

CHRISTOPHER B. MANN

The Paradox in Jefferson's Views on Race: Contrasts in Equality on Whites, Indians and Blacks

*We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal...*¹

As the author of the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson's words provided expression to this guiding principle of American ideals. But how can the author of this principle have such divergent opinions about whites, blacks and Indians?² Investigation of Jefferson's views of blacks and of Indians reveals he did not see the world as white and non-white. Not only did he think about Blacks and Indians as distinct groups, he thought about them in very different terms. The terms in which he thought about each group were bound up in the context, the institutions, in which he saw them. For Jefferson, racial questions about blacks were inextricably intertwined with the institution of slavery, especially since his experience with free blacks was quite limited. Racial questions about Indians were framed by his interpretation of their social and political structure as an example of his natural law political philosophy.

Jefferson attempted to treat, "the races of black and of red men... as subjects of natural history."³ Daniel Boorstin has said of attempts to examine Jefferson's views of race:

The Jeffersonian science of man which we must now try to understand was something more than anthropology: it was at once an aspect of cosmology and theology and an avenue to ethics and political theory.⁴

Jefferson's views on race operate in several dimensions simultaneously and we must keep our eyes open to all of these as we compare his views on blacks and on Indians. He saw each group as equal in their natural rights, but Jefferson also stated, "I do not mean to deny that there are variations in the race of men, distinguished by their powers of both mind and body. I believe there are, as I see there to be in the races of other animals."⁵ Jefferson judged these variations in men from basic equality of natural rights by the scientific examination of whether men possessed the capacities to learn and develop the knowledge and skills of contemporary European civilization.⁶

The modern reader will likely find Jefferson's thinking on race complex, contradictory and, at times, revolting. DNA evidence supporting the hypothesis that Jefferson (or a close male relative) had a long term sexual relationship with one of his slaves, Sally Hemings, adds the specter of hypocrisy and even sexual predation to understanding

Jefferson's views of Blacks. However, it is important to keep in mind that Jefferson's views about Blacks made him a progressive and even a radical among his neighbors in Virginia. It was difficult for Jefferson to see past the socialization of eighteenth century Virginia and the environment of slavery in which he saw blacks.⁷

This paper will begin with an introduction to Jefferson's general views on equality. It will then try to untangle the paradoxes in his views on blacks and on Indians respectively. Finally, it will investigate whether the paradox between his largely positive view of Indians and his negative view of blacks can be explained by his inability to separate either group from the institutions in which he saw them.

Jefferson's Views on Equality

Jefferson's hard work in drafting the Declaration of Independence is legendary. The text evolved over numerous drafts as Jefferson strove to express the feelings of the Continental Congress as precisely as possible. Although Jefferson felt each of his successive drafts was an improvement, examining his various drafts serves as a vital indication of what he sought to express. One earlier draft contains an expanded and more detailed expression of the famous phrase above:

We hold these truths to be sacred and undeniable; that all men are created equal and independent, that from equal creation they derive rights inherent and inalienable...⁸

The "truth" that Jefferson was trying to express was not a statement of moral principle, but rather a principle he saw as scientific and historical fact. Jefferson accepted, as was the prevailing thought in his day, that science and history proved that all men had been created by a single act of God (The story of Genesis from the Bible).⁹ As a consequence of the shared creation, all men must necessarily enjoy equal rights.¹⁰ Jefferson believed that all men by definition shared the moral sense: the ability to determine right and wrong. The moral sense was the highest faculty of nature, thus its unique endowment to man, placing him above the other beasts.¹¹

Explaining the role of government in relation to these natural rights, Jefferson said:

Our legislators are not sufficiently appraised of the rightful limits of their power; that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us. No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; and this is all the laws should enforce on him; and, no man having a natural right to be the judge between himself and

another, it is his natural duty to submit to the umpirage of an impartial third. When the laws have declared and enforced all this, they have fulfilled their functions; and the idea is quite unfounded, that on entering into society we give up any natural right.¹²

Jefferson believed the natural equality of man to be the fundamental political value for America. In a letter to George Washington, Jefferson explained, "[t]he foundation on which all [Revolutionary era state constitutions] are built is the natural equality of man, the denial of preeminence but that annexed by legal office, and particularly the denial of preeminence by birth."¹³ The foundation of America was, in Jefferson's eyes, that it strove to treat men according to their natural equality. No man had any right superior to those of any other, except those given to him with the consent of society, for the purpose of governing, in the form of a legal office. "An equal application of the law to every condition of man is fundamental,"¹⁴ to the justice and fairness of the legal system under Jefferson's natural rights theory. The equal and inalienable rights that all men derive from their shared Creation demand that they be seen as equal before the law, no matter what their social, political, or economic position may be within a society.

As early as 1770, the second year of his law practice, Jefferson demonstrated he believed these natural rights applied to blacks as well as whites. He took on slave Samuel Howell's suit for freedom on a *pro bono* basis.¹⁵ Jefferson stunned the court by claiming that Howell's bondage was illegal because it violated his natural rights. Jefferson argued that since all men derive their natural rights from a single shared creation and therefore all men must be equal. Since enslavement was unequal it must be illegal. This argument against slavery was far too progressive for the court, and Jefferson lost the case decisively. Nevertheless, the court's rejection of his argument does not diminish the clear statement of Jefferson's understanding that the equality of the natural rights of men derived from creation applies to all races.

Jefferson's Views on Blacks and Slavery

Thomas Jefferson assured himself a place in history when he drafted the Declaration of Independence. This clear and unequivocal statement of liberal natural rights doctrine both reflected the spirit of the times and helped define American political thought in the future. The idea "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and inalienable rights"¹⁶ is one of the guiding principles of American political thought. However, the fundamental question remains whether Jefferson meant to include blacks when he wrote the Declaration in the definition of "all men"? The answer is a complex and, in many

ways, unsatisfactory one. Jefferson was always profoundly ambivalent about blacks. Jefferson believed that the doctrine of natural rights included blacks within the definition of equally human. However, Jefferson clearly did not see Blacks as equal to white in all ways.

Jefferson rarely made a distinction between his views on slavery and the blacks held in bondage by that institution. The blacks in Jefferson's world were slaves. He did meet a number of free blacks in his travels, but free blacks were few and far between in Jefferson's Virginia. Therefore, in order to have a complete understanding of Jefferson's view of blacks, it is necessary to examine fully both Jefferson's views of slavery as an institution and blacks as a racial group.

Jefferson saw slavery as a moral and practical evil that must be eliminated for the sake of the nation. He felt that slavery stood at odds with every principle that justified the American resistance to British oppression.¹⁷ Jefferson believed blacks had lost their freedom and equality only through the coercion and injustice of human law. In conjunction with this view, he believed that emancipation was inevitable, that the institution of slavery was so corrupt that if emancipation was not granted in a peaceful and controlled manner, it would come on its own, and come violently.

