

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S LEGACY IN AN INTERNATIONAL AND A NATIONAL CONTEXT: A REINTERPRETATION*

Norio AKASHI
University of Tsukuba

Thomas Jefferson was a many-sided man. At one time or other in his life he was scholar, legislator, diplomat, vice-president and president of the United States, inventor, architect and farmer. If there were ever a man to fit Plato's ideal of the philosopher-statesman, he was the one, if not the only one. Moreover, in more than one instance he assumed several of these roles at the same time. Accolades abound about his accomplishments while filling these roles.

Now there is another title given to Jefferson: that of world citizen. This is not the first time, however, that Jefferson's global vision, namely, his scheme of attaining a peaceful and harmonious world, has been singled out for attention. The renewed interest in Jefferson as a world citizen is due, according to Merrill D. Peterson, the renowned Jefferson scholar, to "the universal appeal of his expression of human rights."¹ Peter S. Onuf, who organized the Jeffersonian Legacies Conference in Charlottesville, Virginia, in October last year, is in full agreement with Peterson in assessing the heightened significance of Jefferson's ideas in the world today. He says, "There's no question that Jeffersonian ideas are the common currency...of self-governing, self-determining peoples all over the

Copyright © 1995 Norio Akashi. All rights reserved. This work may be used, with this notice included, for noncommercial purposes. No copies of this work may be distributed, electronically or otherwise, in whole or in part, without permission from the author.

world.”²

Before going further into a discussion of Thomas Jefferson’s legacy, it may be appropriate to stop and establish a common ground for our discussion. What exactly do we mean by “legacy”?

The dictionary meaning of the term is that it is a gift, something handed down or received from an ancestor or a predecessor. But as used in political debate or as loosely referred to in popular mythology, legacy seems to imply more than this surface meaning. It seems to carry a variety of connotations depending on the context in which it is used, the level at which it is used and by whom it is used.

At a meeting of the Catholic Lawyers Guild in 1989, then president George Bush asked in his characteristically folksy way, “Do the founders of our nation have anything to say to the present day?”³ For him when one generation has something to “say to” succeeding generations, there we find a legacy. Another meaning of legacy is “a great power” or inspiration. President Bill Clinton in his address commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Jefferson — April 13 of this year — said as follows: “I draw a great power from his words and from his deeds.”⁴ We all know that his admiration for his namesake — his middle name is “Jefferson” — and predecessor in the White House is so great that President Clinton commenced his inauguration from Jefferson’s home, Monticello, in Charlottesville, Virginia. Furthermore, legacy is sometimes taken to mean a lesson to be learned. Mikhail Gorbachev, the former president of the Soviet Union and special speaker at the Founder’s Day celebration held at The University of Virginia on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the birth of its founder, Thomas Jefferson, made the following remark: “Thomas Jefferson’s most valuable lesson is the lesson of Humanism.”⁵ And still more, legacy is sometimes equated with being a symbol or a metaphor or having some symbolic power, as Gordon S. Wood, who has just published an influential book on the “radicalism” of the American Revolution, suggests. It is Wood’s contention that over the past two hundred years since his death Jefferson has had a “symbolic power” for succeeding generations of Americans.⁶ It may be recalled that Gorbachev also noted the symbolic power of Jefferson when he said:

The name of the third president of the United States has become symbolic of democracy and human rights. Thomas Jefferson’s ideas focused the supreme achievements of humanistic thought.

It is startling, to say the least, that the leader of a former Communist nation looked to Jefferson for inspiration. Yet when we recall that Gorbachev attempted to change Soviet society through his programs of *glasnost* and *perestroika* (openness, freedom and decentralization), it is not hard to see that he has good reason to claim to be a follower of Thomas Jefferson, a representative spokesman of Western democratic thought. "My first encounter with Jefferson was when I was a student at Moscow University," he said:

In my mature years when it fell to me to become the leader of a vast complex conflict-ridden country, I often turned to Thomas Jefferson. He was among those who confirmed me in my belief that without a profound democratization of our society any reform in it would be doomed to fail.

