

# HST 202: US History W20 (Escobar)

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



Search forums

## Forum 1

### A Democratic Revolt ?

[Subscribe](#) [Settings](#) ▼

◀ [Age of Jackson Videos](#)

[Age of Jackson Videos](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move



#### A Democratic Revolt ?

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

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which side of the issue, YES or NO, you have chosen to support or write about. Do NOT simply leave it RE: A Democratic Revolt ?

Sum of ratings: [\\_-](#)

[Permalink](#)

[Edit](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



## Yes, this was a revolt of the people.

by [Brett Lee](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 10:27 AM

I believe with the rising numbers of the states, that this was a democratic revolution. I believe the people were wanting change but didn't have the essential spark to start this fire, its important to note at the beginning of (Robert V. Remini paper) that the new Generation of men had "seen Jackson as a symbol of their own ambitions; saw him as a self made man". this can be a perfect person for them to follow, as he had already established himself as a crowd winning charismatic person. Pulling some quotes from the same paper "an authentic legend, the victor of New Orleans" and "man who won over the British". With this and the aggressive campaigning of the party through Van Buren, by switching to Jackson's camp, and bringing as many Old republicans as he could, and by bringing people while touring the south. Further supported by the Democratic-republican party, who, whenever prodded, restated the doctrines of Jefferson showing the importance of the ordinary citizen. finally, the huge push to make Jacksons campaign successful, it would reestablish the 2 party system and support the common man, who then had the opportunity to express their political opinion.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



## Re: A Democratic Revolt? No

by [Melanie Green](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 2:34 PM

A Democratic Revolt? No.

"Revolt" according to the dictionary, is a "rise in rebellion" or "cause to feel disgust." By this definition of revolt, the election of 1828 was not that. People were not rebelling nor were they disgusted with their candidates. In fact, according to the History textbook (Liberty, Equality, Power: A History of the American People) and the handouts discussing this topic, Andrew Jackson was popular among the common man because he had grown up just like them. He was a farmer, a hunter, a soldier, a politician who achieved his goals through hard work rather than a privileged family or political connections like the other presidents before him.

Yes the vote was higher than normal in this election, but we have to take into consideration the variables that were occurring at this time. We can't just simply say that this was a revolt of the people because more people got up and voted. 1828 was the first election that non-property owners were able and allowed to vote. Most of the states had reverted to popular vote (including the non-property owners), which would make a difference in the turn out.

Not only was that a huge change in the country at the time, but also the use and circulation of newspapers was becoming a thing. It was easier to see what was going on in the country in a more reliable time frame. The country was starting to make its way in the world by building roads and strengthening their infrastructure which, in turn, helps with the spread of news. People were more educated/influenced by the news they read.

Previous to this election, there were more than 2 main political parties, which meant there were more candidates. In 1828, there were 2 parties to be a part of. Making them more influential than they had been. At this time votes were not an official ballot but rather ballots the parties provided. They were handed out to people along with reasons why you should vote for the candidate. According the the handout "it was not unusual for a person to be accosted by several hawkers at once and threatened with bodily harm unless he accepted the proffered ballot." (pg. 2) While they are not threatening them to vote, they are getting them halfway there to take the ballot.

There are still more variables that can be looked at to show how we cannot say for certain that this was a "democratic revolt".

