THE POLITICAL AND DIPLOMATIC CAREER OF WILLIAM VANS MURRAY

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

Louis Evans Walker III

June 1957

THE POLITICAL AND DIPLOMATIC CAREER OF WILLIAM VANS MURRAY

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

---

by
Louis Evans Walker III
June 1957

ABSTRACT

William Vans Murray, a prominent Federalist politician during the formative period of the United States, has been largely overlooked by present day historians. Born in Dorchester County, Maryland, in 1760, he was educated both in this country and in England, where he studied at the Middle Temple. While a student he traveled widely both in England and on the continent.

Shortly after his return to Maryland in 1787, Murray was elected a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, where he served ably but without distinction until 1791. During this period he married a sweetheart of his student days in London, Miss Charlotte Hughins.

Murray was admitted to the bar in Dorchester County in 1791, and soon afterward was elected a member of the Second Congress of the United States. As a member of the House of Representatives, Murray was active in presenting legislation and in working on matters of patronage. His advice was sought by many of the more famous men of his party. His intense loyalty to the principles of the Federalist party made him a most valuable man, and his name deserves a high rating as a politician.

Plans for retirement to a farm on the Eastern Shore ended early in 1797, when President Washington named Murray minister to the Batavian Republic. Murray entered upon these duties with considerable experience, having completed three terms in the House of Representatives. This factor, along with his well-rounded education, enabled him to perform his duties with competence. Both the daily tasks of a diplomat and the larger, more important negotiations were handled with equal skill by Murray.

Early in 1799, John Adams nominated the Marylander to serve as envoy to France to negotiate a settlement of the disputes between the two countries which had threatened to erupt into war for more than a year. Murray's nomination followed a period of several months during which time he had held confidential talks with a representative of the French government. Joined in Paris by Oliver Ellsworth and William Richardson Davie, he played a vital role in the negotiations which resulted in the Convention of 1800.

The election of Jefferson in 1800 ended the public career of Murray. He returned to the United States in 1801 and lived quietly in Dorchester County until his death in 1803. It is hoped that this study will, in a small way, help restore Murray to the position which he rightly deserves.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The purpose of this study of William Vans Murray is to attempt a brief reconstruction of his life and times as a dedicated Federalist politician in the early days of our republic. Largely ignored by historians during the century following his death, Murray only recently has been the subject of fleeting attention on the part of American historians. With the belief that the story of William Vans Murray deserves a more detailed examination than it has previously received, this study was begun.

The principal sources of material which have been consulted include the Library of Congress, which has the largest collection of Murray papers in existence. These include his "Commonplace" book, various letters filed in a letter folio, a large box labeled "Miscellaneous Accessions" containing much interesting material, and a "Green" book which contains many short observations on a wide variety of subjects. Other collections in the Library of Congress which are relevant to this study include the papers of Elbridge Gerry and James McHenry. The Rare Book Room of the Library of Congress contains a copy of Murray's "Political Sketches". In Baltimore, the Maryland Historical Society, aside from the many valuable secondary sources concerning Maryland history, also has a most interesting series of letters pertaining to

Murray's early life. The Society also has much valuable genealogical information about the Murray family in Scotland and Maryland. Photostatic copies of several Murray letters in the Morgan Library, New York City, are deposited in the Library of Congress. Members of the staff of each of these institutions were most helpful in providing materials needed for this study.

Other institutions which have assisted in various ways include the National Art Gallery, Washington, D. C., the Dorchester County (Maryland) Historical Society, Colonial Williamsburg, the Library of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., the Maryland Hall of Records in Annapolis, and the Fondren Library, Rice Institute. Thanks must also be given to H. A. C. Sturgess, Librarian and Keeper of the Records, Middle Temple, London, England, and to the staff of the M. D. Anderson Library, University of Houston.

Especial thanks are due Dr. Edwin A. Miles, committee chairman and advisor on this thesis. Many valuable suggestions have also been made by the other members of the committee, Dr. C. B. Ransom and Dr. R. D. Younger.

CHAPTER I

On February 9, 1760, during the last year of the reign of George II, William Vans Murray was born in Cambridge, Maryland.[1] He grew to manhood during the turbulent era of the American revolution and later served with distinction both his state and nation. Although he died at the early age of forty-three, his brief career as a Federalist congressman and diplomat is worthy of greater attention than it has generally received from American historians.

He was the son of Dr. Henry and Henrietta Maria (Orrick) Murray. His paternal grandfather, Dr. William

---

[1] There is considerable controversy on the point of Murray's birth especially in "A Sketch of William Vans Murray" by Clement Sulivane. The article, written by a descendant of Murray, appeared in the Southern History Association Publications for 1901 and indicated that Murray was born in 1763. 1760 seems, however, to be the correct date. Murray himself lends credence to the date in at least two places among his personal papers. In one place, on the last day of 1799, he recorded in his "Green Book" now in the Library of Congress, the fact that he was born in 1760, and that he had lived almost a half century. Writing in the same book on February 9, 1801, Murray spoke of his birthday as being that day. It would seem that the date set by Sulivane is incorrect; this is not surprising in view of other inaccuracies in his article. Other support for 1760 comes from the following sources: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950) p. 1605; William S. Carpenter, "William Vans Murray", Dictionary of American Biography, 21 volumes. Edited by Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1937), VIII, 368.

Murray[2] fled Scotland after the abortive rebellion of 1715 on behalf of James, the "Old Pretender",[3] and settled first at Hunting Mills, Caroline County, and later at Cambridge, Dorchester County, Maryland.[4] William Vans Murray's maternal

---

[2] Dr. William Murray had been born at Castle Tullibardine, Perthshire, in 1692, the son of William Murray and Mary Vans. Dr. Murray's paternal ancestor was another William Murray, who was appointed Controller of Her Majesty's Household in 1565. In 1606 he was created Earl of Tullibardine and in 1609 he died. The first Earl of Tullibardine was a grandson of Sir William Murray, tenth, of Tullibardine who, in turn, traced his ancestry to Sir Gilbert Murray who was consecrated Bishop of Caithners in 1222. Much additional information concerning the Murray family, both in the United States and in Scotland is available in the following sources: Emily Emerson Lantz, "Murray Family of Scotland and Maryland", Baltimore Sun, April 7, April 14, April 21, 1907; Dictionary Of National Biography; and the Dictionary of American Biography. The early letters and charters of the Murray family in Scotland are available today in printed form in the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Seventh Report, Appendix, Part II, and the Twelfth Report, Appendix, Part VIII. In these letters and charters, one finds conclusive evidence of the prominence of the family in Scotland from the very earliest recorded times.

[3] R. B. Mowat, A New History of Great Britain (London: Oxford University Press, 1920), p. 440.

[4] Prior to moving to Cambridge in 1730, Dr. Murray had married Sarah Ennalls of Dorchester County, who bore him ten children. The fourth son, Henry, born June 29, 1727, was the father of William Vans Murray. In Dorchester County, the Murrays lived on a tract of land known as "Ayreshire". This estate was originally a portion of "Lockerman's Manor", named in honor of the original patentee of Lord Baltimore. Information concerning this estate can be found in Ancestral Records and Portraits: a Compilation from the Archives of the Colonial Dames of America (New York: Prepared under the direction of the Publications Commission by the Editorial Department of the Grafton Press, 1910), 147-148.

great grandfather, John Ourrouck, had settled in Maryland as early as 1665.[5]

The extent of the young Marylander's education before he entered London's Middle Temple is not known. Perhaps, like his Middle Temple contemporary and fellow Marylander, Philip Barton Key, he was privately tutored.[6] Or perhaps he attended one of the numerous academies then existing on Maryland's Eastern Shore:[7] possibly Back Creek (later Washington) Academy in Somerset County, where his closest friend of Middle Temple days, John Leeds Bozman,[8] studied; or West Nottingham Academy in Cecil County, where his good friend, John Henry,[9] later one of Maryland's prominent Federalist

---

[5]In 1665 a patent for one hundred and ninety acres of land was issued to John Ourrouck on the bayside known as Orwick. His grandson, John Orrick married Susannah Hammond and their sixth child, Henrietta Maria, born September 14, 1723, was the mother of William Vans Murray. The Orrick family was supposed to have owned the Federal Hill in Baltimore, which is the site of Fort McHenry, but this cannot be conclusively proved. It is, however, recorded in the "Green Book" of William Vans Murray in the Library of Congress. The genealogy of the Orrick family is discussed in the Baltimore Sun for February 10, and March 8, 1907.

[6]W. C. Mallalieu, "Philip Barton Key", Dictionary of American Biography, X, 363.

[7]Several of these colonial academies became colleges and universities after the revolution.

[8]Hayes Baker-Crothers, "John Leeds Bozman", Dictionary of American Biography, II, 539.

[9]J. Winfield Henry, Letters and Papers of Governor John Henry (Baltimore: George W. King, 1904), p. 85.

politicians, matriculated. From his later writings and the scholarly interests he developed, it is quite evident that Murray acquired the thorough classical education of young gentlemen of his day.

One of the principal sources concerning the young Marylander's early life is his correspondence with his cousin and close friend, Henry Maynadier. A group of nine letters dating from 1781 to 1784, these offer interesting sidelights on Murray's life and times.[10] Late in 1781, he was engaged in writing various political pamphlets. In a letter to Maynadier he stated that "I enclose by post my latest brat whose very existence depends entirely on the midwifery of Green through your patronage."[11] "When you are blessed with the smiles of an infant and not till then, can you possibly be a judge of the apprehensions with which I have been surrounded since I entered the faithful fields of literary ambition." Closing on a practical note, he asked Maynadier

---

[10] Henry Maynadier was of a prominent Maryland family whose history in that state had been closely connected with the Murray family. He was the son of Dr. Maynadier who settled on Maryland's Eastern Shore after leaving his native France early in the eighteenth century. His mother was Margaret Murray Maynadier, the third child of Dr. William Murray and a sister of Dr. Henry Murray, who was William Vans Murray's father.

[11] This Green referred to by Murray was either Frederick or Samuel Green. Both of these men were the sons of Jonas Green who founded the paper which became famous as the Maryland Gazette. See Clarence S. Brigham, History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820, 2 volumes, (Worcester Massachusetts: American Antiquarian Society, 1947), I, 219.

to see if the word "viccissitudes" was spelled correctly on the last literary piece which was sent to him.[12] In 1782, one of his articles in the press drew considerable adverse comment from a reader, but Murray told his cousin that "I shall treat it as the kick of some ass and answer it with the lash. It is a squib which sets forth that from the cussed hard words I make use of, it is impossible to make either head or tail of what I say."[13]

Politics, however, did not completely monopolize the attention of the two young cousins. Their letters were filled with references about the young ladies of their acquaintance. Murray once wrote to Maynadier that he and Robert Milligan "both desire maids confoundedly". He felt that "vices are as dead as virtues in Cambridge. Only indifference remains".[14] Young Murray continued his interest in the opposite sex by inquiring about "Miss Dulaney". Of her he mused, "She has introduced a new art of love and

---

[12]William Vans Murray to Henry Maynadier, October 1, 1781, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland.

[13]Murray to Henry Maynadier, February 26, 1782, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[14]Murray to Henry Maynadier, January 25, 1783, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

formed a revolution in the system of female conquest".[15]

The young Marylander had previously commented on the prospects of peace according to the latest intelligence from Philadelphia, and on April 2, 1783, related to Maynadier the following:

> We gave the best proof we could express of joy with firing cannon and getting drunk. I did myself the honor of getting completely so last Saturday night and what with bawling, making speeches when licentiously drunk to the Goddess of Liberty and singing songs all night I am extremely hoarse. In showing our joy for a blessing we thus prove ourselves unworthy of it.[16]

This Saturday night celebration of peace was not only over-enthusiastic and inappropriate, but also premature since the end of the Revolution was not officially proclaimed by Congress until April 19, 1783. In his next letter he recognized that fact and expressed himself on the peace and what it will mean in some lines which he quite modestly called the "belchings of the Muses".[17]

Early in 1783, writing from his home in Cambridge, Murray informed Maynadier that he feared he would soon be "banished to London, in that purgatory to dwell".[18]

---

[15] Ibid.

[16] Murray to Henry Maynadier, April 2, 1783, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[17] Murray to Henry Maynadier, April 21, 1783, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[18] Murray to Henry Maynadier, January 25, 1783, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

This was a correct assumption for he left for London late in 1783, arriving there early in 1784.[19] The voyage was unpleasant and it was the cause of much distress to Murray. He told Maynadier that he "suffered more sickness in finding the Old World than did Columbus suffer doubt and anxiety in finding the new".[20] After Murray reached the Old World, his outlook was not materially altered since his first impression of London was that it was a city of corruption and materialism.[21] He did not change his opinion for several years.

On April 28, 1784, he entered the Middle Temple in order to prepare for a career at the bar. At the time Murray entered the Temple, that institution was in a period of its history when its progress had been halted.[22] During medieval times the Inns of Court, of which the Middle Temple was a prominent segment, had been exponents of a system of

---

[19] Murray to Henry Maynadier, February 8, 1784, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] E. Alfred Jones, American Members of the Inns of Court (London: Saint Catherines Press, 1924), p. 163. William S. Carpenter, "William Vans Murray", Dictionary of American Biography, VIII, 368. This information was verified by H. A. C. Sturgess, Librarian and Keeper of the Records, The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, in a letter of March 28, 1957, to the author.

legal training consisting of lectures, moots and the taking of notes in court. During the early eighteenth century the apprenticeship had largely replaced the older system and this was the training which Murray received.[23] Aside from the study under a member of the profession, the students also spent some time reading various legal works. The library which had been started in 1641, was sorely neglected and by 1784, many of the prize volumes were missing.[24] The general atmosphere was more informal in 1784 that it had been earlier or was to be in the early nineteenth century.

The Middle Temple possessed a large hall which even today stands as one of the finest of all extant Elizabethan buildings in England. Also standing today, as in 1784, is the famous round church, one of four of its type in England. The students of the Inns during Murray's time generally took lodgings in nearby hostels. Early mail addressed to him at the Temple Coffee House indicates that common eating facilities were available for the students.[25] Later in 1784, Murray's

---

[23] Roscoe Pound, The Lawyer from Antiquity to Modern Times (St. Paul, Minnesota: the West Publishing Company, 1953) p. 89.

[24] H. H. L. Bellot, "Inns of Court and Chancery", Encyclopaedia Britannica, Fourteenth Edition, 24 volumes. (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1951), XII, 376.

[25] Murray to Henry Maynadier, February 8, 1784, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

address was changed to No. 1 Fig Tree Lane.[26]

Student life apparently did not weigh too heavily on Murray. His apprenticeship is supposed to have been to a Mr. Price with whom he studied the classics.[27] He also spent considerable time in writing letters home to his family and friends. He advised his sister in one letter to practice her harpsichord diligently.[28] Occasionally he wrote lengthy letters to his parents which were actually requests for money thinly disguised as discussions of politics.[29]

The series of letters to Henry Maynadier were full of news about the other Marylanders in the Middle Temple at the time. Among these were John Leeds Bozman, later the deputy attorney-general of Maryland under Luther Martin, and Philip Barton Key, uncle of Francis Scott Key.[30] Murray often dined with Philip Key and commented that he lived

---

[26]Murray to Henry Maynadier, Mary 20, 1784, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[27]Clement Sulivane, "A Sketch of William Vans Murray", Southern History Association Publications, V, (1901), 151.

[28]Murray to his sister, March 5, 1784, Murray Papers, Letter Folio, 1784-1801, Library of Congress.

