

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](#)

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](#)



No, not a democratic revolt.

by [Raleigh Reese](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 9:02 AM

When I read through the "yes" side of the handout, I found it was filled with factual statements but lacked in the statistical data to pull me to its side. The author of the "no" essay shows us comparisons between the 1828 election and the 1840 election which in my opinion helps tell a much different story about the "roaring flood of new democracy" that occurred in 1828. The data presented shows that from the 1828-1836 elections about 55% of white males turned out to vote, the author then presents the jump in numbers for the 1840 election from 55% to 78% of white males casting their vote. I believe this data shows that the "Democratic revolt of the people" or the "roaring flood of new democracy" was not until the later election of 1840 and what we see in 1828 is more of a landslide scenario rather than a record breaking turnout of voters.

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

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

**Re: No, not a democratic revolt.**by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 10:29 PM

It seems to me that we are on the same page on this issue. I am usually lured to one side or another by statistics and the "yes" article while having some important numbers, lacked the necessary eye-popping statistics as the "no" article had in order to grab my attention. The 1840 election is the more profound "democratic uprising" as voting participation sky-rocketed, unlike the election of 1828, which in my book fits as a fight for democracy and a cry for the betterment of the nation through the voice of the "common man."

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Re: No, not a democratic revolt.**by [Cynara Onyemordi](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 11:45 PM

While I do see what you are saying about the second article providing a substantial amount of mathematical data, I would have to disagree in regards to the first article. McCormick uses relevant data "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." but so does Remini "Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 or just a little better than 56 per cent of the entire vote." There are many good examples all throughout Remini's essay that provides insight as to how Jackson was a catalyst for a democratic revolt. Even someone on the opposing side of Jackson admitted "All our efforts," said one of Clay's friends, "have not withstood the Torrent." If even enemies of Jackson were able to admit that he proved a revolt then that should be adequate proof that there was a democratic revolt in the 1830s.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**yes democratic revolt.**by [Patryce Miller](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 11:40 PM

From what it sounds like the textbook authors are a Yes it was a democratic revolt. they said, "voter turn was doubling what it had been 1824, totaling 56.3 percent popular vote (a landslide unmatched until the 20th century) (p.380)." Which got me to change my answer to yes, but I still think Richard P. McCormick's argument has the most logical position. He has a lot more information (from what I can tell) while explaining each reason with facts that support him. While Robert V. Remini mostly talks about Jackson than the election itself.

I switch sides because of "56.3 percent popular vote". That tells me that the number of people voting increase and not because of children or women. It is too soon for the growing population to affect the voting. So that must mean people who didn't vote in 1824 are now voting because of what the government did or the debt/speech had ignited in them. They (1828) wanted to change the government and they liked Andrew Jackson's message and went with him.

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



I'm not quite so sure about that...

by [Ryan Peel](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 9:30 PM

So, I'm of the mindset that a revolt did happen. Maybe it wasn't here, during Jackson's time. Maybe it was during another time. But, let me ask you this. If it wasn't a democratic revolt during Andrew Jackson's time, then what was it? I'm inclined to believe it was, mostly because of the high voter turnout during his election, the many changes that went into his long administration, and many other things. The first I'll recount is the high voter turnout. Do you guys remember about the "corrupt bargain" made between John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay? Where Clay promised Adams his support in exchange for Adams making him Secretary of State? Well, if you remember, Clay went to Jackson first with this deal, and Jackson declined. Afterwards, during the next Presidential Election where Jackson won, while I can't remember the exact statistics, didn't Adams lose by a wide margin? Someone said something here in their post that I really like, that this election was where they "stuck it to the big man." The public wasn't happy about the Adams election when it came to this illicit deal between Adams and Clay. This doesn't say much about why, I'll admit that. But, think about it! So much began happening during Jackson's time. Perhaps this was simply the road to something bigger, perhaps Jackson paved the way for an even bigger democratic event to take place.