Unfortunately, Jefferson felt trapped by slavery. Slavery supported the economic structure of the South, especially Jefferson's Virginia, and his own personal lifestyle. As a practical matter, slave labor would have to be replaced before slaves could be emancipated. In the candid words of Jefferson's frequent opponent in Virginia, Patrick Henry, "I am drawn along by ye. general inconvenience of living without them, I will not, I cannot justify it."¹⁸ The paradox of needing slaves, yet abhorring slavery, haunted Jefferson his whole life. He searched to find a solution to this dilemma, always holding on to the hope that a peaceful solution did exist. In the course of his life, his strong anti-slavery views and desire for emancipation rose and fell as he was distracted by other problems, but on his death bed his opinions remained much the same as they had been before the American Revolution.¹⁹

The Moral Danger of Slavery

Jefferson wrote only three published political works. Each of these was a patriotic response to attacks on America. It is significant that in each of these defenses of America, he attacks slavery as a moral evil in violation of natural right and natural law. The early pair of treatises, *A Summary View of the Rights of British North America* (1774) and the Declaration of Independence (1776), were responses to the British King's wrongdoing against the Americans. In *A Summary View*, Jefferson protested the King's insistence on legal slave-trading in Virginia. Further, Jefferson decried

the moral damage slavery did to all involved, saying "the rights of human nature [are] deeply wounded by this infamous practice." Two years later, Jefferson's final draft of the Declaration of Independence made an even stronger statement against slavery: "[The King] has waged a cruel war against human nature itself, violating it's most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, capturing and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation hither." Although this section was deleted by the Continental Congress at the insistence of pro-slavery delegations from South Carolina and Georgia, it nonetheless shows that Jefferson viewed slavery as cruel and perceived it as damaging to American morality. In these two indictments of the British, Jefferson saw the removal of the immoral institution of slavery as an important and legitimate justification for the rebellion by the Americans. In blaming the British for slavery in these two treatises, Jefferson may have also been seeking to remove the paradox of slavery from the high morality he saw in America and her Revolution.

His early legislative efforts on the state and national level reflected the anti-slavery position he established in these two political works. In his first term in the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1769, Jefferson authored a Bill proposing gradual emancipation. In the first session of the independent Virginia legislature, Jefferson's "Bill to Prevent Importation of Slaves" was passed, banning slave trade in Virginia after 1778 but not emancipating existing slaves.²⁰ In 1783, Jefferson submitted a draft Constitution for Virginia, which contained a key provision that slavery be gradually abolished starting in 1800.²¹ In his original draft of the Northwest Ordinance of 1784, Jefferson included a ban on slavery in the new federal territory and the states to be made from it. This provision was dropped by Congress but included again in the new Northwest Ordinance in 1789 as a provision banning slavery in the Territories after 1800.²² There is plausible speculation by historians that his assignment by Congress as Minister to France was in part due to the desire of the defenders of slavery to get this well respected Revolutionary and Virginia opponent out of the country.²³

Critics have argued that Jefferson's unwillingness to take a public stand in favor of emancipation and abolition later in his career was due to his fear that such a position would undermine his political popularity. This argument is not entirely untrue, although it was not as self-serving as these critics suggest. First, excusing himself from joining an anti-slavery society, Jefferson says that, despite being "willing to encounter every sacrifice for that object," he cannot join because, "it might render me less able to serve it [abolition] beyond the water."²⁴ Although our modern cynicism about political figures may quickly discount such

statements, the realism of Jefferson's assessment of the effects on his standing among his 18th century contemporaries – especially in Virginia – on whom he depended to be asked to serve in public office suggests that we give at least some credence to his sincerity.

Other scholars have rejected concern for political reputation as a major factor in Jefferson's reticence to take a public stand on emancipation or abolition. In their views, Jefferson's reticence was a result of his assessment of the political environment with regard to emancipation. Winthrop Jordan argues that Jefferson feared that a premature attack on slavery would serve to entrench the institution more deeply as pro-slavery forces would rally to its defense.²⁵ Jefferson's reluctance to publish *Notes* is often cited as the prime example of his reticence about revealing his true opinion of slavery. William Peden defends this reticence in the introduction to his edition of *Notes on the State of Virginia*: "[T]here is no question concerning the sincerity of Jefferson's efforts to keep his book from the public—at least until he was certain that its publication would not endanger the attainment of his two most cherished goals, the emancipation of slavery [sic] in Virginia and the reformation of the Virginia Constitution."²⁶ By these accounts, Jefferson feared that starting a debate over slavery would enable pro-slavery forces to entrench slavery more deeply into America.

Slavery presented the South, and the nation, with an unsolvable dilemma. "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."²⁷ To emancipate the slaves was just, but meant the destruction of society as it had existed. To hold onto slavery preserved society, but was unjust and slowly destroyed society through moral corruption. Although he remained a committed opponent of slavery throughout, Jefferson was also a slave owner for his entire adult life. This paradox has been the source and central point of much debate about Jefferson's legacy. Jefferson never addressed this contradiction directly, but did offer explanations of why he continued to be a slaveholder. In a letter to Edward Coles, Jefferson wrote:

My opinion has ever been that, until more can be done for them [slaves], we [slave-holders] should endeavor, with those whom fortune has thrown on our hands, to feed and clothe them well, protect them from all ill usage, require such reasonable labor only as is performed voluntarily by freemen, & be led by no repugnancies to abdicate them, and our duties to them. The laws do not permit us to turn them loose, if that were for their good: and to commute them for other property is to commit them to those whose usage is beyond our control.²⁸

Bound by the strict laws of Virginia and the inability of most slaves to survive as freed men because they lacked trade skills, Jefferson rationalized the necessity of keeping slaves until more could be done for them—i.e., as Jefferson explains in this letter, until they could be trained in the necessary skills to survive outside of plantations and sent to colonies after emancipation. Jefferson's actions were consistent with this explanation, as the only slaves he manumitted were those with trade skills to support themselves, and he paid for the passage of each of his manumitted slaves to the Northern free states.²⁹ Although his affair (or his nephew's affair) with Sally Hemings, makes him more hypocritical as a slave-owner engaging in (or aware of) the depraved conduct he deplores, the training given to the Hemings family to allow them to survive once freed reinforces the consistency of his actions and beliefs with the need to do more than simply emancipate slaves.

While the legal obstacles and the survival of former slaves as freedmen provided a rationalization for Jefferson's continued slaveholding, they do not provide a complete explanation for it.³⁰ The remaining part was coldly practical, selfish and largely hypocritical. Neither Jefferson, nor the Southern plantation economy as a whole, could survive without slaves. Jefferson's lifestyle was supported by slave labor. Although a brilliant politician, Jefferson was a failure as a businessman. He died deeply in debt and if he had been compelled to rely on the labor market, rather than slave labor, there is little doubt that he would have been bankrupt earlier.

Jefferson's criticism of slavery and his attempts to stop it were motivated in part by his fear that slavery was undermining the morality of white society. While he recognized the miserable conditions of slavery for blacks, he was very concerned with the impact it had on whites.³¹ In *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Jefferson wrote, "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 the degrading submissions on the other...The [white] man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances."³² Whites are "thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny."³³ Tyranny, to the Founding Generation, was the ultimate example of immorality and corruption, and the antithesis of American ideals and values.

