

8th Grade History: US History

April 13th – 17th

Time Allotment: 30 minutes per day

Mr. Maiorano's Office Hours via Zoom:

Period 1: Monday and Wednesday from 10:00am –
10:50am

Period 2: Monday and Wednesday from 11:00am –
11:50am

Period 6: Tuesday and Thursday from 1:00pm – 1:50pm

Mr. Growdon's Office Hours via Zoom:

Period 3: Monday and Wednesday from 1:00pm – 1:50pm

Period 4: Tuesday and Thursday from 10:00am –
10:50am

Student Name: _____

Teacher Name: _____

Packet Overview

Date	Objective(s)	Page Number
Monday, April 13 th	1. DAY OFF	3
Tuesday, April 14 th	1. Explain how the Tariff Debate became a debate about State and Federal Power.	3
Wednesday, April 15 th	1. Describe the major arguments for and against the nullification of Tariffs from the Webster-Hayne Debate	8
Thursday, April 16 th	1. Explain why Jackson disagrees with Chief Justice John Marshall on the <i>Worcester vs. Georgia Case</i>	15
Friday, April 17 th	1. Quiz: Jackson on Tariff Debate, and Indian Removal Act	27

Additional Notes: As we enter another week of Remote Learning, take some time to reflect on the lyrics of our school song, “The Minstrel Boy”

The minstrel boy to the war is gone
In the ranks of death you'll find him
His father's sword he hath girded on
And his wild harp slung behind him

"Land of Song!" cried the warrior bard
(Should) "Tho' all the world betrays thee
One sword, at least, thy rights shall guard
One faithful harp shall praise thee!"

The Minstrel fell! But the foeman's chain
Could not bring that proud soul under
The harp he lov'd ne'er spoke again
For he tore its chords asunder

And said "No chains shall sully thee
Thou soul of love and brav'ry
Thy songs were made for the pure and free
They shall never sound in slavery

Academic Honesty

I certify that I completed this assignment
independently in accordance with the GHNO
Academy Honor Code.

Student signature:

I certify that my student completed this
assignment independently in accordance with
the GHNO Academy Honor Code.

Parent signature:

Monday, April 13th: OFF / NO SCHOOL

Tuesday, April 7th

History Unit: Jacksonian Democracy

Lesson 1: The Nullification Crisis

Unit Overview: Jacksonian Democracy

Objective: Be able to do this by the end of this lesson.

1. Explain the nullification crisis through the eyes of Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster and Robert Hayne

Introduction to Lesson 1:

After the War of 1812, one of the ways government sought to protect American manufacturing from foreign competition was through tariffs. Tariffs are taxes on important goods. The goal is make buying from another nation more expensive that buyers will want to buy American goods that are cheaper. In 1828, under President John Quincy Adams' Presidency, Congress passed even higher tariffs than the first set of tariffs passed right after the way. Remember, how a few weeks ago, Southern States did not appreciate these tariffs because they thought tariffs supported Northern Manufacturing while hurting the South's importing habits? The South's dislike for tariffs does not go away. Many Southerners believed and voted for Andrew Jackson because he was "The People's President", and would do all he can to convince Congress to repeal or remove the Tariff of Abomination! However, when Jackson did not make this an immediate priority, southern threats of nullification and secession arose, much to the approval of Andrew Jackson's Vice President John C. Calhoun. South Carolina sought to nullify the tariffs! Remember, to nullify is to legally overturn federal laws deemed unconstitutional.

The following lesson will have us look at multiple perspectives into this crisis, which will serve as a foreshadowing of the Civil War.

Plan of Attack:

- A. USH SS: Khan Academy on the Tariff of Abomination
- B. USH RS: Khan Academy on the Tariff of Abomination
- C. USH SS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis
- D. USH RS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis
- E. USH SS: Mr. Maiorano on the Webster-Hayne Debate
- F. USH RS: Mr. Maiorano on the Webster-Hayne Debate

SS: Summary of Tariff of Abomination from Khan Academy

“After the [War of 1812](#), a series of tariffs—taxes on imported goods—was enacted. The purpose of these tariffs was to protect American manufacturing from low-priced British manufactured goods. Because the domestic manufacturing industry was still in its infancy, it could not compete with the low prices of British manufactures. The first protective tariff was passed in 1816, followed by an increase in tariff rates in 1824. In 1828, during the presidency of [John Quincy Adams](#), Congress passed legislation that included an even higher tariff designed to shelter the burgeoning American manufacturing industry from British competition.

The tariff became known to its Southern opponents as the **Tariff of Abominations**. Tariffs heightened sectional tensions because they raised prices on manufactured goods, which benefited the domestic manufacturing industry in the North but was bad for Southern slaveholders who had to pay higher prices for goods. Southerners also feared that foreign countries would enact higher tariffs on raw materials produced in the South. Moreover, because the British reduced their exports to the United States in response to the tariff, they had less money to pay for US imports, especially cotton from the South. As a result, the British imported less cotton, which further depressed the Southern economy.”

RS: Summary of Tariff of Abomination from Khan Academy

1. Quick note: Abomination means “something that one detests, hates, or finds ugly. It may also mean something disgusting, evil, or vile.”
2. What is a tariff?

3. Which region benefits from the Tariff? Why?

4. Which region is hurt by the tariff? Why?

5. Why would Southerners call this tariff an abomination?

USH SS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis

Jackson's failure to address the tariff issue opened a rift between the president and vice president. Calhoun authored a pamphlet titled "South Carolina Exposition and Protest," which was published anonymously and put forward the theory of nullification—the declaration of a federal law as null and void within state borders. He argued that since the authority of the federal government derived from the consent of the states, states could nullify any federal law they considered unconstitutional. Calhoun contended that the US Constitution authorized tariffs only for the purpose of raising revenue and not for the purpose of discouraging foreign competition. The theory of nullification, in maintaining that South Carolina could refuse to enforce a federal law, ushered in a constitutional crisis.