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

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



1840: The REAL "Democratic Uprising"

by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 12:03 PM

To begin, I must say that I agree with position two in that Richard P. McCormick states that no, the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people. I was particularly swayed by the statistics that he laid out in his argument that showed that the *real* democratic revolt did not take place in 1828, but rather in 1840. The "common man," who was supposedly rushing out to the polls in flocks in 1828, was more concerned at that time with state elections. "The "common man" was more stimulated by local factors to cast his vote" than national factors, "and he frequently responded in higher proportions than he did to the later stimulus provided by Jackson" (Reading pg 6).

In 1840, the nation saw a surge in voting that it had never seen in its previous history. In the election of 1840 that pitted William Henry Harrison against Martin Van Buren, "four out of five (78.0 per cent) of the adult white males cast their votes...This new electorate was greater than that of the Jackson period by more than 40 per cent" (Reading pg 7). Yes, an increase in the general population can be attributed to this as well, however, this was a jump in voting participation that had never been seen before and has since been only replicated a few times in American history. This was a defining election for the "common man" in that previously (even during the election of Jackson in 1828), he did not feel the need to make the effort to vote, however, now his vote was cast and had weight in the political scene. As Andrew Jackson's war with the Bank of the United States resulted in very high inflation, high unemployment rates, and business failures, the "common man" felt the need to speak up and change the negative direction in which the country was going (Notes From Class). After the *real* democratic revolution of 1840, voter participation remained well above that of the Jackson elections. While the fact that Jackson's personal popularity still remains, my conclusion from the readings is that the "mighty democratic uprising" came 12 years after the 1828 election of Andrew Jackson.

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

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

**Re: 1840: The REAL "Democratic Uprising"**

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

I agree with your assessment of Richard P. McCormick's essay. Although most eligible voters were children at the time of the first depression of 1818, its practical they remembered the hardships they and their families endured. As a result of Jackson's war on the BUS, history does show a new economic and financial depression on the rise for the common man, as you have clearly pointed out. Many voters in 1828 believed in Andrew Jackson and his stance on State Rights, but during Jackson's presidency he imposed protective tariffs on the Western and Northern States resulting in the Southern States having much more difficulty with the sales of their goods. Jackson also openly defied The laws of the common man by encouraging the burning of mail in public spaces, with no recourse to the President himself. It appears that from 1828 to 1840 daily life in the united states was getting harder, not easier. However white male voters still believed in the political concepts of the democrats, individual freedoms, State Rights, and smaller government, which McCormick points out in 1840 with the increase of voter turnout by 40% compared to 1828.

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

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

**Re: 1840: The REAL "Democratic Uprising"**

by [Cynara Onyemordi](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 11:18 PM

While I do agree that the numbers presented by mccormick in regards to the 1840 election are impressive, I would have to argue that the democratic revolt was a slow and gradual one. People were interested in Jackson because they saw themselves in him. The general public was aware of his shortcomings as a person and how many sins he had committed over his lifetime prior to the presidential election and yet this information "enhanced his image as a melodramatic hero" (textbook pg 313). The voter turnout was "double what it had been in 1828" (textbook pg 313). It was clear that Jackson was a popular man and he brought people out to vote. If a 100% increase in voter participation isn't the signs of a revolt then I'm not sure what is. An estimated "15,000 to 30,000 citizens" (textbook 314) were present at Andrew Jackson's inauguration and many people traveled several miles to see him. Jackson got people excited about politics and he garnered attention to politics.

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

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



Yes it is a Revolt.

by [Nathan Lee](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 5:39 PM

The 1828 election was without a doubt a democratic revolt of the people. The proof is in the pudding, look at the 1824 election. Andrew Jackson won the popular vote (textbook pg 303). The contingent election gives us John Quincy Adams, who only achieved presidency due to a quid pro quo with Henry Clay. Andrew Jackson claiming he was cheated out of the presidency only gave him a larger appeal to "common man" leading up to the 1828 election. Van Buren hops on the opportunity to help Jackson when he realizes his boy Crawford has no shot (textbook pg 305). Once Jackson had proper political backing his popularity took over. Combine this with the smear campaign Adams and company put up in their attempt at re-election in 1828, and you have all the rumblings of a heated match up resulting in loads of angry voters trying to elect Jackson in a classic case of sticking it to 'The Man'. Think about it, a majority of people outside of those in Rhode Island and Virginia are voting in their first election without property requirements (Remini Essay pg 2.). The people finally got to choose their own electors in the majority of the states, so they felt more involved in the process. On top of that, they felt more connected to Andrew Jackson because he wasn't a typical politician. He was a coveted war hero, it's easy to see why the common man would prefer him over the supposed shady opposition, John Quincy Adams. This election was a revolt because the people felt empowered to use their rights. We saw proper reform of the voting system and evidently, people jumped on it immediately to participate.

