

FOREWORD

WRITING TO William Jarvis, the U.S. consul in Lisbon, in July, Jefferson expressed a hope that Portugal would be able to maintain its neutrality through the great maelstrom of the current war in Europe. Going on to address the position of his own nation in such a chaotic world, Jefferson wrote: "it is a great felicity to us, and it secures all our other felicities, that so wide an ocean is spread between us & the lions & tygers of Europe, as enables us to go forward in the path of justice and independance fearing nothing but our creator." This was a vivid expression of a view of American exceptionalism that was not exclusive to Jefferson, but often found voice in him. Geography helped ensure neutrality, separating the country from Europe. By not being adjacent to the warring powers of Europe, the United States would not as a matter of course be pulled into military coalitions and alliances.

Not long after he wrote to Jarvis, Jefferson considered using the contentions between "the lions & tygers of Europe" to the advantage of the United States. At issue were relations with Spain. There was no progress toward resolution of two major subjects of disagreement between the two nations: boundaries and indemnification of spoliations. The latter question involved compensation for merchant ships and cargoes seized by privateers claiming Spanish authority and condemned by prize courts despite the status of the United States as a neutral nation. The two countries had negotiated a convention to settle the claims, but the Spanish government refused to ratify the agreement. On the matter of boundaries, the line between Louisiana and Texas was unmarked on the ground. East of the Mississippi, the positions of the United States and Spain regarding the border between Louisiana and West Florida differed substantially.

In August, during the summer period when Jefferson was at Monticello, he conceived a plan by which the United States might barter its neutrality, in some limited way, to get what was needed from Spain. The key would be an agreement with Great Britain for a prospective alliance: "the treaty should be provisional only," Jefferson tried to explain to Madison by letter, "to come into force on the event of our being engaged in war with either France or Spain, during the present war in Europe. in that event we should make common cause, & England should stipulate not to make peace without our obtaining the objects for which we go to war" (27 Aug.). Madison argued in return that the British would enter into no agreement that did not

FOREWORD

oblige the United States to participate in the war for a period dictated by British, not American, goals. There was, he contended, no reason to promise an alliance until circumstances required it. Gallatin, who was in New York City, prepared a long memorandum in which he advocated that the spoliation claims and boundary questions were insufficient cause for war with Spain, which would come at a high economic cost. He contended that British transgressions were the more acute problem: “it may be questioned whether both as a real injury & as a point affecting the national dignity, the annual blockade of our ports & the perpetual impressment of our seamen be not more essential wrongs than any we have suffered from Spain” (see the enclosure to Gallatin’s second letter of 12 Sep.).

Jefferson kept Spanish relations as his focus when he returned to Washington in October and with time was finally able to gather the heads of executive departments to discuss matters in person. He stopped advocating a prospective alliance with Britain and took another tack. As long as the war continued in Europe—the “lions & tygers” fighting among themselves—it was to France’s advantage to take the leading role in negotiations involving Spain. It would be particularly in France’s interest if the most efficient way to resolve the Louisiana-Florida boundary was by the sale of East and West Florida to the United States, with payment going to France, rather than Spain. In November, the president and cabinet decided that the United States would offer up to \$5 million for the Floridas. They received word from John Armstrong, the U.S. minister in Paris, that the French were interested in reaching such an agreement, although with a starting price of \$7 million. They also received reports that patrols from the Spanish garrison at Nacogdoches on the Texas side of the line had seized goods and horses of traders from Natchitoches, a trading town and U.S. military post on the Red River roughly a hundred miles to the east of Nacogdoches. The intelligence said also that the Spanish at San Antonio were transferring two companies of soldiers to the border region. The Jefferson administration, which had been trying without success to get Spain to agree to “the military status quo in the Controverted districts” until formal agreement on the boundaries could be reached (see Madison’s letter of 2 Aug.), viewed those actions with concern. Following a meeting of the cabinet on 19 Nov., Jefferson sketched out orders for the officer at Natchitoches, instructing him to send out patrols to intercept any “armed men not under the authority of the U.S.” found east of the Sabine River. The draft orders emphasized “that aggressors are to be *arrested* if possible, & the spilling of blood be avoided,” and as an afterthought Jefferson

