

On the first count of Indian removal, I thought Jackson should have been impeached due to his role in what the impeachment arguments emphasized as ethnic cleansing. The arguments did good to provide a moral reasoning against Jackson, as well as showcased his false promises of being free from Western expansion in their new territory as being treacherous towards the natives. They did good to make Jackson appear as the “bad guy”, arguing that he threatened the Native population. Through their arguments, he was portrayed as an undemocratic leader; Jackson ignored the supreme court ruling, *Worcester v. Georgia* to remove the Cherokee, as well as described multiple illegitimate treaties between the Jackson Administration and the natives to force them out. The Indians were emphasized as victims very well in their argument.

On the other hand, the defense placed too much emphasis on an argument, that Jackson was not accountable for the actions of his officials and military. I felt this approach had some underlying problems, such as it now seemed to me that Jackson was not only an Indian killer as argued by the Impeachers, but also unable to have control of his own military and branch of government. This argument made me further question Jackson's ability to have been commander in chief. While the defense made some good points regarding Jackson trying to protect natives and their sovereignty, the impeachment argument of natives later being kicked out of the Indian Territory, despite Jackson's promises, took away much validity of the argument.

On the count of the Bank of the United States, I thought Jackson should not have been impeached. The defense did well to correlate Jackson's actions to protecting state's rights, and advocating for state equality and the needs of the people. Their argument showcased Jackson's vision of being for the common people, especially in this case against the privileged class of America. Jackson was portrayed very well, and their arguments safeguarded his character in relation to this count. They emphasized Jackson as a man of the people and used their arguments to show it.

For me the impeachment argument did not do enough to tarnish Jackson. While the defense put heavy emphasis on making Jackson and his reasoning appear well-intended in their arguments, the impeachment argument felt more informative about Jackson's decision regarding the bank of the United States, rather than argumentative against Jackson. That being said, the impeachers had some good arguments against Jackson, including Jackson's favoritism towards states through his pet banks, and his personal rivalry with Henry Clay getting in the way of his decision-making. In the end though, the arguments were not striking enough for me to vote against Jackson on this count.

On the count of Maysville, I voted to impeach Jackson. The impeachers did very well to establish a strong connection between Jackson's rivalry with Henry Clay and his decision regarding Maysville. They supported this argument using Jackson's undermining of the legislative branch, as well as countered Jackson's reasoning for vetoing, using their explanation of the Federal government's role in internal improvements, to unify the entire country. Also describing the reasoning for Jackson's animosity towards Clay, through the alleged “corrupt bargain”, the impeachers did well to support their argument.

The defense placed heavy emphasis on supporting Jackson's reasoning. They argued that Jackson was supporting the principle of checks and balances in his veto, and that his decision was in line with his strict constructionist views. The defense displayed Jackson as an advocate for state's equality and autonomy, as well as supporting Jackson's view that the

spending was too wasteful. However, the defense, in my opinion, was not able to effectively counter this impeachment argument, relating to Jackson's hate for Clay. The reasonableness of the defenses' argument led me to vote against Jackson on this count.

On the count of the Nullification Crisis, I voted in favor of Jackson. The impeachers argued that the Nullification Crisis was contradictory to the other argument's emphasis on Jackson being a man of the people. Not only that, but it was also different from his previous anti-federal government stances seen in the previous counts. Supported by the compact theory, a key part of their argument was that Jackson enabling military force against South Carolina, through the force act, was unconstitutional.

However, The defense effectively countered that point. They claimed Jackson was within the scope of the constitution during this crisis, and their evidence and interpretation, derived from the constitution, overwhelmed the impeachment's unconstitutional argument. The defense argued that Jackson was instead upholding the constitution during this matter, and successfully compared Jackson's declaration of military force to Washington and the Whiskey rebellion, setting precedent for the way Jackson handled the situation. With the precedent they established, they showed Jackson's actions during this crisis, as a one that a President would do, and had been done. They also countered the impeachment's other points, including that the compact theory was not in the constitution, as well as being too open for interpretation.

Overall, the arguments against Jackson, particularly those of Indian removal and Maysville, prompt me to vote against Jackson and in favor of his impeachment.