In response to requests from teachers and parents, the Papers celebrated Washington’s 269th birthday last February by debuting a new Educational Resources section on our website. Designed for students of various ages from elementary to high school, our four series of lesson plans focus on what we do best: examining the documentary evidence.

In three of the lesson series, students review a chronological sequence of “slides,” dealing with specific aspects of George Washington’s life and giving secondary information about the larger historical context. From each of these slides, users can link to the accompanying primary document and questions. Manuscripts like Washington’s schoolbook exercises, an address to the Senate, and his will give students the chance to examine firsthand the life and times of a leading figure in American history. In addition, we have challenged our younger users to apply basic reading comprehension, math, and geography skills as they progress through the questions. Finally, throughout the lessons we have tried to communicate just what it is that historians do by referring to the editing process along the way and giving students a chance to try their own hand at transcription and corrections.

In our fourth series, “Webquest GW,” Washington students of all ages can enjoy searching the varied primary and secondary resources on our website to answer a series of progressively more challenging questions.

All lessons link to Teacher’s Notes, which provide explanatory material for the documents and questions and connect to sites of related interest.

We invite you to take a look at www.virginia.edu/gwpapers/lesson and encourage your comments and questions. Coming soon: interactive timelines for Washington’s life!

— Lisa Moot
**George Washington’s Weather**

“Climate is what you expect, but weather is what you get.”
— American military saying

During his lifetime George Washington got his fair share of unexpected weather, much of it of the severely cold kind—from his crossing of the frozen Allegheny River in December 1753 that nearly cost him his life at the age of 21—to his crossing of the icy Delaware River in December 1776 that won him great fame at the age of 44—to his ride through a winter storm at Mount Vernon in December 1799 that may have contributed to his death at the age of 67 (see *Diaries*, 1:155-56; 6:378-79; and *Revolutionary War Series*, 7:454-61). Washington became largely inured to the effects of all sorts of weather at an early age, learning as a young surveyor and soldier to disregard almost any personal discomfort or inconvenience caused by changing weather conditions. On his journey to inspect his western lands in 1784, when he was 52 years old, Washington found himself on the evening of September 25 in a sparsely populated area near Maryland’s western border. “At the entrance of the . . . [Youghiogheny] glades,” he wrote in his diary entry for that date, “I lodged this night, with no other shelter or cover than my cloak; & was unlucky enough to have a heavy shower of Rain” (*Diaries*, 4:44). Washington steadfastly refused to let mere weather alter his personal routine or particular plans except under the most extreme conditions.

As a practicing farmer most of his adult years, however, Washington, like farmers of all times, worried a great deal about the adverse effects of weather on his crops. Freezes, floods, droughts, and storms of all kinds preoccupied him whenever he thought about his Mount Vernon fields, which he did often, even when far from home. Not surprisingly, Washington began by 1760 to make almost daily notations of weather conditions in his diaries. Like his entries about his daily activities, his weather entries usually are very brief, but some of them, such as the following ones, are of particular interest.

**The Great 1772 Snowstorm.** One of the rare weather events that significantly disrupted Washington’s daily life was the great Potomac Valley snowstorm of 1772, which confined him very unwillingly in the Mount Vernon mansion house for several days and delayed his attending the House of Burgesses session in Williamsburg by three weeks. The storm, which was one of the worst ever recorded for the Mount Vernon area, came on without much warning. “A Snow which began in the Night and was about 5 or 6 Inches deep this Morning,” Washington wrote in his diary entry for January 27, 1772, “kept constantly at it the whole day with the Wind hard & Cold from the Northward.” “The Same Snow,” he wrote the following day, “continued all last Night and all this day with equal violence the Wind being very cold and hard from the Northward—drifting the Snow into high banks.” January 29 began with a “Fine pleasant Morning without any Wind—but before 11 Oclock it clouded up & threatened Snow all the remaining part of the day—being full 3 feet deep every where already” (*Diaries*, 3:87). Apparently suffering from cabin fever and concerned about the farther reaches of his plantation, Washington on that third day of the storm rode “With much difficulty...a sf a ra st h e Mill the Snow being up to the breast of a Tall Horse everywhere” (*Diaries*, 3:85). More snow that night kept Washington at home until February 1, when he “Attempted to ride as far as the Ferry Plantation to wch. there was a Tract broke but found it so tiresome & disagreeable that I turnd back before I got half way.” After three more days at home, Washington ventured out to survey a field at his Ferry Plantation on February 5 and 6. On February 7 he “Attempted to ride to the Mill, but the Snow was so deep & crusty, even in the Tract that had been made that I chose to Tye my Horse half way & walk there” (*Diaries*, 3:89). Wash-

