

# The legacy of andrew jackson and indian



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Andrew Jackson's Indian removal and Remini's view

The author of this book, Robert V. Remini, wrote about what Andrew Jackson has done about democracy, Indian removal, and slavery. Especially, out of all the issues, Remini's view on Andrew Jackson's policy on Indian removal is very interesting because his view is different from what most people might think about the policy. Most people would focus on what Andrew Jackson did to Indian people to expand the U. S territory and how it was. They might think that most of what he did was brutal or cruel and Indians were victims. In this book, however, the author focuses on why Andrew Jackson had to do that and how it affected the U.

S. According to the introduction of Indian removal part in this book, he says that Andrew Jackson had to do what he did and it exerted favorable influence upon the U. S. Also, he points out that Jackson's actions that look brutal these days were normal and necessary at that time. Because Andrew Jackson was a general, he had to follow orders from the government. The orders were mostly forcing Indians to move because the interest of the public and government was to expand new and fertile (sometimes profitable) lands and they considered Indians as potential enemies.

That's why Andrew Jack had to move Indians but he tried to be nice to them by promising and acknowledging their safety and rights. Andrew Jackson let them live in their new territory, acknowledged their rights, promised protection, and even allowed them to try to negotiate with the U.

S. The only time he took a tough stance on Indians was when the Indians didn't follow rules and broke deals between the U.

S and them. Andrew Jackson even tried to offer them supplies such as food, clothes, and houses. He tried to bribe the chiefs with money to persuade to move to new land rather than attacking and killing them. The author thinks that these kinds of efforts were more humanitarian than most people think they were. Even after Andrew Jackson became the 7th president, he tried to find a nicer way in dealing with Indians. Indian Removal Act that Andrew Jackson signed, which was passed in May, 28, 1830, is a good example. He signed it because he hoped that the Act would resolve the Georgia crisis. At that time, the Congress wanted to make Indians leave by force when Andrew Jackson was president because they found a lot of gold in Georgia.

Many American settlers went to Georgia for gold. Jackson thought forcing Indians to leave was unnecessary and didn't want Indians to be killed. Jackson admitted that the American settlers were greedy and cruel and he didn't think that Indians had done anything wrong. He even wanted to make a deal with Indian by trading lands (He offered the land that is now Oklahoma).

Also, he acknowledged Indians a lot by letting them have their tribe identity, their own language, and their own governments. In order to deal with Indians in humanitarian way, he had to keep arguing against the Congress because the Congress wanted to throw Indians out of their territory. The author, Remini, thinks that treaties that Andrew Jackson agreed were humanitarian and successful. Furthermore, he thinks that deals and what happened between the U. S and Indians could have been bad or worse without Jackson's persuasion and effort. Remini compares Jackson with other presidents to show how humanitarian Jackson's policies on Indians.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-legacy-of-andrew-jackson-and-indian/>

Also, he emphasizes that many Indians could be moved safely for their new territory and the U. S could obtain wide and fertile land with Jackson's effort. Remini says that Indians' move by force was inevitable. Remini concludes that one's effort for better result could require some sacrifices. He thinks that some of Jackson's policies which are blamed now were inevitable and good for the U. S.

Reading Remini's view on Jackson's policies on Indians, it feels like that Remini's opinion is biased. His opinions are focused too much on the policies' good influences on the U. S. Andrew Jackson was obsessed with moving Indians and Remini explains that it was reasonable because it was inevitable and good for the U. S socially and economically. Not every action of Andrew Jackson must have been good for Indians. It is hard to say that Jackson's policies were perfect for Indians.

Reading this book, it seems that readers cannot figure out what would have been the best way for solving problems between white settlers and American Indians. The author did not point out that how Andrew Jackson's policies affected American Indians' life. All he talks about American Indian is why white settlers needed new lands and Indians had to leave and how that happened. His view is not focused on American Indians' stance or situation caused by Andrew Jackson's policies. That's why the author's view is biased and focused only on Jackson's achievements.

Remini insists that Jackson tried to be humanitarian for Indians in moving them to new land for the U. S's sake but humanitarian forcing ones to

move cannot exist. online essay books There should be more Indians who lost their territory, rights, and even lives than those who did not.

That also can explain that many American Indians are having hard time surviving these days, which means policies that were legislated for Indians are not working for them. As bright sides exist, dark sides should exist.