The Nullification Crisis

Calhoun's pamphlet sparked a national debate over the doctrine of nullification and its constitutionality. Former president [John Quincy Adams](#) was one of the leading voices opposing Calhoun and nullification. He argued that it was the Supreme Court, not the states, that had the ultimate authority to declare federal legislation unconstitutional. And although Jackson was sympathetic to Southerners who complained that protective tariffs damaged their interests, he refused to countenance threats of nullification. Jackson supported states' rights but viewed nullification as a prelude to secession, and he vehemently opposed any measure that could potentially break up the Union. In July 1832, in an effort to compromise, he signed a new tariff bill that lowered most import duties to their 1816 levels.

This compromise measure failed to satisfy Southern radicals who wished to see the tariff repealed, and in November 1832, a convention of Southern politicians and proponents of states' rights met to discuss nullification. The convention declared the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 unconstitutional and therefore unenforceable in the state of South Carolina. The delegates to the convention threatened to secede if the federal government forcibly sought to collect import duties.

President Jackson again sought to compromise. In March 1833, he signed a new tariff bill that lowered tariffs even further, thereby appeasing the South. But he also signed the **Force Bill**, which authorized the compulsory [or forced] collection of import duties from the South—by force of arms if necessary. It was a signal to Southerners that threats of nullification and secession would not be tolerated. Though this effectively brought the constitutional crisis to an end, it did not forestall the eventual outbreak of civil war. Southern planters and slaveholders would continue to use the doctrine of states' rights to protect the institution of slavery, and the nullification crisis set an important precedent. For some Southern radicals, the tariff issue had been a mere pretext for the threat of secession. These radicals continued to view the federal government with intense suspicion and threatened to secede every time a federal policy or law was perceived as antagonistic to the interests of the slaveholding South.

USH RS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis.

Directions: Answer questions using SS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis.

1. What does it mean to nullify a federal law?

2. What pamphlet did Vice President John C. Calhoun write and publish anonymously? Did this paper support a state's right to nullify federal laws?

3. Why does John C. Calhoun support state nullification of federal law?

4. What did former President John Quincy Adams argue about State Nullification of Federal Law?

5. Did President Jackson agree with his Vice President? What evidence is there to support your claim?

6. How is nullification a kind of “stepping stone”, could lead to secession?

7. What compromise did Jackson do with Southern states?

8. What was the goal of Jackson's Force Bill? What did this Force Bill signal to southern states?

9. In the end, did Southern States trust Jackson and the Federal government? What evidence supports your claim?

Make Corrections on RS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis with Red Pen using answer key on page 22

Khan Academy Challenge

1.	What is the vocabulary word for “to legally overturn a federal law deemed unconstitutional”?	
2.	What is the vocabulary word for “a tax on imported goods”?	
3.	What is the vocabulary word for “goods or products bought and entering into a country”?	
4.	What is the vocabulary word for “goods or products sold and leaving the country”?	
5.	Which region of the United States seems most hurt by the tariffs?	
6.	Which region of the United States seems most benefited by the tariffs?	
7.	The tariff caused regions to start arguing for and pursuing their own regional interests rather than national interests. What is a good vocabulary word for “rivalry based on the special interests of different regions”?	
8.	Who supports the States Right to nullify federal laws: Andrew Jackson or John C. Calhoun?	
9.	Who does not support the States’ right to nullify federal law: Andrew Jackson or John C. Calhoun?	
10.	Does John Quincy Adams support the states right to nullify federal law?	
11.	What bill does Jackson pass that forces Southern States to pay federal tariffs?	

Make Corrections using RED PEN and answer key on page 23.

Concept Map:

How can
nullification put
the Constitution in
danger?

How is the Tariff /
Nullification Debate
about State and Federal
power?

Wednesday, April 14th

History Unit: Jacksonian Democracy
Lesson 2: The Webster-Hayne Debate

Unit Overview: Jacksonian Democracy

Objective: Be able to do this by the end of this lesson:

1. Describe the major arguments for and against the nullification of Tariffs from the Webster-Hayne Debate

Lesson 2:

During the nullification crisis, a great debate emerged in the Senate about the states' right to nullify federal law. All senators were interested in the following question: Do State Legislatures have the power to nullify federal law? President Jackson and former President John Quincy Adams both argued against nullification, while Vice President John C. Calhoun argued for nullification.

What about in the Senate? Well, Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts and Senator Robert Hayne of South Carolina entered into the debate in a kind of head-to-head fashion. Looking at their State gives insight into where they will fall in the debate. Senator Webster from Massachusetts will argue against nullification, whereas Senator Hayne from South Carolina will argue for nullification. However, their argument leads ultimately into an interesting conversation about the nature of our Constitutional Union. Both men leads us to toward very profound questions about the founding of the United States.

Was our Union intended to be a kind of unbreakable covenant between states at the founding or was our Union simply another contract, although good one, that States can elect out of when the contract is not met?

In other words, is our union a covenant not meant to be broken or a contract with a release clause?