[29]Murray to his parents, August 6, 1785, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[30]E. Alfred Jones, American Members of the Inns of Court, p. 163.

like a gentleman yet economically.[31]

In accordance with the fashion of the day, Murray traveled on the continent of Europe. Such travel was an essential part of a gentleman's education. During the summer of 1784, he spent some time touring Holland, possibly in the company of John Quincy Adams.[32] Some years later Adams said that the journal Murray kept during his trip was worthy of publication.[33]

Travel within England also claimed Murray's time. During the summer of 1784, he wrote from the Mermaid Inn, Windsor, and described his visit to the castle located there. It was his opinion that the palace was either a "modern structure outdated or an old stile modernised."[34] He also visited Bath while he was in England, one trip

---

[31] Murray to Henry Maynadier, February 8, 1784, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[32] John Quincy Adams wrote to his father on June 15, 1784, and told him, "There is a young American here named Murray, from Maryland; he is studying law at the Temple and intends making a tour through Holland this summer, perhaps he will go over at the same time I do". W. C. Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, 7 volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913), I, 15.

[33] John Quincy Adams, "William Vans Murray", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1912 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1914), p. 348.

[34] Murray to Henry Maynadier, August 30, 1785, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

being made in 1787. He wrote to Maynadier telling, in fulsome terms, the benefit to be derived from the baths in that city.[35]

The earlier opinions of England which Murray expressed were not too kind toward the British people. Later on, having experienced English society, he held to the same viewpoint. He was shocked at the moral laxity so evident in London, especially in the number of streetwalkers around the Strand. He also thought the English were entirely too credulous for their own welfare. Before one condemms the English as seen through Murray's eyes, however, one must consider his background. Although the scion of a prominent colonial family, he had not been prepared for life in England on the basis of his past experience. Cambridge, Maryland was far removed from London, England. Of that background of eighteenth-century Maryland it has been remarked: "The Maryland aristocracy enjoyed culture, but they did not produce it".[36] Thus Murray's early religious training caused him to find English materialism distasteful and the imitative culture of Maryland led him to find fault with the more stimulating society which he found in England.

---

[35]Murray to Henry Maynadier, January 12, 1787, Murray Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

[36]Thomas J. Wertenbaker, The Golden Age of Colonial Culture (New York: New York University Press, 1949), p. 103.

While Murray was in England, his father, Dr. Henry Murray, passed away. According to John Quincy Adams, filial affection plus a weakened physical constitution caused the grieving son to become seriously ill. For six weeks he was in bed and then he spent several months in convalescence.[37]

In 1784 and 1785, Murray, who was by this time nearly twenty-five, wrote a series of essays, six in number, which he entitled "Political Sketches" and which he dedicated to John Adams, at that time serving as the United States Minister to Great Britain.[38] The six essays were entitled as follows: (1) Abbe Mably, (2) Virtue, (3) Aristocracy, (4) Extent of Territory, (5) Balance of Power, (6) Religion. Essentially the "Sketches"were designed to refute the criticisms of the American government which had been voiced by several European writers. Murray was not the only person who replied to the critics. John Adams made his rebuttal through his Sketches of American Policy, published in 1784.

---

[37] John Quincy Adams, "William Vans Murray", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1912 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1914), p. 348.

[38] There is a manuscript copy of the "Political Sketches" not in Murray's hand but that of a copyist in the Corner MSS, in the Maryland Historical Society. The Rare Book Room of the Library of Congress has a copy of the pamphlet as published in 1787 by C. Dilly, Publisher. This copy was presented to Thomas Jefferson by Murray and the note of presentation is still attached.

It is in the shadow of the works of Adams and Noah Webster that Murray's work has remained until recently. Politically the work showed Murray to be a "nationalistic conservative" much like John Adams.[39] Murray was generally more optimistic concerning the future of democracy as practiced in the United States. He was also an isolationist and indicated a fear of the people. When one considers the age and the background of the writer of the "Sketches" one cannot fail but be impressed by his logic and breadth of concept. These factors, coupled with a clearly delineated literary style make the "Sketches" valuable as insights both to the man and to his times.

The America to which Murray returned in 1787 was not the same America which he had left four years earlier. The weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation had been recognized by many Americans, and a new Constitutional Convention met during that year. Murray, too, had changed since 1784. He had become sobered in his outlook. He had developed a strong desire to enter politics.

---

[39]Alexander DeConde, "William Vans Murray's Political Sketches", Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLI, (March 1955), 634. Mr. DeConde, in this work, thoroughly analyzes the backgrounds of the political theories involved and the place they deserve in the historiography of American political theory. The Abbe Mably's political thought is discussed in Kingsley Martin, French Liberal Thought in the Eighteenth Century (London: Turnstile Press, Ltd., 1954), pp. 242-250.

His opportunity in that field was not long in arriving because in 1788, Maryland faced a crucial domestic crisis -- the controversy over the ratification of the Constitution. Since colonial days the political control of the state had been in the hands of the so-called "country party". Prior to 1776, there had been a constant struggle between this group and members of the "court party", which had been closely aligned with the proprietary interests and the Crown. After 1776, however, the "country party" played an increasingly important role in Maryland politics. It was a group noted for its wealth, social prominence and legal training.[40] Names like Chase, Carroll, Ridgely, Lloyd, Tilghman, Goldsborough, Sullivane, Mercer, and Hanson appeared in the ranks of the "country party" which, became the Federalist party in the struggle over the ratification of the constitution. By the fall of 1788, the crisis had passed. After a bitter struggle, Samuel Chase and his Anti-Federalists had been defeated, the constitution ratified, and the political status quo maintained to a large degree.

The state of Maryland under the constitution did not allow the political talents of Murray, who adhered to the Federalist Party, to remain dormant. After his return from

---

[40] Philip A. Crowl, Maryland During and After the Revolution (Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXI, No. 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943), p. 231.

England, he began to practice law, but when the Maryland House of Delegates assembled for the fall term of 1788, he was present as a newly elected representative of Dorchester County. The group of men which convened in Annapolis in the historic State House was extremely distinguished. Charles Carroll of Carrollton was among those present.[41] Several of the delegates from Dorchester County were close friends of Murray.

Murray's record in the session of 1788, which opened on November 7[42] and lasted for thirty-six days, appears to be rather insignificant. He served on the public roads committee[43] and on a special committee to study proposals for enlargement of the powers of the high court of chancery.[44] He was absent on several occasions and his voting record showed no definite trend.[45]

Between his first and second legislative session Murray married. A romance begun during his student days

---

[41] Ellen Hart Smith, Charles Carroll of Carrollton (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945), p. 231.

[42] Votes and Proceedings of the Maryland House of Delegates, November Session, 1788, p. 4

[43] Ibid., p. 7

[44] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[45] No definite trend can be established in Murray's record because the source of information concerning the House of Delegates, The Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates, recorded only the most important votes which were taken during a session.

in London[46] led to marriage with Miss Charlotte Hughins on October 15, 1789.[47] It was a successful match for both parties and the new Mrs. Murray was quite popular in diplomatic circles in later years.

"William Vans Murray, a delegate returned for Dorchester County, appeared, and after qualifying in the mode prescribed by the Constitution and form of government, and taking the oath to support the Constitution of the United States, took his seat in the House."[48] Thus the newly wed delegate returned to his legislative post on November 21, 1789, fifteen days after the opening of the session. He was much more active in his second legislative term, serving on a committee to study land drainage problems[49] and on several committees to study memorials presented to the House of Delegates.[50] The young lawyer displayed an interest in legislation that might affect his profession. He opposed a

---

[46] John Quincy Adams, "William Vans Murray", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1912 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1914), p. 348.

[47] Complete List of Court House Records, Dorchester County, Maryland. (Washington: D.A.R. Library, 1935); also Marriage References, Circuit Court, Dorchester County, 1780-1867.

[48] Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, November Session, 1789, p. 30.

[49] Ibid., p. 34

[50] Ibid., p. 36; p. 42; p. 47.

bill requiring practicing attorneys to pay the sum of ten pounds to each court before which they practiced[51] and he favored higher salaries for members of the judiciary than the House of Delegates allowed.[52] Indicative of his liberal religious views was his vote in favor of a bill to allow those who could not take oaths because of religious scruples to hold legislative and other state offices simply by affirmation.[53] Evidence of his humane views regarding the care of slaves was his support of a bill to prohibit the manumission of disabled slaves by will.[54] His interest in the welfare of Revolutionary veterans was manifested by his advocacy of a bill to permit the Governor and the Council to examine Maryland's muster rolls in order to reimburse those citizens who had served in the War of Independence.[55]

Murray's third and final term as a member of the House of Delegates began on November 4, 1799.[56] On that day, he and Moses LeCompte were present for the opening sessions as

---

[51] Ibid., p. 93.

[52] Ibid., pp. 88-93.

[53] Ibid., pp. 94-97.

[54] Ibid., pp. 97-105.

[55] Ibid., pp. 105-110.

[56] Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, November Session, 1790, pp. 1-2.

delegates from Dorchester County. A week later the committee of elections and privileges duly certified the election of the above gentlemen along with James Steele and William Goldsborough of the same county.[57] Murray was not present on this day because he had earlier been granted a leave of absence which lasted until November 22, 1790.[58]

Due perhaps to his long absence, Murray did not play a conspicuous role in the session. He served on a committee to determine what state legislation was needed as a result of the federal assumption of state debts[59] and also on a committee to investigate land claims of the Choptank Indians.[60] Jealous of the powers of the legislature, Murray opposed the creation of a tribunal which would have had the power to declare marriages null and void in certain cases.[61] He again voted in favor of higher salaries for judges.[62] His last recorded action in the House of Delegates was a vote in favor of a bill for road improvements on December 8, 1790.[63] The session adjourned two weeks later.

---

[57] Ibid., pp. 8-10.

[58] Ibid., pp. 6-8; pp. 33-35.

[59] Ibid., p. 35.

[60] Ibid., pp. 64-68.

[61] Ibid., p. 54.

[62] Ibid., pp. 59-62.

[63] Ibid., pp. 68-69.

What was indicated by Murray's service in the House of Delegates? Several conclusions may be reached. He was sensitive to any legislation which might affect his own profession. He generally favored a separation of powers in government. He gave evidence of a liberal spirit in connection with religious affairs. In view of his "Political Sketches" this was not unexpected. His legislative career, however, was undistinguished. Its greatest value was the training that it offered to a political apprentice like Murray. The evidence of lessons well learned would be shown in the future.

CHAPTER II

On October 25, 1791, President George Washington, delivered his third annual address to the Congress of the United States. He praised the accomplishments of the young republic, and noted that several important matters needed the urgent attention of Congress. These matters included the militia, the post office, the mint, and the sale of public lands.[1] It was natural that discussion of these items played a prominent role during the session which followed.

The session had opened the previous day in Philadelphia. One of the six members representing Maryland in the lower house was William Vans Murray, who had been admitted to the bar in his native Dorchester County, earlier in the year.[2] The young representative was late in arriving for the session, not taking his seat until November 9.[3]

---

[1] James D. Richardson (comp.), Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 20 volumes (New York: Bureau of National Literature, Inc., 1897), I,

[2] Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 1605. Murray, although he studied in England, was never admitted to the bar there.

[3] Debates and Proceedings of the Congress of the United States, Third Congress, First Session, (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1849) c. 166.

The month of October had been a busy one for Murray. He had been engaged in a number of court cases, and several delays kept him from getting back to Cambridge as soon as he had expected.[4]

During his first session in Congress, Murray held at least one important committee appointment. He was a member of a committee to study the report of the Attorney-General on the judiciary system of the United States.[5] Other members of this committee included Theodore Sedgwick of Massachusetts, James Hillhouse of Connecticut, John Laurence of New York, Elias Boudinot of New Jersey, John Kittera of Pennsylvania, and James Madison of Virginia.[6] The committee was active throughout the session and several communications from President Washington and Attorney-General Edmund Randolph were given to them for consideration.[7] Randolph was seeking to have his office, rather than the State Department, recognized as the central authority to supervise the district attorneys.[8] But his proposal had been passed on to the House

---

[4]Murray to Charlotte Murray, October 6, 1791, Murray Papers, Letter Folio, 1784-1801, Library of Congress.

[5]Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 298.

[8]Leonard D. White, The Federalists (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), p. 167.

without Washington's endorsement; therefore no action was taken on it.[9]

Early in the session, the question of reapportionment came before the House of Representatives.[10] Under the Constitution each state was entitled to one representative from each group of thirty thousand people, and many members of the House, including Murray, favored continuation of that ratio until the census of 1800. Later in the session, after lengthy debate in which Murray played his first prominent role as a legislator,[11] it was decided to change the ratio to one representative per thirty-four thousand population. Murray opposed this change. He also opposed an amendment by the Senate which would have allowed fractional representation.[12] For example, under this scheme states with a population of fifty-five thousand would be entitled to two congressmen, but in order to attain this, five thousand of the people they represented might be residents of another state. Murray cited the example of Delaware as a case in point. The state would have two representatives but only by counting five thousand people in another state who would have only

---

[9] Ibid., p. 168.

[10] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 177.

[11] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 284.

[12] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 251.

theoretical representation. This amendment, in Murray's opinion, was indiscriminate trifling with representation as defined by the Constitution and a violation of a principle of good government.[13] Shortly after this speech the House voted down the amendment, and after further discussion in January and February 1792, the House passed a bill without the amendment.[14] It had been proposed by John Vining of Delaware, early in February, that in determining the representation from each state the entire population of the United States should be considered as the basis for the ratio of one in thirty thousand. Murray opposed this as an infringement of the rights of the individual states. He felt that the Constitution intended to have the states control the matter of representation and the state population by itself should be used in determining the number of congressmen.[15]

The problem of the operation of the Post Office Department took considerable time during the first session. There were long debates over the advisability of imposing the death sentence on persons caught robbing the mails.[16] Murray spoke in defense of capital punishment, although he did

---

[13] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 268-269.

[14] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 416.

[15] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 412-413.

[16] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 284.

mention the fact that Montesquieu had concluded that there were various grades of both crime and punishment.[17] In a speech on the franking privilege he favored allowing officials of the government to enjoy the right, but felt that extending it to include members of the Congress would be allowing competition between personal privilege and the postal service.[18] Murray favored having Congressional mail sent to the Speaker for distribution. Although the motion was amended in accordance with the views he had expressed, the revised motion failed to carry.[19] Equally unsuccessful was another motion of his on the same bill which would have allowed newspapers to be carried at one-half the normal postage rate.[20]

The first Militia Act, passed in 1792, was the object of much criticism. Murray took a prominent share in the debate on the bill. He made an extremely sarcastic speech on April 21, 1792, attacking the opponents of the bill. He felt that they should not denounce the bill without being prepared to offer a reasonable substitute. Murray pointed

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 296.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 315.

out that the bill was remarkable for what he termed its "nationality".[21] He maintained that it would result in state and national co-operation and would also aid southern raw materials and northern manufactures by creating a demand for their products and services. The bill finally passed by a margin of seventeen votes.[22]

During the second session of the Second Congress, Murray served on the committee on Indian trade,[23] the committee to wait on the President following his annual address,[24] and the committee on the Post Office.[25] He was also named along with John Laurence and Theodore Sedgwick to study loans made by the Bank of the United States.[26]

Murray had favored the militia bill passed the previous session only because no better substitute had been presented. Many of the features of the bill did not seem workable to the Dorchester County representative. Twice during the second session he tried to get the House to name a committee to reconsider the bill.[27] According to Murray,

---

[21] Annals, Second Congress, First Session, c. 569-570.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 752.

[24] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 677-678.

[25] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 688

[26] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 749.

