From Poverty to Assimilation: Thomas Jefferson on Native Americans as Indigent People

Zoltán Vajda

https://doi.org/10.30608/HJEAS/2022/28/1/6

ABSTRACT

Thomas Jefferson has long been noted for his vested academic interest in Native Americans, whom he considered to be a doomed, yet, through assimilation, a redeemable race—who in his view were people living in poverty; an aspect of Jefferson's vision of the indigenous peoples of North America which has so far been ignored. This essay therefore claims that Jefferson's general concern with them was also fueled by his understanding of Native Americans as people whose way of life relegated them into the condition of indigence by definition—a state Jefferson wished to alleviate. Drawing on Jefferson's ideas of political economy, combined with a perspective provided by early American poverty studies, I argue that his republican ideal of free-holding male household heads was also a key to his conception of Native American poverty as well as to his solution to it. In his view, gender roles and practices within the Native communities prevented male heads from adapting to the Euro-American ideals. In Jefferson's eyes, women's contribution to basic activities of sustenance, thus, rendered their spouses incapable of providing for their families by the Euro-American standard of the gender division of labor. He regarded them as indigents because of their actual mode of sustenance, but a desirable shift to white ways, Jefferson implied, held the promise for them to get out of destitution. (ZV)

KEYWORDS: Thomas Jefferson, Native Americans, poverty, assimilation, republicanism

An avid student of Native Americans and their cultures, Thomas Jefferson nonetheless developed an ambiguous attitude toward them. Although holding Native Americans in high esteem with respect to their moral and political traits, he regarded them as culturally and economically backward and inferior people, and as such, doomed to extinction unless they changed their way of life. In this essay I will contend that this vision was powerfully informed by his understanding of Amerindian nations as ones living in poverty due to their way of subsistence, which radically affected other facets of their culture, too. First, the question of how indigence as a concept influenced such a vision, as well as the structure of the interaction between the two races in America prompting Jefferson's justification for the assimilation of Native Americans, will be addressed. Second, I will also investigate what larger patterns pertaining to poverty and sustenance Jefferson applied in understanding the situation of American Indians as people whom he thought were lagging behind Whites with a view to their cultural development. I will argue that Jefferson employed the discourse of indigence to justify Native Americans' adoption of White cultural patterns while understanding the process implicitly as a substitute for poor-relief. In his blueprint for their civilization, he argued for a White-man style farming as a means of better subsistence for the tribes, ultimately to deal with the issue of poverty. At the same time, it was also to promote self-sufficiency among them, making them independent producers. Given that no systematic analysis has so far addressed Jefferson's conception of Native American indigence,[1] this essay offers to shed light on his efforts to justify assimilation through the rhetoric of poverty.

Jefferson's views on American Indians have been subject to critical discussions, mainly on account of their difference from the dominant White culture and the treatment of this difference by Jefferson. Most scholars have noted how, despite Jefferson's positing them as inferior because of their cultural traits, they fit into his vision of an ideal republic through the program of "civilization," aiming to transform them into an image of citizens to fulfill the

cultural standards of White Americans. Scholars also point out that although Jefferson meant the preservation of Native Americans as individuals, all this prepared the way for their cultural genocide.[2]

To understand Jefferson's view of indigence and poverty among the indigenous peoples in particular, his general views on poverty in America as well as his ideas concerning the model republican order should be discussed. Donald A. Grinde calls attention to Jefferson's "dualistic perception" of the indigenous people of America. While he often expressed his admiration for their culture, he also despised them for the supposedly primitive conditions in which they lived, voicing his indignation over their unwillingness to change. By contrast, the positive side of his vision was rooted in his attempt to refute ideas about the New World emphasizing its inferiority to Europe.[3] Jefferson held positive views about the indigenous peoples of the land only to the extent that he could use them to rebut European claims about the inferiority of the New World. He was more concerned with their "assimilation" in order to avoid their "extermination." Preserving their culturally "independent" status, "Native American peoples" would be "a hindrance to 'progress,'" he thought.[4]

Jefferson formulated the bulk of his views in response to the polemical arguments of the Count Georges-Louis Leclerc de Buffon (1707-1788), who, in a comparative analysis of the Old and the New World, strove to prove the inferiority of the former in terms of the size and number of species, largely caused by climatic differences. Among his claims was the one according to which this overall inferiority involved the physical difference of Native Americans. Jefferson sought to refute such claims by pointing out that all their negative characteristics were to be attributed to environmental factors, customs, and diet, and thus, with the improvement of these, the indigenous people of America could also improve in body.[5]

Such an attitude, however, was greatly influenced by poverty-related discourses identifying the Native American way of life with scanty subsistence. The tensions that scholars

have perceived in this conception of American Indians can be resolved by seeing them through the perspective of poverty. Jefferson hoped to preserve the tribes by changing their culture in order to promote their survival. Nonetheless, this became possible for him by addressing the issue of poverty: he was convinced that Native Americans could only make a shift to a prosperous culture by adopting White patterns of subsistence, by fighting poverty through civilization.

Despite the common belief that there were equal opportunities for all to survive on their own in the early American republic, poverty was relatively widespread mainly because of the general scarcity of resources, which made it difficult for most to make ends meet.[6] In addition to "traditional dependents" such as women or children, there were other social groups who counted as poor on account of their dependence on others for subsistence. Their state could be permanent or temporal, the former resulting in dependents such as slaves, women in marriage, children, and the disabled, while the latter typically included the "laboring poor," "indentured servants" or vagrants.[7] Along with Black slaves, American Indians represented a sizeable proportion of the indigent in early America, contributing to the extensive presence of poverty across the country. Having lost their lands to White settlers, Native Americans were often forced to move further west or become vagrants, or were enslaved by Whites.[8]

They were considered among the poor in the eyes of White Americans, as most of them lacked access to property and only a few of them could make it to the ranks of the propertied wealthy.[9] This was in part owing to the fact that despite the abundance of natural resources that they had access to, they objected to the materialistic culture of amassing and storing goods, and tended to work for their subsistence only but nothing more. Furthermore, their hunting and nomadic lifestyle defied the Euro-American ideal of appropriate existence, associating them with various problems including poverty.[10]

Jefferson on poverty

Jefferson generally connected poverty with dependence—the lack of someone's ability to sustain their household. This characterized indigence among White people for him, at least. He, at the same time, held that such persons were taken good care of in America, hence no one had to suffer from destitution unlike the poor of the Old World.[11] Such a conception of poverty, at the same time, was intimately linked with the ethos of republicanism, the ideology and culture that Jefferson has long been associated with by scholarship.[12] Republicanism upheld the ideal of independent producers in the preservation of republican economic, social, and political order; for Jefferson, agriculture and landed property served as the preferable basis of such a way of life. Economic independence was expected to lead to political independence, hence the significance of the yeoman farmer whom Jefferson cherished as the model republican citizen of the early American nation.[13]