Washington again remained at home for three days, which apparently was his personal limit, because on February 11 he “Went out to make some further discovery of the [property] Lines of [John] West [Penelope] French & [Harrison] Manley & was much fatigued by the deepness and toughness of the Snow.” Nothing if not persistent, Washington on February 12 “Attempted to ride out again but found the Roads so disagreeable and unpleasant that I turned back before I got to the Ferry Quarter” (Diaries, 3:90). Conditions improved enough after that date to allow Washington to resume a more normal daily routine, surveying additional property and field lines and visiting a sick slave at the Mount Vernon mill, but not until February 25 did he begin his trip to attend the House of Burgesses, which had convened in Williamsburg on February 10. Washington rode only a few miles that day when he was stopped by the high waters of Accotink Creek which had been “much Swelled by the late Rains” and melting snow. Obliged to return home, Washington doggedly set out again the following day and finally reached Williamsburg on March 2 (Diaries, 3:90-91, 94).

June Snow. In his diary Washington described the weather at Mount Vernon on June 11, 1773, as “Cloudy & exceeding Cold Wind fresh from the No. West, & Snowing.” That rare occurrence is confirmed by the anonymous memorandum that is written inside the front cover of the Fairfax County court order book for 1772–74: “Be it remembered that on the eleventh day of June in the year one thousand seven hundred and seventy three It rain’d Hail’d snow’d and was very Cold” (Diaries, 3:190-91).

The Hard Winter of 1779–80. The period from about 1750 to about 1850 has been called a “Little Ice Age” because of the relative coldness of the climate during that time (see David M. Ludlum, Early American Winters, 1604–1820 [Boston, 1966], 111). Be that as it may, the winter of 1779–80, when Washington was camped with the Continental army at Morristown, N.J., was remarkably severe by any standard. Between December 28, 1779, and January 7, 1780, three major snowstorms hit the mid-Atlantic and New England states, blowing ships ashore and piling up huge drifts. Washington recorded the second and third of those storms in the weather diary that he kept for the first five months of 1780, one of only two surviving Washington diaries for the Revolutionary War period, the other one being for the 1781 Yorktown campaign. The roads around Morristown were already blocked with snow on January 6, 1780, when the third storm began there. “Snowing & Sunshine alternately,” Washington wrote in his entry for that date. “Night very stormy. The Snow which in general is Eighteen Inches deep, is much drifted—roads almost impassable” (Diaries, 3:342). Washington may have been measuring only the newly fallen snow, because observers in other places reported much greater total accumulations on the level (see Ludlum, Early American Winters, 114). It was the drifted snow, however, that caused serious problems for Washington’s army. Dr. James Thacher, a Continental surgeon at Morristown, said in his journal in early January that “The snow is now from four to six feet deep, which so obstructs the roads as to prevent our receiving a supply of provisions. . . . It is well known that General Washington experiences the greatest solicitude for the sufferings of his army, and is sensible that they in general conduct [themselves] with heroic patience and fortitude” (Thacher, Military Journal, 185). “The oldest people now living in this Country,” Washington wrote to Lafayette on March 18, 1780, “do not remember so hard a Winter as the one we are now emerging from. In a word, the severity of the frost exceeded anything of the kind that had ever been experienced in this climate before” (Washington Papers, Library of Congress). Washington spoke too soon, because the winter was not over yet. A general thaw had set in on February 16 when

Continued next page
Washington wrote in his diary: “Clear & quite warm in the forenoon. Snow yielding fast to the Sun. Much Water in the roads & brooks and the thick beds of Snow over which good sleighing had been were now too soft to bear and too difficult & dangerous to Horses to pass” (Diaries, 3:345). On the last day of March, however, it began snowing “generally pretty fast,” and the following day Washington noted: “The Snow which fell yesterday & last night was about 9 or 10 Inches deep upon a level.... Pretty good Sleighing in the forenoon” (Diaries, 3:349-50). Although the snow soon melted again, spring was slow to arrive, and on May 11 Washington wrote: “Clear but too cool for the Season” (Diaries, 3:353). The winter of 1779–80 at Morristown was worse than the more famous one two years earlier at Valley Forge at least in meteorological terms if not in terms of a crisis of the revolutionary spirit.