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

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



Re: Yes it is a Revolt.

by [Raleigh Reese](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 11:55 AM

I agree that the large increase of voting for Jackson specifically is evident. However the statistical evidence in the "no" portion of the handout (Richard McCormick's argument) shows that the amount of voters between 1812 and 1832 can be explained by population increases and the switch from legislative choice of electors to their election by popular vote, not more people going to the polls as a form of revolt (Handout Pg. 5). In my original post I mentioned Jackson winning in landslide proportions being the really significant piece of the equation, not the number of voters that turned out for the election which was an insignificant increase from 1824 and is easily explained by population growth, the legislative change and slander campaign.

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

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

**Re: Yes it is a Revolt.**by [Nathan Lee](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 6:22 PM

While I agree there is firm statistical evidence that the 1840 election was more significant in McCormick's argument, the people couldn't foreshadow a future election which is why I'm almost exclusively trying to stick to the context in the 1828 election. At that specific time, the country had never seen a landslide so large in any election. Of course, you can point to party reformations and population increases to help pad the voting numbers, I'm not discounting that. I just believe that if you consider what it was like to see how Jackson won as if you were a citizen in that time period, it had to have felt like a new era. The quotes in Remini's essay on page 3 further my sentiment. On top of the massive landslide, Jackson's inauguration speech was filled with an estimated 15,000 to 30,000 people (textbook pg. 306). That kind of [attendance](#) at the time is insanity when you consider transportation methods. The country had a serious passion toward Jackson and it's evident in the election and the moments following.

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

1

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Yes it is a Revolt.**by [Joshua Dalton](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 10:23 PM

Its true my friend, 15,000 to 30,000 people attending Andrew Jackson's inauguration is a lot of people for the time. However I think it is worth noting that the text book does not give actual statistics for these numbers. Most likely because there may not be any historical statistics, or any factual way to count the amount of attendees at this inauguration, in 1828. The text book (ch.11 pg. 314) states "Newspapers estimated from 15,000 to 30,000 people". I read it as, it could have been 15,000 people, or it could have been double that. This is a very large margin for error and a possible exaggeration on the part of the newspapers. Fake-news is not new on the behalf of reporters in the U.S.. Rickard P. McCormick's use of historical statistics in his essay still carries my support.

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

1

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Yes it is a Revolt. I agree with your opinion**by [Yibo Zhang](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 10:08 PM

Yes, I agree with your analysis. Although there are many statistics indicate some of other reasons to explain why Jackson got more supports from people, the most important reason still could be considered as the progress of political society and people's desire to take part in the politics. Robert V. Remini states in his article that "For Van Buren, like many other politicians of the day recognized that the political system of the 1820s had failed to respond to a changing society and that unless something were done right away it might collapse altogether" (1). In other words, we could say that the increase of population was probably a reason to explain the win of Jackson, but the main trend of entire society helped Jackson to win from that election. 1. Common people started to vote without property certificate. 2. Two-party system came out and increased the competition. 3. Conflicts about slavery and federal power between north and south. All three reasons above urged the consequences of 1828 election.

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

2

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

**Re: Yes it is a Revolt. I agree with your opinion**by [Ailah Altemus](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 10:09 PM

Although I agree with you on your points I think some of them could also be used to back my argument, that the election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt. The two-party system did indeed lead to more competition. However, based off of evidence from the 1824 election where "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" (6), the competition to get Andrew Jackson the presidency seems more like people were tired of John Quincy Adams being president so they voted for the other guy, as people often do today. Add in the fact that immigration was on the rise, and more people obtaining the right to vote, you might have what looks like a landslide. Although, when you look at the evidence you see it is not a landslide, just the result of an unpopular president and a larger pool of voters.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**I agree with you!**by [Ryan Peel](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 9:41 PM

