"Guilty of a Skin not Coloured like Our Own": Timothy Pickering on Slavery and Race, and the Complicated Legacy of New England High Federalism

Introduction

On February 24 1806, President Thomas Jefferson received a surprising letter, five pages long. The House of Representatives was about to vote on the "Santo Domingo Bill," which banned American trade with the newly founded Haitian Republic, formerly the French colony of Saint-Domingue. The Haitian rebels had declared their independence in 1804, after thirteen years of a bloody revolt. The bill had passed in the Senate in a vote by strictly partisan lines. The writer, "impelled by the dangers of a measure of great *national concern*," urged Jefferson not to let the bill pass and warned him that he would "be held responsible…for all its consequences."[1]

The writer was Senator Timothy Pickering of Massachusetts, the former secretary of state who had played a vital role in the success of the Haitian Revolution. The letter began with a two-page critique of the ban's moral implications. Pickering reminded Jefferson of his pronounced sympathy for the French Revolutionaries. While the current leader of Haiti, Jean Jacque Dessalines, was "pronounced by some to be a ferocious tyrant," the French Reign of Terror, Pickering argued, had equaled Dessalines' atrocities in nature and far surpassed it in extent. If Jefferson legitimized the atrocities of the Reign of Terror because of the nature of the Old Regime, such a justification would surely apply to "the hapless, the wretched Haitians." Were the Haitians guilty of something? Pickering sardonically answered that they were "'guilty,' indeed, 'of a skin not colored like our own'." He reminded Jefferson that they were "*emancipated*, and by a great national act declared free," and managed to remain free "in arms-resolved to *live free or die*." After admonishing the president for his moral reasoning for two

pages, Pickering went on to warn him of the bill's repercussions on foreign policy issues for three more pages. "Nobody is acquainted with the matter," he concluded. "I am the depository of my own secret." The letter apparently had no impact on Jefferson's actions: there is no evidence that he responded or ever spoke to Pickering about it. The bill passed in the House of Representatives by a strict partisan vote.[2]

****

Sixty one years-old Timothy Pickering was an old foe of the Sage of Monticello. After serving as an officer in the Continental Army during the American Revolution and Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the first Washington administration, he served as secretary of war and secretary of state under George Washington and John Adams. Although Pickering was initially a relatively anonymous administrator, the partisan divide between the Federalist and Democrat-Republican Parties made him a well-known figure and an exemplary High Federalist: a supporter of Alexander Hamilton, opponent of the French Revolution and an opponent of social equality in general. As Federalists enacted the Alien and Sedition Acts and suppressed the media critical of the administration, Pickering emerged as one of the suppression's strongest public supporters. He became a main target for Republican hatred, and his effigy was often burned.[3]

After Jefferson's election in 1800, Pickering was his most vocal opponent. His criticism was mainly concerned with Jefferson's egalitarian rhetoric and policies. "I am disgusted with the men who now rule," Pickering wrote to Rufus King. For him, Jefferson was the leader of the "aristocratic democrats from the South," possibly the biggest insult Pickering had in his vocabulary. Pickering led fellow New England Federalists' secret plan to sever the Union and

establish a Northern Confederacy; the plan never materialized. He remained a fierce opponent of Jefferson's and Madison's policies, including the Louisiana Purchase, the embargo on British trade, and the War of 1812. At the Hartford Convention, Pickering was one of the leading voices for a stronger protest against the War, including the explicit threat of disunion. All of these positions went against historical currents and marginalized Pickering and fellow New England Federalists even more. [4]

As Linda Kerber has noted, historians usually consider the New England Federalists who opposed Jefferson vigorously, such as Pickering, as "a pack of quarreling, ill-tempered curmudgeons, the poorest losers in American history." In his last decade Pickering challenged Jefferson's authorship of the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson never forgave Pickering; his attacks forced the Sage of Monticello to write his memoirs in defense of his historical reputation.[5] He believed Pickering was motivated by his opposition to democratic implementations of the American Revolution: "Timothy thinks the instrument [the Declaration of Independence] the better for having a fourth of it expunged," he wrote to Madison in 1823, adding, "the only [part of the Declaration of which Pickering] approves [is the expression of] friendship to his dear England, whenever she is willing to be at peace with us." Jefferson concluded, "In opposition…to Mr. Pickering, I pray God that [the Declaration's] principles may be eternal." To John Adams he wrote, "The Pickerings are the enemies of reform," making Pickering the symbol of High Federalists.[6]

In the antebellum era, white Americans overwhelmingly embraced Jefferson's legacy, each appropriating the parts that suited its goal. Meanwhile, Pickering nearly vanished from memory after his death in 1829. Henry Adams' publication of Pickering's disunionist plots in 1877 brought him to public memory as an early villain. In his memoirs, published in 1881,

Jefferson Davis approvingly mentioned Pickering as "one of the leading secessionists of his day." In a country still experiencing the aftershock of disunion, these developments seemed to seal Pickering's fate.[7] Historians subsequently continued to present Pickering as an "arch-Federalist" and a "disunionist leader" who was loyal to England and opposed to republicanism. This was especially apparent during the celebration of Jefferson's legacy in the Consensus History of the mid-twentieth century: one historian noted that Pickering "had no more place in the nineteenth century than the dinosaur or the mammoth." In 1980, Pickering's most recent biographer Gerard Clarfield approvingly characterized him as "one of the principal villains of early American history."[8]

These depictions, however, fail to account for Pickering's support of certain kinds of reform. Specifically, it fails to address his views on the question of Haitian independence and his promotion of it as secretary of state. In both expressing humanitarian sympathy for the Haitians and explicitly alluding to Jefferson's racialist view, Pickering was quite advanced for his time: debates on the "Santo Domingo Bill" concerned issues of American trade relations and the policy of American neutrality in the European wars. Those who did express humanitarian concern for the Haitians did not imply that racial prejudice motivated Jefferson. Only later did black radicals such as David Walker begin to focus their criticism of Jefferson on his avowed racism. The celebration of the Haitian Revolution as an Atlantic revolution had to wait for well over a century. Only in the past several decades have some historians acknowledged that Jefferson's Haitian policy was motivated by his "Negrophobia," in Michael Zuckerman's phrasing. Others noted that the Haitian Revolution in general had a deep impact on white Americans' perception of slavery and race.[9]

This side of Pickering is only rarely reflected in the scholarship. No biography of Pickering has appeared since Clarfield's *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic* (1980). In the 1960s there was a brief revival of Federalism scholarship. Since Pickering is deemed an extreme example of loyalty to old Federalism and its anti-democratic doctrine, these treated him as a symbol of the generation that became irrelevant in Jeffersonian America. They focused on his opposition to democracy and his favorable treatment of New England localism. More recent studies of Federalist culture usually treat him only marginally if at all, since Pickering represents adherence to a partisan structure only inhabited by the social elite.[10] Usually, Pickering's admonitions against the "slave power," as well as those of other Federalists, are either considered disingenuous rhetoric masking sectional interests or unexamined.[11] A rare exception, Garry Wills' *"Negro President"* (2003) celebrates Pickering's opposition the "slave power." However, Pickering mainly serves as a "useful anti-Jefferson" for Wills. He does not attempt to explore Pickering's positions as a coherent world-view, and the reader might very well conclude that Pickering was an egalitarian hero. Two other recent books, by Richard Buel and Arthur Scherr, attack Pickering. Again, their stated goal is to contrast him with Jefferson, this time in order to praise the latter.[12]

The following essay attempts to move beyond Jefferson in studying Pickering's ideas.[13] It explores Pickering's views on race and slavery as part of a coherent world-view. It argues that while Pickering was, indeed, the enemy of "reform," it was specifically the *Jeffersonian* conception of reform that Pickering opposed. Pickering's version of reform can best be summarized as "benevolent paternalism": the belief that all men are equal under God and have certain inalienable rights. However, those who were not well-off and did not enjoy the blessings of education and introduction into "civilization," meaning Christianity, should be cultivated

gradually. For benevolent paternalists, a hasty transformation from a degraded state to full republican citizenship would endanger both them and their benefactors. This view pertained to white frontiersmen as well as to non-whites. Pickering's Dominguan policy as secretary of state, as well as his remark to Jefferson on the Haitians' skin color, suggest that in some instances Pickering's notion of reform was far more progressive than was Jefferson's. This world-view explains Pickering's opinions on slavery and his racial policies, as well as his ardent anti-Jacobin stance. Rather than abandoning the values of the American Revolution and returning to the bosom of the British Empire, Pickering's world-view presented an alternative implementation of the Revolution's values. The Federalist Party served as the means to achieve Pickering's end.[14]

The essay presents Pickering's world-view through a discussion of four stations in his life: his actions in the 1780s as an army officer and Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs, demonstrating his benevolent paternalist approach both to Indians and white frontiersmen; his reaction to the Haitian Revolution and his support of Dominguan independence as secretary of state, while attempting to maintain a cross-sectional Federalist coalition; his support of the colonization movement from 1808 to 1819; and his disillusionment from the colonization plan following the Missouri Compromise, followed his private written thoughts and public statements on slavery while a retired statesman until his death in 1829. The essay presents Pickering's reactions to the transformations of American society, all of which placed him in the losing side of the political spectrum. These developments included Jefferson's growing strength, making him the "American synecdoche," as Peter Onuf and Jan Lewis note; the growing sense of American nationalism following the War of 1812 and the Hartford Convention; the growth of a "racial consensus" and "the Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics," in the words of James Oakes and David Waldstreicher; and the shift to a Southern justification of

slavery as a "positive good." In addition to discussing Pickering's actions, the following essay demonstrates his adverse reaction to these developments. Finally, the essay suggests a possible continuity between Pickering's ideas and antebellum New England antislavery, specifically with regard to Pickering's benevolent paternalism and William Lloyd Garrison's racial approach.[15]

****

Born in 1745 in Salem, Massachusetts, Timothy Pickering belonged to the Bay State's Northeastern elite. One of "the most reluctant of revolutionaries," he only became a leading Whig after several years of supporting the Crown. Pickering's conservatism reflected that of other prominent members of the Essex County elite. Headed by Pickering's close friend Theophilus Parsons, they authored the "Essex Result," a conservative version of the 1778 Massachusetts State Constitution. In letters written to his brother John, a delegate to the 1778 Constitutional Convention, Pickering opposed William Gordon's radical suggestions to abolish property qualifications for suffrage and resemble the Pennsylvania State Constitution, the most democratic of the state constitutions.[16] He argued that Pennsylvanians "cannot command the force of the State," and for that purpose a more central constitution was required. Responding to Gordon's proposal to abolish property qualifications for suffrage, Pickering agreed that "liberty…is the capital good," but asserted that "the free enjoyment of property is essential to the happiness of a people."[17]

However, Pickering had far more progressive views on other issues. Like many members of the Northeastern elite he was an adherent of liberal Christianity and a member of the Unitarian Church; some historians have dubbed him a "deist." Like other Unitarian Federalists, Pickering supported the establishment of religion in the Massachusetts Constitution. In that sense, as in his support of property qualifications, he was indeed an "enemy of reform." However, he agreed

with Gordon "that all freemen of whatever color [should] be indulged the liberty of voting for representatives &c if not otherwise disqualified." Since the 1778 Constitution was not explicit on this issue, Pickering opined that this was its intention. Due to protests by Massachusetts citizens, the 1780 State Constitution was amended as to state clearly that no suffrage qualifications were based on race. Thus, Massachusetts became the first state to actively debate the issue of black enfranchisement, rather than simply continue with the state's colonial policy.[18]

Pickering abhorred the institution of slavery. His father, Timothy Pickering Sr., the Deacon of Salem's Third Congregational Church, actively worked to change the minds of fellow Salem residents on slavery. In 1755 he petitioned to tax blacks as persons rather than as property. He further queried in public about the "mind of the town" with regard to the slave trade. As Salem's Representative Pickering Sr. petitioned the Massachusetts General Court against the importation of slaves in 1755. Christopher Malone notes that this was the first such petition made on moral grounds.[19] To the ridicule of many, Pickering resembled his father in his moralizing attitude. This applied to slavery as well: in Douglas Egerton's phrasing, he "was a second generation abolitionist."[20]

In 1783, as Quartermaster General of the Army, Pickering drew up a plan for a proposed new state in the Ohio Territory. The plan proposed "The total exclusion of slavery from the state [is] to form an essential and irrevocable part of the Constitution," more than a year before Jefferson proposed to exclude slavery in the new states after 1800. In 1785 Massachusetts representative in Congress Rufus King proposed an immediate ban on slavery while securing slaveholders' interests by providing for the rendition of fugitives. Both proposals were ultimately abandoned. Some historians surmise that Pickering's proposal influenced the ban on slavery in the Northwest Ordinance.[21]

Pickering shared his anger with King and asserted that "after the admission of *slavery* it was right to say nothing of *Christianity*." He quoted the Declaration of Independence's assertion of "self-evident truths," and added that "a proposition for preventing a violation of these truths- in a country not yet unsettled, and from which such violation might easily have been excluded- did not obtain!" At no stage, however, did Pickering consider immediate emancipation as prudent. While asserting that "the admission [of slavery in the new territories] for a day or an hour should have been forbidden," he added that "to justify the continuance of slaves till they can gradually be emancipated, in states already overrun with them, may be pardonable, because unavoidable, without hazarding greater evils."[22]

Pickering engaged with Indians extensively in the early stages of his public career. After engaging with the battles between Indians and frontiersmen as an army officer, he later became Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington's cabinet. To a large degree, Pickering's attitude towards Indians reflected New Englanders' late eighteenth century racial images of Indians: in his early correspondence he referred to Indians as "savages" and "barbarians." Elsewhere he echoed the conventional assumption that Indians were hunters by nature. These assumptions reflected the growing racial constructions of Indians in New England and Pennsylvania.[23]

Nonetheless, Pickering's benevolent paternalism was stronger. Just as he had opposed racial suffrage qualifications in the Massachusetts Constitution, so he came to abhor white frontiersmen's encroachment of Indian rights. Just as in 1778 he had viewed Indians as "savages," in 1785 he wrote to Rufus King that "the emigrants to the frontier lands… are little less savages than the Indians." He later described frontiersmen who brutalized Six Nations Indians in stronger terms still. As Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Pickering continually

insisted that the "one great principle [that] ought to govern all public negotiations [was] *a rigid adherence to truth*- a principle that is essential in negotiation with *Indians*." He continually pressured Washington to attempt a genuine cultivation of Indians. In a 1794 letter Pickering defended the hiring of blacks and asserted, "If you admitted a Negro to be a *man* the difficulty would cease."[24]

In upholding these views, Pickering conformed to the views of many New Englanders. Since the beginning of English colonization of North America, New England's leading theologians were theoretically committed to a theological view of men as equal before God. While holding common assumptions about non-white slaves' mental inferiority, most also believed that the conditions of enslavement affected these differences. European religious thinkers often opposed the theories of Enlightenment thinkers such as Comte de Buffon, who divided mankind to different races.[25] Adhering to these theological assumptions, many New Englanders explicitly opposed Jefferson's racialist views on the innate inferiority of people of African descent in his *Notes on the State of Virginia*. As Nicholas Guyatt has noted, while historians have recently tended to infer from Jefferson's support of colonization "that colonization was a political extension of a well-developed racism," even other Virginians such as James Madison and St. George Tucker refrained from assuming racial hierarchies. New Englanders were more explicit in their criticism: in 1789 the *Massachusetts Magazine* specifically criticized Jefferson's racialist assumptions in the *Notes*.[26]

Jefferson's views on the innate potential of Indians were far more liberal; they resulted in his "philanthropic" view that supported the need to cultivate Indian "acculturation." Pickering emphatically shared Jefferson's view and attempted to implement it.[27] True to his world-view that integrated benevolent paternalism with opposition to radical transformations, he regarded

"most attempts at civilizing the Indians" as "preposterous": Indians needed to learn "the simple and essential labors of life," he argued, before they could truly understand the truth of Christianity. Thus, he supported Pennsylvania Quakers' attempts to introduce Indians to "the most necessary arts and manufacturers directly connected with it" as a first step in their eventual conversion. Some Indian leaders were aware of Pickering's favorable attitude, and in the 1820s the *Cherokees Phoenix*, a paper that included articles in both the Cherokee language and English and encourage assimilation, published Pickering's articles. Pickering was especially struck by the fact that he could understand the language of some Indian tribes because they were similar to western languages. To him, such phenomena cleared the path to some form of Indian assimilation.[28]

Although Jefferson and Pickering both believed in the need to "civilize" Indians, their different views on other matters ultimately separated them on this issue as well. As the partisan split in the 1790s created two separate political cultures, the Federalist "elitist" culture advocated a "gradualist" education to freedom for men of all races. This approach reflected Pickering's own views throughout his career: he supported gradual education to freedom for men of all races. In 1787 he argued that the Wyoming settlers were unwilling to accept Federal authority due "to the natural instability of the common people." Their "natural instability" reflected the state of anarchy in which they had lived. In 1803, during the debate on the Louisiana Purchase, Pickering argued that white Louisianans were "incapable of performing the duties or enjoying the blessings of a free government" since they were "too ignorant to elect suitable men." As Peter J. Kastor notes, Louisiana's representative later "singled out [Pickering] for special scorn" because of his stance.[29]

Conversely, the Jeffersonian culture celebrated the white frontiersmen' rights to immediate full civic equality. However, it gradually denied non-whites of any rights. John Taylor of Caroline, a leading Jeffersonian ideologue, charged that the Federalists' benevolent policy towards Indians denigrated the frontiersmen to the level of Indians; Pickering's reasoning confirmed Taylor's accusation. Thus, while theoretically maintaining his original beliefs and professing his intent to "civilize" the Indians, as President Jefferson enacted a policy of seizing Indian lands. Some historians argue that his policy paved the way for Andrew Jackson's policy of Indian Removal.[30]

The 1790s saw the creation of a partisan rift. In Pickering's reaction to the Reign of Terror and to Jefferson's rise, as well as his reaction to the radically egalitarian implementation of the French Revolution, his gradualist beliefs manifested themselves most strongly.