For Jefferson, the worst part of the corruption and immorality of the relations between master and slave was, "Our young see this, and learn to imitate it."³⁴ Jefferson hoped that the next generation, raised in the new nation with American moral values, would see the evil of slavery and bring about emancipation. "It is to them I look, to the rising generation, and not to the one now in power, for these great reformatations

[emancipation].³⁵ Within his lifetime during the Missouri Compromise of 1820, Jefferson came to fear that this generation too had been corrupted by the temptation of the tyranny of slavery.

In Jefferson's view, the moral corruption of whites by slavery threatened the very survival of the nation. By denying blacks their natural rights, slavery undermined the validity of natural rights as the basis for American society. He asked: "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure where we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?"³⁶ Jefferson found it incomprehensible that man could struggle so hard and sacrifice so much to achieve his liberty, and then the next moment be deaf to all of his own motives and vindications as he places another in bondage. Yet every man in America who owned or condoned owning slaves was turning a deaf ear to the very motives and vindications of their Revolution and the foundation of their nation.³⁷

Despite arguing that Blacks have the same natural rights as whites based on common descent from the act of Creation, Jefferson advanced the hypothesis, "that the blacks...are inferior to the whites in both body and mind."³⁸ In *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Jefferson systematically examines the equality of blacks on a variety of criteria. Jefferson perceived blacks to be physically inferior to whites. In Query XIV of *Notes*, Jefferson discusses his observations of the physical attributes of blacks. His observations are clearly based upon his ethnocentric presumption that the characteristics of whites are the norm for beauty and excellence. Jefferson insists that, "[t]he circumstance of superior beauty, is thought worthy of attention in the propagation of our horses, dogs, and other domestic animals; why not in that of man?" He concludes that whites are more beautiful, because of their skin color, "flowing hair, more elegant symmetry of form, [blacks'] own judgement in favour of whites, declared by their preference for them..." Jefferson finds that blacks, "secrete less by the kidneys, and more by the glands of the skin, which gives them a strong and disagreeable odor."³⁹

Jefferson makes similar observations of the emotional "faculties" of blacks. He believes that their emotions are more primal than those of whites. "They are more ardent after the female: but love seems with them to be more eager desire, than a tender delicate mixture of sentiment and sensation." Their emotions are more "transient," not controlled by reason as much as those of whites. He believes blacks to be "at least as brave, and more adventuresome," than whites, but attributes that to a "want of forethought, which prevents their seeing a danger till it is present." He said blacks were inferior because they sleep like animals, rather than reflect when not distracted by some activity.⁴⁰

Although physical and emotional inferiority are important elements

of Jefferson's case that blacks are inferior, the most important considerations to this intellectual man are his observations of their intellectual capacities:

Comparing them by their faculties of memory, reason, and imagination, it appears to me, that in memory they are equal to whites; in reason much inferior, as I think one could scarcely be found capable of tracing and comprehending the investigations of Euclid; and that in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous.⁴¹

The concession that blacks are equal to whites in memory is not as significant as it might appear. Jefferson viewed memory as the lowest form of intellectual capability. He associated it with intellectual immaturity. In his discussions of education, he suggested exercises of memory, in such activities as studying foreign languages, for children between the ages of eight and sixteen. The faculty of reflection has not yet developed in these children to allow more complex, mature thought.⁴²

Equating blacks with white children in terms of developmental stages was a central metaphor in Jefferson's thought about blacks. For example, Jefferson wrote to Edward Bancroft, "...as far as I can judge from the experiments which have been made to give liberty to, or rather abandon, persons whose habits have formed in slavery is rather like abandoning children."⁴³ Jefferson believed the position of slaves, of blacks, in relation to whites was the same as that of white children to white adults: They were unquestionably human but also undeniably inferior. Unlike children, blacks' inferiority was not something that will disappear on its own as with white children growing up. Jefferson believed their capacity to train and develop their faculties left them at a level significantly inferior to that of whites. Thus what began as a promising concession of equality in memory turns out to be another patronizing statement of inferiority.

In asserting black inferiority in reason in *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Jefferson chose to use Euclidean geometry as his example of reasoning blacks were incapable of understanding. Ironically, within a few years after Jefferson published *Notes*, black mathematician Benjamin Banneker defied Jefferson's assertions of inferiority in this arena. Banneker's work clearly demonstrated that he understood Euclidean geometry and other forms of advanced mathematics. In 1791, Jefferson wrote two letters concerning Banneker and his almanac, a copy of which Banneker had sent to Jefferson. In thanking Banneker for the almanac, Jefferson wrote:

Nobody wishes more than I do to see proofs such as you exhibit, that nature has given our black brethren, talents equal to those of the other colors of men, and that the appearance of the want of them is owing merely to the degraded condition of their existence, both in Africa and America.⁴⁴

In a letter accompanying a copy of Banneker's almanac Jefferson sent to the Marquis de Condorcet, Jefferson also expressed hope that corresponding intellectual achievements by other blacks would reinforce the example of Banneker.

I shall be delighted to see these instances of moral eminence so multiplied as to prove the want of talents, observed in [blacks], is merely the effect of their degraded condition, not proceeding from any difference in the structure of the parts on which the intellect depends.⁴⁵

Reflecting his persistent ambivalence about blacks, Jefferson was reluctant to accept black equality in reason. He required additional corroborating proof that Banneker's accomplishments could be duplicated by other blacks. Moreover, elsewhere in the letter to Condorcet, he expressed doubt about that Banneker had written the almanac unassisted by his white neighbor, reflecting his continuing cynicism about the possibility of true black achievement that could be taken as proof of their intellectual equality.⁴⁶

Despite defending the moral equality of Blacks by pointing to the degrading influence of slavery, Jefferson rejected such considerations when judging blacks "body and mind." He makes a three pronged attack against environmentalist claims about black intellectual capabilities: 1) He dismisses the inequity of slaves' relative social position by drawing comparisons to white slaves in ancient Rome; 2) He questions why blacks with an opportunity for education have not excelled; 3) He cites the lack of poetry as evidence that the environment is not the cause of their inferiority.⁴⁷

Not surprisingly for an Enlightenment thinker like Jefferson, he appeals to ancient Rome for a model of slavery. His examination of the circumstances of slaves in ancient Rome leads to the conclusion that their lot was far more odious than the lot of black slaves in America:

Yet notwithstanding these and other discouraging circumstances among the Romans, their slaves were often among their rarest artists. They excelled too in science, insomuch as to be usually employed as tutors to their masters children... But they were of the race of whites. It is not [the black American slaves'] condition then, but nature, which has produced the distinction.⁴⁸

Jefferson's comparison between black and white slaves showed him that the white slave was far superior to the black slave, even where the position of the white slave was more onerous than that of the black slave. He ignored differences between the Roman and American circumstances and institutions of slavery such as opportunities for education. From this comparison he concluded that it was the faculties of each race, not

the impact of the position of slavery, which made black slaves inferior.

