

DOCUMENT BASED QUESTIONS

Thomas Jefferson & His World

I. **RATIONALE:**

This unit is designed to help students in higher level AP and IB classes begin to develop the skills required to deal effectively with the Document Based Questions that are part of AP and IB courses.

II. **SETTING:**

This unit is designed for use in the AP U.S. History class as well as use in the IB - History of the Americas class. Also, it might be of some use in an AP World History class during the period of the Enlightenment and Revolutions.

III. **BIG IDEA:**

The big idea of the unit is to deepen student understanding of Thomas Jefferson while helping them develop skills in the use of DBQs. This unit examines Jefferson's views on human rights, slavery, and what he meant by the phrase "pursuit of happiness." It also includes a series of documents on the impact of the Declaration of Independence across history and some documents relating to the Sally Hemings affair.

IV. **LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

At the end of this unit students should be able to analyze Jefferson's views on slavery and be able to discuss the opposing views he sets out. Students should have a stronger grasp of how Jefferson viewed human rights and an idea of the impact the Declaration of Independence has had over the last 200 or so years. Students should also be able to assess the Sally Hemings issue as it relates to Jefferson.

V. **INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES:**

- A. DBQ – Jefferson on Slavery & Race
- B. DBQ – Jefferson & Human Rights
- C. DBQ - The Meaning of "the pursuit of happiness."
- D. DBQ – The Impact of the Declaration of Independence
- E. DBQ – Sally Hemings & Thomas Jefferson

VI. **THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS:**

Each set of documents is meant to be used in a single class period or for homework. They are simply created as a resource for teachers to use and develop as they see fit. They can be used independently or together. It is important to remember that these exercises are to be used in developing DBQ skills.

Created by: William Dunnagan
Klein Oak High School – Spring, Texas
Contact: wdunnagan@kleinisd.net

DBQ – THOMAS JEFFERSON & HUMAN RIGHTS

DOCUMENT 1

Jefferson sees the rights of man as based on our innate humanity; that when Jefferson speaks of natural law, he means if every rational being would consult his own heart, he would come to the same conclusions about fundamental rights, that these are rights that are somehow inscribed in the very nature of man himself. Now, the creator, God, will have implanted this sense in humanity . . . Humans are the apex of creation: they're almost godlike in their ability to reason and to reshape the world. But our rights, our liberties are not God-granted. They're merely human.

interview, Clay Jenkinson to Ken Burns, 1997

DOCUMENT 2

. . . I too found articles which I thought objectionable. The absence of express declarations ensuring freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of the person under the uninterrupted protection the Habeas Corpus, & trial by jury in civil as well as in criminal cases excited my jealousy

Autobiography of Thomas Jefferson, 1821

DOCUMENT 3

All facts in cases . . . shall be tried by a jury upon evidence given in open court

No person hereafter coming into this country shall be held within the same in slavery under any pretext whatever.

All persons shall have full and free liberty of religious opinion; nor shall any be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious institution

Printing press shall be free, except so far as by commission of private injury cause may be given of private action.

Jefferson's, *Draft Constitution for Virginia, 1776*

DOCUMENT 4

It rests now with ourselves alone to enjoy in peace and concord the blessings of self-government, so long denied to mankind: to [show] by example the sufficiency of human reason for the care of human affairs and that the will of the majority, the Natural law of every society, is the only sure guardian of the rights of man.

Jefferson's, *Response to the Citizens of Albemarle*, 1790

DOCUMENT 5

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with solemn reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between church and State.

Jefferson letter to, *Danbury Baptist Association*, January 1, 1802

DOCUMENT 6

Whenever there are in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right. The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on. If for the encouragement of industry we allow it to be appropriated, we must take care that other employment be provided to those excluded from the appropriation.

Jefferson to Madison, "Property & Natural Right," Oct. 28, 1785

THOMAS JEFFERSON & HUMAN RIGHTS

Use the collection of documents titled “DBQ – Thomas Jefferson & Human Rights” to answer the questions below. Answer each question thoroughly and in complete sentences.