****

The 1790s left no discernable trace of the passionate antislavery rhetoric of Pickering's letters to King: while he joined the Pennsylvania Abolitionist Society, he made no further actions on the issue. Nonetheless, there were some corollaries between his political affiliations and opposition to slavery: as Paul Finkelman notes, the three men who fought the most for a ban on slavery in the Northwest Ordinance, Rufus King, Nathan Dane and Manasseh Cutler, all became "Federalists of the 'Old School.'" Furthermore, Pickering's closest political associate, Alexander Hamilton, vehemently opposed slavery. Indeed, many historians note the 1795 debate over the Jay Treaty as a turning point in the public debate and in Pickering's own vehemence toward the Jacobins and their American supporters, Jefferson and Madison. Historians tend to separate between the threat of the Jacobin democratic menace and opposition to slavery. However,

slavery was an important component of Hamilton's defense of the Treaty. As James Oakes has recently pointed out, Hamilton's argument was "the first major American defense of military emancipation under the laws of war."[31]

During these years, Pickering offered the only statements that seemingly tolerated slavery. In a letter to South Carolinian Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Pickering argued that a French invasion to the Spanish Territories would bring about "the danger of communicating the principles of unqualified and immature liberation of Negroes," because of the 1794 emancipation. He emphasized that the danger applied especially to South Carolina and to Georgia. Pickering added that "although the original enslaving of the blacks is deeply to be deplored, their hasty emancipation would produce greater evils than their continuance in a state which may be gradually ameliorated." The few historians who have explored this letter either interpret it as contradictory to his general anti-slavery positions or ignore its complexity altogether. Arthur Scherr asserts, on the basis of the letter, that "for Pickering opposition to slavery was primarily motivated by political expediency."[32]

Nonetheless, in Pickering's case "political expediency" was not divorced from moral values. In fact, Scherr ignores the cultural context of early American politics when he examines Hamilton and Pickering's opposition to the Jacobin menace as separate from their opposition to slavery. Hamilton and Pickering were alarmed at the growing appeal of Jefferson and Madison's new party in the South. To prevent it, Hamilton sought the support of prominent Southerners such as Pinckney. In a letter to Pickering Hamilton opined that "Pinckney has had too much French *learning* to consider him in conjunction with Jefferson or Madison as perfectly safe," and the need to remove Pinckney away from such influences appeared crucial. Pinckney, a slaveholder, conformed to the conventional Southern position in the early republic: he opposed

attempts to interfere with slavery while maintaining that slavery contradicted the republican principles of the Revolution to which he adhered. The need to enlist Pinckney explains Pickering's intention.[33]

In asserting that slavery was "to be deplored" on principle, Pickering spoke to a theme he shared with the South Carolinian, at least in rhetoric. Indeed, Pinckney would become the High Federalists' presidential candidate in 1800 and 1804. Nonetheless, the future proved that Pinckney and Pickering were world apart: in the debates on the Missouri question Pinckney argued on behalf of the admission of Missouri as a slave state. As a signer of the Constitution, he argued, he knew that the Southern interpretation was correct. After the Missouri Compromise, Jefferson wrote Pinckney that the Missouri question was "a mere party trick" caused by the "leaders of federalism" who "are taking advantage of the virtuous feelings of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line." Pinckney seemed to agree. Indeed, by the 1820s Pinckney used the language of amelioration to explicitly support the continuation of slavery. Pinckney supported religious education for the slaves, just like Pickering; however, he did so to support slavery's continuation. As Pickering's reaction to the Missouri Compromise would indicate, his belief in a cross-sectional moral consensus on the evil of slavery aided him to maintain it.[34]

Pickering's cautious rhetoric and political maneuvering enabled him to aid another area in the American Hemisphere where issues of slavery, freedom and race relations were being negotiated: the French colony of Saint-Domingue, which would become the Haitian Republic. The story of the Haitian Revolution has attracted increased attention in recent years from historians of the early republic. The reactions to the revolt demonstrate that white Americans understood its implications: by the mid-1790s contemporaries considered the revolt's leader,

former slave Toussaint Louverture, as the first Caribbean ruler of African descent. Since American leaders had long before considered the West Indies a crucial area for American commercial interests, the administrations of the 1790s took an active interest in the developments in Saint-Domingue. With the encouragement of Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson, the Washington administration actively supported the white planters on the island.[35]

However, in 1798 Louverture approached the British and American administrations and offered to cooperate with them in matters of trade. After making the initial contact, Louverture sent his envoy Joseph Bunel to meet Pickering in Philadelphia. Louverture proposed to ensure the safety of American merchants in Saint-Domingue in exchange for American commercial support. At Pickering's instigation, Adams agreed to initiate the American-Dominguan relations. Shortly thereafter, Adams appointed Dr. Edward Stevens as Counsel General to Saint-Domingue. Stevens served in a semi-official diplomatic capacity, thus bringing the new American republic closer to recognition of a government led by a man of African descent. After Adams agreed, the Federalists proposed the "Intercourse Act," officially allowing the United States to negotiate with rebellious French colonies. The House of Representatives was divided on partisan lines. This was especially surprising with regard to the Federalists: as Jefferson exclaimed to Madison, "Even South Carolinians in the H. of R. voted for it."[36]

Although Adams approved the relations as president, Pickering was their most dominant supporter within the administration.[37] The "Intercourse Act" was promoted by Harrison Grey Otis and Robert Goodloe Harper, two of Pickering's closest political allies within the Federalist Party. Otis and Harper had joined Pickering's meeting with Bunel as well. While Hamilton was the leader of the High Federalists, he took a less active interest in the relations until a fairly late stage. It was Pickering who pressured Hamilton to take note of the negotiations with Louverture.

Furthermore, while Edward Stevens was Hamilton's childhood friend, Pickering initiated his mission. [38]

While Adams saw the relations strictly in terms of their advantage to American commercial interests, Pickering wanted to pressure Louverture to declare Saint-Domingue an independent island. While the term "independence" had various possible implications, Adams explained in September 1798 that it was the "prevailing conjecture" in the United States that "at least the largest Islands will become independent states, and be connected with the continent *by alliance and friendship rather than by subjection*." The idea, then, involved a sovereign nation led by a black man and inhabited by former slaves and free people of color. With the idea of Dominguan independence in mind, Pickering turned to Hamilton for advice and asked him to sketch the structure of a future Dominguan regime; Hamilton stalled for several months. Finally heeding Pickering's request, Hamilton argued, "No regular system of liberty will at present suit [Saint-Domingue]. The government if independent must be military- partaking of the [feudal] system." Hamilton went on to discuss the exact functions of the military and the different branches of government in great detail. Louverture's Constitution of July 1801, which established his autonomic status, included many autocratic elements, reminiscent of Hamilton's suggestions. Some historians have surmised that it was based on Hamilton's plan, passed to Louverture through Stevens.[39]

While Adams came to oppose the idea of Dominguan independence, he agreed to help Louverture in other significant ways: as Edward Stevens became an enthusiastic supporter of Louverture's regime, he sent glowing reports on Louverture's success as the de facto ruler of the colony. His personal relationship with the Dominguan leader advanced the relations considerably: his reports convinced the administration of the prudence of a military support for

Louverture against fellow Dominguan André Rigaud. David Brion Davis asserts that the military aid to Louverture "was perhaps the strongest antislavery measure taken by a president [in the years 1789-1861]." Particularly thanks the military aid to Louverture, the American-Dominguan relations had monumental significance: as Hamilton noted after the Louisiana Purchase, the Adams administration's military aid to Louverture was crucial, as it likely gave him enough strength to oppose Napoleon Bonaparte's efforts to reconquer Saint-Domingue, thus making Bonaparte agree to sell the Louisiana territory to Jefferson.[40]

Was the debate on the American-Dominguan relations strictly a debate over American foreign relations? Many accounts portray it in such a way, characterizing Louverture as a "black pawn" between the different European powers. However, the debate in the House of Representatives exposed racial assumptions that crossed conventional sectional divisions: Northern Jeffersonians employed racial images in their arguments on the danger embedded in the aid to Louverture. Albert Gallatin, formerly a member of the Pennsylvania Abolitionist Society, cautioned that "Toussaint's Clause" would bring about Dominguan independence. Establishing such a regime, he argued, would be equivalent to "throw[ing] wild tigers on society." Gallatin's zoological metaphor would become prevalent over the next several decades. Meanwhile, Abraham Bishop of Connecticut, who had offered an enthusiastic defense of the Dominguan rebels in the 1790s, stopped addressing the matter as he increasingly becoming a full-fledged member of the Jeffersonian coalition. Like other Northern Jeffersonians, he understood that in such a coalition he would have to focus his efforts on equality among whites.[41]

If the Democrat-Republicans used a racial reasoning, did Federalists support the "Intercourse Act" because of notions of racial egalitarianism? The question here is trickier, and goes both to the need to build a cross-sectional coalition and to different Federalists' own views.

Harrison Gray Otis, for instance, never shared Pickering's and others' passionate opposition to slavery. In his later career as Mayor of Boston in the 1830s Otis would become an enemy of the abolitionists. The need to secure Southern support for the Act also made public support of humanitarian principles imprudent.[42]

A letter Pickering wrote to Rufus King demonstrates his need to maneuver several different forces to enable the relations. It also indicates an interest in the relations that surpassed mere foreign policy considerations or commercial interests. Pickering marked the letter, dated March 12 1799, as "private and confidential," and distinguished it from the content of a "public letter of this date," regarding the administration's official position on Saint-Domingue. Just as much as it was deciphered to be hidden from foreign powers, the letter was a secret from Adams, whose animosity towards High Federalists in general and Pickering specifically had deepened by then. When read through the frame of his initial distinction between the private and public letters, his explanation seems different than a mundane letter on foreign interests: Pickering seems to explain to King how, within the boundaries of the need for a cross-sectional Federalist coalition and the need for an alliance with the slaveholding Great Britain, he managed to secure the American-Dominguan relations.[43]

While his public letter described American commercial interests as the sole reason for the relations and did not mention the possibility of Dominguan independence, in the private letter he estimated that the administration's assurance of commercial aid would encourage Louverture to declare independence.[44] Pickering then explained to King he persuaded the Southern Federalists that if black Dominguans were "left to themselves," they would "be incomparably less dangerous than if they remain the subjects of France." He then convinced British representatives to support Dominguan independence, despite their fear that Louverture's successful rise would encourage

slaves to revolt in the neighboring British colony of Jamaica. Since the British thought "the radical evil is already done" when France abolished slavery, Pickering could count on their "jealousy" of France to enable the relations with Louverture. [45]

Far from discussing the matters in terms of pure *realpolitik*, Pickering then asserted that "political" and "*moral* reasons… would warrant [the United States] in urging [Louverture] to the Declaration." Were the "moral" reasons simply his opposition to Jacobinism? This seems unlikely, since Pickering then went on to elaborate on the nature of an independent Dominguan regime. The discussion did not concern the regime's ability to defend itself against Bonaparte, but rather the internal structure of the new sovereignty. Like Hamilton, Pickering estimated that Louverture could not establish "a black republic." However, he did not think this should be a permanent solution. He reasoned that since currently "the blacks [were] too ignorant" to form such a regime, Louverture should establish a military regime for the war, "and perhaps for a much longer period."[46]

Significantly, nothing in Pickering's phrasing implies that a non-republican regime should be the best *permanent* solution for the Haitian people. Moreover, there is no indication that the term "the blacks" denoted the black race *as such*. Rather, Pickering apparently meant the island's current residents who, unlike Louverture, did not fight actively for their freedom and were likely illiterate. Thus, for Pickering, they were not yet suited for republican liberty. As François Furstenberg has argued, the courage of rebellion was an important element in republican discourse on slavery, both chattel slavery and political "slavery"; the lack of such courage implicitly justified enslavement. However, Pickering only used that reasoning in a very limited way: while supporting Haitians' right to freedom, he did not think they were capable of exercising full republican liberty. In short, like frontiersmen in Wyoming and French

Louisianans, Dominguans who only recently came from slavery were not fit to rule. Conversely, not only was Louverture literate; he led fellow Dominguans from slavery to freedom while he himself was no longer a slave; such an act was deemed especially heroic in republican ideology. Thus, Louverture symbolized the ideal transformation to republican society in High Federalist thought: for Pickering, Hamilton, and King Louverture was "the Haitian [Edmund] Burke."[47]

The reference to Burke was not coincidental. Louverture's rebellion never reflected the Jeffersonian vision of egalitarian democracy. High Federalists such as Pickering likely viewed Louverture as a role model for creating a regime that managed to balance liberty and order. These values were cherished and applied to all citizens, without a distinction of color. For that reason, Hamilton and Pickering's interest in the nature of the Dominguan regime betrays much more than a mundane discussion of foreign policy interests. Attempts to dismiss it as such miss the significance of the Haitian episode. The same applies to treatments of Pickering's support of the Haitian Revolution as if he was a Jeffersonian egalitarian. These reflect a modern conflation of genuine antislavery enthusiasm with support for full democracy.[48]

Adams came to oppose Dominguan independence. Since Louverture also feared its realization, it did not come to fruition during his lifetime. In 1801 Louverture declared Saint-Domingue an autonomous entity, but still vowed his allegiance to Bonaparte. By then, Jefferson was president. The concept of a "black republic" became highly contested in the following decades. Adams' opposition to Dominguan independence resonated with the stance offered by Gallatin and other Jeffersonians. For well over a century afterwards, the very concept of a "black republic" troubled many white leaders, from John Adams to Daniel Webster and Woodrow Wilson. Not all were consumed with Jefferson's level of "Negrophobia." Meanwhile, many

black abolitionists used "the black republic" as their role model. White abolitionists celebrated Louverture's legacy and extolled him as a ferocious leader.[49]

