

Andrew jackson analysis essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

1. In his veto message, Jackson did not question the ability of the bank to regulate currency and credit.

What public policy objectives does his message attempt to advance? Jackson is saying that much too often the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. And that this bank does not permit competition in its monopoly, it is a monster to society. As well as advancing the fact or belief that some of the powers and privileges possessed by the existing bank were unauthorized by the constitution, and are dangerous to the liberties of the people. As well as the fact that the bank is too often bent to the will of the rich and selfish individuals.

2. Despite the Supreme Court's decision in *McCulloch V. Maryland*, Jackson insisted in his veto message that some of the " powers and privileges possessed by the existing bank are unauthorized by the Constitution" What reasons does he give for that judgment? Jackson says that the bank does not permit competition in its " Monopoly" he also says the bank believes that stockholders have the right to decisions in the bank more than the federal government. With this institution gone other people not now stockholders may be opened into the " door" of competition and may be offered charters and loans on more reasonable government terms.

3. What did the " humbler members of society" rightly complain about, in Jackson's view?

The Humber members of society complain about injustice of their government, because they have no means of securing favors for themselves,

Jackson says that there are no evils in government there are only evils in their abuses. It would not provide equality.

1. How does Leggett define a monopoly?

William Leggett describes a monopoly as all corporations liable to the obligation that whatever powers given to them may not be taken away, even though doing so is a clear invasion of the grand republican principle of equal rights.

2. In Leggett's view, why do banks inevitably tend toward corruption?

He believes this because he believes that the bank will become too large and inevitable desire more profits or stockholders will become too much a part of decisions within the bank, leading decisions not to be made for the good of the people as a majority but for the few rich stakeholders the minority.

3. Consider the implications of Leggett's remarks.

How might the Jacksonians have protected the people from the mischief of what they " foolishly imagined money"? Jacksonians would have forced the Banks to stop printing money that was not backed up by hard currency of gold or silver, as well as destroying all implications of corrupt cooperate banks that are in existence due to the complete fact of profits and run by shareholders that are just trying to increase profits while no money is at hand, therefore the economies and banks stay afloat in times of crises.

1. How does Jackson believe that the federal government's Indian policy to date has been counterproductive to its stated goals? What information does

Jackson provide to support his position? Based on what you already know about federal Indian policy since the Confederation period, does Jackson's reasoning make sense?

Jackson states the Indians within the states of Georgia and Alabama have no rights to form a government, in what was already sovereign states, therefore if they do not subject themselves to the laws of the United States then they, must be moved beyond the Mississippi River to retain any form of government they would like to keep and administer themselves. He states that Indians are surrounded by whites who are destroying the resources that will weaken and cripple the Indians, and states will destroy and overtake the Indian nations of Mohegan and Narragansett and many others. Jackson's reasoning makes sense although largely inhumane and cruel what he states is true Indians were being overtaken and it was only a matter of time before whites would destroy Indian life in an effort to gain land and expand power.

2. What does Elias Boudinot argue, and how does his position concerning federal Indian policy compare with Jackson's?

He states that the founding father gave them the land to create a agricultural nation and that in was in no right of Jackson to refute what they said that the state of Georgia was in fact there and extended her jurisdiction (which was partly true), and that after they have been encouraged to create government and been provided protection and have been dutiful children of the President, only to be invaded by a " storm" of tyrannical unchristian laws which will destroy all hopes in the Indian nations of hope and rising expectations of survival in the new world.

3. Do you think Jackson truly believes that he is helping the Indians?

Or is Jackson's rhetoric merely a cynical cover for yet another white seizure of Indians lands? Explain. I believe that Jackson is a cruel and evil man bent on showing the country what he is capable of as well as securing votes for reelection, and what better way than moving the Indians and creating more land available for white voters while showing the nation and even the world that he has an army and no matter what the Supreme court says he is in total control, and has expanded the power of the executive branch further than ever before.

1. Jackson's Constitutional positions were not consistent. Jackson only followed the constitution when he felt like it, and when it didn't agree with what he wanted to do, he simply chose to ignore it, like he did in the case of the Indian Removal Act. After John Marshall's court ruled twice that what Jackson was doing to the Indians was unconstitutional, he went along with it anyway because the court couldn't "enforce" its decision. But when the Constitution supported what Jackson thought, he stuck to it like glue, like the case with the Bank of the United States, Jackson used the Constitution to say it was unconstitutional and get rid of its charter.

2. Jackson was impacted by fighting in the Revolution a great deal and took it as a personal matter, this led him to think that America's population should be made up of hard workers, and self-made men. Jackson thought that the Bank of the United States would be the undoing of all that the Revolution had fought for because it would mean a society where the government could be bought by the rich and would forget its people's rights and become

corrupt. I think that at the time, the government did need a wakeup call to address the fact that they were allowing the country to go into debt, and they were allowing the government to be hoodwinked by the rich, but I still think the Bank for the United States is overall a good idea.

3. I believe this is because each of the Presidents who thought that the government power should be reduced didn't know exactly what they were up against until they were elected President. Once they were in political office, they probably still kept their strong ambition to help the people of the United States from oppression from their government, but at the same time, realized how much the people need a strong government to keep them in place. Once these men who have good morals and think that there need to be some serious adjustments made to the government are elected, they may change what actions they carry out, but they still do their best to carry out actions that will benefit the country, which means they would do a good job in office because they bring new ideas to the table, and they would be re-elected.