Nonetheless, this agrarian model, Jefferson thought, marked only one stage in the development of human societies. It was a highly advanced form of subsistence, which had replaced the hunter-gatherer and nomadic lifestyles that he associated with the indigenous population in the New World. Jefferson strongly believed in the stadial scheme of the historical development of human society, and he also held that American settlements were undergoing such a process with the westward movement, thus going through increasingly developed stages of civilization.[14]

The stadial theory of human social development originated with Scottish Enlightenment philosophers such as Henry Home (Lord Kames), James Adair, John Millar, and Adam Smith. They believed that human societies passed through four stages of historical development, each representing a higher stage in the process of civilization.[15] According to this model, Native Americans were at the lowest two stages of social development. Nevertheless, as another instance of his ambiguous attitude toward them, Jefferson formulated a high opinion of them in

view of their political and moral culture. As "natural republicans," to use historian Peter S. Onuf's term, Native Americans were, as Jefferson asserted in his *Second Inaugural Address* (1805), "[e]ndowed with the faculties and the rights of men, breathing an ardent love of liberty and independence."[16] Jefferson's positive opinion about the American Indians reflected his appreciation of them as integral parts of humankind.[17] Jefferson also acknowledged their social patterns, the fact that they lived in small societies without laws or government, hence, they were capable of doing without any "coercive power," since public opinion was the only means of making members of their communities observe norms.[18]

Based on such ideas, Jefferson approached the issue of Native American indigence in two ways. According to the first, being in the hunter-gatherer stage they necessarily had a low standard of living—a logical concomitant of their, as Jefferson put it in *Notes on the State of Virginia*, "savage" way of life.[19] The second, related to the problem of stadial development, too, was intimately connected with the problem of gender roles in a cultural context based on a non-republican form of subsistence.

Jefferson believed that Native Americans, as he knew them from personal experience as well as from his scientific investigations, led a pitiable way of life with subsistence hardly meeting the requirements of adequate nourishment ultimately caused by what Jefferson considered their backward culture.[20] He was silent on this in his communication with representatives of Indians (see below), but was more explicit about the issue in texts not addressed to them, such as, for example, the *Report of the Commissioners to the University of Virginia*, his blueprint for the University of Virginia of 1818. The treatise accentuated the role of education and the importance of knowledge as key to generating prosperity for the people. This notwithstanding, he claimed, Native Americans had no desire to grow in knowledge and improve their lot, but, instead, were persistent in adhering to their ancestors' ways. As he put it,

> What, but education, has advanced us beyond the condition of our indigenous neighbors? And what chains them to their present state of barbarism and wretchedness, but a begotted veneration for the supposed superlative wisdom of their fathers, and the preposterous idea that they are to look backward for better things, and not forward, longing, as it should seem, to return to the days of eating acorn and roots, rather than indulge in the degeneracies of civilization?[21]

Jefferson thus connected the state of savagery with the lack of development and, more critically, with the unwillingness to change and adopt new cultural knowledge that, in his view, could positively affect the amelioration of subsistant conditions.

Jefferson strongly believed that poverty and the low level of civilization were interrelated, which is also underlined by his understanding of the role of "domestic manufacture" in providing subsistence, comfort, and independence for the nation. As he explained to Benjamin Austin in a letter in 1816, "He . . . who is now against domestic manufacture, must be for reducing us either to dependence on [a] foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns."[22] A low level of civilization, in this case without manufactures, would thus result in a very modest way of subsistence, which Jefferson refused to endorse, as he associated it with poverty and the lack of comfort.

In connection with physical differences between Native Americans and Europeans, Jefferson emphasized that those were not given but were rooted in the environment. As a consequence, he argued that their lifestyle had a negative impact on their physical stature. Their lamentable state, Jefferson believed, had a lasting effect on their physical well-being, as due to their lifestyle and way of subsistence, they suffered from hunger on a regular basis. Starvation became more common among them when walking the war path, but staying in their permanent

settlements equally caused a problem from the viewpoint of subsistence, as they had to put up with a scarcity of food. As Jefferson asserted in the *Notes*, "Even at their homes the nation depends for food, through a certain part of every year, on the gleanings of the forest: that is, they experience a famine once in every year."[23] Therefore "the same diet and exercise" would result in the same negative physical traits for the Whites as for the Natives.[24]

In Jefferson's opinion, regular exposure to hunger and the shortage of food were even consequential for the Native Americans in terms of demography. He contended that their supposedly low living standards accounted for the low fertility rate among them. He also argued that in addition to physical labor and the expectation of women to accompany their spouses on the war path, malnutrition deriving from poverty was the major reason why Native American mothers bore fewer children than their Euro-American counterparts. "Where food is regularly supplied," he explained, "a single farm will shew [sic] more of cattle, than a whole country of forests can of buffaloes [sic]. The same Indian women, when married to White traders, who feed them and their children plentifully and regularly, who exempt them from excessive drudgery, who keep them stationary and unexposed to accident, produce and raise as many children as the white women."[25] He maintained that there was a similarly remarkable rate of fertility among American Indian women enslaved by Whites.[26] Intermarriage, in Jefferson's opinion, thus, proved to be a good option for Native American women to have a better life and a higher standard of living.

This leads to the second basic tenet of Jefferson's understanding of Native American poverty, related to the gender division of labor generated by the lack of a republican socio-economic order among Natives. To Jefferson's mind, American Indian communities were based on a division of labor between the sexes that was basically unfavorable for women. They were the ones in the community to perform menial tasks, that is, work in the fields, and hence were "submitted to unjust drudgery," as he put it in the *Notes*.[27] The labor that in White society men

were responsible for was done by women in Native American communities. He found this overtly unjust and against nature and argued that such females were subjected to the will of the "stronger sex" by force, thus failed to enjoy the "natural equality" that White women could supposedly have in what he viewed as "civilized" societies. For him, this system of labor was typical of "barbarism," with males performing no farming thus being physically inferior to European men, who by way of doing hard physical work, got more exercise.[28]

This difference, however, was rather a consequence of the agricultural way of subsistence as the basis of the republican order, as Jefferson pointed out in his travel account written about countries in Western Europe in the first half of the 1780s. Comparing the situation of German and French women to that of White Americans, he maintained that only those societies made their female members perform "external" labor, that is, farming, that were poor in his eyes, where, compelled by indigence, a man required his spouse to participate in farming for subsistence. As he noted during one of his European travels in 1788, "It is an honorable circumstance for men, that the first moment he is at his ease, he allots the civil employments to his female partner, and takes the external on himself. And this circumstance is a pretty good indication that a people are, or not at their ease."[29] Native American societies, he claimed, also frustrated this ideal since they were always at war and hence the labor of production and providing for war parties fell onto women, the only social group to form the "civil" part of the nation. "But this is a barbarous perversion of the natural destination of the two sexes. Women are formed by nature for attentions, not for hard labor," he concluded.[30]

Such a model, however, was an outright contradiction of the republican ideal of self-sufficient male freeholders, capable of providing for their families including their spouses. Native American men were not like that in Jefferson's reading; their wives could not be "at their ease." Yet, the ultimate reason for that was that "barbarian" societies were poor by definition, because they had to rely on the labor of women to sustain themselves. They lacked

republican male independence based on self-sufficient farming to save them from drudgery.

