

“FREE TO BEG OR TO FIGHT:”

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND RELATIONS WITH
BARBARY, 1785-1805

By

BRETT A. MANIS II

Bachelor of Arts in History

Oklahoma City University

Oklahoma City, OK

2006

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
July, 2013

“FREE TO BEG OR TO FIGHT”:
THOMAS JEFFERSON AND RELATIONS WITH
BARBARY, 1785-1805

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Richard C. Rohrs
Thesis Adviser
Dr. L.G. Moses
Dr. David M. D’Andrea

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Lauren and my girls (Avery, Teryn, and Lilee): Without your love and support, I could not have finished. This paper is for you.

To Mom and Dad: For helping in any way I needed.

To Lace and Ralph, Terry and Claudia: For taking care of Lauren and the girls while I spent far too much time in the library.

To Dr. C. Michelle McCargish, for being a great friend and an even better grad school mentor (whether you knew you were or not).

To Dr. Richard Rohrs, for patience, as well as teaching me to be a much better writer and historian.

Name: BRETT A MANIS II

Date of Degree: JULY, 2013

Title of Study: FREE TO BEG OR TO FIGHT: THOMAS JEFFERSON AND
RELATIONS WITH BARBARY, 1785-1805

Major Field: HISTORY

Abstract: Thomas Jefferson, with great consistency, supported American action against the threat of the Barbary pirates. His peers and the great powers of Europe during this time advocated continuing the established tradition of tribute and ransom. In contrast, Jefferson moderated his calls for war based upon the ability of the United States: initially, as part of an international confederation of smaller nations during the 1780s to the sole power willing to fight during his presidency. Throughout his career, Jefferson advocated a position that would not only display American strength, but also affirm his belief in the freedom of the seas and commerce.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. HONOR AND AVARICE IN BARBARY: JEFFERSON AS DIPLOMAT, 1784-1790.....	15
III. ALL THE REST OF THE WORLD IS OPEN: JEFFERSON AS SECRETARY OF STATE AND VICE PRESIDENT, 1790-1801.....	40
IV. CHASTISE THEIR INSOLENT: JEFFERSON AS PRESIDENT, 1801-1805.....	56
V. CONCLUSION.....	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For over two hundred years before the United States gained its independence, the Muslim regencies of Barbary used piracy to fund their states and terrorize the Christian nations of the Mediterranean. Though piracy was nothing new in the area, the North African regencies amassed power and influence far beyond what their size warranted. For years they forced powerful nations to pay tribute to protect Mediterranean commerce. By the time of American independence, the regencies were not as strong as in the seventeenth century. Even with their decline, Barbary piracy managed to destroy or severely curtail the trade of smaller nations.

At its root, the word piracy means “sea robber” in Latin or “brigand” in Greek.¹ By the Crimes Act of 1790, the United States defined piracy as “murder or robbery”

¹ The Latin word is *pirata* and the Greek is *peirates*. Bruce A. Elleman, Andrew Forbes, and David Rosenberg, Naval War College, editors, *Piracy and Maritime Crime: Historical and Modern Case Studies*, *Newport Papers* 35 (January 2010), 1.

while at sea.¹ In an international context, Dutch lawyer Hugo Grotius offered up an explanation in his work *Mare Liberum*.² Summing up Grotius, Commander Penny Campbell of the Royal Australian Navy stated that, beyond the coast, “all states should enjoy free access to the high seas and be denied exclusive jurisdiction over them.”³ By extension, any piracy was against all nations and beyond the scope of national control, generally making the pirate “an outlaw, an enemy of all mankind.”⁴ Thomas Jefferson certainly agreed.

In 1784, the United States faced its first war after the American Revolution. Algiers, recognizing the loss of British protection, declared war on the United States, effectively ending American trade to the Mediterranean. That same year, Congress appointed former Virginia governor Thomas Jefferson to serve on the American diplomatic commission in Europe. Joining Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, Jefferson quickly became the strongest advocate for American strength and honor when dealing with Barbary. With Franklin returning to the United States in 1785, Adams assumed the unofficial post of senior diplomat and adamantly opposed Jefferson’s ideas and strategies. Undeterred, Jefferson continued his personal crusade against Barbary piracy and American inaction throughout his career, culminating in a daring campaign that carried the American flag to the shores of North Africa.

¹ “Statute II: Chap. IX – An Act for the Punishment of certain Crimes against the United States.” House of Representatives 1st Congress, II Session, 30 April 1790, *Statutes at Large*, 113-115 <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage> (accessed 27 June 2013)

² In English, *Freedom of the Seas*, published in 1608.

³ Penny Campbell, “A Modern History of the International Legal Definition of Piracy” in *Piracy and Maritime Crime: Historical and Modern Case Studies*, edited by Bruce A. Elleman, Andrew Forbes, and David Rosenberg, Naval War College, *Newport Papers* 35 (January 2010), 20-21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

Piracy had been an issue in the Mediterranean as far back as ancient times. By the eighteenth century, it had become a largely religious and cultural system. The Muslim states of North Africa⁵ resorted to piracy not only to finance their economy but also as a way to exert power far beyond what they could have by conventional means. By terrorizing the commercial shipping lanes of southern Europe, the Barbary States commanded tribute from many European kingdoms, both minor and world powers. Although they could be used as pawns by both Britain and France, the Barbary States terrorized the smaller states of Italy, as well as both Spain and Portugal. Before American independence, the English colonies enjoyed the protection of both the Royal Navy and any treaty the Crown signed with the Barbary States. Upon its rebellion, however, the new United States of America lost all protection. Without a navy capable of defending anything beyond their shoreline, and even that was tenuous, the United States had no leverage with which to negotiate.

Although the idea of American action against Barbary was popular, most in the government and diplomatic circles believed it nearly impossible. Jefferson was among the few, and sometimes the only, government official to remain consistent in his dedication to securing American commerce and upholding her honor. What began as a personal quest at the beginning of his diplomatic career in 1785 turned into a career-long pursuit of action. Through the course of over twenty years of public service, Jefferson continued his calls for a change in not only how the United States dealt with the piracy, but also how European nations handled it. Though characterized as a man of peace and

⁵ These states were Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. Morocco was fully independent while the other three owed nominal allegiance to the Ottoman Empire.

often labeled a pacifist, Jefferson had no tolerance for the piratical nature of Barbary and this profoundly influenced his future actions.

Very few works have been written about this topic. Often, an author devotes a chapter to Barbary in the course of a broader history, or focuses entirely on the nature of the war with the various Barbary States. In addition, interest in the subject has ebbed and flowed over time. This work adds to the historical narrative by focusing on the diplomatic career of Thomas Jefferson, rather than one specific conflict or only the military aspect. Although Jefferson's involvement is touched upon in several histories, very few extend it beyond his involvement as president during the Tripolitan War of 1801-1805.

One of the earliest works is Gardner W. Allen's *Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs*.⁶ Allen presents a narrative history covering roughly forty years of American interaction with Barbary, ending after the war with Algiers in 1815. Allen's aim is to collect the "other adventures of American seamen and consuls among the pirates of the Mediterranean" that "have escaped notice, or are barely mentioned in most histories."⁷ Allen presents a straightforward account of the events that serves as a good starting point for the American point of view.

Louis B. Wright and Julia H. Macleod deliver the more typical focus on General William Eaton, the Navy's agent to the Barbary region, and his attempted capture of

⁶ Gardner W. Allen. *Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1905).

⁷ Allen, *Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs*, preface.

Tripoli. In *The First Americans in North Africa*,⁸ the authors use Eaton's letters and writings to present their account of his actions.⁹ They dispute the popular assessment that Jefferson was opposed to a standing Navy by claiming that Adams signed the bill to reduce the Navy's strength.¹⁰ Their narrative follows Eaton's exploits before concluding that "force, vigorously and intelligently applied, quickly wiped out a nuisance that had been the plague of Christendom for more than six centuries."¹¹ This would not be the last example of exaggeration.

Although his work does not fit into the American history on Barbary relations, Sir Godfrey Fisher's *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa, 1415-1830*¹² serves as a valuable addition to the historiography. Fisher writes from the British perspective and his book is devoted to that viewpoint. His only mention of the United States comes in the preface when he states that the "'conscience of Europe' was unexpectedly awoken from across the Atlantic."¹³ Fisher's contribution is a thorough account of the beginnings of the Barbary regencies.

American historians revived interest in the subject during the 1960s. The largest in scope is James Field's *American and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882*.¹⁴ Field covers the first century of post-independence contact, including a thorough treatment of the missionary movement that developed in the mid-to-late eighteenth century. Although

⁸ Louis B. Wright and Julia H. Macleod, *The First Americans in North Africa: William Eaton's Struggle for a Vigorous Policy Against the Barbary Pirates, 1799-1805* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945).

⁹ Wright and Macleod, *The First Americans in North Africa*, vi.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, vi.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 206.

¹² Sir Godfrey Fisher, *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa, 1415-1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957).

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ James A. Field, Jr., *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

he explores the American use of its Navy as an instrument of policy, Field focuses on missionaries.¹⁵ Historian Alexander DeConde notes the author relies exclusively on English-language sources, showing “no real appreciation for the feelings and cultural attitudes of the peoples who were the objects of American policy.”¹⁶ Field touches briefly on the three-decade-long battle in American foreign policy over how to confront the Barbary pirates. Although his claim that the United States Navy was “a rationalist, not a mercantilist, navy,”¹⁷ the truth is not as black and white. Jefferson did not only use the Navy as a tool of Enlightenment idealism, but also to protect commercial interests. Though his actions were not in the mercantile tradition of European countries, it was also not Enlightenment idealism, as the author suggests.

A more detailed account of the first interaction between the United States and Barbary can be found in H.G. Barnby’s *The Prisoners of Algiers*.¹⁸ Barnby goes beyond most histories in the breadth in which he covers the topic. Not only does he provide a narrative of the conflict, but he also provides the reader with background and substance that places the Algerine War in context. In giving the history of Algiers and a sketch of the people who lived and ruled there, Barnby provides an alternative to the typical American-centered story.¹⁹ In addition to giving more attention to the Algerines, Barnby uses British and French archives to place the conflict in the larger context of European

¹⁵ Alexander DeConde’s review of James A. Field, Jr’s, *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882*, in *The American Historical Review*, 75 (February 1970), 917-919.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 918.

¹⁷ Field, *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882*, 18.

¹⁸ H.G. Barnby, *The Prisoners of Algiers: An Account of the Forgotten American-Algerian War of 1785-1797* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).

¹⁹ George W. Knepper’s review of H.G. Barnby’s *The Prisoners of Algiers*, in *The Journal of American History*, 53 (March 1967), 807-808.

diplomacy between the *ancien regime* and the new Europe forged by the French Revolution.²⁰

Unusual amongst these historians, Samuel Edwards stands out for focusing on one person. Edwards's *Barbary General: The Life of William H. Eaton*²¹ offers a sympathetic account of the consul-turned-general and his story. Almost immediately, Edwards presents Eaton as a larger-than-life figure who possessed all the qualities needed to accomplish anything. In closing his introduction, Edwards says of Eaton: "He alone, of all Americans, conquered a foreign land with a ragged army of mercenaries, and placed his hand-picked puppet on a throne in order to ensure permanent peace in a part of the world where peace had been unknown for centuries."²² Referring to Eaton as "America's 'Lawrence of Arabia'" only shows the esteem the author feels for the subject.²³

Howard Nash focuses on the chronology of events in his book *The Forgotten Wars*.²⁴ The first half focuses on the Quasi War with France at the end of the Adams administration. Though not related to Barbary, it does give an account of the creation of the United States Navy and its first taste of combat. The second half is a summary of the Tripolitan War. While not offering much in the way of analysis, Nash provides a concise history of the conflict. In addition, the author makes good use government documents and official naval correspondence. If nothing else, the author's footnotes and

²⁰ George A. Billias's review of H.G. Barnby's *The Prisoners of Algiers* in *The New England Quarterly*, 40 (June 1967), 299-301.

²¹ Samuel Edwards, *Barbary General: The Life of William H. Eaton* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968).

²² Edwards, *Barbary General*, 15.

²³ *Ibid.*, 268.

²⁴ Howard Nash, *The Forgotten Wars: The Role of the U.S. Navy in the Quasi War with France and the Barbary Wars 1798-1805* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1968).

bibliography offer a great starting point for the primary documents pertaining to this conflict.

A great study of Jefferson and his views on war is Reginald Stuart's *The Half-Way Pacifist*.²⁵ Stuart notes "Jefferson did not put his views of war down in a systematic manner" and "to structure Jefferson's thought too rigorously would do violence to its eclectic and encyclopaedic [*sic*] nature."²⁶ Stuart argues that "Jefferson's thought on war developed as he witnessed and participated in the conflicts of his time, and his attitudes varied with circumstances and his own position."²⁷ While short (only 65 pages of text), Stuart adds a valuable narrative on Jefferson's attitude toward conflict.

The subject generated very few new works for the next two decades. Not until the 1990s and the early 2000s, following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on New York City and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, did historians and journalists renew their interest in Barbary. While most of the early histories focus on the American military, the newer histories have tended to correlate the Barbary Wars with the War on Terrorism following September 11. Unfortunately, many of the authors continued the traditional approach by focusing on American and (less frequently) European sources,

A.B.C. Whipple wrote one of the first books in this "new generation" of studies. In *To the Shores of Tripoli*²⁸ Whipple's opening line delineates his purpose: "This is a book about America's first war with an Arab tyrant."²⁹ Writing in the aftermath of the

²⁵ Reginald C. Stuart, *The Half-Way Pacifist: Thomas Jefferson's View of War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, x.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ A.B.C. Whipple, *To the Shores of Tripoli: The Birth of the U.S. Navy and Marines* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1991).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

United States-led Gulf War against Iraq, Whipple argues that Jefferson “dealt with a confrontation strikingly similar to what the United States would face 200 years later.”³⁰ Whipple exceeds reality to prove his thesis, writing that the Barbary War was “in large part responsible for the formation of the United States navy and Marine Corps, and not least for weaning a new nation from infancy to adolescence.”³¹ In advocating this position, the author ignores the preceding ten years of American military history. It was the “war” with Algiers³² that caused the government to realize the impotence of American power and finally push for the creation of the United States Navy. Many of the officers who made headlines in the Mediterranean first learned the art of war fighting against France in the Quasi War from 1798-1800. While Barbary was important and helped solidify American naval force, it was neither the reason nor the only proving ground for its development.

Expanding this scope to the whole of the early national era, Robert Allison’s *The Crescent Obscured*³³ surveys the period from American independence to the war with Algiers in 1815. Allison’s narrative takes on a dogmatic view, contrasting the two sides as a conflict between the European and the Turk, the civilized and the barbarian.³⁴ Viewing the North African Muslims as “the consummate Other,” Allison portrays the American war with Tripoli in ideological terms.³⁵ Offering the United States as a nascent savior, he writes that the United States did what Europe would not do: “[beat] the forces

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., 6,

³² Though the Algerine War officially lasted from 1784 to 1797, the United States never sent any forces to fight with Algiers and the war was ended with a peace treaty.