Plan of Attack

1. Nullification Crisis Chart to Review USH SS Nullification Crisis by Khan Academy
2. USH PS: The Webster-Hayne Debate
3. USH RS: The Webster-Hayne Debate

USH Chart: Nullification Crisis

Directions: Using yesterday's USH SS/RS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis, fill in the following chart

Do State Legislatures have the right to nullify federal laws?			
Name	Position: What government job did they have during Nullification Crisis?	Yes or No: Would this person support or not support state nullification?	Why or why not?: Use textual evidence / blend-in quotes.
John Quincy Adams	Former President of the United States	No, he does not support State Nullification...	Adams argued that it was the Supreme Court, not the states, that had the ultimate authority to declare federal legislation unconstitutional.
Andrew Jackson			
John C. Calhoun			

Make Corrections with Red Pen using Answer Key found on page 24

USH PS: Webster-Hayne Debate

Directions: Read and annotate the following excerpts from the Webster-Hayne Debate.

Source Links: <https://www.abbevilleinstitute.org/review/who-won-the-webster-hayne-debate-of-1830/> <http://ashbrook.org/library/document/the-webster-hayne-debates/>

Speech of Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, January 26 and 27, 1830

1. “...We, sir, who oppose the Carolina doctrine, do not deny that the People may, if they choose, throw off any government, when it become oppressive and intolerable, and erect a better in its stead. We all know that civil institutions are established for the public benefit, and that when they cease to answer the ends of their existence, they may be changed...

2. “The inherent right in the People to reform [or change] their government, I do not deny; and they have another right, and that is, to resist unconstitutional laws, without overturning the Government. It is no doctrine of mine, that unconstitutional laws bind the People. ... [However] the right of a State to annul a law of Congress, cannot be maintained, but on the ground of the unalienable right of man to resist oppression; that is to say, upon the ground of revolution. I admit that there is an ultimate violent remedy, above the Constitution, and in defiance of the Constitution, which may be resorted to, when a revolution is to be justified. But I do not admit that, under the Constitution, and in conformity with it, there is any mode in which a State Government, as a member of the Union, can interfere and stop the progress of the General Government, by force of her own laws, under any circumstances whatever...”

3. **“It is, sir, the People’s Constitution, the People’s Government; made for the People; made by the People; and answerable to the People. The People of the United States have declared that this Constitution shall be the Supreme Law...”**

4. “Sir, the very chief end, the main design, for which the whole Constitution was framed and adopted, was to establish a Government that should not be obliged to act through State agency, or depend on State opinion and State discretion. The People had had quite enough of that kind of Government, under the [Articles of Confederation]. Under that system, the legal action — the application of law to individuals, belonged exclusively to the States. Congress could only recommend — their acts were not of binding force, till the States had adopted and sanctioned them. Are we in that condition still? Are we yet at the mercy of State discretion, and State

construction? Sir, if we are, then vain will be our attempt to maintain the Constitution under which we sit...”

5. “When the gentleman says the Constitution is a compact between the States, he uses language exactly applicable to the old Confederation. He speaks as if he were in Congress before 1789. He describes fully that old state of things then existing. The Confederation was, in strictness, a compact; the States, as States, were parties to it. We had no other General Government. But that was found insufficient, and inadequate to the public exigencies. **The People were not satisfied with it, and undertook to establish a better. They undertook to form a General Government, which should stand on a new basis — not a confederacy, not a league, not a compact between States, but a Constitution;** a Popular Government, founded in popular election, directly responsible to the People themselves, and divided into branches, with prescribed limits of power, and prescribed duties. They ordained such a Government; they gave it the name of a Constitution, and therein they established a distribution of powers between this, their General Government, and their several State Governments. When they shall become dissatisfied with this distribution, they can alter it. Their own power over their own instrument remains. But until they shall alter it, it must stand as their will, and is equally binding on the General Government and on the States...”

6. “**Liberty and Union, now and for ever one and inseperable!**”

Speech of Senator Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina, January 27, 1830

7. ...The gentleman [from Massachusetts, Mr. Webster] insists that the States have no right to decide whether the constitution has been violated by acts of Congress or not, — but that the Federal Government is the exclusive judge of the extent of its own powers; and that in case of a violation of the constitution, however “deliberate, palpable and dangerous,” a State has no constitutional redress, except where the matter can be brought before the Supreme Court, whose decision must be final and conclusive on the subject. Having thus distinctly stated the points in dispute between the gentleman and myself, I proceed to examine them.

8. And here it will be necessary to go back to the origin of the Federal Government. It cannot be doubted, and is not denied, that before the formation of the constitution, each State was an

independent sovereignty, possessing all the rights and powers appertaining to independent nations; nor can it be denied that, after the constitution was formed, they remained equally sovereign and independent, as to all powers, not expressly delegated to the Federal Government.

This would have been the case even if no positive provision to that effect had been inserted in that instrument. But to remove all doubt it is expressly declared, by the 10th article of the amendment of the constitution, “that the powers not delegated to the States, by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”...

9. The whole form and structure of the Federal Government, the opinions of the framers of the Constitution, and the organization of the State Governments, demonstrate that though the States have surrendered certain specific powers, they have not surrendered their sovereignty. ...

10. No doubt can exist, that, before the States entered into the compact, they possessed the right to the fullest extent, of determining the limits of their own powers — it is incident to all sovereignty. Now, have they given away that right, or agreed to limit or restrict it in any respect? Assuredly not. They have agreed, that certain specific powers shall be exercised by the Federal Government; but the moment that Government steps beyond the limits of its charter, **the right of the States “to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties, appertaining to them,” [This quote is take from Jefferson’s Kentucky Resolutions] is as full and complete as it was before the Constitution was formed...**

11. But the gentleman apprehends that this will “make the Union a rope of sand.” Sir, I have shown that it is a power indispensably necessary to the preservation of the constitutional rights of the States, and of the people. I now proceed to show that it is perfectly safe, and will practically have no effect but to keep the Federal Government within the limits of the constitution, and prevent those unwarrantable assumptions [or the dangerous grabbing] of power, which cannot fail to impair the rights of the States, and finally destroy the Union itself. ...