Jefferson nonetheless asserted the possibility for American Indians to change their way of life and rescue indigenous women from the lot assigned to them in the state of "barbarian" indigence. He argued that by moving Native Americans from the stage of hunting and gathering to farming, they would also move out of a state of general poverty into that of prosperity. In this sense, his assimilation program, which was aimed at breaking up the social and cultural structure of the Indians of the land, can also be seen as an attempt at poor-relief.

Native Americans and assimilation as poor-relief

Native Americans perceived by Jefferson as people living in poverty were in a special situation insofar as their relationship to poor-relief was concerned. They fell outside of a system which was based on local resources providing for those in need, through the "outdoor" system, that is, one placing them under neighborly care usually in return for compensation out of the funds of the local community. By the late eighteenth century, however, this system had undergone a transition, and poor-relief had been institutionalized with the appearance of the almshouse for those unable to work, and the workhouse for those supposedly unwilling to work or being temporarily unemployed.[31]

American Indians in Jefferson's view obviously had no place in this system of poor-relief as a community. The idea was that they were to avoid the need to be sponsored in a like manner by transforming themselves into independent agricultural producers. If they refused to do so, they were regarded as the "unworthy" poor, who were able to, but were unwilling to work for subsistence.[32]

In his blueprint for the assimilation of Native Americans, Jefferson broke with the model that had prevailed in Euro-Native relations for eighty years, exemplified by the Brafferton Institute at the College of William and Mary. It was meant to be a major tool of assimilation by

providing education for the youth of their cooperating communities. Schooling was assumed to have a formative influence inasmuch as such young people were believed to act as agents of transformation upon their return to their native villages. The main emphasis was on Christianizing these people, who would then also win over their fellow tribesmen. The school had the highest number of enrollees of twenty-four in 1722. Its method was followed by other similar schools (for example, at Fort Christiana, Virginia), whose main goal was to offer a boarding-school style of education for Native Americans, with the hope of making them adopt White ways, which they were supposed to disseminate upon their return to their communities.[33] By the time of Jefferson's presidency, however, the project had fallen through with no significant impact. Therefore, Jefferson initiated a program of assimilation to take place within the Native American communities encouraging them to adopt the farming way of life.[34]

It was not only Jefferson's perception of Native Americans that was characterized by "duality"—so were his ideas that he wanted to implement. His involvement in trying to improve conditions was a mixture of benevolent attitude to, and the intention to help the Natives, on the one hand, and the will to satisfy the land hunger of White settlers, thereby promoting expansion at the expense of tribal lands, on the other.[35] Jefferson's poverty-based argument connected these two by urging the Natives to give up the lands that they would not use after shifting to farming. He suggested that it was also to their benefit, and this would help them rise out of indigence.

Jefferson's conviction that the hunter-gatherer state of Native Americans was the main reason for their poverty because of the low productivity of their economy compared to White-style farming should again be stressed. He believed their system of production yielded less for subsistence than the cultivation of the earth, which, Jefferson hoped, Native Americans also realized: "They are becoming sensible that the earth yields subsistence with less labor & more of certainty than the first," he asserted in the draft of his *Fifth Annual Message*. He also

emphasized that all this change would also yield a new conception of political economy for the Natives, and it would benefit the White society as well. The former would understand "it [is] their interest from time to time to dispose of parts of their surplus & waste lands for the means of improving those they occupy, and of subsisting their families while they are preparing their farms." More efficiency in producing for subsistence would thus allow Native Americans to have a surplus both in terms of goods and land. Their land possessions were to be used for exchange in their interactions with Whites, bringing in extra income that they desired.[36]

The change would also benefit the Natives by restoring, what Jefferson conceived as, the natural order of gender roles. In the first place, he connected the greater productivity of farming and economic independence with the emancipation of indigenous women from occupations unsuited to them. Native females were to become important members of household economy through the domestic manufacturing of clothes. As he made clear to Choctow leaders in 1803, "A little land cultivated, and a little labor, will procure more provisions than the most successful hunt; and a woman will clothe more by spinning and weaving, than a man by hunting."[37] Assimilation then, promising the triumph of Native Americans over indigence, would also mean a changed role for women in their economic system, according to Jefferson's expectations, as women, no longer performing menial labor in the fields, but leaving it to their husbands, would still participate in the self-sufficient system of production. At the same time, however, they would pursue tasks characteristic of household manufacturing, which would approximate the gender role ideal that Jefferson assigned for women in general.

Secondly, his expectations for Native women were coupled with those that he held for men. In the *Notes* Jefferson wrote about Native American men rather disapprovingly; they, he argued, instead of cultivating the land, preferred to engage in warfare, an activity he judged as inferior, and therefore proved less useful members of their communities. As he contended in an address to the Wolf and Mandan people: "If you will cease to make war on one another, if you

will live in friendship with all mankind, you can employ all your time in providing food and clothing for yourselves and your families."[38]

The traditional Native American way of life, with its constant struggle for hunting grounds was deemed dysfunctional by Jefferson. Instead, he was of the opinion that American Indian males should cultivate the land for subsistence. Such a change, in his view, was also to result in a peaceful way of existence, as well as in the ultimate promotion of prosperity among Native Americans, and the end of indigence. "Natural" gender roles restored would thus contribute to the maintenance of self-sufficient farming households.