FOREWORD

inserted an instruction to first “propose to Commdt. Nacogdoches to restrain aggressions.” Jefferson also drafted a projet of a treaty that would cover the sale of the Floridas to the United States, declare which rivers would form the boundary west of the Mississippi, and require Spain to complete settlement of the spoliation claims.

That autumn he also invested time in preparing two draft bills related to national defense. One proposed act would classify militia-eligible men aged 18 to 45 into categories by age with an expectation that when the militia was called up, the greatest burden of service would fall on what Jefferson called the “Junior” class, those aged 21 through 25. The other bill sought to organize deep-sea and coastal mariners, all of whom were exempt from militia service under existing law, into a naval militia. Both draft bills, along with documents relating to their creation, are in this volume at 14 Nov. (see also Dearborn to TJ, 22 Oct.; Estimates of Men Eligible for Militia, at 22 Oct.; TJ to Dearborn, 23 Oct.; and Naval and Land Militia Enrollment Estimates, at 3 Nov.).

Connected to relations with Spain in the trans-Mississippi region was Jefferson’s policy toward Native Americans. Writing as governor of Louisiana Territory on 6 Nov., General James Wilkinson referred to the “great Objects” of Jefferson’s program, which included a prohibition of settlement by non-native people in the zone between the established communities of the St. Louis region and those of Orleans Territory to enable what Wilkinson characterized as “the transfer of the Southern Indians to this Territory.” In November, Jefferson made a tally that showed the United States had obtained cessions of more than nine million acres from nations east of the Mississippi just in the period from July to November (see Expenditures for Land Cessions, at 19 Nov.). He calculated that in one case the annuity payments in exchange for the land worked out to about a penny per acre. Early in November, he and Secretary of War Henry Dearborn found themselves wrangling with a visiting delegation of Creeks, led by William McIntosh and Alexander Cornells, who were determined to hold out for a higher price for their lands between the Oconee and Ocmulgee Rivers than the U.S. government was offering.

A simpler matter of foreign policy than that presented by Spain was, at least for a time, the war with Tripoli. In September at Monticello, Jefferson received the news that William Eaton and the pasha’s disaffected brother, Ahmad Qaramanli, had led a successful campaign against the port of Derna and that Tobias Lear, as general consul to the North African states, had with a show of U.S. naval strength persuaded Pasha Yusuf Qaramanli to agree to a treaty. Margaret Lowther

FOREWORD

Page, wife of the governor of Virginia, was visiting at Monticello with her husband when the news arrived. She was moved to compose a poem addressed to Jefferson “On hearing of the Victory which produced the Peace with Tripoli.” Its final stanza reads:

Splendid shalt Thou superior rise,
No envious Mist thy Glory shade;
A grateful World thy Virtues prize,
’Till Time and Memory shall fade!

There were complications to come regarding the terms of the peace, but for a while the country could bask in the decisive resolution of the conflict.

Other information from afar had come in August, when a shipment of specimens sent in April by William Clark and Meriwether Lewis from the winter encampment they had named Fort Mandan arrived in Washington. The lot, consisting of a barrel, four boxes, and cages holding a live magpie and prairie dog, had been transported down the Missouri River to St. Louis, then down the Mississippi to New Orleans, then by sea to Baltimore, then by road to the capital. Members of the President’s House staff, supervised by the steward, Étienne Lemaire, who was himself under guidance from the secretary of war, unpacked the containers that contained animal skins, bones, and horns. They beat the skins they found infested with insects, then aired them in the sun for several days, rolled them with tobacco leaves as a repellent, and repacked them in cloth sacks. The shipment also included mineral and plant specimens to be studied by experts under the auspices of the American Philosophical Society at Lewis’s suggestion, and in the fall Jefferson passed some zoological specimens along to Charles Willson Peale for his museum. Lemaire stowed most of the specimens in the attic of the executive mansion, but he appropriately set up the prairie dog and magpie, which he reported were doing well—“*Se porte tres bien*”—in the downstairs room in which the president received visitors.