12. A State will be restrained by a sincere love of the Union. The People of the United States cherish a devotion to the Union, so pure, so ardent, that nothing short of intolerable oppression, can ever tempt them to do any thing that may possibly endanger it. Sir, there exists, moreover, a

deep and settled conviction of the benefits, which result from a close [connection] of all the States, for purposes of mutual protection and defen[s]e. This will co-operate with the feelings of patriotism to induce a State to avoid any measures calculated to endanger that [connection].

13. If this is to become one great “consolidated government,” swallowing up the rights of the States, and the liberties of the citizen, “riding and ruling over the plundered ploughman, and beggared yeomanry,” the Union will not be worth preserving. **Sir it is because South Carolina loves the Union, and would preserve it forever, that she is opposing now, while there is hope, those usurpations of the Federal Government, which, once established, will, sooner or later, tear this Union into fragments...”**

USH RS: Webster-Hayne Debate

Using PS: The Webster-Hayne Debate, answering the following questions.

Historical Quotes: Who would say which argument?

1. ____: States have the right to nullify unconstitutional laws, which in this case, are the Tariffs of Abominations.
2. ____: States do not have the right to nullify unconstitutional laws, but should look to convince their Congressional Representatives and Senators to change the law!
3. ____: We, as a nation, have moved past the Articles of Confederation and toward a united states under the Federal Constitution.
4. ____: Nullification of Federal Law is built upon the idea of Revolution. It is a slippery slope. Once law can be ignored by States, it is just one step toward a revolution.
5. ____: To say that States have the power to nullify federal laws is to contradict Article IV in the Constitution that states that the Constitution is the “supreme law of the land.”
6. ____: State Nullification of laws serves as a key check on the federal government from abusing their powers.
7. ____: It is because we love that Union and the Constitution that our State seeks to nullify the Tariff of Abomination.
8. ____: The 10th Amendment, or the reserved powers of Congress, permits States to nullify federal law.

A. Senator Daniel Webster

B. Senator Robert Hayne

Make corrections with Red Pen using answer key found on page 24.

Do State Legislatures have the right to nullify federal laws?			
Name	Position: What government job did they have during Nullification Crisis?	Yes or No: Would this person support or not support state nullification?	Why or why not?: Use textual evidence / blend-in quotes.
Daniel Webster			
Robert Hayne			

Make corrections with Red Pen using Answer Key on page 25.

Thursday, April 15th

History Unit: Jacksonian Democracy

Lesson 3: Worcester vs. Georgia.

Unit Overview: Jacksonian Democracy

Objective: Be able to do this by the end of this lesson.

1. Explain why Jackson disagrees with Chief Justice John Marshall after the Worcester vs. Georgia Case.

Introduction to Lesson 3: Read through this carefully because it gives a summary of Worcester vs. Georgia.

Another major issue that emerged during Jackson's Presidency was the Federal Government and State Government relationship with Native American Tribes. How to handle these interactions proved tricky because the Natives Tribes signed various treaties with the Federal Government, but state governments, such as Georgia, were beginning to break those treaties. Georgia, in particular, wanted legal control over the Cherokee nation. For the Georgia government, if the Cherokee people were going to live within the natural boundaries of the Georgia, then the Cherokee should follow and be held accountable to the laws of Georgia. However, the Cherokee Nation along with Samuel Worcester, an Christian missionary who sought to aid the Cherokee Nation, argued that the State of Georgia has no legal authority with the Cherokee Nation. The Cherokee Nation responds only to the Federal government. These arguments emerged in a landmark court case, known as *Worcester vs. Georgia*. In the end, Chief Justice Judge Marshall agrees with Samuel Worcester and the Cherokee Nation. President Andrew Jackson and Georgia however, disagrees immensely. When Georgia intentionally disregarded and ignored the Supreme Court decision, Jackson famously responded "John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it!" Ultimately, Federal Marshalls are not sent to carry out the decision to avoid any political conflict, while the decision from the court still stood. The hope would be that Georgia and its' people would change their mind. This did not happen. Today, you will read an overview of Jackson's Native American Policies form Khan Academy, analyze Chief Justice John Marshall's conclusion on the Worcester vs. Georgia Case, and then read through Andrew Jackson's first annual message to Congress in 1829, before the case, to show his thoughts on how to treat the Natives.

Plan of Attack:

- A. USH SS: Jackson's Native American Policies from Khan Academy
- B. USH PS: Andrew Jackson on Indian Removal
- C. USH PS/RS: Chief Justice John Marshall's Opinion on Worcester vs. Georgia

USH SS: Jackson's Native American Policies from Khan Academy

Overview

- US President Andrew Jackson oversaw the policy of Indian removal, which was formalized when he signed the **Indian Removal Act** in May 1830.
- The Indian Removal Act authorized a series of migrations that became known as the **Trail of Tears**.
- The policy of Indian removal was devastating to Native Americans, their culture, and their way of life.

A history of conflict between Euro-Americans and American Indians

From the earliest days of colonial contact, relations between white European settlers and American Indians were plagued by conflict over land and its natural resources. John C. Calhoun, who served as Secretary of War under President James Monroe, was the first to design a plan for removing Native Americans to lands west of the Mississippi River, but the Georgia delegation in the House of Representatives sunk the bill.

President [John Quincy Adams](#) believed the issue should be resolved peaceably, but Georgia again proved an obstacle when they blocked the implementation of voluntary removal of Native Americans from territories in the southeast United States. It wasn't until the presidency of [Andrew Jackson](#) that Indian removal became official US policy.