[27] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 701-702; c. 708-710.

it would be difficult to expect the average citizen to be able to comply with the arms requirement of the bill, and he favored public expenditures for this purpose. Both times his pleas for reconsideration were overwhelmingly defeated; in the last instance only six representatives favored the motion.[28]

A bill for considering the promotion of the useful arts came before the House during this session. It was suggested that a director of patents should be named.[29] Murray countered by outlining what he felt would be a more workable scheme whereby the judges of the district courts would be empowered to grant patents. This was opposed by several representatives as being overly decentralized and liable to lead to duplicity of patents.[30] Murray felt this would not be a severe problem and thought the close proximity of district judges to prospective inventors would permit even unprofitable inventions to be patented. His amendment did not pass the House,[31] but he did succeed in later sessions in having the privileges of the bill restricted to United States citizens.[32]

---

[28] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 708-710.

[29] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 854.

[30] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 855.

[31] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 856.

[32] Annals, Second Congress, Second Session, c. 860.

Little is known of Murray's activities during the summer of 1793. However, one interesting incident did occur. This was a case involving a British ship which had been captured by the French. The schooner had landed in Oxford, Maryland, in Murray's district, and he had advised the officer of the custom house to detain the ship unless an officer produced a commission from the French government. When the customs officer boarded the schooner he found it was commanded by Captain John Hopper, a citizen of Maryland, whose commission, originally issued to a French officer, Captain Fery, had been signed by members of the Executive Council of the French Republic. Murray reasoned that the ship was under the dominion of the United States, and he wrote to Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, informing him of the action which had been taken. He also expressed hope that the French people would be successful in creating a republican form of government.[33] Jefferson evidently replied quickly to Murray's letter, because the latter wrote a second letter concerning the case and explained that he did not favor the return of the prize.[34]

---

[33] Murray to Thomas Jefferson, May 9, 1793, Thomas Jefferson Papers, Tucker-Coleman Collection, Colonial Williamsburg. There is a short footnote concerning this case in Steiner's Life and Correspondence of James McHenry (Cleveland: Burrows Brothers, 1907), p. 142.

[34] Murray to Thomas Jefferson, May 30, 1793, Thomas Jefferson Papers, Tucker-Coleman Collection, Colonial Williamsburg.

On December 2, 1793, Philadelphia witnessed the opening session of the Third Congress of the United States.[35] The following day Murray arrived from Maryland and took his seat in the House.[36] His committee service during this Congress was widely varied, ranging from a group to study the fortification of Annapolis,[37] to a committee responsible for studying the continuation and regulation of embargoes of the United States.[38] Along with William Smith of South Carolina, Jeremiah Smith of New Hampshire, Andrew Moore of Virginia, George Thatcher of Massachusetts, Thomas Scott of Pennsylvania, and his fellow Marylander, Gabriel Christie, Murray was on the committee to consider the act to establish the judicial courts of the United States.[39]

The extremely busy schedule which Murray followed during this session precludes a complete survey of his activities, but some which were particularly noteworthy should be mentioned. The longest speech which he made during the first session was concerned with the report on the commerce of the United States which Jefferson presented to

---

[35] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 133.

[36] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 134.

[37] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 563.

[38] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 531.

[39] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 143.

Congress in December, 1793.[40] In this report, the Secretary of State showed the different ways in which the various foreign nations treated the commerce of the United States, and then discussed the means by which such treatment might be counteracted. As the debate continued in the House, nearly every member spoke concerning the bill and Murray was no exception. He opposed Madison's resolutions which were designed to act as enabling legislation for Jefferson's report. His main objection, however, stemmed from the fact that he felt that the report offered little of value as an answer to the problems of commerce.[41]

Difficulties with the Algerian states as a result of continued attacks on American vessels, also came up for consideration during the session. Murray, who did not believe the British were responsible for the renewed differences with the Algerines,[42] opposed raising a naval force to maintain peace in the Mediterranean.[43] This was early in the session, but he soon shifted his position and supported naval action

---

[40] Charles Marion Thomas, American Neutrality in 1793: A Study in Cabinet Government (Columbia Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, No. 350, New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), p. 243.

[41] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 355-366.

[42] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 446.

[43] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 154.

in that area.[44] He felt this would not only stop the disturbance but would give material aid to industries in the United States.[45]

The question of impressment of American seamen also began to present difficulties during the early months of 1794. On May 19, Murray proposed that a committee be named to draw up a bill which would enable American seamen to obtain proof of citizenship. He cited the stringency of British rules concerning citizenship and said that ship captains often could not make sworn testimony concerning a man's home country. The committee consisting of Murray, Uriah Tracy, and Alexander Gillon, brought in a bill which was read and passed on May 27, 1794,[46] shortly before the close of the session.

The fall of 1794 was a difficult period in the history of the United States. For the first time since its inception five years earlier, the authority of the central government was challenged by the frontiersmen of western Pennsylvania. When Murray reached Philadelphia early in November he found a definite feeling of anxiety in the seat of government.[47] The

---

[44] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 440

[45] Ibid.

[46] Annals, Third Congress, First Session, c. 729.

[47] Harry M. Tinkcom, The Republicans and Federalists in Pennsylvania, 1790-1801 (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1950), pp. 104-105.

previous month George Washington had reviewed the troops in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, as they prepared to march westward to quell the insurrection. The President then returned to Philadelphia and delivered his annual address to Congress. The speech set off a serious debate in the House over some of Washington's remarks.[48] This concerned the President's instruction that the members retrace carefully the steps leading to the insurrection and seek to determine its causes. The discussion of the republican societies brought a sharp division in the House. Murray spoke at length concerning the societies. He was of the opinion that the House was justified in considering the part the societies played in the case, and while he opposed their abolition, he indicated approval of a reprimand such as that implied in Washington's speech.[49] Gabriel Christie objected to Murray's rather general statements as abusive to the good citizens of Baltimore, but Murray quickly pointed out that his reference was only to certain people in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.[50]

Animosity between Murray and Representative William Branch Giles of Virginia was evident when they exchanged heated words over the former's attitude toward the press.

---

[48] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 905.

[49] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 906.

[50] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 908.

Giles accused Murray of wanting to "dress the press" but Murray's actual remark was, as he pointed out, that "the rights of the press ought not be freely handled".[51] Giles felt that the House should not spend its time in denouncing actions that were not strictly its concern. It was his opinion that serious misfortune could result from such unbridled debate.[52]

Shortly after the Battle of Fallen Timbers a discussion of a proposal to send a vote of thanks to General Anthony Wayne for his part in that engagement drew comment from Murray.[53] He favored conveying thanks not only to Wayne, for winning the first victory under the Constitution, but also to the militia of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New Jersey.[54] This motion was passed and he and William Smith were named to deliver the resolutions to President Washington.

During the session, the young Maryland legislator advocated maintaining the existing pay scale of government officials,[55] went on record as opposing a reduction of the armed forces,[56] and expressed belief in the value of publishing

---

[51] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 916.

[52] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 917.

[53] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 961.

[54] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 966.

[55] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 1146.

[56] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 1123.

laws of the United States in German as well as in English.[57] His opposition to having foreign nobility renounce their titles before becoming American citizens caused him to mention that a baronet once spent three years in the House.[58] The end result, he said, was that people in this country found baronets to be quite harmless. He added that the chief European use of nobility was to establish precedence for ladies leading a country dance.[59]

It seems remarkable that a man from Maryland's Eastern Shore would be greatly concerned over the frontiers of the United States. However, Murray repeatedly stressed the value of well guarded boundaries as essential to the security of the nation. As the second session of the Third Congress drew to a close he advocated maintenance of a series of Indian trading posts as a means of reducing border difficulties and keeping up a systematic trading system.[60]

In 1795, Murray spent a busy year. The Third Congress had taken much of his time, but his off session duties were equally arduous. He had begun the year with a long letter of reminiscence to James McHenry. In it he expressed regret

---

[57] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 1229.

[58] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 1049.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Annals, Third Congress, Second Session, c. 1763.

over not being able to spend his holidays in the "feudal-like life" on the Eastern Shore. The young legislator was amused that President Washington had invited the politicians to have sweet cakes and wine. Murray felt this showed clearly Washington's lack of understanding of the common tastes of the day.[61]

The news of the signing of the Jay Treaty with Great Britain reached Philadelphia late in January, 1795.[62] The uproar which ensued involved Murray in a political cross-fire. He had earlier expressed dismay over the publication of correspondence between Jay and Grenville,[63] and by July 1795, public opinion in his district was forcing him to seek advice from Oliver Wolcott.[64] While approving of the treaty as the best possible under the circumstances,[65] he asked Wolcott to provide material on the treaty which would offset increasing attacks from his constituents. Murray thought

---

[61] Murray to James McHenry, January 1, 1795, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[62] Bradford Perkins, The First Rapprochement (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), p. 30.

[63] Murray to James McHenry, December 16, 1794, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[64] Murray to Oliver Wolcott, August 7, 1795, in George Gibbs (ed.), Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and Adams, Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott (New York: Printed for the Subscribers, 1846), pp. 222-223.

[65] Murray to Oliver Wolcott, July 19, 1795, Ibid., pp. 213-214.

Alexander Hamilton could render great aid by "giving the public his luminous pen".[66] Wolcott complied with Murray's request and the latter set out on horseback to cover his district in defense of the treaty.[67] Evidently his tour was successful because in the fall of 1795, when the General Court of the Eastern Shore convened at Easton, a large majority of the group favored the treaty.[68]

December 7, 1795, marked the opening of the first session of the Fourth Congress.[69] Murray was present on the opening day along with four other representatives from Maryland. Murray's opening duties consisted of introducing a resolution to send assurances to President Washington that the items mentioned in his opening address would be considered. This resolution passed after little debate.[70]

Shortly after he was named a member of the Ways and Means committee,[71] the most interesting incident in Murray's

---

[66] Murray to Oliver Wolcott, August 7, 1795, Ibid., p. 213-214.

[67] Murray to Oliver Wolcott, August 29, 1795, Ibid., pp. 228-229.

[68] Murray to Oliver Wolcott, October 2, 1795, Ibid., p. 249.

[69] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 125.

[70] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 128-129.

[71] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 159.

term in Congress took place. This was the bribery case involving Robert Randall and Charles Whitney. Along with a group of Canadians, these men were land speculators who wanted Congress to cede to them in fee simple all lands between Lakes Michigan, Erie, and Huron. This area of some twenty million acres was to be divided into forty shares, twenty-four of these being reserved for members of Congress who favored the scheme.[72] Randall first approached William Smith of South Carolina with the proposition, and he, in turn disclosed it to Murray. After consultation, they decided to consult John Henry, a member of the Senate from Maryland. Henry suggested that they inform President Washington.[73] In speaking before the House on December 28, 1795, Murray revealed that he had been offered a cash payment if he did not want land. Murray felt it was his duty to report to the House to avoid embarrassment to members who might propose a memorial along the lines desired by Randall.[74] After this disclosure several other members including William Branch Giles and James Madison of Virginia, and Daniel Buck of Vermont revealed that they had been approached on the same matter.[75]

---

[72] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 166.

[73] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 167.

[74] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 168.

[75] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 168-169.

see next page

the separation of powers and the duties of the House under that separation. He favored calling for the papers on the treaty,[83] and granting the appropriation for the treaty.[84] As a staunch Federalist, he opposed the principle involved in the House's assertion of its power to withold enabling legislation simply because some members might not approve a treaty.[85]

Murray along with thirteen other congressmen voted against a bill for relief and protection of the American seamen.[86] He had earlier favored the bill,[87] but later changes which seemed to him to threaten the powers of the President led him to reverse his position. Murray's vote seems indefinsible because since late 1795, the impressment problem had grown in magnitude and by March 1796, had reached alarming proportions in spite of sincere attempts by Robert Liston, British minister at Philadelphia, to stem the tide.[88]

During the last months of the session, Murray voted to allow the City of Washington to have a government loan

---

[83] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 480-481.

[84] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 531.

[85] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 500-501.

[86] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 820.

[87] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 804.

[88] Bradford Perkins, The First Rapprochement (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), p. 62.

Randall and Whitney were taken into custody on December 29, 1795,[76] and brought to the House chamber. A debate of some length took place after Randall refused to admit his guilt.[77] During this lengthy exchange Murray spent some time defending his action in disclosing the matter to the President. He felt that the dignity of the House made it mandatory that they not ask Randall to name those he had contacted. This would, in Murray's opinion, allow a man of few principles to incriminate loyal member of the House, and should not be permitted.[78] On January 4, 1796, Murray, Giles, Buck, and William Smith read their sworn testimony in the case,[79] and Randall was again brought in. His trial lasted until January 6, when the House reprimanded and dismissed him.[80] On the following day they also dismissed Charles Whitney.[81] Thus the matter closed quietly.

Like the majority of the Federalist members of the House, Murray spoke at length in defense of Jay's Treaty.[82] His speech was an able, if somewhat tiresome, exposition of

---

[76] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 169-170.

[77] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 173.

[78] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 174.

[79] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 200-206.

[80] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 220.

[81] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 229.

[82] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 684-703.

to complete the public buildings.[89] He favored this appropriation because he thought property improvement would increase land values and eventually benefit the government. In spite of opposition from Pennsylvania congressmen, the House approved the bill by a vote of 72-21.[90]

The record which Murray made during this session was remarkable for party loyalty. On nine of the most important bills of the session, only twelve Federalists voted the straight party line. Murray was one of these. For this performance he deserved the accolade of "high Federalist".[91]

William Hindman and Murray left Philadelphia in May, after the close of the first session in order to return to the Eastern Shore. When Murray reached his home he found his wife seriously ill and unable to walk.[92] In addition to his personal troubles, he faced political unrest arising out of the signing of Jay's Treaty. His constituents were thoroughly agitated and upset by ratification of the treaty.[93] Fortunately, however, both his personal and political problems lightened

---

[89] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c.834.

[90] Annals, Fourth Congress, First Session, c. 840.

[91] Manning Dauer, The Adams Federalists (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953), p. 290.

[92] Murray to James McHenry, June 7, 1796, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[93] Murray to James McHenry, June 4, 1796, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

as the summer progressed, and by the end of the month he could report that he had purchased one hundred and fifty acres of land for eight hundred pounds.[94] He planned to serve notice on the raccoons "to quit the woods" and then begin to burn bricks in order to build a house. The remainder of the summer Murray lamented that he was cut off from the national political scene while on the Eastern Shore.[95] Late in the summer he was the victim of a serious inflammatory fever which his doctors treated by bleeding and purging. This prevented him from taking his seat in the House on December 6, 1796, the opening day of the second session.[96]

Murray did not appear on the floor of the House until December 27, 1796.[97] He was just in time to protest the rejection of a plan for a National University to be located in the future capitol of Washington. He felt the action of the House was hasty and ill informed. President Washington advocated the establishment of the school and granted some personal annuities to the Commissioners of the District of

---

[94] Murray to James McHenry, June 27, 1796, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[95] Murray to James McHenry, August 29, 1796, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[96] Murray to James McHenry, September 9, 1796, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[97] Annals, Fourth Congress, Second Session, c. 1764.

Columbia to help endow the institution.[98]

During the second session, the young representative of Dorchester, Somerset, and Worcester counties continued to show a faithful adherence to his earlier voting record. He urged that Congress grant a pay raise to the Attorney-General, who had neither an office nor an assistant.[99] He again expressed opposition to a reduction in the armed forces, especially the Navy.[100] His faith in the value of the Navy as a tactical weapon was very great, but it must be realized that a large Navy would have been quite beneficial to the district Murray represented, and this may have influenced his voting. When the session ended he again had a record of one hundred percent party loyalty, but, even more important, he had the experience of more than five years in the national legislative body. He had not always been successful in achieving his desires, but he had never been afraid to stand for what he believed. He had shown strength of character in the case involving attempted bribery. His arguments on the floor of the House were lucid and showed competence in legal training.