Addressing the lack of education available to blacks, Jefferson points out that many blacks had been given the opportunity to educate themselves:

[M]any have been so situated, that they might have availed themselves of the conversation of their masters; many have been brought up in the handicraft arts, and from that circumstance always been associated with the whites. Some have been liberally educated, and all have lived in countries [states within the Articles of Confederation] where the arts and sciences are cultivated to a considerable degree, and have had before their eyes samples of the best works from abroad... But never yet could I find that a black had uttered a thought above the level of plain narration; never see even an elementary trait of painting or sculpture.⁴⁹

In contrast, "[t]he Indians, with no advantages of this kind," will, "prove the existence of a germ in their minds which wants only cultivation... [and] prove their reason and sentiment strong, their imagination glowing and elevated."⁵⁰ Even with informal exposure to educational opportunities, Jefferson believed blacks did not demonstrate this germ of potential for cultivation. In the absence of any demonstrations of potential, Jefferson concluded that their faculties for reason, sentiment, and imagination must be innately inferior.

Jefferson supports his claim "that in imagination [blacks] are dull, tasteless, and anomalous," by stating that blacks have been unable to produce much poetry, and none worthwhile, despite living in a condition that he believed ought to inspire it. Jefferson reasons that if the inferiority of blacks can be expected because of their circumstances, then surely the natural products of their environment should be expected as well:

Misery is often the parent of the most afflicting touches in poetry. Among the blacks there is misery, God knows, but no poetry Love is the peculiar oestrum of the poet. Their love is ardent, but it kindles the senses only, not the imagination.⁵²

Jefferson's point in this passage is that if the slavery environment did not produce poetry as expected, it cannot be assumed that it produces the deficiencies predicted by environmental theory. The lack of poetry demonstrates that the environment is not the determining factor in the inferiority of blacks, because if it was then that environment should have led the blacks to produce good poetry.

In his analysis of blacks' intellectual capacities, Jefferson rejects a comparison of black slaves with blacks in Africa. Jefferson claims, "[i]t would be unfair to follow them [blacks] to Africa for this investigation. We will consider them here, on the same stage with the whites, and where the facts are not apocryphal upon which a judgement is to be

formed."⁵³ There is some validity to Jefferson's fear that any comparison with Africa would be based on information about Africa of questionable accuracy. However, this fear seems secondary to Jefferson's inability to think about Blacks outside of their interactions with whites in the institution of slavery. Thus Jefferson considers blacks only in a setting defined by an institution which Jefferson characterized as, "cruel war against human nature."⁵⁴

As empirical proof of blacks' inferiority, Jefferson claims, in *Notes*, "[t]he improvement of blacks in body and mind, in the first instance of their mixture with whites, has been observed by every one, and proves that their inferiority is not the effect merely of their condition of life."⁵⁵ The direct statement in this passage cannot be missed: Blacks are naturally inferior to whites and are improved by adding white genes.

However, in describing albino blacks in *Notes*, Jefferson reveals how simplistic stereotypical associations of skin color impacted his thinking. Comparing albinos to other blacks, he infers that, "[t]hey are uncommonly shrewd, quick in their reply." Since it is known through modern science that albinos are no more intellectually gifted than their pigmented peers, Jefferson's impression was driven by his expectation that those with fair skin would be more intelligent. This simplistic association with skin color contradicts his more elaborate disparagements of blacks based on racial difference.

Despite these conjectures of Black inferiority, Jefferson remains steadfast in his argument that Blacks are equal to whites in "moral sense" and natural rights. "Whether further observation will or will not verify the conjecture, that nature has been less bountiful to them [blacks] in the endowments of the head, I believe that in those of the heart she will be found to have done them justice."⁵⁶ In this passage, Jefferson is drawing on a distinction between the heart as that which discerns right and wrong (i.e. the location of the moral sense) and the head which has the power of reason. Jefferson, then, believes blacks to be equal in their moral ability to discern right and wrong, but questions whether they have equal intellectual faculties to apply reason to fact.

Jefferson dismisses the claim that Blacks do not have the same "moral sense" as whites saying, "[t]hat disposition to theft with which they have been branded, must be ascribed to their situation, and not to any depravity of the moral sense."⁵⁷ Jefferson concludes, "[a] man's moral sense must be unusually strong if slavery does not make him a thief. He who is permitted by law to have no property of his own can with difficulty conceive that property is founded in anything but force."⁵⁸ Thus it is the institution of slavery, not lack of moral sense, which is responsible for immoral behavior among slaves.

Jefferson feared that before a practical, controlled, peaceful method

of emancipation was discovered, the evils of slavery would coalesce and violently tear apart the institution and the society around it. Jefferson believed emancipation was inevitable: Providence, experience and time were all working against the continuation of the practice. No just God could allow slavery continue, Jefferson wrote to Monsieur de Meusnier:

We must await with patience the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of these [slaves], our suffering brethren. ...doubtless a God of Justice will awaken to their distress, and by diffusing light and liberty among their oppressors, or, at length, by His exterminating thunder, manifest His attention to the things of this world...⁵⁹

In a letter to St. George Tucker, Jefferson spoke of an imminent "revolutionary storm" that would lead to an uprising of slaves throwing off their bondage and seeking revenge against their masters. "[I]f something is not done, and soon done, we shall be murderers of our children."⁶⁰ Jefferson's fear, at the time of this letter, was motivated by the recent slave revolt that took place on the Caribbean island of Santo Domingo. This example reinforced his fears that slavery would come to its cataclysmic end very soon. Seventeen years later, the cataclysm had not occurred, but Jefferson's fear of its imminence remained. "The hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time. It will come; and whether brought on by the energy of our own minds; or by the bloody process of Santo Domingo, ...is a leaf of our history not yet turned over."⁶¹

Jefferson expressed his firm conviction that emancipation and subsequent colonization must be linked together. Jefferson saw blacks as a distinct people, set off from whites by their race and by their experience as slaves. "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people [slaves] 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."⁶² Jefferson explains why freed slaves could not live among white society in *Notes on the State of Virginia*:

It will probably be asked, Why not retain and incorporate the blacks into the state, and thus save the expence of supplying, by importation of white settlers, the vacancies they will leave? Deep rooted prejudices entertained by the whites; ten thousand recollections, by the blacks, of the injuries they have sustained; new provocations; the real distinctions which nature has made, and many other circumstances, will divide us into parties, and produce convulsions, which will probably never end but in the extermination of one or the other race.⁶³

Jefferson's fear of black rebellion and revenge and his ethnocentricity obviously had significant influence on this dire prediction. However, it

is notable that the "distinctions which nature has made" between the races are the last of the reasons Jefferson gives for colonization. For Jefferson, the institution of slavery is the foremost part of the problem of the races living together.

Jefferson never formally proposed his colonization plan as legislation, most likely because he recognized that although he thought it best, it was not politically viable. His scheme of replacing slaves with free white laborers brought from Europe would not convince most plantation owners that the entire economic structure would not collapse. Jefferson's plan also involved stretching both Constitutional and humanitarian scruples.⁶⁴ It was a radical plan, difficult for many people to accept—especially those who did not feel emancipation was inevitable as Jefferson did.⁶⁵

While Jefferson wanted the freed slaves out of Virginia, he did not deny their natural right to govern themselves. Jefferson argued the legacy of slavery meant that Blacks could not live under the same social contract with whites, but that they had the natural right and abilities (with some education/training) to form a social contract of their own to freely govern themselves in a new location.⁶⁶ The colonists had been unable to live within the British social compact at the time of the Revolution. Thus, the inability of blacks to live within the social compact of white Americans did not make inferior their right to govern themselves, it required them only to form a separate social compact as the colonists had done in the Revolution.⁶⁷

What Effect Did Sally Hemings Have on Jefferson's Thinking?