Andrew Jackson's Indian policies

Before becoming president, Andrew Jackson had distinguished himself as a champion of white settlers against the American Indians. In the [War of 1812](#), Jackson had led an offensive against the Creek nation in an attempt to clear the Mississippi Territory for white settlement, and under President James Monroe, he had participated in the First Seminole War, which devastated the Seminole tribe of Florida.

By the time Jackson entered the White House, white settlers in Georgia had been complaining for some time about the continued presence of Cherokee and Creek people on the lands they wished to inhabit. These white settlers were emboldened by the election of Jackson in 1828 and revoked the constitution of the Cherokee nation in Georgia, declaring that the Indians were subject to the laws of the state of Georgia. In 1830, the Cherokee nation took the state of Georgia to the Supreme Court, arguing that it was an independent nation and as such, was not subject to the authority of the state of Georgia. Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Marshall agreed that the Cherokee nation was a distinct society but not that it was a foreign nation

⌚
In *Worcester v. Georgia*, Chief Justice Marshall expanded on this argument, declaring that the state of Georgia had no authority over the Cherokee, which as a sovereign nation could only be subject to the authority of the federal government. The ruling established the nature of relations between the federal government and Indian tribes as that between sovereign nations. But President Jackson refused to enforce the ruling and pursued a policy of Indian removal.

The **Indian Removal Act of 1830** authorized the voluntary relocation of Native American tribes to the lands west of the Mississippi River but was frequently abused by government officials and resulted in some forced removals.

The Trail of Tears

The Indian Removal Act was applied to the "**Five Civilized Tribes**"—Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole—so named by people of the time because they had to some degree assimilated into white European culture and society. In September 1830, Choctaws became the first tribe to sign a treaty and voluntarily relocate to the territory that would become the state of Arkansas. Seminoles refused to leave their ancestral lands in Florida, sparking the Second Seminole War in 1835. Seminole chief Osceola led the resistance, which proved costly to the United States in terms of both money and casualties. The US Army ultimately emerged victorious, however, and forced remaining Seminoles out of Florida and into the area west of the Mississippi River that became known as Indian Territory.

Chickasaws agreed to leave their lands in exchange for a monetary settlement of \$3 million, which the United States refused to pay until almost 30 years later. The Creek had been forced to cede over 20,000 acres of their ancestral lands in the Treaty of Fort Jackson following the **Battle of Horseshoe Bend** in the War of 1812; the remaining Creek signed over the rest of their lands after the enactment of the Indian Removal Act and **relocated to Indian Territory in the Trail of Tears**.

As for Cherokees, a small faction had signed a treaty with the US government in 1835, but that faction did not represent Cherokee leadership, who refused to leave their lands voluntarily. As a result, Cherokees were forcibly relocated to the Indian Territory west of the Mississippi River. Of the 17,000 Cherokee that were rounded up, at least 4,000—and possibly as many as 8,000—perished.



Figure 1: The Land Route taken by the Cherokee Nation. What state did they end up living in?

USH PS: President Andrew Jackson on Indian Removal, 1829

During his First Annual Message as President to Congress, President Andrew Jackson recognizes the struggles States and Native Americans face, and the possibility of Natives creating their own sovereign tribes within the borders of states. President Jackson gives his response as President of the United States. Yet, he also shows a sense of compassion toward the Natives.

Source: Major Problems in the Early Republic, p. 374 – 376

1. “The condition and ulterior destiny of the Indian tribes within the limits of some of our States have become objects of much interest and importance. It has long been the policy of Government to introduce among them the arts of civilization, in the hope of gradually reclaiming them from a wandering life. This policy has, however, been coupled with another wholly incompatible with its success. Professing a desire to civilize and settle them, we have at the same time lost no opportunity to purchase their lands and thrust them farther into the wilderness... A portion, however, of Southern tribes having mingled much with the whites and made some progress in the arts of civilized life, have lately attempted to [construct] an independent government within limits of Georgia and Alabama. These States, claiming to be the only sovereigns within their territories, extended their laws over the Indians, which induced the latter to call upon the United States for protection.”

2. “Under these circumstances the question presented was whether the General Government had a right to sustain those people in their pretensions. The Constitution declares that ‘no new State shall be formed ... within the jurisdiction of any other State’ without the consent of [the states’] legislature. If the General Government is not permitted to tolerate the [creation] of a confederate State within the territory of one of the members of this Union against her consent, much less could it allow foreign and independent government to establish itself there. Georgia became a member of the Confederacy which eventuated into our Federal Union as a sovereign State, always asserting her claim to certain limits, which, having been originally defined in her colonial charter...Alabama was admitted into the Union in the same footing with the original States, with boundaries which were prescribed by Congress...”

3. “Actuated by this view of the subject, I informed the Indians inhabiting parts of Georgia and Alabama that their attempt to establish an independent government would not be countenanced [or acknowledged] by the Executive by the United States, and advised them to emigrate or [move] beyond the Mississippi or submit to the laws of those States...”

4. “[Yet our] conduct toward these people is deeply interesting to our national character... Their present condition, contrasted with what they once were, makes a most powerful appeal to our sympathies... By persuasion and force, they have been made to retire from river to river and from mountain to mountain, until some of the tribe have become extinct... Surrounded by the whites with their arts of civilization, which by destroying the resources of the savage doom him to weakness and decay... that this fate surely awaits them if they remain within the limits of the States does not admit of a doubt. Humanity and national honor demand that every effort should be made to avert so great a calamity. It is too late to inquire whether it was just in the United States to include them and their territory within the bounds of new States, whose limits they could control. That step cannot be retraced. A State can not be dismembered by Congress or restricted in the exercises of her constitutional power. But the people of those States and of every State, actuated by feelings of justice and a regard for our national honor, submit to you the interesting questions whether something can not be done, consistently with the rights of the States, to preserve this much-injured race.”