---

[98] John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), Writings of Washington, 39 volumes (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1931-1944), XXXIV, 106-107.

[99] Annals, Fourth Congress, Second Session, c. 2009.

[100] Annals, Fourth Congress, Second Session, c. 2058.

His perceptive judgment was valued by his colleagues whether on matters concerning appointments or on questions of political strategy. His transition from political apprentice to astute politician had been accomplished.

CHAPTER III

William Vans Murray in service to state and nation had demonstrated his competence as a lawyer and as a legislator. He showed alertness to the desires of his constituents and undeviating loyalty to the principles of the Federalist party which brought him to the attention of party leaders. When George Washington was making appointments prior to leaving office in March 1797, he chose Murray to succeed John Quincy Adams as Minister Resident to the Batavian Republic.[1] Murray was no doubt pleased to have been chosen to fill such an important post, although he still wished to return to private life and the practice of law. It was the latter desire which had led him to announce in August, 1796, that he would not seek re-election to the House of Representatives.[2] As evidence of the high regard in which Murray was held, it has been said that John Adams would have nominated him to the same post if George Washington had not done so.[3] This was not necessary, however, because Washington thought highly of Murray.

---

[1] U. S. Senate, Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate, I, 228.

[2] At this time Murray had said that he wished to retire even though he could probably have been re-elected because the district was behind him. "Commonplace" book, October 7, 1796, Murray Papers, Princeton University Library.

[3] Murray, "Commonplace" book, Murray Papers, Princeton University Library.

After the nomination, he asked Murray to take his nephew, Bartholemew Dandridge, to the Hague as his personal secretary. Although Murray had planned to take John McHenry, the nephew of James McHenry, he changed his plans to include Dandridge.

Armed with lengthy instructions from Secretary of State Timothy Pickering, and sailing under a passport issued by Letombe, Consul General of France, the new Minister Resident and his wife, along with Dandridge, left for their post on April 9, 1797.[4] They arrived in the Batavian Republic exactly two months later after an exceedingly rough passage over the northern route on the ship Good Friends.[5] One rather alarming incident in the voyage occurred when a British officer boarded the ship, made an inspection, and told the passengers that the King of Prussia had died.[6] It was with considerable relief that the Murrays stepped ashore.

---

[4]Certificate issued by Letombe, April 9, 1797, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[5]Murray to John Quincy Adams, June 9, 1797, "Letters of Williams Vans Murray to John Quincy Adams", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1912 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1914), p. 354. This letter was written from Helder, now Den Helder, to Adams in the Hague and marked seven p.m. Adams, in his diary entry for June 9, 1797, said that the Murray's arrived in the Hague, a distance of some sixty-five miles, the same evening.

[6]This was Frederick William II, the indolent, dissipated nephew of Frederick the Great who had been king since 1786. Murray to James McHenry, June 9, 1797, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

When Murray and his wife reached the Hague, it was a pleasant reunion for Murray and John Quincy Adams who had not seen each other since the summer of 1784 when they had both toured Holland. Adams commented in his diary that his Maryland friend clearly showed "upon his countenance the lapse of thirteen years".[7] He also added that Murray and his wife were unwell as a result of their rough passage from the United States. He was delighted to receive the late news from the United States and on at least one occasion stayed up until 2:00 a.m. reading the many newspapers brought by the Murrays.[8] In the time between the Murray's arrival and the departure of Adams, the latter did all that he could to help Murray become acquainted with the country and its inhabitants. The evening following their arrival the entire American party attended the theatre.[9] On June 11, 1797, Murray and his wife, accompanied by John Marshall and his wife, Adams, Bartholemew Dandridge, and Louis Marshall, the younger brother of John Marshall, went on a tour of

---

[7] Charles Francis Adams (ed.), Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, 12 volumes. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1874-1877), I, 189-190.

[8] Ibid., p. 190.

[9] Ibid., pp. 190-191. The play was a French comedy, "Le Conciliateur, on l'homme aimable" by M. de Moustier and L'Epreuve Villageoise.

northern Holland in order to acquaint the new arrivals with the countryside.[10] Murray, like Adams, was impressed with the cleanliness of the villages visited.[11] When Adams left the Hague on June 31, 1797, to go to London to be married, he left, as his successor, a person whose competence he respected. He wrote his father that "it gives me a great pleasure to have a person for whom I have so great a regard and esteem to succeed me here".[12] The friendship which had thus been renewed was to last until ended by death.

The new diplomatic representative did not neglect his duties during the interim between his arrival on June 9, and the departure of John Quincy Adams on June 31, 1797. Much of the time he spent with Adams was devoted to a discussion of the political situation of the Batavian Republic. As a satellite of revolutionary France, the Batavian puppet government was, not unexpectedly, hostile to the United States. Under the official cloak of hostility, however, was the attitude of the Dutch people which was friendly toward the

---

[10] John Marshall was in Europe prior to going to Paris as one of the special envoys to that country from the United States named by John Adams.

[11] Charles Francis Adams (ed.), Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, 12 volumes. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1874-1877), I, 191.

[12] Worthington C. Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, 7 volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913-1917), II, 178.

country which Murray represented. This was insofar as the people dared to voice disagreement with the official policy of France. The formal transfer of diplomatic duties took place during this time. On June 16, Adams presented Murray and Dandridge to Van Leyden, Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Four days later, Adams and Murray presented their letters of recall and credence to the President of the National Assembly, Mr. Vitringa.[13] Shortly after the official presentation of credentials, Murray wrote to McHenry expressing faith in the Dutch attitude toward the United States. He was also of the opinion that the French privateering would continue on the sea until the United States presented a united front against such action.[14]

When Murray took over his post as Minister Resident from John Quincy Adams, he faced many problems. The most important of these was the maintenance of amicable relations between the United States and the Batavian Republic. Since Batavia was in the French orbit, the problem was not a small one. Secretary of State Timothy Pickering had instructed

---

[13]Charles Francis Adams (ed.), Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, I, 192.

[14]Murray to James McHenry, June 22, 1797, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

Murray to strive to preserve the close relationship which had always existed between the two nations. Pickering warned Murray that he must "embrace every occasion to give to the Batavian Republic proofs of our sincere good will".[15] Shortly after his arrival Murray felt he was becoming closely associated with the Batavian political circles, especially those close to the Directory.[16] It was this close relationship with the government which was of great service in 1798 when peace overtures were sent to the United States through the U. S. Minister at the Hague.

One immediate problem arose as a result of the publication of a letter which John Quincy Adams had written to Pickering on November 4, 1796. In this letter, Adams had stated that while the Batavian government was cordially in favor of the neutral policies of the United States, they could not express an opinion which showed disagreement with the policies of France.[17] The letter was immediately misconstrued by certain Batavian officials who felt that Adams

---

[15] Timothy Pickering to Murray, April 6, 1797, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 352.

[16] Murray to James McHenry, July 18, 1797, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[17] Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, II, 35-40.

had implied that Batavia was but a province of France. As a result, shortly after Murray assumed his duties, he found himself in a delicate position with the officials of the government. One of these was Jacob G. H. Hahn, who quickly launched an attack upon Adams, declaring that he would have been forced to leave the country if Murray had not succeeded him when he did.[18] Murray relayed this attack to Adams in Berlin and Adams replied telling how his letter had been prompted by a letter from Hahn which was insulting to the United States.[19] While this exchange of letters was taking place, the Batavian government sent orders to their minister in Philadelphia, asking him to make an official complaint. The matter closed "without bloodshed and but little of ink-shed".[20] Adams and Murray did not openly clash over the impropriety of the former's action but Murray commented to McHenry that if the United States wanted to have all of its ministers ordered home, they should publish all of Adams' dispatches.[21]

---

[18] Murray to John Quincy Adams, October 1, 1797, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 364.

[19] Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, II, 223-228.

[20] Murray to John Quincy Adams, November 4, 1797, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 369.

[21] Murray to James McHenry, October 13, 1797, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

In addition to the difficulties inherited from his predecessor, Murray had many problems of his own while in the Hague. He was constantly in communication with the State Department about various aspects of the domestic politics of the Batavian government. One of the most important of these subjects was the series of revolutions during 1798. These uprisings kept the Hague in a constant state of upheaval and Murray often found he had new officials with which to deal. Murray also kept John Quincy Adams informed on the progress of these uprisings which were largely inspired by the excesses of French rule.[22] He also kept Sylvanus Bourne, United States Consul at Amsterdam, informed as to the events in the Hague.[23] Murray showed great sympathy to the faction which favored an independent Holland. He and Rufus King, the United States minister to Great Britain, carried on extensive correspondence concerning the Dutch patriots. In the spring of 1798, Murray told King that the Dutch would welcome British aid to help produce a counter-revolution. Although negotiations continued until November, they failed because Grenville would offer no aid except on the basis of a restoration of the Prince of Orange.[24]

---

[22]Murray to John Quincy Adams, January 22, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 371-377.

[23]Murray to Sylvanus Bourne, January 23, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[24]Bradford Perkins, The First Rapprochement (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), p. 105.

When an uprising took place in January 1798, a group of moderates was overthrown and replaced by a Directory modeled along French lines.[25] This revolution was reasonably quiet; Murray said his hairdresser was the only agitated person he had seen.[26] Such apathy toward a curtailment of personal freedom was largely because the people feared reprisals from the French government. The group which took power in January remained in office until June 12, 1798. On that date another revolution took place. This time the people were joyous and excited.[27] The new government was composed of men that Murray felt were sensible and moderate.[28] After this time, he had an easier road in his negotiations with the government. It was his opinion that the government would remain in power if questions of party loyalty and political theory were not discussed, and if the suppression of the French Jacobins continued.[29]

---

[25] Murray to John Quincy Adams, January 22, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 372.

[26] "Commonplace" book, January 23, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[27] Ibid., June 12, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[28] Murray to Sylvanus Bourne, June 13, 1798, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[29] "Commonplace" book, June 12, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

As a diplomat, Murray seems to have been pleasing to his own government. John Adams and George Washington were high in their opinions of him.[30] James McHenry and John Quincy Adams were in constant private correspondence with him. Murray, however, did take certain action which drew rebukes from Timothy Pickering, who was slowly becoming more and more opposed to John Adams. One rebuke came in 1798. When the government was organized following the January revolution, Murray, along with the remainder of the diplomatic corps, was invited to meet the new government. He expected protocol to be followed and prepared a speech which he intended to deliver to the President of the Assembly in reply to the latter's expected greeting. However, no mention was made of the United States. Murray felt this was a deliberate omission on the part of the Batavian government so he wrote a lengthy protest to its foreign minister. When Timothy Pickering received a copy of the letter, he was outraged at Murray's attitude toward France. He severely rebuked Murray in a letter which surely must rank as a masterpiece of diplomatic invective.[31] He

---

[30] Washington's nomination of Murray for the post at the Hague was evidence of his esteem for Murray. John Adams, in his Works, IX, 249, expressed a high opinion of Murray's ability.

[31] Pickering to Murray, April 21, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 397-399.

attacked, in a scathing fashion, not only Murray's motivation in writing the letter but also his overconciliatory phraseology and his want of discretion. Pickering wished to believe that the omission was merely another example of French attitude toward the United States. Aside from Pickering's denunciation of his action, John Quincy Adams felt that Murray had answered something which was unstated. He said that "we are not bound to utter what we think, but was are to think what we utter".[32] In a letter of June 23, 1798, to Pickering, Murray terminated the exchange by pointing out the honorable Secretary's own conciliatory tone in letters to France concerning the Gerry-Pinckney mission.[33]

Bartholemew Dandridge, Murray's secretary in the Hague, had been taken upon request of George Washington. He remained in this position until September 21, 1798, when he went to London to serve under Rufus King.[34] Dandridge had found the climate in the Hague disagreeable and had wanted a transfer for that reason. Rufus King asked Murray for his opinion on Dandridge's capabilities and then decided to accept him.[35]

---

[32] John Quincy Adams to Murray, July 3, 1798, in Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, II, 331.

[33] Murray to Timothy Pickering, June 23, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 421-422.

[34] Murray to John Quincy Adams, September 6, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 467.

[35] Rufus King to Murray, August 15, 1798; September 17, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

At the same time, Murray recommended Dandridge to James McHenry for a commission in the Army. This appointment was approved in December 1798.[36] John McHenry was Dandridge's successor as Murray's secretary. James Cole Mountflorence, formerly an aide to Colonel C. C. Pinckney, served as an interim secretary for a period of three months.[37] Young McHenry was delayed and did not reach Hamburg until April 22, 1799.[38] James McHenry was worried that his nephew's delay would inconvenience Murray but evidently it did not.[39]

On May 31, 1797, John Adams, as President of the United States, submitted to Congress the names of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, John Marshall, and Elbridge Gerry as commissioners to France. These nominations were of considerable interest to Murray, and, even though he was not officially a member of the group, his role was by no means negligible. Elbridge Gerry spent two days with Murray at the Hague before going on

---

[36] Murray to James McHenry, August 30, 1798, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[37] John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.) Writings of Washington, XXXVII, 71-72. J. C. Mountflorence was a Frenchman who was prominent in North Carolina during the Revolution. He served as European agent for the Blount family. See Alice Barnwell Keith (ed.), "Letters of James Cole Mountflorence" North Carolina Historical Review, XIV (1937), 252.

[38] Murray to John Quincy Adams, September 28, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 477.

[39] James McHenry to John McHenry, July 1, 1799, McHenry Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

to Paris late in September 1797.[40] On October 9, 1797, Gerry relayed to Murray the news that the commissioners had presented their credentials to Talleyrand, Minister of Foreign Affairs.[41] Two weeks later John Marshall, whom Murray greatly admired,[42] informed him of their failure to be received.[43] About this time, a dispute developed between the commissioners over leaving France. Marshall and Pinckney wanted to leave early in March 1798, while Gerry wished to remain. After they were not received, Pickering wrote to Murray asking him to see that the commissioners left France as soon as possible so that the XYZ dispatches could be published.[44] Marshall left for Bordeaux on April 16, 1798, while Pinckney went to southern France two days later. Gerry alone remained in Paris. During this time he wrote several letters to Murray explaining that he stayed in Paris in order to avoid an open break with France.

---

[40] Murray to John Quincy Adams, October 1, 1797, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 361.

[41] Elbridge Gerry to Murray, October 9, 1797, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[42] Murray to John Quincy Adams, February 20, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 379. Murray said, "I consider Marshall as one of the most powerful reasoners I ever met with either in public or in print."

[43] Murray, "Commonplace" book, October 25, 1797, in Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[44] Timothy Pickering to Murray, March 28, 1798, Elbridge Gerry Papers, Accession 6167, Library of Congress.

Gerry said that his own personal gain did not influence his decision to remain.[45] Murray had previously expressed confidence in Marshall, but it is evident that he did not hold Gerry in high esteem as a diplomat. He said, "I know him well. I know he has a kind and friendly disposition. He is, however, a minority man. He mistakes common things perpetually, and has a costive way of higgling between two ideas and even synonimous words that forbode feebleness of conception, digestion and powers."[46] Murray added, with obvious disapproval, that Gerry's companions included a Mr. Codman, Nathaniel Cutting, U. S. consul at Paris, "who reviles government", and "dear, amiable, sweet, and clean Tom Paine".[47] Yet Murray seemed to pity Gerry. He even thought that the United States government knew that Gerry would stay in Paris,[48] for he felt that the French would yield to bargaining. He did not, like many others of his party, abhor the French, although he thought the politices of their government were wrong. When Gerry

---

[45] Elbridge Gerry to Murray, April 23, 1798, June 5, 1798, July 16, 1798, Elbridge Gerry Letterbook, 1797-1800, Gerry Papers, Library of Congress.

[46] Murray to John Quincy Adams, April 27, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters," p. 402.