In a matter that braided together politics and his personal life, Jefferson received a reply, dated 30 July, from Levi Lincoln in Massachusetts to a letter that Jefferson wrote in June but has not been found. The subject was an accusation, one of an array of charges recently rehashed by Jefferson’s opponents, that, as he expressed it, “when young & single I offered love to a handsome lady” (to Robert Smith, 1 July, in the previous volume). Lincoln may have echoed language in Jefferson’s missing letter, and certainly rang notes favorable to Jefferson, when he wrote that even the president’s enemies must think of the incident as “a thoughtless indiscretion which a

FOREWORD

young Virginian had been betrayed into from the hay day of blood by the free & inviting countenance of beauty, forty years since.” This interpretation sidestepped the difficulty that even though Jefferson was single at the time of the incident, the object of his attention, Elizabeth Moore Walker, was not, she being in fact the wife of one of his good friends. The interpretation embraced by Lincoln and other Jefferson allies also, in that male-dominated political world, blamed the incident on Elizabeth Walker’s beauty, as if even the coolly rational Jefferson could not have resisted. Lincoln affirmed the message that Jefferson no doubt wanted the world to embrace, that “however to be regreted and blamable the indiscretion, which none can be more candidly disposed to censure than yourself; it is considered by your friends & acknowledged by your political enemies, at least, by those whose sentiments have weight in society, to be cruel & savage to urge the common foibles of Juvenile inexperience, against the chastised habits of acting & thinking, long fixed, by the reflections of wisdom & mature age.”

This volume is similar to the full body of Jefferson’s papers, in that it provides but limited information about the many workers bound in slavery who provided most of the labor needed to support him. Hints of some of the varied tasks they performed are found in a letter from Bowling Clark (4 Aug.), who mentioned that communications from Jefferson had been conveyed some distance across Virginia by Hercules, a member of the enslaved workforce raising tobacco at Poplar Forest, and in a letter from Jefferson to his new Monticello overseer, John Hoomes Freeman (14 Nov.), that referred to women charged as nursemaids with caring for enslaved mothers’ young children. Transactions for Jefferson’s purchase of workers made in the period covered by this volume appear primarily in his financial memoranda, not in correspondence or other documents printed here. From Gabriel Lilly, his departing overseer, he agreed to buy Lucretia Hern, her two sons, and the yet-unborn child she was carrying. They were the family of James Hern, one of the Monticello workforce. From Thomas Eston Randolph he agreed to purchase a man named Martin. One arrangement for purchase of enslaved laborers does find its way into the documents printed in this volume. Because he had to pay the \$800 price over time in two notes, a transaction in the spring of 1805 for Jefferson’s purchase of two men, named Isaac and Charles, from their owner in Alexandria appears in one of his financial tallies (Notes on Personal Finance, [May-September 1805]; MB, 2:1153, 1155, 1157, 1162).