I am very much in agreement here! The first reason for me was how high the voting numbers went during Jackson's election! Can I ask one question here though? Do you guys remember about the "corrupt bargain" made between John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay? Where Clay promised Adams his support in exchange for Adams making him Secretary of State? Well, if you remember, Clay went to Jackson first with this deal, and Jackson declined. Afterwards, during the next Presidential Election where Jackson won, while I can't remember the exact statistics, I had to pull them up on the almighty Wikipedia web search, but, didn't Adams lose by a wide margin? Someone said something here in their post that I really like, that this election was where they "stuck it to the big man." The public wasn't happy about the Adams election when it came to this illicit deal between Adams and Clay. Jackson got 141,636 more popular votes, and 95 more electoral votes. While I'm not sure about what a very large electoral vote margin is, it still seems like a lot, and 141,636 more votes from the people? That's a very big number, they really weren't happy about how Adams got in, that's for sure. Ehh, here's my two cents on this.

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

**Yes. I support Robert V. Remini's idea.**

by [Yibo Zhang](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 6:50 PM

I agree that the election of 1828 represented a Democratic Revolt of the People because it was a necessary consequences, not the personal effort of president Jackson. As an international student, I have less background knowledge about the history of that period. Based on my limit reading and understanding, I believe that the social, political enviornment and progresses decided the consequences of 1828 election. President Jackson's personal experiences was probably the reason to explain his behaviors about againted bank system and imigrated native Americans. However, the serious conflicts about slavery between north and south was the unstoppable trend which pushed two-party system came out. The intense competition between two prsident candidates required Jackson to get more supports from mass.

In Robert's article, there is a description about supports from common people, " But in any event the fact remains that no matter how the statistics are analyzed or interpreted the people themselves who lived at the time believed that Jackson's election represented a great surge of popular support for the General" (para. 13). Also, people were no longer to be limited to have their rights to vote encouraged them to join politics.

Although professor Richard P. McCormick believes that the real political revolution has started from 1840 election, the 1828 election still played an important role for America and American people to grab political rights in their own hands. In other words, 1828 election was probably not the perfect start, but it was the foundation of further political reformation and revolutions.

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

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

**No**

by [Ailah Altemus](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 7:17 PM

Although Andrew Jackson won the popular vote I agree with John Quincy Adams winning the presidency. Our political system was set up with the electoral college for a reason. Now that we look back on history and Andrew Jackson's legacy we can conclude that he was not a good president for his positions on slavery, his attacks of the African American people, and his elitist views of the upper class.

In 1824 people were not very well informed and did not have the same immediate access to news that we now have today. This is why the electoral college was formed, so well educated scholars could have the final vote and protect against a misinformed public. Through the years the electoral college has been repeatedly abused, however in 1824 all news was mostly spread through word of mouth and was most likely not very accurate. As we can see by looking back at history, having more well-informed people vote for the presidency was the better thing to do.

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

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

**Re: No**by [Phoebe Fergus](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 9:14 PM

Hi Ailah, I was very interested in your post. I personally felt that the election of 1828 was not a democratic revolt. After reading your post, I do agree with you that the election of 1824 was not a democratic revolt based on the relatively low voter participation that year (26.5%) (Handout p. 6). This was due to confusion among the electorate. I am most curious to hear how you felt about whether or not the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt?

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: Richard P. McCormick's side of the argument**by [Caleb Willis](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 7:44 PM

I would say that I agree with Richard P. McCormick's position. This is due to what is an abundance of evidence showing that there wasn't a democratic uprising until 1840, not during the Jacksonian era. For example, McCormick speaks about how the average voter participation for all states in 1828 was 56.3%, and before 1824, fifteen of the twenty-two states passed that percentage, which is quite the number. He writes, "...this means that the 1828 election failed to bring to the polls the proportion of the electorate that had voted on occasion in previous elections." (pg. 6-7 packet). This indicates that there simply was not a Democratic Revolt of the People in 1828, as shown by statistics, and that the Jacksonian election did not cause such an event.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Was Andrew Jackson's election a catalyst for a Democratic Revolt?**by [Ryan Peel](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 8:27 PM