When discussing white sympathy for the Haitian Revolution, historians tend to celebrate Abraham Bishop since he represents the Jeffersonian support of egalitarian rhetoric, despite the fact that Bishop ceased discussing racial equality in 1800. Conversely, they rarely discuss Pickering in those terms. The disparity demonstrates historians' recent reluctance to highlight those who belonged to the privileged political elite. The latter were forced to make compromises and to try to implement their vision through compromises. Thus Bishop, a relatively marginal figure and a future Democrat-Republican, is a more comfortable example for white support of the black rebels. Nonetheless, Pickering likely influenced the success of the Haitian Revolution in a way Bishop never could.[50]

Pickering remained proud of his role in the relations with Louverture after Jefferson's victory. He gladly helped Stevens' requests to gain recognition and pension as Counsel General to the island, both during the Jefferson administration and in the 1820s. Pickering likely never considered his "political and moral reasons" a sufficient cause for the American-Dominguan relations, and always named advantages to American commercial interests as the primary reason for the relations. However, as the Haitian Revolution had become "the Haitian specter," he continued to display a positive view of Louverture, referring to him as a "distinguished Negro General" and an "extraordinary man."[51]

During his retirement, Pickering challenged the usage of the Haitian Revolution for pro-slavery arguments while criticizing Congressman Edward Everett's remarks in a speech in the House of Representatives. Everett used the "specter of Haiti" to actively support slavery: he

asserted that he "would cede the *whole continent* to anyone who would take it…before [he] would see *any part* of this fair America converted into a continental [Haiti], by that awful process of bloodshed and desolation, by which alone such a catastrophe could be brought on." Pickering fiercely attacked Everett's reasoning in a letter to Virginian Congressman Andrew Stevenson, himself a slaveholder, commenting, "Mr. Everett would rather witness the destruction of the whole continent, with its forty million inhabitants, than see the whites of a single state fall by the hands of their slaves! But would it not be better to pluck out a right eye, or to cut off a right hand, than to let the *whole body* perish?" [52]

At the Chicago World Fare in 1893, Frederick Douglass spoke of the legacy of the Haitian Revolution at length. He stated, "We should not forget that the freedom you and I enjoy to-day; that the freedom eight hundred thousand colored people enjoy in the British West Indies; the freedom that has come to the colored race the world over, is largely due to the brave stand taken by the black sons of Haiti ninety years ago. When they struck for freedom… they struck for the freedom of every black man in the world." Douglass pointed out that prior to the Haitian Revolution, "no Christian nation had abolished Negro slavery." Some of the reports of Douglass' speeches in white newspapers avoided mentioning of the Haitian Revolution. "The black republic" still had a forceful power in a society grappling with the issue of race.[53]

An example of the liberality embedded in Pickering's reference to "a black republic" came more than six decades after his death: Rufus King's grandson Charles, who published his grandfather's correspondence in the 1890s, apparently felt very uncomfortable with Pickering's usage of the term "black republic," in Pickering's very clear handwriting, in his letter to King. In the printed volume of King's correspondence, that term was replaced with "a black (colony)."[54]

****

The years 1808-1816 were among the stormiest in Pickering's political career: in those years he combatted Jefferson's embargo on trade with British goods. Later, he opposed the War of 1812 and called for radial measures at the Hartford Convention. He was labeled a disunionist by many. Understandably, historians have focused on this aspect of Pickering's career in those years. However, Pickering simultaneously dealt with the project of colonizing free blacks to the African continent.[55]

Pickering was familiar with the concept of colonization as a way to fight prejudice: as Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs, he had offered to remove Indians to a reservation in order to prevent their extinction. While the idea of colonization dated at least to the early eighteenth century, Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* gave it national recognition. The 1807 Slave Trade Act enhanced interest in colonization, as the Act ostensibly brought the national debate on slavery to an end. In the years after 1808 supporters and opponents of slavery, as well as whites and free blacks, found colonization a consensual idea behind which they could rally.[56]

As Marie Tyler-McGraw notes, colonization is often perceived as "a sideshow in nineteenth-century American history," evolving "bizarre and racist concepts." Many historians associate the colonization plan with Jefferson's overt racism. Furthermore, they associate it with the American Colonization Society (hereafter ACS), in which slaveholders were prominent. Accepting William Lloyd Garrison's subsequent denunciation of the plan as racist and pro-slavery, historians tended to ignore other possible motives. Nonetheless, as Nicholas Guyatt notes, even most Virginian supporters of colonization in its earliest days, such as James Madison and St. George Tucker, opposed assumptions of innate racial inferiority. This certainly applied to

early Northern abolitionists such as Anthony Benezet and Benjamin Rush, both of whom actively invoked the unity of mankind. Indeed, in its earliest days the colonization plan was initiated by black Americans. Its leading advocate for black colonization in the early republic was merchant Paul Cuffe, a black Quaker from Pennsylvania. Motivated by an early form of Black Nationalism, Cuffe began to promote a settlement in the British colony of Sierra Leone. A devout Christian, Cuffe hoped to bring "civilization" to Africa. Like Louverture, then, Cuffe embodied an ideal for benevolent paternalists such as Pickering.[57]

While Virginians, including Jefferson and Madison, approved of Cuffe's plan, his associates turned to Massachusetts' Congressional representatives to advance it. They had good reason: while Jefferson maintained his support for colonization and his theoretical opposition to slavery, as he aged he came to abandon the benevolent reasoning embodied in the *Notes* and discussed blacks as a dangerous internal enemy. Rather than an asylum of blacks, the new African colony became a place from which the United States would need "protection." While some New Englanders and Pennsylvanians concurred and supported colonization as a means to rid the nation of the memory of black presence, many continued to oppose the notion of innate differences. They genuinely supported "black uplift" through education, but came to consider this goal unattainable due to white racial prejudice.[58]

Pickering belonged to this last group. The fact that the colonization efforts were led by Cuffe, a member of the Philadelphian black elite, further endeared the project to Pickering and other benevolent paternalists. Thus, Pickering and Senator Christopher Gore sponsored a bill authorizing President Madison to permit Cuffe's voyage to Sierra Leone. While the Senate proposal passed, the House proposal was defeated. As Paul Cuffe was ill at this point, his efforts never materialized. To a large degree he represented the benevolent paternalists' last and best

hope for a racial uplift: after his death in September 1817, the *Centinel*, a leading Federalist newspaper, published a long obituary in his honor.[59]

The colonization efforts were renewed in 1817, with the establishment of the ACS. However, while before they had taken a distinct anti-slavery character, the leadership of the ACS included slaveholders such as Charles Fenton Mercer and John Randolph. Nonetheless, Pickering again led the colonization efforts in the House of Representatives. Randolph was a strong opponent of the War of 1812 and thus Pickering's political ally; Pickering likely hoped to take advantage of this connection. The report and resolution of the House of Representatives' Slave Trade Committee endorsed the concept of colonization. While the House of Representatives endorsed the report, the plan never materialized. In undated notes he wrote to himself, Pickering explained the rational of colonization. The main danger he saw for the black population in the United States was "the extension of our white population." If the republic continued its westward expansion, he explained, "wars and destruction that would ensue; especially if our immigrants would carry with them any people of color as slaves." A member of the Revolutionary generation and an admirer of Great Britain, Pickering was appalled that these two would not abolish the institution: "The two nations, who in opposition to the sense of all the rest of Europe and of the civilized world, persist in this traffic in human beings, are persevering in a war against MAN." Pickering continued: "And is it not the duty of all others to unite against the enemies of man?" He added: "To say to the aggressors: cease your wrongs against an unoffending race, equally with yourselves the offspring of God!"[60]

****

Pickering ended his public career in 1818, but continued to show concern for the colonization efforts. He maintained close connections with Reverend William Meade of Virginia, an agent of the ACS, and counseled him how to acquire New Englanders' awareness of the humanitarian project of colonization. Meade belonged to the humanitarian strand in the ACS as well. In one of the ACS press releases, Meade wrote that on the faces of the Africans he "could see written these memorable words: 'Am I not a man and a brother?'" As the Missouri crisis intensified in Congress, Southern supporters of slavery regarded Meade's humanitarian rhetoric as dangerously abolitionist. Such views convinced some Northern contemporaries that the colonization efforts were truly intended to end slavery in the United States.[61]

The Missouri crisis proved a rude awakening for Pickering; he no longer believed that colonization could end slavery in the United States. Upon first hearing of the crisis he sent Randolph a short letter, in which he argued that "if Negro slavery is to be admitted in Missouri and all other states to be formed in that western region, the colonization project should be abandoned." Its continuation would mean "to open the treasury with one hand, in support of a measure whose ultimate object and tendency would be the gradual emancipation of the slaves, while with the other their numbers would be multiplied a hundred or a thousand fold." Pickering expressed his expectation that Randolph would protest "the extension of this great moral and political evil," and hoped that Randolph's "efforts and those of other distinguished members united in this most important and righteous cause may prevail." Of course, Randolph did nothing of the kind: he was one of the leaders of the Southern defense of slavery as a benevolent institution. He maintained and enhanced his rhetoric thereafter.[62]

After he received a short and unsatisfying reply from Randolph, Pickering sent Mercer a much longer and more passionate letter. Justifying his characterization as a moralizer, Pickering asked Mercer: "When it shall be seen that nearly all the members of Congress from the slaveholding states vote for the unlimited admission of slaves into the vast regions west of the Mississippi, what inference will be drawn from the sentiments of many (and the zeal of some) citizens of those states in favor of colonization plan, but this- that they considered it as the best and perhaps only means of ridding themselves of troublesome and dangerous inmates, the existing free people of color? After which, the chains of their slaves would be forever invincibly riveted." By 1819, it became clear that the black population, including the black Philadelphian elite, began to fiercely oppose the plan. Pickering considered black Philadelphians' position an important factor in determining his own position: "If I mistake not," he wrote, "the few people of color in Philadelphia, in protesting against the colonization plan, suggested that one of its objects or effects was or would be in confirmation of the slavery of their brethren."[63]

Pickering went on to discuss the institution of slavery in general. To Mercer, a slaveholder himself, Pickering criticized the justification of slavery: "What can so powerfully influence the great majority of the members of the slave-holding states- and evidently therefore of their constituents," he asked, "than to promote and perpetuate Negro slavery but the impression of a direct pecuniary interest? Of all interests the most persuasive and the most apt to blind the eyes of the understanding and render the heart insensible?" Since the slave population is multiplying, the slaveholders can "sell them to planters and farmers of the more southern states of the Western world, who will give *great prices* for them."

For the Revolutionary generation, still adhering to republican values rather than commercial benefits, that was a loaded charge. Pickering added that "the advocates for the

extension of slavery will perhaps spasm at the idea that such candid avarice influences their conduct. What then is their governing motive? Constitutional scruples? How then does it happen that with few exceptions those scruples are distinguished by territorial lines?" Quoting the Declaration of Independence's "self-evident truths" and noting Jefferson's "sentiments on Negro slavery [in] his *Notes on Virginia*," Pickering continued, "what apology do they make for a conduct in direct contradiction to that? For until they can be safely emancipated [from?] slavery, the miserable beings who, like their land, they have received by inheritance, they may plead necessity, and the plea must be admitted. But to extend and perpetuate the evil by a voluntary act will leave them without excuse." Despite his continuing feud with Jefferson, Pickering seemed credit his opposition to slavery as sincere. Just as he thought that reference to the Haitians' "skin color" might evoke something in the Sage of Monticello, he seemed to believe that noting the contradiction between republican principles and slavery would give Mercer a new perspective on his activities. [64]

The persistence of slavery in the United States continued to worry Pickering after the Missouri Compromise. "What is to be the final [unclear] of Negro slavery in the United States, God only knows," he wrote to Virginian Andrew Stevenson in 1826.[65] For Pickering, the problem remained interconnected with the rise of Jeffersonian democracy. His first written response to the Missouri crisis was directed at 44 year-old Elijah Hunt Mills. Mills, then the Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, was an ardent supporter of the "old Federalist" opposition to democracy. To Mills Pickering bemoaned the state of the New England states: "In short [New Englanders] are held in contempt. This may be got rid of by incurring the *hatred* of the slave holders, but *hatred* is allied to *fear*- and *fear* is connected with respect."[66]

An old and increasingly uninfluential man, Pickering attempted to act as he preached in his private correspondence with Southern slaveholders. To Mercer he wrote, "Do gentlemen imagine that the free states of New England, with the state of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, composed wholly of *freemen*, will acquiesce in a boundless increase of rulers representing slaves?" Long before the United States extends to the Pacific Ocean, he added, "the Union will be broken, and new confederacies formed." While Pickering believed this would happen in any case, he asserted that "the Republican introduction of slaving beyond the Mississippi will hasten the separation." Indeed, "barring accidents which cut the thread of [life]," Pickering believed he "also may live to see it, although now in [his] 75th year." Later correspondence reveals a similar pattern: in letters to Southerner correspondents such as Andrew Stevenson and John Marshall, Pickering brought up the issue of slavery unprovoked. Stevenson, a member of the House of Representatives from Virginia, asked Pickering for his opinion on an amendment to the Constitution unrelated to slavery. Pickering's 14-page reply included five pages devoted to the issue of slavery.[67] In a letter to Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Pickering mentioned the possibility of disunion as a result of the West's separation from the East, but added that "other causes may break the bond of Union." He then quoted Marshall's statement that slavery "has had a vast influence on the past, and may affect the future destinies of America, to an extent which human wisdom can neither foresee nor control."[68]

In the last decade of his life Pickering further bemoaned the erosion of his benevolent paternalism towards non-whites. Georgia Governor George M. Troup gained national headlines when he publicly criticized the Federal government for its lenient policy toward the Creeks and Cherokees in Georgia. Explicitly defying Jefferson's philanthropic assumptions, Troup argued

that any presence of Indians in Georgia threatened the state harmony; for Troup, Indians should not become equal citizens and would ultimately become slaves. In letters to Stevenson and Marshall Pickering attacked Troup, but observed that he "appears to be supported by a majority of the Georgians." In his letter to Marshall, Pickering commented that the ability to stop white Georgians who supported Troup from defying the Federal government rested on the "supreme Federal authority." He concluded: "I pray God you may long continue as its head."[69]

In the mid-1820s Congressman Edward Everett of Massachusetts, a promising scholar at Harvard University, argued that slavery was justified by both history and biblical morality. Pickering denounced Everett in several letters, as well as in an article in the *Salem Gazette*.[70] To Stevenson Pickering expressed his "astonishment" at Everett's views, and proceeded to refute Everett's arguments by proofs from the New Testament. To his relative John Lowell he conjectured that Everett's "direct object was to conciliate the opinions of the slave-holding states." Especially troubled by Everett's comments, Pickering wrote comments on "Negro Slavery" in his personal papers in April 1826. Additionally, he attacked Everett's comments in an article in the *Salem Gazette*. The two pieces serve as Pickering's final long statements on slavery before his death. The solution Pickering offered to the problem of slavery is similar in both places, as was his denunciation of the institution. His personal judgment of slaveholders, however, was strikingly different.[71]