This volume does contain substantive information about two attempts, one of them successful, to escape the hold of enslavement at

FOREWORD

Monticello. In July, James Oldham, a Richmond artisan who supplied Jefferson with joinery work such as window sashes, wrote to say that Jamey Hemings was in the city and had agreed to stay with Oldham until they heard from Jefferson. This James Hemings, about 18 years old, was the nephew of the better-known person of that name, who was a brother of Sally Heming and had learned the arts of French cookery in Paris in the 1780s. This younger James had been a worker in the smithing shops and nailery at Monticello—a brutal place to work—in 1804, when Oldham, who was doing joinery at Monticello at the time, took care of the young man during a three-day bout with illness and tried in vain to protect him from whippings by Lilly, who was sure Hemings was shirking (see Oldham to Jefferson, 26 Nov. 1804, in Vol. 45). Following Lilly’s “Barbarity,” Hemings disappeared from Monticello, not to be heard from again until Oldham learned that he was in Richmond and had worked during the fall as a sailor on boats on the circuit between Richmond and Norfolk and in the spring as a hand on boats farther up the James River. In response to the news from Oldham, Jefferson wrote that “I can readily excuse the follies of a boy and therefore his return shall ensure him an entire pardon” (to Oldham, 20 July). He stated that during his own absences from Monticello, Hemings would be put to work as a house-joiner rather than in the nailery. But the prospect of returning to the regimens of forced labor at Monticello was apparently too much for Hemings, for on the day that Jefferson wrote that letter, the young man left Oldham’s residence and by the next day had found a place on a boat passing through the locks at Richmond. Jefferson let him go. Hemings’s mother, Critta Hemings Bowles, wrote to Jefferson on 16 Nov. from Monticello, but that letter has not been found and its subject is unknown.

In September, Daniel Bradley, a jailer in Fairfax County, placed in confinement James Hubbard, another fugitive from the blacksmithing and nail-making shops at Monticello, who was carrying forged papers intended to let him pass as a free man. This incident illuminates the systems in place in Virginia to support slaveholders. Bradley challenged the authenticity of Hubbard’s papers, which he had obtained from Lilly’s son not long before the Lillys’ departure for Kentucky. The jailer informed Jefferson that he found Hubbard “in possession of the within Papers endeavouring to Pass as a freeman which Convinced me that he was Runaway,” which suggests that Hubbard’s mere possession of papers purporting to show that he was a free Black man was itself enough to arouse Bradley’s suspicion. Bradley brought the young man before a justice of the peace and obtained an order for his

FOREWORD

confinement in jail. Bradley was a little on edge about holding Hubbard, who was in his early twenties, about six feet tall, and by Jefferson's description "very stout," as might be expected of someone whose daily work required constant swinging of a heavy smith's hammer against an anvil. There were incentives to accept the risk. Jefferson paid Bradley \$35 for his fees and another \$20 to a man who had also informed Jefferson of Hubbard's capture and agreed to bring him back to Monticello (Bradley to Jefferson, 7 Sep., 6 Oct.; Jefferson to Bradley, 6 Oct.; MB, 2:1173).

It is likely that while Jefferson was at Monticello in the summer and early fall he wrote and sketched out an ambitious general plan for landscaping the property (see Plan for the Grounds at Monticello, at the end of September). In this plan he anticipated the leveling and formal laying out of the grand kitchen garden that he called the "Olitory," which would be the subject of another set of detailed notes that he would begin in the spring of 1806. In this 1805 plan, he gave most of his attention to the aesthetics of what he called the "pleasure grounds." He created a descriptive overall landscape design program, rather than a detailed plat. He gave thought to the use of walkways and sight lines as primary elements, punctuated by groves of trees and "clumps of thickets." He noted the varieties of trees and shrubs that could serve well, and anticipated architectural features that would include a Tuscan temple, "Demosthenes's lantern," and Gothic and Chinese elements. Also in the summer of 1805, Jefferson made a visit to his Poplar Forest property in Bedford County as he moved forward with plans for members of his family to locate there and for it to be a place of retreat for himself.

This edition and historical scholarship suffered a deep blow with the sudden passing away of Herbert Sloan while this volume was in press. On its publication in 1995, Herb's *Principle and Interest: Thomas Jefferson and the Problem of Debt* made a definitive contribution to Jefferson studies. His originality of mind and ever-skeptical take on Jefferson will be sorely missed by his colleagues in the profession, students, and friends.