³³ Robert J. Allison, *The Crescent Obscured: The United States and the Muslim World, 1776-1815* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

³⁴ Ibid., xv.

³⁵ Herbert L. Bodman’s review of Robert J. Allison’s *The Crescent Obscured* in *Journal of Church and State*, 38 (September, 1996), 919.

of Islamic despotism and piracy.”³⁶ David Lesch notes that one of Allison’s strengths is his study of how American reactions to the “white slavery” of Americans captured by Algiers and Tripoli contrasted with their own views of the “African slavery” practiced in the United States. According to Lesch Allison exposes the “moral inconsistency of clamoring for the release of the Americans suffering under Barbary captivity while overlooking the infinitely more destitute position of African-Americans in the country.”³⁷

One of the best works is Richard B. Parker’s *Uncle Sam in Barbary*.³⁸ C. Edward Skeen notes Parker “is the first historian with the background and knowledge of the Arabs to explain the first encounter of the United States with Islam meaningfully,” having served as an American diplomat in Algeria, Lebanon, and Morocco.³⁹ While primarily dealing with Algeria, Parker’s work helps to dispel with the American superiority complex that so often dominates the texts relating to Barbary. Parker uses Arabic sources, portrays life in the regencies, and gives a voice to those who have always been condemned as anonymous and faceless enemies.⁴⁰ With his background in the area, Parker dismisses the connection to the current challenges and struggles of the United States with Islamic terrorism. Contrasting the two periods, Parker says “the corsairs were not terrorists as we understand that term today. They were not involved in random

³⁶ Allison, *The Crescent Obscured*, xvi.

³⁷ David W. Lesch’s review of Robert J. Allison’s *The Crescent Obscured* in *Middle East Journal*, 50 (Autumn, 1996), 623-624.

³⁸ Richard B. Parker, *Uncle Sam in Barbary: A Diplomatic History* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2004).

³⁹ C. Edward Skeen’s review of Richard B. Parker’s *Uncle Sam in Barbary* in *The Journal of American History*, 91 (March 2005), 1437.

⁴⁰ Phillip C. Naylor, in his review, concurs by claiming that the “narrative reanimates and humanizes Americans and Maghribis.” Phillip C. Naylor’s review of Richard B. Parker’s *Uncle Sam in Barbary* in *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 38 (2005), 560-563.

killings for political ends. They were interested in booty and ransom money, and there was nothing clandestine about their activities.”⁴¹

Taking the opposite approach are books by Joseph Wheelan,⁴² Richard Zacks,⁴³ and Joshua London.⁴⁴ Wheelan’s *Jefferson’s War* has a two-part focus: Jefferson wanted the war and that war was similar to the post-September 11 threats faced by the United States.⁴⁵ Acknowledging that Jefferson’s image has been as a pacifist, Wheelan states that Jefferson “was a complicated and sometimes vindictive man with a long memory.”⁴⁶ Falling into a similar trap as Whipple, Wheelan argues for a connection between the Barbary pirates and the Al Qaeda terrorists that perpetrated the September 11 attacks. In doing so, however, he fails to grasp that “profit, not millenarian ideology, drove the Muslim buccaneers of yesteryear.”⁴⁷

Joshua London’s *Victory in Tripoli* falls into a similar category. Using his work to correlate Barbary with September 11, London describes the war with Tripoli in terms of civilization. London contrasted the “rationalism, progress, and industry” of Europe in opposition to the “permanent battle mode, and the glory of *jihad*” of Muslim North Africa.⁴⁸ London views this conflict in terms of a clash of religions and civilizations; the Barbary wars were a continuation of the medieval Crusades and *jihads* that dominated the pre-Enlightenment era. Bill Weinberg states that, like Wheelan before him, London

⁴¹ Parker, *Uncle Sam in Barbary*, xiv.

⁴² Joseph Wheelan, *Jefferson’s War: America’s First War on Terror, 1801-1805* (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2003).

⁴³ Richard Zacks, *The Pirate Coast: Thomas Jefferson, the First Marines, and the Secret Mission of 1805* (New York: Hyperion, 2005).

⁴⁴ Joshua E. London, *Victory in Tripoli: How America’s War with the Barbary Pirates Established the U.S. Navy and Built a Nation* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2005).

⁴⁵ Wheelan, *Jefferson’s War*, xxiii.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, xxiii.

⁴⁷ Review of Joseph Wheelan’s *Jefferson’s War* in *Kirkus Reviews*, 13 (July 1, 2003), 903.

⁴⁸ London, *Victory in Tripoli*, 9-10.

portrays the Arabs as “gutless, conniving and greedy (using shameless adjectives like ‘perfidious’ and ‘irascible’), while ascribing the highest motives to the Americans, even while acknowledging that they also engaged in ruses and trickery.”⁴⁹ Besides inclusion of American exceptionalism, London also portrays Jefferson as weak and shows no historical appreciation of his many years advocating war against the pirates.⁵⁰

In *Pirate Coast*, Richard Zacks offers a more recent take on William Eaton and his unlikely march across North Africa. Like Edwards before him, Zacks portrays Eaton as the hero and treats those opposite him with scorn. Zacks is a journalist. David Skaggs argues that, because of this, his work “is a lively written, error-filled volume.”⁵¹ He shows this in his righteous indignation against Consul General Tobias Lear. Lear, when signing on peace treaty with Tripoli, gave \$60,000 for the ransom of the captured American seamen. Zacks either forgets or ignores the fact that the United States paid even more in 1796 to secure the Algerine peace treaty under President George Washington.⁵²

More academic in its approach, Frederick C. Leiner’s *The End of Barbary Terror* chronicles the more neglected war with Algiers in 1815 that ended American tribute to Barbary.⁵³ Leiner focuses on Captain Stephen Decatur and his mission to confront Algiers after it declared war on the United States. Though the American Navy focused on fighting Great Britain during the War of 1812, the end of that conflict left the United

⁴⁹ Bill Weinberg’s review of Joshua London’s *Victory in Tripoli* and Joseph Wheelan’s *Jefferson’s War in Middle East Policy*, 13 (Fall 2006), 169-175.

⁵⁰ London, *Victory in Tripoli*, 231, 233.

⁵¹ David Curtis Skaggs’s review of Richard Zacks’s *The Pirate Coast* in *The Journal of Military History*, 70 (January 2006), 230-231.

⁵² Richard B. Parker’s review of Richard Zacks’s *The Pirate Coast* in *Middle East Journal*, 60 (Autumn, 2006), 827-828.

⁵³ Frederick C. Leiner, *The End of Barbary Terror: America’s 1815 War Against the Pirates of North Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

States determined to end the system of tribute. In Leiner's words, "the United States would speak from the mouths of its cannon" in future dealings with Barbary.⁵⁴

This work contributes to the historical narrative by analyzing Thomas Jefferson's view of Barbary during his career. Whereas the majority of the books on this topic focus on either one small part of the narrative or a broad overview, I have set out to study how Jefferson and the Barbary regencies intersected over a twenty year period. This covers the breadth of Jefferson's service to the United States and shows a maturation of American policy and ability toward foreign threats.

Several factors affected Jefferson's policy toward the Barbary pirates. Primarily, he seemed determined to protect American trade abroad and defend his country's honor. He wanted to insure access to overseas markets that benefitted American economic interests. He was also concerned about the maintenance of American honor and how European countries viewed the new republic. Though some of his contemporaries described the captivity of American sailors in terms of slavery, Jefferson did not use that language. His position as a slave owner may have precluded his use of the term "slave" as connecting African slavery to white captivity could have caused tension. Jefferson's preferred method of achieving those objectives at times contradicts the typical portrayal of him as distrustful of the military. Though his foreign policy preferences usually reflected his aversion toward war, Jefferson never wavered in advocating the use of force when dealing with the pirates of North Africa.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 4.

As Jefferson rose through the ranks of the American government, his resolve to end tribute and ransom never wavered. Although he could not claim to be responsible for the end of the tribute system, Jefferson's actions paved the way for that end. With determination and persistence, he did not allow the successive administrations he served to ignore the problem. By the time he retired in 1809, the "pacifist" could rightfully claim that he had advocated a stronger and more forceful response than any American before him.

CHAPTER II

HONOR AND AVARICE IN BARBARY:

JEFFERSON AS DIPLOMAT, 1784-1790

For four years, Thomas Jefferson was the chief American diplomat in France and one of two for all of Europe. Jefferson focused his attention on two topics: piracy and trade agreements to enter potential European markets. Throughout the eighteenth century, piracy originating in northern Africa had wide-ranging consequences. To protect themselves, countries paid tribute to the Barbary States or risked having their commerce or coastal towns attacked for plunder and slaves.

Prior to the American Revolution, the Royal Navy and British treaties of peace had protected American shipping. After the beginning of the Revolutionary War, American commerce presented an easy target for the Barbary corsairs. By the time Jefferson landed in France in 1785, Algerine pirates had already captured two American

vessels and enslaved their crews of over twenty sailors. Jefferson's arrival coincided with an order from the American Congress to negotiate a peace with the North African states to secure the release of the prisoners and allow American commerce to enter the Mediterranean Sea undisturbed.¹

During his time in Europe, Jefferson became the predominate voice for the use of force to protect American commercial interests abroad. His debates with John Adams and other members of the American government set the tone for Jefferson's attitudes later in his public career as well. As the junior minister, Jefferson followed Adams's pace; Jefferson "rejected the posture of subservience born of European power politics as being incompatible with honor, justice, and the national interest."² As such, he looked for opportunities for the United States to end forced tribute.

Jefferson was aware of several solutions to the problem of piracy. He did his best to analyze each and deduce the best option, especially through his correspondence with Adams. Jefferson's ideal resolution was for the United States to destroy the pirates and open the Mediterranean to shipping. He also discussed the possibility of sending American goods in foreign ships. This would allow commerce to continue, but at the expense of developing an American merchant marine and leaving American commerce at the discretion of other countries. The final option was, simply, to buy peace and maintain some form of a tributary relationship with the various Barbary States.³

¹ Parker, *Uncle Sam in Barbary*, xv, 33.

² Reports on Mediterranean Trade and Algerine Captives (Editorial Note) in [Jefferson's] *Papers*, 34 vols, Julian P. Boyd, ed (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), 18: 371-372.

³ Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 6 February 1785 in *Papers*, 7: 639

Jefferson wanted to uphold the honor of the United States. One of his fears was that submitting to the Barbary States would hurt his country in more ways than just financial. He firmly believed that justice and honor could only be satisfied if the United States fought for the rights of its merchants. Jefferson said that it would require at least a small naval force to protect American cargo. Otherwise, he feared that “everyone which possesses a single ship of the line may dictate to us, and enforce their demands.”⁴ Such a state of affairs would not allow the United States to gain respect among nations, especially those European nations that were its chief commercial rivals.⁵

Jefferson’s desire to improve the United States’ standing with Europe motivated many of his attempts to act against Barbary. He believed that a tributary system or inaction would leave the new republic open to scorn. Jefferson stated that, “A *coward* is much more *exposed to quarrels* than a *man of spirits*.”⁶ Concerned about the future of the United States just two years after the Treaty of Paris of 1783 had secured independence, Jefferson wanted to make sure that the European kingdoms, both great and small, had no reason to intimidate the young nation.

Repelling attempts to interfere with the United States coincided with Jefferson’s desire for national honor. Deciding that the United States must maintain some measure of defense and that “weakness provokes insult and injury, while a condition to punish it often prevents it,” Jefferson enthusiastically supported the creation of a navy.⁷ He believed “a naval force can never endanger our liberties, nor occasion bloodshed; a land

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ William M. Goldsmith, *The Growth of Presidential Power: A Documented History* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1974), 372.

⁶ Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 6 February 1785 in *Papers*, 7: 640 (emphasis in original).

⁷ Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 23 August 1785 in *ibid.*, 8: 427.

force would do both.”⁸ In addition, it was difficult for any nation except the world powers to reach American shores to endanger the United States. As the Barbary States demonstrated, even the pettiest chieftain with some semblance of a naval force could strike at any country’s commerce beyond its own waters.

In addition to honor and strength, Jefferson believed that fighting the pirates was more economical than paying tribute. To those who worried that naval action would cost more than other options, Jefferson argued:

It is not the choice of the states whether they will pay money to cover their trade against the Algerines. If they obtain a peace by negotiation [*sic*] they must pay a great sum of money for it; if they do nothing, they must pay a great [sum] of money in the form of insurance; and in either way as great a one, and probably less effectual than in the way of force.⁹

Jefferson believed that money spent as tribute was wasted. The Dey of Algiers was about eighty years of age. His death would allow his successor to scrap the current treaty and demand new presents and possibly higher tribute. Not only would the United States need to offer presents to keep the leaders of the Barbary States from breaking their treaties, but consuls would also be needed in each of the regencies. Without an active agent with diplomatic powers, the pirates would break treaties with impunity and American citizens would remain captive until the United States’ government sent a new diplomatic mission. To Jefferson, showing American strength and resolve in the beginning would allow the United States to avoid these other issues.¹⁰

Jefferson realized that it would be difficult to maintain the force necessary to defeat the Barbary powers. Although he believed them to be weak, he knew the lack of a

⁸ Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 11 August 1786 in *ibid.*, 10: 225.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 23 August 1785, in *Papers*, 8: 427.

United States' Navy negated any chance to overcome the pirates' ambitions. Under the Articles of Confederation, Jefferson understood that it would be extremely difficult to allocate money for a protracted campaign (or even tribute).¹¹ Writing to James Monroe, Jefferson showed a desire to have "the confederacy [show] its teeth" and that "the [individual] states must see the rod" and face some kind of punishment to get the necessary funding.¹²

Jefferson argued that an international confederacy would make it easier to suppress the pirates. This option would not only spread the cost but also the requirement for keeping forces off the coast of North Africa. By having several nations send smaller naval contingents, the blockade of the coast would be more effective than relying on one country to supply the entire fleet. This would also allow more nations to participate in deciding their relations with the Barbary pirates.¹³ Jefferson targeted smaller European kingdoms and principalities to participate in this confederation. He knew that both Great Britain and France benefited from the pirates because their commercial rivals often had their Mediterranean trade plundered and networks disrupted. Jefferson's initial hope was that France would allow its treaty with Algiers to expire in 1785 and then the United States could participate in a joint military expedition. Jefferson wrote the Comte de Vergennes, the French foreign minister for Louis XVI, stating that Jefferson would rather the United States fight than "treat with Nations who so barbarously and inhumanly commence hostilities against others who have done them no injury."¹⁴ The United States

¹¹ The Articles of Confederation gave Congress no power to tax the states. Instead, Congress requested funding and it was up to the individual states to decide whether they would comply and, if so, the amount they would contribute.