[47] Murray to John Quincy Adams, June 5, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 414.

[48] Murray to Sylvanus Bourne, May 21, 1798, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

finally did leave France in August 1798, Murray might have thought that his problems were ended but new ones were soon to emerge.

Early in August 1798, Murray received information from a source in Hamburg to the effect that an American whose name was supposed to be Droghan had landed and was on his way to Paris to offer his service as a mediator in the Franco-American dispute. Murray told John Quincy Adams that if he had one hundred guineas he would be able to ascertain the correct identity of the man and his plans because he felt such information was a salable commodity.[49] On August 5, the man was correctly identified as Dr. George Logan of Philadelphia.[50] Logan was an ardent anti-federalist and disciple of Thomas Jefferson. Murray immediately wrote to Pickering about the event, describing how Dr. Logan was bearing a passport signed by Jefferson and Judge Thomas McKean.[51] He then decided to visit Dr. Logan in Rotterdam.[52] In the company of Mountflorence, he visited Rotterdam where he searched all the taverns and lodging places without finding the physician.

---

[49] Murray to John Quincy Adams, August 2, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 444.

[50] See Deborah Norris Logan, Memoirs of Dr. George Logan of Stenton (Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1899)

[51] Murray to Timothy Pickering, August 7, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 450.

[52] Although Murray and Logan did not meet in Europe, Logan reported to Washington that he had visited with Mr. Murray. See Fitzpatrick (ed.) Writings, XXXVII, 18.

After fruitless appeals to the sheriff and the president of the council in Rotterdam, Murray returned to the Hague.[53] Murray then decided to have Logan arrested and entered a formal request on August 10, 1798.[54] News evidently reached Dr. Logan that he faced arrest and he left for France. As a result, the order for the arrest was withdrawn, although the sheriff in Rotterdam continued his search.[55] Murray had hoped by arresting Logan to ruin what he believed was a Republican peace mission. It was a dangerous move as Murray well recognized,[56] but it could have resulted in some excellent Federalist propaganda. Murray's intervention, however, availed him nothing. Likewise Dr. Logan's mission was unsuccessful and he was subsequently disavowed by Thomas Jefferson.[57]

American diplomats in eighteenth-century Europe were constantly warning one another about person whose character

---

[53]"Commonplace" book, August 10, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[54]Murray to Citizen Goguel, August 10, 1798, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[55]J. Hubert to Murray, August 11, 1798, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[56]Murray to John Quincy Adams, August 14, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 456.

[57]Paul Leicester Ford (ed.), The Works of Thomas Jefferson, 12 volumes. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904-1905), IX, 15-17.

and purpose were doubtful. One of these was John Skey Eustace, former aide of the controversial Revolutionary general, Charles Lee.[58] In early 1798, he had been ordered to leave England and he chose to go to Batavia. Rufus King warned Murray that Eustace was not a suitable companion for either of them, being more suitable for James Monroe.[59] The advice was not wasted, but Murray felt that he could perhaps learn from Eustace something of the secrets of the American Jacobins in France so he dined with him in Rotterdam.[60] He also thought that he could perhaps influence Eustace in favor of the United States, This action, as Timothy Pickering expressed it, was an effort to reform Eustace based on Murray's good judgment and Christian temper and not on the doubtfulness of effect.[61] Eustace then left the Batavian Republic and went to the United States where he wrote a series of articles designed to embarrass Monroe. Along with Gerry and Logan, Eustace had done much to harass Murray in 1798.

---

[58] J. R. Alden, General Charles Lee, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), p. 285.

[59] Rufus King to Murray, March 31, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress. Monroe's book on his diplomacy in France had been published in December 1797, and Eustace was mentioned as an acquaintance.

[60] Murray to Pickering, March 8, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 382-383.

[61] Pickering to Murray, May 28, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 383.

On-the-spot observers have usually felt they possessed a clearer sense of historical perspective than those further removed. Murray found himself in this situation all during his service at the Hague. He was always hopeful that mediation could settle the disputes between France and his own country, but he often became discouraged at the attitude of his government. He particularly deplored the inactivity of Congress in seeking to avoid a rupture with France.[62] His sensitivity over an aimless Federalist foreign policy made it necessary for him to stall for time when questioned.[63] In the spring of 1798, he told Bourne that war was bound to result unless a settlement took place immediately. He further stated that ships and money should have been voted four years previously.[64] Murray probably failed to realize that the reason Congress was so lethargic was because of extremely partisan politics. Murray himself had been very partisan in his service in the House just two years earlier. This partisanship, along with a justified distrust of France, made it difficult for the United States to maintain a concrete foreign policy which would have satisfied its foreign representatives.

---

[62] Murray to James McHenry, August 11, 1797, McHenry Papers, Library of Congress.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Murray to Sylvanus Bourne, May 26, 1798, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

A voluminous correspondence of considerable importance on affairs and events in the United States took place among many Americans in Europe like King, Murray, Adams, and Bourne. News like the attempted expulsion of Matthew Lyon for spitting at Roger Griswold offered sufficient excuse for long letters.[65] Murray carried on an extensive correspondence with Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury, concerning loans outstanding in Holland.[66] In the summer of 1798, William Loughton Smith, pamphleteer and United States minister to Portugal, wanted to exchange ciphers with Murray but felt the risk was too great. He was of the opinion that the domestic crisis in the United States had passed but that "constant exertion would be essential to keep all going well".[67] Joseph Pitcairn felt that the United States Army under Washington could far outweigh the Jacobin Club of France.[68] Charles Cotesworth Pinckney sent Murray and his wife greetings from Colonel Trumbull along with

---

[65] Rufus King to Murray, April 17, 1798, Murray Papers, Letter Folio, 1784-1801, Library of Congress.

[66] Oliver Wolcott to Murray, May 11, 1798, Murray Papers, Letter Folio, 1784-1801, Library of Congress.

[67] William Loughton Smith to Murray, August 15, 1798, Murray Papers, Letter Folio, 1784-1801, Library of Congress.

[68] Joseph Pitcairn to Murray, August 28, 1798, Murray Papers, Letter Folio, 1784-1801, Library of Congress.

new additions for the cipher list.[69] In June 1799, writing to Rufus King, Murray said that because some people in the United States strongly desired war with France, the Federalist party was being weakened. He felt that the party needed to take a positive stand in order to prevent accusations of treason.[70] News of social events in the United States was related in correspondence between Murray and Richard Bond of Philadelphia.[71] Perhaps the most extensive correspondence on affairs in the United States took place between Murray and John Quincy Adams. Both men were ardent correspondents and their exchange of letters is not only interesting but necessary to an understanding of both men. Wide ranging and pungent, their letters are today prime examples of the correspondence carried on by diplomats of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

Aside from his concern with domestic politics in Batavia, the United States Minister was constantly troubled with problems arising from the quasi-war with France. The two main theatres of action during this dispute were in

---

[69] Charles Cotesworth Pinckney to Murray, September 19, 1797, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[70] Murray to Rufus King, June 17, 1799, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[71] Richard Bond to Murray, May 22, 1800, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

diplomatic affairs and in naval affairs. Murray's greatest concern was with the diplomatic problems of the dispute which related to Batavia, but because many of the diplomatic problems came about as a result of the French naval policy, he was also concerned with that theatre of operations.

Perhaps the most important naval case with which Murray dealt was that of the Wilmington Packet. Although it did not arise as a result of the quasi-war, being instead a product of the dispute between France and Holland, it did involve an American ship. The case was also a violation of the Dutch-American treaty of 1782. The dispute arose on September 6, 1793, when the Wilmington Packet was captured near the island of Nevis, by the armed schooner Elinda flying the Netherlands flag.[72] After a public hearing in Charleston, South Carolina, the papers, along with vague and indefinite instructions, were turned over to John Quincy Adams, then at the Hague.[73] Adams cautiously presented a memorial to the President of the Estates-General in December 1794, but it was not accepted until it had been translated from English to French.[74] This

---

[72] Hunter Miller (ed.), Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America, 8 volumes. (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1931-1947.), V, 1079.

[73] Ibid., p. 1082.

[74] Samuel Flagg Bemis, John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1949), p. 54.

memorial was answered in 1796, but changes in the Batavian government prevented a settlement although Adams continued to press for one. When Murray took over in 1797, he had planned to reply immediately concerning the case. He decided, however, to wait for a time when the government would be more settled so he allowed the case to rest until December 26, 1798, when he sent a long and competent dissertation on the validity of the American claim to Maarten van der Goes, the Minister of Foreign Relations.[75] The memorial, whose length had caused Murray much eyestrain while writing it,[76] was submitted to the Directory in February 1799. Murray had earlier commented to Adams that because of so many changes in the Batavian government, no one had any knowledge of the case.[77] A note from Murray insisting upon a reply brought an answer on September 4, 1799.[78] The Directory accepted Murray's idea that as a free ship, the Wilmington Packet could discharge her goods regardless of whether she possessed a sea letter.[79] Dispute

---

[75] Miller (ed.), Treaties, V, 1085.

[76] Murray to John Quincy Adams, January 1, 1799, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 502.

[77] Murray to John Quincy Adams, December 7, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 491.

[78] Miller (ed.), Treaties, V, 1095.

[79] Ibid.

continued on the actual basis of settlement until December 12, 1799, when Murray accepted a sum of twenty thousand florins.[80]

A case involving the American ship Farmer, commanded by a Captain Macullen of Philadelphia, kept Murray busy for some time. The ship which carried a valuable cargo of sugar and coffee was captured by a one-gunned French ship six miles off Helvoet. Murray immediately entered into a discussion of the case with Willem Buys, an official in the Batavian government.[81] The ship, aside from its cargo, carried dispatches to Murray from the government in Philadelphia. For that reason, Murray went to Rotterdam to ask for the return of his letters. The consul of the French Commissary of Marine refused to return the letters. Murray was greatly disturbed by his treatment at Rotterdam and he deplored the plundering of the merchant vessels of the United States which was taking place.[82] Later Murray received notice that his mail had been opened and the dispatches forwarded to Paris. He was powerless to take action

---

[80] Miller (ed.), Treaties, V, 1077-1078. Although this note settled the case insofar as the United States and Batavia were concerned, difficulties remained in distributing the money obtained in the settlement. Murray refused to take the responsibility and not until May 15, 1813, was the case finally closed when a distribution of the money was finally effected.

[81] Murray to John Quincy Adams, April 17, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 397.

[82] Murray to John Quincy Adams, April 24, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 399.

until the Farmer was cleared.[83] In May, the vessel was condemned by the French consul at Rotterdam.[84]

Early in 1799, an incident involving the brig Mary out of Boston took place off the coast of Batavia.[85] The vessel was seized on March 13, 1799, as she lay at anchor off the Batavian gun battery on the shore.[86] Actually the Mary, before anchoring, had been engaged by a French privateer, so the Batavian minister detained both ships until it could be determined whether or not the battle took place on Batavian territory or the high seas.[87] Murray adroitly circumvented this action by stating that the French privateer was not concerned because the Mary was seized by a captain of the Batavian shore battery. Murray assured Jacob Spoors, Minister of the Batavian Marine, that Captain Hall had utmost respect for the republic of Batavia and had merely been seeking refuge from a French marauder.[88] He also asked Spoors to permit the Mary

---

[83] Murray to John Quincy Adams, May 14, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 406.

[84] Murray to John Quincy Adams, June 1, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters, p. 413.

[85] D. W. Knox (ed.), Naval Documents Related to the Quasi-War between the United States and France, 7 volumes (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1935-1938), II, 178.

[86] Murray to Jacob Spoors, March 14, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, II, 452.

[87] Jacob Spoors to Murray, March 15, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, II, 452.

[88] Murray to Jacob Spoors, March 18, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, II, 453.

to proceed to Rotterdam after giving security that she would pay whatever penalty was deserved for a violation of the Batavian limits.[89] The permission was granted and the case was closed.[90] In these dealings, as in all others with the Batavian government, Murray felt that the Batavians were acting as well as they could under the circumstances. According to Murray, Spoors was an able official who was as friendly as his position permitted.[91]

The problem of distressed American seamen in Europe during the quasi-war was another vital facet of the operations of the Hague diplomatic outpost. There were several agents for these seamen including Isaac Cox Barnet, United States commercial agent at Bourdeaux, P. F. Doubree, United States consul at Nantes, Le Baron at Dieppe, Allbree at Brest, Pinaud at Noirmoutier, and Vail at L'Orient.[92] Since these men were of subordinate rank, they had to clear their actions, especially in financial affairs, through Murray, Doubree, in

---

[89] Murray to Jacob Spoors, March 18, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, II, 454-455.

[90] Jacob Spoors to Murray, March 22, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, II, 455.

[91] Murray to John Quincy Adams, March 22, 1799, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 530-531.

[92] Doubree to Timothy Pickering, September 18, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, IV, 205-206.

1799, needed assistance on the disposition of captured ships and he had been unable to find out from Murray what action should be taken.[93] Isaac Barnet was likewise dependent on Murray's approval of his expenditures.[94]

One last naval case which is of interest because of its owner's connection with Maryland is that of Jeremiah Yellott's ship Mary. Yellott was an agent for the United States Navy in Baltimore and helped to build and outfit many ships during the 1790's.[95] On the fourth of February, 1800, the Mary, commanded by Isaac Philips, was captured by the French privateer Renommee and carried to Curacao. Philips then demanded return of the ship under Article two of the Proclamation of the Intermediate Executive Power of the Batavian Republic of 1798.[96] Instead of returning the ship, the court decreed sale of both vessel and cargo.[97] When Murray, who was in Paris, heard what had happened, he wrote a strongly worded letter to the Batavian government demanding money on

---

[93] Ibid.

[94] Pickering to Isaac Cox Barnet, March 31, 1800, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, V, 368-369.

[95] See references to Yellott in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, II, IV, V.

[96] This article rendered liable to restitution all captors of vessels bound between two Batavian or one Batavian and one neutral port.

[97] John Marshall to Murray, June 16, 1800, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, V, 189.

behalf of the United States government.[98] He also urged Sylvanus Bourne to do what he could in the matter.[99]

These small cases which took so much of Murray's time constituted the bulk of the eighteenth-century diplomat's work, in much the same manner as today. However, every dedicated practictioner of the art of diplomacy earnestly desires an opportunity to secure lasting glory and benefit for both himself and his county. For William Vans Murray, the summer of 1798 offered such an opportunity, for he was to play an important role in the negotiations that settled the existing disputes between his nation and the French Republic.

---

[98] Murray to the Batavian Executive Directory, September 15, 1800, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

[99] Murray to Sylvanus Bourne, September 25, 1800, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

CHAPTER IV

The summer of 1798 marked the end of a difficult year for Murray at his post in the Hague. It would have been a trying year even for a seasoned diplomat; for a newcomer to the field of diplomacy it was especially so. The problems of the first year had been, however, routine in comparison to those which the future would unfold. Soon Murray would be called upon to make decisions which would affect not only his own future, but that of his fellow Americans as well.

Louis André Pichon, in the summer of 1798, was a young man slightly under thirty. A member of the French diplomatic corps, he had served in the United States, as a secretary to ministers Edmond Genêt and Joseph Fauchet. Late in June, he was named to be secretary of the French legation in the Hague.[1] To the casual observer of the European scene, this appointment appeared to be of no great significance. The appointment was, in actuality, the beginning of a carefully laid French plan to re-open negotiations with the United States. The choice of Pichon was a good one since he was widely experienced in American affairs, having been closely connected with the American bureau of the French government since his return from Philadelphia.

---

[1] Murray to John Quincy Adams, July 3, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 426.