The Indoor Thermometer. Washington’s diary entry for December 7, 1785, begins rather disconcertingly: “Thermometer at 52 in the Morning & 59 at Noon—but removing it afterwards out of the room where the fire was, into the East Entry leading in to my Study, this circumstance with the encrease of the cold fell the Mercury to 42” (Diaries, 4:245). Although some of Washington’s contemporaries such as Thomas Jefferson recorded meteorological temperatures outdoors, the practice of doing so indoors, strange as it now seems, had serious scientific support in the eighteenth century. In 1723 Dr. James Jurin, secretary of the Royal Society of London, recommended that when keeping a meteorological register, one should place the thermometer “in a room which faces the north, where there is very seldom, if ever any fire in the fireplace” (Diaries, 1:xxxix). Washington’s use of that method caused his morning, noon, and sunset temperature readings at Mount Vernon to be much less varied than they would have been if taken outside, and it means that they are unfortunately of little value for studying eighteenth-century weather patterns. His readings, however, are very instructive in regard to the practical realities of domestic life in a large poorly insulated mansion heated only by open fireplaces. It is a bit sobering to remember that Washington undoubtedly was recording inside temperatures, albeit in an unheated vestibule, when he wrote on January 19, 1786, “Thermometer at 19 in the Morning—20 at Noon and 22 at Night,” and on February 5, 1788, “Mercury in the Ball of the Thermometer in the Morning, from whence it never rose the whole day, being intensely cold” (Diaries, 4:265; 5:273). The inhabitants of such a house could be kept reasonably warm during the winter months only by employing a large labor force (i.e., slaves) to cut wood and to tend the fires day and night, and fireplace etiquette was an essential social skill. Two of the “Rules of Civility” that Washington carefully copied in his youth, in fact, concern proper fireside behavior:

8th At Play and at Fire its Good manners to Give Place to the last Commer, and affect not to Speak Louder than Ordinary.

9th Spit not in the Fire, nor Stoop low before it neither Put your Hands into the Flames to warm them, nor Set your Feet upon the Fire especially if there be meat before it.

As a teenage surveyor, Washington found, however, that such etiquette did not necessarily apply in the rougher sort of frontier homes. “I have not sleep’d above three Nights or four in a bed,” Washington wrote a friend during his surveying days, “but after Walking a good deal all the Day lay down before the fire upon a Little Hay Straw Fodder or bairskin which ever is to be had with Man
Wife and Children like a Parcel of Dogs or Catts & happy’s he that gets the Birth nearest the fire” (Colonial Series, 1:44).

The 1788 Hurricane. Washington’s diary entry for July 24, 1788, reads: “Thermometer at 70 in the Morning—71 at Noon and 74 at Night—A very high No. Et. Wind all Night, which, this morning, being accompanied with Rain, became a hurricane—driving the Miniature Ship Federalist from her Moorings, and sinking her—blowing down some trees in the groves & about the houses—loosning the roots, & forcing many others to yield and dismantling most, in a greater or lesser degree of their Bows, & doing other and great mischief to the grain, grass &ca. & not a little to my Mill race. In a word it was violent and severe—more so than has happened for many years. About Noon the Wind suddenly shifted from No. Et. to So. Wt. and blew the remaining part of the day as violently from that quarter. The tide about this time rose near or quite 4 feet higher than it was ever known to do driving Boats &ca. into fields w[h]ere no tide had ever been heard of before—And must it is to be apprehended have done infinite damage on their Wharves at Alexandria—Norfolk—Baltimore &ca” (Diaries, 5:366). Newspaper accounts confirm that considerable destruction was done to all three of those ports. At Norfolk the hurricane had hit the previous evening, “tearing up large trees by the roots, removing houses, throwing down chimneys, fences, etc., and laying the greatest part of the corn level. . . . Only two ships in Hampton Roads survived the gale” (Philadelphia Independent Gazette, Aug. 8, 1788). A report from Alexandria said the storm “brought in the highest tide that was ever known in this river, and the damage done to Tobacco, Sugar, Salt, &c. in the Warehouses in this town is computed at five thousand pounds. Several inhabitants on the wharves were obliged to retire to their chambers, and some were taken out of their houses in boats” (Maryland Journal, Aug. 5, 1788). At Baltimore “The Wind . . . blew with unabated Fury, (accompanied with heavy Rain) for upwards of Twelve Hours, which occasioned a most dreadful Inundation of the Sea, that deluged all the Wharves, Stores, and low Grounds near the Bason and at Fell’s Point, producing a Scene of Devastation and Horror not to be described . . . Immense Quantities of Sugar, Rice, Salt, Dry Goods, and other valuable Merchandise were entirely ruined” (Maryland Journal, July 25, 1788).