¹² Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 11 August 1786, in *Papers*, 10: 225.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 224-5

¹⁴ American Commissioners to Vergennes, 28 March 1785 in *ibid.*, 8: 62.

never received a response from Vergennes, who told his agent in Algiers that France had “no advantage” in the United States “procuring a tranquil navigation in the Mediterranean.”¹⁵

Jefferson monitored relations between many European countries and Algiers and the other states of northern Africa. He listed several countries as being favorably disposed toward an association: Portugal, Naples, Sicily, Venice, Malta, Denmark, and Sweden.¹⁶ Jefferson hoped that the proposed convention would reduce the American contribution to two or three frigates. The main obstacles were Britain and France. Jefferson knew that many of the smaller kingdoms feared the French fleet. When he asked Vergennes about the British reaction to any American action, the French noble claimed that Britain would not dare interfere.¹⁷

Jefferson drafted a proposed convention as a basis for negotiation. In it, he called for all the powers at war with the various states of Barbary to join resources, first against Algiers and, then, the remaining states. The goal was to “compel the pyratival [*sic*] states to perpetual peace, without price, and to guarantee that peace to each other.”¹⁸ To blockade the Barbary ports efficiently, convention forces would maintain a constant cruise with a fleet decided by a quota system. Ambassadors from the several powers, given full authority by their respective governments, would form a committee to manage the convention, with voting rights to be determined using the same quota system as the military force. To avoid infighting, Jefferson suggested the new convention come with

¹⁵ Parker, *Uncle Sam in Barbary*, 59.

¹⁶ Jefferson’s Proposed Concert of Powers against the Barbary States (Editorial Note) in *ibid.*, 10: 562. Jefferson sent letters to Naples, Portugal, and Russia advancing his idea of a confederation. No copies are known to survive.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 567.

no salary or honors. He wanted to avoid the political drama that new titles or income would create in a European society based on acquiring them.¹⁹

To gain legitimacy for his plan, as well as to avoid the embarrassment of publicly disagreeing with John Adams, Jefferson enlisted Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette as the spokesperson for the enterprise. Jefferson's hope was that Lafayette would influence the courts in Europe and that the United States' Congress would be more likely to heed his plan than if the Virginian worked alone.²⁰ Lafayette eagerly agreed to the project and began corresponding with other influential Americans.

Lafayette wrote to Jefferson in 1786 suggesting himself as "Chief to the Antipiratical Confederacy." Lafayette's plan was to divide responsibilities for the force amongst the various members. He wanted money from Naples, Rome, Portugal, Venice, and some of the commercial German towns; naval stores and sailors from the United States; a treaty with Malta; and a harbor in Sicily. He hoped to keep two-thirds of the fleet in action at all times while refitting the other third. He believed that this would allow them to crush the pirates and destroy their ships and afford the opportunity for a land campaign, should the corsairs be defeated.²¹

Lafayette also wrote George Washington. Lafayette pointed out that the difference between Adams and Jefferson was one of purchasing peace as opposed to using those funds to fight an honorable war. Lafayette pushed Jefferson's idea of a confederation, stating that if each gave "a Sum of Monney [*sic*] Not Very large" then a

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 567-568.

²⁰ Jefferson's Proposed Concert of Powers against the Barbary States (Editorial Note) in *Papers*, 10: 562, 564.

²¹ Lafayette to Thomas Jefferson, 23 October 1786 in *ibid.*, 486.

“Common Armament May distress the Algerines into Any terms.”²² Lafayette believed that with the resources of a strong alliance he could “Crush those Rascals.”²³ Though Washington’s sentiments lay with Jefferson and Lafayette, Washington found it “almost Nugatory to dispute about the best mode of dealing with the Algarines [*sic*] when we have neither money to buy their friendship nor the means of punishing them for their depredations.”²⁴ He believed that it was “the highest disgrace” for those nations that paid tribute to “such a banditti who might for half the sum that is paid ... be exterminated from the Earth.”²⁵

Though Jefferson never formally submitted his idea to Congress, delegates from his home state of Virginia did. In July 1787, William Grayson introduced a motion that authorized Jefferson, as Minister to France, to form a Confederation of European powers for war against Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli.²⁶ Grayson’s motion declared that United States would seek to join a military alliance with any European nation “who are now at War with the piratical States ... or may be disposed to go to War with them.”²⁷ It called on the Confederation to remain allied for the duration of the war. In addition, the Confederation would secure peace, with the threat of continued war as a means of enforcement. Following Jefferson’s vision, it called for the Confederation to form a quota system to provide men and materiel, as well as set up a command system that was

²² Lafayette to George Washington, 26 October 1786 in *The Papers of George Washington. Confederation Series*, 6 vols, ed. W.W. Abbot and Dorothy Twohig (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992): 4: 312.

²³ *Ibid.*, 514.

²⁴ George Washington to Lafayette, 25 March 1787 in *The Papers of George Washington*, 5: 106-107.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 107.

²⁶ “A Motion being made...,” *Journals of the Continental Congress*, 33: 419. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwjc.html> (accessed 9 September 2010).

²⁷ *Ibid.*

amenable to the nations involved.²⁸ In a victory for Jefferson, Congress carried this motion by a vote of nine states to one²⁹ and ordered John Jay, as Secretary for Foreign Affairs, to instruct Jefferson to create the Confederation.³⁰

There were also indications of agreement from other countries. The Queen of Portugal ordered her navy to seal the Straits of Gibraltar and blockade the Algerine corsairs in the Mediterranean. Furthermore, she ordered her ships to guard American vessels as if they belonged to her own subjects.³¹ P.R. Randall, an American diplomat in Spain, informed both Jefferson and Adams that the Portuguese envoy stated he “would rather see a Confederacy framed against the Barbary States,” as he had no hope of his country securing peace through negotiation.³²

John Adams disagreed with Jefferson on nearly every point. Adams, as the senior diplomat,³³ usually dictated the terms by which he and Jefferson operated. Jefferson aided this by adhering to protocol and demurring to Adams whenever they disagreed. Adams’s understanding of the economics of tribute and war differed from Jefferson’s, as well as his belief that a peace would end problems with the Barbary States.³⁴ These differences altered the way the commissioners handled the situation, but did not stop Jefferson’s drive for an honorable solution.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Only New Jersey voted against.

³⁰ Journals of the Continental Congress, 33: 419-420.

³¹ Jefferson’s Proposed Concert of Powers against the Barbary States (Editorial Note) in *Papers*, 10: 566.

³² P.R. Randall to the American Commissioners, 14 May 1786 in *ibid.*, 9: 525.

³³ He had arrived in London the year before Jefferson arrived in Paris. Initially, Benjamin Franklin was the senior commissioner with Adams and Jefferson as the junior members. When Franklin left for the United States in 1785, Adams became the ranking minister in American diplomacy.

³⁴ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 31 July 1786, in *ibid.*, 10: 177

Adams never denied his distaste for tribute and a purchased peace. Although he advocated this position with tenacity, it was not his preferred solution. There were two reasons he thought it was easier to pay than to fight. First, he believed that the American government and the individual American states, were incapable of coming to a consensus.³⁵ Second, he argued that as long as the major European states favored tribute over war, the United States could not destroy the pirates.³⁶

Adams's primary dispute with Jefferson revolved around whether it would be cheaper to pay tribute or wage war. While Jefferson believed that a war, especially in cooperation with other states, would be cheaper, Adams argued that the war would be more expensive. Adams estimated that the United States could buy peace with all four Barbary regencies, as well as the Ottoman Empire, for £200,000 - £300,000.³⁷ Jefferson disputed this, saying that after presents for Ottoman ministers and the peace treaty, any agreement with the Porte "would be ineffectual towards opening to us the Mediterranean until a peace with Algiers can be obtained."³⁸ Adams responded that the loss of trade and the drastic increase in insurance rates would cost more than his estimated sum for peace. To illustrate his point, Adams asserted that the interest payments, loans, and debts for a war would cost ten times more than paying tribute.³⁹

Adams also believed that the United States lacked the resolve to combat piracy. Arguing that the United States "ought not to fight them at all, unless ... determine[d] to

³⁵ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 31 July 1786 in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 2 vols, ed. Lester Cappon (Chapel Hill, Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1959), I: 146; Adams to Jefferson, 3 July 1786 in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 1: 139.

³⁶ Goldsmith, *The Growth of Presidential Power*, 1: 371-372.

³⁷ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 6 June 1786, in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 1: 133.

³⁸ Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 26 September 1786 in *Papers*, 10: 405.

³⁹ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 6 June 1786, in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 1: 133-134.

fight them forever,” Adams wrote that “this thought is ... too rugged for our People to bear. To fight them at the Expence [*sic*] of Millions and make peace after all by giving more Money and larger Presents than would now procure perpetual Peace Seems not to be Economical.” He believed that a purchased peace was the only solution that the American people would support.⁴⁰

Other problems Adams found with Jefferson’s argument were related to execution and planning. Adams argued that while defeating Algiers would be a great achievement for the new republic, it alone “would not obtain Peace with Morocco Tunis or Tripoli [*sic*], so that our Commerce would still be exposed.”⁴¹ He calculated that Jefferson had underestimated the force necessary to defeat the pirates. Adams feared that any American naval force would only exacerbate the situation. While favoring a standing navy,⁴² Adams believed that the Algerines were too strong for the United States to defeat easily. He estimated a force of at least fifty gunboats would be required and reminded Jefferson that a formidable wall surrounded Algiers, which made any enterprise more difficult.⁴³

Despite his arguments, Adams desired an American victory against piracy. He stated that “if our States could be brought to agree [to fight], I Should be very willing to resolve upon eternal War with them.”⁴⁴ His main fear was that the American public would not support it. He thought that neither his calls for tribute nor Jefferson’s case for war would be adopted and found the lack of a response was “more humiliating ... than

⁴⁰ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 31 July 1786, in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 1: 146-147.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 147.

⁴² Ten years later as President, John Adams helped oversee the establishment of the United States Navy.

⁴³ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 31 July 1786, in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 1: 147.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 146.

giving the Presents.”⁴⁵ Adams wrote that the pirates had turned the Christian world into cowards and knew that glory and honor awaited an American victory. As much as he desired the defeat of the pirates, he did not trust his people or his government to take action due to a lack of resolve.⁴⁶

Others sided with Adams. Two of the most vocal were Richard O’Bryen⁴⁷ and William Carmichael. O’Bryen was the captain of an American merchant ship captured by the Algerines in 1785. He was the main source of information from Algiers and corresponded frequently with all the American diplomats in Europe. William Carmichael was the American representative in Spain, and Jefferson often used him as a liaison with American agents in Barbary.⁴⁸

As a captain, the Algerines treated O’Bryen relatively well. As such, he became very knowledgeable about Algiers and was a reliable source of intelligence for the American commissioners. O’Bryen listed numerous reasons for a quick peace with Algiers. His primary concern was money. He was convinced that the European powers were encouraging Algiers to remain at war with the United States to “reap such benefits in being the carriers of our commerce.”⁴⁹ O’Bryen asked Jefferson to consider the amount of insurance American merchants paid just to cross the Atlantic and believed that they could better use that money to buy peace.⁵⁰ O’Bryen also believed that fighting a war would be too expensive. Because the Algerines did not have a merchant marine,

⁴⁵ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 31 July 1786 in *Papers*, 10: 178.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 176, 177.

⁴⁷ Various letters have his name spelled O’Brien, etc. This paper follows Jefferson in using O’Bryen.

⁴⁸ William Carmichael to Thomas Jefferson, 31 July 1786, in *ibid.*, 10: 178

⁴⁹ Richard O’Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 8 June 1786 in *Papers*, 9: 615.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

there would be no profit in capturing their ships. As such, the United States' government would have to build, equip, and maintain the force sent to the Mediterranean.⁵¹

O'Bryen stated that the objective had to be a purchased peace. Without it, the United States would never develop as a commercial nation and would expend far too much money in a war without a definite conclusion. He argued that any "delays breed danger and opportunity once lost is not easily recovered" but that "money is the God of Algiers and Mahomet their prophet."⁵² The captain said it was necessary that the United States appoint a consul to Algiers who was familiar with the local politics. Such a move, with a well-defined plan for peace, had a great chance of success. Should purchasing a peace fail, however, the United States should immediately build a fleet to "change [the] tone of peace."⁵³

While Jefferson discussed the options, he and Adams agreed that a diplomatic mission to Algiers must begin immediately. John Lamb⁵⁴ arrived in September 1785 with orders from Congress granting Adams and Jefferson the power to appoint negotiators⁵⁵ to the Barbary States.⁵⁶ In September 1785, Jefferson proposed that Lamb become the American agent in Algiers and Adams approved.⁵⁷

The commissioners would not hear from Lamb again until March 1786. During the interim, Lamb travelled to Algiers and appraised the situation. His first letter was less

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid., 619, 617.

⁵³ Ibid., 617.

⁵⁴ Others spelled his last name "Lambe" in various letters.

⁵⁵ The power to sign treaties remained with the commissioners; the new orders only allowed Adams and Jefferson to delegate the power to negotiate a treaty.

⁵⁶ Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, 19 September 1785 in *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 1: 65; Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, 19 September 1785 in *Papers*, 8: 526.

⁵⁷ Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, 24 September 1785 in *ibid.*, 543.

than positive. He wrote that without a great increase in funds, the American government should abandon its attempts at purchasing peace. He reported that the minimum required was \$1,200 per prisoners for twenty-one prisoners, or \$25,200.⁵⁸

Lamb believed that in addition to the cost, the United States needed to placate the Porte in Constantinople. Though Algiers and the other Barbary regencies operated independently, they owed nominal allegiance to the Ottoman Sultan. Lamb believed that it would “cost a Tower to Constantinople.” He argued that even though the Barbary States acted independently of the Ottomans in most areas, getting the North African potentates to make peace required friendly relations with the Sultan. To do this, Lamb recommended a present of five thirty-six-gun frigates.⁵⁹ Thomas Barclay⁶⁰ concurred. Quoting Count D’Espilly, the Spanish minister to Algiers, Barclay wrote that the United States could expect no more than a truce until Congress sent a minister to Constantinople.⁶¹ Jefferson then suggested to Adams that peace was possible “but at a price far beyond our powers” and that they should send Lamb back to Congress for further instructions.⁶²

While the ministers deliberated, Lamb stayed in Algiers and prepared a report for Adams and Jefferson. Lamb noted that it was apparent he did not have the funds to secure peace. In April 1786, he met with the Dey, but “he would not speake of Peace,

⁵⁸ John Lamb to Thomas Jefferson, 29 March 1786 in *ibid.*, 9: 364.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ Barclay was the American consul to France and agent to Morocco.

⁶¹ Thomas Barclay to Thomas Jefferson, 5 April 1786 in *Papers*, 9: 376.

⁶² Jefferson to Adams, 11 May 1786 in *ibid.*, 506.