Pichon lost no time in beginning talks with Murray. Some five days after he arrived in the Hague, Pichon had already opened conversations with the American minister. The latter felt that Pichon had been sent to impress him "doucement" and to draw him into a discussion of the difficulties between the two countries.[2] Murray demonstrated a calculated reluctance in his dealings with Pichon and he was always careful to let Pichon be responsible for each new move in their diplomatic fencing game. He was especially careful to appear to Pichon to be wary of the peace overtures of France, but he secretly favored any move which would help to avoid a rupture between the two countries. He thought that France feared the United States in the summer of 1798 and was merely waiting for a more opportune time to create an open break between the governments.[3] The move which Murray had secretly hoped that France would make came in a letter of August 29, 1798, from Talleyrand to Pichon, in which the French Foreign Minister praised the character of Murray and expressed high esteem for his principles which Talleyrand thought were quite unlike most Americans.[4]

---

[2] "Commonplace" book, June 27, 1798, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[3] Ibid.

[4] American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 241-242.

This letter, which Pichon showed to Murray, enabled the latter to make the step for which he had been waiting. He forwarded it to President John Adams, thus disclosing the first official indication of the French willingness to consider a renewal of negotiations. The letter was no great shock to Adams, for he had earlier received from Murray a communication in which the latter described the private conversations which he had held with Pichon.[5]

President Adams was not the only recipient of news from Murray about the sudden reversal in French policy toward the United States. To Timothy Pickering, Murray disclosed the new French attitude while assuring the Secretary of State that any decision as to final action would be a question for the Secretary himself to decide.[6] To John Quincy Adams, Murray wrote lengthy letters explaining in detail his every move with Pichon. The younger Adams even received copies of the dispatches which Murray sent to the President.[7] The President's son favored the renewal of negotiations with France and he wrote to Timothy Pickering urging that Murray be allowed to

---

[5]Murray to John Adams, July 17, 1798, in Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, VIII, 680-684.

[6]Murray to Timothy Pickering, August 18, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 457-458.

[7]Murray to John Quincy Adams, September 6, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 466.

continue his communications with the French government.[8] Rufus King, in London, also was informed, although in rather indefinite terms, of the negotiations underway in the Hague.[9]

The negotiations continued when Murray, in September, wrote to Pichon and outlined the steps that would be necessary for an amicable termination of the difficulties.[10] It was Murray's hope that "important and mutually good consequences" would be the end result of this letter.[11] The outcome of this correspondence which was a confidential discussion of the previous conversations,[12] was Talleyrand's note of September 28, 1798, to Pichon which offered the assurances Murray had been trying to obtain. Talleyrand praised Pichon's action in the case and said that he was quite correct in entrusting to Murray the confidence of the French government.[13] Talleyrand felt it was his duty to point out the previous French attitude which had met only rebuffs from the United States. He also reminded Murray that the assurances in earlier letters,

---

[8] John Quincy Adams to Pickering, October 6, 1798, in Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, I, 372-373.

[9] Murray to John Quincy Adams, September 6, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 466.

[10] Murray to Louis Pichon, September 23, 1798, Despatches, the Netherlands, volume four, private letters. National Archives.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Murray to John Quincy Adams, September 28, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 475-478.

[13] American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 239.

especially the letter of July 6, were quite as comprehensive as those sent in the present communication. Murray later said that one of the more difficult parts of his discussion with Pichon had been trying to convince him that the earlier assurances of French sincerity were not sufficient for the government of the United States to open negotiations.[14]

With the dispatch to President Adams of October 7, 1798,[15] Murray closed one chapter of his negotiations with France. He had long been desirous of peace with the French and he had welcomed the overtures made by Pichon. His maneuvers had been remarkably skillful, as he traversed the diplomatic maze separating the two countries. While secretly anxious for a lessening of difficulties, he knew, as a diplomatic negotiator, that he must not seem overly concerned by the breach which separated the countries. To outsiders Murray had appeared almost indignant over the French advances, pointing out the past performances of that country in diplomatic affairs. When Murray finally concluded the French advances were sincere, he was quick to act in a manner which he thought would be decidedly advantageous to the United States. In doing so he placed the responsibility for further exchanges completely

---

[14] Murray to John Quincy Adams, September 28, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 475.

[15] C. F. Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, VIII, 688-690.

in the hands of his government. There is no indication that Murray acted with one eye cast on the rewards which he might reap in the future.

The risk taken by Murray in holding private negotiations with a representative of revolutionary France was a great one. Although he did not know it at the time, he soon learned of the vicious attacks on Dr. George Logan as a result of the latter's trip to France. Murray knew that Timothy Pickering was strongly opposed to any further intercourse with France. Federalist opinion in the United States strongly favored war and the prospect of renewed negotiations with France was, as Murray later found out, an anathema to party leaders. The talks which Murray undertook were decidedly acts of personal courage, the breadth of which would be more fully understood as the spring of 1799 unfolded.

Murray's letter of October 7, 1798, reached John Adams several weeks later.[16] The President, his son John Quincy, and Murray were the only Americans who knew of the letter and its contents, at least for the time being. John Adams realized the predicament in which the letter placed him. It was not to remain a predicament for long. His New England conscience quickly settled for him any misgivings which he might have had.

---

[16]The exact date of receipt from Murray is not known, but an interval of two to three months usually elapsed.

Adams believed that the French overtures were sincere. He was convinced that his previous action toward France had been correct. He was not unaware of the internal dissension which threatened to wreck his administration in 1799. He saw in Murray's letter a chance to win the long sought peace and to expose to the glaring scrutiny of public opinion, the actions of the Hamiltonians who fervently sought war with France. Armed with assurances, not only from Murray, but also from his son John Quincy, and from Richard Codman and Joel Barlow,[17] the course was clearly marked for John Adams.[18]

In an act of unprecedented courage, the President, on February 18, 1799, sent to the Senate of the United States a message nominating William Vans Murray as Minister Plenipotentiary to France.[19] Along with the nomination, which empowered Murray to re-open diplomatic negotiations with France, Adams enclosed the letter from Talleyrand to Pichon of September 28, 1798, in order to acquaint members of the Senate with the action which had transpired between the two countries. Adams thought highly

---

[17] C. F. Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, IX, 242-244.

[18] It is interesting to note that Adams did not act solely on the basis of Murray's note, nor did he act without the knowledge of his own cabinet. When the Federalists later had reason to cry that Adams had betrayed them, they overlooked the fact that Adams had consulted with his Cabinet as to the proper course of action, without being completely specific as to the exact course he planned to follow.

[19] American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 239.

of Murray and it was only natural that he should be nominated to complete the exchanges with which he had been closely associated. Adams said that Murray was a "gentleman of talents, address, and literature, as well as of great worth and honor, every way well qualified for the service, and fully adequate to all that I should require of him".[20] To those who would have preferred Rufus King, a group which included King himself,[21] Adams pointed out that Murray was closer to Paris, and that King was serving as the United States minister to England, a country at war with France.[22]

The announcement of a new mission to France led to bitter protests from the members of the Federalist party who realized that peace with France would end their hopes for continued political dominance. Although the leading men in the party had been aware of the more lenient attitude of France toward the United States, the nomination of Murray led many Federalists to claim that they had had no indication that the President was planning a renewal of the negotiations. The Hamiltonian faction of the Federalists supposed all such efforts had been suspended by the failure of the XYZ mission.

---

[20] C. F. Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, IX, 249.

[21] Charles King (ed.), The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, 6 volumes. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896-1900), III, 31.

[22] C. F. Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, IX, 249.

Leading men of both parties had much to say about the nomination. There was little opposition to the selection of Murray, but considerable opposition to a new mission to a country which had so recently rebuffed attempts at peace and impugned the honor of the United States.

The most prominent citizen of the United States, former President George Washington, expressed complete surprise at a renewal of negotiations. He was shocked that the action was taken without direct assurances from France that the commissioners would be received.[23] Vice President Jefferson was no doubt gratified that Adams had seen fit to renew the peace offensive. He was amused at the Federalist chagrin over the nomination and felt that French sincerity had been completely vindicated.[24] Jefferson commented to Robert Livingston that since he was not in on the juggle, he did not know how it would be played off.[25] Adams' arch rival Alexander Hamilton was furious over the action which Adams had taken.

---

[23]John E. Fitzpatrick (ed.), The Writings of George Washington, XXXVII, 18.

[24]Jefferson to Madison, February 19, 1799, in P. L. Ford (ed.), The Works of Thomas Jefferson, 12 volumes. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904-1905), IX, 50-53.

[25]Jefferson to Livingston, February 23, 1799, Ibid., pp. 57-59.

Hamilton said that:

> Overtures, so circuitous and informal, through a person who was not the regular organ of the French government for making them, to a person who was not the regular organ of the American government for receiving them, might be a very fit mode of preparing the way for the like overtures in a more authentic and obligatory shape. Yet upon this loose and vague foundation, Mr. Adams, precipitately nominated Mr. Murray as Envoy to the French Republic without previous consultation with any of his ministers.[26]

John Jay expressed a wish that Murray could have been more reserved in his conversations with the French secretary.[27] Timothy Pickering was, of course, outraged at the action of President Adams, and the war-hungry Federalists gathered around him to plan a counter-attack on their enemies who supported the nomination of Murray.[28] Elbridge Gerry felt that John Adams sent the new mission to France as a rebuke to Timothy Pickering whose political views toward France opposed his own.[29] James McHenry was of the opinion that the new mission was the result

---

[26] Henry C. Lodge (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton, 12 volumes. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886), VI, 418-422.

[27] John Jay to Benjamin Goodhue, March 29, 1799, in Henry P. Johnston (ed.), The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay, 4 volumes. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1873), III, 440.

[28] Charles W. Upham, Life of Timothy Pickering, 3 volumes. (Boston: Little Brown, and Company, 1873), III, 440.

[29] Elbridge Gerry to Jefferson, January 20, 1801, in W. C. Ford (ed.), Some Letters of Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, 1784-1804. (Brooklyn, New York: Historical Printing Club, 1896), p. 18.

of Murray's "coaxing and wheedling for another experiment".[30] Albert Gallatin commented to his wife that "Murray, I guess, wanted to make himself a greater man than he is by going to France".[31] Stephen Higginson felt that Adams' decision to send another mission to the "French tygars" was "an act of feeling, of passion, and not of judgment".[32]

The uproar which resulted from the nomination of Murray seemed to herald the end of the Federalist strangle hold on political affairs in the United States. The resulting dissension eventually wrecked the cabinet of Adams, led to an open break with Hamilton, and contributed materially to the defeat of the party in 1800. By reopening negotiations, Adams had completely stripped the Federalists of any feasible platform. They persisted in planning for war with France, building ships and equipping soldiers. But Talleyrand's pen, guided in part by Murray, had defeated their plans.[33]

---

[30] James McHenry to Pickering, February 23, 1811, in H. C. Lodge, Life and Letters of George Cabot (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1878), p. 205.

[31] Albert Gallatin to his wife, March 1, 1799, in Henry Adams, Life of Albert Gallatin (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1879), pp. 227-228.

[32] Stephen Higginson to Pickering, March 3, 1799, in "Letters of Stephen Higginson", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1896. (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1897), I, 819-820.

[33] While this cannot be docemented positively, it is evident from the correspondence of Murray, that much of what was embodied in Talleyrand's letter of September 28, 1798, was taken verbatim from letters which Murray had written to Pichon.

There was little doubt from the beginning that the nomination of Murray would be defeated by the Senate unless the mission was modified in some manner. When the initial shock had passed, the Federalists named a committee of five to meet with Adams in an effort to persuade him to change his course of action.[34] This group urged the President to name at least two other men to the commission. Adams, who felt from his own experience that one man could do a better job, finally relented when he realized that the only alternative would be a Senate refusal to accept Murray.[35] Therefore, on February 25, 1799, he sent to the Senate the names of two additional men to serve with Murray as commissioners. Adams stipulated that the envoys were not to leave until full assurance had been received from the French government that they would be received.[36]

Adams chose men of proven party loyalty, Patrick Henry of Virginia, and Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut. Henry, a former revolutionary turned conservative, now old and in poor health, refused to undertake the mission.[37] As a substitute,

---

[34]This committe consisted of Theodore Sedgwick of Massachusetts, Richard Stockton of New Jersey, Jacob Read of South Carolina, and William Bingham and James Ross from Pennsylvania.

[35]C. F. Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, IX, 249-250.

[36]American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 240.

[37]Ibid., 241.

the President named William Richardon Davie, Governor of North Carolina. Davie had long been active in the political affairs of the North Carolina Federalists.[38] Oliver Ellsworth, Chief Justice of the United States, the other commissioner, was a widely respected Federalist spokesman. Both he and Davie were mildly opposed to the mission to France. Davie said that though the "appointment as envoy is highly favorable to me, the unknown situation of the government to which we are addressed casts the reputation of those concerned in it entirely upon chance".[39] Pickering hoped to use Ellsworth to influence the President against the mission but evidently the Chief Justice refused to co-operate.[40] Later Pickering confessed to Cabot that although he had thought of urging Ellsworth to refuse to go to France, the alternative would probably have been the appointment of Burr or Madison in his place.[41]

---

[38] J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, William Richardson Davie: a Memoir (James Sprunt Studies, No. 7, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1907), p. 18.

[39] Davie to James Iredell, September 18, 1799, in Grifith J. McRee, Life and Correspondence of James Iredell, 2 volumes. (New York: Peter Smith, 1949), II, 534.

[40] Pickering to George Cabot, in H. C. Lodge, Life and Letters of George Cabot (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1878) p. 237.

[41] Pickering to George Cabot, October 22, 1799, Ibid., p. 248.

The Federalists, who were surprised when Adams added two names to the commission, were not willing to let the envoys leave for France without further attempts to block the President's plans. Pickering, in his letter of commission to Murray on March 6, 1799, ordered him to have no further conversations with the French government.[42] Talleyrand, on May 5, 1799, sent Murray assurances that the envoys would be received in accordance with Adams' request for concrete proof of French intentions.[43] Murray then informed Pickering that the assurances had been received, but the latter delayed until Adams ordered Ellsworth and Davie to leave for France.[44]

Ellsworth and Davie reached Newport, Rhode Island, on the last day of October, 1799.[45] At twelve o'clock on November 3, 1799, they sailed aboard the ship of war United States on their way to France.[46] On November 27, the envoys reached Lisbon, Portugal. Because of the changes which had occurred in the French government with the overthrow of the Directory earlier in the month, the commissioners decided to sail to

---

[42] American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 243.

[43] Ibid.

[44] C. F. Adams (ed.), Works of John Adams, IX, 255.

[45] Envoys to Pickering, November 1, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, IV, 346.

[46] Gibbs and Channing, Navy Agents, Newport, Rhode Island, to Benjamin Stoddert, November 3, 1799, in Knox, (ed.), Naval Documents, IV, 500.

Holland in order to confer with Murray.[47] They sailed from the Tagus River, where they had been anchored, in an effort to reach some port in Holland.[48] The extremely rough seas in the Bay of Biscay made a planned landing at L'Orient, a port in the French province of Brittany, impossible, so on January 21, 1800, they landed at Corunna, a small village on the northwest coast of Spain.[49]

While Davie and Ellsworth had been enduring the uncertainties of an ocean voyage through stormy weather, Murray had been preparing to leave the Hague. News that the other envoys had landed reached him late in January, when he received a letter from Talleyrand enclosing his passport.[50] Murray had been busy packing his furniture, books, and personal papers,[51] and as soon as he received his passport from Talleyrand, he asked for an audience with Maarten van der Goes, Minister of Exterior Relations of the Batavian Republic in

---

[47] Envoys to Pickering, December 7, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, IV, 500.

[48] Thomas Bulkeley, U.S. Consul, Lisbon, Portugal, to Captain John Barry, U.S.N., December 18, 1799, in Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, IV, 553-554.

