

TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY PROJECT
President Jackson and Chief John Ross's Arguments For/Against Relocation
From Taylor Lebovich

Grade – 11th

Length of class period – 1 hour

Inquiry – (What essential question are students answering, what problem are they solving, or what decision are they making?)

Did President Andrew Jackson or Chief John Ross make a more compelling/persuasive argument regarding the removal of Native Americans?

Objectives (What content and skills do you expect students to learn from this lesson?)

Students will identify arguments that President Andrew Jackson and Chief John Ross presented regarding their opinion on the removal of the Cherokee from Georgia.

Students will evaluate whether President Andrew Jackson or Chief John Ross had more persuasive arguments.

Materials (What primary sources or local resources are the basis for this lesson?) – (please attach)

Andrew Jackson's Second Annual Message (December 6, 1830 to US Congress)

Chief John Ross's Letter Protesting The Treaty of New Echota (September 28, 1836 to US Congress)

(from pbs.org)

Activities (What will you and your students do during the lesson to promote learning?)

- Opener: I want the students to begin thinking about some of the reasons for and against the removal of Native Americans. I will assign half the class to be opposed to removing the Cherokee from Georgia and half the class in favor of removing the Cherokee from Georgia. I will give them one minute to individually brainstorm arguments to support their assigned position. They will break up into groups of three to share their ideas, then share with the entire class. This will be a short activity- only 5 minutes.

- Students will read Andrew Jackson’s Second Annual Message aloud in groups of three and will fill out the reading guide. They will explain his arguments and give specific examples of how he supports these arguments. Class will discuss. (20 minutes)
- Students will read Chief John Ross’s Letter aloud in groups and fill out the reading guide. They will explain his arguments and give specific examples of how he supports these arguments. Class will discuss. (20 minutes)
- Students will discuss which argument was more persuasive and why. I will get a “temperature check” on what the class thinks and then ask people to explain their opinion. (10 minutes)
* If Chief John Ross did have a better argument, why did he still lose out?
- Closer- Each student will write several sentences explaining which argument they thought was most persuasive using specific examples from the documents. (5 minutes)

How will you assess what student learned during this lesson?

- Walk around when students are discussing in groups to get a feel for what they are discussing. Ask them questions about what they are discussing to get them to think deeper and clear up any misunderstandings.
- Through class discussion.
- Collection of reading guides at end of class.
- Collection of closer activity.

Connecticut Framework Performance Standards –

Standard 1.1- Investigate the causes and effects of migration within the United States

Standard 1.34- Analyze human factors that cause migration

Standard 2.3- Cite evidence from a source to determine an author’s purpose and intended audience.

Andrew Jackson's Second Annual Message- December 6, 1830 to U.S. Congress

It gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly thirty years, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching to a happy consummation. Two important tribes have accepted the provision made for their removal at the last session of Congress, and it is believed that their example will induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages.

The consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual States, and to the Indians themselves. The pecuniary advantages which it promises to the Government are the least of its recommendations. It puts an end to all possible danger of collision between the authorities of the General and State Governments on account of the Indians. It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage hunters. By opening the whole territory between Tennessee on the north and Louisiana on the south to the settlement of the whites it will incalculably strengthen the southwestern frontier and render the adjacent States strong enough to repel future invasions without remote aid. It will relieve the whole State of Mississippi and the western part of Alabama of Indian occupancy, and enable those States to advance rapidly in population, wealth, and power. It will separate the Indians from immediate contact with settlements of whites; free them from the power of the States; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way and under their own rude institutions; will retard the progress of decay, which is lessening their numbers, and perhaps cause them gradually, under the protection of the Government and through the influence of good counsels, to cast off their savage habits and become an interesting, civilized, and Christian community.

What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization and religion?

The present policy of the Government is but a continuation of the same progressive change by a milder process. The tribes which occupied the countries now constituting the Eastern States were annihilated or have melted away to make room for the whites. The waves of population and civilization are rolling to the westward, and we now propose to acquire the countries occupied by the red men of the South and West by a fair exchange, and, at the expense of the United States, to send them to land where their existence may be prolonged and perhaps made perpetual. Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers; but what do they more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions. Does Humanity weep at these painful separations from everything, animate and inanimate, with which the young heart has become entwined? Far from it. It is rather a source of joy that our country affords scope where our young

population may range unconstrained in body or in mind, developing the power and facilities of man in their highest perfection. These remove hundreds and almost thousands of miles at their own expense, purchase the lands they occupy, and support themselves at their new homes from the moment of their arrival. Can it be cruel in this Government when, by events which it can not control, the Indian is made discontented in his ancient home to purchase his lands, to give him a new and extensive territory, to pay the expense of his removal, and support him a year in his new abode? How many thousands of our own people would gladly embrace the opportunity of removing to the West on such conditions! If the offers made to the Indians were extended to them, they would be hailed with gratitude and joy.