Both in his private notes and in his article, Pickering maintained that gradual emancipation was the only viable solution for the problem of slavery. To Pickering, the solution benefited both the slaves and to their former masters. In the *Salem Gazette* article he condemned the immorality of trading in "*human beings,* our *fellow-men*" and asserted that "the evil must be put away; slavery must be *abolished*." Nonetheless, he emphasized that this should happen "not

at once; their masters are not to be slain." Pickering did not seem to think that immediate abolition of slavery would result in violence by the new free blacks, since immediate emancipation was not proposed at the time, not even by those who considered themselves "abolitionists." Rather, Pickering seemed to assume that the only scenario for immediate emancipation would be a slave revolt. Thus, he immediately added that "the slaves themselves would be grievous sufferers in an attempt to emancipate themselves by violence." Gradual emancipation was the right course for the slaves' "own good, as well as the safety of their masters," as they need to be "gradually prepared, by suitable instructions in religion, in morality, and in the necessary arts of life, to enjoy what every human being is entitled to- *the rights of man*." Pickering compared Everett's opinions with those of British Secretary of State George Canning, who attempted to reconcile growing demands by British abolitionists to immediately end slavery in the West Indian colonies with the objection of the West Indian planters. While Canning admitted that slavery was evil and contradicted to Christianity, Everett did not. Pickering emphasized that Canning proposed "a plan of gradual emancipation." Canning described the slave as a man with "physical passions… but uninstructed reason." Pickering asserted that Canning's opinion, "though admissible as an *apology*, cannot be allowed as a *justification* of Mr. Everett." Pickering opposed "the hasty and indiscreet zeal of those who were disposed, without a gradual process, in which the slaves should be prepared to hail, with salutary joy, the decree which should declare them FREE." He thus proposed that "the people of color in the slave-holding states may be qualified to be *free tenants* on the lands they now cultivate as *slaves*, and workmen in the mechanic arts."[72]

As Pickering was favorably quoting Canning, immediatist abolitionism was gaining ground in Britain. For instance, radical abolitionist Elizabeth Heyrick regarded the continuance

of slavery in the West Indies as "a continued acting of the same atrocious injustice which first kidnapped and tore [the slaves] from their kindred and native soil, and robbed them of that sacred unalienable right which no considerations, how plausible so ever, can justify the withholding." Heyrick's rhetoric is reminiscent of Pickering's language in his letter to King in 1785 and his letter to *slaveholder* Mercer in 1819. In that same article in the *Salem Gazette* Pickering had argued that slavery was wrong because a "human being is entitled to- *the rights of man*." Why, then, did Pickering not dare to offer immediate abolition even when he was free of political considerations? The most likely answer is that detestation for slavery and opposition to hasty shift to any sort of freedom were interlinked in his thought. Furthermore, political reality in the United States was different from the British reality: as Edward Rugemer notes, by the 1830s West Indian planters had very little power in the British Parliament. Slaver power in the United States, however, was on the rise, and Everett was contributing to it. As Pickering had predicted to King 41 years earlier, the economic motive for slavery had only enhanced. Proposing immediate abolition under these conditions simply did not make sense.[73]

While Pickering offered a similar gradualist logic in his private notes, his attitude towards slaveholders appeared quite different. In his personal notes he wrote, "The slave-holders in the United States are extremely sensitive of every intimation that bears the least aspect of the emancipation of their slaves." He reminisced that they had "admitted slavery to be an evil of great magnitude, but said it was one for which they were not responsible; that laws were introduced at a remote period and had so multiplied; that it was dangerous to do or say anything that might produce an excitement among them, which produced destructive insurrections." However, he added, "for some years past I've heard of no such apologies, no regrets." He added that "if [the slaveholders] should ever consent to their emancipation, in consequence of the

interference of the *government*, it would be only on condition that their value, as property, should be paid to their owners." Pickering added: "of course, this mode of setting them free will never take place."[74]

When Pickering supported "incurring the *hatred* of the slave holders," he did not mean to offer a tactic against beloved neighbors. He likely considered many Southerners, including slaveholders, as personal friends; nonetheless, his comments betrayed contempt for slaveholders as a collective body. Conversely, in his article in the *Salem Gazette* Pickering was far more conciliatory: he reminded his readers that even William Penn had owned slaves during the colonial period. While in his private notes Pickering displayed pessimism on the slaveholders' willingness to accept any emancipation plan, to his readers he assured, "Were such a plan for the gradual abolition of slavery devised, there are *now* in the slave-holding states many who would eagerly embrace it." Regardless of his personal feelings toward slaveholders as a collective, Pickering continued to believe in the necessity of a cross-sectional coalition. In the last decade of his life, he supported George W. Crawford in 1824 and Andrew Jackson in 1828.[75]

****

Pickering's career does not resonate well with modern accounts of genuine anti-slavery convictions. For one thing, support of colonization receives a negative treatment. In a recent and fairly laudatory discussion of Pickering's opposition to the Louisiana Purchase, David Mayers qualified his praises by remarking how far removed Pickering was from modern sensibilities: "[Pickering's] notions also included deporting African Americans, a solution he abandoned as unworkable only because of the large people involved." Joanne Pope Melish argues that New Englanders supported colonization in order to eradicate the existence of black New Englanders

from the collective memory. [76] Furthermore, conservative and cautious solutions to the problem of slavery have been no favorites of historians. Historians often distinguish between "gradualists" and "abolitionists." Proposals of indemnification to the slaveholders are especially scorned: historians tend to emphasize the natural injustice in such proposals, and further argue that they betray their authors' racial assumptions.[77]

However, Pickering's gradualist arguments deserve a more nuanced treatment. Pickering had supported gradual education to freedom throughout his life, for men of all races. This was true of his views on frontiersmen, Louisianans and Indians alike. He certainly had no qualms about Louverture's ability to rule. His proposals in the 1820s best reflect his alliance to an old world that was eroding quickly: prior to this decade, gradual emancipation in the North was implemented in states with a large black population such as New York and Pennsylvania. As some historians have pointed out, modern criticism of gradual emancipation plans adhere to the arguments of immediate abolitionists in the 1830s.[78] Pickering was embodying a middle ground that was eroding: New Englanders who came to celebrate the Union as a sacred cause accepted slavery in effect, even if they still opposed it rhetorically. For Pickering the rise of Jeffersonian democracy, as well as the sanctification of the Union without emphasizing New England's uniqueness, was part of the same evil that allowed slavery to continue and expand. [79]

Edward Everett's career demonstrates this point: Everett came to realize that outright support of slavery was not politically prudent. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson shortly after his speech in the House of Representatives he wrote, "If I have not failed in doctrine, I have in prudence." In 1836 he renounced slavery in an article in Garrison's *The Liberator*. In 1853 Everett missed a key vote on Stephen A. Douglas's proposal to open Kansas and Nebraska to slavery if the residents there voted for it. Everett claimed to have opposed Douglas's proposal.

Massachusetts abolitionists charged that his softness on slavery had propelled him to miss the vote. In 1860 he appeared as a candidate of the Constitutional-Union Party. Studies of the transformation of New England Federalism usually mention Everett's turn against older New England sectionalist impulses. Nonetheless, his new brand of Federalism harbored other concessions as well.[80]

Afterthought: Pickering and Antebellum Antislavery

Timothy Pickering died in 1829. By then his reputation was ruined: as he wrote in private notes written in the 1820s, the term "Hartford Convention" was used "*for the purpose of public deception*." Ironically, while he supported Andrew Jackson's candidacy in 1828 Jackson's supporters argued that the Whigs were "the heirs of 'blue light Federalism' and the Hartford Convention." As Jefferson's legacy became a consensus, Pickering's attacks appeared like a petty revenge. His possible contribution to the ban of slavery in the Northwest Ordinance was not acknowledged: His possible contribution to the ban of slavery in the Northwest Ordinance was not acknowledged: Edward Coles, the most prominent historian of the Ordinance, was a confident of Jefferson and Madison. In the antebellum era Coles, an ardent opponent of slavery, wanted to associate the ban with the dominant Virginian Founders. Subsequent historians have followed Coles' lead, and only recently have historians even recognized Pickering's plan.[81]

As the new generation of New England former Federalists took shape, Pickering's threats of disunion were no longer acceptable. As Elizabeth Varon notes, "disunion" had become "the most potent and provocative word in the political vocabulary of Americans." The Whig Party, specifically, came to put stronger emphasis on the cause of the Union in the antebellum era. Everett and Daniel Webster's celebration of the Union became dominant. While praising the

Hartford Convention in private correspondences, in public Webster disassociated himself from the message of disunion so strongly connected with the Convention in the public memory. Pickering's name was generally forgotten, but some invoked it to denote support of disunion: for instance, opponents of the Mexican War were accused of resembling Pickering's treasonous actions during the War of 1812.[82]

New England opponents of slavery in the antebellum era can be divided to opponents of the establishment, headed by William Lloyd Garrison, who called for immediate abolition, and opponents of slavery who wanted to work within the existing party system, either through third parties such as the Liberty Party and the Free Soil Party or by attempting to influence their Whig or Jacksonian Parties in the direction of antislavery. Where did the legacy of Timothy Pickering fit within that division? [83]

Several historians have pointed out that descendants of Federalists tended to become antebellum abolitionists. Specifically, they note the similarity between Garrison's rhetorical tools and Federalist rhetoric. "The New England idiom," Matthew Mason writes, "was Garrison's native tongue." Historians have also argued that the willingness of the more conservative New England Federalists, and particularly Pickering, to consider disunion, influenced Garrison. However, historians seem less persuaded as to any resemblance between Federalist and abolitionist ideological characteristics. As Marc Arkin notes, historians find it hard to believe that abolitionists "have owed a major intellectual debt to the group that history records as 'a pack of quarrelling, ill-tempered curmudgeons, the poorest losers in American history,' an elitist coterie in decline since the Jeffersonian victory of 1800, one of the last truly reactionary political movements in American history."[84]

It has been established that Garrison began his career as a High Federalist. His journalistic career began when he was an apprentice in the *Newburyport Herald*. The paper, run by Ephraim Allen, adhered to conservative Federalist positions and supported Pickering's wing within the party. As Garrison's children noted in his biography, he was acquainted with Pickering and supported his stances as an apprentice. Some historians conclude that Pickering was a father figure to the young apprentice.[85] However, the connection between Pickering and Garrison "rests on shaky foundations," as Matthew Mason has observed. By the 1828 elections Garrison supported John Quincy Adams, whom Pickering loathed. Furthermore, W. J. Rorabaugh argues that Garrison was in fact an indentured servant in the *Newburyport Herald* until 1825. That makes the authenticity of his political position more dubious. Additionally, while Garry Wills surmises that Pickering's denouncement of colonization "dazzled" Garrison the latter waited more than a decade before offering his own denunciation. The direct linkage between Pickering and Garrison, then, is unpersuasive. An ideological lineage is still worthy of examination.[86]

Undoubtedly, Pickering was not as radical as Garrison. While Garrison's condemnation of slavery in *The Liberator* is reminiscent of Pickering's rhetoric in his 1785 letter to King, Garrison did not add a caveat: until the 1860s he insisted that slavery should be abolished immediately. Moreover, Pickering never offered a strong anti-slavery rhetoric in public as he did in private. The differences also lie in the two men's attitude towards democracy: Pickering never "came to terms with democracy." Garrisonian abolitionists, while offering a complicated view of the role of democracy when it legitimated slavery, explicitly defined universal suffrage was society's ultimate goal. Garrisonians supported the 1842 Dorr Rebellion in Rhode Island, for instance, provided that suffrage is expanded to non-whites. Pickering and other High Federalists

would not have had to face the dilemma. For that reason among others, some historians have placed the origins of abolitionism in the democratization of New England.[87]

Nonetheless, the truly innovative part of Garrison's radicalism laid in his racial rhetoric. As Paul Goodman asserted, the immergence of Garrisonian abolitionism marked the first time in American history in which "an articulate and significant minority of white Americans embraced racial equality as both as concept and a commitment, although it was an ideal far more difficult to live up to than to profess." Garrisonian abolitionists prioritized their commitment to racial egalitarianism over their support of universal suffrage: during the "Dorr Rebellion" in Rhode Island they opposed a "color clause" in the proposed constitution, and supported a compromise that would still exclude men of no property, but with no color distinction. In his attack against the ACS and creation of biracial abolitionist societies Garrison created a precedent: he argued that the institution of slavery was evil not simply because of the bondage of "others," but rather it was bondage of equal human beings. By 1832 he explicitly approved of amalgamation.[88]

Against such a radical transformation, New England Federalists seem to pale. Most historians emphasize that Federalist rhetoric did not contain arguments that benefited blacks, whether free or slaves. Matthew Mason expresses the opinion of many scholars when he considers Garrison's radical belief in racial equality fundamentally incompatible with Federalist assumptions. Mason contrasts Garrison's attitude with the depiction of men of African descent by such New England radicals as Ephraim Allen and Elijah Parrish. While conceding that Allen's Christian rhetoric supported "a *theoretical* concern for the rights of all of God's children," Mason argues that "his condescending attitude towards actual African Americans restrained his zeal for the abolition of slavery." Mason assumes a basic contrast between paternalistic assumptions about blacks and the notion of racial egalitarianism. Thus, for Mason

an article that "spoke patronizingly of how 'the influence of Christianity seems to be gradually raising the Blacks in the scale of society'" contradicts Garrison's later rhetoric. For Mason, a belief in basic human equality does not coincide with blatant cultural condescension. Pickering certainly exhibited the latter: despite denunciations of prejudice towards those "guilty of a skin not colored like our own," there is no evidence that Pickering ever associated with non-whites in any meaningful way outside of his political activities.[89]

However, the line distinguishing Pickering's benevolent paternalism from Garrison's racial egalitarianism was not quite so stark. Pickering's son John became a philologist who served as the president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Oriental Society. John Pickering focused on the identification of different Indian languages and the attempt to find "some common and systematic method of writing" American Indian languages. He followed the ideological footsteps of his father, who had written in the 1790s, "The Indian tongue is the great obstacle to the civilization of the Indians. The sooner it is removed the better." John Pickering was involved in missionary works among Indians and sought to further white Americans' ability to communicate "with the various tribes of our borders, either with a view to the common concerns of life or the diffusion of the principles of our religions among them." While few modern scholarly accounts mention his name, Sean Harvey notes that in the antebellum era he had "a considerable degree of intellectual influence," and his theories influenced debates on the meaning of race. His philological theories ultimately promoted the ability of individual Indians to adjust to Western patterns of thought, regardless of their origins. As Harvey notes, for philologists like Pickering "the extinction of Indian languages [was] a necessary precondition for assimilation into the American nation."[90]

For Garrison, John Pickering's missionary work and his own egalitarian beliefs were perfectly compatible. After his "conversion" to immediatism, Garrison espoused the need to "uplift" free blacks to a state of "respectability." Thus, he expressed his thrill at John Pickering's announcement that the persecution against white missionaries among the Cherokees had stopped. Garrison pointed out that he was thrilled "both as an abolitionist and as a Christian." Garrison's assertion reflected his view of the connection between Christianity and his belief that men of all colors were equal under God. As scholars such as James Brewer Stewart and Bruce Laurie have noted, Garrison's humanitarian view of blacks coincided with his Christian paternalism. This approach was prevalent in Massachusetts, dating back to the Revolutionary days. Thus, Garrisonian abolitionists never supported racial equality independent of cultural values.[91]

However, by mid-century all forms of benevolent paternalism were waning. Instead, the scientific racial conjectures that Jefferson had raised in the *Notes* became an acknowledged scientific truth. The father of modern racialism is considered French philosopher Arthur de Gobineau. Like Pickering and many New England High Federalists, Gobineau was an anti-Jacobin. However, unlike men like Pickering or Gobineau's friend Alexis de Tocqueville, Gobineau reacted to the chaos created by the French Revolution by dividing humans along racial lines and thus making sense of the world. Tocqueville was incensed, but many accepted Gobineau's reasoning even before Charles Darwin's scientific theories gave it more credence.[92]