Jefferson's praise for farming as an alternative for Native Americans was also fueled by other considerations. When encouraging their shift to agriculture as a more productive activity to sustain themselves, he was also hopeful that they would be less in need of hunting grounds, as these could be turned into farmland. This change, at the same time, would also mean the availability of more land for White settlers, which, as he pointed out in his message to the Congress, "the rapid increase of our numbers will call for."[39] While, admittedly, Jefferson had a broader vision concerning hunting grounds turned into arable land, in line with the White European style, it would be hard to deny that he also promoted White settlement and colonization, at the expense of land used by Native Americans for hunting. It was not really profits sought that motivated his considerations, but rather his understanding that such a change would permit a presumably efficient mode of using the land. By saving land surplus, as it were, for White settlers, Native Americans could then truly become self-sufficient farmers, alongside their neighbors. Yet Jefferson's aim was primarily to provide land for the Whites through their westward expansion, which went beyond his altruism toward Native people.[40] He believed that by elevating Native Americans out of their state of indigence, a more efficient way of redistributing resources could be achieved, benefiting White settlers hungry for land.

Sharing the opinion of his contemporaries, Jefferson was certain that giving up tribal

lands and selling them for money was a crucial step for Native Americans to proceed on the road to civilization. Moreover, he was also ready to manipulate them into selling more lands by encouraging them to become indebted. Their need for commodities produced by Whites was to generate business transactions that would no longer be governed by conventional fur trade relations, that is, barter, but rather by the selling of their land as the basis of exchange.[41] As he explained the benefits of farming and manufacturing to the Seneca chief, Handsome Lake: "Persuade our brethren to be sober and to cultivate their lands, and their women to spin and weave for their families. You will soon see your women and children well fed and clothed, your men living happily in peace and plenty, and your numbers increasing from year to year."[42]

Jefferson was convinced that it was the federal government's responsibility to supervise the assimilation of Native Americans through various channels, including charity, and by providing them with the agricultural tools and farming methods of the White settlers. Such an initiative, however, was not unequivocally altruistic on his part, since usually this kind of assistance was connected to land cession treaties and was hence granted in return for the land the tribes gave up.[43] As he explained in his *Second Inaugural Address*, "now reduced within limits too narrow for the hunter's state, humanity enjoins us to teach them agriculture and the domestic arts; to encourage them to that industry which alone can enable them to maintain their place in existence, and to prepare them in time for that state of society, which to bodily comforts adds the improvement of the mind and morals."[44] The US government promoted subsistence farming and domestic manufacturing for the Natives and, to that end, it provided the tools necessary for these activities, and commissioned experts as well to teach them the new ways: "We have therefore liberally furnished them with the implements of husbandry and household use, we have placed among them instructors in the arts of first necessity . . .."[45]

Since assimilation was supposed to result in a better life for Indians, Jefferson stressed that the government implemented his plan, in part, out of benevolence, "acting for their greatest

good."[46] An important element of his assimilation project entailed the establishment of commercial ties between the Native tribes and the Whites. Such contacts were expected to generate exchange between the two, resulting in greater "domestic comfort" for the former. Consequently, elevating them out of poverty in the Jeffersonian fashion would also hold promise for better relations with Euro-Americans. In his *Third Annual Message* he was pleased to report that the changes in the Native ways of life had brought about better relations with the Whites.[47]

With a view to the role of the federal government in providing Native Americans with the means of implementing the transition to farming and thus into a state expected to be free of indigence, Jefferson, in fact, proposed a relationship characteristic of the sentimental culture of antebellum benevolence as explored by historian Susan M. Ryan. According to Ryan, contemporary Americans understood the relationship between the donator and the receiver of charity as an intricate dynamic of sameness and difference. On the one hand, those in need were supposed to receive help on account of a certain degree of similarity that they shared with their potential benefactor. Yet, at the same time, complete identification could not take place because of the threat to the identities of both. Ryan argues that complete identification was impeded by the fear of losing the social difference between the beneficiary and the benefactor, with the former becoming eliminated as a point of reference for understanding the identity of the latter.[48]

By the Jeffersonian logic, however, there were no such fears involved in the desired relationship with Indians living under the benevolent protection of the US government as they were expected to undergo assimilation and would thereby, naturally, adopt the identity of the benefactor completely. He was convinced that changing their identity as "savages" as well as indigents would not threaten White identity at all. Especially not if his hopes for the intermingling of the two races, as revealed to Hendrick Aupaumut in 1808, came true: "[y]ou will unite yourselves with us, join in our Councils & form one people with us and we shall all

be Americans, you will mix with us by marriage, your blood will run in our veins, & will spread with us over this great Island."[49] He supported their assimilation as "individuals" and was opposed to their preservation as a social group.[50] The intermingling of Native Americans and Euro-Americans represented the end-result of the process facilitated by the supposedly benevolent behavior of the latter. The reason for that was that they were to change collectively and hence, as individuals, they would assimilate even as self-sufficient farmers.[51] It must be noted, however, as historian Bernard Sheehan has pointed out, that the number of intermarriages between the indigenous population and Euro-Americans was not significant, and thus it did not meet Jefferson's expectations. When White people appeared in large numbers in Indian territory, it resulted in confrontations between the two races rather than in nuptial harmony.[52]

Toward the end of his second presidential term, Jefferson proudly reported about the success of his civilization program, arguing that farming and "household manufactur[ing]" were becoming more widespread among the tribes participating in the project. The success of the program, however, he suggested equaled not simply victory over indigence among Natives, but also the improvement of race relations between them and White Americans. "And, generally, from a conviction that we consider them as part of ourselves and cherish with sincerity their rights and interests, the attachment of the Indian tribes is gaining strength daily."[53] For Jefferson, then, the supposed racial harmony was conditional upon the Natives' willingness to shift to White ways of subsistence as well as upon their equal treatment by Whites. These were concomitant gains of assimilation besides the rising living standards of the Native Americans.[54]

Once achieved, prosperity, at the same time, Jefferson claimed, would also bring honor for Native American leaders because they could raise their people out of poverty. As he explained to Seneca leader Handsome Lake, "[i]t will be a great glory to you to have been the instrument of so happy a change and your children's children, from generation to generation, will repeat your name with love and gratitude for ever."[55] Jefferson's appeal to the pride of

Native American leaders combined with the promise of generational affection was, however, in sharp contrast with his general despisal of generational reverence among them.