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt? No

by [Kerry Herring](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 4:59 PM

First of all I want to say that I respect your view on this forum question. That being said, based on the 1828 Webster's dictionary definition of Revolt "1. To fall off or turn from one another. 2. To renounce allegiance and subjection to one's prince or state; to reject the authority of a sovereign; as a province or a number of people. It is not applied to individuals. 3. To change". (webstersdictionary1828.com) I agree with you on several points you made. The first is that they did for the first time open the voting to non-property owners, but that does not mean that those whom didn't own property were not as educated as those who did own property. I don't believe they just go up and voted as you said, my assumption to that is they just simply picked at random. I do agree with you that there were many new ways for Americans to now attain literature which equates to a better education for all. An article from the Foundation for Economic Education stated that "from 1800 to 1840 the North literacy rates went up from 75% to 91%-97%. The South literacy rate rose from 55% to 81%." (fee.org) It was up to the nationals in the 1828 Election to choose between John Quincy Adams the "unscrupulous aristocrat who misappropriated tax dollars" and the adulterer Andrew Jackson. (Britannica.com) I'd say this debate is actually about which definition of a revolt we're going to abide by the definition that is calling a revolt a "rise in rebellion" or a "cause to feel disgust" (google.com) or the 1828 definition of a revolt calling this Election something that forced this country "To change". (1828 Webster's dictionary)

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)

**Re: A Democratic Revolt? No**

by [Melanie Green](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 6:40 PM

I understand what you are pointing out and thank you for finding the 1828 definition. That definitely helps to understand the question. When I was reading the handout and the book trying to figure out what to write about, I found myself not able to pick a side. I read the "Yes" handout and the "No", and kept disagreeing with things they were saying. I picked no because I couldn't come up with a solid reason why I would say yes. I kept finding holes. We don't know exactly what it was like in the election of 1828. We know the numbers, which was an extraordinary thing, yes. And yes if I were just looking at a few things including the numbers I would also agree that this was a cry for change with the American people. But the things we don't know bother me. We don't know how many people were living in America in 1824 compared to 1828. We also don't know if there was a "Boomer generation". What if there was a huge number of kids in the same generation that were old enough to vote in 1828 but weren't in 1824. That would skew the numbers. The other thing we have to look at, is that this was the first time where there were 2 main parties. Instead of there being multiple candidates there were only 2. I can see how that would make numbers do weird things. The other thing is, it doesn't sound like John Quincy-Adams was liked much after his first term. So I would assume that would make people's decisions a bit easier to make. Get rid of Adams and elect someone who says he's for the people and the Union.

However, because I don't know what America was like back then, I can't say for certain that it wasn't a revolt. Maybe people really were fired up because finally a candidate was there promising them things that they had a right to all along. The common man, the low income, the farmers, they were and have been more numerous than the rich. Appeal to them in a presidential election and you've won half the race, and I think Jackson knew that. I don't think it was a revolt. But I can see how the common man, in this election because of who was running, they felt for the first time like they had the right to vote. Because Jackson in his campaign, reached out to them and made them feel like they could decide what happened with their country. But then that gets into feelings and I can't in good conscience just assume what the people felt back then.

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt? No

by [Thomas Lemelin](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 11:47 PM

Hello Melanie!

I wanted to touch down upon some of the different variables that you have identified as deeming the election unfit of being revolutionary. These same factors were, to me, examples of significant change that made me agree with Remini in the first place, so it stood out to me to see them used to identify the opposite.

I understand why the election might not be considered a "revolt" specific to Webster's definition, but I think that the connotation of the word is more important to consider here. When I think of the word "revolt" or "revolution", ideas and images of significant changes being made in order to better the current well-being of a person or society come to mind. In the context of this time period, the eligible voter population is expanding, communication is improving, infrastructure is coming to fruition, political powers are forming and strengthening public opinion; the people haven't necessarily overthrown the government and completely changed the system in which it operates, but there are significant changes being made to which it operates and the way the people operate themselves. These aren't factors to discredit the increase in voter turnout, but rather steps made in order to create the change people wanted to see. Jackson being elected as president in 1828 is the culmination of these revolutionary differences and embodies the idea that nothing is unmoving, and if the people in a democratic state aren't being properly represented, they can change that. I would agree with you that the increased number of voters is fairly insignificant, but the result of the election proves that these new ideas and policies were effective. As you said, Jackson was a farmer, a soldier, and not a typical politician of the time. Like the factors that helped elect him, his presidency in itself was revolutionary.

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt? No

by [Melanie Green](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 10:46 PM

Hello!

