



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

Home ► My courses ► HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897) ► Week 3 ► Forum 1 ►
Age of Jackson

 Search forums

Forum 1

Age of Jackson

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

Age of Jackson

by Joe Escobar - Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 10:40 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Age of Jackson 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: Age of Jackson

Sum of ratings: -

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

A White Revolt

by Banyan Ryan - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 3:43 PM

The theme of these video clips appears to be the exclusion of women and blacks, and specifically the Indian removal in Georgia as conflicting information with the idea that this was a Democratic revolt. As Theda Perdue explains in her argument against it being a revolt, "It is a period in which the United States becomes more Democratic for adult white men but less Democratic for everyone else." I've already stated that I was one who didn't see it as a Democratic revolt due to low participation from the people, and this also helps backup my point. And this can be seen in the fight against Jackson before the Indian Removal Act of 1830.

When the Cherokees went to court against Georgia for the second time in 1832 (Worcester v. Georgia) to avoid being driven out of their home, they actually won. But "President Jackson ignored the decision, reportedly telling a congressmen, 'John Marshall has made his decision: Now let him enforce it!'" (textbook, page 385). So they had the law on their side, but they were removed anyway. It wasn't just that the Indians were being mistreated, but that their rights as Americans were being ignored by the very man who supposedly started this "Democratic revolt".

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: A White Revolt

by Kate Weiss - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 11:19 PM

I guess I would argue that the theme of these videos is both about the exclusion of rights to blacks, women, and Indians, while expanding voting rights to most white males. This is the key to analyzing the dramatic increase in voter turnout from previous elections. By adding up the popular votes from previous elections, using data from Wikipedia, I noticed the voter turnout increased over threefold from 1820 to 1824 (87,343 to 352,780), and again from 1824 to 1828 (352,780 to 1,143,450). This increase reflects the changes in voting restriction laws of only white males, which expanded the countries electorate. In the first video, Eric Foner brought up the fact that the election of 1828 witnessed the formation of two well-organized political parties, Democrats and National Republicans, with very different views. Andrew Jackson's Democrats were for the citizens and states rights, while John Q. Adam's National Republicans fought for a strong central government. This polarized the public to choose sides and get more involved in American politics by joining public rallies and gatherings (Foner 0:40), which signified a democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Eric Foner and His Notion of a White Man's Democratic Revolt

by Mariah Goodman - Thursday, January 25, 2018, 6:16 PM

Professor and Historian Eric Foner seems to support the notion that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. He provides that the democracy of the revived two-party system evoked Americans' interests in politics as it became more competitive. Foner discusses the new ease of voting for the white man, as most states eliminated property qualifications for voting, thus allowing more people to participate in politics. Foner acknowledges though, that as this exclusionary factor was mitigated, a new "line of exclusion" arose: black men -even free ones- were not granted the right to vote. Women's lack of suffrage was also mentioned. So although Professor Foner appears to agree with the statement that the Election of 1828 symbolized a democratic revolt of the people, he understands it to be only of those people who were white and male.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Still agree with Remini

by Kate Weiss - Friday, January 26, 2018, 11:22 AM

The two additional video clips support my initial view siding with Robert Remini that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. Historian Eric Foner mentioned that the emergence of two well-organized political parties changed the political scene because the competition between the Democrats and Whigs brought people into politics by holding rallies and gatherings (Foner 0:40). The second video stressed that the changes in technology and transportation in the 1820's brought on a change in the market, which became much more active (2nd Video 0:45). The changing market also increased people's worries about their liberties being rationed by landlords and people who might have power over them. I think this is what prompted the public to start looking toward the government, who makes economic decisions, because they want to start contributing to the decision process (2nd Video 1:20). In 1824, Andrew Jackson campaigned for presidency as a "grassroots" contender, with the support of the "common man". He ranked in the most popular and electoral votes, but was denied the White House since he didn't hold the minimum number of electoral votes needed. This was because all four candidates were all from the Democratic-Republican party, which split the votes and made it difficult for anyone to win without congress intervention. Unlike the 1824 election, the election of 1828 became a two-way contest between the Democratic candidate Andrew Jackson and the Whig John Q. Adams. The expansion of the right to vote in many states to most white men marked a dramatic increase in the electorate, with 9.5% of Americans casting a vote for President compared to 3.4% in 1824 (Wiki election 1924).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Still agree with Remini

by Kate Weiss - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 9:20 AM

edit: (Wiki election 1824, not 1924)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_presidential_election,_1824

