "common man" took place when Harrison was elected not when Jackson was elected.

(Electorate = all the people in a country or area who are entitled to vote in an election)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by George Prigmore - Monday, January 23, 2017, 11:51 PM

The election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. Professor Robert V Remini argues this in his "Election of 1828" essay. "In percentages," Remini states, "it was unequalled in any presidential election during the nineteenth century(206)." This along with the nearly 800,000 increase from the previous election in 1824 prove that more Americans were realizing their political responsibility. The results of the previous election that resulted in a Andrew Jackson losing outraged his voters making them believe that the system was a scam. After this election a trend of a two party system develops as well. This is best shown in the snaking picture from class. On the picture at Jackson's election a trend is developed for years of a democratic president as well as a two party system. These define the election of 1828 as a democratic revolt by displaying a rule by majority. The rise of voters in 1828 and the continuing trend of a democratic president in a two party system show that the majority is controlling the nation.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Aaron Fredrickson - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 12:00 AM

Hello everyone,

This question is hard to answer with either a simple yes or no, because I'm a m encouraged to employ both of these words, but I choose "no". Although the election of 1828 showed a significant increase in voter turnout, despite what McCormick had to say; this increase did not constitute a "revolution."

-Aaron

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Alexander Salgado - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 4:52 PM

I am curious to hear more of an elaboration on why you chose to side with no. If the overall turnout of voters was a little more than double what it was the prior election how would that not be considered a "revolt" of the Democratic party?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Megan Martin - Tuesday, January 24, 2017, 5:50 PM

Although this question was not directly aimed at me, I also chose to side with no after rereading the articles. In response to how the voter turnout was more than double, McCormick states "this outpouring shrinks in magnitude when we observe that in only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established"(211). He then continues on that instead of a "mighty democratic uprising" in 1828 the voter turnout approached and rarely matched or exceeded the voter highs of previous elections before Jackson times. To conclude my point, McCormick states that "after three Jackson elections, sixteen states had not achieved the proportions of voter participation they had reached before 1824"(211). Once the statistics of voter turnouts of the 1840 election were stated (78%) is when I was more convinced that the revolt occurred then.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Taking Sides - Election of 1828

by Aaron Fredrickson - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 9:10 AM

I recognize that the doubling of the voter turnout from 1824 to 1828 is the most proportionately significant such increase in American history (Week 2 Lecture Images), and I also recognize that this increase was, to some degree, a result of public outrage at the hijacking of the 1824 election by John Q. Adams and Henry Clay (Lecture, Textbook). I think it is fair to say that this was a change in the character of American attitudes toward voting. However, I think it would incorrect to call this change a "revolt." Here are the definitions for revolt given in my unabridged dictionary (Merriam-Webster's Third New International):

1 : a casting off of allegiance : an uprising against legitimate authority : a renunciation of allegiance and subjection

2 : a movement or expression of vigorous dissent or refusal to accept

3 : a change of party or opinion

No allegiance was cast off. There was no significant change in party or opinion. While there was some dissent toward the corrupt bargain between Adams and Clay, and refusal to accept it; the increased voter turnout seems to be in support of "Old Hickory," rather than in repudiation of Adams and Clay (Remini, 205-6).

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Jackson's bossy attitude

by Noah Cramer - Wednesday, January 25, 2017, 4:51 PM

In Jackson's eight years in office, his way of going about problems really outraged a strong amount of the U.S citizens. He was known to have a strong arrogant attitude and seemed to be vengeful towards his political enemies. He despised many of his political enemies such as John C Calhoun, who established the Second Bank of the United States. His attitude towards others and bashfulness towards his political enemies definitely added yet another reason to the democratic revolt.

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



Re: Jackson's bossy attitude

by Raya Aviani - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 8:58 AM

Unfortunately, Jackson's presidency after the election of 1828 has nothing to do with the question at hand. The republic had little to no idea what would happen during his term when they voted for him. I agree that he was a truly appalling president at times. Though

during the election, Calhoun actually voted for Jackson because he wanted to stay on as Vice President (Textbook p.379).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The passion or the numbers?

by Noah Cramer - Thursday, January 26, 2017, 2:53 PM

There are a lot of numbers that Mr. McCormick shows to sway his readers that this was not a democratic revolt. After doing further research on the subject, I believe that the voters were much more passionate about their political party. The "No" argument has a lot to do with statistics rather than the passion and spirit of the people who revolted. In my eyes, I see this as a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: The passion or the numbers?

by Jonathan Whittington - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 12:38 PM

I completely agree. I think it goes farther then actual numbers when you look at how passionate the voters were to Jackson, they really believed he was the peoples president.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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

◀ Taking Sides - Election of 1828

Age of Jackson Videos ▶

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W17 (Escobar Meta 30937 30938)

