

THE "REAL ESSENCE" OF ALL GOVERNMENTS IS ON THE TWENTY DOLLAR BILL

By Evan Gutman CPA, JD (2013)

The "Nominal" Essence of any thing, object or person is what it "purports" to be. The "Real" Essence is what it truly is. As an example, consider the trial court Judge who presents himself as an honest person who bravely upholds the law and renders fair judicial decisions. Then let us presume as typically occurs, this Judge in actuality subverts the written law by utilizing any one of the numerous available Judicial techniques of manipulation and deception delineated herein. Under this scenario, the Judge's Nominal Essence is that of a moral, upstanding Judicial official. However, his Real Essence is that of a deceptive, tricky, conniver. Thus, the Real Essence of any thing, object or person may be precisely opposite to its Nominal Essence. It also may be the same or only slightly different from its Nominal Essence.

With these principles in mind, I now turn to the Real Essence of all governments, since history began thousands of years ago. It is my proposition that the Real Essence of governments may be found on the U.S. Twenty Dollar Bill (hereinafter, the "Bill"). The Bill portrays the picture of former U.S. President Andrew Jackson. He served two full terms as President winning the 1828 and 1832 elections.

The Nominal Essence of a President who has their picture on currency is perceived by the average citizen to be for the purpose of honoring their Presidency. The average citizen is given the impression that the former President faithfully served his country, promoted the principles and values of his country, and was a devoted servant of his nation. However, notably the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing as described on the website www.moneyfactory.gov neither confirms nor denies this common perception. Instead, it simply states in reference to people who have their picture on currency as follows (emphasis added):

"Treasury Department records do not reveal the reason that portraits of these particular statesman were chosen in preference to those of other persons of equal **importance and prominence**." ²⁷⁹

Jackson was undoubtedly "important" and "prominent." However, Importance and Prominence are not necessarily terms of positive moral character connotation. A classic example is Adolf Hitler. He was definitely

"important" and "prominent", but one would be hard-pressed to find a rational person who would consider him in a positive light. Quite to the contrary, he exemplified the most negative moral character traits imaginable.

Thus, all we can conclude from the statement regarding Treasury Department records is that a former President whose portrait is on currency is that they were Important and Prominent. The question of the positive or negative nature of their moral character traits is left wholly open.

In my view, the most authoritative biography about Andrew Jackson was written by Robert Remini.²⁸⁰ Remini portrays both the positive and negative moral character aspects of Jackson's life, career and presidency. On the positive side, Jackson did bring government to the public, removed a great deal of its elitism, and played a major role in transforming a "Republic" into a "Democratic Republic." However, on the negative side, he was cruel, vain, ruthless and lacked respect for the authority of the other two branches of government. He was largely responsible for the vicious treatment of Indians and what came to be known as the "Trail of Tears." He ignored opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court. He took it upon himself to interpret, as well as administer the law. He was probably as close to a Dictator as we've ever had in this nation, although many contend Franklin Delano Roosevelt was also a Dictator. Jackson regularly conducted himself as above the law.

Both before and after becoming President, Jackson hated the U.S. Bank. As President, one of his primary goals was to destroy it and he succeeded in doing so. He drew his power from the public and viewed the Bank as the instrument through which elitists were exploiting the general public. The Bank had a controversial past since its inception. The legal legitimacy of its predecessor institution was debated ferociously between Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. As a result of the ongoing conflict about the legal legitimacy of a national Bank, it had gone in and out of existence a number of times during the first 60 years of our history. When Jackson became President, the Bank was back in existence.

A large part of the disputes regarding the U.S. Bank focused on the use of "hard money" versus "soft money." Hard money was known as "Specie." It consisted of gold or silver. Thus, using hard money meant that if you wanted to buy a product you would actually hand over gold or silver. In contrast, soft money allowed for the use of paper money or promissory notes, as we commonly use today.

Jackson was a staunch "hard money" man. It was his belief that the Bank's main tool for exploiting the working class was its use of soft money. Thus, the "Real Essence" of Jackson was to eliminate soft money and have trade

effectuated primarily by Specie (i.e. hard money). That was the crux of his economic policy.

After a controversial Presidency and life, Jackson died on June 8, 1845. In 1928, the Federal Reserve, which was essentially the new U.S. Bank, put his portrait on the twenty-dollar bill. And that is what the "Real Essence" of government is all about.

Jackson's portrait isn't on the Bill as an honor. It's on the Bill for the purpose of disgracing everything he believed in. I am the first to wholeheartedly agree he was an absolute vicious tyrant. This is particularly the case as regards the cruel treatment the American Indians endured. But, the bottom line is that Jackson is not on the Bill for the purpose of honoring him. He's on the Bill because the new version of the old U.S. Bank which he had destroyed, wanted to give him what's known as a "zinger" so to speak.

They put him on the Bill because they knew there is absolutely nothing he would detest more. Jackson himself would positively be the first one to passionately object to putting his portrait on the Bill (i.e. soft money). This is because he didn't want paper money to even exist for the most part. He strongly believed in the use of Specie (hard money gold or silver). He was against the Bank and against soft money (paper money).

Every now and then on the internet I come across a website that points out quite correctly, how ruthless Jackson was. Such websites then point out that since he was so ruthless and cruel, he shouldn't be honored by having his portrait on the Bill. But, these websites are interpreting it all incorrectly. The U.S. government didn't put Jackson's portrait on the Bill to honor him. They did it to disgrace everything he believed in.

Now, here's the major problem with the U.S. government's theory. The average citizen is unaware of the "Real Essence" related to Jackson's portrait being on the Bill. They don't know it was for the purpose of disgracing everything he believed in. Instead, the average citizen knows only the "Nominal Essence." They only know that the portrait of a former President on currency conveys a recognition of importance and prominence. As indicated previously, prominence and importance are not necessarily connotations of positive moral character. They can be indications of negative moral character traits as well. Nevertheless, there is a tendency for people to view importance and prominence in a positive light, since that is the most common usage of the terms.

Most citizens are not well-versed in American history. At best, the average citizen only knows that Jackson was a former President at some point in time during the 19th century. Many citizens don't know even that much. They haven't read Robert Remini's biographies of him. They probably have never heard of the "Trail of Tears," although they may remember that at some point in

grammar school, they heard something about Indians not being treated fairly.

The impact of this disparity is that the average citizen pulls out the Bill to pay for a product, sees Jackson's picture on it, and instinctively assumes he must have been an all around good guy. At the next level, you have people who are aware of the negative aspects regarding Jackson's moral character, and they are outraged by the fact that he is "honored" with his portrait on the Bill.

But, the "Real Essence" is that the government put Jackson's picture on the twenty dollar Bill for the purpose of disgracing his beliefs, even though it was concurrently aware most people would consider only the Nominal Essence that such is generally an honor. This gives rise to the following conclusion. The government advanced its own agenda of disgracing the beliefs of a person it disagreed with (i.e. Jackson) even though the government was fully aware that by doing so it would have to intentionally trick the general public into a false set of beliefs. Thus, the government's duty to be truthful to its own citizens took a backseat to the government's own political agenda.

And that is the "Real Essence" of all governments since time began.