[and] set the Slaves at a most Exorbitant price, far beyond my limits.”⁶³ Even after two more meetings and a reduction in price, Lamb reported the cost was enormous.⁶⁴

Attempting to use backchannels, Lamb gave presents to an interpreter in the hope that the man might influence events in favor of the United States. The interpreter responded by informing Lamb that there would be no negotiating so long as Algiers had no treaty with Spain. The Algerine demands on the United States were only to make their demands on Spain seem more modest.⁶⁵

Lamb reported that a treaty with Constantinople would be of no use. The Algerines felt they had “an intire [*sic*] rite [*sic*] to make Peace or war without the voice of the Grand Segnor [Sultan], and that they were under no control by the Ottoman port[e].”⁶⁶ Lamb believed that a letter from the French but not the Spanish would be much more helpful. This did not help the United States because the French offered no assistance, but the Spanish did.⁶⁷

Lamb reported that the price for the twenty-one captives was 59,496 Spanish milled dollars. Algiers’s tactic was evident in that they demanded Spain pay around 1.5 million Spanish milled dollars for the redemption of just over 1,100 captives.⁶⁸ After adding in the cost of making peace, Spain would pay more than three million dollars for

⁶³ John Lamb to the American Commissioners, 20 May 1786 in *ibid.*, 549.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 550.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ This adds up to about 2,830 Spanish milled dollars per captive for the American captives and 1,300 Spanish milled dollars per captive for Spanish captives.

peace with Algiers.⁶⁹ Even with this extremely high price, Lamb advised the commissioners to make peace, for that would cost less than it would to fight for a year.⁷⁰

Lamb was not the only person in Algiers who reported to Jefferson. Richard O'Bryen, the captive merchant captain, also reported on Lamb's mission. O'Bryen wrote that Lamb delayed arriving in Algiers and made no effort to learn the local customs on captive redemption. Lamb offered the Dey \$10,000, but he demanded \$50,000 because Lamb advertised that he had cash. O'Bryen wrote that, "we are much surprized that Mr. Lamb should bring so trifling a sum as five or six thousand dollars to redeem 21."⁷¹ O'Bryen further stated that Lamb was inconsistent. Lamb would alternately claim his funds were in Holland, Spain, or that the commissioners did not authorize him to draw more than £3,300 and that one Mr. Randal must write the order.⁷²

Barely a month later, O'Bryen reported that Lamb had agreed to redeem the captives and left to get the funds. An Algerine close to the captives reported that Lamb had agreed to the \$50,000 price demanded by the Dey and would have it within four months.⁷³ This contradicted the letter Lamb wrote O'Bryen that he was waiting for direction from Adams and Jefferson, in addition to limiting the ransom to \$200 per captive.⁷⁴ O'Bryen begged Jefferson to inform him of the actual situation, saying that the captives needed to hear of "our redemption or if it is our hard lot here to remain."⁷⁵

⁶⁹ John Lamb to the American Commissioners, 20 May 1786, in *Papers*, 9: 551.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 551-552.

⁷¹ Richard O'Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 8 June 1786, in *Papers*, 9: 615.

⁷² *Ibid.* Mr. Randal is unidentified.

⁷³ Richard O'Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 12 July 1786, in *ibid.*, 10: 131. The letter left it unclear when Lamb agreed to the peace.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 132.

Through all of this, O’Bryen bluntly told Jefferson that Lamb was unfit to negotiate a peace.⁷⁶

O’Bryen also expressed frustration to William Carmichael, the United States’ envoy in Spain. O’Bryen believed “Mr. Adams [and] Mr. Jefferson acted for the best, but ... it was badly planned [and] worse executed.”⁷⁷ Congress and the commissioners were at fault. The commissioners ordered Lamb to redeem the captives at \$100 per man and to provide up to \$6,000 for presents to the Dey. O’Bryen was unsure how any man “could think we possibly could be redeemed at that price.”⁷⁸

O’Bryen believed that peace was possible with Algiers, but not only was Lamb “losing a very favorable opportunity,” but his actions also jeopardized the “peace which is of very great importance to the United States.”⁷⁹ O’Bryen further characterized Lamb as a conniving agent with dangerous intentions. Lamb’s plan, according to the captain, was “to set all Europe a fighting or to take some of the Spanish territory in America & thereby oblige the Spaniards to make our peace.”⁸⁰

Even without this information, Jefferson pondered whether to alter Lamb’s mission. In early May 1786, Jefferson wrote Adams that letters from agents around the Mediterranean proved that “our peace is not to be purchased at Algiers but at a price far beyond our powers” and wondered whether they should send Lamb back to Congress so

⁷⁶ Richard O’Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 8 June 1786, in *Papers*, 9: 620.

⁷⁷ Richard O’Bryen to William Carmichael, 13 September 1786 in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 6 vols, Published under the direction of the Honorable Claude A. Swanson, Secretary of the Navy (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1939), 1: 13.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

that body could decide on the next move.⁸¹ Jefferson acted on his inclination and recalled Lamb. Jefferson's rationale was that the mission had lost any chance of success within the financial parameters, and Congress must now "chuse [*sic*] to buy a peace, to force one, or to do nothing."⁸²

Adams agreed. Showing his disgust with the process, he declared,

It would be imprudent in us, as it appears to me to incurr [*sic*] any further Expencc, by sending [a diplomatic mission] to Constantinople, or to Algiers, Tunis, or Tripoli. It will be only so much Cash thrown away, and worse, because it will only increase our Embarrassment, make us and our Country ridiculous, and irritate the Appetite of these Barbarians already too greedy.⁸³

While Jefferson and Adams lamented the status of negotiations and the lack of information from Lamb, the American agent to Algiers wrote two letters to Jefferson explaining the situation. Writing from Alicante in eastern Spain, Lamb said that he was unable to travel to the United States due to poor health, but the commissioners were correct that the expense of resolving the situation in Algiers would be great.⁸⁴ In a follow-up letter, Lamb stated that he forwarded his correspondence to Congress, and gave them "a full account of all my Proceedings as if I were present my Self."⁸⁵ He did not offer much hope for future prospects but believed "it is out of the Power of the United States to force [the Algerines] to a compliance of a peace."⁸⁶ While reiterating that his

⁸¹ Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, 11 May 1786 in *Papers*, 9: 506.

⁸² Thomas Jefferson to John Lamb, 20 June 1786 in *ibid.*, 667.

⁸³ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 25 June 1786, in *ibid.*, 68.

⁸⁴ John Lamb to Thomas Jefferson, 15 July 1786, in *ibid.*, 139.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 151.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 152.

conduct was appropriate, he implored Jefferson to take counsel from his reports and no others. Lamb declared that no other person knew the truth of his actions or his mission.⁸⁷

William Carmichael, the American envoy to Spain, sent his own report to Jefferson. Lamb had sent his resignation to Carmichael as well as Jefferson, blaming ill health.⁸⁸ Carmichael reported that, though now based in Spain, Lamb continued to communicate with the Algerine Minister of the Marine. Carmichael believed that the negotiations with Algiers were tenuous in that “the Algerines ought to think we wish to have peace with them, at the same time that we do not fear their hostilities.”⁸⁹ Carmichael admitted that Lamb had been “extremely Zealous for the Interests of his Country,” but doubted whether “he has the qualifications necessary for a Negotiator.”⁹⁰ In his short time in Algiers, Lamb had managed to upset the consuls from Spain and France, the United States’ only major allies in the region.⁹¹

Jefferson was less than pleased as he received information from around the Mediterranean. He notified John Jay, serving as Secretary of Foreign Affairs for Congress, that the commissioners had recalled Lamb for debriefing.⁹² As Jefferson received the more letters from Lamb and Carmichael showing that Lamb declined to return to the United States, Jefferson began to grow suspicious. He wrote James Monroe that he feared “some malversation” with Lamb.⁹³ Jefferson did not blame Lamb for the failure to secure peace. Jefferson believed that an “Angel sent on this business, and so

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ William Carmichael to Thomas Jefferson, 18 July 1786, in *ibid.*, 149.

⁸⁹ William Carmichael to Thomas Jefferson, 3 October 1786, in *ibid.*, 428.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 8 July 1786, in *ibid.*, 99.

⁹³ Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 11 August 1786, in *ibid.*, 224.

much limited in his terms, could have done nothing.” Yet, he did not believe Lamb was a “proper agent,” if Congress opted for renewed negotiation.⁹⁴

Jefferson and Adams attempted to force the issue. Jefferson instructed Carmichael to stop all payments to Lamb.⁹⁵ With input from Adams, Jefferson also prepared new instructions for Lamb. The Commissioners acknowledged his handicap but again ordered him to return to the United States to brief the government. They informed him that Congress alone could settle his accounts and requested that he return his letter of credit.⁹⁶ Even with these specific instructions, Lamb told the commissions he could not leave Alicante. He agreed to return his letter of credit but conditionally. He said he would wait for “the first safe hand” because “by post all my letters are broke” and showed signs of inspection. He agreed not to draw on any more credit.⁹⁷

Jefferson’s frustration with Lamb did not diminish, even after Congress dismissed him. Jefferson directed Carmichael and Barclay to meet with Lamb in Spain and settle his accounts, as well as retrieve any sensitive papers he still possessed. When Barclay arrived at Alicante in November 1786, Lamb had departed for Minorca. Rather than follow him, Barclay returned to France. Lamb ceased communication with the American diplomats for several months. Not until May 1787 did he write Jefferson, informing him that someone covered his cipher in vinegar (presumably to damage it and deny its use to

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Thomas Jefferson to William Carmichael, 22 August 1786, in *ibid.*, 287.

⁹⁶ American Commissioners to John Lamb, 26 September 1786, in *ibid.*, 407.

⁹⁷ John Lamb to Thomas Jefferson, 10 October 1786, in *ibid.*, 441.

others). Lamb also stated that he had no plan to travel anywhere else in Europe but rather to return to New York City.⁹⁸

Lamb not only failed to procure a peace or redeem captives, but he also hurt the American cause in Algiers. The Dey of Algiers considered Lamb's attempt at negotiation as a binding agreement, and believed that the United States had failed to fulfill its obligation of paying cash for the ransom.⁹⁹ Although Adams argued that he and Jefferson were not responsible for Lamb's conduct, future American diplomats had to correct Lamb's mistakes.¹⁰⁰

After 1786, American interaction with Barbary declined. As the weakness of the Articles of Confederation became overwhelming and the states began debating the proposed Constitution, congressional action was limited. There were a few motions debated and carried; however, the results were generally disappointing. Much of the discussion that occurred was negative in the sense that action was unlikely. Jay informed Jefferson that while the captivity was "much to be lamented," Congress could not pay for the captives' release.¹⁰¹ In return, Jefferson pleaded that redemption and peace be kept separate during the initial negotiations. He feared the Algerines would increase the price, which would "form the future tariff," potentially causing them to abandon their actions against others so that they could focus on American shipping.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ John Lamb to Thomas Jefferson, 20 May 1787, in *ibid.*, 11: 368; William Carmichael to Thomas Jefferson, 25 March 1787, in *Papers*, XI: 236. Congress relocated to New York City for much of the 1780s.

⁹⁹ Richard O'Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 28 April 1787, in *ibid.*, 322.

¹⁰⁰ John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 25 January 1787, in *ibid.*, 66.

¹⁰¹ John Jay to Thomas Jefferson, 14 December 1786 in *ibid.*, 10: 597.

¹⁰² Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 1 February 1787 in *ibid.*, 11: 101.

In July 1787, Congress authorized Jefferson to explore the formation of his anti-piracy confederation. This validation of Jefferson's plan did last long. In a letter dated 2 August 1787, John Jay responded to Congress on American abilities to wage war. While noting, "it would always be more for the Honor and Interest of the United States to prefer War to Tribute," Jay listed the difficulties.¹⁰³ Due to the current state of finances and resources, the United States was unable to create and maintain a naval force to contribute to the proposed-antipiracy Confederation. He argued that Representative Grayson's motion was based on opinion. According to Jay, American commerce had declined rapidly, due to the "inefficiency of the national Government."¹⁰⁴

Jay continued that it was "with great Regret" that he was "obliged to consider the Motion in Question as rendered unseasonable by the present State of our Affairs." The United States could only fulfill any quota placed upon it with difficulty, if at all. He believed it was impossible for the United States to build, outfit, and maintain a force of three frigates. His final recommendation was to wait until American finances improved to the point that Congress could maintain a naval force and the United States would have the opportunity to lead such a force, rather than depend on others.¹⁰⁵

Even before receiving this information from Jay, Jefferson continued to work on a diplomatic solution. Maintaining his reliance on the Catholic Mathurin order of France, Jefferson wrote to the Commission of the Treasury for Congress. Noting that the Mathurins often redeemed French prisoners for less than \$400 per man, Jefferson hoped

¹⁰³ "Office for Foreign Affairs," *Journals of the Continental Congress*, Vol. 33, 452.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 452-453.

that they could keep the price for American sailors near \$500. At that price, with twenty-one captives,¹⁰⁶ it would cost the United States a minimum of \$10,000.¹⁰⁷

Congress accepted a higher estimate than the Mathurins. According to a report issued in July 1787, Congress allocated \$6,000 for a master of the vessel, \$4,000 for mates, and \$1,500 for common seamen. Of the twenty-one captives, two were masters, four mates, and fifteen common seamen. This totaled \$50,500 for the American captives in Algiers, although the report expressed confidence that Jefferson could reduce the price below the \$40,769 left in the fund for redemption.¹⁰⁸

Jefferson wrote to Jay the following day informing him that he would continue diplomatic efforts. Jefferson stressed the need for secrecy about the Mathurin Order, as the Dey of Algiers had made the Spanish minister the guarantor of the American captives after his attempts to help.¹⁰⁹ This hurt the American effort as the Dey held the Spanish minister at the price which Spain redeemed her captives—a price higher than any paid before.¹¹⁰ As such, Jefferson said, “I shall pay no attention therefore to the Spanish price,” as paying such a high ransom would make American merchantmen the primary target of the pirates.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁶ One captive had died of plague, see: Richard O’Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 28 April 1787, in *Papers*, 11: 322.

¹⁰⁷ Thomas Jefferson to the Commissioners of the Treasury, 18 September 1787, in *ibid.*, 12: 149.

¹⁰⁸ “Report,” 31 July 1787 in *Journal of the Continental Congress*, 33: 442.

¹⁰⁹ William Carmichael to Thomas Jefferson, 22 August 1787, in *Papers*, 12: 51; Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 19 September 1787 in *ibid.*, 151.

¹¹⁰ Spain paid \$24,000 to redeem two captured ships (no mention of the number of captives) and Carmichael expected an additional \$700,000 to finish redeeming their captives and other presents, which “will procure a precarious peace.” Thomas Jefferson to William Carmichael, 25 September 1787 in *ibid.*, 173.

¹¹¹ Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 19 September 1787, in *ibid.*, 151.

Jefferson also instructed William Carmichael to dispel any belief that the United States' government was attempting redemption. Jefferson knew that more Algerine captures of American ships would make the price too high for Congress. He urged that the Americans "must never make it [the Algerines'] interest to go out of the streights [*sic*] in quest of us, and we must avoid entering into the streights [*sic*], at least till we are rich enough to arm in that sea."¹¹² Jefferson saw his determination to avoid tribute borne out when the pirates began taking Neapolitan vessels captive only three months after their peace treaty. Captain O'Bryen declared that "no principal of national honor will bind those people," and "there is very little confidence to be put in the royal word."¹¹³

Thomas Jefferson left Europe in 1789 to become George Washington's Secretary of State. During his time in France, he attempted to advance the American struggle against the Barbary States and piracy. Though he failed, Jefferson pushed for a new approach. Although the standard response was to placate the pirates with tribute and bribes, Jefferson advocated military action. The Virginian believed that national honor was at stake, and anything less than victory would result in disrepute.

Although the United States secured an advantageous peace with Morocco in 1787, Algiers was by far the most dangerous of the regencies. Though American knowledge of the workings of Barbary increased tremendously, Jefferson's mission of redemption or peace failed. The United States had not made peace with Algiers when he left Europe, nor was the country prepared to retrieve her citizens militarily.