1. What are four rights of men that Jefferson identifies in this collection of documents?
2. Why is reason so important to Jefferson?
3. What did Jefferson mean by the phrase, “the sufficiency of human reason?”
4. Why does Jefferson want a “wall of separation between church and state?”
5. Do you agree with the statement, “if every rational being would consult his own heart, he would come to the same conclusions about fundamental rights.” Why?
6. How does Jefferson view the ownership of uncultivated lands?
7. What do you think Jefferson meant by “Natural rights?”

DBQ - THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

DOCUMENT 1

I think people have not reflected often enough on the meaning of that phrase. If we follow Jeffersonian clues, and look at the meaning of the words in their time, and think about the word “pursue” and its significance in Jefferson’s day, we find that it doesn’t mean exactly what we thought it meant. We must remember that we tend to think of a pursuit of happiness as something that’s chasing after happiness. But, we also use the expression “He pursues the law,” by which we mean “practices the law.” And the idea of pursuit of happiness in that day probably meant just as much the right to enjoy happiness as the right to pursue it. And there’s a difference there.

Daniel Boorstin to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 2

The phrase “pursuit of happiness” comes from John Locke; it was a widely used phrase in the eighteenth century in Enlightenment circles and it essentially means the pursuit of public happiness, the creation of a republic which enables humans to thrive. But, for Jefferson . . . it means much more than that. Nobody knows quite what Jefferson meant by it but it seems to mean a limited government that leaves you more or less alone to pursue your own ideas of destiny and fulfillment . . .

Clay Jenkinson to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 3

. . . what is basically meant is that people have to shape their lives in such a way that they can have control over pleasure and pain in their lives. And so when he’s saying that a system is denying us our pursuit of happiness, he’s saying that a system that we get more pain, more torture, more imprisonment, more illegal procedures under that system then we would get out of this other system. He worked it out . . . in a very scientific way. . . The Encyclopedists would say things like, “This town has a greater quantity of happiness because fewer communion wafers are distributed in it, which means there is less superstition so it’s more enlightened, and therefore the pursuit of happiness is more successfully carried on there.

Gary Wills to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 4

Americans constantly refer to this pursuit of happiness as the quintessential statement of Jeffersonian optimism. Jefferson meant little by the pursuit of happiness. He meant merely a quality of moral bearing, that we should live our lives, that we could live our lives in a morally consistent way. That was the pursuit of happiness, nothing more.

Andrew Burstein to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 5

I think Jefferson thought the pursuit of happiness was a rigorous discipline. It was not easy. Jefferson is so wildly misunderstood because he is widely thought to have been an optimist, and his optimism is portrayed as facile, almost fatuous. In fact, he had a dark, pessimistic side. He was interested in the ecology of liberty or the sociology of virtue. They're both fragile and perishable, he said. Remember he said democracy and self-government will work if, but only if, a certain kind of society existed.

George Will to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 6

Historians don't know exactly what Jefferson meant by happiness. For a long time, people thought he was just substituting "happiness" for Locke's "property" and that meant something that was very tangible and material and individualistic. Many of us think, however, that when Jefferson said "happiness," he meant something that was more social. It was something that was generally enjoyed by society. Not so much an individual happiness that we think of now as when we've bought something that we like or when we had a great day at the beach, we're happy then. But instead he meant a general sense of contentment in society.

Jan Lewis to Ken Burns interview, 1997

QUESTIONS: THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

1. In Document 2 describe what John Locke meant by the phrase *the pursuit of happiness*.
2. How are Document 2 and Document 4 different?
3. What did the Encyclopedists mean by *the pursuit of happiness*?
4. What is meant by the phrase, “a quality of moral bearing?”
5. Write a 200 word (1 page) answer to the question: What did Thomas Jefferson mean by the phrase *the pursuit of happiness*? Support your answer with information from the documents and your own knowledge and research.