—Philander D. Chase
ing pledged to independence, a committee consisting of James Madison, Oliver Ellsworth, and Alexander Hamilton, on 12 June 1783, delivered a report on the subject of navigation and commerce to the Continental Congress. That body then resolved, in part, that “the true interest of these [United] states requires that they should be as little as possible entangled in the politics and controversies of European nations.” Perhaps remembering this earlier resolution, Hamilton warned four years later in Federalist No. 7 that unless the several states firmly united, they might be tempted to form their own separate treaties with foreign nations. In that instance, America “would, by the operation of such jarring alliances, be gradually entangled in all the pernicious labyrinths of European politics and wars.”

As first president, Washington was conscious that he headed a newly independent and not overly powerful nation in an era dominated by the great power rivalry between Great Britain and France, and he sought, as he explained in a 9 October 1795 letter to Patrick Henry, “to comply strictly with all our engagements foreign & domestic; but to keep the U. States free from political connexions with every other Country—To see that they may be independent of all, & under the influence of none. In a word, I want an American character; that the powers of Europe may be convinced we act for ourselves and not for others—this in my judgment, is the only way to be respected abroad & happy at home” (autograph draft, Washington Papers, Library of Congress).

Given the difficulties that his administration faced in responding to the claims, offers, and threats made by Great Britain and France while establishing a national identity, it is not surprising that George Washington would treat the problem of European entanglements in his Farewell Address. Although Washington nowhere warned against “entangling alliances” in those precise words, he did express such a caution. After asserting a difference of interests among foreign nations and the United States, Washington asked, “Why . . . entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European Ambition, Rivalship, Interest, Humour or Caprice? ‘Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent Alliances, with any portion of the foreign World.” An earlier draft from May 1796 placed the words “entangle” and “alliance” in slightly closer proximity. Jefferson’s briefer turn of phrase five years later in no way contradicted Washington’s formulation.

Throughout the nineteenth century, Jefferson’s declaration “entangling alliances with none” became a shorthand reference for the foreign policy recommendations of Washington and the entire founding generation. First sporadically but then almost invariably, the words themselves and not merely the idea expressed also became attributed to Washington. Because apparently every American statesman felt obligated to wrap himself in Washington’s mantle, at least rhetorically, a few illustrative examples must suffice. In a private letter of 3 May 1826 between two future presidents, Andrew Jackson wrote to James Knox Polk in opposition to the Panama conference. Jackson opposed “a departure from that wise policy recommended by Washington ‘peace with all nations entangling alliances with none.’” In his 1849 inaugural address, Zachary Taylor observed that “we are warned by the admonitions of history and the voice of our own beloved Washington to abstain from entangling alliances with foreign nations.” In a letter of 21 February 1852, the ailing Henry Clay declined an invi-
tation to speak at a congressional banquet in honor of Washington’s birthday, although he praised the first president’s “great principles in peace and neutrality, of avoiding all entangling alliances with foreign powers.” A few weeks later on the Senate floor, William Seward, criticizing those who “quoted the Farewell Address of Washington” to oppose any foreign involvement, contended that “Washington’s policy . . . consisted in avoiding new entangling alliances and artificial ties with one of the belligerent Powers in a general European war, but it admitted of expressions, assurances, and manifestations of sympathy and of interest in behalf of nations contending for the principles of the American Revolution.”

Presidents continued to appeal to Washington’s policy with greater or lesser attention to attribution. In his inaugural address in 1857, James Buchanan declared, “To avoid entangling alliances has been a maxim of our policy ever since the days of Washington, and its wisdom no one will attempt to dispute.” Grover Cleveland in 1885 correctly quoted Jefferson to summarize “the policy of Monroe and of Washington and Jefferson—‘Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.’” William McKinley in 1897 praised “the policy of non-interference with affairs of foreign governments wisely inaugurated by Washington, keeping ourselves free from entanglement.” In all instances, “entangling alliances” became the identifying feature of Washington’s “policy,” “maxim,” or “principle.”