That is an interesting take on it. I like how you said "These aren't factors to discredit the increase in voter turnout, but rather steps made in order to create the change people wanted to see." I think maybe instead of saying that the election was a revolutionary thing, maybe saying that this entire era, the 1820's itself was revolutionary. I don't think the 1828 election was what brought the change. I think the election was the result of change that was already happening. But that being said, I'm probably going to contradict myself now that I've watched the videos, everything about the election was different. Andrew Jackson campaigned differently than the other's before him, the political parties made politics a more exciting experience, and more people were able to vote. So I guess all that to say, I agree with your last sentence. His presidency was revolutionary. It changed the field for the politicians that had to follow in his footsteps.

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt? No

by [Thomas Lemelin](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 10:38 PM

You make a good point.

I think that is a very fair argument (to say the election is a product of the revolutionary changes, but it in itself isn't revolutionary itself), and honestly, since writing my first reply, I am starting to see that viewpoint more. Especially when considering the contents of his presidency, and the ways in which he continued to act like a typical "politician" of the time. In the book, it says that "in 1828 and 1829, when they petitioned the government to stop movement of the mail on Sundays, Jackson had turned them down." (book, 438) This is an example of a totalitarian action made in order to control information being spread by the national government which, like the "corrupt bargain", people were not in favor of. So in reality, the presidency even was revolutionary. Only the new changes being made which led to the election of Andrew Jackson can be considered this way.

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

1

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



### The election of 1828 resulted in a revolt of the people.

by [Kelvin Johnson](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 9:35 PM

Election of 1828

Yes, because it was more than the peoples vote in numbers, even though it was considered a landslide. It was a change of the political parties, a change in the electoral system, and was also a changing of people's attitudes toward elections.

Let us look at the numbers, "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. This was an extraordinary achievement by Jackson, a veritable landslide." (Robert V. Remini) Jackson got support from all sections of the country including New England, which was very important in the year of 1828.

The election of 1828 saw the two-party system reemerge. They were the Democratic and the National Republican parties. "Four states, representing a considerable electorate, changes their laws and transferred the selection of electors from the legislature to the people." (Robert V. Remini) This was an important event because it brought the vote back to the people, away from the government.

The American people were excited about the election of 1828 they had a candidate who they would put their trust in and whom they believed was a representative of their rights. "...the Democrats tended, when prodded, to restate the doctrines of Jefferson, particularly those emphasizing the rights of the states and the importance of the ordinary citizen." (Robert V. Remini)

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

2

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)

**New era in the political game.**by [Kerry Herring](#) - Saturday, January 18, 2020, 11:31 PM

Did the Election of 1828 represent a Democratic revolt of the people?

My Answer is yes it absolutely was. After the 1824 Election where Jackson clearly should have won with his popular votes and his electoral votes. (Book page 311) He was cheated out of his victory, his perseverance after such a devastating loss was admirable because that loss didn't stop his run to presidency. He moved away from the standard and was the lead in a stand against the government with Van Buren and like-minded republicans that called themselves the new democratic party. (Book page 313) The Election of 1828 was one where the politics didn't matter as much as slandering the Presidential political nominee by making the personal matter of nominees the first bullet in their own gun to run. (Book page 313) Thus, gaining a new weapon in the political war that would very much be used today, almost 200 years later. In my own eyes, knowing that Jackson and company won that slanderous Election of 1828 that, in fact there was a revolt of the American people where states rights mattered more and less government influence was wanted.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) 
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**The Election of 1828 was a Democratic Revolution.**by [Riley McQueen](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 4:15 PM

- I agree more with Robert V. Remini's essay about the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt of the people. The reason that I think that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt is the fact that the popular vote showed an increase of nearly 800,000 votes over the election of 1824 (handout pg. 2). In his essay, Remini says "Generations of historians, therefore, have interpreted Jackson's election in 1828 as the beginning of the 'rise of the common man' in American history", the common man being farmers, workers, and frontiersmen (handout pg. 3). The common man believed that by voting for Jackson they had seized their opportunity to express their political opinion and be heard. They rallied behind Jackson because he inspired confidence among the masses who saw the election as a symbol of the people's arrival to political responsibility.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) 
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Hunter Weast](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 5:21 PM

YES

I believe that the election of 1828 did/does represent a revolt of the people. You can find the support to my claim in that he was regarded as the first true man of the people, and that they saw him as coming from a similar life situation. I think these are important factors in this debate because in order for a revolt to happen, there must be some sort of uprising or rebellion, and this cannot happen if Jackson wasn't seen as coming from the same place as them.