Specifically, Gorbachev claimed he had followed Jefferson in four areas. First, personal freedom: namely, freedom of the press and freedom of conscience. Secondly, decentralization or the notion of limited government. Third, the idea of union. Regarding union Gorbachev had this to say: "Jefferson called on all citizens to unite for the sake of the country's future. As president of the U.S.S.R., I had similar thoughts and same intentions." And fourthly, the emphasis on gradual change. Gorbachev duly pointed out that Jefferson was envisioning only gradual change: not revolution but evolution.

As shown by the example of Gorbachev, Jefferson's legacy is claimed outside the United States as well. This is hardly surprising as Jefferson himself desired very strongly that the new nation, which he had helped so much to build, be a model for the rest of the world to emulate. In his first inaugural address (March 4, 1801) Jefferson referred to the United States as "a rising nation," "the world's best hope," and "a chosen country."⁷ He almost sounds like John Winthrop, the seventeenth-century Puritan, who had a vision that New England would be like the biblical "city upon a hill," doesn't he? More than a decade later and after he had resigned from the presidency, Jefferson told John Adams, his one-time political rival but with whom he would later conduct an extremely meaningful dialogue, about his long-cherished prophecy:

[T]hat same light from our West seems to have spread and illuminated the very engines employed to extinguish it. It has given them a glimmering of their rights and their power. The idea of representative government has taken root and grown among them....Belgium, Prussia, Poland, Lombar-

dy, etc., are now offered a representative organization — illusive, probably, at first, but it will grow into power in the end.⁸

Now, turning to the domestic scene, you may be intrigued to know that it was Jefferson more than any of his predecessors — except J. F. Kennedy — that Ronald Reagan quoted. To give an example, he stated that:

Thomas Jefferson also knew that too much government threatened human rights....Limited government, in a sound federal system with essential powers properly distributed among local, state and national bodies, was his goal.⁹

The source he used to prove the point is Jefferson's first inaugural address where Jefferson said: "A wise and frugal government...shall restrain men from injuring one another...[It] shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor."¹⁰ But he could have gone elsewhere to support his view. He might have had in mind Jefferson's letter to James Madison written while he was in Paris, which contains a passage that reads: "I own I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always oppressive."¹¹ Reagan was then advocating his program of New Federalism, the purpose of which was to assign a smaller role to the federal government in areas such as social welfare and education.

Reagan also said that he could quote Thomas Jefferson who, according to Reagan, "warned that the courts were getting out of hand and that the courts, if they did take powers that properly belonged to the legislature, could upset the whole balance."¹² Needless to say, Reagan was strongly against court-ordered busing to achieve racial integration and was in favor of instituting prayer in public schools. The most likely source for Reagan to fall on might have been Jefferson's letter to William Johnson written much later in his life, on June 12, 1823, in which he criticized the rulings of the Federal Supreme Court under John Marshall. In this letter Jefferson stated that "the Supreme Court has advanced beyond its constitutional limits."¹³

I have no intention of going into a detailed exegesis of Jefferson's political principles here, but it is only natural to ask whether, were he alive today, he would approve of the cutting of federal spending on social welfare. What would his view be on the so-called judiciary activism? The least we can say is that by the time Jefferson wrote his letter to

William Johnson, in the wake of the controversy regarding Missouri's admission to the Union as a slave state, his earlier optimism about America's future had waned and his thinking had begun to echo narrow provincial voices. In other words, Jefferson's writings at this time do not represent the enlightened ideas and democratic aspirations which he had held earlier in his life. Instead, in the eyes of people like Reagan, they can be taken as good authority with which to buttress a generally conservative political or social stance.

It strikes us as very strange to hear the two arch-rivals in the Cold War, the leaders of opposing "evil empires," invoke the same name of "Thomas Jefferson" to lend support to their respective position. How do we account for this?