5. “As a means of effecting this end I suggest for your consideration the propriety of setting apart an ample district west of Mississippi, and without the limits of any States or Territory now formed, to be guaranteed to the Indian tribes as long as they shall occupy it, each tribe having a distinct control over the portion designated for its use... There may be secured in the enjoyment of governments of their own choice, subject to no other control from the United States than as such as may be necessary to preserve peace on the frontier and between the several tribes...”

6. “This emigration should be voluntary, for it would be as cruel as unjust to compel the aborigines to abandon the graves of their fathers and seek a home in a distant land. But they should be distinctly informed that if they remain within the limits of the States they must be subject to [the State’s] laws... Submitting to the laws of the States, and receiving, like other citizens, protection in their persons and property, they will ere long be merged in the mass of our population...”

USH RS: President Andrew Jackson on Indian Removal, 1829

1. According to Jackson, what does the Constitution prohibit Natives tribes to do in states?

2. According to Jackson, what will he not do as President in section 3?

3. Yet, in section 4, how does Jackson view the Natives? Provide some textual evidence to support your claim.

4. In Section 5, what is the best option he, as President can give to Native Tribes seeking recognition as a nation?

5. In Section 6, why does Jackson say the emigration or movement of the Natives should be voluntary?

6. In Section 6., if the Natives stay within state boundaries, then what is their expected behavior?

Make corrections with Red Pen using answer key on page 26.

USH PS: Chief Justice John Marshall’s Opinion in the Worcester vs. Georgia Case

“... The Cherokee Nation, then, is a distinct community occupying its own territory...in which the laws of Georgia can have no force, and which the citizens of Georgia have no right to enter but with the assent of the Cherokees themselves, or in conformity with treaties and with the acts of [the U.S. Federal Government] The whole intercourse between the United States and this Nation, is, by our Constitution and laws, vested in the Government of the United States.

...The acts of the Legislature of Georgia interfere forcibly with the relations established between the United States and the Cherokee Nation, the regulation of which, according to the settled principles of our Constitution, is committed exclusively to the Government of the Union.”

USH RS: Chief Justice John Marshall’s Opinion in the Worcester vs. Georgia Case

1. According to Chief Justice, which government is responsible for dealing with the Cherokee Nation: The Federal Government or the State Government?

2. Who, in the Federal government, can make treaties with other nations? Think Louisiana Purchase...

3. What did the laws of Georgia do to the relationship between the United States and the Cherokee people?

Make corrections with Red Pen using an answer key on page 27.

ANSWER KEYS

USH RS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis.

Directions: Answer questions using SS: Khan Academy on the Nullification Crisis.

1. What does it mean to nullify a federal law?

Answer: to legally overturn a law / to make a law void or without substance

2. What pamphlet did Vice President John C. Calhoun write and publish anonymously? Did this paper support a state's right to nullify federal laws?

Answer: Calhoun's *South Carolina Exposition and Protest* supported a states right to nullify federal law.

3. Why does John C. Calhoun support state nullification of federal law?

Answer: Calhoun states that the Constitution derives his just powers from the consent of the governed, and therefore, the state has the authority to nullify federal law. In particular, Calhoun views the tariffs as only raising revenue for the North, and not for helping the nation as a whole.

4. What did former President John Quincy Adams argue about State Nullification of Federal Law?

Answer: Adams argued that only the Supreme Court has the ultimate authority in declaring laws unconstitutional. State governments do not have this right.

5. Did President Jackson agree with his Vice President? What evidence is there to support your claim?

Answer: Jackson did not agree with Calhoun. Although Jackson supports states' rights, he saw nullification as a step toward secession, and wanted to prevent any kind of break up of the union, which as President, he swore to "preserve, protect, and defend."

6. How is nullification a kind of "stepping stone", could lead to secession?

Answer: If a state has the legal authority to legally overturn federal laws, then what is preventing them from leaving the union as a whole? Remember, Washington sent the militia in Western Pennsylvania to ensure that the Whiskey tax was being paid and to stop the rioters. If the federal government cannot enforce its own laws, then is cannot prevent a state from deciding to leave the union.

7. What compromise did Jackson do with Southern states?

Answer: Jackson approved a new tariff plan that decreased the tariff over time.

8. What was the goal of Jackson's Force Bill? What did this Force Bill signal to southern states?

Answer: Jackson's Force Bill states that Southern states must submit and pay the tariff. Force may be used if necessary. The Force Bill signaled to Southern states that the federal government will not approve or put up with nullifying states.

9. In the end, did Southern States trust Jackson and the Federal government? What evidence supports your claim?

Answer: Ultimately, Southern States grew very suspicious and cautious of the federal government looking to hurt the south and benefit the north.

Answer Key for Khan Academy Challenge

1. What is the vocabulary word for "to legally overturn a federal law deemed unconstitutional"?	"nullify"
2. What is the vocabulary word for "a tax on imported goods"?	Tariff
3. What is the vocabulary word for "goods or products bought and entering into a country"?	Import
4. What is the vocabulary word for "goods or products sold and leaving the country"?	Export
5. What is a good vocabulary word for "something disgusting, evil, or distasteful"?	Abomination
6. Which region of the United States seems most hurt by the tariffs?	Southern Region / The South
7. Which region of the United States seems most benefited by the tariffs?	Northern Region / The North
8. The tariff caused regions to start arguing for and pursuing their own regional interests rather than national interests. What is a good vocabulary word for "rivalry based on the special interests of different regions"?	Sectionalism
9. Who supports the States Right to nullify federal laws: Andrew Jackson or John C. Calhoun?	John C. Calhoun
10. Who does not support the States' right to nullify federal law: Andrew Jackson or John C. Calhoun?	Andrew Jackson
11. Does John Quincy Adams support the states right to nullify federal law?	No, he does not support the state's right to nullify.
12. What bill does Jackson pass that forces Southern States to pay federal tariffs?	The Force Bill

USH RS: Webster-Hayne Debate Historical Quotes: Who would say which argument?