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Kelvin Johnson](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 2:29 PM

Hello Hunter,

I agree with you that the people needed a leader they could trust and follow through with their beliefs. Also, the election of 1828 became the revolt of the people because of the election of 1824. Thus "The public distrusted the caucus as undemocratic because it represented the only party in government and thus could dictate the choice of the president" (Textbook pg.310). I thought it was interesting that the presidential campaign of 1828 was not a debate on public issues but rather an exercise in slander. (Textbook pg. 313) "The attempt to brand Jackson as a lawless man, in fact enhanced his image as a melodramatic hero..." (Textbook pg.313) This helped him win the election.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 7:10 PM

Did the election of 1828 represent a democratic revolt? Yes, I do think that the 1828 election did represent a democratic revolt. There are multiple reasons why. The first is people saw Jackson as a symbol. As stated in the Yes article Robert V. Remini Wrote "men saw in Jackson, a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man. Surely if an orphan boy from the backwoods could make good, there was no reason why they too could not aspire to wealth and social status by relying on their own talents to get what they wanted." So people saw Jackson and what he had done in his life and use him as a symbol and said if he can do we can too. Because of this Jackson won the support of the common folk. This is shown in the Election data. It is stated in the Yes article Robert V. Remini says that Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, John Quincy Adams received 507,730; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 which would be about 56 percent of the vote. Because of this, I do think that the election of 1828 did represent a democratic revolt.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Alexander Brown](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 8:12 PM

Hi Ethan,

I agree with you that the election proved to have been a democratic revolt by the people. Adding on to your argument however, I think the reason for this large shift in American politics is not only due to the charisma and symbolism of Andrew Jackson and his party as you have stated, but due partly by the actions of individuals in this party besides that of President Jackson. Individuals such as Martin Van Buren and John Calhoun also aided the party through support of powers and eventual campaign funding which allowed Jackson to truly bury his opposition by such an incredible margin like you stated near the end.

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



### Questioning the Democratic Surge

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

Richard P. McCormick in his essay "New Perspectives on Jacksonian Politics" makes the most compelling argument regarding the democratic revolution taking place in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. While Robert V. Remini's essay "Election of 1828" highlights the unprecedented victory for Jackson in the titular election, McCormick's use of voting history and statistics puts it into perspective and leads us away from the idea of a democratic revolution taking place before 1840.

Despite the high numbers of votes that were cast post-1824 the average voter participation in 1824 was 26.5 percent, and in previous elections, of the eighteen states who's electors were chosen by popular vote, fifteen of them had seen voter turnouts above 50 percent (McCormick). While the election of 1828 saw an average voter participation of 56.3 percent, an obvious increase from the previous election, it still failed to dwarf the participation in elections before 1824. McCormick also brings up the voting motivations during this era in United States history, with a drastic difference in voter interest between state and federal elections. In contrast with today's age of information and accessibility to the country and world's happenings, for the voters of the past it was the state elections that held more weight, shown by the numbers of votes. These state elections would have a greater impact on day to day life for the time, and thus they had garnered more interest. This maintained from pre-1824 to the eight years that followed, where in thirty four out of fifty elections from 1824 to 1832 saw a higher voter turnout in electing governor than it did for president (McCormick). These statistics create a solid foundation of skepticism regarding the so-called democratic revolution of the Jacksonian era.