No discussion of Jefferson's views on blacks could be complete without addressing the theory that he had a long-term affair with slave Sally Hemings. This theory has long been the center of great debate about Jefferson's views of blacks. A fairly convincing case has been assembled that Jefferson did indeed keep Sally Hemings as his paramour beginning sometime during her stay in Paris with his household.⁶⁸ However, other scholars have refuted, or at least raised serious doubts about, many of the suppositions upon which this case relies.⁶⁹ Unquestionably, the Hemings family were favorites of Jefferson and received special treatment.

The debate over whether Jefferson actually kept Sally Hemings as his paramour is an unfinished one. Neither side has been able to prove conclusively that it is correct despite bring the tools of history and modern science to bear. Unquestionably, whether Jefferson had a relationship with a black woman and the nature of this relationship has a significant

impact on how Jefferson's views towards blacks should be read. I have attempted to present Jefferson's thinking as clearly as possible given that he expressed himself in letters rather than comprehensive treatises after *Notes on the State of Virginia* was published in the 1780s. A careful chronological reading of Jefferson's letter and other writings with the estimated timeline of the Jefferson-Hemings relationship in mind might illuminate whether there are any attributable changes in his thinking. However, my perusal of his writings suggest that there is more variation from one letter to the next—probably based on the other, unseen side of the correspondence—than there is over Jefferson's lifetime.

A Summary of Jefferson's Views on Blacks

Jefferson's views can be seen as the product of two factors. First, Jefferson was a son of eighteenth century Virginia. He was thoroughly socialized in the common beliefs of his day. The degree to which he overcame this socialization to see Blacks as equal to whites in natural rights and moral sense was remarkable, and was what made him a radical for his time and place. Second, as an eighteenth century Virginian he was constrained by what was possible—both personally and in his public roles. He sought to avoid a violent cataclysm, a revolution, over slavery because he believed it would result in the destruction of society in America, her experiment with democratic government, and quite possibly the annihilation of one race.

Normally a man of firm convictions, the most striking thing about Jefferson's views on Blacks is that he remained ambivalent through his entire life. Despite clear statements of their inferiority in "body and mind," Jefferson remained willing to be proven wrong on these observations. Just as in 1791 he had responded to the mathematical accomplishments of Benjamin Banneker, in 1809 he thanked Henri Gregoire for a copy of *Literature of Negroes*, which attempted to establish that blacks did have literary ability, by saying, "No person wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a complete refutation of the doubts I myself entertained and expressed on the grade of understanding allotted them [blacks] by nature, and to find in this respect they are on par with ourselves [whites]."⁷⁰ In this same letter, Jefferson also reiterates his split decision on equality, saying "whatever their degree of talent it is no measure of their rights." The proof of Black equality to whites in "body and mind" that Jefferson says he is looking for would put an end to his many contortions of natural rights philosophy around this split decision.

Much of Jefferson's ambivalence stems from his failure to separate Blacks from slavery. "I have supposed the black man, in his present state, might not be [equal]; but it would be hazardous to affirm, that,

equally cultivated for a few generations, he would not become so."⁷¹ Since Jefferson did not look beyond America to observe Blacks, he is forced to admit here that his observations of Blacks may be a product of the institution of slavery rather than a racial characteristic.

Jefferson's Views of Indians and Their Society

Thomas Jefferson saw the essence of America in the Native American Indians. They represented the greatness and the potential of the New World. From his childhood to his dying days, Indians played a major role in Jefferson's life. They stimulated his intellect, inspired his philosophy, and frustrated him in the political arena. He would defend them fiercely against the charges of Europeans, and attack them for not assimilating European culture.⁷² He was widely respected as a scholar of Indians and his *Notes on the State of Virginia* was considered by many to be the most knowledgeable statement on Indians of his day.⁷³

Jefferson's experience with Indians came at an early age. On their way to the capital at Williamsburg, many Indians stopped to visit his father, Peter Jefferson, at Shadwell when Jefferson was a young boy.⁷⁴ Peter Jefferson treated the Indians with friendliness and respect. Young Thomas learned these things from his father.⁷⁵ When Jefferson himself went to Williamsburg some years later to attend William and Mary, his contact with the Indians continued.⁷⁶ After his retirement from public life, Jefferson wrote to John Adams describing his experiences with Indians in his younger days:

[C]oncerning Indians, a people whom, in the early years of my life, I was very familiar, and acquired impressions of attachment and commiseration for them which have never been obliterated. Before the Revolution they were in the habit of coming often and in great numbers to the seat of government where I was very much with them.⁷⁷

The attachment, commiseration and awe created by Jefferson's early experiences with Indians were clearly reflected in his thought about them.

Native American scholar Donald Grinde cautions against the impression that Jefferson was completely enamored of the Indians. His examination of Jefferson's interest in Indians revealed a major change in Jefferson's life when he returned from France and re-entered national politics. Prior to that point, Indians were a fascinating abstract intellectual pursuit for Jefferson. However, engaged in national politics after that point, Jefferson had to deal with Indians as an obstacle to white expansion. The emphasis of his interest in Indians shifted from admiration of their independent society to advocacy of assimilation of Indians into white society or their forceful elimination as a hindrance to

the expansion of white society.⁷⁸ By thoroughly examining Jefferson's thought about the Indians, this section seeks to resolve the paradox between these two positions.

Scholar of Indians

Jefferson's study of Indians was a lifelong task. While most of his contemporaries focused exclusively on educating the Indians in European ways for their improvement, Jefferson advocated study of the Indians for the lessons they could contribute to European society as well. In regard to the Brofferton professorship for the instruction of Indians at William and Mary, Jefferson said:

The purposes of the Brofferton institution would be better answered by maintaining a perpetual mission among the Indian tribes, the object of which..., should be to collect their traditions, laws, customs, languages, and other circumstances...⁷⁹

In his study of the Indians, Jefferson would find much to admire, and some things to emulate, in their societies.

Jefferson attempted to make his scholarship scientific and empirical.⁸⁰ He sought to observe and explain Indians scientifically as a topic of natural history.⁸¹ He undertook a massive project to collect the vocabularies of various tribes, because he was convinced that linguistic analysis would reveal a wealth of knowledge about their past and their relations to one another.⁸²

One of the most significant areas of Jefferson's scholarship on Indians was his study of their origins. He believed them to be a very ancient people. From his linguistics project, he concluded in *Notes* that the greater differentiation of languages among Indians than among the people of Asia indicated that the Indians were an older people than the Asians.⁸³ He explained this conclusion about the age of Indians to Ezra Stiles in 1786, "I suppose the settlement of our continent to be of the greatest antiquity ...among our Indians the number of languages is infinite which are so radically different as to exhibit no appearance of their having been derived from a common source. The time necessary for the generation of so many languages must be immense."⁸⁴

Jefferson also speculated in *Notes* that the Indians arrived in America in ancient times by one of two routes. He postulated that Indians might have come from Europe in ancient times, because, "a passage from Europe to America was always practicable, even to the imperfect navigation of ancient times."⁸⁵ However, this seemed the more unlikely alternative to Jefferson. "[T]he resemblance between the Indians of America and the Eastern inhabitants of Asia, would induce us to conjecture, that the former were descendants of the latter, or the latter of

the former...⁸⁶ Jefferson favors the Asia to America route, rather than the reverse.⁸⁷ He supports his theory of a relationship between Asians and Indians, by pointing out, "the late discoveries of Captain Cook, coasting from Kamschatka to California, have proved that, if the two continents of Asia and America be separated at all, it is only by a narrow streight [sic]."⁸⁸ Jefferson believed ancient Indians would have been able to cross from Asia to America over this strait.⁸⁹ It is unclear how Jefferson reconciled favoring this arrival theory with his linguistic theory on the age of the Indian and Asian people.