Admitting the difficulty of the project of transformation, Jefferson also found resistance to it on the part of Native Americans against reason, rooted in their insistence on their traditional culture. As he claimed in his *Second Inaugural Address*, "[t]hey are combated by the habits of their bodies, prejudice of their minds, ignorance, pride, and the influence of interested and crafty individuals among them . . .."[56] The latter were a major obstacle to Native Americans' break with the previous generations since, he complained, "[t]hese persons inculcate a sanctimonious reverence for the customs of their ancestors, that whatsoever they did, must be done through all time." Moreover, such an attitude, according to him, was based on irrationality, as "that reason is a false guide, and to advance under its counsel, in their physical, moral, or political condition, is perilous innovation; that their duty is to remain as their Creator made them, ignorance being safety, and knowledge full of danger . . .."[57] Such a behavior seemed all the more inexpedient to Jefferson by implication, since it promoted poverty instead of prosperity. The "crafty individuals" whom Jefferson referred to in his speech were the leaders of conservative groups within the tribes who opposed change and assimilation. They could be found most conspicuously among the Cherokees and the Creeks in the South and the Shawnees of the North.[58] Their behavior was considered subversive to the alleviation of the poverty among them.

Southern tribes fared better in Jefferson's scheme of civilization given their familiarity with the idea and the activities of males as agricultural producers. Also, through the intermarriage of White fur traders and indigenous women, they had incorporated several elements of the white way of life into their culture. Yet, even the Cherokees and the Creeks were reluctant to give up their hunting grounds for generating cash.[59]

Jefferson's plan to assimilate American Indians was also hindered by the special

conditions that these tribes lived under. In the first place, by giving up hunting and hunting grounds, Native Americans lost their source of income from the fur trade, a revenue they could spend on items that they could not produce. This definitely refuted Jefferson's notion of subsistence farming as the ideal form of existence for Native communities. Furthermore, Native Americans were reluctant to accept changes in gender roles or to make warrior males adopt farming and, thus, degrade themselves. They were also hostile to the idea of private property.[60]

Another obstacle to Jefferson's assimilation plans stemmed from the British interference during the War of 1812, when the British incited tribes against the American administration in the frontier areas. Due to foreign intervention, Jefferson claimed, benevolent intentions on the part of the US government came to be hampered. As he wrote to German naturalist Alexander von Humboldt in 1813:

> [T]he interested and unprincipled policy of England has defeated all our labors for the salvation of these unfortunate people. They have seduced the greater part of the tribes within our neighborhood, to take up the hatchet against us and the cruel massacres they have committed on the women and children of our frontiers taken by surprise, will oblige us now to pursue them to extermination, or drive them to new seats beyond our reach.[61]

Thus, even though the ambitions to help Native Americans change their lifestyle were not abandoned after the war, Jefferson had to face the corrupting influence of the British on bellicose tribes in the frontier; he put the blame on the former for hindering the process of assimilation. Foreign intervention, then, ultimately rendered the plans of the American federal government impossible to fulfill, with indigenous people turning against it and frustrating its attempts at raising them out of poverty. For Jefferson, such adversities warranted an alternative

approach to warring tribes—even the use of force against them.[62]

The difficulties that Jefferson came up against when trying to implement his plans originated in the misperception of a man who often addressed his Native American audience as "children"—an attitude inherently paternalistic.[63] He wrongly assumed that subsistence farming would redeem the Native tribes and would bring economic independence for them. His social experiment proved his assumptions false: the Natives were far from being self-reliant both before and after the stage of transition to the White agricultural mode of existence. Even if Native American women did indeed perform household manufacturing, it was only partially sufficient to cater for the needs of their communities.

Conclusion

Jefferson believed that Native Americans failed to fulfill the republican ideal of subsistence and, accordingly, lived in indigence. Economic independence was key to republican existence, and the ideal way of achieving it was provided by the White agrarian way of life with, at its core, the gender division of labor and the male heads of families having the responsibility, without assistance, to sustain themselves and their dependents by farming. In line with this, Jefferson also expected Native American wives to get involved in household economy within their sphere of existence, appropriate for their gender.

Peter Onuf argued that in Jefferson's vision of Native Americans, the European contact resulted in their degradation from being exemplary republicans with no coercive political structures into a people wielding power over others in an unfair manner, most obviously, their wives. He claimed that this was the result of the deranged course of civilization generated by European influences moving in the wrong direction, toward despotic tendencies.[64] This argument presupposes a shift away from an ideal cultural state in the case of Native Americans. However, Jefferson's plan to urge them to change their mode of subsistence and improve their

standard of living to avoid indigence shows a different pattern. First, he hoped for the advancement of the Natives and not for their return to what they thought was an ideal state of existence; he wanted them to move ahead to achieve a new ideal state. Secondly, he firmly believed this transformation would also result in the betterment of the position of Native women, superseding their supposedly miserable conditions.

Ironically, however, civilization meant increasing dependence for Native Americans on the White man. Before the assimilation project was launched, their lands were assets for acquiring White products, yet, civilization brought about new dependencies for them. Along with that, cultural and social decline also set in.[65] More civilization then meant a further step for the Natives on the road to cultural and social decline.

Jefferson never directly addressed Native Americans as people living in poverty. Nonetheless, his strategy of treating them as supposedly backward representatives of the species "Homo sapiens Europaeus,"[66] rendered them people in need of poor relief. Peculiarly enough, in their case, it was to be facilitated by pushing them out of their traditional cultural status and toward assimilation promising republican self-sufficiency in order to escape the state of barbarism and indigence. Their assimilation, practically, their cultural death, was meant to save them from indigence and extinction; it was the concepts of poverty and the problem of poor-relief that Jefferson used as justifications for promoting this process.

University of Szeged

Notes

[1] Works addressing Jefferson's views of Native Americans have dealt with his understanding of their identity as well as the closely related issue of his blueprint for their assimilation with no particular attention to the significance of poverty in his arguments. See,

for instance, Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (New York: Norton, 1977 (1968)); Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1973); Anthony F. C. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1999); Alexander O. Boulton, "The American Paradox: Jeffersonian Equality and Racial Science," *American Quarterly* 47.3 (1995): 467-92; Donald A. Grinde, Jr., "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans," in *Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a Citizen*, ed. James Gilreath (Washington: Library of Congress, 1999), 193-208.

[2] Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction;* Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*; Boulton, "The American Paradox;" Peter S. Onuf, "'We shall all be Americans': Thomas Jefferson and the Indians," *Indiana Magazine of History* 95.2. (1999): 103-41; Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2002); Harold Hellenbrand, "Not 'To Destroy But to Fulfil': Jefferson, Indians, and Republican Dispensation," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 18.4 (1985): 523-49; David Bergeron, "Thomas Jefferson and His Thinking about Native Americans: Understanding a Nature at the Basis of a Human Project," *Revue Française de Science Politique* [French Political Science Review] (English Edition) 67.3 (2017): i–xxiv; Thomas Dikant, "Settler Colonial Statistics: Jefferson, Biopolitics, and *Notes on the State of Virginia*," *Early American Literature* 54.1 (2019): 69-96; J. Diane Pearson, "Medical Diplomacy and the American Indian: Thomas Jefferson, the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and the Subsequent Effects on American Indian Health and Public Policy," *Wicazo Sa Review* 19.1 (2004): 105-30.