The conflation of Washington’s name and policy with Jefferson’s words continued in American foreign policy debates during the twentieth century. The cover of the Saturday, 12 March 1904, issue of Harper’s Weekly featured an extraordinary cartoon with nationalistic caricatures of England, France, Russia, and Japan tied in ropes variously dangling from or clinging to cliffs. The caption helpfully explained, “‘BEeware OF Entangling Alliances’—George Washington.” Two years later in the same publication, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge erroneously wrote, “It was with these facts [about France] strongly in his mind that Washington, in his farewell address, laid down so strongly the proposition that the United States should hold itself free from all ‘entangling alliances.’” The outbreak of the First World War and the subsequent debate over participation in the League of Nations multiplied appeals to George Washington’s “words.” In the July 1916 issue of the North American Review, Roland G. Usher opened an essay by asking, “Precisely what had Washington in mind when he incorporated in his Farewell Address the famous dictum about ‘entangling alliances’?” Another writer later denounced what he perceived as the misinterpretation and misuse of Washington’s address by opponents of American membership in the World Court. In the July 1931 issue of South Atlantic Quarterly, J.G. Randall ridiculed a “well-known chain of newspapers” which directly quoted Jefferson (“‘Honest friendship with all nations—Entangling alliances with none’”) but attributed the words to Washington. In more recent decades, the call against “entangling alliances” has been heard in debates concerning the role of the United States in the United Nations, the NATO alliance, and the World Trade Organization.

American statesmen and commentators throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries employed the phrase “entangling alliances” to represent a foreign policy system that the United States had deliberately avoided. Jefferson’s words summarized Washington’s policy. From there it was an easy and unsurprising error to attribute the words directly to Washington.

Washington’s final manuscript of the Farewell Address is owned by the New York Public Library. For a transcript and a digitized facsimile of the final manuscript, taken from Victor Hugo Paltsits’s Washington’s Farewell Address: In Facsimile, with Transliterations of all the Drafts of Washington, Madison, & Hamilton, Together with Their Correspondence and Other Supporting Documents (New York, 1935), see the Papers website: http://www.virginia.edu/gwpapers/farewell.

— James E. Guba & David R. Hoth

***********

...I was left to fight two Battles, in Order, if possible, to save Philadelphia, with less numbers than composed the Army of my Antagonist, whilst the World has given us at least double. This, though mortifying in some points of view, I have been obliged to encourage; because, next to being strong, it is best to be thought so by the Enemy (GW to Patrick Henry, 13 November 1777).
Volume 11 of the Revolutionary War Series contains correspondence, orders, and other documents covering one of the most militarily active periods of the war. The volume begins with Washington’s army camped about twenty miles north of Philadelphia. Deciding that British general William Howe’s army, at sea since July, was headed to South Carolina, Washington prepared to march his own forces toward the Hudson River in order to deal with Gen. John Burgoyne’s northern expedition. On 22 August, however, scouts sighted the British fleet in the Chesapeake Bay. Washington immediately put his troops into motion, and his army was at Wilmington, Delaware, when Howe’s army began landing at the head of the bay on 25 August.

While Howe’s seasick soldiers rested for a few days, Washington personally led reconnaissance parties quite close to British lines. Determined to halt Howe’s subsequent march toward Philadelphia, Washington positioned his army on Brandywine Creek in Pennsylvania, where on 11 September the Americans suffered a nearly disastrous defeat. A week later another attempt to stop the advancing British was frustrated by a fierce rainstorm that made both arms and ammunition unusable. Howe then skillfully outmaneuvered Washington by appearing to threaten the American supply depot at Reading, Pennsylvania, before turning to Philadelphia and taking possession on 26 September as Congress fled the city.