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Differing Historian Views on Whether the 1828 Election Was a Democratic Revolt

by Mariah Goodman - Friday, January 26, 2018, 11:43 AM

Harry Watson, Professor at UNC Chapel Hill, appears to find the 1828 election a democratic revolt of the common (white) man who Andrew Jackson so well represented. Watson explains that among the growth of the Market, common men sought freedom more out of the fear that these new expansions would give people authority over some aspect of their lives. The election, and Andrew Jackson's presence in it in particular, according to Watson, gave these men an opportunity to protect their liberties through democracy.

Professor at SUNY Buffalo, Richard Ellis, seems to lean more on the side supporting that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the people. He acknowledges Andrew Jackson as the first "grassroots" representative of the people. Ellis also mentions that the scope of politics widened as the government tried to gain more economic control. This suggests that Ellis believes the common people who disfavored government intervention were inspired to revolt and vote in the 1828 election.

Professor at UNC Chapel Hill, Theda Perdue, on the the other hand, does not seem to see the 1828 election or the Jacksonian age as a democratic revolt of the people, so much as a time of cruel racial discrimination. She speaks at length of the Indian Removal that occurred at the time which went hand in hand with the South's "strict racial codes" that limited the rights of free black people. Perdue believes the U.S. to have only been democratic in the case of the white man, but otherwise, not representative of a democratic revolt of all of the people who were a part of the country.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The Validity to the Viewpoint I Oppose

by Mariah Goodman - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 1:37 PM

While I have mainly supported the notion provided by Professor McCormick that the Election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt of the American people, and I still believe his evidence-dense argument to be superior among all, I must admit that I am more in agreement with the arguments made by the professors who support the idea that this election was a democratic revolt than the one who does not. What I like most about the arguments, made in particular by Harry Watson and Richard Ellis, is that they acknowledge both the large impacts of the election, as well as the reality that it did not represent a large portion of people in the country - really, only the white man. Theda Perdue does speak of this aspect as well, but I did not find that she addressed fully the impact of the election itself, particularly as it pertains to the context of the time. Seeing as though rights for black men and women had not been in place to begin with, the voter turnout and passions that did arise were still remarkable among those white men who had not taken as much of an interest in politics prior. Watson and Ellis both agree that Jackson was a sort of "grassroots" leader for the people. And while I think his success is owed more to his divergent new party than his own personality, I must also agree. To an extent, these professors have convinced me that the election of 1828, given the circumstances of the time, was in some ways a democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Validity to the Viewpoint I Oppose

by Casandra Fountain - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 8:54 PM

I was finding myself in the same boat as you. I was siding with McCormick because of the extent of his statistical evidence proving his point but the new historian videos showed me a different side of how this could be considered a revolt. Instead of looking at the election percentage in voter turnout and judging the the revolt off that, we should look at what impacts were happening during this period. Eric Foner brought up how with the two-party system return brought back interest in voting. Politics started to open up to the public and Richard Ellis contributes this emergence with Andrew Jackson. Also the increase in voting was contributed to the change in voting eligibility and how states changed from selection of electors from the legislature to the people. Watson brought up the fact candidates for presidency have had to act like voters are the wisest best judge of public affairs and were having to organize appeals and policies to attract the majority vote which was white males at the time. But since the Jacksonian period candidates have expanded that thought to

now the majority being men, women and different races. I see this election being the start of “modern”, if you will, politics. What you can say to the voters to get their attention and votes in your pocket, whether they be true or not is a different story. If we look at the election of 1828 in these terms for defining it as a revolt, I have an easier time believing it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Validity to the Viewpoint I Oppose

by McKenna Wilson - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 10:27 PM