[3] Grinde, "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans," 195-97.

[4] Grinde, "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans," 208.

[5] Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* in Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. Merrill D. Peterson (New York: The Library of America, 1984), 169-71, 182-87 (hereafter cited as *Writings*); and Boulton, "The American Paradox," 478-79. Unlike Native Americans, whose assimilation Jefferson believed to be possible, Blacks fared even less fortunate in his vision. Finding them different even as human beings, he considered them incapable of coexistence with the Whites when freed, and thus he advocated their expatriation in the wake of gradual emancipation. *Notes on the State of Virginia*, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 264; Peter S. Onuf, "Every Generation Is an 'Independant [sic] Nation': Colonization, Miscegenation, and the Fate of Jefferson's Children," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser. 57.1 (2000): 153-70; Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire*, 147-48. In addition, Jefferson had a homogenizing vision of Native Americans with no sense of distinction among individual tribal traits. His only way of differentiating them was tied to their individual degree of advancement on the road to "civilization." Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 288.

[6] Billy G. Smith, ed., *Down and Out in Early America* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania UP, 2004), ii.

[7] Smith, *Down and Out in Early America*, xvi¸ xvii-xviii; Philip D. Morgan, "Slaves and Poverty," in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania UP, 2004), 96.

[8] Smith, *Down and Out in Early America*, xv. Early American conceptions of poverty were intimately linked with the republican way of constructing social relations. Those depending on others for subsistence fell into the category of the poor, excluding "traditional dependents" such as women, children or Black slaves, and into that of indentured servants. Thus, the unemployed as well as the laboring poor living from one day to the next comprised the bulk of the indigents, who also included transients such as beggars, vagabonds, or migrant workers. They, as well as traditional dependents, were often thrown upon poor-relief provided

by municipalities. Philip D. Morgan, "Slaves and Poverty," in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania UP, 2004), 96; Billy G. Smith, "Poverty and Economic Marginality in Eighteenth-Century America," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 132.1 (1988): 86-87. Quantifying poverty in the early Republic meets unsurmountable difficulties. In the first place, the lack of contemporary statistical data prevents even a rough estimation of the rate of poverty at any given time. Second, historians have tended to produce research confined to particular areas and types of the indigents, hence the lack of an overall quantification of the rate of indigence by numbers. Seth Rockman, "Introduction," in *Welfare Reform in the Early Republic: A Brief History with Documents* (Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, Inc., 2014), 10. Third, the criteria for measuring poverty are not unanimous among historians. Partial results show only that, for instance, in Philadelphia in 1772, one-quarter of the adult White men, amounting to 4.9% of the total inhabitants, were poor, relying on the city's poor relief system. Billy G. Smith, "Poverty and Economic Marginality in Eighteenth-Century America," 96-97. Finally, the fact that the indigents included individuals who were considered poor temporarily only, complicated even estimations of their number to a great extent.

[9] Morgan, "Slaves and Poverty," 98-99.

[10] Daniel K. Richter, "'Believing That Many of the Red People Suffer Much for the Want of Food': Hunting, Agriculture, and a Quaker Construction of Indianness in the Early Republic," *Journal of the Early Republic* 19.4 (1999): 601-28; Jean R. Soderlund, "The Delaware Indians and Poverty in Colonial New Jersey," in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania UP, 2004), 290-91.

[11] For Jefferson's concern with indigence see Brian Steele, "Thomas Jefferson's Gender Frontier," *The Journal of American History* 95.1 (2008): 17-42; Charles Guzzetta, "Jefferson, Rumford, and the Problem of Poverty," *Midwest Quarterly* 26 (1985): 343-45; and Arthur

Scheer, "Thomas Jefferson's 'Poor Woman': A Symbol of Sentiment or Social Inequality?" *Midwest Quarterly* 39.3 (1998): 329-46.

[12] Garrett Ward Sheldon, *The Political Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1991), 53-82; Robert E. Shalhope, "Thomas Jefferson's Republicanism and Antebellum Southern Thought," *The Journal of Southern History* 42.4 (1976): 529-56; Lance Banning, "Jeffersonian Ideology Revisited: Liberal and Classical Ideas in the New American Republic," *William and Mary Quarterly* 43.1 (1986): 3-20; Lance Banning, "The Republican Interpretation: Retrospect and Prospect," in *The Republican Synthesis Revisited: Essays in Honor of George Athan Billias*, ed. Milton M. Klein et al. (Worcester, MA.: American Antiquarian Society, 1992), 91-119; J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton and London: Princeton UP, 1975.)

[13] Query XIX, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 290-91. Jefferson's ideal of the self-sufficient yeoman farmer as the lynchpin of his republican model of subsistence, also offered for Native Americans, was derived from the real Whigs of Britain. They belonged to a republican tradition that originated with James Harrington of the seventeenth century, who emphasized the importance of political independence of the citizen whose virtue was based on landed property, ensuring the economic basis of such independence. His ideas became incorporated into the eighteenth-century "Country" version of English republican thought setting the problem of the corruption of republican virtue at its center in the midst of the rise of commerce and credit as major organizing principles of English economic development. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*, 361-552.

[14] Thomas Jefferson to Ludlow in Jefferson, *Writings*, 1496-97.

[15] Ronald L. Meek, *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976), 2-6, 99-126, 162-74. Jefferson believed that western European societies had reached the

most developed level of human advancement, that is the commercial stage, resulting in dependence, corruption, and poverty. It represented a far too developed state by his taste, and hence he thought it destructive of republican values. Britain belonged to this category in his eyes, having an economy increasingly dominated by commercial relations and the manufacturing sector as a major source of subsistence for the population. At the same time, all this went in tandem with the corruption of morals. Jefferson also developed animosity against the former mother country, as he found it represented a culture that had reached an extreme and thus corrupt form of civilization. Drew McCoy, *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1980), 19-20, 185-87; Merrill D. Peterson, *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation* (London: Oxford UP, 1987), 342; Lance Banning, *The Jeffersonian Persuasion* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell UP, 1978), 214-15.

[16] Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire*, 19; Jefferson, *Writings*, 520.

[17] Grinde, "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans," 198.

[18] Jefferson, *Writings*, 220. In Query VI of his *Notes on the State of Virginia* Jefferson compared the state of Native Americans to that of the German tribes of ancient Europe, arguing that even the latter living outside Roman civilization took centuries to acquire traits of civilization, such as literacy, and hence should not be used as a measurement to assert the superiority of European culture over the American one. Jefferson, *Writings*, 189.