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

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



### The People Revolt: The Democratic Revolution of 1828

by [Alexander Brown](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 11:52 PM

I believe that the election of 1828 did represent a revolt toward Democracy, however this "revolt" was definitely influenced by the Democratic Republican party as well as supporters of the party. The numbers show clearly that Jackson won the race by a large margin as he won 56% of the popular vote (Remini 2), but the reason for this is not all black and white. The election showed improvement in the way parties got people to vote for their candidate as the parties attempted connect to the interests of the majority population of the U.S. Andrew Jackson would try to connect with the, "so-called "common man," who were farmers, workers, frontiersmen, and the like" (Remini, 3). Another contribution to Jacksons campaign (and ultimately started it), was New York Senator Martin Van Buren, who eventually became the 8th president of the United States. Van Buren went to Vice-President John C. Calhoun in order to gain support from someone who is in Washington and has a good if not great reputation. Calhoun agreed to give this support to Van Buren and Jackson which furthered the Democratic Revolution. These influences helped the Democratic Republican party initiate a large scale revolt of the people and finally push Andrew Jackson into office.

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

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



## Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Thomas Lemelin](#) - Sunday, January 19, 2020, 11:53 PM

In recent discussions of American political history, a controversial issue has been whether or not the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people. On the one hand, some argue that this election symbolizes the maturation of the two-party system and the people's arrival to political responsibility. On the other hand, however, others argue that a legitimate political revolt did not take place until the presidential election of 1840 when fairly well balanced political parties had been organized in virtually every state.

I agree with the idea that the election of 1828 represented a democratic revolt of the people for 3 reasons: an increase in voter turnout, procedural changes in voting, and the reemergence of the two-party system.

When trying to define what a "revolution" in context with the topic is, I like to think of what significant change occurred, and what were the results of this change. These three examples together represent a massive change shift in the way American politics operated at the time, and the result of this is a person outside of the "Virginia political machine" is elected president which legitimizes the idea that a "common man" (YES, pg. 3) can be the president. This is the basis of which I formed my opinion to agree with Remini in saying that it was in fact a revolution.

In McCormick's argument against this idea he does, however, provide some compelling statistics that are hard to discredit. He speaks extensively about the importance of looking at previous presidential elections and comparing them to the election of 1828 to see if the percentage of voters had increased and not just the number of people voting (to account for an increase in popular and eligible voters. He says "The average rate of voter participation in the election was 26.5 percent. This hardly fits the image of the "roaring flood of the new democracy..." This is very important to consider because a large portion of what makes the revolt seem genuine is the increase in people voting. Remini touches upon this in his writing as well, but rather than speaking about percentages, he provides the overall number of voters in 1828 compared with 1824. He only provides the statistic for Pennsylvania and says "the number rose from forty-seven thousand to 152,000 four years later" (YES pg. 2), but with that example comes a lot of significance. Maybe the entire country as a whole hadn't fully changed yet, but because poorer people could vote, and because voting was moving away from being caucal in nature and to a more semi-inclusive system, a significant change in voting behavior in many parts of the country was occurring.

McCormick says that the true revolution doesn't occur until 1840, which is fair to say that there was a noticeable difference from previous politics, but those differences were based on the factors that began in 1828.

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Alexander Marx](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 7:13 PM