As racialism became prominent, the linguistic theories of men like Alexander Von Humboldt and John Pickering were either dismissed or simply not applied to the analysis of human nature. The American School of Ethnology challenged philology and argued that there were fixed and unalterable races. Symbolically, the shift from belief in "the unity of man" to racialism is reflected in Pickering's own family. His grandson Charles Pickering also

participated in the debate on race. However, if his grandfather Timothy Pickering and his uncle John Pickering opposed the notion of innate racial differences, Charles Pickering joined the growing racialist interpretation of the Enlightenment. In *The Races of Man and their Geographical Distribution* (1848), Charles Pickering challenged the notion that men descend from one prime creator, and identifies seven races in the world. Abolitionist Lewis Tappan even noted that Charles Pickering was betraying the legacy of his uncle John Pickering, and objected to the publication of Charles Pickering's report. In *The Inequality of Human Races* Gobineau cited Charles Pickering's research to support his racialist arguments.[93]

In the United States Vice President of the Confederacy Alexander Stephens argued that the American Founding "rested upon the assumption of equality between the races. This was an error." The Confederacy rested upon "the great truth that the Negro is not the equal of the white man; that slavery- subordination to the superior race- is his natural and normal distinction." Thus, Stephens' position rested on Jefferson's racialist argument in the *Notes* on the one hand, but "corrected" his assumption of natural rights on the other. Meanwhile, the Haitian Revolution shook racial discourse in the United States for the next century. In 1861 Wendell Phillips' lecture glorifying Louverture became a popular success. Later in the War, Lincoln met with Frederick Douglass. Abolitionists thought that their agenda had finally won. Subsequent events clearly establish, however, that it did not. As Matthew Clavin notes, "after the abolition of slavery, as the issues of sectionalism and black freedom faded into the past, the national forgetting of the Haitian Revolution began apace." It seems that Charles Pickering's racialism and Alexander Stephens' argument brought the old differences between Jefferson and Pickering full circle.[94]

Acknowledgments

I want to acknowledge those who helped me towards the completion of my Master's thesis. Among the faculty I want to thank my advisers Gary Gallagher and Elizabeth Varon, who provided important feedback. Among the History Department faculty, I want to thank scholars who have given me crucial guidance on the paper's themes: Max Edelson, who helped me understand the Caribbean context of American history; John Stagg, who helped me understand the history of political culture and diplomacy in the early republic; and Alan Taylor, who also helped me understand these two themes, and further taught me better writing methods and pointed me to some important books in the field. I also thank James Ceaser from the Politics Department, who helped me understand the development of American political thought in the early republic and the antebellum era. In addition, I thank Paul Halliday, Claudrena Harold, and Brian Owensby for aiding my academic development during coursework.

Among my fellow grad students, I want to thank Rhonda Barlow, who has been very helpful throughout the process; Brian Bowman, who originally suggested the idea that eventually (with numerous changes) ended as this essay; Jim Hrdlicka and Katie Lantz, who provided useful quotes; and Nic Wood, who gave helpful advice on colonization and his dissertation informed me considerably.

At a certain point during the writing of this thesis, I also experienced personal hardships. For crucial personal help, I especially want to thank Rhonda Barlow; Swati Chawla; Kimberly Hursh; Scott Miller; and above all Elizabeth Klaczynski, whom I barely knew before and who gave me very useful personal advice in crucial phases of the road. I also thank Brian Bowman, Clayton Butler, Rachael Johnson, Barin Kayaoglu, Kristen Lashua, Stephanie Lawton, Nick

Lindberg, and Drew Sorber. In the realm of personal problems, among the faculty I especially thank Peter Onuf, John Stagg and Elizabeth Varon for conversations we had in especially crucial junctions.

---

[1] For the letter, I have relied on Donald Hickey's transcription in Donald R. Hickey, "Timothy Pickering and the Haitian Slave Revolt: A Letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1806," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, vol. 120, no. 3 (July 1984), pp. 149-63. All emphases in Pickering's quotes are in the original, unless indicated otherwise. I have modernized the spelling and changed "Santo Domingo" (as it was called at the time) to Saint-Domingue. The above excerpts are from page 157. My account of the historical circumstances and the debate on the bill in Congress is based on Hickey's introductory explanation and Gordon S. Brown, *Toussaint's Clause: the Founding Fathers and the Haitian Revolution* (University Press of Mississippi, 2005), pp. 268-76.

[2] For the quotes see Hickey, "Timothy Pickering and the Haitian Slave Revolt," 157-8, 163. For the results see *Annals of Congress*, 9th Congress, first session, pp. 1228-9; and Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 274

[3] For recent accounts emphasizing Pickering's role in the Alien and Sedition Acts, see for instance Joanne B. Freeman, "The Election of 1800: A Study in the Logic of Political Change," *The Yale Law Journal*, vol. 108, no. 8 (June 1999), pp. 1959-94 ; James P. Martin, "When Repression is Democratic and Constitutional: the Federalist Theory of Representation and the Sedition Act of 1798," *The University of Chicago Law Review*, vol. 66, no. 1 (winter 1999), pp. 117-82; Paul Newman, *Fries's Rebellion: the Enduring Struggle for the American Revolution* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005); Eric Burns, *Infamous Scribblers: the Founding Fathers and the Rowdy Beginnings of American Journalism* (Public Affairs, 2007), pp. 361-7; and Maurice J. Bric, "The Irish Immigrant and the Broadening of the Polity in Philadelphia, 1790-1800," in *Empire and Nation: the American Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by Eliga H. Gould and Peter S. Onuf (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), pp. 167-9. For examples (among many) of Pickering's vilification after Jefferson's elections see George Dangerfield, *The Era of Good Feelings* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952), p. 36; and Andrew Shankman, *Crucible of American Democracy: the Struggle to Fuse Egalitarianism and Capitalism in Jeffersonian Pennsylvania* (University Press of Kansas, 2004), p. 198.

[4] For the quotes see Pickering to Rufus King, March 4 1804, in Henry Adams, *Documents Relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815* (Boston, 1877), p. 351; and Pickering to Richard Peters, December 24 1803, in Adams, *Documents Relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815*, 338. For recent discussions of the Northern Confederacy plans see Thomas DiLorenzo, "Yankee Confederates: New England Secession Movements prior to the War Between the States," in *Secession, State, and Liberty*, edited by David Gordon (Transaction Publishers, 1998), pp. 135-54; Forrest McDonald, *States' Rights and the Union: Imperium in Imperio, 1776-1876* (University of Kansas Press, 2000), pp. 60-62; Kevin M. Gannon, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction': New England Federalists and the Idea of a Northern Confederacy, 1803-1804," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 21, No. 3

(autumn, 2001), pp. 413-43; and David C. Hendrickson, *Union, Nation, or Empire: the American Debate over International Relations, 1789-1941* (University Press of Kansas, 2009), pp. 451-2.

[5] For Kerber's quote see Linda K. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America* (Cornell University Press, 1970), p. vii. Kerber did not agree and attempted the challenge this view. However, it applies to most histories since her book came out. For Pickering's feuds with Jefferson in the last decade of his life see Merrill D. Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind* (Oxford University Press, 1960), 120; Francis Cogliano, *Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy* (Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 138-40; Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1997) pp. 172-7; and Jeffrey H. Morrison, "James Madison and Thomas Jefferson: A 'Friendship which was for Life,'" in *A Companion to James Madison and James Monroe*, edited by Stuart Leibiger (Wiley and Sons, 2012), p. 261.

[6] Jefferson to Madison, August 30 1823; *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Berg (Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, 1904), XV: 463-4; Jefferson to John Adams, June 15 1813; *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: the Complete Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams*, edited by Lester J. Cappon (University of North Carolina Press, 1959), pp. 331-2.

[7] For the documents, see Adams, *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*; and *Life and Letters of George Cabot*, edited by Henry Cabot Lodge (Boston, 1878). On Adams' admonition against disunion through denunciations of Pickering, see James P. Young, *Henry Adams: the Historian as Political Theorist* (University of Kansas Press, 2001), pp. 60-62; Michael O'Brien, *Henry Adams and the Southern Question* (University of Georgia Press, 2005), pp.88-9; and Garry Wills, *Henry Adams and the Making of America* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005). For Jefferson Davis' quote see Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (D. Appleton and Company, 1881), 71-2. For the specter of disunion in the early republic and especially the antebellum era see Kevin M. Gannon, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction': New England Federalists and the Idea of a Northern Confederacy, 1803-1804," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (autumn, 2001), pp.413-43; Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (University of North Carolina Press, 2008); and Daniel Corbett Wewers, "The Specter of Disunion in the Early American Republic, 1783-1815" (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 2008).

[8] For references to Pickering as a disunionist see for instance Bradford Perkins, *Prologue to War: England and the United States, 1805-1812* (University of California Press, 1961), p. 34 and passim. For Pickering's characterization as a "disunionist leader" who was similar to the "dinosaur or the mammoth," see George Dangerfield, *The Era of Good Feelings* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952), p. 87. For Clarfield's characterization, see Gerard H. Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980), p. vii.

[9] For the debates on the Santo Domingo Bill see Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 47-9; and Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 268-76. On Walker, see for instance Verner D. Mitchell, "David Walker, African Rights, and Liberty," in *Multiculturalism: Roots and Realities*, edited by C. James Trotman (Indiana University Press, 2002), pp. 94-5.
On Jefferson's racism see for instance Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes towards the Negro, 1550-1812* (University of North Carolina Press, 1968); Michael Zuckerman, "The Power of Blackness: Thomas Jefferson and the Revolution in Saint-Domingue," in idem, *Almost Chosen People: Oblique Biographies in the American Grain* (University of California Press, 1993), pp. 175-218 (reference to "Negrophobia" on p. 196); Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), pp. 157-65; and Ronald Angelo Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (University of Georgia Press, 2014), pp. 161-84.
For recent emphasis on the Haitian Revolution's impact on the slavery and race discourse in the United States, see for instance Bruce R. Dain, *Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic* (Harvard University Press, 2002), pp.81-111; White, *Encountering Revolution*; David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation* (Alfred A. Knopf, 2014); and Sarah Fanning, *Caribbean Crossing: African Americans and the Haitian Emigration Movement* (New York University Press, 2015).

[10] For the older studies on Federalism see David Hackett Fischer, "The Myth of the Essex Junto," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (April, 1964), pp. 191-235; idem, *The Revolution of American Conservatism: the Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy* (Harper & Row, 1965); James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: the Federalists and the Origins of Party Structure in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (Alfred a. Knopf, 1970); and Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*.

For recent studies of New England Federalism that either treat Pickering marginally or do not mention him at all, see for instance Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (University Press of Virginia, 2001); Jonathan D. Sassi, *A Republic of Righteousness: the Public Christianity of the Post-Revolutionary New England Clergy* (Oxford University Press, 2001); Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge University Press, 2009); and Jonathan Den Hartog, *Patriotism and Piety: Federalist Politics and Religious Struggle in the New American Nation* (University of Virginia Press, 2014). For the general abandonment of parties in recent political histories see for instance Sean Wilentz, "American Political Histories," in *A Century of American Historiography*, edited by James M. Banner JR. (St. Martin's, 2010), pp. 1-10; and Johann N. Neem, "Two Approaches to Democratization: Engagement versus Capability," in *Practicing Democracy: Popular Politics in the United States from the Constitution to the Civil War*, edited by Daniel Peart and Adam I. P. Smith (University of Virginia Press, 2015), pp. 247-80.

[11] For studies that downplay the connection between Federalist critics of the "slave power" and moral opposition to slavery, see for instance Banner, *To the Hartford Convention*, 104-9; Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 23-64; Gordon

S. Wood, "The Crisis of 1798-1799," in idem, *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp.260-61; and idem, "Between Slavery and Freedom," in idem, *Empire of Liberty*, pp. 532-3. For recent studies see Matthew Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic* (University of North Carolina Press, 2006); and George William Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders' Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic* (University of Chicago Press, 2010).

[12] See Garry Wills, *"Negro President": Jefferson and the Slave Power* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003); Richard Buel Jr., *America on the Brink: how the Political Struggles over the War of 1812 almost destroyed the Young Republic* (Palgrave McMillan, 2005); and Arthur Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson's Haitian Policy: Myths and Realities* (Lexington Books, 2011). For Wills' usage of Pickering as a "useful anti-Jefferson," see p. xiv. Moreover, as several historians have noted, opposition to the "slave power" did not necessarily reflect a moral opposition to slavery. Thus, Pickering's stance on the issue does not say much about his ethical attitudes. For a discussion of the "slave power", see Leonard L. Richards, *The Slave Power: the Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860* (Louisiana State University Press, 2000).

[13] As will be apparent, I have found that this could only partially be done; Jefferson's prominence throughout most of Pickering's career, and the immense focus on his character in American memory and historiography, compel his inclusion in the analysis.

[14] On benevolent paternalism in the North see Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860* (Cornell University Press, 1998); James Brewer Stewart, "Modernizing 'Difference': the Political Meanings of Color in the Free States, 1776-1840," in *Race and the Early Republic: Racial Consciousness and Nation-Building in the Early Republic*, edited by Michael A. Morrison and James Brewer Stewart (Rowman and Littlefield, 2002), pp. 113-34; and Peter S. Onuf, "Federalism, Democracy, and Liberty in the New American Nation," in *Exclusionary Empire: English Liberty Overseas, 1600-1900*, edited by Jack P. Greene (Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 132-59. My discussion of benevolent paternalism in Massachusetts is shaped in part by Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), especially pp. 1-16 and 87-105. Laurie discusses the antebellum era but he deals extensively with the origins of benevolent paternalism in Massachusetts, which date back to the early republic.

[15] On Jefferson see for instance Peter S. Onuf and Jan Ellen Lewis, "American Synecdoche: Thomas Jefferson as Image, Icon, Character, and Self," in *The Mind of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Peter S. Onuf (University of Virginia Press, 2007), pp. 50-64. On the rise of nationalism in the early American republic see for instance David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: the Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (University of North Carolina Press, 1997); and Peter S. Onuf, "Imperialism and Nationalism in the Early American Republic," in *Empire's Twin: U.S Anti-imperialism from the Founding Era to the Age of Terrorism*, edited by Ian Tyrrell and Jay Sexton (Cornell University Press, 2015), pp. 21-40. On the specific influence of the Hartford Convention and the perceived triumph of Jeffersonian ideology on New Englanders see for instance Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *The Plain*

and Noble Grain of Truth: Nationalism and Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860 (University of Georgia Press, 2008), pp. 36-41; and Alan Taylor, "Dual Nationalisms: Legacies of the War of 1812," in *What So Proudly We Hailed: Essays on the Contemporary Meaning of the War of 1812*, edited by Pietro S. Nivola and Peter J. Kastor (Brookings Institution Press, 2012), pp. 67-96. On the rise of racial consensus see James Oakes, "Conflict versus Racial Consensus in the History of Antislavery Politics," in *Contesting Slavery: the Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (University of Virginia Press, 2011), pp. 291-304; and David Waldstreicher, "The Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics: Before, Beneath, and Between Parties, 1790-1840," in *Contesting Democracy: Substance and Structure in American Political History, 1775-2000*, edited by Byron E. Shafer and Anthony J. Badger (University Press of Kansas, 2001), pp. 37-64. On the rise of the "positive good" justification of slavery see for instance Jan Lewis, "The Problem of Slavery in Southern Political Discourse," in *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*, edited by David Thomas Konig (Stanford University Press, 1995), pp. 265-300.

[16] For the term "the most reluctant of revolutionaries," see J. Rixey Ruffin, *A Paradise of Reason: William Bentley and Enlightenment Christianity in the Early Republic* (Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 134. On Theophilus Parsons and the "Essex Result," see Ronald M. Peters Jr., *The Massachusetts Constitution of 1780: a Social Compact* (University of Massachusetts Press, 1978), pp. 29-31.