Stages of Civilization

Regardless of whether Indians had arrived in America by way of Asia or Europe, Jefferson believed that they were of the same race as whites. To him, their copper skin color was not an indication of a difference in race, but merely of variety within the race.⁹⁰ In *Notes*, Jefferson argues that after accounting for differences on the basis of environment, "we shall probably find that they [Indians] are formed in mind as well as in body, on the same module with the 'Homo sapiens Europaeus'."⁹¹ Jefferson regarded Indians as scientifically, zoologically and biologically, indistinguishable from whites. When disparaging the skin color of blacks as inferior later in *Notes*, Jefferson asked rhetorically, "[a]re not the fine mixtures of red and white, ...of colour in the one, preferable," to the monotonous skin color of blacks?⁹² He perceived red and white skin colors as belonging not to distinct races, but as mixed "in the one" to create variations of the same race.

Since Jefferson saw Indians as a variety of the race to which whites belong, Jefferson must explain how they can have such a primitive civilization when compared to whites. In *Notes*, he cites the treatment of women as indicative of the primitive state of Indian society:

The women are submitted to unjust drudgery. This I believe to be the case with every barbarous people. With such force is law. The stronger sex therefore imposes on the weaker. It is civilization alone which replaces women in the enjoyment of their natural equality.⁹³

However, Jefferson did not judge the Indians through direct comparison of the whites and Indians he knew. Instead, he compared Indians and whites at similar stages of civilization and found evidence of equality in the potential which Indians possessed.

He explains the primitive state of Indian society as being a function of the progress of civilization, wherein all civilizations evolve through the same stages.⁹⁴ Indians, he believes, are simply at an earlier stage than whites in this evolution.

I am safe in affirming, that the proofs of genius given by the Indians of North America place them on a level with whites in the same uncultivated state. The North of Europe furnishes subjects enough for comparison with them, and for proof of their equality. I have seen some thousands [of Indians] myself, and conversed much with them, and found in them a masculine, sound understanding. ... [Men who have lived among the Indians] have all agreed in bearing witness to the genius of this people. ... I believe the Indian, then, to be, in body and mind, equal to the white man.⁹⁵

Jefferson believed the evolution of their civilization merely had not progressed as far as that of whites. Their genius was not yet cultivated. However, they proved equal to whites when their faculties of "body and mind" were examined at a similarly uncultivated stage in the evolution of civilization.

Jefferson uses the settlement of America in the 1820s to illustrate the stages and inevitable progression of civilization.

Let a philosophic observer commence a journey from the savages of the Rocky Mountains, eastwardly towards our seacoast. These he would observe to be in the earliest stage of association living under no law but that of nature, subsisting and covering themselves with the flesh and skins of wild beasts. He would next find those [Indians] on our frontiers in the pastoral state, raising domestic animals to supply the defects of hunting. Then succeed our own semi-barbarous [white] citizens, the pioneers of the advance of civilization, and so on in his progress he would meet the gradual shades of improving man until he would reach his, as yet, most improved state in our seaport towns. This, in fact, is equivalent to a survey, in time, of the progress of man from the infancy of creation to the present day... And where this progress will stop no one can say.⁹⁶

Since Jefferson believes Indians to be equal to whites, he believes that they too will pass through these stages of civilization seen moving West to East in America or forward through development.

In essence, Jefferson perceived Indians as suffering from a developmental lag. Indians, because Jefferson thought they were equal to whites, were capable of making up this developmental lag and leaping into the eighteenth century, if they were instructed in European cultural skills.⁹⁷

Before we condemn the Indians of this continent as wanting in genius, we must consider that letters have not yet been introduced among them. Were we to compare them in their present state with the Europeans North of the Alps, when Roman arms and arts first crossed those mountains, the comparison would be unequal, because, at that time, those parts of Europe were swarming with numbers; because numbers produce emulation, multiply the chances

of improvement, and one improvement begets another. Yet I may safely ask, How many good poets, how many able mathematicians, how many great inventors in arts of sciences, had Europe North of the Alps then produced? And it was sixteen centuries before a Newton could be formed.⁹⁸

This passage is ripe with sarcasm directed at the scholars of "Europe North of the Alps" who had condemned the Indians as inferior in their mental abilities.⁹⁹ Jefferson's point is clear: No more could be expected of the Indians at their earlier stage of civilization than was achieved by whites at a comparable stage. Especially since Jefferson believed the concentrated populations in pre-Roman Northern Europe to be more conducive to the advancement of civilization than the sparse settlements of North America. However, once the tools of European civilization, such as letters, were introduced to the Indians, Jefferson believed that they would demonstrate their equality on the terms of 18th century white civilization, just as they had at earlier stages of civilization.

The Cherokee tribe presented one concrete example of this process of instruction in contemporary European culture at work. The Cherokees, the only tribe I know to be contemplating the establishment of regular laws, magistrates, and government, propose a government of representatives, elected from every town.... This, the only instance of actual fact within our knowledge, will be a beginning by republican, and not by patriarchal or monarchical government, as speculative writers have generally conjectured.¹⁰⁰

Jefferson considers the democratic republican form of government adopted in the United States as the best, most highly evolved, civilized form of government in the history of man. The fact that the Cherokees choose to skip over the intermediate stages in the evolution of government demonstrates, for Jefferson, that Indians have the potential to make up the developmental lag in a single leap and join eighteenth century white society.

Most contemporary attempts to "civilize" Indians were by religious missionaries, who tried to convert Indians to Christianity. Jefferson rejected this approach, saying, "[t]he plan of civilizing the Indians [newly undertaken by Virginia] is undoubtedly a great improvement on the ancient and totally ineffectual one of beginning with religious missionaries. Our experience has shown this must be the last step of the process."¹⁰¹ The process which Jefferson believes will be more successful, such as the one commended above, is summarized in his praise to James Pemberton. "It is evident that your society has begun at the right end for civilizing these people [Indians]. Habits of industry, easy subsistence [by farming rather than hunting and gathering], attachment to property, are necessary to prepare their minds for the first elements of science,

and afterwards for moral and religious instruction."¹⁰² The Indians required a grounding in the simpler, practical skills of eighteenth century European civilization, before they could tackle the higher, more complex concepts of science, moral philosophy and religion.