DBQ – THE IMPACT OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

DOCUMENT 1

In the midst of a war, while forming constitutions in their own provinces, men obviously felt that the treaty and the articles were more difficult projects of practical politics, and set more useful or dangerous legal precedents, than the Declaration itself. The latter was not a legislative instrument. Its issuance was a propaganda adjunct to the act of declaring independence on July 2- and that act in turn, was just the necessary step toward the two projects men were principally wrestling with.

The Declaration had a modest objective; yet it failed to accomplish even that small object. It was an explanation, addressed to a candid world, of what had happened. It was a propaganda overture, addressed primarily to France, which the treaty was meant to follow. But we have seen that the Declaration was not read much, nor studied at all, in France. The Declaration had a loftier destiny ahead of it-but an accidental one, and one still far down the road . . .

Garry Wills, *Inventing America, Jefferson's Declaration of Independence*, 1979

DOCUMENT 2

The first source of the Christian nation concept during the nineteenth century came from the notion that the American nation and its democratic system were based on Christian principles. This notion was derived from popular belief that the first settlers had been guided to the new land by the providential hand of God which had in turn protected and nurtured the colonies in their development into a nation. These providential influences guided the Founding Fathers in creating the new government and found their way into the nation's organic documents. Thus, central to this argument was the belief that Christian principles provided the foundation for the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and for American democracy itself. Because of these origins, the state had a special obligation to promote Christian principles as a way of preserving both democratic and religious institutions.

This view of America's Christian nationhood was widely shared in varying degrees throughout the nineteenth century. . .and is even espoused today. What is so remarkable about this perspective is that it was not generally shared by the founders and their contemporaries

Steven Green, *Rhetoric and Reality of the "Christian Nation" Maxim in American Law, 1810-1920*, 1997

DOCUMENT 3

[an eminent citizen of New England] says "The Declaration of Independence is really the, full Preamble of the Constitution. It sets forth sentiments and principles; the Constitution follows it with rules and regulations. That document, at the outset, declares it to be a self-evident truth that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with all their rights; and closes with an appeal 'to the Supreme Judge of the World.'"

We are fully sensible of the value of these expressions in the Declaration. They prove that the nation then owned her allegiance to God. They vindicate her right, now strenuously denied, to acknowledge God in public documents. They show that what we propose is consistent with the spirit and example of our fathers, in the noblest passages of our history. But we must clearly distinguish between these two documents. The Declaration is not part of the written Constitution. Its value is historical rather than legal. It is a deed of the nation which has passed into history; the Constitution, as a law, is an ever-present act of the nation's will. The argument which is drawn from the silence of the Constitution concerning God and Religion against all Christian features of our government as contrary to "our political covenant," not covered by the bond, cannot be adequately met by an appeal in the Declaration of 1776.

Rev. D. McAllister, "Answers to Objections to the Religious Amendment of the United States Constitution", 1874

DOCUMENT 4

The Declaration of Independence didn't especially have any great importance in its own time

How the word [about the Declaration of Independence] went out is one story; what became of the Declaration afterward is another, more complex and of continuing significance. The Declaration was at first forgotten almost entirely, then recalled and celebrated by Jeffersonian Republicans, and later elevated into something akin to holy writ, which made it a prize worth capturing on behalf of one cause after another. The politics that attended its creation never entirely left its side, such that the Declaration of Independence, which became a powerful statement of national identity, has also been at the center of some of the most intense conflicts in American history, including that over slavery which threatened the nation itself. In the course of those controversies, the document assumed a function altogether different from that of 1776: it became not a justification of revolution, but a moral standard by which the day-today policies and practices of the nation could be judged.

Pauline Mailer, *American Scripture, Making the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776*, 1998

DOCUMENT 5

All men are created equal: they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights: among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness

This immortal statement was made in the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America in 1776. In a broader sense, this means: All the peoples on the earth are equal from birth, all the people have the right to live, to be happy and free.

Those are undeniable truths

Nevertheless, for more than eighty years, the French imperialists, abusing the standards of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, have violated our Fatherland (Vietnam) and oppressed our fellow citizens. They have acted contrary to the ideals of humanity and justice.