[17] The quotes are from Pickering's letter to John Pickering, April 26 1778; Timothy Pickering Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (hereafter cited as TPP), reel 5, p. 77. For this letter I have relied on James Hrdlicka's transcriptions. On William Gordon's proposals see *The Popular Sources of Political Authority: Documents on the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780*, edited by Oscar and Mary Handlin (Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 21; *The Patriot Preachers of the American Revolution, with Biographical Sketches, 1766-1783*, edited by Frank Moore (C. T. Evans, 1882), pp. 158-9; Samuel Elliott Morrison, *A History of the Constitution of Massachusetts* (Wright and Potter Print Co., 1917), p. 16; Ronald M. Peters Jr., *The Massachusetts Constitution of 1780: a Social Compact* (University of Massachusetts Press, 1978), p. 27; Ruffin, *A Paradise of Reason*, 25. On the 1776 Pennsylvania Constitution see Anthony M. Joseph, *From Liberty to Liberality: the Transformation of the Pennsylvania Legislature, 1776-1820* (Lexington Books, 2012), pp. 18-19. For Pickering's early life and changing affiliations in the American Revolution, see Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, pp. 3-61. See also Randall Nelson Flaherty, "To 'the Most Distant Parts of the Globe': Trade, Politics, and the Maritime Frontier in the Early Republic" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2014).

[18] For Pickering's letter see Pickering to John Pickering, April 26 1778; TPP, reel 5, p. 77. I have relied on James Hrdlicka's transcriptions. For Pickering's religious affiliation, see George Willis Cooke, *Unitarianism in America: A History of it Origin and Development* (American Unitarian Association, 1902), p. 381. For Unitarianism and Federalism see Jonathan D. Sassi, *A Republic of Righteousness: the Public Christianity of the Post-Revolutionary New England Clergy* (Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 158-62, 159; Amanda Porterfield, *Conceived in Doubt:*

Religion and Politics in the New American Nation (University of Chicago Press, 2012), p. 30; Eric R. Schlereth, *An Age of Infidels: the Politics of Religious Controversy in the Early United States* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); and Den Hartog, *Patriotism and Piety*, 119-40. For descriptions of Pickering as a "deist," see Peter S. Onuf, "Jefferson's Religion: Priestcraft, Enlightenment, and the Republican Revolution," in *The Mind of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Peter S. Onuf (University of Virginia Press, 2007), p. 159; and Catherine O'Donnell Kaplan, *Men of Letters in the Early Republic: Cultivating Forms of Citizenship* (University of North Carolina Press, 2008), p. 109. On the "Essex Result" and Massachusetts Constitution's especially liberal attitude on race, see Marc W. Kruman, *Between Authority and Liberty: State Constitution Making in Revolutionary America* (University of North Carolina Press, 1997), pp. 106-7 and 135-6; and Eric Nelson, *The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding* (Harvard University Press, 2014), p. 171.

[19] On Timothy Pickering Sr. and slavery in general see Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*,4-7; Charles Rappleye, *Sons of Providence: the Brown Brothers, the Slave Trade, and the American Revolution* (Simon and Schuster, 2006), p. 233; and Ruffin, *A Paradise of Reason*, 51. On the 1755 petition to the Massachusetts General Court see George W. Williams, *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880* (G.P Putnam's Sons, 1883), 1:220; and Christopher Malone, *Between Freedom and Bondage: Race, Party, and Voting Rights in the Antebellum North* (Routledge, 2008), pp. 152-3. Malone refers to the representative as "Thomas Pickering" but references Williams. The latter named the representative Timothy Pickering.

[20] For ridicule over Pickering's moralizing attitude see Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, 4-7. For the phrase "second generation abolitionist" see Douglas R. Egerton, *Death or Liberty: African Americans and Revolutionary America* (Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 235.

[21] For Pickering's plan, see Octavius Pickering and Charles W. Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering* (Boston, 1867-1873), 1:458-60, 1:546-9. For the narrative, see Peter S. Onuf, *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance* (Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. 110-11; and Paul Finkelman, "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 6, no. 4 (winter 1986), 353-4. For the speculation on the connection between Pickering and the ultimate ban on slavery see Rappleye, *Sons of Providence*, 245-6.

[22] See Pickering to Rufus King, March 8 1785; TPP, reel 5, pp. 352-3.

[23] For Pickering's early comment on Indians as "savages," see Pickering to Zebulon Butler, July 10 1778; TPP, reel 5, p. 88. I have relied on James Hrdlicka's transcription. For Pickering's assertion on Indians as hunters, see Robert W. Venables, "American Indian Influences on the America of the Founding Fathers," in *Exiled in the Land of the Free: Democracy, Indian Nations, and the U.S Constitutions*, edited by John C. Mohawk and Oren R. Lyons (Clear Light Publishers, 1992), p. 110. On the racial construction of Indians in New England and Pennsylvania in the late eighteenth century see Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (W. W.

Norton, & Co., 2007); David J. Silverman, *Red Brethren: the Brotherhood and Stockbridge Indians and the Problem of Race in Early America* (Cornell University Press, 2010); and idem, "Racial Walls: Race and the Emergence of American White Nationalism," in *Anglicizing America: Empire, Revolution, Republic*, edited by Ignacio Gallup-Diaz, Andrew Shankman, and David J. Silverman (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), pp. 181-204. On Indian self-construction see for instance Gregory Evans Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: the North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), p. 27.

[24] On Pickering and Indians in general, see Edward H. Phillips, "Timothy Pickering at his Best: Indian Commissioner, 1790-1794," in Essex Institute, Historical Collections, CII (July 1966), pp. 163-202; Bernard W. Sheehan, "The Indian Problem in the Northwest: from Conquest to Philanthropy," in *Launching the "Extended Republic": the Federalist Era*, edited by Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert (University Press of Virginia, 1996), pp. 214-16; Alan Taylor, *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution* (Vintage Books, 2006); and David Andrew Nichols, *Red Gentlemen and White Savages: Indians, Federalists, and the Search for Order on the American Frontier* (University of Virginia Press, 2008), pp. 129-35. For Pickering's comment to King, see Pickering to Rufus King, June 4 1785; quoted in Stewart Banner, *How the Indians Lost their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier* (Harvard University Press, 2005), 2005, p. 126. For Pickering's insistence on truthfulness, see Pickering to Anthony Wayne, April 8 1795, quoted in Andrew R.L. Clayton, "'Noble Actors' upon 'the Theatre of Honour': Power and Civility in the Treaty of Greenville," in *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*, edited by Andrew R.L Clayton and Fredrika J. Teute (University of North Carolina Press, 1998), p. 259. For Pickering's comment see Pickering to Hargrove, August 8 1794; quoted in Edward Hake Phillips, "The Political Career of Timothy Pickering, Federalist, 1750-1802" (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1950), p. 411. On Jefferson's support of a "philanthropic" approach with regard to Indians and its similarity to Pickering's view, see Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (University of North Carolina Press, 1973), passim; specifically on Pickering's agreement with him, see p. 6. See also Robert Glenn Parkinson, "Enemies of the People: the Revolutionary War and Race in the New American Nation" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2005), p. 342. On the religious aspects of Pickering's views (as well as others') see for instance Jonathan D. Sassi, "Religion, Race, and the Founders," in *Faith and the Founders of the American Republic*, edited by Mark David Hall and Daniel L. Dreisbach (Oxford University press, 2014), p. 193.

[25] On views of race from the beginning of colonization to the late eighteenth century in Europe and New England see William Stanton, *The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes toward Race in America, 1815-59* (University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 1-14; James W. Ceaser, *Reconstructing America: the Symbol of America in Modern Thought* (Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 35-6; Melish, *Disowning Slavery*, 1; Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors*, 116-21; Ann Fabian, *The Skull Collectors: Race, Science, and America's Unburied Dead* (University of Chicago Press, 2010), pp.14-15, 34-6; Richard A. Bailey, *Race and Redemption in Puritan New England* (Oxford University Press,

2011), pp. 115-33; and Katherine Reklis, *Theology and the Kinesthetic Imagination: Jonathan Edwards and the Making of Modernity* (Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 110-14.

[26] For Jefferson's comments on Africans see Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, edited by William Paden (University of North Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 137-41. On the challenges to Jefferson's racial theories, see for instance Frank Shuffelton, "Thomas Jefferson: Race, Culture, and the Failure of Anthropological Method," in *Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America*, edited by Frank Shuffelton (Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 58; and Nicholas Guyatt, "'The Outskirts of Our Happiness': Race and the Lure of Colonization in the Early Republic" *Journal of American History* (March 2009), pp. 991-2 and passim.

[27] For Jefferson's views on Indians see Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, 48-64. On Jefferson's support of a "philanthropic" approach with regard to Indians and its similarity to Pickering's view, see Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (University of North Carolina Press, 1973), passim; specifically on Pickering's agreement with him, see p. 6. See also Robert Glenn Parkinson, "Enemies of the People: the Revolutionary War and Race in the New American Nation" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2005), p. 342. On the religious aspects of Pickering's views (as well as others') see for instance Jonathan D. Sassi, "Religion, Race, and the Founders," in *Faith and the Founders of the American Republic*, edited by Mark David Hall and Daniel L. Dreisbach (Oxford University press, 2014), p. 193.

[28] On Pickering and Indian languages, see Karim M. Tiro, "'We Wish to Do you Good': the Quaker Mission to the Oneida Nation, 1790-1840," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 26, no. 3 (fall 2006), pp. 357-8; Sean P. Harvey, *Native Tongues: Colonialism and Race from Encounter to the Reservation* (Harvard University Press, 2015), pp. 68-70; and Phillip Round, *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663-1880* (University of North Carolina Press, 2010), pp. 137-8. As I note below, Pickering's son John continued the tradition and became a renowned philologist determined to fight racial prejudice through assimilation.

[29] On Pickering and the Wyoming settlers see Peter S. Onuf, *The Origins of the Federal Republic: Jurisdictional Controversies in the United States, 1775-1787* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), p. 71. On Pickering and the Louisianans, see Peter John Kastor, "'An Apprenticeship to Liberty': the Incorporation of Louisiana and the Struggle for Nationhood in the Early American Republic, 1803-1820" (PhD Dissertation, the University of Virginia, 1999), p. 153 (Pickering's quote), and 527 (Kastor's quote).

[30] On John Taylor of Caroline, see Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire: the Language of American Nationhood* (University of Virginia Press, 2000), pp. 41-4. On Jefferson and Indians see for instance Cecile Vidal, "From Incorporation to Exclusion: Indians, Europeans and Americans in the Mississippi Valley from 1699 to 1830," in *Empires of the Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase*, edited by Peter J. Kastor and François Weil (University of Virginia Press, 2009), pp.82-3; and Andrew Clayton, "Thomas Jefferson and Native

Americans," in *Companion to Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Frank Cogliano and Francis D. Cogliano (John Wiley and Sons, 2011), pp. 237-52.

[31] For Pickering and the PAS see Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (the University of North Carolina Press, 2002), p. 28. On King, Dane and Cutler see Paul Finkelman, "The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Federalism," in *Federalists Reconsidered*, edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar (University Press of Virginia, 1998), pp. 138-9 (quotes from p. 138).
For Hamilton and the Jay Treaty see Hamilton, "The Defense no. III," July 29 1795, *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, edited by Harold C. Syrett [University of Virginia press, 2011 (hereafter PAH)], 18:519; and James Oakes, *The Scorpion's Sting: Antislavery and the Coming of the Civil War* (W.W. Norton, 2014), p. 118. On Federalists' anti-Jacobinism see for instance Joanne B. Freeman, "Explaining the Unexplainable: the Cultural Context of the Sedition Acts," in *The Democratic Experiment: New Directions in American Political History*, edited by Meg Jacobs, William J. Novak, and Julian E. Zelizer (Princeton University Press, 2003), pp. 20-49. For a connection between Federalist anti-Jacobinism and antislavery see Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America*.

[32] For Pickering's letter see Pickering to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, February 25 1797; TPP, reel 37, p. 55. For explanations of the letter see Phillips, "The Political Career of Timothy Pickering," p. 411 note 16; Gerard H. Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and American Diplomacy, 1795-1800* (University of Missouri Press, 1969), p. 121, 166; and Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson's Haitian Policy*, 64-6.

[33] For Hamilton's comment on Pinckney see Hamilton to Pickering, May 11 1797; PAH, 21:82. For Pinckney and slavery see Lewis, "The Problem of Slavery in Southern Political Discourse," 266-72; Varon, *Disunion*, 25-6; and Christa Breault Dierksheide, "The Amelioration of Slavery in the Anglo-American Imagination, 1770-1840" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2009), p. 155.

[34] Jefferson to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, September 30 1820, quoted in Dierksheide, "The Amelioration of Slavery in the Anglo-American Imagination," 67. On Pinckney and the Federalists see Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism* (Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 735. On Pinckney and the Missouri Compromise see Marvin R. Zahniser, *Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Founding Father* (University of North Carolina Press, 1967), pp. 244-5; Lewis, "The Problem of Slavery in Southern Political Discourse," 266-72; Dierksheide, "The Amelioration of Slavery in the Anglo-American Imagination," 168, 177; and Robert Pierce Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (University of North Carolina Press, 2005), pp. 112-15.

[35] My general narrative of the American administrations' reaction to the Haitian Revolution has been shaped by Donald R. Hickey, "America's Response to the Slave Revolt in Haiti, 1791-1806," in *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Winter, 1982), pp. 361-379; and Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*. On Jefferson and the white

planters see Wills, *"Negro President,"* 35-7. I hereafter refer to the Adams administration's relations with Louverture as the "American-Dominguan relations," to distinguish them from Jefferson's colder relations. For the Founders and the Caribbean see Hamilton, *The Federalist 11*; Daniel G. Lang, "Hamilton and Haiti," in *The Many Faces of Alexander Hamilton: the Life and Legacy of America's Most Elusive Founding Father*, edited by Douglas Ambrose and Robert W.T Martin (New York University Press, 2006), pp. 231-46; and Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 20. For contemporaries' recognition of Louverture as a black leader, see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, p. 2 and passim.

[36] On Edward Stevens' significance see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 68-86 and passim; and Philippe R. Girard, "Trading Races: Joseph and Mary Bunel, a Diplomat and Merchant in Revolutionary Saint-Domingue and Philadelphia," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 30, no. 3 (fall 2010), p. 364. For Jefferson's comment see Jefferson to Madison, February 12 1799; quoted in Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 65.

[37] For the general agreement that Pickering was the main force, see for instance Douglas R. Egerton, "The Empire of Liberty Reconsidered," in *The Revolution of 1800: Democracy, Race, and the New Republic*, edited by James Horn, Jan Ellen Lewis, and Peter S. Onuf (University of Virginia Press, 2002), pp. 309-30; and Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 106-78. On Harper and Otis see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 13, 25; and Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*, 736.

[38] Historians who assume that that Pickering acted under Hamilton's instructions follow an old and thoroughly debunked myth created by Adams, according to which Pickering was merely Hamilton's "puppet" within the administration, and further note that Hamilton and Stevens were childhood friends; see Adams to Jefferson, June 30 1813; *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, p. 346. For assumptions that follow Adams' assertion see for instance R.B Bernstein, "John Adams: the Life and the Biographers," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to John Adams and John Quincy Adams*, edited by David Waldstreicher (John Wiley and Sons, 2013), p. 18. For attribution of the American-Dominguan relations to Hamilton see Michael D. Chan, "Alexander Hamilton on Slavery," *The Review of Politics*, 2004, vol. 66 no. 2, p. 221; and Lang, "Hamilton and Haiti." However, many historians have emphasized Pickering's independence and refuted any notion that he was Hamilton's puppet. Both men disagreed on several key issues such as the possible sending of Jefferson and Madison as envoys to France in 1797 or the Federalists' stance on the Louisiana Purchase in 1803; see for instance Manning J. Dauer, *The Adams Federalists* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953), pp. 174-5; Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and American Diplomacy*; Jacob Ernest Cooke, *Alexander Hamilton* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982), pp. 187-90; Robert W. Smith, *Keeping the Republic: Ideology and Early American Diplomacy* (Northern Illinois University, 2004), pp. 89-91; and Karen E. Robbins, *James McHenry, Forgotten Federalist* (University of Georgia Press, 2013). Specifically on the American-Dominguan relations, historians have recently emphasized that it was Pickering who pressured Hamilton to take note of the negotiations with Louverture. Furthermore, while Edward Stevens was Hamilton's childhood friend, Pickering initiated his mission. Pickering wrote in his memoirs that he had met Stevens through another acquaintance, Dr.