To explain the multifarious use of Jefferson's writings — sometimes apparently against his original intentions — it will be necessary to go back to the source, namely, Jefferson's political principles themselves. Jefferson's political principles are expressed eloquently in the Declaration of Independence where he states that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness...; that governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." ¹⁴ In the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, another of his great achievements, he states that "the opinions of men are not the object of civil government nor under its jurisdiction.... To suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy." ¹⁵ But his political creed is best summarized in his first inaugural address where he lays out the "essential principles of our Government," fifteen in all:

- *equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political
- *peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations
- *the support of the State governments in all their rights
- *the preservation of the General Government
- *a jealous care of the right of election by the people
- *absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority
- *a well-disciplined militia
- *economy in the public expense
- *the honest payment of debts
- *encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid

- *the diffusion of information
- *freedom of religion
- *freedom of the press
- *freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus
- *trial by juries impartially selected ¹⁶

It is not an easy task to put Jefferson's political principles in any simplified form, but perhaps one way to grasp them may be to place them under two categories or headings: democracy and human rights. Here democracy is to be taken as meaning the concepts of self-government, majority rule, separation of powers, and limited government or decentralization. And we are to understand by human rights a wide range of freedoms. The concept of human rights is also to be taken as encompassing the various issues touching on equality.

At the risk of gross over-generalization, I would like to argue that of the two categories, democracy is the one which is the more likely to be invoked outside the United States, whereas Jefferson's notion of human rights is found more relevant in the American context. It is my thesis that the legacy of Thomas Jefferson is perceived differently in the international and the national context, and that this gives rise to the inconsistencies often observed in discussions of exactly what constitutes Thomas Jefferson's legacy.

That Jefferson is often quoted by American politicians of a conservative bent or libertarian persuasion for his notion of democracy has already been hinted at. On the other hand, Jefferson's record in the area of human rights has become subjected to severe criticism these days. It has been pointed out time and again by civic activists as well as by revisionist-oriented scholars that Jefferson's ideas and practices in this area were lacking in consistency and full of contradictions. It has become commonly recognized that discrepancies exist between what Jefferson professed and what he actually did in other areas also. The image of Jefferson as a dedicated apostle of liberty and freedom seems to have become tarnished for this very reason.

Let us look at one concrete example. When he wrote the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, it is sometimes asked, did he mean to include women? Apparently he did not, as he held the view that "the appointment of a woman to office is an innovation for which the public is not prepared nor am I." ¹⁷ How about Native Americans? There is no doubt that he was not inclined to include them either. He would, rather,

have excluded them as these words of his suggest: "If we are to wage a campaign against these Indians the end proposed should be their extermination or their removal....The same world will scarcely do for them and us." ¹⁸

But the question most often asked and certainly the most perplexing is: how could the man who wrote that "all men are created equal" own slaves? This is without doubt the part of Jefferson's legacy that has drawn the most interest in the light of the new racial awareness and historical consciousness that have come about in the United States during recent years. No discussion of Thomas Jefferson's legacy is really complete without mentioning his view of race and his attitude toward slavery.

Governor Douglas Wilder of Virginia, in his address welcoming Gorbachev to the Founder's Day ceremony at the University of Virginia, said:

Some 250 years ago it may never have been envisioned that I would be here representing the commonwealth, succeeding Thomas Jefferson in office and welcoming [Mr. Gorbachev]. ¹⁹

Wilder is here alluding to the fact — a bitter memory for him — that he, an African American, was refused admission to the Law School of the University of Virginia in the early 1950's, as the institution was racially segregated then. Dwelling on the same theme he stated later the same day at Monticello that "universal education should have been the right of women as well as people of color — to receive the same education as the sons of Virginia's elite. Yet factually this was not so." ²⁰ Going back to his earlier remark, Wilder also reminded the audience — Gorbachev among them — that in 1857 the United States Supreme Court had decided that "African Americans were not human...and they had no right that needed to be respected by others." In 1896 the Court upheld the constitutionality of segregation laws and it was only in 1954, Wilder said, that the Court ruled that such laws were, in his word, "wrong."