[A list of French abuses of Vietnam follows]

For these reasons, we, members of the Provisional Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, solemnly declare to the world that Vietnam has the right to be a free and independent country – and in fact is so already.

Ho Chi Minh, Speech given to the people of Vietnam, 1945

DOCUMENT 6

. . . in other areas of the world – especially in those areas of the world like central Europe, especially in those areas of the world like the former Soviet Union and even in China – Jefferson re-emerges as their prototypical hero. Symbols of Jefferson carried about, little replicas of the Declaration of Independence carried about by workers in Gdansk, by the people of Prague, by the dissenters in Peking. Jefferson even . . . there's little books that are passed out in the capitals of Europe and Asia, the "Blue Book of Thomas Jefferson" to sort of counter the "Red Book of Chairman Mao." So, he still remains the symbol of what is eternally powerful and convincing about liberal tradition especially in those regions of the world that have come under the influence of tyranny and...oppression. They see him as the symbol of what they want to become . . .

interview Joseph Ellis to Ken Burns, 1997

QUESTIONS: THE IMPACT OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

1. How was the Declaration of Independence viewed when it was first written?
2. What does Gary Wills mean when he says the Declaration of Independence was simply *propaganda*? You may want to look up the meaning of propaganda before answering this question.
3. According to Document 2, where does the concept of a Christian nation come from in U.S. History?
4. How are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution different?
5. How does Ho Chi Minh expand the scope of the Declaration of Independence?
6. What is Thomas Jefferson a symbol of in Eastern Europe?
7. Write a 200 word essay (about a page) describing the legacy of the Declaration of Independence in both the United States and in the world. Remember, you may use your own knowledge as well as additional research in developing your essay.

DBQ – Jefferson Slavery & Race

DOCUMENT 1

The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other . . . The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.

Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, 1787

DOCUMENT 2

[King George III] has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating them & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere or to incur miserable death in their transportation . . .

deleted portion of the *Declaration of Independence*, 1776

DOCUMENT 3

. . . negroes are property, and as such cannot be distinguished from the lands or personalities held in those States where there are few slaves, that the surplus of profit which a Northern farmer is able to lay by, he invests in cattle, horses, etc where as a Southern farmer lays out that same surplus in slaves. There is no more reason therefore for taxing the Southern states on the farmer's heads & on his slave's head, than the Northern ones on their farmer's heads & on the heads of their cattle, that the method proposed would therefore tax the Southern states according to their numbers only; that negroes in fact should not be considered as members of the state more than cattle & that they have no more interest in it.

Jefferson's, *Autobiography* (1821)

DOCUMENT 4

Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that their people (Africans) are to be free. Nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion has drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation.

Jefferson's, *Autobiography*, 1821

DOCUMENT 5

The opinion, that they are inferior in the faculties of reason and imagination, must be hazarded with great diffidence. To justify a general conclusion, requires many observations . . .

Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, 1787

DOCUMENT 6

I can say with conscious truth that there is not a man on earth who would sacrifice more than I would to relieve us from their heavy reproach, in any practical way. The cession of that kind of property, for so it is misnamed, is a bagatelle which would not cost me a second thought, if, in that way, a general emancipation and expatriation could be effected; and gradually, and with due sacrifices, I think it might be. But as it is, we have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale and self-preservation in the other.

letter from Thomas Jefferson to William Short, October 31, 1819

DOCUMENT 7

Indeed, nothing is more to be wished than that the United States would themselves undertake to make such a [colony] on the coast of Africa. Exclusive of motives of humanity, the commercial advantages to be derived from it might well repay all its expanses. But for this the national mind is not yet prepared. It may perhaps be doubted whether many of these people would voluntarily consent to such an exchange of situation, and very certain that few of those advanced to a certain age in habits of slavery, would be capable of self-government.

letter from Thomas Jefferson to John Lynch, 1811

DOCUMENT 8

Jefferson had [deep] reasons for his conflicted views of slavery. . . For him, the racial differences separating whites and blacks were of overriding importance. Because, in his view, those differences defined whites as superior and blacks as inferior, he believed that blacks could not be trusted with freedom. Also, though he hoped to end slavery he feared that former slaves' resentment of their past treatment would combine with former masters' fears of retribution to trigger a horrific race war.