[19] Jefferson, *Writings*, 220.

[20] Jefferson's personal experience was based on his regular encounters with Native American delegations while president as well as his exposure to the oration of a Cherokee chief at the College of William and Mary in 1762. Christian B. Keller, "Philanthropy Betrayed: Thomas Jefferson, the Louisiana Purchase, and the Origins of Federal Indian Removal Policy," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 144.1 (2000): 42.

[21] Jefferson, *Writings*, 461.

[22] Jefferson to Benjamin Austin, 9 January 1816, in Thomas Jefferson, *The Works of Thomas Jefferson* [Federal Edition], ed. Paul Leicester Ford, 12 vols. (New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1904-05), vol. 12, 504 (hereafter cited as *Works*).

[23] Jefferson, *Writings*, 186.

[24] Jefferson, *Writings*, 184, 186.

[25] Jefferson, *Writings*, 186. According to Donald Grinde, by promoting intermarriage between the two races, Jefferson suggested "transcending the dualistic contradictions." Grinde, "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perception of Native Americans," 197.

[26] Jefferson, *Writings*, 186-87.

[27] Jefferson, *Writings*, 185.

[28] Jefferson, *Writings*, 186. On the difference between European and Native American gender roles see also Steele, "Thomas Jefferson's Gender Frontier," 24.

[29] "Memorandum on a Tour from Paris to Amsterdam, Strasburg, and back to Paris," 19 Apr. 1788, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 651.

[30] Jefferson, *Writings*, 652. Brian Steele restricts the origins of such a stance to the Virginia experience of patriarchal political economy based on the planters' experience. See Steele, "Thomas Jefferson's Gender Frontier," 30-31. Jefferson, however, had a far more general vision, connecting it with the modern western world.

[31] Gary B. Nash, "Poverty and Politics in Early American History," in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania UP, 2004), 16-17.

[32] See Karin Wulf, "Gender and the Political Economy of Poor Relief in Colonial Philadelphia," in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania UP, 2004), 173.

[33] Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 277-79.

[34] Ibid.

[35] The former has been emphasized by Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction*, while Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians* and Robert M. Owens, "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison" have emphasized the latter. See Robert M. Owens, "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison," *Journal of the Early Republic* 22.3 (2002): 405-35. Characterizing Jefferson's sympathy for the Indians and his refusal to take "responsibility" for their sufferings, Gordon M. Sayre has indicated another duality describing it as the conflict "between head and heart." See Gordon M. Sayre, "Jefferson and Native Americans: Policy and Archive," in *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Frank Shuffelton (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009), 62. Yet, it can be argued that through the discourse of Native American indigence Jefferson was able to alleviate the tension.

[36] Draft of Jefferson's Fifth Annual Message, 3 Dec. 1805, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 10, 194; see also Jefferson to Benjamin Hawkins, 18 Feb. 1803, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 9, 447; *First Annual Message*, 8 Dec. 1801, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 9, 326-27.

[37] 17 Dec. 1803, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 559.

[38] To the Wolf and People of the Mandan Nation, 30 Dec. 1806, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 565. Jefferson also believed that an important element of the civilization of Amerindians would be for them to discontinue their lifestyle largely based on violence and warfare often applied against white settlers. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction*, 191.

[39] Confidential message on expedition to the Pacific, 18 Jan. 1803, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 9, 427.

[40] Also see his letter to his Indian agent William Henry Harrison. Thomas Jefferson to William Henry Harrison, 27 Feb. 1803, in Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh. 20 vols. (Washington, D. C.: The Thomas

Jefferson Memorial Association, 1903-04), vol. 10, 370 (hereafter cited as *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 1903-04).

[41] Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction*, 67-68, 169, 171.

[42] Jefferson to Brother Handsome Lake, 1 Nov. 1802, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 556. See also his *First Annual Message*, 8 Dec. 1801, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 9, 327).

[43] Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 282, 283. The Shawnees, for instance, had difficulty getting such help for the shortage of surplus land that they could exchange for White equipment. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 294.

[44] Jefferson, *Writings*, 520.

[45] Ibid. In order to assimilate Indians and raise them out of poverty, Jefferson had a definite vision consisting of a learning process based on various stages of development that he associated with the general advancement of human societies. In his letter to James Jay of 1809, he argued that the pastoral stage was to be the first one teaching them the concept of "property," to be followed by the farming phase. He associated the former with "arithmetic," the latter with "writing." Jefferson to Governor James Jay, 7 Apr. 1809, in Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 1903-04, vol. 12, 270.

[46] "Confidential message on expedition to the Pacific," 18 Jan. 1803, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 9, 431.

[47] 17 Oct. 1803, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 10, 38.

[48] Susan M. Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2003), 17-19.

[49] Jefferson to Hendrick Aupaumut, 21 Dec. 1808, *Founders Online*, https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/99-01-02-9358, accessed 15 Jan. 2020. See also Jefferson to Benjamin Hawkins, 18 Feb. 1803, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 9, 447.

[50] Grinde, "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans," 208.

[51] In contrast to Blacks, whom he regarded as a species different from Whites in his theory of racial science, Jefferson believed Indians and Whites were of one species, which he considered a fact proven by the comparison of Natives and Europeans displaying similar characteristics. (See Boulton, "The American Paradox," 482.) Hence, he could imagine the mixing of the two races belonging to the same species without any problem, whereas in the case of Blacks he was deeply bothered by the difference. As Winthrop D. Jordan claims in his classic study, "[a]malgamation and identification, welcomed with the Indian, were precisely what Jefferson most abhorred with the Negro." Jordan, *White Over Black*, 480.

[52] Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction*, 174.

[53] *Eighth Annual Message*, 8 Nov. 1808, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 11, 66-67.

[54] As was discussed, Jefferson regarded the diverse collection of Native American tribes as homogeneous independent nations, identifying race with nation; he would have found it difficult to regard them as citizens of the union. See Onuf, "We shall all be Americans," *Jefferson's Empire,* 18-52; Bergeron, "Thomas Jefferson and His Thinking about Native Americans," 22. At the same time, as a result of assimilation, they were expected to behave not as a nation but as a collection of individuals, hence, theoretically, prepared for becoming US citizens at the expense of losing cultural identity.

[54] Jefferson, *Writings*, 556-57.

[56] Jefferson, *Writings*, 520.

[57] Ibid. See also *Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia*, 4 Aug. 1818, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 461-62.

[58] Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 301-09.

[59] Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 300-01, 304. Benjamin Hawkins as agent to the Southern tribes, played an active role in promoting agriculture among them, also relying on his own farming skills. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 285-86. For the implementation of

Jefferson's assimilation program among Northern tribes see Owens, "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground."