His bitter memories aside, Wilder's point is that Jefferson should not be "canonized" because of his position on race and slavery. That Jefferson held a view of African Americans and an attitude toward race relations in America which by today's standards would be conceived as racist cannot be denied. In fact he owned more than two hundred slaves and freed no more than seven of them, only two during his lifetime. And that he failed to envision a society in which whites and blacks would live in harmony is obvious from his following words:

[T]he blacks, whether originally a distinct race or made distinct by time and circumstances, are inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind.... This unfortunate difference is an obstacle to the emancipation of these people.... [W]hen freed, [the slave] is to be removed beyond the reach of mixture.²¹

On the other hand, it needs also to be recognized that Jefferson did hold a view critical of slavery and abhorred the institution. His most typical words to this effect are: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free."²² And there is the famous passage in his draft of the Declaration of Independence in which he accused the British King of introducing slavery to America, one which was struck out because of the opposition of several slave-holding colonies:

[The British King] has waged a cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people...captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation hither.²³

But one participant at the Jeffersonian Legacies Conference remarked that, if Jefferson condemned slavery, he was far more concerned about what slavery did to whites than about what it did to blacks, so "there is little substance to the anti-slavery Jefferson."²⁴

Especially tantalizing is his alleged liaison with a slave woman, Sally Hemings. Jefferson never confirmed such a liaison. But questions remain: Did he have an African American lover? If so, what were his feelings? Did he have any degree of remorse or sense of guilt?

These are all very important questions, and people seem to be inclined to take sides regarding this issue depending on their estimate of the state of race relations in the United States today. For example, one writer said:

Most Jefferson scholars believe him.... Many black Americans accept it as undisputed fact, for it symbolized the unequal relationship, the intricate realities of black oppression, sexual and otherwise.²⁵

And the same participant at the conference quoted above had this to say:

No one bore a greater responsibility for that failure [to place the nation on the road to liberty] than the author of the Declaration of Independence.²⁶

In marked contrast to what such scathing remarks might imply,

Gorbachev saw the question as “less important than other things.”²⁷ In his words, “the principles of historical analysis require that political leaders be judged by what they were able to do within the context of their time.”²⁸ So Gorbachev’s advice is, “Let us not ask too much of Thomas Jefferson.”²⁹ Is this right? I would challenge you to think about this kind of rebuttal or defense of Jefferson and bring your answer

For the moment, I suggest that we let the issue stand where it is now: there is not enough evidence to either prove or disprove the Sally Hemings case. Be that as it may, there is one thing that comes out of the whole discussion of Jefferson and race. In the words of one participant at the conference, Jefferson “did experience personal anguish, moral agony”³⁰ over the gap between his belief in the equality of all human beings and his inability to act on it.

We are tempted to speculate — that is, to ask if Jefferson had had “a sense of an inherent sinfulness, a felt need for forgiveness,”³¹ the very religious traits that would characterize many of the latter-day anti-slavery advocates or abolitionists, would the whole question of race relations in the United States have turned out differently? This is a hypothetical question and had better not be pursued too far. But it would be unwise totally to disregard the religious dimension of the problem, for slavery was an original sin, as it were, for Americans.

Edward L. Ayers, a colleague of Peter S. Onuf at the University of Virginia, put it succinctly thus:

We cannot get past the fact that the original sin of slavery was there at the beginning of America and therefore with the man who envisioned the best for America to be.... His worry that somehow that seed of evil that was planted with slavery there at the beginning of our nation is still going to be what kills us.³²

It was a religious problem, then, that Jefferson was facing, but he was not equipped to see it as such and therefore was not able to find viable solutions to it.

There are other instances of the discrepancy between what Jefferson professed and what he accomplished. For one, a believer in a strict interpretation of the constitution, he broadened it in order to be able to buy Louisiana from France. For another, acting as if he were a prosecutor, he despaired of getting Aaron Burr, his former vice-president, convicted of treason. On the other hand he came to see the need to encourage manufacturing, to restore public credit and to promote foreign trade.