Hey Thomas,

Thanks for your thorough and informative post! While I sided with McCormick and his alternate view of the Jacksonian era, you make some good points to support the pro-revolt side of the argument which does cause me to question my thought process regarding the issue. The statistics provided by McCormick were quite convincing to me, but the semantics of what I would consider to be a democratic revolt "of the people" is what is making me struggle with taking Remini's side. With the increase in voter eligibility and the changes to the voting system causing the popular vote to hold more weight, then most likely there would be an increase in overall voters. In addition to this, the two-party system's re-emergence was sure to bring out more voters by avoiding the issue of the 1824 election where there were too many presidential candidates and the winner of the popular vote wasn't even elected. The textbook authors describe the 1828 election as "an exercise in slander rather than a debate on public issues" with personal attacks taking the front stage. (Textbook 379). I believe that this emotional focus of the election when paired with clear cut sides allowed people to pick a candidate more easily, akin to rooting for a sports team. These changing factors were sure to increase the overall voter participation both in number and percentage, although instead of viewing it as the people themselves causing this democratic revolt, to me it feels more like the system causing a reasonable, but not revolutionary, increase in voters. The textbook authors' statistic of the voter turnout percentage doubling from 1824 to 1828 (Textbook 380) doesn't have as much impact when considering McCormick's claim that "there was in 1828 a voter turnout that approached – but in only a few instances matched or exceeded – the maximum levels that had been attained before the Jackson era" (McCormick 2). I think your closing statement sums it up nicely, with elections in 1840 and onward containing the significant record breaking numbers, and that this was allowed by what was started in the 1828 election, but my disagreement lies in the "of the people" aspect that I don't see coming to fruition until 1840.

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

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



### yes a democratic revolt

by [Brett Lee](#) - Monday, January 20, 2020, 12:07 PM

Jacksons supporters believed him as a war hero who had been born poor and rose to wealth and fame through patriotism, valor and hard work. The election of 1828 was regarded as one of the most malicious presidential campaigns in history. they had painted Adams as a harvard graduate and son of a former president as out of touch with the common man. and with this election favoring more of the common mans vote, jackson was almost guaranteed to win. This was a chance for the common man to rise up against the "government powered" man that was Adams. a democratic uprising? yeah the people wanted to be heard.

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

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

**Re: yes a democratic revolt**by [Kelvin Johnson](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 7:52 AM

Hello Brett,

I agree with you with that this was a chance for the Common man to be able to vote in a man, that they felt would be for the people after the corruption of 1825. With the landslide of votes for Jackson and the four states "representing a considerable electorate changed their laws and transferred the selection of electors from the legestrator to the people" (YES pg.3). This also played a part in the democratic revolt of the people.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Marcus Mantanona](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 12:50 AM

I believe that the 1828 election did in fact represent a democratic revolt of the people. I believe that the people are more passionate about their parties. In the "YES" packet, it mentions how this was a way for people to finally be able to vote for their presidential electors directly. This allowed voters and politicians to nominate the candidates, instead of the [political party](#) leaders in Congress. This method also represented the people when they voted for the president. Jackson also gave government jobs to people. He gave federal jobs to people who had campaigned for the Democratic Party. Andrew Jackson believed that more democrats should have a government job so he limited terms in office and did a rotation. That was called the spoils system. The spoils system helped build a strong two party system by showing how one man was no better than another.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**YES cont.**by [Hunter Weast](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 7:15 PM

To strengthen my point that a revolt can only be truly achieved if the common public feels that the appointed leader is a good representation of themselves, we can look at Daniel Webster's quote on page 4 of the Robert v. Remini essay. "I never saw such a crowd here before," he said. "Persons have come five hundred miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger." Now with that being said, I do acknowledge that prior to this election the voting rates were much different, therefore possibly dismissing the first part of his quote, but we cannot overlook the second sentence.

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Sebastian Mertens](#) - Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 9:34 PM

After reading both articles I found that I agreed more with the article by Robert V. Remini. Going into reading the two articles I already had an opinion on this election and its significance as a democratic revolt of the people and Richard P. McCormicks article just didn't do enough to sway that opinion that was further backed up by the first article. However I don't think that this would have been considered a democratic revolt of the people if it weren't for Andrew Jackson and how he was viewed by the people going into office, as Robert says in his article "These men saw in Jackson a symbol of their own ambitions; they also saw in him a living example of the self-made man." (first article first page). For this reason I think it made Jackson and his ideas much easier to agree and identify with making the whole democratic party much more appealing in the eyes of the voters. There were a lot of other factors that contributed to this democratic revolt including the ever changing and evolving voting system and the whole ballot system (some people being forced to take and vote on these ballots) but what I think it comes down to is how Jackson was seen by the people and how closely they felt they could relate to this new political ideas and statements (on top of him being a Great War hero) he really made this election of 1828 and caused the democratic revolt of the people.