The Defense of Indians in *Notes on the State of Virginia*

When Jefferson wrote *Notes*, he was responding not simply to the queries of French legation secretary Francois Marbois, but also to the European scholars who had belittled his beloved America. Renowned French zoologist Monsieur de Buffon was Jefferson's primary antagonist. Buffon had advanced the theory that all forms of life in the New World were degenerate forms of those found in the Old World. As a great defender of the New World (especially Virginia and America), Jefferson felt compelled to defend all things native to the New World, particularly the native people.¹⁰³

Jefferson addressed Buffon's charges of the degeneracy of Indians in *Notes* by cataloging each of the assertions Buffon makes about Indians. He stated this list is, "[a]n afflicting picture indeed, which, for the honor of human nature, I am glad to believe has no original."¹⁰⁴ Jefferson said, "[t]he Indians of North America being more within our reach, I can speak of him somewhat with my own experience, but more from the information of others better acquainted with him, and on whose judgement I can rely."¹⁰⁵ Jefferson's evidence is derived from first-hand experience with the Indians, whereas Buffon's assertions are based on, "fables published of them [Indians]. These I believe to be just as true as the fables of Aesop."¹⁰⁶ On the strength of his superior evidence, Jefferson continued, "[f]rom these sources I am able to say, in contradiction to this representation [by Buffon]..."¹⁰⁷ and then systematically refuted each of Buffon's flawed assertions of degeneracy in Indians.

In contradicting Buffon's sweeping assertion that Indians lack the skills necessary for civilization, Jefferson holds them up as peers of the Enlightenment's model civilizations of ancient Greece and Rome.

The principles of their society forbidding all compulsion, they are to be led to duty and enterprize by personal influence and persuasion. Hence eloquence in council, bravery and address in war, become foundations of all consequence with them. To these acquirements all their faculties are directed. Of their bravery and address in war we have multiplied proofs, because we have been the subjects on which they were exercised. Of their eminence in oratory we have fewer examples, because it is displayed chiefly in their own councils. Some, however, we have of very superior lustre. I may challenge the whole orations of Demothenes and Cicero, and of any more eminent orator, if Europe has furnished more eminent,

to produce a single passage, superior to the speech of Logan, a Mingo [Indian] chief, to Lord Dunmore.¹⁰⁸

Among intellectuals who thought European societies should strive to live up to the Greek and Roman models, Jefferson is paying Indians the highest possible praise.

When Jefferson confronted charges by Buffon that he could not refute, he turned to his theory on the stages of development of civilization as an explanation.¹⁰⁹ In these instances Jefferson claimed Indians were merely at an early stage in the development of civilization and any apparent deficiencies would disappear when they were taught 18th century European skills and knowledge. In short, Jefferson rejected all charges of Indians "degeneracy" in favor of seeing temporary deficiencies in their development.

Indian Political Arrangements

Jefferson was deeply interested in Indian political arrangements, in addition to his interest in Indians as a subject of natural history. In his study of Indian society and governing structures, Jefferson found much to be admired. Indian political arrangements coincided closely with his political philosophy of natural rights and natural law. In Indian societies, Jefferson detected the unimpeded operation of natural law and natural rights theory. In many ways, they served as a functioning model for this theory of government. Indian governing structures were similar to the democratic republics which Jefferson felt were the ideal form of government.

Jefferson believed the ideal form of government to be a system of small democratic "ward republics."¹¹⁰ In the system of small, democratic tribes, Jefferson saw the essence of his ward republic system. Indian society displayed the positive results of governing in small, democratic units.

But it is said, they [Indians] are averse to society and a social life. Can any thing be more inapplicable than this to a people who always live in towns or clans? Or can they be said to have no "republique," who conduct all their affairs in national councils, who pride themselves in national character, who consider an insult or an injury done to an individual by a stranger as done to the whole, and resent it accordingly?¹¹¹

Based on these merits, "[s]ocieties... as among our Indians... [may be] best. But I believe them inconsistent with any degree of population."¹¹² The participation intensive democracies of the Indians are the best form of government, because they operate close to the people, as his theoretical ward republics would. However, Jefferson believed that this type of

government can only work with small populations, where it is easy to build consensus among the citizens. "It will be said, that great societies cannot exist without government. The Savages [Indians] therefore break them into small ones."¹¹³ Comparing Indian political arrangements to those found in the societies of Europe, Jefferson found the societies of the Indians far superior:

...insomuch that it were made a question, whether no law, as among the savage Americans, or too much law as among the civilized Europeans, submits man to the greatest evil, one who has seen both conditions of existence would pronounce it to be the last...¹¹⁴

Too much emphasis on civilization, as in these European societies, leads to violations of natural rights and interference with the operation of natural law. Jefferson believes that sticking to the simple, fundamental laws of nature, as Indian societies do, is a better form of government. "As for France, and England, with all their preeminence in science, the one is a den of robbers, and the other of pirates, as if science produces no better fruits than tyranny, murder, rapine and destitution of natural morality. I would rather wish our country to be ignorant, honest and estimable as our neighboring savages."¹¹⁵

Jefferson retains this view of Indian society as an example of his ideal of a society built on natural law throughout his life. In a letter to Francis Gilmer criticizing the infringements of American government on natural rights, he reiterates his equation of Indian society and a natural society:

Our Indians are evidently in that state of nature which has passed the association of a single family; and not yet submitted to the authority of positive laws, or of any acknowledged magistrature. Every man, with them, is perfectly free to follow his own inclinations. But if, in doing this, he violates the rights of another, if the case be slight, he is punished by the disesteem of his society, or, as we say, public opinion; if serious, he is tomahawked as a dangerous enemy. Their leaders conduct them by influence of their character only; and they follow, or not, as they please, him of whose character for wisdom or war they have the highest opinion.¹¹⁶

In Jefferson's view, Indian society is a natural society which strikes a balance between the advantages of living under a social contract and the dangers inherent in excessive positive law by intervening only to prevent violations of one individual's natural rights by another.

Indian Impact on Jefferson's Political Thought

Jefferson found much to be admired in the natural societies of Indians, but in the vast scholarship on Jefferson's political thought the impact of Indians has been largely excluded. The focus of this scholarship has

been on Europe as the central or only theme. Authors such as Adrienne Koch, Garry Wills, Garrett Ward Sheldon, and Richard Matthews have studied in great detail the influence of various European political philosophers on the various elements of Jefferson's political philosophy. The influence of Indian political arrangements in Jefferson's political thought has been marginalized or ignored. Ignoring or marginalizing the significant impact that Indians did, in fact, have, distorts our understanding of Jefferson's political philosophy.¹¹⁷

Jefferson thought that Americans should emulate many of the political arrangements of Indian society because they allowed the unimpeded operation of natural rights and natural law. To the extent that these elements could be incorporated into American society, Jefferson believed American society would be improved. Many of the distinctive concepts which Jefferson embraced were either discovered in, or proven by, the political arrangements of the Indians. The detailed description of Indian political arrangements given in the first Appendix to *Notes* illustrates several of the major themes in Jefferson's, and American, political thought that could be observed among the Indians. Federalism, meritocratic elections, and representational decision making processes were each major features of Indian political arrangements.

The Indian system of tribes within larger tribes was the type of federalism that would be adopted by the United States of America.

Their government is a kind of patriarchial confederacy. Every town or family has a chief... The several towns or families that compose a tribe, have a chief who presides over it, and the several tribes composing a nation have a chief who presides over the whole nation.¹¹⁸

Although federalism was well known in Europe, the idea of applying it to small democratic republics was a revolutionary one in European political thought. The Indian tribal confederacies proved that federalism could and did work when combined with democratic republican theory.