James Yard, and Hamilton knew nothing of the issue until later. Pickering's comment comes within a laudatory evaluation of Hamilton, whom Pickering had admired until his death; thus, he had no interest in depriving Hamilton of his aid to the relations. See Pickering, "Alexander Hamilton," February 15 1822, TPP, reel 51, p. 250; Pickering, "Alexander Hamilton," June 29 1822, TPP, reel 51, p. 302; Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 79-81, 195 note 33. On Hamilton's reluctance and Pickering and King's pressure see Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson's Haitian Policy*, 66-76.

[39] For Adams' definition of independence see Charles Callan Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873: a Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938), p. 34, emphasis added. For Hamilton's letter see Hamilton to Pickering, February 21 1799; PAH, 22:492-3. For emphasis on Hamilton's reluctance see Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson's Haitian Policy*, 66-76. For speculations on the connection between Hamilton's plan and the Haitian Constitution see Lang, "Hamilton and Haiti," 241; and Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 177. For the 1801 Haitian Constitution's conservative nature see Philippe R. Girard, *The Slaves who defeated Napoleon: Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian War of Independence, 1801-1804* (the University of Alabama Press, 2011), pp. 11-32.

[40] On Stevens' significance see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*. For Davis' quote, see David Brion Davis, *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery* (Harvard University Press, 2003), pp. 103-4 note 12. On the relations' significance for the Louisiana Purchase, see Hamilton, "Purchase of Louisiana," to the *New York Evening Post*, July 5 1803; PAH, 26:129-30. For modern historians' agreement with Hamilton see for instance Egerton, "The Empire of Liberty Reconsidered," 324; James Horn, Jan Ellen Lewis, and Peter S. Onuf, "Introduction," ," in *The Revolution of 1800*, pp. xiii-xix; Roger G. Kennedy, *Mr. Jefferson's Lost Cause: Land, Farms, Slavery, and the Louisiana Purchase* (Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 176-7; Wills, *"Negro President,"* 114; Laurent DuBois, "The Haitian Revolution and the Sale of Louisiana; or, Thomas Jefferson's (Unpaid) Debt to Jean-Jacques Dessalines," in *Empires of the Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase*, edited by Peter J. Kastor and François Weil (University of Virginia Press, 2009), pp. 93-116; White, *Encountering Revolution*, 157-65; Malick W. Ghachem, *The Old Regime and the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 2; Edward Baptist, *The Half has never been told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (Basic Books, 2014), pp. 48-9; and Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 3, 180.

[41] For the reference to Louverture as a "black pawn" see Rayford W. Logan, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776-1891* (University of North Carolina Press, 1941), pp. 83-4. Other historians who emphasize this aspect have been Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo*; and Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, introduction and passim. For Albert Gallatin's comments see *Annals of Congress*, House of Representatives, Fifth Congress, 3rd Session, pp. 2751-2. See also White, *Encountering Revolution*, 159; and Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 60-61. For the animalization of blacks, see Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation*. For Abraham Bishop and the Haitian Revolution see Tim Matthewson, "Abraham Bishop, 'The Rights of Black Men,' and the American Reaction to the Haitian Revolution," *The Journal of Negro History*, vol.67, no. 2 (summer 1982),

pp. 148-54; David Waldstreicher and Stephen R. Grossbart, "Abraham Bishop's Vocations, or the Meditations of Jeffersonian Politics," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 18, no. 4 (winter 1998), pp. 617-57; White, *Encountering Revolution*, 134-6; and Nicholas Perry Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency: the Slave Trades and African Colonization in the Early National Antislavery Movement" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2013), pp. 45-7. On Northern Jeffersonians' growing commitment to slavery and racialism see Simon P. Newman, "American Political Culture and the French and Haitian Revolutions: Nathaniel Cutting and the Jeffersonian Republicans," in *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by David P. Geggus (University of South Carolina Press, 2001), pp. 72-92; Rachel Hope Cleves, "'Hurtful to the State': the Political Morality of Federalist Antislavery," in *Contesting Slavery: the Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (University of Virginia Press, 2011), pp. 207-26; and Padraig Riley, "Slavery and the Problem of Democracy in Jeffersonian America," in *Contesting Slavery: the Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (University of Virginia Press, 2011), pp. 227-46. On Bishop's shift see Waldstreicher and Grossbart, "Abraham Bishop's Vocations."

[42] On attributing Pickering's stances to commercial interests alone see for instance Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 6 On Otis see Larry E. Tise, *The American Counterrevolution: A Retreat from Liberty, 1783-1800* (Stackpole Books, 1998), p. 525 and elsewhere; and Leonard L. Richards, *Gentlemen of Standing and Property: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America* (Oxford University Press, 1970).

[43] For the letter see Pickering to King, March 12, 1799; *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, edited by Charles R. King (G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900), vol. 2, 557-8; emphasis added. I hereafter cite this as LCRK. The letter ended with a comment deriding Adams for leaving to Quincy; this is evidence that Pickering specifically did not intend for Adams to read it. On Adams and Pickering's deteriorating relationship see for instance Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and American Diplomacy*; Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*; and Nathan Pearl-Rosenthal, "Private Letters and Public Diplomacy: the Adams Network and the Quasi-War, 1797-1798," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 31, no. 2 (summer 2011), pp. 283-311. Pickering withheld from Adams one of Louverture's letters; see Philippe R. Girard, "Black Talleyrand: Toussaint Louverture's Diplomacy, 1798-1802," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, vol. 66, no. 1 (January 2009), p. 99.

[44] For the contrast see LCRK, 2:556; and LCRK, 2:557-8.

[45] LCRK, 2:557-8

[46] LCRK, 2:557-8; emphasis added

[47] François Furstenberg, "Beyond Freedom and Slavery: Autonomy, Virtue, and Resistance in Early American Political Discourse," *Journal of American History*, 89 (March 2003), pp. 1295-1330; Tise, *The American Counterrevolution*, 491-2. For Louverture's literacy see Deborah Jenson, "Toussaint Louverture, Spin Doctor?

Launching the Haitian Revolution in the French Media," in *Trees of Liberty: Cultural Legacies of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by Doris L. Garraway (University of Virginia Press, 2008), pp. 48-60.

[48] As an example of the presentation of the Haitian Revolution as egalitarian in the modern sense of the term see Nick Nesbitt, *Universal Emancipation: the Haitian Revolution and the Radical Enlightenment* (University of Virginia Press, 2008). On the conservative and not easily defined nature of the Haitian Revolution see Girard, "Black Talleyrand"; and David Geggus, "The Haitian Revolution in Atlantic Perspective," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, 1450-1850*, edited by Nicholas Canny and Philip Morgan (Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 533-49. For references to Hamilton and Pickering's plan for the Dominguan regime that treat the issue shortly see for instance Ronald Angelo Johnson, who treats the matter shortly as a symbol of "the condescending political views of High Federalists towards all others, including people of color," and leaves the matter at that; see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 176-7. See also Egerton, "The Empire of Liberty Reconsidered," 321.
For discussions of Pickering and Haiti that attempt to turn him into a Jeffersonian egalitarian hero see Wills, *"Negro President,"* 33-45. Similarly, Michael J. Drexler has recently surmised that Hamilton's sketch of a feudal regime tempered "the enthusiasm of perhaps the most sincere advocate of Louverture and the rebel slaves in American government." However, there is no reason to assume that Pickering saw a contradiction between Hamilton's proposed regime and the ideals of the Haitian Revolution. See Michael J. Drexler, "Haiti, Modernity, and U.S Identities," *Early American Literature*, vol. 43, p. 2 (2008), p. 404 note 1. Larry E. Tise has noted the ideological dimensions of the Federalist support of the Haitian Revolution and their envy of Louverture for keeping liberty and order; see Tise, *The American Counterrevolution*, 491-2. While Tise considers it a betrayal of the principles of the American Revolution, he at least acknowledges the ideological dimension that guided "Federalists." However, contrary to Tise's contention, it was not "the Federalists" who glorified Louverture. As I note below, Adams came to oppose Dominguan independence.

[49] On Adams's later position on independence see Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo*, 53. For Adams' letter to Pickering, see Adams to Pickering, April 17 1799; http://founders.archives.gov/?q=17%20april%201799&s=1411311113&r=213 For Adams' discomfort of the notion of a black republic see for instance Alexander DeConde, *Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy* (Northeastern University Press, 1992), p. 23. For a later example, regarding Daniel Webster's recognition of Hawaii, see Eric Love, "White is the Color of Empire: the Annexation of Hawaii in 1898," in *Race, Nation, and Empire in American History*, edited by James T. Campbell, Matthew Paul Guterl, and Robert G. Lee (University of North Carolina Press, 2007), p. 77. On Wilson's invasion of Haiti, possibly from racist motives, see Erez Manela, "'People of Many Races': the World beyond Europe in the Wilsonian Imagination," in *Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson: the American Dilemma of Race and Democracy*, edited by John Milton Cooper Jr. and Thomas J. Knock (University of Virginia Press, 2010), p. 200. For white and black abolitionists' usage of Louverture as a role model see Alfred N. Hunt, *Haiti's Influence on Antebellum America: Slumbering Volcano in the Caribbean* (Louisiana State University Press, 1988), pp. 90-101; Sterling Stuckey, *Slave Culture: Nationalist Theory and the Foundations of Black America*

(Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 128; Douglas R. Egerton, *Gabriel's Rebellion: the Virginia Slave Conspiracies of 1800 and 1802* (University of North Carolina Press, 1993), pp. 46-7; John Stauffer, *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race* (Harvard University Press, 2001), p. 255; Benjamin Quarles, "Black History's Antebellum Origins," in *African-American Activism before the Civil War: the Freedom Struggle in the Antebellum North*, edited by Patrick Rael (Routledge, 2008), pp. 87-8; Jeffrey R. Kerr-Ritchie, *Freedom's Seekers: Essays on Comparative Emancipation* (Louisiana State University Press, 2013), pp. 60-71; and Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation*. On the significance of the concept of "a black republic" in the nineteenth century see for instance Leslie M. Alexander, "'The Black Republic': the Influence of the Haitian Revolution on Northern Black Political Consciousness, 1816-1862," in *African Americans and the Haitian Revolution: Selected Essays and Historical Documents*, edited by Maurice Jackson and Jacqueline Bacon (Routledge, 2010), pp. 57-80.

[50] For historians who mention Bishop as an example of the liberating nature of Jeffersonian ideology see for instance Arthur Scherr, "'Sambos' and 'Black-Cut Throats': Peter Porcupine on Slavery and Race in the 1790s," *American Periodicals*, vol. 13 (2003), p. 7; and Seth Cotlar, *Tom Paine's America: the Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic* (University of Virginia Press, 2014), pp. 58-9. For the general abandonment of parties in recent political histories see for instance Sean Wilentz, "American Political Histories," in *A Century of American Historiography*, edited by James M. Banner JR. (St. Martin's, 2010), pp. 1-10; and Johann N. Neem, "Two Approaches to Democratization: Engagement versus Capability," in *Practicing Democracy: Popular Politics in the United States from the Constitution to the Civil War*, edited by Daniel Peart and Adam I. P. Smith (University of Virginia Press, 2015), pp. 247-80. To a large degree, this tendency to sanctify those who avoided political participation characterizes treatments of anti-slavery in the antebellum era as well; see Laurie, *Beyond Garrison*; and Reinhard O. Johnson, *The Liberty Party, 1840-1848: Antislavery Third-Party Politics in the United States* (Louisiana State University Press, 2009). Two exceptions from the neglect of Pickering with regard to sympathy towards the Haitian Revolution are Donald Hickey, who published Pickering's letter to Jefferson, and Garry Wills. See Hickey, "Timothy Pickering and the Haitian Slave Revolt"; and Wills, *"Negro President,"* 33-45. Matthew Clavin briefly mentions Pickering alongside Bishop and Theodore Dwight as early advocates of the Revolution; see Matthew Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: the Promise and Peril of A Second Haitian Revolution* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), p. 21.

[51] On Pickering's aid to Stevens see Pickering to William Thornton, January 4 1826; TPP, reel 16, p. 83-83a. For Pickering's later comments on Louverture see Pickering, "Alexander Hamilton," February 15 1822, and Pickering to Thornton (cited above).

[52] See Pickering to Andrew Stevenson, April 10 1826; TPP, reel 16, pp. 107a-108. For Everett's speech, see the *Register of Debates*, House of Representatives, 19th Congress, 1st session, p. 1579. The emphases in Everett's speech are Pickering's.

[53] Frederick Douglass is quoted in David Brion Davis, "Impacts of the French and Haitian Revolutions," in *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by David P. Geggus (University of South Carolina Press, 2001), p. 3. For the reactions to Douglass's speech see Glenn McClish, "Frederick Douglass and the Consequences of Rhetoric: the Interpretative Framing and Publication History of 2 January 1893 Haiti Speeches," *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, vol. 30, no. 1 (winter 2012), pp. 45-6, 55-6.

[54] See LCRK 2:557; and TPP, reel 10, p. 476. I thank Rhonda Barlow for calling my attention to the discrepancy.

[55] For recent discussions of Pickering and the Jefferson and Madison administrations' policies see for instance Wills, *"Negro President"*; Buel, *America on the Brink*; and Randall Nelson Flaherty, "To 'the Most Distant Parts of the Globe': Trade, Politics, and the Maritime Frontier in the Early Republic" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2014). For the opinion that Pickering was a significant leader among New England Federalists around that time, see Donald R. Hickey, "Federalist Party Unity and the War of 1812," *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1 (April 1978), pp. 23-39. On the view of New England Federalists' opposition to the administration's British policy in general, and the Hartford Convention in particular, as almost disunionist in nature, see for instance Forrest McDonald, *States' Rights and the Union: Imperium in Imperio, 1776-1876* (University of Kansas Press, 2000), p. 68; and Gordon S. Wood, "The War of 1812," in idem, *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 667-8. For the lesson drawn from the fate of the Federalist Party against partisan dissention during wartime, see for instance Mark E. Neely, *The Union Divided: Party Conflict in the Civil War North* (Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 11, 119-21, 197.

[56] For Pickering's earlier suggestion for the Indians, see Tim Alan Garrison, *The Legal Ideology of Removal: the Southern Judiciary and the Sovereignty of Native American Nations* (University of Georgia Press, 2009), p. 13. For the general narrative, see Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency," 276-86; and John Wood Sweet, *Bodies Politic: Negotiating Race in the American North, 1730-1830* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), pp. 331-2.

[57] For the quote see Marie Tyler-McGraw, *An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia* (the University of North Carolina Press, 2007), pp. 1-2. For the argument that the ACS was dominated by Southerners see Douglas R. Egerton, "'Its Origin is Not A Little Curious': A New Look at the American Colonization Society," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (winter, 1985), pp. 463-80. For the historiographical treatment of the colonization movement see for instance Eric Burin, "Rethinking Northern White Support for the African Colonization Movement: the Pennsylvania Colonization Society as an Agent of Emancipation," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 127, no. 2 (April 2003), pp. 197-229; idem, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society* (University Press of Florida, 2005); Beverly C. Tomek, *Colonization and its Discontents: Emancipation, Immigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York University Press, 2011); and Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency," 273-6. On Virginians and Northerners with regard to racialism at this period see Guyatt, "'The

Outskirts of our Happiness,'" 991-3. On Cuffe's early association with Black Nationalism, see James Sidbury, *Becoming African in America: Race and Nation in the Early Black Atlantic, 1760-1830* (Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 57-64.