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

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



### It was a Democratic Revolt.

by [Riley McQueen](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 2:58 PM

Another reason I believe that the election was a democratic revolt was how popular Andrew Jackson was during this time. In his essay Remini uses Jackson's inauguration as President as a way to show this saying "some twenty thousand people from all parts of the country converged on Washington to witness the triumph of their candidate" (handout pg 4). The people thought of Jackson as a "man of the people" who had at last been elected President of the United States. They saw him as the "victor of New Orleans...the greatest feat of arms in American history" who had a "dignity and bearing about him the bespoke leadership and authority" (handout pg. 3). These qualities inspired confidence among voters and made the election of 1828 a democratic revolt.

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

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



### I still think yes

by [Brett Lee](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 4:57 PM

After the 1824 Election where Jackson should have won with his popular votes (Book, 311) He was cheated out of his victory the fact that the popular vote showed an increase of nearly 800,000 votes over the election of 1824 (Robert pg. 2), we should not look at the legislative votes, as clearly shown by THE PEOPLES vote Out of a total of 1,155,022 popular votes cast, J.Q.A received 507,700; Andrew Jackson won 647,292 which would be about 56 percent of the vote. even looking past the numbers, and at the man, the myth, the legend Martin V. Buren who went to Vice-President candidate John C. Calhoun in order to gain support from someone who is in Washington. Calhoun agreed to give this support to Van Buren and Jackson a big boost in his run. I still believe the democratic revolt on the system was there.

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 11:40 PM

After reading some other posts that provide some good points for the 1828 election not being a democratic revolt however, I still believe that it was a democratic revolution. It goes back to the 1924 election where Jackson lost but should have won the popular vote by 139,592 votes but lost the election due to J.A.Q cheating. This planted the seed that Jackson used in the election of 1828. In Which we see the people again vote in favor of Jackson in the popular vote but also he won the Electoral College by a landslide as well In the Electoral College, Jackson won a total of 178 electoral votes to 83 for Adams. (handout page 2)

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Sebastian Mertens](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 8:34 PM

Not a Democratic Revolt of the people

After looking more closely into the election of 1828 and looking at several of my classmates posts I had a change of mind and now believe that the election of 128 was not a Democratic revolt of the people. In the election of of 1824 there was only a single [political party](#) that all candidates aligned with, during the the election of 1828 Andrew Jackson opened up a whole new [political party](#) which was new to the voters of this year. This change on top of how the people saw Andrew Jackson as a "living example of a self made man" I'm sure really made the Democratic Party seem very appealing to most people or should I say most people who could vote. Since the number of voters in this election doubled from the last election it would defiantly seem to stick out as a Democratic revolt of the people but there are a lot of other factors that go into this. One large one being that 24 states had taken away property requirements for voting making so pretty much any white male was able to vote. Jackson and his Democratic Party also changed the way presidents ran for the election for the next years, the strategies and advertising that he was using made the people really feel as though they has a choice in what was going to happen in their country as Jackson said "Vote for us if you believe the people should govern". So rather than the election of 1828 being a Democratic revolt of the people it was more so a Democratic revolt of Andrew Jackson.

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

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



### Re: A Democratic Revolt ?

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Thursday, January 23, 2020, 11:54 PM

While you make a good point that it was more of an Andrew Jackson democratic revolt. However, people still choose to vote for him. Andrew Jackson just took advantage of the opportunity and played his cards right. Just because he fueled the fire doesn't make it not a revolt he still needed for people to do it as well. Most revolts have a leader. One could say that Andrew Jackson was the leader of this revolt because of the way that he campaigned in the 1828 election.

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

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

**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Alexander Brown](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 10:35 PM

I agree with you Ethan, that this election is a great example of a president playing to his strengths. Jackson knew he had the "common folk" on his side as well as solid representation in Washington and worked with his tools in order to secure the presidency by a landslide. The election was a perfectly orchestrated storm that lead the people of the U.S to believe that Andrew Jackson was their only hope.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Melanie Green](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 6:38 PM

Hello Sebastian!