These were the policies that Jefferson, an ardent agrarian, had criticized his political opponents — men like Alexander Hamilton — of pursuing at the sacrifice of the general public. But he and his administration ended up adopting these measures and actually pushed them through with vigor. It is a historical irony that these have become the standard national policy of the United States. You may say then, Hamilton was right and Jefferson was wrong. If so, where do we go to find the Jeffersonian legacy?

Coming to a more personal level, it may be disheartening to learn that Jefferson, far from being an original thinker, was merely a synthesizer of ideas; or that he wrote lucidly but did not always succeed in making the meaning of what he wrote clear. He himself would not deny this. In his often quoted letter to Henry Lee written almost half a century after the event, he explained the original intention of the Declaration of Independence as follows:

[It] was not to find out new principles, or new arguments never before thought of; not merely to say things which had never been said before; but to place before mankind the common sense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent, and to justify ourselves in the independent stand we are compelled to take.... It was intended to be an expression of the American mind. ³³

More fundamentally, the fact that America today is a nation very different from the one in which Thomas Jefferson lived is what makes it difficult for us to adopt Jefferson's political principles or relate to his so-called legacy whole-heartedly. America is today much urbanized and industrialized, bearing little resemblance to the agrarian republic that Jefferson cherished so dearly. The role of the federal government — or the general government as Jefferson would call it — has been enlarged far wider than Jefferson could have imagined. The enforcement of human rights is now largely in the hands of the judiciary, the branch of the government in which Jefferson had the least trust. The United States, by choice or of necessity, no longer pursues a course of no entangling alliances with other nations. Instead, its commitment to world affairs is vast and ever-increasing. Finally, to use a typical contemporary terminology, if "pluralism, diversity or multiculturalism" are the words that best describe American society today, one cannot help realizing — with a touch of nostalgia, perhaps — that Jefferson's conception of a harmonious and uniform universe carries little relevance if any. In other

words, Jefferson's world is lost now, irreparably so. If such is the case, our conclusion would have to be something like this:

Perhaps his legacy is simply to remind us, in a disturbing way, that it was once possible to entertain real hopes for the future, and to do so with an elegance and a style that...seem utterly lost.³⁴

This sounds plausible but I have a different interpretation. That is, although I am in no position to assess with authority or predict with any accuracy what race relations in the United States are going to be like in the future, this does seem to be one area where Jefferson's legacy is still sought after, where his idealism may prove workable if stretched, expanded and adapted after careful scrutiny.

Truly some black activists have become disillusioned with the American creed of freedom and equality. For example, in 1965 Malcolm X criticized Jefferson's hypocrisy in the harshest terms:

Who was it who wrote that "all men are created equal"? It was Jefferson.... [But] you amounted to nothing in the sight of Jefferson.³⁵

Recent criticism regarding Jefferson and slavery has already been mentioned. However, Julian Bond, the civil rights activist and former Georgia state legislator, presents an opposing view:

The power of Jefferson's rhetoric "we hold these to be self-evident, that all men are created equal" served as a rationale and justification for the movement led by Martin Luther King. Arguments with Jefferson the slaveholder, then long dead, have disappeared. Still living are Jefferson's words, and these are seized upon to honor the past and the defense of the present struggle...For King and others like him the words were unambiguous and clear.³⁶

In his view "Jefferson was the most useful founding father to the civil rights movement."³⁷ And Douglas Wilder, who pointed out that the university Jefferson had founded was racially segregated for much of its history, himself made a ringing affirmation of Jefferson's legacy:

As a child when I first heard that all men are created equal, I never ever doubted their validity. I never ever doubted the human rights for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Are these mere rhetorical flourishes? Hardly so, for the potency of Jefferson's idealism is clearly recognizable in the words of these African