Was Andrew Jackson's election a catalyst for a Democratic Revolt? The short answer I would give to that question is yes. His election was the catalyst for a revolt against the "elites" of the early US. I say yes because what I can see from the article given in class was that when the property requirements for voting were removed from what the article called "the list of restraints" (Election Article, page 1) the common man "rose up and threw the elite leaders out of our nation's capital." (Election Article, page 1) While I'm sure it was a great relief to no longer have those kinds of requirements to vote for your nation's leader, you have to wonder, what should have been kept from that "list of restraints." I'm not quite sure if slaves counted towards the property requirements, but I know they counted more towards the heavy influence of power that the Southern US had. But, we're now straying off the topic. I do want to ask one question, if all these changes came after the Jackson administration, known as the "age of the common man," what other changes came after other administrations like the Jackson administration? What were they known as?

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



The Election of 1828 Was Not a Democratic Revolt

by [Phoebe Fergus](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 9:10 PM

It is easy to read the information in the "Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?" handout and find valid points with both sides of the argument. After reading through both arguments and reading in the textbook I feel like it can still be hard to say, but I believe it did not.

In the "Yes" section, Robert Remini explains that Jackson did have a following and it did help to bring out many voters. Jackson is portrayed as a man of the people and bringing forward the Democratic Party. At first I quickly accepted this information and thought it to be true.

After reading more about the subject and analyzing the "No" section, Richard McCormick shows that while Jackson did have a following and was voted highly for, it is explained that we now have so much more research to investigate if that is true or not.

McCormick takes his time to explain that the mighty democratic uprising did not actually happen until 1840. He talks about how voter participation in 1824 was only 26.5%. This is due to having too many candidates available to vote for, which led to many people being confused and not voting. Because there were only two candidates to vote for in 1828, this made it much easier for people to make a decision on who to vote for, making the voter participation in 1828 (56.3%) appear much larger in comparison to 1824.

McCormick also talks about how it is made to seem as if there was a great deal of difference in voter participation in 1828, when in reality only 6 out of 22 states broke their voter participation record, which was most likely due to voting becoming much easier to do in this time frame.

Lastly, to touch back on the mighty democratic revolt happening in 1840. In 1840, all states except five of them had a higher voter participation rate than they did in 1824. If Andrew Jackson was responsible for the new democracy, it would be assumed that there would be a higher voter participation for the presidential election than the state level elections. Although many voted in 1828, that didn't continue to happen in years after. With a democratic revolt, it would be expected that people would continue to vote as passionately as what was portrayed in 1828.

This information leads me to believe that the election of 1828 did not represent a democratic revolt of the people.

(Textbook p. 425, 5th Edition)

(Handout : Did the Election of 1828 Represent a Democratic Revolt of the People?)

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Joshua Dalton](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 9:12 PM

My answer is no. I agree with Rickard P. McCormick on his assessment of the electoral data regarding the election in 1828 compared to the electoral data of 1840. In his essay McCormick points out in 1828 (55.2%) of eligible male white voters turned out the vote compared to (78.0%) in 1840. History reminds us that Jackson campaigned on states rights as opposed to the Federalist form of centralized government. Jackson and the house Democrats passed a tariff protecting trade goods for the Mid-Atlantic and Northwest States. This protective tariff isolated the Southern States by hurting cotton sales and other manufactured goods, ultimately affecting the democrats politic influence in the United States during this time period.

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

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



A Democratic Revolt ? No

by [Patryce Miller](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 11:20 PM

I have to agree with Richard P. McCormick and say no to the democratic revolt. The reason is the facts he used. On page 5 he points out the different types of voting they used back then. He also points out the growth of the population at the time. This one sentence, "The shift from the legislative choice of electors to their election by popular vote, together with the steady population growth"(NEW PERSPECTIVES ON JACKSONIAN POLITICS) got me to start agreeing with him.

When I was reading Robert V. Remini's argument, none of his points stuck out to me. They were more opinion-based than the facts, at least to me they were. So I found my self skimming it before going back. I was forcing myself to read it again to make sure I understand where he was coming from, unlike Richard P. McCormick where it was easying to grasp where he was coming from and what his points were.