¹¹² Thomas Jefferson to William Carmichael, 25 September 1787, in *ibid.*, 173.

¹¹³ Richard O'Bryen to Thomas Jefferson, 28 April 1787 in *ibid.*, 11: 322.

Congress' ineffectiveness, the poor character of John Lamb, and the avarice of the regencies all doomed Jefferson's attempt. He remained committed to an honorable and noble result, only for the powers to which he answered to thwart him. Though Jefferson carried his desire for a peace into his own presidency, he was unable to accomplish anything while in Europe.

CHAPTER III

“ALL THE REST OF THE WORLD IS OPEN”:

JEFFERSON AS SECRETARY OF STATE AND VICE PRESIDENT, 1790-1801

Jefferson’s tenure as an American diplomat in Europe ended in 1789. He returned to a country adjusted to the rigors of independence. The Constitution, recently ratified to replace the Articles of Confederation, called for the creation of an executive branch. George Washington, the country’s first president, requested that Jefferson assume the post of the country’s top diplomat, Secretary of State.

After five years abroad, Jefferson accepted the post early in 1790. Although now tasked with more than just negotiating trade agreements and dealing with pirates, the Barbary issue remained. Algiers had been the primary problem in North Africa during his time as minister, though the 1790s saw Tripoli and Morocco come to the fore as well. In fact, the situation was becoming so dire that Washington told Congress, “So many circumstances unite in rendering the present state of [our captives] distressful to us that

you will not think any deliberations misemployed which may lead to [their] relief and protection.”¹

One of Jefferson’s first tasks was to report on the status of the American captives in Algiers. When the House of Representatives sent the new Secretary of State a petition from the captives, Jefferson hoped that “certain measures... might prove effectual” in redeeming them. New information, however, “weakened those expectations.”²

Jefferson offered the House a brief history of the crisis in late 1790, reporting that Algerine pirates captured twenty-one captives from the American ships *Maria* of Boston and *Dauphin* of Philadelphia. Jefferson explained that the commissioners in Europe, appointed before the capture “thought it their duty to undertake that ransom [of the prisoners], fearing that the captives might be sold” if they waited for Congress to act. Acting on a limited budget, the commissioners restricted their agent to \$200 per captive in ransom, expecting that Congress would reject a higher price.³

The \$200 limit was lower than the ransom just paid by the French and proved too low. The Dey of Algiers, meeting with the American agent, demanded that the United States’ government pay \$59,496 for the return of the twenty-one captives, averaging to

¹ Washington’s Second Annual Message, in James D. Richardson, ed, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 20 vols. (New York: Bureau of National Literature, Inc., 1897) I: 75.

² Report from Jefferson to Washington, 28 December 1790, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 6 vols., Published under the direction of the Honorable Claude A. Swanson, Secretary of the Navy (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1939), 1: 18.

³ Report from Jefferson to Washington, 28 December 1790, in *ibid.*, 19.

\$2,833.14 per captive. The agent returned without coming to any agreement, and the prisoners remained in Algiers.⁴

At the time, the United States' government, through agents, paid the captives a allowance for necessities. The Mathurins⁵ suggested, and Jefferson implemented, a reduction in that allowance. The Mathurins reasoned that too much income would lead the Dey and his ministers to believe the United States was capable of paying high ransom.⁶ Jefferson knew that the first ransom paid would set the precedent for subsequent American efforts, so he desired to keep the price as low as possible. He lowered the allowance and even feigned coolness toward the captives in an attempt to convince the Algerines that their American prisoners had a lower value than they hoped. Jefferson knew the captives had to suffer without knowledge of his plan, as any leaked information could leave redemption unlikely, if not impossible.⁷

Just as negotiations began, other European countries altered the situation. Spain, Russia, and Naples made peace with Algiers and “redeemed [their captives] at exorbitant sums.”⁸ In addition, the redemption of large numbers of Europeans made slaves a scarce commodity on the Barbary Coast and left the Dey less eager to sell. The commissioners, aware their original target of \$200 per person was inadequate, authorized the Mathurins to increase the price to \$550 per person. Unfortunately, internal French politics

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ A French religious order tasked with redeeming Christian slaves. See Chapter II.

⁶ Report from Jefferson to Washington, 28 December 1790, in *ibid.*, 20.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid..

preempted any action. In a wave of anti-monastic legislation, the Mathurins were dispossessed of their lands and funds, forcing a suspension of all their activities.⁹

Between 1785 and 1790, the estimates for ransom ranged from \$1,200 to \$2,920 per person. Though the Dey of Algiers demanded \$2,833 per person, John Lamb offered \$1,200 in 1786. This was, by far, the lowest price during this period. Spain paid \$1,600 per person for her peace in 1786, while Russia paid \$1,546 in 1787. Captain O'Bryen increased his estimate for ransom from \$1,800 in 1788 to \$2,920 in 1789.¹⁰ Just prior to submitting his report, Jefferson received word that Britain recently redeemed a sailor for \$1,481. Jefferson estimated that, with a 50 percent increase for the two American captains, the United States could redeem its captives for an average of \$1,571.¹¹

Jefferson was adamant that the American government had to take some action to secure the release of its citizens. He even went so far as to advocate the creation of a small naval force and the capture Algerine sailors. Acknowledging that the Algerines only occasionally ransomed their own sailors, Jefferson offered the capture of Turkish sailors as an alternative. He argued that should the United States put pressure on Algiers's imperial sovereign, the Turks would force Algiers to deal with the United States in a more advantageous way.¹²

Economic realities also concerned Jefferson. With Algerine pirates operating with impunity, American commerce in the region was virtually nonexistent. Jefferson lamented the loss of those valuable markets for American exports. He informed

⁹ Ibid., 20-21.

¹⁰ Ibid., 21.

¹¹ Ibid..

¹² Ibid., 21-22.

Washington that the redemption of captives related directly to the alleviation of American economic fortunes in the region, saying the “distresses of both proceed from the same cause” and “the relief of the one may, very probably, involve the relief of the other.”¹³

In Jefferson’s report to Congress, trade was critical. For various reasons, many states lost their records during the Revolution. Jefferson was not, therefore, able to find exact figures on colonial trade. His best estimate showed just how significant of an economic loss the United States faced. He estimated that the colonies shipped one-sixth of their wheat and flour, one-fourth of their dried or pickled fish, as well as Carolina rice, to the Mediterranean.¹⁴ Hostilities, as well as the loss of British naval protection, ended this trade early in the Revolutionary War.¹⁵

Without British protection, American commerce was at the mercy of every country with a naval force. The United States disbanded the Continental Navy after independence, leaving the new republic no way of protecting its commercial interests around the world. American merchants knew that, without British protection, “their adventures into [the Mediterranean] sea would be exposed to the depredations of the piratical States on the coast of Barbary.”¹⁶ Jefferson declared that the only way American commerce in the region could resume was to “bring that war to an end, or to palliate its effects.”¹⁷

¹³ Ibid., 22.

¹⁴ Report of Secretary of State to the Congress of the United States, 28 December 1790, in *ibid.*, 22. Jefferson sent this message to the House of Representatives on 30 December 1790 and the Senate on 3 January 1791.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid., 23.

Though insuring American ships was another option, albeit an extremely expensive one, Jefferson's first suggestion was a diplomatic convention in which Algiers would exchange captured Americans at a fixed rate.¹⁸ He acknowledged that the price set for American sailors would be high, though he declined to give an estimate. He also feared that, given a guaranteed ransom for American sailors, the convention "may tempt [Algerine] cupidity to seek our vessels particularly."¹⁹

Jefferson informed Congress that lack of military experience in the Mediterranean left the United States without guidance. As the Mediterranean was, essentially, an inland sea with only one point of entrance or exit, any nation using that route faced greater danger than a nation with direct access to the sea. French or Spanish commerce would be harder to capture as their coastlines offered multiple points of origin and safe harbors. Conversely, American commerce had to enter through the Straits of Gibraltar, creating a bottleneck²⁰ where Algerine and other pirates concentrated.²¹ With that threat of captivity, the best sailors would choose to go elsewhere, as "all the rest of the world is open."²²

If a continual threat to commerce was too much to accept, Congress could emulate the European nations in the centuries-old practice of purchasing peace. Declaring that these nations "[count] their interest more than their honor," Jefferson gave numerous examples of what a peace would entail. He estimated the range from \$60,000 to \$1,000,000. Spain, the most recent country to make peace, paid between \$3 and \$5

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ At its narrowest point, less than ten miles separates Europe and Africa.

²¹ Report of Secretary of State to the Congress of the United States, 28 December 1790, in *ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, 24.

million. Jefferson did not know the amount paid but he knew the French gave the Dey presents every ten years to maintain their treaties.²³

Even if the United States signed a treaty, Jefferson warned that a strong naval force would be required to maintain any agreement. Without a navy, the pirates would be free to break the treaty at their whim and attempt to obtain more ransom. Even a navy was no guarantee, as both the French and Spanish suffered seizures soon after signing their treaties with Algiers.²⁴ The Algerines occasionally refused peace with certain countries so they could continue to capture ships. Jefferson admitted that Algiers could reject an advantageous offer if they deemed piracy was more beneficial than ransom.²⁵

Jefferson's third option was war. Advocating this alternative since his time as the American minister to France, Jefferson estimated the Algerines possessed six *chebecks*²⁶ and four galleys. He expected that, in case of conflict, the Ottoman Sultan would send a forty-gun frigate and two cruisers to assist its vassal.²⁷ Jefferson's contacts informed him that these ships would not fare well against "the broadside of a good frigate," but the Algerines built ships to be fast and cheap. They had different caliber guns, often on the same ship, and their skill level was low. Most ships aimed to board as quickly as possible to allow man-to-man combat instead of naval gunnery. He also noted that the Dey did not own all the ships, and, as such, he did not control every cruise.²⁸

²³ Ibid., 24-25.

²⁴ Ibid., 25.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ These ships generally had ten to thirty-six guns.

²⁷ Report of Secretary of State to the Congress of the United States, 28 December 1790, in *ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

Though currently at peace with most of Europe's major powers, Algiers's corsairs remained active in the Mediterranean. At the time of Jefferson's report, Algiers engaged in piratical operations against Russia, Portugal, and several Italian states. Jefferson used that fact to push, once again, his idea of a Confederation of small nations at war with Algiers. He noted the United States had a friendly power in Portugal, which had earlier closed the Straits of Gibraltar to Algiers for five years.²⁹ Jefferson wanted to create an alliance with Portugal before that country made peace with Algiers. Should that happen, Jefferson believed, "the Atlantic will immediately become the principal scene of their piracies."³⁰

A committee on trade reported to the Senate in January 1791 and supported Jefferson's views on Algiers. They advised that American trade to the Mediterranean "cannot be protected but by a naval force."³¹ Urging action, the committee recommended establishing an American navy, as quickly as the funding became available.³² Less than a month later, the Senate gave formal direction to President Washington. In a resolution passed on 1 February 1791, the Senate advised him to "take such measures as he may think necessary for the redemption of the citizens of the U.S. now in captivity at Algiers," allowing expenditures up to \$40,000.³³ On 22 February, Washington responded that he

²⁹ Ibid., 26.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Report of a Committee on the Trade of the Mediterranean, made to the United States Senate, 6 January 1791, in *ibid.*

³² Ibid.

³³ "Senate Resolution on the Algerine Captives," 1 February 1791 in *Papers*, 18: 444.

would conform to the resolution, as soon as the House of Representatives appropriated the money.³⁴

While the American government continued debating the best course of action, the prisoners in Algiers languished in captivity. Unlike the American system of slavery, the Algerines used Christian captives as aides to many of the high-ranking officials in the Dey's palace. Captain O'Bryen reported that captive George Smith was Chamberlain to the Effendi Vickelhage General, who also acted as Minister for Foreign Affairs. Smith used his position to tell Vickelhage of the advantages of the United States. As Algiers was a sea-faring nation, Smith described his country's abundant forests for shipbuilding, as well as all the other components necessary to construct a formidable warship.³⁵ Using the assertion that "no nation in the world ... builds such fine and fast sailing Cruisers as the Americans" as a bargaining piece, Smith stated the United States only wanted an honorable peace with Algiers.³⁶

Hearing that the United States could provide these shipbuilding supplies in lieu of money, Vickelhage confided in Smith that Algiers "would make a Peace with America on as easy Terms as possible."³⁷ Vickelhage offered to be "a friend and Advocate" of the United States at court, promoting peace. Proving that Algerine avarice manifested

³⁴ "The President to the Senate," 22 February 1791 in *ibid.*, 444-455; Message of President George Washington relative to the Ransom of Prisoners, 22 February 1791, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 26.

³⁵ Richard O'Bryen to William Carmichael, 11/15 May 1790, in *Papers*, 18: 438.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 438.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 439.

even in professions of friendship, Vickelhodge told Smith he expected “for his Weight, Trouble, and Influence, an American built Schooner of 12 Guns.”³⁸

O’Bryen urged Carmichael, the American consul in Spain, to push Congress to appoint a diplomat to Algiers with “as extensive Powers as possible.”³⁹ Arguing that Vickelhodge “sways the whole Regency as he thinks proper,” O’Bryen believed the “Question is will America give Cruisers and Maritime stores to this Regency to make a Peace[?]” If not, then Algiers will get their ships and stores elsewhere and continue targeting American shipping.⁴⁰

Soon after, O’Bryen contacted Carmichael again. Claiming domestic troubles in both Britain and France meant that they could not hinder American interests to the same degree, he pointed to Spain’s fear of war with Algiers as an opportunity to benefit the United States. With war pending against a European power, Algiers would need cruisers. O’Bryen claimed, “I cannot perceive that ever a more favorable Opportunity offered for America to make a Peace than the present.”⁴¹

Though O’Bryan declared Spain’s peace was “very dishonorable and impolitic,” Algiers held to it only for “the vast Sums of Money and Presents given, which are sufficient to almost tempt these People to adore Lucifer.”⁴² O’Bryen’s estimated that Spain paid over \$4.5 million in “Presents and Redemptions” from June 1785 to May

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 440.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 441.

⁴¹ Richard O’Bryen to William Carmichael, 17 May 1790, in “Enclosure II: Secretary of State to the President of the Senate on 20 January 1791,” in *ibid.*, 443.

⁴² Ibid.

1790. This total included at least \$32,000 paid to Vickelhage for his assistance in making peace, making the gift of an American-built schooner seem inexpensive.⁴³

Although price, for either redemption or war, was a major factor for Congress, lack of action had a cost its own. O'Bryen calculated that insurance for American shipping ran "upwards of one million Sterling, which Sum the British Nation gets by insuring American Property on Account of our not being at Peace with the Barbary States."⁴⁴ Such a price dwarfed the highest estimates for ransoming the captives.