American followers of his. In this connection it may be pertinent to note that Jefferson's idealism was given new strength by none other than Abraham Lincoln. It was Lincoln, who in his Gettysburg address in November 1863, put into Jefferson's eighteenth-century notion of equality "an essential new meaning."³⁸ In Douglas Wilson's apt phrase, the philosophical concept of natural rights was turned by Lincoln into "a statement about the social and political conditions that ought to prevail." And we all know that Martin Luther King, on the occasion of the great March on Washington on August 28, 1963, spoke from the front of the Lincoln Memorial about his dream which he said was "rooted in the American creed," a creed which had been derived from the Declaration of Independence penned by Jefferson.³⁹

The adaptation of Jefferson's language by Lincoln and King — and by many others — shows one thing: that it has the capacity to transform itself to fit changed conditions and to speak for the aspirations of peoples living in different circumstances than his. In this connection it must be pointed out that those politicians, who are working to introduce change and seek popular support, like to quote Jefferson's letter to Samuel Kercheval written on July 12, 1816, which has the following passage:

Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.⁴⁰

You can see Jefferson is adept at using simple and clear analogy.

Well Reagan quoted this passage, Bush did it, Gorbachev did it, and now Clinton has done it. He said, "I think Thomas Jefferson would tell us that this is one of those times we need to change... There were people who opposed the Louisiana Purchase [but] he fought and prevailed" and he quoted these words of Jefferson's.⁴¹ Clinton also stated that "the genius of Thomas Jefferson was his understanding that you must adapt, innovate, invest in order to succeed.... Today we must remember Thomas Jefferson and allow his vision to encourage us to be bold and to give us the will to change."⁴² Putting aside any partisan interest in salvaging his economic stimulus package, I think Clinton's was a very

valid allusion and that he was right in calling upon Jefferson's legacy.

We have so far dwelled on Jefferson's influence in the political realm. But his legacy may be observed in other realms as well; in education, for example. He laid out a plan of public education for his state of Virginia, for he believed that "no other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness [than education]." ⁴³ "Preach a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people," he said. His scheme did not see fruition in his lifetime, but the first public institution of higher learning in Virginia, the University of Virginia, was a product of his grand scheme.

The recent movie "A Few Good Men" has the theme of conflict between military duty and the honor and conscience of the individual in dealing with a murder case in an United States Marine Corps camp and the commander's plot to cover it up. There is one scene in the movie which shows, of all places, not the Supreme Court Building but the Jefferson Memorial in Washington. I do not know for sure, but I assume this can hardly be by accident but is a deliberate choice on the part of the movie's producers. If Jefferson is here depicted as a symbol of justice, we see another image of him in at least popular mythology.

I would like to conclude my presentation with this question: with all this said, what can we say Thomas Jefferson's legacy is? The vision of America and of the world over, an optimistic vision even Pollyanna-like if you will, is his legacy, I think. As such it dwells more in the realm of imagery than in any concrete manifestation. And because of such a nature, it appears so fragile sometimes and elusive at other times. These are naturally shortcomings of the legacy but I would think they are its strengths as well. For one, because it dwells in people's imagination, it can be susceptible to diverse interpretations. People read it differently according to their needs and to the circumstances in which they find themselves. It would be neither prudent nor useful to place it in a narrow confine or even to "canonize" it. That is not what Jefferson would have wanted. Gordon S. Wood has said that "Jefferson's words and ideas transcended his time, but he himself did not." ⁴⁴ The essence of Jefferson's legacy lies here. And I think Gorbachev put it very nicely when he said, "For myself I found one thing to be true. Having once begun a dialogue with Jefferson one continues the conversation with him forever." We have not yet established the exact parallels between him and Jefferson. But superficially Gorbachev is a good follower of Jefferson and maybe we should all learn from his example. So finally I would like

to contest that it is left for us the living, Americans and others alike, rather to grapple with what Jefferson has passed on to us, in words and deeds, and to discover what they really mean.