Richard Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson*, 2003

DOCUMENT 9

I advance therefore as a suspicion only, that the blacks, whether originally a distinct race, or made distinct by time and circumstance, are inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind. It is not against experience to suppose that different species of the same genus, or varieties of the same species, may possess different qualifications . . . This unfortunate difference of colour, and perhaps faculty, is a powerful obstacle to the emancipation of these people.

Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, 1787

DOCUMENT 10

When pressed to sharpen the focus on “the people” [Jefferson] developed an explanation based on who was not in the picture. Infants and children were obviously excluded, as were women, who “could not mix promiscuously in the public meetings with men.” Slaves were also absent, on the principle that those “who have no will could be permitted to exercise none in the popular assembly.” The picture of “the people” that he saw in his head, then, included “qualified citizens only.”

Joseph Ellis, *American Sphinx*, 1996

DBQ – JEFFERSON SLAVERY & RACE

Answer all the questions below using the documents provided. Be sure and answer in complete sentences.

1. Compare Jefferson's view of slavery in Document 1 with Jefferson's view of slavery in Document 3. What happened between 1787 and 1821 that would explain the change in Jefferson's views on slavery?
2. What did Jefferson mean in Document 2 when he said "has waged a cruel war against human nature itself?"
3. What does Jefferson mean in the quote: "we have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him nor safely let him go?" What is going on in 1820-21 that occasions this comment?
4. What did Jefferson mean by the term EXPATRIATION?
5. What do Documents 5, 8 and 9 have in common?
6. What did Jefferson mean when he used the phrase "the people"?
7. From what you have read write a short 200 word* essay on Jefferson's views of slavery and race.

*A 200 word essay is about one type written page.

SALLY HEMINGS & THOMAS JEFFERSON

*In 1802 James Callendar published a story about an alleged affair between Thomas Jefferson and a slave girl named Sally Hemings (Dusky Sally). The story has circulated ever since and its validity has been debated ever since the publication of the story. Below are a series of documents that relate to the controversy. **Read the documents and then write a 400 word (2 pages) essay defending Jefferson or accusing him of having the affair. Use information from the documents to support your position.***

DOCUMENT 1

. . . accusations were originally made by a notorious polemicist named Callendar in 1802, the Jefferson and Sally were lovers . . . Its like a tin can that's been tied to Thomas Jefferson's tail and has rattled through the . . . pages of history. And Fawn Brodie's book in 1974 revived it. I think that, if it were a legal case brought before a dispassionate group of jurors, the evidence would now be such that Jefferson would not be found guilty. The bulk of the scholarly evidence suggests that it is not Jefferson who fathered Sally's children but probably Jefferson's nephew, Peter Carr.

Joseph Ellis to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 2

Sally Hemings remains the notorious mystery of Jefferson's sexual life. Most Americans think that Jefferson had a slave mistress named Sally Hemings and at least four and perhaps more children by her. Most historians have been reluctant to admit this. We don't know. The evidence is slender. What we know is this: that Jefferson was at Monticello nine months before Sally Heming's children were born, that her children were certainly mulattos, that they had a white father, that Jefferson may have been their father. Her youngest son, Madison Hemings, late in his life gave a newspaper interview in Ohio saying that his mother Sally had told him . . . on her deathbed that Jefferson was his father and the father of his siblings.

Clay Jenkinson to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 3

If you have any sense of Jefferson's character, I think it would be hard to imagine that he would have this woman near his daughter . . . as his mistress, beget children by her, and not educate the children, not prepare them in any way to be free people. That's so far from what I conceive Jefferson to be. He denied it; I don't think he was a liar.