[58] For the division between different supporters of colonization see Tomek, *Colonization and its Discontents*, 1-4. Tomek addresses colonizationists in Pennsylvania, but the distinction seems to apply here as well. For New Englanders' support of colonization from benevolent motives see for instance Hugh Davis, "Northern Colonizationists and Free Blacks, 1823-1837: A Case Study of Leonard Bacon," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 17, no. 4 (winter 1997), pp. 651-75. On Jefferson's growing abandonment of the benevolent rhetoric see Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire*, 176-8.

[59] For the narrative see Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency," 291-2. On the obituary to Cuffe see Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic*, 278 note 79.

[60] Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency," 309; Pickering, "Report on Committee on Memorial of the American Colonization Society," undated; TPP, reel 55, p. 364

[61] On Meade, see Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency," 334-5; and Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation: Emancipation in Virginia from the Revolution to Nat Turner's Rebellion* (Louisiana State University Press, 2006), pp. 167-8. For Pickering and Meade's acquaintance see Pickering to William Meade, September 12 1819; John J. Jones, *A Memoir of the Life of the Right Rev. William Meade, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia* (Baltimore, 1867), p. 123. See also Pickering to Samuel Pickering Gardner, September 23 1819; TPP, reel 38, p. 264.

[62] For Pickering's letter see Pickering to John Randolph, December 24 1819; TPP, reel 15, p. 188. On Randolph and slavery see Aaron Scott Crawford, "John Randolph of Roanoke and the Politics of Doom: Slavery, Sectionalism, and Self-Deception, 1773-1821" (PhD Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 2012), pp.222-69; David F. Ericson, "Slave Smugglers, Slave Catchers, and Slave Rebels: Slavery and American State Development, 1787-1842," in *Contesting Slavery: the Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (University of Virginia Press, 2011), pp. 183; Riley, "The Problem of Slavery and Democracy in Jeffersonian America," 236, 240; and Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath*, 112-15.

[63] Pickering to Charles Fenton Mercer, January 15 1820; TPP, reel 15, p. 199

[64] See Pickering to Charles Fenton Mercer, January 15 1820; TPP, reel 15, p. 199a. For Mercer's status as a large slaveholder see Douglas R. Egerton, *Charles Fenton Mercer and the Trial of National Conservatism* (University Press of Mississippi, 1989), pp. 50-51.

[65] Pickering's biographer Gerard Clarfield notes that slavery was "the moral and political issue that most interested Pickering in his long years in retirement"; see Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, 264.

Clarfield's remark is especially significant since he ignores Pickering's stance on slavery throughout his biography. For Pickering's comment see Pickering to Andrew Stevenson, April 10 1826; TPP, reel 16, p. 108.

[66] See Pickering to Elijah Hunt Mills, January 24 1820; TPP, reel 15, p. 205. On Mills, see Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism*, 270-71; and Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy*, 39-40.

[67] See Pickering to Mercer (cited above); and Pickering to Andrew Stevenson, April 10 1826, TPP, reel 16, p. 107a. Stevenson and Pickering continued their friendly correspondence, but Pickering's preaching did not help; in the historical record he is remembered as a proud slaveholder. He was later the American ambassador to Great Britain, and he became the subject of Irish abolitionist Daniel O'Connell's attacks because of his "slave-breeding." See Angela F. Murphy, *American Slavery, Irish Freedom: Abolition, Immigrant Citizenship, and the Transatlantic Movement for Irish Repeal* (Louisiana State University Press, 2010), 32-3, 39-40; and Suzanne Cooper Guasco, *Confronting Slavery: Edward Coles and the Rise of Antislavery Politics in Nineteenth-Century America* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2013), p. 200.

[68] See Pickering to John Marshall, January 17 1826, TPP, reel 16, pp. 84-84a. The quote in Pickering's letter to Marshall is taken from John Marshall, *A History of the Colonies Planted by the English on the Continent of North America* (Philadelphia, 1824), p. 56.

[69] For Pickering's letters see Pickering to Marshall, TPP, reel 16, p. 85; and Pickering to Stevenson, TPP, reel 16, p. 106. For the information on Troup, see Davis A. Nichols, "Land, Republicanism, and Indians: Power and Policy in Early National Georgia, 1780-1825," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, vol. 85, no. 2 (summer 2001), pp. 199-200, 224; and William G. McLoughlin, "Georgia's Role in Instigating Compulsory Indian Removal," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, vol. 70, no. 4 (winter 1986), pp. 607-8. To a degree, Marshall fulfilled Pickering's expectations. In Worcester v. Georgia, he accepted the Cherokees' contention that they were politically distinct from the United States, were entitled to maintain their existing political and legal institutions, and held a legitimate title to their lands that was guaranteed by federal treaty. In an earlier ruling he asserted that the relationship between the Federal authority and the Cherokees "resemble[d] that of a ward to his guardian." Southern supporters of slavery later cited his ruling as evidence of Native American inferiority. See Tim Alan Garrison, "Beyond Worcester: the Alabama Supreme Court and the Sovereignty of the Creek Nation," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 19, no. 3 (autumn 1999), pp. 426-8; and McLaughlin, "Georgia's Role in Instigating Compulsory Indian Removal," 631-2.

[70] Pickering, "Mr. Canning and Professor Everett"; *Salem Gazette*, April 14 1826. I discuss this article below.

[71] Pickering to Stevenson, April 10 1826, TPP, reel 16, p. 106; Pickering to John Lowell, April 25 1826, TPP, reel 16, p. 120; Irving H. Bartlett, "Edward Everett Reconsidered," *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 69, no. 3 (September 1996), pp. 436-7

[72] My following quotes from the article are taken Pickering, "Mr. Canning and Professor Everett," *Salem Gazette*, April 14 1826. On Canning see Dierksheide, "The Amelioration of Slavery in the Anglo-American Imagination," 251-2.

[73] Elizabeth Heyrick is quoted in Clare Midgley, "The Dissenting Voice of Elizabeth Heyrick: an Exploration of the Links between Gender, Religious Dissent, and Anti-Slavery Radicalism," in *Women, Dissent, and Antislavery in Britain and America, 1790-1865*, edited by Elizabeth J. Clapp and Julie Roy Jeffrey (Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 103. For the context see Seymour Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation* (Oxford University Press, 2002), p.129; and Edward Bartlett Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: the Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Louisiana State University Press, 2008), pp. 1-16.

[74] For Pickering's personal comments see Pickering, "Negro Slavery," April 1826, reel 46, pp. 316-17.

[75] For Pickering's support of Jackson see Lynn Parsons, *The Birth of Modern Politics: Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, and the Election of 1828* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 164-6.

[76] David Mayers, *Dissenting Voices in America's Rise to Power* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 30; Melish, *Disowning Slavery*, 212-13 and passim

[77] On the distinction between gradualists and abolitionists see for instance Tomek, *Colonization and its Discontents*, 1-9. For negative accounts of gradual emancipation see for instance Melish, *Disowning Slavery*, 58-64; and Nick Nesbitt, "On the Political Efficacy of Idealism: Tocqueville, Schoelcher, and the Abolition of Slavery," in *America through European Eyes: British and French Reflections on the New World from the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (the Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), pp. 91-116.

[78] See for instance David N. Gellman, *Emancipating New York: the Politics of Slavery and Freedom, 1777-1827* (Louisiana State University Press, 2008); Tomek, *Colonization and its Discontents*; and Paul J. Polgar, "'To raise them to an Equal Participation': Early National Abolitionism, Gradual Emancipation, and the Promise of African American Citizenship," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 31, no. 2 (summer 2011), pp. 229-58.

[79] On the Whig Party's unity see for instance Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (University of Chicago Press, 1979); and Rachel A. Shelden, "Not So Strange Bedfellows: Northern and Southern Whigs in the Texas Annexation Controversy, 1844-1845," in *A Political Nation: New Directions in Mid-Nineteenth Century American Political History*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Rachel A. Shelden (University of Virginia Press, 2012), pp. 11-35.

[80] See Edward Everett to Thomas Jefferson, April 16 1826, quoted in Bartlett, "Edward Everett Reconsidered," 437 note 20; Dain, *A Hideous Monster of the Mind*, 124-5; Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*,

161-2, 166-8. For discussions of Everett as a transitional figure that ignore his early pro-slavery rhetoric, see for instance Gordon S. Wood, *The Idea of America: Reflections on the Birth of the United States* (Penguin Press, 2011), p. 76, 121-2; and Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy*, 182-3 (Foletta mentions Pickering as a representative of the old Federalism on pages 30 and 34). For an exception see William F. Hartford, *Money, Morals, and Politics: Massachusetts in the Age of the Boston Associates* (Northeastern University Press, 2001), p. 100.

[81] For Pickering's remark, see "The 'Essex Junto,'"; TPP, reel 51, p. 323, emphasis in origin. On Jackson's supporters and the Hartford Convention see Jay Sexton, "Anglophobia in Nineteenth-Century Elections, Politics, and Diplomacy," in *America at the Ballot Box: Elections and Political History*, edited by Gareth Davies and Julian E. Zelizer (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), p. 101. For Edward Coles' early attribution of the ban on slavery to Jefferson and its reasons, see Kurt E. Leichtle and Bruce G. Carveth, *Crusade against Slavery: Edward Coles, Pioneer of Freedom* (Southern Illinois University Press, 2011), p. 177; Guasco, *Confronting Slavery*, 205-13; and Cogliano, *Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy*, 203-5. For mentions of Pickering's neglect see for instance John Chester Miller, *The Wolf by the Ears: Thomas Jefferson and Slavery* (the Free Press, 1977), p. 27; Kennedy, *Mr. Jefferson's Lost Cause*, 249-50; Wills, "*Negro President*"; Egerton, *Death or Liberty*, 235-6.

[82] For the quote see Varon, *Disunion*, 1. On the Whig Party and the Union see Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*; and Shelden, "Not so Strange Bedfellows." On Daniel Webster and the Hartford Convention see Thomas Brown, *Politics and Statesmanship: Essays on the American Whig Party* (Columbia University Press, 1985), p. 56. On the accusations against opponents of the Mexican War see Anne-Marie Taylor, *Young Charles Sumner and the Legacy of the American Enlightenment, 1811-1851* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), p. 242.

[83] For antislavery politics, see for instance Jonathan H. Earle, *Jacksonian Antislavery and the Politics of Free Soil, 1824-1854* (University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Frederick J. Blue, *No Taint of Compromise: Crusaders in Antislavery Politics* (Louisiana State University Press, 2005); Laurie, *Beyond Garrison*; Thomas G. Mitchell, *Antislavery Politics in Antebellum and Civil War America* (Praeger, 2007); and Johnson, *The Liberty Party*. Of course, the term "abolitionists" is applied differently by different scholars. In my division I specifically refrain from discussing men like Everett or Daniel Webster.

[84] For emphases on the correlation between Federalists and antebellum abolitionists see for instance William M. Wiecek, *The Sources of Antislavery Constitutionalism in America, 1760-1848* (Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 154-5; Paul Finkelman, "The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Federalism," in *Federalists Reconsidered*, edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar (University Press of Virginia, 1998), pp. 135-56; Marc M. Arkin, "The Federalist Trope: Power and Passion in Abolitionist Rhetoric," *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 88, No. 1 (June 2001), pp. 75-98; John T. Cumbler, *From Abolition to Rights for All: the Making of a Reform Community in Nineteenth- Century America* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); and Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America*. For specific references to similarities see Banner, *To the Hartford Convention*, 104-9; Kerber, *Federalists*

in Dissent, 64; and Matthew Mason, "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence," *American Nineteenth Century History* (March 2009), p. 9, 18. Elsewhere Mason surmises that "the Federalists' ambivalence about the Union likely at least made possible Garrison's disunionism" and argues that Garrison's characterization of the Constitution as a "covenant with death" was likely taken from an 1814 article in the *Herald*; see Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic*, 300-1 note 105. For Arkin's quote see Arkin, "The Federalist Trope," 77.

[85] For the early references to a connection between Pickering and Garrison see Francis Jackson Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879: the Story of his Life told by his Children* (1894), 1:38, 1:54-5; Pickering and Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering*, 4:319-20; Archibald Henry Grimke, *William Lloyd Garrison, the Abolitionist* (1891), p. 26; Oliver Johnson, *Garrison: an Outline of his Life* (1889), p. 4. For modern references see John L. Thomas, *The Liberator, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biography* (Little Brown, 1963), 30, 32-4, 40; Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 64; Robert H. Abzug, *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination* (Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 36-7; Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*, 626; Wills, *"Negro President"*; and Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America*.

[86] On Garrison and John Quincy Adams see Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison*, 1:104. For Matthew Mason's quote see Mason, "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence," 2. On Garrison's status as an indentured servant see W. J. Rorabaugh, *The Craft Apprentice: from Franklin to the Machine Age in America* (Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 100-101. For Wills' and Mason's different opinions see Wills, *"Negro President*," 192; Mason, "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence," 2

[87] On Garrisonian abolitionists and the Dorr Rebellion see for instance W. Caleb McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists and Transatlantic Reform* (Louisiana State University Press, 2013), pp. 142-3. For attribution of Garrisonian abolitionism to the rise of democracy see for instance Henry Mayer, *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (St. Martin's Press, 1998); and Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*, 10 and passim.

[88] On Garrison and race see Paul Goodman, *Of One Blood: Abolitionism and the Origins of Racial Equality* (University of California Press, 1998), quote on p. 1; John Stauffer, *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race* (Harvard University Press, 2001); Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*; Varon, *Disunion*, 73-4 and elsewhere; and McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery*, 38-41,142-3. For Garrison's support of amalgamation see for instance Louis Ruchames, "Race, Marriage, and Abolition in Massachusetts," *The Journal of Negro History*, vol. 40, no. 3 (July 1955), pp. 253-4.

[89] See Mason, "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence," 7, my emphasis. For other examples see for instance Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 50; and Alan Taylor, *The Internal Enemy: Slavery and War in Virginia, 1772-1832* (W.W Norton, 2013), p. 390.

[90] Timothy Pickering quoted in Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction*, 136; John Pickering quoted in Round, *Removable Type*, 82; Harvey, *Native Tongues*, 169 (first quote); Sean P. Harvey, "Must Not their Languages be Savage and Barbarous like them? Philology, Indian Removal, and Race Science," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 30, no. 4 (winter 2010), p. 532 (second quote)

[91] Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison*, 1:270; Laurie, *Beyond Garrison*, 84-8, 97-8; Stewart, "Modernizing Differences," 121-2 and passim

[92] On the rise of Gobineau's racialism and his dispute with Tocqueville see Ceaser, *Reconstructing America*, 136-61.

[93] On Charles Pickering see for instance Stanton, *The Leopard's Spots,* 92-6; James D. Bilotta, *Race and the Rise of the Republican Party, 1848-1865* (Peter Lang, 1992), p. 109; Fabian, *The Skull Collectors*, 121, 126, 151-2, 242 note 1; and Harvey, *Native Tongues*, 201. For Gobineau's reference to Charles Pickering see Arthur de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races*, translated by Adrian Collins (William Heinemann, 1915), p. 114.

[94] For Alexander Stephens' quote see James W. Ceaser, "Foundational Concepts and American Political Development," in idem, *Nature and History in American Political Development: A Debate* (Harvard University Press, 2006), p. 46. On Wendell Phillips' lecture see Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*, 1-4; and McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery*, 220. Clavin's quote is in *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*, 184.