Washington still hoped to reverse Howe’s apparent victory. On 4 October, after learning that Howe had weakened his main army by detachments, Washington ordered an attack on British positions at Germantown, Pennsylvania. Washington’s complicated plan of attack, battlefield confusion, and stout British resistance combined to defeat the Americans, although Washington afterwards portrayed the battle as a near-certain victory forestalled only by fog and ill luck. No longer able to come to grips with Howe’s main army, Washington turned his attention to blocking passage of the Delaware River to prevent supplies from reaching the British in Philadelphia. Washington succeeded on 22 October, when two Rhode Island regiments at Fort Mercer, New Jersey, repulsed a Hessian attack. As the campaign neared its close, however, American hopes of recapturing Philadelphia looked dim.

— Edward G. Lengel

The Fight for Philadelphia

One of the early manned flights in North America occurred at Philadelphia during Washington’s first administration when Frenchman Jean-Pierre Blanchard (1753-1809), described as a “bold ÆRONAUT” in the 16 January 1793 issue of the Pennsylvania Gazette, “at five minutes past ten o’clock, on Wednesday morning [9 January] rose with a BALOON from the Prison Court in this city, in presence of an immense concourse of spectators there assembled on the occasion. The process of inflating the Baloon commenced about 9 o’clock.— Several cannon were fired from the dawn of day, until the moment of elevation—a band of music played during the time of inflating, and when it began to rise, the majestic sight was truly awful and interesting—the slow movement of the band added solemnity to the scene. Indeed the attention of the multitude was so ab-
sorbed, that it was a considerable time e'er silence was broke by the acclamations which succeeded.

"As soon as the clock had struck 10, every thing being punctually ready, Mr. Blanchard took a respectful leave of all the spectators, and received from the hands of the President a paper, at the same time the President spoke a few words to him, who immediately leaped into his boat, which was painted blue and spangled; the baloon was of a yellowish coloured silk, highly varnished, over which there was a strong net work—Mr. BLANCHARD was dressed in a plain blue suit, a cocked hat and white feathers. As soon as he was in the boat, he threw out some ballast, and the baloon began to ascend slowly and perpendicularly, whilst Mr. BLANCHARD waved the colours of the United States and also those of the French Republic, and flourished his hat to the thousands of citizens from every part of the country who stood gratified and astonished at his intrepidity. After a few minutes, the wind blowing from the northward and westward, the baloon rose to an immense height, and then shaped its course towards the southward and eastward. Several gentlemen rode down the Point road, but soon lost sight of it, for it moved at the rate of 20 miles an hour.

"About half after 6 o'clock the same evening, Mr. BLANCHARD returned to this city, and immediately went to pay his respects to the President of the United States.—He informed that his aerial voyage lasted forty-six minutes, in which time he ran over a space of more than 15 miles, and then descended a little to the eastward of Woodbury, in the state of New-Jersey—where he took a carriage and returned to Cooper's ferry—and was at the President's, as we have already mentioned, at half past 6 o'clock that evening." Thus ended Blanchard's forty-fifth aerial flight and his first on the North American continent.

The "paper" that Washington gave Blanchard just before his flight was an official pass in which the president recommended the balloonist "to all citizens of the United States, and others, that in his passage, descent, return or journeying elsewhere, they oppose no hindrance or molestation to the said Mr. Blanchard; And, that on the contrary, they receive and aid him with that humanity and good will, which may render honor to their country, and justiceto an individual so distinguished by his efforts to establish and advance an art, in order to make it useful to mankind in general."

The 16 January 1793 newspaper account of Blanchard's flight in the Pennsylvania Gazette can be found on the website for the Papers of George Washington at http://www.virginia.edu/gwpapers. A printed transcript of the pass that Washington issued to Blanchard on 9 January 1793 is located in the Papers of the Institute of Aerospace Sciences at the Library of Congress and will be published in volume 11 of the Presidential Series.

—Christine Sternberg Patrick

From The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, 12 September 1931.
Announcements

The Washington Papers, an NEH project for three decades, is featured on pages 8-9 of the recently published history of the endowment, Rediscovering America: Thirty-Five Years of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The book can be ordered from the U.S. Government Online Bookstore (http://bookstore.gpo.gov) or call toll-free 866-512-1800.


Editor in Chief Philander D. Chase was in Washington on March 26 and 27 for the Jefferson Day humanities advocacy events and on May 2 and 3 for the Humanities on the Hill advocacy events.

Phil Chase’s biographies of cavalry officer and congressman Theodorick Bland and politician Cuthbert Bullitt are included in volume 2 of the Dictionary of Virginia Biography, which is scheduled to be published by the Library of Virginia in the fall of 2001.