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

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



Andrew Jackson as a Cause of the Democratic Revolt of the 1830s

by [Cynara Onyemordi](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 11:51 PM

When analysing historical events there are always an innumerable amount of topics that arise, especially when discussing the political arena. The 1830s are no stranger to this principle and there are an array of interesting political outcomes that took place during that era. Andrew Jackson's win in the 7th presidential election was something that rocked the entire nation. One question that presented itself during this time was whether the election represented a Democratic revolt within the people. After careful analysis it has become abundantly clear that there was indeed a Democratic Revolt. The numbers alone are a prime example of this truth. A breakdown of state by state analysis provides insight on these aforementioned numbers. "In Pennsylvania alone, the number rose from forty-seven thousand to 152,000 four years later" (Remini). With a 480% increase it's hard to believe that this victory was nothing short of an uprising.

Eligible men of every type came out to vote and numbers were extremely high. Jackson was without a doubt well liked. Thanks to his eventual vice president, Van Buren, not only was Andrew Jackson well liked but he also had a great connection with people in power. "1828. Van Buren promised to swing over the Richmond Junto" Van Buren's persuasive letter to the editor of the Richmond Enquirer played a huge role in Jackson's subsequent success in the election. In Van Buren's letter Thomas Ritchie, he detailed the utmost importance of a two-party election and he realized the 1830s were a changing time; the political scene needed to change with it. Needless to say, he was successful and not long after the Jackson-Calhoun-Van Buren campaign had become known as "Democratic Republican party". If two people are able to have that big of an influence on the state of political parties holistically, then it is not that far off of an idea that they did in fact instate a democratic revolt with their election.

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

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



Re: Another Point from McCormick

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 4:47 PM

The points made by Richard P. McCormick have stuck out far more than Robert V. Remini's. Remini describes Jackson's charisma and own popularity being a major key factor for his victory. However, it is hard to believe that simply looking "presidential looking" (pg.3 packet) and being a "living, authentic legend" (pg.3 packet) are a major source for his victory in the 1828 election. Objectively speaking, McCormick's statistics and data on voter turnout for the 1840 election shoots down Remini's near anecdotal claims. It is shown by Remini that between 1824 and 1832, there were fifty gubernatorial elections in the states that chose their electors by popular vote. McCormick says that "In only sixteen of these fifty instances did the vote for President surpass the corresponding vote for governor." (pg.7 packet). In the states of Rhode Island, Delaware, Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Mississippi, and Georgia, the vote for governor consistently exceeded that for President. McCormick adds that only in Connecticut, was the opposite true. (pg.7 packet). In retrospect, the smallness of Jackson's election stands out when this factual data provided by McCormick is displayed, and as a result, means that Jackson's election was not of a "Democratic Revolt" or "Democratic Uprising."

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

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



Another Point to Consider - 1828 Was Not a Democratic Revolt

by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 6:06 PM

The election of 1828 up to this point had commonly been compared with elections that were held prior to the year 1824 or in other words before Andrew Jackson ran for president. It is thought that "we have no reliable election statistics" for elections prior to 1824 and that "only small numbers of citizens seemed to have bothered to go to the polls" (Handout pg 5). However, we do actually have reliable statistics from prior to 1824 and they put Jackson's 1828 "democratic revolution" election in its place. In the 1824 election, which included Andrew Jackson, "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" (Handout pg 6). Now, you would think that it might be anticipated that interest in the elections in which "presidential looking" Andrew Jackson was the central figure would result in greater voter participation than in gubernatorial contests (Handout pg 3). However, as Caleb and I mentioned already in this forum, that is just simply not the case. The 1828 election of Andrew Jackson was no more than just a landslide victory. Voter turnout was low in the 1828 election due to Jackson having "such a one-sided advantage that the result was a foregone conclusion" and "consequently there was little incentive for the voters to go to the polls" (Handout pg 8). The 1828 election was not so much a "democratic revolution" as it was more of a: 'well we didn't like the corruptness of John Quincy Adams (our previous president), so we'll take the other guy running.'