[49] Envoys to Pickering, February 10, 1800, In Knox (ed.), Naval Documents, V, 205-206.

[50] Talleyrand to Murray, January 30, 1800, in American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 308.

[51] Murray to J. Q. Adams, February 14, 1800, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 641-642.

Talleyrand asking for an official audience. In a reply issued the same day, Talleyrand informed the Americans that they would be received at 12:30 p. m. on the following day.[55] At this conference it was decided that the envoys would meet with Napoleon Bonaparte, First Consul of France, on March 17, in the Hall of Ambassadors in the Tuileries.[56] Following this meeting, several delays took place. Joseph Bonaparte, brother of the First Consul and a member of the French commissioners, was ill for some time, postponing the opening of negotiations.[57] The original instructions of the French commissioners, who included besides Bonaparte, Charles Pierre Claret Fleurieu, and Pierre Louis Roederer, suggested negotiations on "the differences raised between the two states".[58] This was not suitable to the American ministers who wished to conclude a treaty, so on April 5, Napoleon Bonaparte issued a decree which enabled his ministers to treat "everything which touches these differences as well as to sign and conclude, in the name of the Republic, everything which appears necessary to the perfect re-establishment of good relations".[59] During April

---

[55] American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 309.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid., p. 310.

[58] E. Wilson Lyons, "The Franco-American Convention of 1800", Journal of Modern History, XXI, (1940), p. 312.

[59] Ibid.

order to request a temporary leave from his duties.[52] This audience was on February 14, and three days later Murray and his wife set out for Paris. Owing to severe weather conditions and a short illness of his wife, they did not reach Paris until March 1, 1800. On the following day, Davie and Ellsworth joined them in the "City of Light".

The commissioners were anxious to begin their work as soon as possible. Ellsworth and Davie had spent much more time than they had expected in reaching Paris. Officials in the United States did not expect the negotiations to require much time because early in April, Pickering dispatched the ship Portsmouth, to Havre de Grace in order to await the envoys' return trip to the United States. Pickering's order aroused interest among several "republicans" who speculated over the purpose of the voyage.[53] Fortunately, Pickering had included instructions to send the ship back to the United States in case the conferences were not completed when it arrived.[54]

From the beginning, however, it appeared that the negotiations would not be expedited as quickly as had been hoped. On March 3, 1800, the commissioners sent a note to

---

[52] Murray to Van der Goes, February 10, 1800 in American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 309.

[53] Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Mann Randolph, April 4, 1800, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Seventh Series, I, (1900), 74.

[54] Pickering to Envoys, April 9, 1800, in Knox, Naval Documents, V, 399.

and May, negotiations were at a standstill because Talleyrand was ill and because the First Consul was absent from Paris. On May 17, the envoys reported to Pickering that the success of their mission was still very much in doubt.[60] This feeling of doubt became even more evident during June and July as the commissioners spent days in discussions which resulted in an open rupture on September 12, 1800.[61] This break came over the refusal of Joseph Bonaparte to accept any modifications of the treaty of 1778 and at the same time allow indemnities to American citizens for losses sustained at the hands of French vessels and agents.[62] The American commissioners, who anxiously hoped to conclude some type of agreement with France, then proposed a temporary settlement that would restore normal political and commercial relations between the two countries. The French accepted this proposal after some discussion over the name of the document. The Americans steadfastly refused to consent to any title except that of convention. The document, prepared in French and English, was signed on October 1, 1800, at the Maison des Oiseaux, Rue de Sevres, the lodging of Davie and Ellsworth.[63] The celebration of the signing took

---

[60] Envoys to Pickering, May 17, 1800, in American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, II, 325.

[61] Ibid., 338.

[62] E. Wilson Lyon, "The Franco-American Convention of 1800", Journal of Modern History, XII, (1940), 305-333.

[63] Ibid., p. 325.

place the same evening at Mortfontaine, the country estate of Joseph Bonaparte.[64] At the fete held there Talleyrand praised the convention as a "monument of justice, liberality, and commonsense".[65]

Talleyrand's characterization of the convention was quite accurate. The convention suspended the operation of previous treaties between the two countries and allowed the question of indemnities to remain open until such time as the countries would be able to resume discussions with "less embarrassment".[66] It also provided for the restoration of naval vessels captured by either country, arranged for payment of debts due in each country, called for a continuation of the doctrine of "free ships, free goods", and furthered the doctrine of free convoys.[67] It embodied much more than either country had expected it to, and it generally conformed to

---

[64] This fete was written up in detail by Murray and portions of his notes relating to it were published by the American Antiquarian Society in their Proceedings, XII, (1899), 240-260.

[65] E. Wilson Lyons, "The Franco-American Convention of 1800", Journal of Modern History, XII, (1940), 326.

[66] Ralston Hayden, The Senate and Treaties, 1789-1817. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1920), p. 117.

[67] E. Wilson Lyons, "The Franco-American Convention of 1800", Journal of Modern History, XII, (1940), 324-325.

Pickering's original instructions.[68] It did not settle, however, two important questions. It failed to provide for abrogation of the earlier treaties, and did not offer any solution to the problem of indemnities.

The signing of the convention on September 30, 1800, did not mark the end of the work for the American envoys, although Davie and Ellsworth left Paris soon after the gala fete of Mortfontaine. The details of the convention reached the United States on November 8, 1800,[69] and opposition from the Hamiltonian faction of the party began to develop almost immediately.

This opposition and dissension were not the first to affect the treaty. Contrary to the generally accepted opinion concerning the relations among the American envoys, co-operation was not the watchword of their relationship while in Paris. Ellsworth and Davie viewed Murray, as chief of the commission, with a jaundiced eye. They had not been too anxious to undertake such a mission and then association with Murray, whom many Federalists felt had betrayed the party, was not conducive to close co-operation. Murray, for his part, was young, not nearly as well known as either Ellsworth and Davie, and he was undoubtedly awed by the enormity of the undertaking for which

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Murray, "Green" book, p. 174, in the Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

he was responsible.[70] Murray confessed in his diary that Ellsworth and Davie "were men of sense but somewhat rude and raw. They thought lightly of me clearly, and I had too much pride to please them". He believed "they were ignorant of the world, its manners, and were too conceited, particularly Davie, to borrow any ideas from me. As to Mr. Ellsworth, he thought of little but the logic of the point, as if logic had anything to do in the courts of Europe".[71]

With personal differences left behind in Paris, and with the Convention dispute in the United States removed by several thousand miles, Murray and his wife were happy to return to the Hague on October 26, 1800.[72] Their stay in Paris had been marked by pleasant moments such as the week spent at Versailles in June,[73] but generally it was, as Murray described it, "a voyage through fog, with the port reached at last".[74] The Murrays had given up their lodgings and sold

---

[70] Murray to John Quincy Adams, February 17, 1800, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters:, p. 643.

[71] Murray, "Green" book, p. 178, in the Murray Papers, Library of Congress. There is no indication of a date on these comments.

[72] Murray to John Quincy Adams, November 7, 1800, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 660.

[73] Murray, "Green" book, p. 141, in the Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[74] Murray to John Quincy Adams, November 7, 1800, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 659.

their furniture when they left for Paris because he feared that it might be necessary for him to leave the country if negotiations failed. So upon their return to the Hague, they took up temporary lodgings which served them until they left for the United States in the fall of 1801.

Meanwhile the Convention had continued to receive a cold reception in the United States. First submitted to the Senate by Adams on December 16, it had been refused. Davie did not reach the country until December 1800, and Ellsworth, suffering from a combination of the gout and the gravel, spent the winter in England.[75] Murray felt that the treaty would have been better received if Ellsworth had been in the United States to defend it from attack. This was also the opinion of Pichon, who, for services well rendered, had received the post of consul-general in the United States, succeeding the aged Letombe.[76] John Adams, with remarkable courage, again submitted the treaty to the Senate on February 3, 1801, and this time the treaty was given conditional acceptance.[77] Pichon urged his own government to accept the

---

[75] Murray to John Quincy Adams, November 18, 1800, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 662.

[76] E. Wilson Lyons, "The Franco-American Convention of 1800", Journal of Modern History, XII, (1940), 330.

[77] The Convention was limited to eight years duration by the Senate and the second article which dealt with further negotiations on the questions of indemnities, the treaty of 1778 and the Convention of 1788, was not approved.

changes which had been made by the Senate before the situation between the two countries returned to its previous state. This was the stalemate when the Federalists and John Adams left office in 1801.

The advent of the pro-French Thomas Jefferson to the presidency was an auspicious day for Franco-American relations. The two countries reopened diplomatic relations with the appointment of Robert Livingston as minister to France. Late in May 1801, Murray received word that he, or Oliver Ellsworth who was still in England, was to proceed to Paris in order to exchange ratifications with the French government.[78]

Murray, being the closest to Paris, immediately set out for the French capital in order to finish the negotiations. On June 8, 1801, he reopened talks with the French commissioners. The French did not like the conditional ratification of the original convention.[79] Again delays resulted because Talleyrand was still in bad health and both of the Bonapartes were away from Paris. Finally in July, with no other course remaining for either the French or the Americans, the French agreed to conditional ratification on July 31, 1801.[80]

---

[78] Murray to John Quincy Adams, Mary 16, 1801, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 697.

[79] American State Papers, Class I, Foreign Relations, VI, 137-141.

[80] Hunter Miller (ed.), Treaties, II, 482.

As signed by the French on July 31, and as finally ratified by the Senate of the United States on December 19, the Convention was limited in duration to eight years and the second article was expunged. It was this article, relating to indemnities and the previous treaties which had been the heart of earlier American claims, but the French government was unyielding on either point. In any case, the Convention should not be viewed as a failure. It rescued the United States from its first "entangling alliance" and prevented a war which might have proved disastrous to the young republic.

With normal relations restored between France and the United States, the government under Thomas Jefferson lost no time in removing Murray from the diplomatic scene. In a letter dated June 1, 1801, the government recalled Murray from his post at the Hague. In a remarkably self-controlled letter of reply, Murray told the Secretary of State, James Madison that he would vacate his post as soon as he concluded his business in Paris. Murray did not let the occasion pass, however, without pointing out the value of maintaining diplomatic representatives in the smaller European countries. He also expressed dismay at the fact that the French government knew of his recall before he did himself.[81] As soon as Murray had

---

[81] Murray to James Madison, July 7, 1801, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

exchanged ratifications he left for the Hague to finish out his term which lasted until September 1, 1801.

Leaving the Hague after four years of service was extremely difficult for Murray to do.[82] He and his wife had made many friends while stationed there, and after their return from Paris on August 19, 1801, they spent several days paying farewell visits to their numerous acquaintances. Charlotte Murray dreaded the long voyage which they faced, and her illness early in September threatened to postpone their departure, scheduled for September 12.[83] They went from the Hague to Rotterdam, thence to Gravsdal, near Dort.[84] Late in the afternoon of September 15, the Murrays sailed for the United States with forty-five pieces of luggage, a dog, and Charlotte Murray's pet canary.[85] Eleven weeks later, on December 2, 1801, after an unscheduled stop at Falmouth, England, because of adverse weather conditions, the Murrays

---

[82] To some people on the other side of the Atlantic, it was difficult not to be pleased at Murray's distress. One of these was his old enemy William Branch Giles who ardently favored abolition of the diplomatic missions overseas. See D. R. Anderson, William Branch Giles: A Study in the Politics of Virginia and the Nation from 1790 to 1830. (Menasha: Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1914), p. 80.

[83] Murray, "Green" book, p. 46, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[84] Ibid., p. 48.

[85] Ibid., p. 199.

reached Alexandria, Virginia. The step from boat to shore ended the dedicated service of the Marylander to his country and marked the beginning of his political oblivion.

CHAPTER V

December 2, 1801, was a turning point in the life of William Vans Murray. He had returned from the bustling cities of Europe to a quiet village on Maryland's Eastern Shore, well aware of the changes which would be necessary in his way of life.[1] There is no doubt that he was apprehensive of making such drastic changes, but he also looked forward to his retirement which had been postponed for over five years. These five years had been the busiest ones of his life.

Upon his return to the United States, the only official business which occupied Murray was the settlement of his compensation as envoy to France. It was his opinion that he was entitled to a sum equal to that paid to Ellsworth and Davie. He visited the new Federal City which had come into existence during his absence and dined with Secretary of State Madison and President Jefferson. He felt gratified that Madison was so cordial. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin was responsible for settling Murray's account.[2] This was accomplished without difficulty, but Gallatin did fail to return a social call made by the former envoy.[3] Murray

---

[1] Murray, "Green" book, p. 185, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[2] Murray to J. Q. Adams, April 3, 1802, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", pp. 703-704.

[3] Ibid.

was considerably irked at the high handed manner of the Republicans now that they were in control of the political machinery of the country.[4]

It was fortunate for the newly retired diplomat that the winter of 1802 was a mild one.[5] His paternal home had burned in his absence so he faced the task of building a small cottage for himself and his wife. With this in mind, on April 19, 1802, he purchased a small farm of eighty acres from the widow of William Dorrington Glover.[6] He spent much time planting fruit trees and trying to make the rather barren land more fertile. He was greatly discouraged by the thriving weed crop which thwarted all his cultivation plans.[7]

Politics still interested Murray, as might be expected, but he made no effort to resume activities in that field. According to him, most of the gentlemen of Dorchester County were Federalists. However, he was greatly shocked and chagrined by the number of Republicans in the vicinity.

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Murray, "Green" book, p. 210, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

[7] Murray to J. Q. Adams, April 3, 1802, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 704.

There had been only ten or so when he left for Europe and he found well over one hundred when he returned in 1801. To make certain that he did not become overly interested in politics, he discontinued reading newspapers. It was his opinion that he had devoted enough time to political affairs and that a much needed rest was in order.[8]

Having built a small home which had four rooms and a kitchen, Murray and his wife settled down to enjoy their retirement. Unfortunately, he did not live long enough to enjoy fully his sedentary existence. He had not been well in the spring of 1801 when he went to Paris to exchange the final ratifications, and the extended ocean voyage of eleven weeks returning to the United States did not aid in his recovery.[9] In August 1802, he became quite ill from an unidentified ailment, and not until November 1803, was he able to resume his customary activities on a limited scale.[10] In October 1803, he had made an attempt to visit John Quincy Adams when the latter stopped in Baltimore en route from

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Murray to J. Q. Adams, February 28, 1801, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 685.

[10] Murray to J. Q. Adams, November 10, 1803, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 708.

Boston to Washington,[11] but regrettably the old friends did not meet. The last chance for Murray to see one of his closest friends had passed.

In December 1803, several of the newspapers in the United States carried the following short notice.

> Departed this life, on Sunday 11th inst. at his seat in Dorchester County, (Maryland) after a short illness, William Vans Murray, Esq. late minister from the United States at the Hague, and minister plenipotentiary to the French republic. As a statesman, Mr. Murray stood high, and filled with integrity the several departments which his country had confided to his trust; particularly in bringing about the settlement of the late unhappy, difference that existed between the United States and the French republic.[12]

Thus the press of the United States passed over the death of Murray. A proper eulogy was not undertaken until his old friend, John Quincy Adams, wrote one which appeared in the Portfolio, a Philadelphia magazine, some months after Murray had died.[13]

---

[11] Samuel Flagg Bemis, John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1949), p. 119.

[12] Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, December 17, 1803; Maryland Gazette, December 22, 1803; Washington National Intelligencer, December 21, 1803.

[13] This eulogy by Adams, taken from the Portfolio of January 7, 1804 and reprinted in the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1912, is a remarkable tribute when one considers the achievements of the Adams family. John Quincy Adams obviously had the highest regard for Murray and he expressed in beautiful prose the tribute to his loyal friend and fellow diplomat.