On February 3 Associate Editor Robert F. Haggard gave a talk entitled “In the Shadow of the Newburgh Conspiracy: George Washington and the Founding of the Society of the Cincinnati” at a meeting of the Sons of the American Revolution in Ivy, Virginia. He also contributed to an article on the presidencies of the Founding Fathers, slated for publication in the NHPRC newsletter, Annotation.

Assistant Editor Christine Sternberg Patrick attended the Conference on New York State History at Wells College in Aurora, New York, from June 7 to 9, during which she served as a commentator on the session “Filling in the Picture: Biographies of Eighteenth-Century New Yorkers.” On June 27 she presented a lecture on Washington and the Constitution at the George Washington Scholars Institute held at Mount Vernon.

Research Assistants Lisa Moot and James E. Guba attended the NHPRC’s Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents, popularly known as “Camp Edit,” in Madison, Wisconsin, from June 18 to 22.

Research Assistants James E. Guba and Daniel B. Smith were awarded graduate degrees at the University of Virginia’s commencement ceremonies this past May. Mr. Guba received his Ph.D. in history, and Mr. Smith received his M.A. in foreign affairs.

Please note that the Papers’ area code has changed to 434. The old area code will continue to work, however, through the end of 2001.

Volume 11 of the Revolutionary War Series (August–October 1777), edited by Philander D. Chase and Edward G. Lengel, includes documentation for the important battles of Brandywine and Germantown. It is being published in the fall of 2001.

Volume 12 of the Revolutionary War Series (October–December 1777), edited by Frank E. Grizzard, Jr., documents the latter stages of the Philadelphia campaign and the establishment of the Continental army’s winter camp at Valley Forge. It is currently being indexed and proofread and is scheduled to be published in 2002.

Volume 10 of the Presidential Series (March–August 1792), edited by Robert F. Haggard and Mark A. Mastromarino, includes the first presidential veto and the first congressional investigation. It has been delivered to the press and will be published in 2002.

Volume 11 of the Presidential Series (August 1792–January 1793), edited by Christine Sternberg Patrick, covers the developing conflict within the cabinet and Washington’s decision to accept a second term as president. It is scheduled for publication in 2002.
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********

Farewell

This summer the Washington Papers bids farewell to three very talented staff members:

Electronic Text Assistant Lisa Moot left Charlottesville in mid-July for the wilds of Montrose, Colorado. We thank Lisa for her work on the CD-ROM edition of the Papers and for launching her innovative online lesson plans.

Digital Developer Christine Madrid French gave birth to a healthy baby boy on June 21 and is now devoting herself fulltime to motherhood. We thank Chris for redesigning and fastidiously maintaining our website.

Assistant Editor Robert F. Haggard will leave the project in late August to assume the role of Associate Editor at the Thomas Jefferson Retirement Papers. We thank Robert for his years of service in research, copy editing, and volume editing.

We wish Lisa, Chris, and Robert the best of luck in all their future endeavors.

Major funding for the Papers of George Washington is provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, as well as by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, the University of Virginia, the Packard Humanities Institute, and the Norman and Lyn Lear Foundation. Your gift, regardless of size, is important to the project in enabling it to meet the matching requirements of many of its grants and to maintain its high standards of quality and productivity.

I wish to help support the continuing work of the Papers of George Washington.

Name ____________________________
Address __________________________

All individual donors will receive the project’s newsletter. Those giving at the following levels for a single calendar year will receive added benefits:

• $50 or more will be acknowledged in the newsletter and on the project’s website.
• $500 or more also will receive a future volume of The Papers signed by the editors.
• $1,000 or more also will be acknowledged in a future volume of The Papers.

I am enclosing a check for a contribution of $__________________

Make checks payable to:

The Papers of George Washington
University of Virginia, Box 400117
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4117

Your gift is tax deductible to the full extent of the law.
The Papers of George Washington at the University of Virginia was established thirty years ago under the auspices of the University and the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association to publish a complete edition of Washington’s correspondence and other writings. The published papers, now half completed, will include:

The Diaries of George Washington* (6 vols.)
The Colonial Series* (10 vols.)
The Revolutionary War Series (40 vols.)
The Confederation Series* (6 vols.)
The Presidential Series (20 vols.)
Journal of the Proceedings of the President*
The Retirement Series* (4 vols.)
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