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

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Patryce Miller](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 10:20 PM

Richard P. McCormick influence most on my decision in paragraph seven, when he wrote, "Prior to that critical election, fifteen of those eighteen states had recorded votes in excess of 50 per cent of their adult white male population, but in 1824 only two states- Maryland and Alabama—exceeded this modest mark. The average rate of voter participation in the election was 26.5 per cent. This hardly fits the image of the "roaring flood of the new democracy... foaming perilously near the crest." I agreed with him here. To me, when a person or a writer has you agreeing with them that is wan they have the most influence on you; then there is when he is telling you the percentage of the Voter participation in election 1836 through 1844.

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

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



Re: A Quick Point From McCormick

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 11:27 PM

McCormick makes a good point on page 5. He puts the ordeal of a democratic revolt in the election of 1828 on trial, like he has many of times. This time, McCormick reveals how there was a significant population increase from 1824 to 1832. The shift from the legislative choice of electors to their election by popular vote and as well as the steady population growth were two factors that grew the presidential vote. This in of itself is compelling evidence to say that the 1828 election wasn't necessarily a democratic revolt or uprising, and simply a result of a growing population, not necessarily Jackson's traits.

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

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



Another Point to Consider from McCormick and my Bottom Line

by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 10:41 PM

Richard P. McCormick makes an interesting point on page six of the handout where he mentions that "the average rate of voter participation in the election" of 1824 "was 26.5 per cent." Now, this statistic is interesting to me in that if Andrew Jackson was this flamboyant, "melodramatic hero," why was the voter participation so low for the election of 1824 (Textbook pg 379)? The elections of 1824 and 1828 both involved Andrew Jackson, so why didn't the "common man" flock to vote for this man four years prior to 1828 when they had the chance to? My bottom line is that if this man was so great and revolutionary, why didn't people vote for him right away? Moreover, the "peak participation recorded for each state" was "before 1824," and therefore before Jackson ran for president (Handout pg 8). Now, I don't know about you, but this does not sound like a roaring flood of "new democracy... foaming perilously near the crest. ..." to me (Handout pg 6).

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

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



Re: McCormick's States and Numbers

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 11:22 PM

In the election of 1828, it is claimed that the "common man" went to the polls in groundbreaking numbers. The number of white adult males who voted had climbed to 56.3%, which was over double the figure of 1824 (26.5%). However, McCormick brings up an important point. He states that "...only six of the twenty-two states involved were new highs in voter participation established." (pg.6 packet). It is said that in three out of those six states, Maryland, Virginia, and Louisiana that the recorded gain was rather infinitesimal. New York, which is stated to have the bulk of the increase in voter participation was due to suffrage qualification (ex: property ownership requirements) changes in the 1820s, prior to the election. McCormick adds that six states had gone above the 70% mark, while ten states had went beyond that prior to 1824. "...there was in 1828 a voter turnout that approached, but only in a few instances matched or exceeded - the maximum levels that had been attained before the Jackson era." (pg.6 packet).

This says that a "democratic revolt" or "uprising" wasn't present during Jackson's era. Instead, the election really did not bring out significant numbers that were unseen, as they were seen before prior to the Jackson era. The three states that were said to have increased voter turnout were very small, and in New York, there were simply changes in suffrage requirements. Jackson did not necessarily bring out the voters, and consequently, shuts down the idea of a "democratic revolt" or "democratic uprising" during the 1828 election year.