For the next year, the Americans remained captive in Algiers and the United States' government took no action. O'Bryen again offered his advice directly to Congress. Writing in April 1791, O'Bryen reported the latest ransom price as 34,450 Spanish milled dollars.⁴⁵ He condemned his government's constant asking for quotes, claiming the Algerines took such requests as disingenuous and reduced their faith in the Americans.⁴⁶

Conditions in Algiers had changed greatly since Americans first became captives in 1785. In 1786, there were three thousand Christian slaves in Algiers. By the time of O'Bryen's letter in 1791, only seven hundred remained. Algiers had ransomed many Europeans, and a great many others died in "the pest, that great storm of mortality" in 1787-1788, including six Americans.⁴⁷ This caused prices to rise, as the slaves become precious commodities rather than sources of ransom. Seeing as how the slaves performed

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ To the Congress of the United States from Richard O'Bryen, 28 April 1791, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 28.

⁴⁶ Given O'Bryen's previous statements about Algerine avarice and duplicity, it seems his complaint comes mostly as aggravation at remaining in captivity rather than a matter of principle.

⁴⁷ To the Congress of the United States from Richard O'Bryen, 28 April 1791, in *ibid.*, 29.

both hard labor and important administrative duties, Algiers was loath to part with those remaining.

O'Bryen also feared a change in the international political situation. While Britain and France remained embroiled in turmoil, both internally and with each other, Portugal sought peace with Algiers. The Portuguese had been at war with Algiers for longer than the Americans and provided military assistance in blocking the Straits of Gibraltar. Without this deterrent, Algiers would have no impediment to sailing past the Straits and attacking shipping in the Atlantic. O'Bryen estimated that the United States would need to build or procure eight to ten vessels to patrol the Straits. Without such a force, no company would insure American property for less than 25 percent of their cargo's value.⁴⁸ Without the power to blockade the Straits, he also worried that Algerine ships would eventually patrol off the coast of the United States. However little gain the United States would "[derive] by being at war with the Barbary States ... being at peace, [had] many advantages, [including] extended and beneficial commerce."⁴⁹

With Spain the latest country to ransom its citizens, many in the United States feared that the cost of ransoming the American captives would increase. O'Bryen estimated that peace would cost the United States between 50,000 and 60,000 pounds Sterling, with an additional 15,000 pounds Sterling for Tunis. O'Bryen insisted that the United States should link Tunis, as a tributary to Algiers, in any peace treaty.⁵⁰ He offered two solutions. First, he suggested that the United States supply naval stores in lieu of cash. Second, he suggested that the United States buy passports of safe conduct

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 29-30.

from the Algerines and sell them to merchants wishing to trade in the Mediterranean. This would help to defray any costs from tribute or ransom, while providing trade protection.⁵¹ O’Bryen also offered that the American government make any peace in the form of an annual tribute, rather than a large sum. Given the Algerine propensity to accept tribute payments for peace and then restart the conflict, O’Bryen worked to bind the Algerines to peace by extending the receipt of tribute over several years.⁵² Closing a letter written to Congress in April 1791, O’Bryen issued one last plea. Hoping Congress would “consider What our sufferings must have been... [for] nearly six years captivity,” he again advised negotiating with Algiers.⁵³

Jefferson continued his attempts to better American relations with Barbary. In 1792, he appointed John Paul Jones to be the “Commissioner to treat with Algiers” on the subjects of peace and redemption of prisoners.⁵⁴ Jefferson explained the problems encountered by previous diplomats, saying that the multitude of people attempting help has, “though undertaken with good intentions, run directly counter to our plan” to give the appearance of indifference to the Algerines.⁵⁵ Causing the opposite reaction, Algiers considered these entreaties to be official and expected the United States to pay record prices for their captives.⁵⁶ While Washington and Congress expected results, Jefferson made it very clear that “no *ransom* is to take place without a *peace*.”⁵⁷

⁵¹ Ibid., 30.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Thomas Jefferson to John Paul Jones, 1 June 1792, in *ibid.*, 36.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 37.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 38 (emphasis in original).

Algiers was not the only threat in North Africa. The other three regencies, though much smaller and less powerful than Algiers, also posed problems. The next potential issue was with Morocco. The United States had signed a treaty of friendship with the Emperor of Morocco shortly after the American Revolution; however, the emperor died in 1790. Following the local customs, all countries had to renew their treaties with the new emperor to remain in effect. Jefferson immediately recommended that the United States dispatch an agent to offer presents and renew diplomatic ties with Morocco. Geography made that country a potentially dangerous enemy as it controlled coasts on both the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea.⁵⁸

Using the previous agreement as a basis, the United States offered a treaty with presents in the range of \$10,000 to the Emperor of Morocco. President Washington appointed Thomas Barclay, already consul at Morocco, as the chief diplomat to the new emperor's court. Specifically, the United States sought a continuation of the previous treaty.⁵⁹ Barclay sailed back to Morocco with this objective, but found the situation more chaotic. The late emperor's sons were involved in a bloody succession struggle, leaving the country without an effective government.⁶⁰

Barclay, while still at Gibraltar, received information on the situation in Morocco.⁶¹ He relayed a story of the late emperor's two sons. The elder son, Muley Yezid, took sanctuary to "avoid the resentment of his father," who immediately ordered his younger son, Muley Slama, to lay siege to the place and force Yezid to surrender.

⁵⁸ Report of Secretary of State to the Congress of the United States, 28 December 1790, in *ibid.*, 23.

⁵⁹ To Thomas Barclay, U.S. Consul, Morocco, from Secretary of State, 13 May 1791, in *ibid.*, 30.

⁶⁰ Parker, *Uncle Sam in Barbary*, 156.

⁶¹ He notes in his letter to Jefferson that strong winds prevented his sailing.

However, before Slama succeeded, the emperor and northern Morocco and its major cities proclaimed Yezid as successor. To avoid his brother's vengeance, Slama placed himself in sanctuary.⁶²

Despite this uncertainty, Barclay intended complete his mission to Morocco. Before doing so, he contracted a disease and died. A letter to Jefferson from James Simpson, United States consul in Gibraltar, showed that by 1793 the situation in Morocco was even more chaotic: another prince, Muley Soliman, was contending for the throne.⁶³

Jefferson's time as Secretary of State ended on 31 December 1793 with his resignation from Washington's cabinet. Retiring to Monticello to continue its never-ending reconstruction, Jefferson spent more time fretting about French and British affairs than about piracy. During his absence, American agents finally made progress: in 1795, the new Moroccan emperor renewed his father's treaty and the Algerian Dey finally signed a peace treaty that freed the American captives.⁶⁴ David Humphreys, the American consul in Lisbon and agent for Barbary negotiations, managed to keep both treaties within Jefferson's original instructions; there was nominal tribute, partially paid in naval stores, and no annual payments.⁶⁵

Even with his election as Vice President in 1796, Jefferson said little in relation to Barbary. James Madison, having just left his seat in the House of Representatives, had given him regular updates on the previous treaties as the Senate debated them, but

⁶² To Secretary of State from Thomas Barclay, U.S. Consul, Morocco, 18 December 1791, in *ibid.*, 34.

⁶³ To Secretary of State from James Simpson, U.S. Consul, Gibraltar, 1 June 1793, in *ibid.*, 44.

⁶⁴ Moroccan treaty: To Edward Church, U.S. Consul, Lisbon, Portugal, from James Simpson, U.S. Consul, Gibraltar, and Agent at Tangier, 18 August 1795, in *ibid.*, 106. Algiers treaty: "Algiers – Treaty," 5 September 1795, in *ibid.*, 107.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

Jefferson barely deigned to mention them. The United States secured peace with all the Barbary States as they signed treaties with both Tripoli⁶⁶ and Tunis⁶⁷ in 1796-1797.

Jefferson's time between diplomat and President spanned a full decade.

Continuing his call for action while in France, Jefferson used his office as Secretary of State to press for a resolution with Barbary, preferably without tribute. Although he had resigned by the time the treaties were finalized, his ideas influenced the outcome. The treaty with Algiers did not include an annual tribute (though it could not escape the custom of large gifts) and the new emperor of Morocco agreed to honor the treaty his father signed. Shortly after Jefferson's departure as Secretary of State, Congress passed legislation authorizing the creation of a navy to protect American interests. When Jefferson assumed office as President on 4 March 1801, the country remained at peace with all four Barbary States and enjoyed full trading rights in the Mediterranean for the first time since the English Navy ceased protecting American shipping in the 1770s. This would not remain for long. Unlike earlier times, President Jefferson now had the office and the authority to act.

⁶⁶ The United States signed the treaty with Tripoli on 4 November 1796 in Tripoli and 3 January 1797 in Algiers. The treaty reached the Senate on 29 May 1797 and the executive ratified it on 10 June. Avalon Project: The Barbary Treaties, 1786-1816 "Treaty of Peace and Friendship, Signed at Tripoli November 4, 1796," http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1796t.asp (accessed 25 July 2011).

⁶⁷ The United States signed the treaty with Tunis on 28 August 1797, and with alterations, on 26 March 1799. The executive ratified the treaty on 10 January 1800. Avalon Project: The Barbary Treaties, 1786-1816 "Treaty of Peace and Friendship, Signed at Tunis August 28, 1797," http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1797t.asp (accessed 25 July 2011).

CHAPTER IV

“CHASTISE THEIR INSOLENT”:

JEFFERSON AS PRESIDENT, 1801-1805

On Jefferson’s first day in office, the United States was at peace with the world. The war with Algiers had ended five years earlier, while the Quasi War with France had ended in 1800. Although his inaugural address preached peace and reconciliation as themes, Jefferson wasted little time in taking action against his old foes.

The Quasi War with France caused the United States to expand its navy beyond the original scope of the 1794 legislation meant to combat Algiers. The United States’ Navy now had several frigates not serving in combat. For the first time in its history, the United States could project some measure of power beyond its shores. This option directly affected the scope of Jefferson’s conflict with Barbary.

Within a week of becoming president, Jefferson suggested to his Cabinet the

United States send an armed force to the Mediterranean to end the tribute system with the Barbary States.¹ In a debate that shaped events of the year, Secretary of State James Madison and Secretary of War Henry Dearborn wanted to authorize the force to attack any vessel that threatened American commerce.² Although Attorney General Levi Lincoln anticipated sending a squadron for a “demonstration of our power to reduce the capricious Sovereigns of Barbary to a new sense of justice,”³ he gave the legal opinion that Jefferson could not send the force “to attack any foreign vessel without the approval and authorization of Congress.”⁴ Without consensus, Jefferson tabled his proposal.

It would not remain so for long. Within weeks, the United States learned that Tripoli had resumed the capture of American shipping in the Mediterranean in October 1800.⁵ Following these actions, the Pasha⁶ of Tripoli demanded more tribute than the Treaty of 1797 allowed. Richard O’Byrne, former captive and now Consul General at Algiers, reported in April 1801 that the Pasha, Yusuf Karamanli, had “ordered his Cruisers to Sea with [a hostile] Intention to Capture American Vessels [and] make Slaves of the Citizens of the U.S.”⁷ William Eaton, Consul at Tunis, confirmed the news several days later. Knowing the consequences of continued hostility, Eaton wrote that “if the

¹Joshua E. London, *Victory in Tripoli: How America’s War with the Barbary Pirates Established the U.S. Navy and Built a Nation* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2005), 92.

² Ibid.

³Michael L.S. Kitzen, *Tripoli and the United States at War: A History of American Relations with the Barbary States, 1785-1805* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 1993), 46.

⁴ London, *Victory in Tripoli*, 92.

⁵ Ibid., 93; To Captain Edward Preble, U.S. Navy, from Samuel Smith for Acting Secretary of the Navy, 1 April 1801, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 425-426; To Captain Thomas Truxtun, U.S. Navy, from Samuel Smith for Acting Secretary of the Navy, 2 April 1801, in Ibid., 426-427.

⁶ The Tripolitan leader’s title varies by text and is generally listed as Pasha, Bashaw, or Bey. The author will use “Pasha” except in direct quotes where the original author uses another title.

⁷ *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 427.

United States will have a free commerce in this sea they must defend it: There is no alternative. The restless spirit of these marauders cannot be restrained.”⁸

Jefferson knew that “there [was] no end to the demand of these powers, nor any security in their promises.”⁹ To him, the United States had only two options: withdraw from the Mediterranean and abandon any commercial activities there or send a fleet to protect American interests.¹⁰ To resolve the American position, the President reconvened his Cabinet. In a 15 May meeting, Jefferson posed two questions: Should the United States send a naval squadron to the Mediterranean and what would be the purpose of the cruise? Attorney General Lincoln reiterated his position that American forces could defend themselves but “may not proceed to destroy the enemy’s vessels generally” without the permission of Congress.¹¹ The rest of the Cabinet disagreed, arguing that Jefferson was only responding to a declaration of war and not making one of his own. His role as commander-in-chief required that he defend the country and its commerce. Treasury Secretary Albert Gallatin argued that the executive “can not put us in a state of war, but if we be put into that state ... by the other nation, the command [and] direction of the public force then belongs to the [President].”¹²

With everyone in agreement, Jefferson authorized Robert Smith¹³ to dispatch three frigates and a sloop to the Mediterranean. Jefferson ordered the squadron, led by

⁸ Ibid., 430.

⁹ Thomas Jefferson to Wilson Cary Nicholas, 11 June 1801, in Thomas Jefferson, *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, 12 vols., ed. Paul L. Ford (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1904), 9: 264-265.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ 15 May 1801, *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, 1: 365.

¹² Ibid., 365-366; Alexander DeConde, *Presidential Machismo: Executive Authority, Military Intervention, and Foreign Relations* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2000), 22.

¹³ Smith was Acting Secretary of the Navy and took the post officially on 27 July 1801.

Commodore Richard Dale, to show “that the views of your [government] are perfectly friendly” unless Tripoli had already declared war, in which case the warships should “chastise their insolence—by sinking, burning or destroying their ships wherever you shall find them.”¹⁴

Even while sending the ships to protect American commerce, Jefferson and his administration remained careful of the political situation both domestically and abroad. Though Jefferson’s instructions included the command to “chastise insolence,” he handicapped the power of his naval commanders by prohibiting offensive action without congressional approval. This included the release of any prisoners taken in battle and the release of any ship captured, albeit after disabling it.¹⁵

Internationally, Secretary of State Madison instructed the consuls in Algiers and Tunis to keep those regencies neutral. Madison stressed that any war the United States engaged in was one of “defence [*sic*] and necessity, not of choice or provocation.”¹⁶ Worried about starting a general war, the American government confirmed its dedication to the existing peace treaties with the other regencies. Jefferson stated that the American government would adhere to those agreements, even “the tributes and humiliations,” but would only follow “what the laws impose on us ... nothing more.”¹⁷

Following Dale’s arrival in the Mediterranean in July 1801, he blockaded Tripoli’s harbor. For most of the year, there were simultaneous blockades of Tripoli and

¹⁴ Goldsmith, *The Growth of Presidential Power*, 1: 373.

¹⁵ “Congress, the President, and the Power to Commit Forces to Combat.” *Harvard Law Review* 81 (June 1968), 1779.

¹⁶ Secretary of State to Consuls O’Bryen and Eaton, 20 May 1801, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 461.

