

Great Job!

Andrew Jackson was not always on the twenty dollar bill. His face did not appear there until 1928. Since then, there has been controversy over whether or not Jackson is an appropriate character to display on the twenty dollar bill. Some believe that Jackson was placed on the bill as a historical irony. I think that Jackson should not be on the twenty dollar bill unless this belief is true. One characteristic of Andrew Jackson, his relationship with the national bank and paper currency, supports this opinion.

Jackson hated the Bank of the United States. During his presidency, one of his major goals was to “kill the bank.” He distrusted the federal bank, and made it his priority to destroy it. The charter for the Bank of the United States was going to run out in 1836. However, Jackson could not let it die a “natural” death. Instead, he carried out certain actions which caused the bank to fail, such as removing federal revenue from the national bank and placing it into several smaller state banks known as “pet banks.” This led to the demise of the Bank of the United States. Jackson also did not trust paper money. This was illustrated by the issue of Jackson’s Specie Circular in 1836, which required that all public lands be purchased with only hard currency, or specie.

Jackson’s actions and beliefs exemplify that the only reason he should be on a piece of paper currency is out of irony. He believed that the bank would end him, so he struck out against it. He disliked the use of soft, or paper, currency, and yet his face decorates the front of a paper bill that represents the bank that he wanted so desperately to destroy. Although it might be understandable for Jackson’s image to appear on a piece

of hard currency, such as a coin, it is logical to state that Andrew Jackson does not belong on an American twenty dollar bill. However, if the intention of having him on the bill was intentional historical irony, then no face would be better suited to appear there.