And is it supposed that the wandering savage has a stronger attachment to his home than the settled, civilized Christian? Is it more afflicting to him to leave the graves of his fathers than it is to our brothers and children? Rightly considered, the policy of the General Government toward the red man is not only liberal, but generous. He is unwilling to submit to the laws of the States and mingle with their population. To save him from this alternative, or perhaps utter annihilation, the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement.

1. What does Andrew Jackson say are the benefits of removing the Cherokee from Georgia to each of the below groups? Underline evidence of these on the document and mark with a 1, 2 or 3 (depending on which category it relates to).

1. United States	2. Individual States	3. The Cherokee

2. Is his argument persuasive? Why or why not?

3. Do you think that Andrew Jackson truly believed that these were all benefits of the removal of the Cherokee? Or was it just a means to get the public's support?

Letter from Chief John Ross to the US Congress Protesting the Treaty of New Echota (September 28, 1836)

It is well known that for a number of years past we have been harassed by a series of vexations, which it is deemed unnecessary to recite in detail, but the evidence of which our delegation will be prepared to furnish. With a view to bringing our troubles to a close, a delegation was appointed on the 23rd of October, 1835, by the General Council of the nation, clothed with full powers to enter into arrangements with the Government of the United States, for the final adjustment of all our existing difficulties. The delegation failing to effect an arrangement with the United States commissioner, then in the nation, proceeded, agreeably to their instructions in that case, to Washington City, for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with the authorities of the United States.

After the departure of the Delegation, a contract was made by the Rev. John F. Schermerhorn, and certain individual Cherokees, purporting to be a "treaty, concluded at New Echota, in the State of Georgia, on the 29th day of December, 1835, by General William Carroll and John F. Schermerhorn, commissioners on the part of the United States, and the chiefs, headmen, and people of the Cherokee tribes of Indians." A spurious Delegation, in violation of a special injunction of the general council of the nation, proceeded to Washington City with this pretended treaty, and by false and fraudulent representations supplanted in the favor of the Government the legal and accredited Delegation of the Cherokee people, and obtained for this instrument, after making important alterations in its provisions, the recognition of the United States Government. And now it is presented to us as a treaty, ratified by the Senate, and approved by the President [Andrew Jackson], and our acquiescence in its requirements demanded, under the sanction of the displeasure of the United States, and the threat of summary compulsion, in case of refusal. It comes to us, not through our legitimate authorities, the known and usual medium of communication between the Government of the United States and our nation, but through the agency of a complication of powers, civil and military.

By the stipulations of this instrument, we are despoiled of our private possessions, the indefeasible property of individuals. We are stripped of every attribute of freedom and eligibility for legal self-defence. Our property may be plundered before our eyes; violence may be committed on our persons; even our lives may be taken away, and there is none to regard our complaints. We are denationalized; we are disfranchised. We are deprived of membership in the human family! We have neither land nor home, nor resting place that can be called our own. And this is effected by the provisions of a compact which assumes the venerated, the sacred

appellation of treaty.

We are overwhelmed! Our hearts are sickened, our utterance is paralyzed, when we reflect on the condition in which we are placed, by the audacious practices of unprincipled men, who have managed their stratagems with so much dexterity as to impose on the Government of the United States, in the face of our earnest, solemn, and reiterated protestations.

The instrument in question is not the act of our Nation; we are not parties to its covenants; it has not received the sanction of our people. The makers of it sustain no office nor appointment in our Nation, under the designation of Chiefs, Head men, or any other title, by which they hold, or could acquire, authority to assume the reins of Government, and to make bargain and sale of our rights, our possessions, and our common country. And we are constrained solemnly to declare, that we cannot but contemplate the enforcement of the stipulations of this instrument on us, against our consent, as an act of injustice and oppression, which, we are well persuaded, can never knowingly be countenanced by the Government and people of the United States; nor can we believe it to be the design of these honorable and highminded individuals, who stand at the head of the Govt., to bind a whole Nation, by the acts of a few unauthorized individuals. And, therefore, we, the parties to be affected by the result, appeal with confidence to the justice, the magnanimity, the compassion, of your honorable bodies, against the enforcement, on us, of the provisions of a compact, in the formation of which we have had no agency.

1. What was Chief John Ross arguing in his letter?
2. What reasons did he give for not accepting the Treaty of New Echota?
3. If the public had read this letter, would history not have happened the way it did?