I agree with you that if any of this was a revolt it was Andrew Jackson's. Jackson was the one who changed things. He was the first president to go after the majority vote. Not only had the property restrictions gone away in 24 states, but this candidate went after the people. He wanted them to feel like they could vote for him. People were excited to vote and excited they had someone worthwhile to vote for. And I think that's where the numbers came from.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: A Democratic Revolt ?**by [Alexander Marx](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 9:16 PM

Hi Sebastian,

I like this alternate perspective to who or what exactly caused the revolt. To be fair to the other side, I would like to add that the actual number of voters between the 1824 and 1828 not only doubled but tripled, going from about 366,000 to over 1.1 million (Wikipedia), and it was the percentage of eligible voters voting that doubled. Still for the reasons that you mentioned along with a growing population this doesn't necessarily constitute a revolt of the people in itself. I think a quote from Harry Watson in one of our Age of Jackson videos heavily supports your argument here, saying "Politicians ever since Andrew Jackson had to act (even if they didn't always believe it) as if the ordinary American voter was absolutely the wisest and the best judge of public affairs who could ever be imagined." He described how Jackson truly approached the election in a new way, influencing elections to come (which you also stated), and using this sort of manipulation to gather support could certainly be seen as the true revolt.

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



### A Revolt of the People? No

by [Melanie Green](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 9:53 PM

After reading the handouts and everyone else's arguments, I still don't think that the 1828 election was a revolt of the people. Yes, the numbers are there, and they are extremely high (though not as high as 1840), and yes, there was a lot of change happening, but I still don't think that the people were revolting. I know that I am kind of alone on this opinion in this forum, but for me it is a simple no. I see that laws were being changed, campaigning was improving, and a candidate rose to the occasion.

I did see an argument that almost changed my mind. Someone (I don't remember who, I'm sorry) mentioned that John Quincy Adams had cheated in the race and the people were siding with Andrew Jackson in a revolt against that. And that was something I hadn't thought of and a really good point. Maybe people were angry that Andrew Jackson wasn't elected according to their votes so they tried again with more force in the next election. But how would we know that was the intention of the people? So much was already changing throughout the 1820's, there could've been so many other reasons for the numbers. And it kind of seems to me like that's the only piece of evidence we have that a supposed revolt occurred.

I would, however, agree that Jackson could have been revolting against the system. He changed the way the game was played. He tried to get the majority vote, he campaigned the way we see it being done which the previous presidents hadn't done. I saw someone else say (Also don't remember who, I'm so sorry) that Andrew Jackson was the leader of the revolt. Because every revolt needs a leader. But even saying that I feel like is not what happened. I've discovered it's a fine line between a revolt and people just exercising their right to vote. Previous to this election, a lot of people weren't allowed to vote. According to Wikipedia, adding up the total popular vote in 1916 the number came out to be roughly 17.5 million. Between 1916 and 1920, women gained the right to vote. 1920 elections, the total number of both popular votes was roughly 25.3 million. Which is roughly 7.8 million more. I don't think that was a revolt so much as women finally being able to vote and using that right. But that is just my opinion 😊

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

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



### Re: A Revolt of the People? No

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 9:42 PM

While, I still think that the election of 1828 was a democratic revolt. I don't think that it was a revolt of the people. I also agree that you and Jackson was revolting against the system which is why I think that the election was a revolt with Jackson leading the revolt. While it may not have been a revolt of the people it was still a revolt. Jackson just took advantage of his opportunities and campaigned in a way that he knew as going to sway the people on his side.

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

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

[◀ Age of Jackson Videos](#)

[Age of Jackson Videos ▶](#)

[◀ Chapter 12 Quiz](#)

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

 Moodle Docs for this page

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

HST 202 W20 (Escobar Meta 30603 30604)

[Get the mobile app](#)

[Policies](#)