[60] Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians*, 298.

[61] Jefferson to Alexander von Humboldt, 6 Dec. 1813, in Jefferson, *Works*, vol. 11, 353.

[62] Grinde, "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans," 207.

[63] "To the Chiefs of the Cherokee Nation," 10 Jan. 1806, in Jefferson, *Writings*, 561; "To the Wolf and People of the Mandan Nation," 30 Dec. 1806, Jefferson, *Writings*, 564.

[64] Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire*, 25-27. Onuf also asserts that Jefferson's reference to the Indians of colonial Spanish America is an example of the degrading impact of despotic rule over such people. However, it needs to be noted that Jefferson also took exception with the free Natives of Mexico, pointing out their independence and successful resistance to subjugation by Whites referring to themselves as creoles. Jefferson to John Jay, 4 May 1787, in *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Paul Leicester Ford, 10 vols. (New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1892-1899), vol. 4, 384.

[65] Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction*, 213-14.

[66] Jefferson, *Writings*, 187.

Works Cited

Banning, Lance. "Jeffersonian Ideology Revisited: Liberal and Classical Ideas in the New American Republic." *William and Mary Quarterly* 43.1 (1986): 3-20. Print.

---. *The Jeffersonian Persuasion*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1978. Print.

---. "The Republican Interpretation: Retrospect and Prospect." *The Republican Synthesis Revisited: Essays in Honor of George Athan Billias*. Ed. Milton M. Klein et al. Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society, 1992. 91-119. Print.

Bergeron, David. "Thomas Jefferson and His Thinking about Native Americans: Understanding a Nature at the Basis of a Human Project." *Revue Française de Science Politique* [French Political Science Review] (English Edition) 67.3 (2017): i-xxiv. Print.

Boulton, Alexander O. "The American Paradox: Jeffersonian Equality and Racial Science." *American Quarterly* 47.3 (1995): 467-92. Print.

Dikant, Thomas. "Settler Colonial Statistics: Jefferson, Biopolitics, and *Notes on the State of Virginia*." *Early American Literature* 541 (2019): 69-96. Print.

Grinde, Donald A., Jr. "Thomas Jefferson's Dualistic Perceptions of Native Americans." *Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a Citizen*. Ed. James Gilreath. Washington: Library of Congress, 1999. 193-208. Print.

Guzzetta, Charles. "Jefferson, Rumford, and the Problem of Poverty." *Midwest Quarterly* 26 (1985): 343-56. Print.

Hellenbrand, Harold. "Not 'To Destroy but to Fulfil': Jefferson, Indians, and Republican Dispensation." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 18.4 (1985): 523-49. Print.

Jefferson, Thomas. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson.* Eds. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh. Washington, D. C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association. 1903-04. Print.

--- *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson.* Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons. 1892-99. Print.

---. *The Works of Thomas Jefferson* [Federal Edition]. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1904-05. Print.

---. *Writings.* Ed. Merrill D. Peterson. New York: The Library of America, 1984. Print.

Jordan, Winthrop D. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812.* New York: Norton, 1977. Print.

Keller, Christian B. "Philanthropy Betrayed: Thomas Jefferson, the Louisiana Purchase, and the Origins of Federal Indian Removal Policy." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 144.1 (2000): 39-66. Print.

McCoy, Drew. *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America.* Chapel Hill: The U of North Carolina P for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1980. Print.

Meek, Ronald L. *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976. Print.

Morgan, Philip D. "Slaves and Poverty." *Down and Out in Early America.* Ed. Billy G. Smith. University Park: Pennsylvania UP, 2004. 93-131. Print.

Nash, Gary B. "Poverty and Politics in Early American History." *Down and Out in Early America.* Ed. Billy G. Smith. University Park: Pennsylvania UP, 2004. 1-37. Print.

Onuf, Peter S. "Every Generation Is an 'Independant [sic] Nation:' Colonization, Miscegenation, and the Fate of Jefferson's Children." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 57.1 (2000): 153-70. Print.

---. *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2000. Print.

---. "'We shall all be Americans': Thomas Jefferson and the Indians." *Indiana Magazine of History*. 95.2 (1999): 103-41. Print.

Owens, Robert M. "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison." *Journal of the Early Republic* 22.3 (2002): 405-35. Print.

Pearson, J. Diane. "Medical Diplomacy and the American Indian: Thomas Jefferson, the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and the Subsequent Effects on American Indian Health and Public Policy." *Wicazo Sa Review* 19.1 (2004): 105-30. Print.

Peterson, Merrill D. *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation.* London: Oxford UP, 1987. Print.

Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment. Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975. Print.

Richter, Daniel K. "'Believing That Many of the Red People Suffer Much for the Want of Food': Hunting, Agriculture, and a Quaker Construction of Indianness in the Early Republic." *Journal of the Early Republic* 19.4 (1999): 601-28. Print.

Rockman, Seth. *Welfare Reform in the Early Republic: A Brief History with Documents*. Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press, Inc., 2014. Print.

Ryan, Susan M. *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2003. Print.

Sayre, Gordon M. "Jefferson and Native Americans: Policy and Archive." In *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Jefferson*. Ed. Frank Shuffelton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 61-72. Print.

Scheer, Arthur. "Thomas Jefferson's 'Poor Woman': A Symbol of Sentiment or Social Inequality?" *Midwest Quarterly* 39.3 (1998): 329-46. Print.

Shalhope, Robert E. "Thomas Jefferson's Republicanism and Antebellum Southern Thought." *The Journal of Southern History* 42.4 (1976): 529-56. Print.

Sheehan, Bernard W. *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1973. Print.

Sheldon, Garrett Ward. *The Political Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1991. Print.

Smith, Billy G., ed. *Down and Out in Early America*. University Park: Pennsylvania UP, 2004. Print.

---. "Poverty and Economic Marginality in Eighteenth-Century America." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 132.1 (1988): 85-118. Print.

Soderlund, Jean R. "The Delaware Indians and Poverty in Colonial New Jersey." *Down and Out in Early America.* Ed. Billy G. Smith. University Park: Pennsylvania UP, 2004. 289-31. Print.

Steele, Brian. "Thomas Jefferson's Gender Frontier." *The Journal of American History* 95.1 (2008): 17-42. Print.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans*. Cambridge: Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1999. Print.

Wulf, Karin. "Gender and the Political Economy of Poor Relief in Colonial Philadelphia." *Down and Out in Early America.* Ed. Billy G. Smith. University Park: Pennsylvania UP, 2004. 163-88. Print.