1. B: States have the right to nullify unconstitutional laws, which in this case, are the Tariffs of Abominations.
2. A: States do not have the right to nullify unconstitutional laws, but should look to convince their Congressional Representatives and Senators to change the law!
3. A: We, as a nation, have moved past the Articles of Confederation and toward a united states under the Federal Constitution.
4. A: Nullification of Federal Law is built upon the idea of Revolution. It is a slippery slope. Once law can be ignored by States, it is just one step toward a revolution.
5. A: To say that States have the power to nullify federal laws is to contradict Article IV in the Constitution that states that the Constitution is the “supreme law of the land.”
6. B: State Nullification of laws serves as a key check on the federal government from abusing their powers.
7. B: It is because we love that Union and the Constitution that our State seeks to nullify the Tariff of Abomination.
8. B: The 10th Amendment, or the reserved powers of Congress, permits States to nullify federal law.

A. Senator Daniel Webster

B. Senator Robert Hayne

Do State Legislatures have the right to nullify federal laws?			
Name	Position: What government job did they have during Nullification Crisis?	Yes or No: Would this person support or not support state nullification?	Why or why not?: Use textual evidence / blend-in quotes.
John Quincy Adams	Former President of the United States	No, he does not support State Nullification...	Adams argued that it was the Supreme Court, not the states, that had the ultimate authority to declare federal legislation unconstitutional.
Andrew Jackson	President of the United States	No, he does not support State Nullification...	Jackson saw nullification as a step toward secession, and wanted to prevent any kind of break up of the union, which as President, he swore to “preserve, protect, and defend.”
John C. Calhoun	Vice President of the United States	Yes, he does support State Nullification	Calhoun states that the Constitution derives his just powers from the consent of the governed, and therefore, the state has the authority to nullify federal law. In particular, Calhoun views the tariffs as only raising revenue for the North, and not for helping the nation as a whole.

Do State Legislatures have the right to nullify federal laws?			
Name	Position: What government job did they have during Nullification Crisis?	Yes or No: Would this person support or not support state nullification?	Why or why not?: Use textual evidence / blend-in quotes.
Daniel Webster	Senator from Massachusetts	No, he does not support state nullification	<p>For Webster, the state's power to nullify federal law contradicts the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution. The People's government requires that the people follow their government, and if the federal government is doing something unconstitutional, then it must be acknowledged and fixed by Congress, the President, or the Supreme Court. Nullification moves the country toward secession and revolution and breaks up the Union needlessly. In addition, nullification was removed as a power when the states transitioned from the Articles of Confederation to the U.S. Constitution. The People were not satisfied with the Articles of Confederation and sought to create "— not a confederacy, not a league, not a compact between States, but a Constitution;"</p>
Robert Hayne	Senator from South Carolina	Yes, he does support state nullification of federal laws	<p>For Hayne, the 10th amendment allows for State nullification, and the states did not lose this power when the country transitioned from the Articles of Confederation into the U.S. Constitution. Nothing in the Constitution explicitly says states can or cannot nullify laws and so that power remains with the state. In addition, after the Alien and Sedition Act, Jefferson and others worked to craft the Virginia Kentucky resolutions which clearly argue that "the right of the States "to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties, appertaining to them," [This quote is take from Jefferson's Kentucky Resolutions] is as full and complete as it was before the Constitution was formed." Finally, Hayne argues that nullification is a crucial check upon a potentially tyrannical federal government and will be used out of love for the union.</p>

1. According to Jackson, what does the Constitution prohibit Natives tribes to do in states?

Answer: According to Jackson, the Constitution declares that “no new state shall be formed... within the jurisdiction of another state” without the state’s consent. Therefore, Native tribes cannot seek for independence within the state boundaries, unless they garner consent from the state legislature.

2. According to Jackson, what will he not do as President in section 3?

Answer: He informs Natives living in Georgia and Alabama that he, as President, will not recognize any attempt by them to establish an independent government, without the consent of the state. They must either move west of the Mississippi to establish their own government or submit to the laws of the state.

3. Yet, in section 4, how does Jackson view the Natives? Provide some textual evidence to support your claim.

Answer: Jackson provides a compassionate and wholistic view toward the Native people. He says that the way the United States will treat the natives is “interesting to our national character”, and will affect national reputation of the country, whether for better or for worse. He recognizes how the Natives have been pushed westward and westward by persuasion or force, and how some tribes are no extinct due to this movement. He writes how “Humanity and national honor demand that every effort should be made to avert so great a calamity.” The calamity, or the tragedy, is that the natives become extinct. He does not wish to eradicate Natives. He does admit that the Native situation is difficult, because the boundaries of the state are drawn as it is “too late” to change the boundaries.

4. In Section 5, what is the best option he, as President can give to Native Tribes seeking recognition as a nation?

Answer: For Jackson the best possible solution in the midst of this terrible situation is to establish land out west specifically for the Natives to form their own government, and GUARANTEE that the land given to the Natives will not be taken. The only time the U.S. Federal government will interfere with the Native tribes are for that which “may be necessary to preserve peace on the frontier and between the several tribes.”

5. In Section 6, why does Jackson say the emigration or movement of the Natives should be voluntary?

Answer: Jackson writes that forcing the natives out will be “cruel [and] unjust” to ask the natives to “abandon the graves of their fathers and seek a home in a distant land.” Again, how we treat the natives will either strengthen or ruin our national honor, and we have a commitment to treat the natives justly.