I definitely agree with your statement that this was the start of modern politics. Candidates are going to say what they need to say to get their parties interest to capture votes, whether or not they follow through with it. I was going back and forth on my opinion of a revolt or not but the second video made me think it was a revolt in some ways like the two-party system. The video also reminded me the voters were mostly white men for some time. In the Age of Jackson video, Historian Theda Perdue talks about the effect of removal of Indians which makes for a white man's country (2nd video, 2:00). There were "strict racial codes" in the South limiting the rights of free Blacks(Perdue, 2:20). Women lost political rights as well which made the United States more democratic for white men but less democratic for everyone else (Perdue, 2:30). Theda Perdue makes great points that this was a time in which adult white men had all the rights to vote while women and African Americans did not.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Erase button doesn't work

by Casandra Fountain - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 5:28 PM

I feel most of the historians in the additional videos were siding with the Yes side of the argument. But I had a hard time deciding this. Eric Foner states the Jacksonian period was the era of the Common Man. People's participation in public life expanded. They were more interested in what was going on around them. The two-party system Democrats and Whigs, enhanced interest in voter turnout. The qualification to vote always was changing during this period. With the voting rights changing the line of division becomes more about race and less about if you own property or not and this is the major factor for voting still.

Historian Theda Perdue was the exception to the rest of the historians. She commented on the indian removal of the Jacksonian era. This step, she states, lead toward a more white man's country in the US and it coincides with the development of very strict racial codes in the South that limits the rights of free blacks. But this also plays back into what Foner was saying when the line of division is now whether your black or white compared to when it was about if you had property or not. She believed the indian removal was a sign of ethnic cleansing of the country. The last thing she says really stuck with me though, we need to be honest about our past- learn from it to plan a better future in which there is racial justice and true democracy. Mr. Escobar is always relaying this message to us. A great example is the democrat website, which Mr. Escobar showed us in class. There is many things in our history that isn't what we want to be known for but it doesn't mean it didn't happen.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Having to Appeal to the Voters**

by McKenna Wilson - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 8:53 PM

In this Age of Jackson video, Harry Watson makes a good point that after Andrew Jackson, presidential candidates had to act like the U.S. voters knew best in all aspects. I think that they had to appeal to the voters to get the majority of votes (Watson). This makes me think of the election in 1828 as a revolt in this aspect because the two-party system took place and continued on. I also think that presidential candidates try to make themselves likable and say things that people want to hear so they can get votes under their individual parties. After watching Harry Watson speak, I am reconsidering my decision and that this was a revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Age of Jackson, a Contradicting Man**

by Daniel Vuong - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 9:08 PM

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

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Professor Foner didn't change my mind.**

by Abigail Gierut - Saturday, January 27, 2018, 9:31 PM

The videos addressing the age of Jackson actually reaffirmed my initial opinion on the matter, siding with Remini in saying yes to the question “Did the election of 1828 represent a democratic revolt”. Professor Foner talks about how you can see the Jacksonian era to be both expansive AND exclusive in ways. He explains the expansive part to the fact that participation in public life increased by who was allowed to vote at the time, in comparison to who use to be qualified to vote. “Virtually all white men have the right to vote because almost all of the property qualifications have been removed” (Video 1, 0:24).

Now even though this may not seem very expansive to us, looking back from what we like to think of as a time where most everyone gets a say no matter what gender or race, this was a

large step in the right direction for the reality of politics in 1828. “The line of exclusion for men has shifted. At the time of the revolution it was property; people without property could not vote. Now it becomes race” (Video 1, 1:30). Now even though it was not our ideal or imagined perfect scenario of democracy, because all of women and “African Americans are largely excluded. There are a few states where blacks are only one or two percent of the population where they can vote” (video 1, 1:08), we now have two organized political parties and more people ARE allowed to vote, even if that expansion only included more white men at the time. The fact that they are changing the qualifications to vote (even in smaller ways), I believe gave the early feminists more backing and support for their fight towards women’s rights because they had more hope that their goal wasn’t impossible anymore.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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

◀ [Age of Jackson](#)

[A Democratic Revolt?](#) ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

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

HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)