Murray was buried in an unmarked grave in an unknown location.[14] Shortly after his death, his wife is supposed to have sold the farm and returned to England to live with her relatives.[15]

---

[14]The various opinions concerning Murray's burial place are interesting. Clement Sulivane is of the opinion that Murray died in Philadelphia while on a business trip. The only substantiation for this assumption is based on the fact that a Philadelphia newspaper carried the first account of his death. The same account was carried in papers in Washington and Annapolis, but each of these articles appeared at later dates than the one in the Philadelphia paper. However, this cannot, in any case, be considered conclusive evidence that he died in Philadelphia. There is the possibility that Sulivane possessed information now lost, but this again is merely conjecture, as he gives no factual evidence in his article. The most probable burial place is in Christ Protestant Episcopal Church Cemetery in Cambridge, Maryland, where several members of his family are buried, as noted in Guy Steele (comp.), Historical Records of Christ Protestant Episcopal Church Cemetery, Cambridge, Maryland. This was done under the auspices of the Dorset Chapter, Maryland State Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1936. In a letter of November 20, 1956, to the author, the research committee of the Dorchester County Historical Society suggested that Murray might have been buried at "Glasgow", the family estate. If the exact location of Murray's burial place eludes us, we do have a description of a proposed monument to his memory. A letter from James McHenry to Robert Gilmor in December, 1803, tells of plans to erect a suitable marble obelisk at a sum not to exceed two hundred dollars. In this letter, which is in the Maryland Historical Society, McHenry tells that even the sum of two hundred dollars will be a great sacrifice for the widow, so one may assume that Murray did not leave a very sizable estate.

[15]Charles J. Ingersoll, Recollections Historical, Political, Biographical and Social, of Charles J. Ingersoll, 2 volumes (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1861), I, 83.

Thus Murray's life came to a quiet end. He had lived only two years after his return from the tumultuous days in Europe before he died, but it is doubtful if the comforting words of his friend John Quincy Adams, had been of much consolation. Shortly before Murray left the Hague, his fellow diplomat in Berlin had counseled him "to keep your mind calm and depend upon it that time will not only insure justification but due applause to you".[16] The applause had not come, but, even in 1803, the justification was evident. It was, perhaps, all Murray could have desired.

In retrospect one sees three principal aspects of the life of William Vans Murray. The first and most important of these is Murray, the man. Possessing an excellent education, he used his abilities with consistent application. His wide ranging scope of interests is especially enlightening in this day of intense specialization. He was widely read in art, history, and philosophy. He was an ardent collector of books, but he did not collect merely for the sake of collecting.[17] He and John Quincy Adams often exchanged

---

[16] J. Q. Adams to Murray, March 17, 1801, in Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, II, 515.

[17] Murray to J. Q. Adams, December 7, 1798, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 382.

information on book sales in Berlin and the Hague,[18] and their letters are filled with references to books which they had read. Murray owned such books as D'Alembert's Eloges des Membres d'L'Academie, Marie-Alexandre Lenoir's Description Historique and Chronologique des Monuments de Sculpture Francais, Friedrich Gentz's Origin and Principles of the American Revolution, Compared with the French Revolution, Lombard's Dix Huit Brumaire, Sir Joshua Reynolds' Discourses, and Dodsley's Annual Register from 1759 to 1792.[19]

Murray could not be considered a scientist, but he was deeply interested in matters pertaining to science. He owned a famous Levebours telescope, several concave mirrors, a solar microscope and an "electrical machine".[20] His inquiring mind led him to such diverse interests as submarines and electric eels. In his "Green" book, Murray wrote paragraphs concerning each of these things.[21] He was also interested in the practical aspects of scientific devices such as the widely used windmills of Holland. He thought these could be used to drain swamps in the United States such as

---

[19] The ownership of these books, along with many others, is indicated in Murray's letters to John Quincy Adams.

[20] Murray to J. Q. Adams, April 3, 1802, in Ford (ed.), "Murray Letters", p. 706.

[21] Murray, "Green" book, p. 103, Murray Papers, Library of Congress. It is interesting to note that Murray believed that the Dutch first planned to use submarines in 1652 to burn and destroy the English fleet according to information in Herroui's Histoire Abreye de la Holland.

the Dismal Swamp in Virginia. This belief led him to send four models of windmills to people in the United States, including his brother John Murray and General C. C. Pinckney.[22] These represent only a few examples of the catholic taste of the gentleman from Maryland.

The second major point of interest in the life of Murray was his career as a public servant. As a legislator with both state and national service, he was constantly aware of the politician's responsibility to his constituents. This was especially true when he was in the House of Representatives. His earlier concern in his own rapid advancement seemed to disappear as he matured, and he began to view legislation in the light of the benefit to be derived from it by the country as a whole. He was definitely in favor of adhering to the Constitution as far as possible but when that document failed to outline fully certain policy moves, Murray was equally quick to act in a manner which he considered most profitable to the country. As a diplomat Murray realized fully the burdens of his post, not only from a personal standpoint but also from the viewpoint of the nation he served. To him it was of utmost importance that a country as young as the United States should have able representatives abroad.

---

[22] Murray to Sylvanus Bourne, February 12, 1800, Murray Papers, Miscellaneous Accessions, Library of Congress.

His awareness of the impressionability of the courts of Europe enabled him to see clearly the fallacy of Jefferson's plan to recall the foreign agents in 1801.[23] He knew that the young country he represented was being judged largely on the basis of actions which he, or persons in similar positions might take. As a member of the diplomatic corps, Murray showed ability and, in general, was a clear thinker. Only rarely did he allow his passions to overrule his reason. He was a careful analyst of each situation which arose, and if some of his private letters indicated a lack of self confidence, his public actions did not. He was especially popular among the people with whom he associated in the Batavian Republic. Among the French he demonstrated clearly how to deal with them without appearing to be a compromiser, as Elbridge Gerry had been. The daily accomplishment of the small tasks which make up the main part of a diplomat's life were not Murray's only contributions as a public servant. He served ably as a source of European information which had value in America, and as a disseminator of American information useful among various United States citizens in Europe. It was his close knowledge of internal affairs in the United States which enabled him to act with decisiveness in many instances. It seems very unlikely that Murray would have

---

[23] Murray, "Green" book, pp. 187-188, Murray Papers, Library of Congress.

talked to Pichon with such freedom in the summer of 1798, if he had not known of the private attitude of John Adams toward France. In short, Murray as a public servant attempted to use his knowledge in order to bring the greatest possible benefit to his country. Such action, taken without regard for personal considerations, was to be his downfall.

Political martyrdom was the real tragedy which marred the life of William Vans Murray. This drama, played in the closing years of his life, showed clearly his true worth as a man and a public servant. As a trusted friend and political protegé of John Adams, Murray found himself closely connected with the feud which wrecked Adams' cabinet in the latter days of his administration. Murray's nomination as envoy to France gave the Hamiltonian faction the political capital which they desired. From the day his name was sent to the Senate in February 1799, he was a marked man. The fact that he carried out his duties as an American citizen, regardless of consequences, is irrefutable evidence of his high principles. In obtaining peace, Murray, like John Adams, wrote the final chapter on his career in public life. Peace for the country which he served so ably brought sufficient gratification for his sacrifice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES.

A. Manuscript Collections

William Vans Murray Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. The papers include letters written from the Hague and Paris on diplomatic and political affairs; the volumes consist of diary notes: the first, dated from June 16, 1797, to April 9, 1799, kept at the Hague, a second, which is entitled "Some remarks on the Stages of Our Negotiations at Paris, 1800, by Mr. Murray at the Time", from April 9 to October 7, 1800, and the third, which begins October 3, 1800, with a description of a fete which was given by Joseph Bonaparte at his Chateau of Morfontaine and continues to October 24, when he returned to the Hague, then begins again on March 18, 1801, and continues to August 14, 1801.

William Vans Murray Papers. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland. This collection, though small is valuable for the information concerning his early life. It consists primarily of a series of letters written by Murray to his cousin, Henry Maynadier. Also included are a few letters to Murray from some of his constituents concerning matters of patronage. A manuscript copy of Murray's "Political Sketches" completes the collection.

James McHenry Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. This collection contains much of the correspondence which took place between Murray and McHenry. The letters throw considerable light on the political and diplomatic events of the Federalist period. Also included are photocopies of several letters which are in the Morgan Library, New York City. These were also between Murray and McHenry.

Elbridge Gerry Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. This collection contains several letters exchanged by Murray and Gerry while the former was Minister to the Batavian Republic. Their special significance is in the information they contain relative to Murray's role in the XYZ affair, and his opinions of Gerry's actions while in France.

Tucker-Coleman Collection. Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia. This collection, which has many Jefferson items, contains two letters written by Murray to Jefferson in 1793, relative to a British prize ship which was brought into Oxford, Maryland, a part of Murray's congressional district.

B. Official Documents.

American State Papers. Documents Legislative, and Executive, of the Congress of the United States, 38 volumes. Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1832-1861.

Annie Walker Burns (comp.), Abstracts from Dorchester Parish Records, Dorchester County, Maryland. Annapolis: The Author, 1939.

Clarence Edwin Carter (ed), Territorial Papers of the United States, 21 volumes. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1934-

Complete List of Court House Records, Dorchester County, Maryland. (Mimeographed) Washington: D. A. R. Library, 1935.

Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate of the United States. Fourth Congress, Second Session. Washington: 1828.

Marriage References Circuit Court, Dorchester County, Maryland, 1780-1867. Original Records in Cambridge, Maryland.

Hunter Miller (ed.), Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America, 8 volumes. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1931-1947.

James D. Richardson (comp.), Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 20 volumes. New York, Bureau of National Literature, Inc., 1897.

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Seventh Report, Part II. London: Printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1879.

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Twelfth Report, Part VIII. London: Printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1891.

State Papers and Public Documents of the United States from the Accession of George Washington to the Presidency, 10 volumes. Boston: T. B. Waits and Son, 1817.

Guy Steele (comp.), Historical Records of the Christ Protestant Episcopal Cemetery, Cambridge, Maryland. Cambridge: Dorset Chapter, Maryland State Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1936.

Votes and Proceedings of the Maryland House of Delegates. November Session, 1788; November Session, 1789; November Session, 1790. Annapolis: 1777-

C. Newspapers.

Philadelphia: Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, 1803.

Washington: National Intelligencer, 1803.

Annapolis: Maryland Gazette, 1803.

D. Works by William Vans Murray.

Political Sketches, Inscribed to His Excellency John Adams ... By a citizen of the United States ... London: Printed for C. Dilly, 1787

"Vindication of Mr. Adams' Defence of the American Constitution". Appended to William Loughton Smith, The Pretensions of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency Examined and the Charges Against John Adams Refuted. Philadelphia: John Fenno, 1796.

E. Memoirs, Diaries, Journals, Correspondence, etc.

Adams, Charles Francis (ed.), Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, 12 volumes. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1874-1877.

Adams, Charles Francis (ed.), Works of John Adams, 10 volumes. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1850-1856.

Adams, John Quincy, "William Vans Murray", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1912. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1914.

Fitzpatrick, John C. (ed.), Writings of George Washington, 39 volumes. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1931-1944.

Ford, Paul Leicester (ed.), The Works of Thomas Jefferson, 12 volumes. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904-1905.

Ford, Worthington C. (ed.), "Letters of William Vans Murray", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1912. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1914.

Ford, Worthington C. (ed.), Some Letters of Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, 1784-1804. Brooklyn, New York, Historical Printing Club, 1896.

Ford, Worthington C. (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams, 7 volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913-1917.

Henry, J. Winfield (ed.), Letters and Papers of Governor John Henry of Maryland. Baltimore: George W. King Printing Company, 1904.

Johnston, Henry P. (ed.), The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1890-1893.

Keith, Alice Barnwell (ed.), "Letters of Major James Cole Mountflorence", North Carolina Historical Review, XIV, 1937.

King, Charles, The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, 6 volumes. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896-1900.

"Letters of Stephen Higginson", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1896. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1897.

Lodge, Henry Cabot (ed.), Life and Letters of George Cabot. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1878.

Lodge, Henry Cabot (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton, 12 volumes. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Mitchell, Stewart (ed.), New Letters of Abigail Adams, 1788-1801. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

II. Secondary Sources.

A. Books, Encyclopedias, etc.

Adams, Henry, Life of Albert Gallatin. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1879.

Alden, J. R., General Charles Lee. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951.

Allen, Gardner W., Our Naval War with France. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.

Ancestral Records and Portraits. A compilation from the Archives of the Colonial Dames of America. New York: Prepared under the direction of the Publications Committee by the Editorial Department of the Grafton Press, 1910.

Anderson, D. R., William Branch Giles: A Study in the Politics of Virginia and the Nation from 1790 to 1830. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1914.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg, John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1949.

Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950.

Brigham, Clarence S., History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820, 2 volumes. Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1947

Crowl, Philip A., Maryland During and After the Revolution. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1943.

Dauer, Manning, The Adams Federalists. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Fourteenth Edition, 24 volumes. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1951.

Essary, J. Frederick, Maryland in National Politics. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1932.

Gibbs, George (ed.), Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and Adams, edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott. New York: Printed for the Subscribers, 1846.

Hamilton, J. G. de Roulhac, William Richardson Davie: A Memoir. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1907.

Ingersoll, Charles J., Recollections Historical, Political, Biographical and Social, of Charles J. Ingersoll, 2 volumes. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1861.

Johnson, Allen, and Malone, Dumas (eds.), Dictionary of American Biography, 21 volumes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1937.

Jones, E. Alfred, American Members of the Inns of Court. London: Saint Catherines Press, 1924.

Jones, Elias, Revised History of Dorchester County, Maryland. Baltimore: Read-Taylor Press, 1925.

Logan, Deborah Norris, Memoirs of Dr. George Logan of Stenton. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1899.

MacKenzie, George Norbury, Colonial Families of the United States of America. Baltimore: The Seaforth Press, 1911.

McRee, Griffith J., Life and Correspondence of James Iredell, 2 volumes. New York: Peter Smith, 1949.

Martin, Kingsley, French Liberal Thought in the Eighteenth Century. London: Turnstile Press, Ltd., 1954.

Mowat, R. B., A New History of Great Britain. London: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Perkins, Bradford, The First Rapprochement. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.

Pound, Roscoe, The Lawyer from Antiquity to Modern Times. St. Paul, Minnesota: The West Publishing Company, 1953.

Smith, Ellen Hart, Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Steiner, Bernard Christian, The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry. Cleveland: Burrows Brothers, 1907.

Stephen, Leslie and Lee, Sidney (eds.), Dictionary of National Biography, 22 volumes. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922.

Thomas, Charles Marion, American Neutrality in 1793: A Study in Cabinet Government. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931.

Tinkcom, Harry M., The Republicans and Federalists in Pennsylvania, 1790-1801. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1950.

Upham, Charles W., Life of Timothy Pickering, 3 volumes. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1873.

Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson, The Golden Age of Colonial Culture. New York; New York University Press, 1949.

White, Leonard, The Federalists. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948.

B. Articles.

Adams, Brooks, "The Convention of 1800 with France", Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings, XLIV (1911)

DeConde, Alexander, "William Vans Murray's Political Sketches", Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLI, (March 1955).

Lantz, Emily Emerson, "Murray Family of Scotland and Maryland", Baltimore Sun, April 7, 14, 21, 1907.

_____, "Orrick Lineage and Arms", Baltimore Sun, February 10, March 8, 1907.

Lyons, E. Wilson, "The Franco-American Convention of 1800", Journal of Modern History, XII, (1940).

Sulivane, Clement, "A Sketch of William Vans Murray", Southern History Association Publications, V, (1901).