6. In Section 6., if the Natives stay within state boundaries, then what is their expected behavior?

Answer: If the natives do decide to not abandon the graves of their fathers and stay within the state’s boundaries, then they must follow state law, and the state must also protect the native tribes and their right to life and property.

USH RS: Chief Justice John Marshall's Opinion in the Worcester vs. Georgia Case

1. According to Chief Justice, which government is responsible for dealing with the Cherokee Nation: The Federal Government or the State Government?

Answer: The Federal Government.

2. Who, in the Federal government, can make treaties with other nations? Think Louisiana Purchase...

Answer: The President or the Executive branch with 2/3rds consent from the Senate.

3. What did the laws of Georgia do to the relationship between the United States and the Cherokee people?

Answer: Georgia's laws violated harshly the interactions between the United States' Federal government and the Cherokee.

Friday, April 15th

History Unit: Jacksonian Democracy

Lesson 4: Quiz on Nullification Crisis, and Indian Removal Act

Unit Overview: Jacksonian Democracy

Objective: Be able to do this by the end of this lesson.

1. Complete a Quiz on the Tariff Debate and the Indian Removal Act

Introduction to Lesson 5:

There was a great deal of reading and analysis this week! Review those key notes and Answer keys, but do not flip to the quiz too early.

Plan of Attack:

- A. Review (8min)
 - a. Review the Answer Key! This is a great place to prepare for your quiz.
- B. Quiz: (22min. max)

*****Do not turn to page 29 until you are ready to begin the quiz. Please do not use your study packet to complete the quiz. By signing the academic integrity statement on page 2 of this packet, you are saying that you completed the quiz on your own and without use of your notes.*****

USH Quiz: Nullification Crisis and the Native Removal Act

Chart Part:

1. What is the vocabulary word for “to legally overturn a law”?	
2. What is the vocabulary word for “to place a tax on imports”?	
3. What is the vocabulary word for “goods or products bought and entering into a country”?	
4. What is the vocabulary word for “goods or products sold and leaving the country”?	
5. What does “Abomination” mean?	
6.	
7. Which region of the United States seems most hurt by the tariffs?	
8. Which region of the United States seems most benefited by the tariffs?	
9. The tariff caused regions to start arguing for and pursuing their own regional interests rather than national interests. What is a good vocabulary word for “rivalry based on the special interests of different regions”?	

Complete Sentence Response: Southerners called the tariffs passed during John Quincy Adams Presidency as a “Tariff of Abomination”. Why did they use this name for the tariffs?



Complete Sentence Response: What is a good title for this map? Why?

Historical Quotes: Who said what about the Nullification Crisis?

1. ____ : I am Vice President during the Nullification Crisis.
2. ____ : I am the Senator from Massachusetts who argues against Nullification.
3. ____ : I am the Senator from South Carolina who argues for Nullification.
4. ____ : I am President during the Nullification Crisis.
5. ____ : I wrote *South Carolina Exposition and Protest*.
6. ____ : Although I agree with State's rights, I argue that nullification is too close a stepping stone to revolution.
7. ____ : We have moved past the Articles of Confederation and nullification when we became a Union under the United States Constitution.
8. ____ : Amendment No. 10, in particular, implicitly argues that States do in fact have the right to nullify Federal law.
9. ____ : State Nullification of Federal Laws is a powerful check on our Federal government.
10. ____ : To say that States have the power to nullify federal laws is to contradict Article IV in the Constitution that states that the Constitution is the "supreme law of the land."

A. Andrew Jackson B. Daniel Webster C. John C. Calhoun D. Robert Hayne

Textual Analysis: You may have seen or not seen these pieces of text before. Good luck!

- A. "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress." - Article IV of U.S. Constitution.

1. Although New States may be admitted into the Union by Congress, can a new State be formed within the boundaries of a state?

2. What is required for a new state to be created in another state?

3. Why does Andrew Jackson use Article IV in his defense of an Indian Removal Act?

- B. "... The Cherokee Nation, then, is a distinct community occupying its own territory...in which the laws of Georgia can have no force, and which the citizens of Georgia have no right to enter but with the assent of the Cherokees themselves, or in conformity with treaties and with the acts of [the U.S. Federal Government] The whole intercourse between the United States and this Nation, is, by our Constitution and laws, vested in the Government of the United States. ...

- Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in the *Worcester vs. Georgia Case*

1. **Complete Sentence Response:** Which government has the constitutional authority to interact with the Cherokee Nation? What evidence is there to support your claim?

- C. "Sir, I have shown that [nullification] is a power indispensably necessary to the preservation of the constitutional rights of the States, and of the people. I now proceed to show that it is perfectly safe, and will practically have no effect but to keep the Federal Government within the limits of the constitution, and prevent those unwarrantable assumptions [or the dangerous grabbing] of power, which cannot fail to impair the rights of the States, and finally destroy the Union itself..."

1. **Complete Sentence Response:** Who would make this argument: Senator Daniel Webster or Senator Robert Hayne? What evidence is there to support your claim? Use blend-quotes or cite text.

- D. "The inherent right in the People to reform [or change] their government, I do not deny; and they have another right, and that is, to resist unconstitutional laws, without overturning the Government. It is no doctrine of mine, that unconstitutional laws bind the People. ... [However] the right of a State to annul [or nullify] a law of Congress, cannot be maintained, but on the ground of the unalienable right of man to resist oppression; that is to say, upon the ground of revolution."

1. **Complete Sentence Response:** Who would make this argument: Senator Daniel Webster or Senator Robert Hayne? What evidence is there to support your claim? Use blend-quotes or cite text.