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

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



Re: Textbook reveals the Democratic Revolt of 1840

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 11:46 PM

Adding more fuel to the McCormick fire, there are more points to consider from him. Essentially, William Henry Harrison is stated to be a proven vote-getter, as he won 7 states in the election of 1836, even though he lost to Van Buren by 97 electoral votes. He took states scattered across the Northwest, mid-Atlantic, New England, and the Upper south. (textbook 326). In the 1840 election, he then received 234 votes to Van Buren's measly 60. Clearly, he lives up to his title as a "vote-getter." The textbook states that the election of 1840 "brought out 78 percent of eligible voters, and the turnout remained at that high level for the rest of the 19th century." (textbook 327). It appears that it's safe to say the democratic revolt of the 1840 election rippled through the rest of the 19th century, as the textbook suggests. As time led up to the Democratic revolt of 1840, the Whigs broke Democratic hold on the south in 1836, and took the states of Kentucky, Georgia, South Carolina, and to add salt into the wound, took Jackson's Tennessee. (327). As the elections went on from 1824, the clear winner in regards to when the democratic revolt actually happened was in 1840, since the numbers of eligible voter turnout went up from 26.5% (1824) to 56.3% (1828) to 78% finally in 1840. Again, to prove that the 1840 election was a democratic revolt of the people, we can turn to the common man. "The Whig party received its core northern support among the market farmers, local merchants, and manufacturers..." (327). The Whigs were supporters of the Market Revolution, seeing themselves as "improvers." Meanwhile, on the other hand, the Democrats tended to be "hurt" by the Market Revolution. Clearly, the Whigs resonated mainly with eligible voters and the "common man", and means that indeed, the election of 1840, in the end, was of a Democratic Revolt or Uprising.

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

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



My Last Stand: No Not a Democratic Revolt

by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 5:05 PM

In my last stand of arguing against the notion that the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 was a democratic revolt, I will go back to one of my original arguments. "Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 or just a little better than 56 per cent of the entire vote" (Handout pg 2). Now, this next sentence is interesting to me in that Remini admits that the results were "a veritable landslide" in Jackson's favor (Handout pg 2). I still believe that this was no more and no less than just that, a landslide victory. On another note, the population of the U.S. was increasing at a rapid rate during this time, therefore, increasing the voting population as well. Moreover, the reason for the increase in voting during the 1828 election was due to the fact that America finally had two clear-cut parties to identify with and two clear-cut candidates to choose from. In 1824, "popular interest was dampened by the confusion of choice presented by the multiplicity of candidates, by the disintegration of the old national parties,..." (Handout pg 8). With a more clear two-candidate field, "each of whom had substantial sectional backing..., voters became sufficiently aroused to go to the polls in moderate numbers" (Handout pg 8). Not overwhelming numbers, but moderate numbers. However, the results of the election were a foregone conclusion and therefore some voters did not feel the need to make their voices heard. This election was not a democratic revolt based on the passionate figure of Andrew Jackson, this was a less befuddling election year due to the emerging two-party system and the fact that John Quincy Adams had no shot at winning this battle. 1828 was a landslide victory for Jackson as the result was already a foregone conclusion, not a democratic revolution based on a "presidential-looking" war hero (Handout pg 3).

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

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



Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Joshua Dalton](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 7:21 PM

My final response to this forum will be brief, because I have finally become ill with my daughters fever she had for the greater part of the week. In McCormick's essay he points out the the voter turnout receded only slightly in 1844 with (74.9%) votes cast as compared to 1840 (79.0%). Which indicates a much greater enthusiasm within the Democrat party in these two election years, as apposed to Andrew Jackson's election in 1828. With only (55.2%) of eligible voters casting there votes in 1828 it could be an indication that the remaining voters that chose to avoid the ballot box did so for the possibility they were not interested in either John Quincy Adams or Andrew Jackson. In my opinion, 1828 was hardly a revolt.

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

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



A changed outlook

by [Ryan Peel](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 11:34 PM

When I first posted here... My stance was yes, yes it was. But after seeing the videos, I can't say that it was in fact an extravagant, life-changing event that followed Andrew Jackson's election. Yes, it was a Democratic Revolt that gave the white male populace more advantages and privileges in politics. But, no one else really gained anything. In fact, I'll still use Ms. Perdue's words here, women and free blacks lost rights after his election. So, sure. You can say it was a revolt, but for some, it was a revolt in the worst way. So, if we look there, then, was it really such a momentous occasion to elect someone that gave and took away so much? Granted, I'm viewing this from the scope of today, where we are most likely about to impeach a President in office for the second time, or maybe this is the first time. Either way, while Andrew Jackson isn't Richard Nixon or Donald Trump, he was offered the "corrupt bargain" which he refused, but he still lost out to someone who accepted it. He also only gave to the majority and took from the minority. I can't say that this event and election sparked a massive event that people believe to have happened afterward. So, no, Andrew Jackson's election did not mark the date for a Democratic Revolt. Someone else's election did, but not his.

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

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

[◀ 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](#)