NOTES

*A slightly different version of this paper was presented at the Fourth Symposium on American Studies in the Asia-Pacific Region, September 10, 1993. I wish to express my gratitude to the International House of Japan for permitting to reprint it.

¹ *The Daily Progress*, Feb. 26, 1993, "Jefferson 250," p.3.

² *Ibid.*

³ "Remarks at a Luncheon hosted by the Catholic Lawyers Guild," Sept. 23, 1989 (*Public Papers of the President, George Bush*, 1989, Vol.II, p.1242).

⁴ Transcript of "Address," on "Thomas Jefferson 250th Birthday Celebration: Special Report," WVIR, Channel 29, aired on April 13, 1993.

⁵ Transcript of "Address," on "Founder's Day Convocation on the Lawn," WVIR, Channel 29, aired on April 13, 1993. Quotations from Gorbachev's address are based on this transcript.

⁶ "The Trials and Tribulations of Thomas Jefferson," in *Jeffersonian Legacies*, ed. Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1993), p.413.

⁷ *Jefferson: Writings* (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1984), pp.492-4.

⁸ Jan. 11, 1916 (*Ibid.*, p.1376).

⁹ "Statement on the 239th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson," Apr. 13, 1982 (*Public Papers of the President, Ronald Reagan*, 1982, p.457)

¹⁰ *Writings*, p.494.

¹¹ Dec. 20, 1787 (*Ibid.*, p.917)

¹² "Remarks at a Louisiana Republican Fundraising Reception in New Orleans," Sept. 28 (*Public Papers of the President, Ronald Reagan*, 1982, pp.958-9)

¹³ *Writings*, p.1474.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.19.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.347.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.494-5.

¹⁷ Quoted in Joyce Appleby, "Introduction: Jefferson and His Complex Legacy," in *Legacies*, p.10.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Transcript of "Address" (see note 5).

²⁰ Transcript of "Address" (see note 4).

²¹ "Notes on the State of Virginia--QueryXIV" (*Writings*, p.270).

²² "Autobiography" (*Ibid.*, p.44).

²³ *Ibid.*, p.22.

²⁴ Paul Finkelman, "Jefferson and Slavery: 'Treason Against the Hope of the World,'" in *Legacies*, p.188.

²⁵ David K. Shieler, *The New York Times*, Apr. 12, 1993, A17.

²⁶ Finkelman, *Legacies*, p.212.

²⁷ Transcript of "Address" (see note 4).

²⁸ Transcript of "Address" (see note 5).

- ²⁹ Transcript of "Address" (see note 4).
- ³⁰ Armstead Robinson, Transcript of "Thomas Jefferson: A Complex Legacy," WHTJ, aired on Apr. 16, 1993.
- ³¹ Paul K. Conkin, "The Religious Pilgrimage of Thomas Jefferson," in *Legacies*, p.22.
- ³² Transcript (see note 30).
- ³³ To Henry Lee, May 8, 1825 (*Writings*, p.1501).
- ³⁴ Herbert Sloan, "The Earth Belongs in Usufruct to the Living," in *Legacies*, p.304.
- ³⁵ Scot A. French and Edward L. Ayers, "The Strange Career of Thomas Jefferson: Race and Slavery in American Memory, 1943-1993," in *Legacies*, p.425.
- ³⁶ Transcript (see note 30).
- ³⁷ *The Daily Progress*, Feb. 26, 1993, "Jefferson 250," p.3.
- ³⁸ Douglas Wilson, "Thomas Jefferson and the Character Issue," *The Atlantic Monthly* (Nov. 1992), p.74.
- ³⁹ Juan Williams, *Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954-1965* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1987), p.204.
- ⁴⁰ *Writings*, p.1401.
- ⁴¹ *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Apr. 14, 1993, A9.
- ⁴² Transcript of "Address" (see note 4).
- ⁴³ To George Wythe (1786) (*The Real Thomas Jefferson*, Second Edition [Washington, D.C.: National Center for Constitutional Studies, 1983], p.408).
- ⁴⁴ *Legacies*, p.401