¹⁷ Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, 28 August 1801, *Republic of Letters*, 2: 1193.

of a Tripolitan cruiser in Gibraltar's harbor.¹⁸ The first test of Jefferson's policy came in August 1801. The schooner USS *Enterprise* captured a Tripolitan corsair of fourteen guns and eighty men. Even though the Pasha was "much mortified, that so small a vessel should take one of his corsairs," Jefferson's orders meant the ship did not leave Tripolitan hands. After disabling all its guns and hindering its ability to sail, the *Enterprise* released the ship and crew.¹⁹

To this point, Jefferson had not convened Congress. They were in recess and he believed that the Constitution allowed him to respond defensively. Jefferson waited until the legislature reconvened later in the year.²⁰ In his annual message to Congress in December 1801, Jefferson requested approval to undertake full-scale operations against Tripoli. Declaring Tripoli's demands "unfounded either in right or in compact," Jefferson informed Congress of his decision to send the squadron to "dispel ... the danger" of American commerce in both the Mediterranean and Atlantic.²¹ Using the experience of the *Enterprise* as an example, Jefferson wrote:

Unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense, the [Tripolitan] vessel, being disabled from committing further hostilities, was liberated with its crew. The Legislature will doubtless consider whether, by authorizing measures of offense also, they will place our force on an equal footing with that of its adversaries.²²

¹⁸ As Gibraltar belonged to the British, the United States did not proclaim a blockade of the harbor itself. Rather, the ship USS *Philadelphia* stayed on patrol outside the harbor to prevent the cruiser from withdrawing.

¹⁹ To James Leander Cathcart, U.S. ex-Consul, Tripoli, at Leghorn, from Captain Richard Dale, U.S. Navy, 25 August 1801, *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 560.

²⁰ Wheelan, *Jefferson's War*, 106; "Congress, the President, and the Power to Commit Forces to Combat," 1779.

²¹ Thomas Jefferson's First Annual Message to Congress, 8 December 1801, in Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 1: 314, 315.

²² *Ibid.*, 315.

This request, ridiculed by his political opponents, exposed Jefferson's dilemma: He was "torn between his acknowledged abhorrence of the Barbary States and the unexplored constitutional questions of how to respond officially if hostilities arose."²³

Alexander Hamilton, as Jefferson's chief adversary, lambasted Jefferson's position on the state of offensive operations and his commander's decision to release all Tripolitan ships and crew. Claiming it to be "one of the most singular paradoxes ever advanced," Hamilton wrote that the decision "amounts to nothing less than this, that *between* two nations there may exist a state of complete war on the one side [and] of peace on the other."²⁴ Continuing the theme, Hamilton stressed that a declaration or act of war did not require concurrent acts of acceptance by the two parties involved.²⁵

While Hamilton continued to complain about Jefferson's "blemish on our national character,"²⁶ Congress began the process of granting the president power to prosecute the war. Samuel Smith²⁷ of Maryland introduced a resolution within a week of Jefferson's address. Smith wanted to empower the president and allow him to "be authorized by law, further and more effectually to protect the commerce of the United States against the Barbary Powers."²⁸ Though there was some debate about whether the measure allowed Jefferson to increase the size of the armed forces, Representative Smith reiterated that his intent was simply "to authorize the President, with the present force, to take measures for

²³ Kitzen, *Tripoli and the United States at War*, 45.

²⁴ Alexander Hamilton, "Examination of Jefferson's Message to Congress of December 7, 1801," in *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, 12 vols (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904) 8: 248.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 252.

²⁷ Brother of Navy Secretary Robert Smith.

²⁸ House of Representatives 7th Congress, I Session, 14 December 1801, *Annals of Congress*, 325-326. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage> (Accessed 9 September 2010).

the defence [*sic*] of our trade.”²⁹ Smith and Jefferson feared that Algiers and Tunis would join the conflict. Without congressional authorization, the president remained constrained to a defensive position and unable to respond to any additional threats. With a Democratic-Republican majority in both houses of Congress, the resolution passed giving Jefferson authority to take the offensive against Barbary.³⁰

With congressional approval, Jefferson won the political battle. While he advocated a conflict to, at least, force an end to tribute, he was setting a precedent for the future. There had been no declared wars fought since the country’s independence and Congress had sanctioned action against French warships threatening American commerce during the Quasi War. Jefferson was hesitant to engender political criticism by overreaching his authority. By putting American forces on the defensive and waiting for congressional approval for offensive actions, Jefferson ensured that his opponents could not accuse him of beginning the war.

With full power, Jefferson moved quickly from the defensive to the offensive. Prior to the resolutions, the United States’ Navy remained handicapped and instituted blockades rather than seeking out enemy vessels. For the several months before the congressional resolution, American envoys in North Africa and Europe pushed to increase American activity in the Mediterranean. Consul Eaton wrote to Secretary Madison in September 1801 stating that he had contacted “the rightful Bashaw of Tripoli.”³¹ Exiled in Tunis, Hamet Karamanli lost control of the country to his brother, Yusuf, who then exiled him. Eaton advocated an American force to assist Hamet in

²⁹ Ibid., 327.

³⁰ Ibid., 327-329.

³¹ To Secretary of State from William Eaton, U.S. Consul, Tunis, 5 September 1801, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 1: 569.

reclaiming Tripoli in exchange for a more favorable peace. Without providing evidence, Eaton declared that the people in Tripoli were “ripe for revolt” and only needed “confidence in the prospect of success.” Eaton offered further incentive for supporting Hamet by stating the Bey of Tunis favored him over Yusuf.³²

From 1801 to 1804, the United States’ Navy blockaded Tripoli and cruised along the North African coast. The American policy was to contain as many ships as possible with attacks only occurring in open waters. This was likely because, during the opening years of the war, the United States Navy was limited to the several frigates and sloops left over from the Quasi War with France. In 1804, the administration authorized a change in policy that altered the outcome. That year saw one of the most heralded events of the nascent American military history with the burning and sinking of the stricken USS *Philadelphia*. The *Philadelphia* ran aground in October 1803 while pursuing a Tripolitan corsair. After grounding on a reef outside Tripoli’s harbor, The *Philadelphia* surrendered when its defense was no longer possible.³³ By February 1804, Captain Edward Preble decided to act on a plan to destroy the *Philadelphia* and deny its use to the enemy. He selected Lieutenant Stephen Decatur of the USS *Enterprize* for the mission. Using a captured corsair, Decatur and his men boarded the stricken frigate and set it on fire, culminating with an explosion that ended any enemy attempt at using the *Philadelphia*.³⁴

The American war effort continued when William Eaton proposed to launch an invasion of Tripoli in support of the exiled Hamet Karamanli. Eaton hoped to raise and command a force that would march from Egypt and invade the area of Derne, before

³² Ibid.

³³ John R. Spears. *The History of Our Navy: From Its Origin to the Present Day, 1775-1897*, 4 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1897), 1: 341-343.

³⁴ Ibid., 354-357.

ultimately marching on Tripoli.³⁵ By appointing Eaton as navy agent “for the several Barbary Regencies,” the Secretary of the Navy placed him under the command of Commodore Samuel Barron.³⁶ Eaton proposed something new for American foreign policy: an invasion of a foreign country. His intelligence reported Tripoli on the verge of revolt and ready to follow the exiled Hamet Bashaw against his brother.³⁷ Though the assault would be American led, logistics kept a large American force from Tripoli. Eaton devised a plan where he and a few United States’ Marines would lead a force of mercenaries, supplemented by Hamet’s followers, in an overland march against Tripoli.³⁸

Eaton, acting as diplomat in addition to commander, knew that the United States needed an arrangement with Hamet Bashaw that would codify future American-Tripolitan relations. Negotiating from a position of strength, Eaton concluded a “convention” with Hamet,³⁹ cementing a “firm and perpetual Peace” between the United States and Hamet Bashaw, promising the United States would use the “utmost exertions” to reinstall him as Bashaw in Tripoli.⁴⁰ Eaton, knowing Hamet needed American help to regain his throne, secured a revolutionary change in Barbary practices. He demanded and received the tribute of Denmark, Sweden, and the Batavian Republic⁴¹ as indemnities for American losses. This was in addition to the release of all American captives and the

³⁵ To Captain Edward Preble, U.S. Navy from William Eaton, appointed U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, 25 January 1805, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 5: 301.

³⁶ To William Eaton, appointed U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, from Secretary of Navy, 30 May 1804, in *ibid.*, 4: 120.

³⁷ To Secretary of the Navy from William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, 6 September 1804, in *ibid.*, 525.

³⁸ To Captain Samuel Barron, U.S. Navy, from William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, 14 February 1805, in *ibid.*, 5: 353; Extract from a letter to an officer on board U.S. Brig *Argus*, from Midshipman Pascal Paoli Peck, U.S. Navy, son of Colonel William Peck, 4 July 1805, in *ibid.*, 361.

³⁹ To Secretary of State from William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, 4 March 1805, in *ibid.*, 367.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ This was the Napoleonic state set up in the former United Provinces of Holland.

agreement that all future wars would use a system of prisoners of war rather than captive slaves.⁴²

The year 1805 saw the culmination of Jefferson's two decade-long against the pirates. On 6 March, William Eaton and Hamet Bashaw marched from Alexandria with over 350 men, including 8 United States Marines.⁴³ While overwhelmingly foreign in numbers, this marked the first time that American forces fought on foreign soil. Over the course of the next three months, Eaton and his motley force would do as Jefferson had preached for two decades: they would take the fight to Barbary.

By the end of April, Eaton had not only crossed into Tripoli but had also captured the second-largest city, Derne.⁴⁴ With the city in his possession, the United States' Navy could directly supply the force with food and weapons. Unfortunately, the drive stalled as Yusuf Bashaw sent forces to lay Derne under siege. With the stalemate reaching into late-May, Eaton's superiors lost confidence in Hamet Bashaw's ability to lead the revolt/invasion. Captain Samuel Barron informed Eaton that due to Hamet's "lack of drive to contest his brother," the United States was no longer required.⁴⁵ Barron's attitude derived from his perception that Hamet lacked strength. Declaring that the exiled Bashaw "must be considered as no longer a fit subject for our support and Cooperation,"

⁴² To Secretary of State from William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, 4 March 1805, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 5: 367-368.

⁴³ Midshipman Peck gives the totals as: "about 300 well mounted Arabs, 70 [Christians] recruited at Alexandria, and 105 camels..." Extract from a letter to an officer on board U.S. Brig *Argus*, from Midshipman Pascal Paoli Peck, U.S. Navy, son of Colonel William Peck, 4 July 1805, in *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 5: 362.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 363.

⁴⁵ To William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, from Captain Samuel Barron, U.S. Navy, 19 May 1805, in *ibid.*, 6: 25.

Barron was adamant that the United States not lead a full-scale invasion of Tripoli.⁴⁶ Seeing an opportunity with Eaton's capture of Derne, Barron instructed Tobias Lear to negotiate with Yusuf for peace.⁴⁷

Eaton argued Hamet's cause to no avail. The American agent said that Hamet had the support of the population and that Yusuf feared his brother, not the Americans.⁴⁸ The sudden abandonment of Hamet angered Eaton, who declared that Barron's decision could not "be reconciled to those principles of honor and justice which, I know, actuate the national breast."⁴⁹ Eaton, by the words of the Secretary of the Navy and Captain Barron himself, encouraged Hamet to leave his exile and return to Tripoli "under an expectation of receiving aids [*sic*] from [the United States] to prosecute his views of recovering his throne."⁵⁰ Beyond his personal attachment to Hamet, Eaton feared that a failed negotiation, coupled with the abandonment of Derne, would cripple American fortunes in the Mediterranean.⁵¹ Little did Eaton know that Consul-General Lear had already succeeded in his mission.

After receiving his orders, Lear proceeded directly to Tripoli and joined Commodore John Rodgers outside the harbor. Yusuf first sent the Spanish consul Don Gerardo Joseph de Souza and then Danish consul Nicholas C. Nissen to negotiate on his

⁴⁶ To Tobias Lear, U.S. Consul General, Algiers, from Captain Samuel Barron, U.S. Navy, 18 May 1805, in *ibid.*, 22.

⁴⁷ To William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, from Captain Samuel Barron, U.S. Navy, 19 May 1805, in *ibid.*, 26.

⁴⁸ To Captain Samuel Barron, U.S. Navy, from William Eaton, U.S. Navy Agent for the Barbary Regencies, 29 May – 11 June 1805, in *ibid.*, 59.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

behalf.⁵² Lear demanded that the Bashaw return all captive Americans in exchange for all Tripolitans in American custody, in addition to \$60,000 for the difference in numbers. On that basis, Lear and Nissen signed a treaty of peace on 4 June 1805 that ended the first foreign war in American history.⁵³ The treaty called for the end of all hostilities, the mutual release of prisoners, the withdrawal of all Americans “in hostility against the Bashaw of Tripoli,” and the end of any supply to Hamet or those loyal to him.⁵⁴

President Jefferson submitted the treaty to the Senate for ratification in December 1805.⁵⁵ Writing to Congress in his annual message, Jefferson declared, “In a government bottomed on the will of all, the life and liberty of every individual citizen become interesting to all.”⁵⁶ Taking this idea seriously, Jefferson had just become the first American president to dispatch troops overseas to conduct a military operation. Although the operation was small and only partially successful, was unwilling to watch as Americans remained in captivity while their government did nothing. Although he did not destroy Tripoli or end the Barbary menace, he had achieved more than any previous president. He managed to project American strength across the Atlantic and forced a peace that did not require annual tribute, a rarity for any nation.

⁵² To Captain Samuel Barron, U.S. Navy, from Captain John Rodgers, U.S. Navy, Commodore of U.S. squadron in Mediterranean, 28 May 1805, in *ibid.*, 52-53; Negotiation concerning exchange of Prisoners, 31 May 1805, in *ibid.*, 68; To Nicholas C. Nissen, Danish Consul, Tripoli, from Sidi Yusuf Caramanli, Bashaw of Tripoli, [1 June 1805?], in *ibid.*, 71.

⁵³ Negotiation concerning exchange of Prisoners, 31 May 1805, in *ibid.*, 68; Treaty of Peace and Amity between the United States and Tripoli, 4 June 1805, in *ibid.*, 81.

⁵⁴ Treaty of Peace and Amity between the United States and Tripoli, 4 June 1805, in *ibid.*, 81.

⁵⁵ The Senate ratified the treaty on 17 April 1806 and proclaimed it on 22 April 1806, making the treaty binding.

⁵⁶ “Message of President Jefferson, communicated on Tuesday, December 3, 1805,” *American State Papers: Foreign Affairs* (Washington, D.C.: Gales and Seaton, 1833) <http://memory.loc.gov/argo.library.okstate.edu/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsp&fileName=001/llsp001.db&recNum=4>, accessed 15 April 2013.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

By the end of 1805, the United States stood alone in how it handled the threat of Barbary piracy. With the decision to fight the enemy directly, the United States changed two centuries of European acquiescence to the North African threat. Thomas Jefferson, through two decades of public service, led this American charge. Though known as a man of reason and peace, Jefferson expended enormous effort in getting the United States to take an aggressive stance against piracy.