Gary Willis to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 4

Callendar's motives, all historians agree, were scurrilous and vengeful. He probably heard the rumors about miscegenation at Monticello while imprisoned in Richmond - it was a story that had been making the rounds in Virginia for several years - and felt no compunction about reporting the gossip as fact. His charges [were] motivated by the basest personal and political motives . . .

Joseph Ellis, *American Sphinx*, 1998

DOCUMENT 5

"Was Sally Hemings his mistress?"

"Well, I just can't say no. Because I can't . . . No, I do not believe Sally Hemings was Jefferson's mistress. . . that would have required . . . that he continue this relationship for a period of 25 years and that two of the children would have been born after the Callender story came out and while he was president of the United States. . . I think, [of] the public sensitivities in this area as well as his own sensitivities. And so I think it's quite impossible.

Merrill Peterson to Ken Burns interview, 1997

DOCUMENT 6

It is well known that the man, whom it delighteth the people to honor, keeps, and for many years past has kept, as his concubine, one of his own slaves. Her name is SALLY. The name of her eldest son is TOM. His features are said to bear a striking although sable resemblance to those of the president himself. The boy is ten or twelve years of age. His mother went to France in the same vessel with Mr. Jefferson and his two daughters. The delicacy of this arrangement must strike every person of common sensibility. What a sublime pattern for an American ambassador to place before the eyes of two young ladies!

If the reader does not feel himself disposed to pause we beg leave to proceed. Some years ago, this story had once or twice been hinted at in Rind's *Federalist*. At that time, we believed the surmise to be an absolute calumny. One reason for thinking so was this: A vast body of people wished to debar Mr. Jefferson from the presidency. The establishment of this SINGLE FACT would have rendered his election impossible. We reasoned thus; that if the allegation had been true, it was sure to have been ascertained and advertised by his enemies, in every corner of the continent. The suppression of so decisive an enquiry serves to show that the common sense of the federal party was overruled by divine providence. It was the predestination of the supreme being that they should be turned out; that they should be expelled from office by the popularity of character....

James Callender, *Richmond Recorder*, 1803

DOCUMENT 7

SIX years ago, the phone rang in the Cheshire home of Alice Woodson Smith. It was a cousin who had some electrifying news: She was descended from Thomas Jefferson and his slave, Sally Hemings.

Starting that day, Mrs. Smith and three of her relatives, her daughter, Linda Woodson Williams of Westbrook, her niece, Deborah Woodson McDonald of Hamden, and her sister, Betty Woodson Rawls of New Haven, have been working to document that they are related to Thomas C. Woodson, who many believe was the oldest of several children Sally Hemings bore by Jefferson.

And the truth is indeed murky. Three weeks ago, a committee appointed by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation announced that it believed, based on lab tests comparing DNA from Hemings descendants to Jefferson descendants, that Hemings probably had at least six children with Jefferson. But the committee also said that not only was there no written proof that Woodson was one of them, the DNA tests also showed that he couldn't be. That is disputed by the Woodson family, and some historians have questioned the DNA tests.

Christine Woodside, *New York Times*, Feb. 13, 2000

DOCUMENT 8

In [November] 1998, the geneticists published an article in the distinguished British science journal *Nature* explaining the results of their [DNA] tests. They concluded that Eston Hemings was the child of a male member of Jefferson's family; that neither Peter nor Samuel Carr could have fathered Eston Hemings; and that Thomas Woodson was not descended from Thomas Jefferson. Putting together the historical evidence and the DNA results, the authors of the *Nature* study concluded that the person most likely to have fathered Eston Hemings was Thomas Jefferson himself to a conclusion without the knowledge of the DNA evidence. This may help them understand the difficulty of the issue for historians. You may want to display the last article on an overhead for the whole class to see and then ask them if this makes a difference in their point of view of the controversy.

Richard Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson*

*TEACHERS: You may want to leave out the last document until after the class has discussed the issue and have students come to a conclusion without the knowledge of the DNA evidence. This may help them understand the difficulty of the issue for historians. You may want to display the last article on an overhead for the whole class to see and then ask them if this makes a difference in their point of view of the controversy.