Jefferson's historical reputation as a pacifist remains as, throughout his career, he argued against a strong permanent military. He believed that a large standing army would go from protecting the country to controlling it, while a strong navy would embroil the United States in foreign wars. In place of a navy with large warships, such as the frigates built under Adams, Jefferson proposed a navy of gunboats. These were small ships for harbor and coastal defense, rather than a force capable of battling on the high

seas. During his administration, the United States' Navy built 157 gunboats to protect the American coast. Jefferson's policy failed because the ships were more expensive than projected, often rotted during storage, and were ineffective in coastal defense.¹

Jefferson's reputation as a pacifist is not entirely justified. Although neither in favor of a large military force nor pursuing war, Jefferson understood the necessary time and place for such action. The campaign against Barbary piracy stands out most, but Jefferson prepared for conflict against Britain after the *Chesapeake* crisis in 1807. Dumas Malone sums up this historical error, observing "the designation of him [Jefferson] as a prophet of pacifism is unwarranted, but he was unquestionably a major prophet of non-involvement in world affairs. For his own time and generation it was basically a wise policy."² Jefferson's own words showed he believed the way "to prevent those [wars] produced by the wrongs of other nations ... [was to put] ourselves in a condition to punish them. Weakness provokes insult and injury, while a condition to punish it often prevents it."³

The common example of his pacifism was his conduct during the crisis with the United Kingdom in 1807. During Britain's war with France, the Royal Navy used impressment to return deserters to service. In many cases, the British targeted American merchant vessels. This caused outrage throughout the United States and led many to demand war in retaliation.⁴ Contrary to international law, the Royal Navy stopped the American warship USS *Chesapeake*. After Captain Samuel Barron refused a British

¹ Christopher T. Ziegler, "Jeffersonianism and 19th Century American Maritime Defense Policy" (Master's Thesis, East Tennessee State University, 2003), 91-92.

² *Ibid.*, 473.

³ Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 23 August 1785, in *Papers*, VIII: 427.

⁴ Robert R. Leonhard, "Enlightened Defense: The National Security Policy of Thomas Jefferson." (Ph.D. Dissertation, West Virginia University, 2006), 206-207.

boarding party, the HMS *Leopard* opened fire on the *Chesapeake*, killing three and wounding ten American sailors. The captain of the *Leopard* then took four sailors he claimed were British deserters.⁵ In spite of this, Jefferson maintained that only Congress could declare war and did not recall Congress from its adjournment.⁶ Jefferson refused to succumb to these pressures to go to war. Instead, the president attempted a policy that asserted the American rights as a sovereign nation and avoided a costly and difficult war.

Citing Jefferson, Dumas Malone noted “Congress would take up the question whether ‘War, Embargo or Nothing’ should be the nation’s course” and that Jefferson was “disposed to take the middle way.”⁷ Jefferson actually vacillated on the topic. By waiting for a British response rather than using force immediately, Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin wrote to Jefferson “that war ... would neither have been recognized abroad as justifiable nor sanctioned by public opinion at home.”⁸

Following Napoleon’s closing of continental Europe to British goods, even on American ships, and Britain’s decision for more impressment, the United States faced a very difficult choice. No longer confined to one potential enemy, the United States now faced strained relations with France as well. In late 1807, Jefferson and his Cabinet decided against war and pushed for the implementation of an embargo of all European trade. Congress passed this measure in December and the Embargo Act of 1807 closed American ports to British and French (which now included most of continental Europe) commerce. Calling it a “dignified retirement within ourselves,” Jefferson claimed that

⁵ Dumas Malone, *Jefferson and His Time*, 6 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1948-1981), 5: 421-422.

⁶ Leonhard, “Enlightened Defense,” 202.

⁷ Malone, *Jefferson and His Time*, 5: 469.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 472.

the embargo would “have the collateral effect of making it to the interest of all nations to change the system which has driven [American] commerce from the ocean.”⁹

Jefferson’s consistent attitudes toward and about Barbary do not fit neatly with his other views. In essence, his consistency against Barbary actually showed his inconsistency throughout his career. Although he had regularly argued against going to war with Britain and France, Jefferson showed no hesitation in calling for action against the Barbary regencies. Jefferson did not go into this possible contradiction or why he was so adamant against Barbary. It is entirely possible that the difference rests solely on the strength of the opponent, as the Barbary States were much weaker than Britain, France, or Spain.

Throughout his career, but particularly as a diplomat in the 1780s, Jefferson used honor as a justification for conflict with Barbary. As a member of the southern elite, Jefferson understood the concept of honor very well. Bertram Wyatt-Brown describes honor as existing “in intimate relation to its opposite: shame.”¹⁰ He goes on to say that “When shame was imposed by others, honor was stripped away.”¹¹ This fit Jefferson’s descriptions of Barbary action, American inaction, and European views of the situation. Jefferson was extremely concerned with the idea that Europe viewed the United States unfavorably.¹²

Jefferson also did not use slavery comparisons to describe the plight of the American captives. In *The Crescent Obscured* studies, Robert Allison explores how

⁹ Ibid., 488.

¹⁰ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), viii.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 6 February 1785, in *Papers*, VII: 640.

many Americans described the captive sailors in terms of slavery. The idea of white slavery (white usually equating Christian) was not a new concept, but existed during the centuries preceding American independence. Robert C. Davis explores this idea admirably in *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters*.¹³ Jefferson, already aware of his contradiction between advocate of liberty and slaveholder, did not cast these events in racial overtones. Unfortunately, he did not explore the idea or offer any explanations for or against this concept of Americans as slaves.

Jefferson did place significance on the commercial prospects of the United States. Jefferson understood just how much the export trade mattered to the United States, for both the agriculture of the South and the merchants of New England. Jefferson realized that the Mediterranean was a huge market for the United States as the pre-Revolution colonies had shipped substantial amounts of rice and flour, as well as indigo to the region.¹⁴

Perhaps most interesting about this entire saga is the constitutional questions posed by Jefferson's actions. This was not first time would Jefferson act near or beyond his limits, or ask Congress to ratify his actions after the fact. Much like the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, Jefferson's decision to send a squadron to the Mediterranean without a declaration of war was difficult. Jefferson's role as the proponent of limited government did not equate to a refusal to act.

¹³ Robert C. Davis, *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast and Italy, 1500-1800* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003).

¹⁴ Report of Secretary of State to the Congress of the United States, 28 December 1790, in *Naval Documents*, I 22. Jefferson sent this message to the House of Representatives on 30 December 1790 and the Senate on 3 January 1791.

Jefferson's crusade against Barbary was long and difficult, but he never wavered in his determination to act and act strongly. Whether pushing for resolve as a junior diplomat or ordering action as the president, Jefferson advocated and then implemented a plan that showed United States' resolve. Though he did not end the problem of Barbary piracy, he made it possible for its destruction within a generation. Where kings and queens paid tribute, Thomas Jefferson refused.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books

Adams, John and Thomas Jefferson. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*, 2 vols, Edited by Lester Cappon. Chapel Hill, Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

Cathcart, James L. *Tripoli. The First War with the United States*, letter book compiled by his daughter, J.B. Cathcart Newkirk. Herald Point, La Porte, IN: 1901.

Hamilton, Alexander. *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, 12 vols. Edited by Henry Cabot Lodge. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Jefferson, Thomas. *The Inaugural Addresses of President Thomas Jefferson, 1801 and 1805*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

_____. *Papers*, 34 vols. Edited by Julian P. Boyd. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

_____. *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, 12 vols. Edited by Paul L. Ford. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Jefferson, Thomas and James Madison. *The Republic of Letters: The Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, 1776-1826*, 3 vols. Edited by James M. Smith. New York: Norton, 1995.

Muller, Julius W., editor. *Presidential Messages and State Papers*, vol 2. New York: The Review of Reviews Company, 1917.

Richardson, James D., editor. *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 20 vols. New York: Bureau of National Literature, Inc., 1897.

Washington, George. *The Papers of George Washington: Confederation Series*, 6 vols. Edited by W.W. Abbot and Dorothy Twohig. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.

Government Documents

Barbary Treaties 1786-1836. Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. Yale Law School, New Haven, Ct.
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century (Accessed 25 July 2011)

House of Representatives 7th Congress, I Session, 14 December 1801, *Annals of Congress*. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage> (accessed 9 September 2010)

Journals of the Continental Congress, Vol. 33, 419. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress. <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwjc.html> (accessed 9 September 2010).

“Message of President Jefferson, communicated on Tuesday, December 3, 1805,”
American State Papers: Foreign Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Gales and Seaton, 1833.
<http://memory.loc.gov/argo.library.okstate.edu/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsp&fileName=001/llsp001.db&recNum=4> (accessed 15 April 2013).

Presidential Messages and State Papers: Being the Epoch-making National Documents of all the Presidents from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson, collected and arranged, with brief biographical sketches. Edited by Julius Muller. New York: The Review of Reviews Company, 1917.

United States. Office of Naval Records and Library. *Naval Documents Related to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 6 vols. Published under the direction of the Honorable Claude A. Swanson, Secretary of the Navy Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939-1944.

Secondary Sources

Books

Adams, Henry. *History of the United States of America during the Administrations of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison*. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1986.

Allen, Gardner W. *Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs*. New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., 1905.

Allison, Robert J. *The Crescent Obscured: The United States and the Muslim World, 1776-1815*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Barnby, H.G. *The Prisoners of Algiers: An Account of the Forgotten American-Algerian War of 1785-1797*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Castor, Henry. *The Tripolitan War, 1801-1805: America Meets the Menace of the Barbary Pirates*. New York: F. Watts, 1971.

Cunningham, Noble E, ed. *The Early Republic, 1789-1828*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968.

DeConde, Alexander. *Presidential Machismo: Executive Authority, Military Intervention, and Foreign Relations*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2000.

- Dupuy, R. Ernest and William H. Baumer. *The Little Wars of the United States*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1968.
- Edwards, Samuel. *Barbary General: The Life of William H. Eaton*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Field, James A. *America and the Mediterranean World, 1776-1882*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Fisher, Godfrey. *Barbary Legend: War, Trade, and Piracy in North Africa, 1415-1830*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Forman, Samuel E. *The Life and Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1900.
- Genovese, Michael A. *The Power of the American Presidency, 1789-2000*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Goldsmith, William M. *The Growth of Presidential Power: A Documented History*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1974.
- Hirst, Francis W. *Life and Letters of Thomas Jefferson*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1926.
- Hodge, Carl C. and Cathal J. Nolan, editors. *U.S. Presidents and Foreign Policy: From 1789 to the Present*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2007.
- Horsman, Reginald. *The Diplomacy of the New Republic, 1776-1815*. Arlington Heights, IL: H. Davidson, 1985.
- Irwin, Ray W. *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with the Barbary Powers, 1776-1816*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1931.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *Entangling Alliances with None: American Foreign Policy in the Age of Jefferson*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1987.
- Kitzen, Michael L.S. *Tripoli and the United States at War: A History of American Relations with the Barbary States, 1785-1805*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 1993.
- Koch, Adrienne. *Jefferson and Madison: The Great Collaboration*. New York: Knopf, 1950.
- Leckie, Robert. *The Wars of America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.
- Leiner, Frederick C.. *The End of Barbary Terror: America's 1815 War Against the Pirates of North Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006
- London, Joshua E.. *Victory in Tripoli: How America's War with the Barbary Pirates Established the U.S. Navy and Built a Nation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2005.

- Malone, Dumas. *Jefferson and His Time*, 6 vols. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1948-1981.
- Nash, Howard Pervear. *The Forgotten Wars*. South Brunswick, NJ: A.S. Barnes, 1968.
- Parker, Richard B. *Uncle Sam in Barbary: A Diplomatic History*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004.
- Rossignol, Marie-Jeanne, translated by Lillian A. Parrot. *The Nationalist Ferment: The Origins of U.S. Foreign Policy, 1789-1812*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2004.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The Imperial Presidency*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- _____. *War and the American Presidency*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2004.
- Spears, John R.. *The History of Our Navy: From Its Origin to the Present Day, 1775-1897*, 4 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Stuart, Reginald C. *The Half-Way Pacifist: Thomas Jefferson's View of War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Wheelan, Joseph. *Jefferson's War: America's First War on Terror, 1801-1805*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2003.
- Whipple, A.B.C. *To the Shores of Tripoli: The Birth of the U.S. Navy and Marines*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1991.
- Wright, Louis B. and Julia H. Macleod. *The First Americans in North Africa: William Eaton's Struggle for a Vigorous Policy Against the Barbary Pirates, 1799-1805*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945.
- Zacks, Richard. *The Pirate Coast: Thomas Jefferson, the First Marines, and the Secret Mission of 1805*. New York: Hyperion, 2005.

Articles

- Carson, David A. "Jefferson, Congress, and the Question of Leadership in the Tripolitan War." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 94 (October 1986): 409-424.
- "Congress, the President, and the Power to Commit Forces to Combat." *Harvard Law Review* 81 (June 1968), 1771-1805.
- Hitchens, Christopher. "To the Shores of Tripoli." *Time* 164 (5 July 2004): 56-61.

Lobel, Jules. "Covert War and Congressional Authority: Hidden War and Forgotten Power." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 134 (June 1986): 1035- 1110.

Sofaer, Abraham D. "The Presidency, War, and Foreign Affairs: Practice under the Framers." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 40 (Spring 1976): 12-38.

Sofka, James R. "The Jeffersonian Idea of National Security: Commerce, the Atlantic Balance of Power, and the Barbary War, 1786-1805." *Diplomatic History* 21 (Fall 1997): 519-544.

Symonds, Craig L. "Milestones Along the Path to WORLD POWER." *Naval History* 19 (February 2006): 42-47.

Theses & Dissertations

Leonhard, Robert R. "Enlightened Defense: The National Security Policy of Thomas Jefferson." Ph.D. Dissertation, West Virginia University, 2006.

Stuart, Reginald C. "Encounter with Mars: Thomas Jefferson's View of War." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Florida, 1974.

Ziegler, Christopher T. "Jeffersonianism and 19th Century American Maritime Defense Policy." Master's Thesis, East Tennessee State University, 2003.

VITA

Brett Allen Manis II

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: FREE TO BEG OR TO FIGHT: THOMAS JEFFERSON AND RELATIONS WITH BARBARY, 1785-1805

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Arts in History at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2013.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in History at Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in 2006.

Experience: Employed as a teller by Tinker Federal Credit Union in Oklahoma City, OK from May 2002 - July 2004, and April 2005 - August 2005. Employed as a tutor/office worker by Oklahoma City University in Oklahoma City, OK from August 2005 - August 2006. Employed by Oklahoma State University-Stillwater, Department of History, as a graduate teaching assistant from August 2006 - May 2008. Employed by Oklahoma State University-Stillwater as a 2nd grade tutor at Will Rogers Elementary from August 2006 - May 2007. Employed as an instructor by the Institute of Reading Development in Oklahoma City, OK from May 2008 - July 2008. Employed as an admission counselor by Oklahoma City University from August 2008 - July 2009. Employed as an Inventory Management Specialist by the United States Air Force on Tinker AFB, OK from August 2009 until June 2013. Selected by the United States Air Force as the 7 Bomb Wing Historian at Dyess AFB, Texas, starting 17 June 2013.

Professional Memberships: Phi Alpha Theta, Oklahoma Historical Society