Jefferson knew tribal chiefs were not hereditary monarchs as his contemporaries assumed, but that instead they were democratically selected on the basis of merit. "The Sachem or chief of the tribe seems to be by election. And sometimes persons who are strangers, and adopted into the tribe, are promoted to this dignity on account of their abilities."¹¹⁹ The selection of adopted "strangers" to the position of chief indicates that it was a truly meritocratic, as well as democratic, process. The selection of these leaders was not done by organized election, but rather by democratic consensus of who possessed the greatest skills, such as eloquence and warfare, needed to lead the tribe.¹²⁰

When the democratically selected chiefs gathered together in their federal councils, they represented their towns and families or tribes in

the decision making process.

In every town there is a council house, where the chief and the old men assemble, when occasion requires, and consult what is proper to be done. Every tribe has a fixed place for the chiefs of the towns to meet and consult on the business of the tribe: and in every nation there is what they call the central council house, or central council fire, where the chiefs of the several tribes, with their principal warriors, convene to consult on national affairs. ...and as their government seems to rest wholly on persuasion, they endeavor, by mutual concessions, to obtain unanimity.¹²¹

The interest of each republic was fully represented, considered, and respected in this process of consultation, concession, and consensus building. Jefferson saw this form of representational decision making as the ideal superstructure to bind together his ward republics. He believed it would protect the positives of his ward republics, while allowing for the provision of those elements of government best accomplished on a large scale. Jefferson was so thoroughly convinced that the role that public opinion played in governing Indian societies increased the happiness of those societies that he was willing to sacrifice European government in order to maintain freedom of expression.

The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, our very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate for a moment to prefer the latter.. I am convinced that those societies which live without [European] government enjoy in their general masses an infinitely greater degree of happiness than those who live under European governments.¹²²

Jefferson saw Indian political arrangements as improvements in or verifications of his political philosophy and in actual American political arrangements.

Desire to Assimilate the Indians

Jefferson went beyond incorporating Indian political concepts into his political philosophy to advocate the incorporation of Indians into American society. Jefferson believed whites and Indians were from the same race, the differences between them being merely small variations, and most of these attributable to the difference in the relative stages of their civilizations.¹²³ Thus, President Jefferson could address Indians visiting Washington, DC in 1809 by saying, "I consider all my red children as forming one family with whites..." As members of the same racial "family,"¹²⁴ endowed with the same natural rights by creation, and

sharing the same homeland, Jefferson believed that whites and Indians should be one people with common interests. "Made by the same Great Spirit, living in the same land with our brothers, the red men, we consider ourselves as of the same family; we wish to live with them as one people, and to cherish their interests as our own."¹²⁵

Since Indians were equal to whites, but suffering from the developmental lag, Jefferson believed that whites have a moral obligation to teach them the skills of European civilization which they lacked and to incorporate them into white society. Jefferson explained this obligation to America in his Second Inaugural Address. The Indians are, "[e]ndowed with the faculties and rights of men, breathing an ardent love of liberty and independence....," but, "they have been overwhelmed by the current [of white expansion], or driven before it." They had been limited to an area that would not support them using the ways of their earlier stages of civilization. Therefore, "humanity enjoins," that America teach them the rudiments of European civilization and protect their rights under the law. Jefferson's advocacy of assimilation was certainly not motivated by calculations of political advantage, as the sentiment of the time ran strongly contrary to this view. Jefferson believed the assimilation to be only a matter of time; believed the merger of white and red man into one people, one society to be an inevitable process. "In time, you [Indians] will be as we are; you will become as one people with us. Your blood will mix with ours; and will spread with ours, over this great Island."¹²⁶ As the developmental lag diminished, Jefferson believed the two societies would naturally and inevitably merge into one.

Jefferson thought those who resisted the assimilation of Indians into white society to be foolish. "[The Indians] are our brethren, our neighbors; they may be valuable friends, and troublesome enemies. Both duty and interest then enjoin, that we should extend to them the blessings of civilized life, and prepare their minds for becoming useful members of the American family."¹²⁷ Jefferson saw both a moral "duty" and a practical "interest" in assimilation. Indians had the capacity to be useful members of American society by virtue of their ability to make up the developmental lag. Resistance to assimilation is morally wrong because it denies their fundamental equality, and a practical mistake because it invites conflict with a "troublesome enemy."

Jefferson envisioned the pressure of the inevitability of assimilation working on the Indians as well as on whites. He explained how Indians also felt pressures for assimilation:

In truth, the ultimate point of rest and happiness for them is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix and become one people. Incorporating themselves with us as citizens of the United States, this is what the natural progress of things will of

course bring on, and it will be better to promote it, than to retard it. Surely it will be better for them to be identified with us, and preserved in the occupation of their lands, than to be exposed to the many casualties which may endanger them while a separate people.¹²⁸

Jefferson expected the natural progression to higher stages of civilization to bring Indians forward to the advanced stage of happiness which eighteenth century whites had achieved. He felt it would be morally wrong for the Indians to resist this progression, because it would be resisting the natural course of civilization. As a practical consideration, their rights and persons would be better protected within American society than if they tried to protect them by physically resisting the forces of eighteenth century white American civilization.

Jefferson believed the pressures from each side converge to make assimilation mutually beneficial as well as inevitable.

While they are learning to do better on less land [by learning contemporary European agricultural techniques], our [whites'] increasing numbers will be calling for more land, and thus a coincidence of interests will be produced between those who have lands to spare and want other necessities, and those who have such necessities to spare, and want lands. This commerce, then, will be for the good of both...¹²⁹

The mutual exchange of surplus goods of one group to meet the needs of the other group provided additional impetus to assimilation because it would be commercially beneficial.

Jefferson looked forward to the day Indians were fully assimilated into American society. "I shall rejoice to see the day when red men, our neighbors, truly become one people with us, enjoying all the rights and privileges we do, without any one to make them afraid, to injure their persons, or to take their property without being punished for it according to fixed laws."¹³⁰

From childhood experiences with his father, through his student days in Williamsburg, to his last days at Monticello, Jefferson treated Indians as fundamentally equal to whites. He saw many things in Indian society to admire and that white Americans should emulate. He explained any "deficiencies" relative to whites using with a theory that Indians were behind but on the same path as whites in the development of civilization. Correspondingly, he saw them as possessed of the potential to leap this developmental gap and be fully assimilated with whites as productive members of society.

Rather than deride Indian societies as primitive, he saw in them the functioning model of an ideal natural society. He believed that the political arrangements in Indian societies insured the authority of natural

rights and natural law. Jefferson felt he was improving his own political philosophy and could improve American governance by emulating and grafting these arrangements onto the successful elements of European political thought.

Blacks and Indians: Examination of the Paradox

When Jefferson discussed his views on race, he used whites as the norm for comparison. As a result, he failed to even consider thoroughly the comparative situations of blacks and Indians.¹³¹ He made only a few references to their comparative situations at all. Fortunately, Jefferson's investigation of each race relative to whites allows whites to effectively become the middleman in comparing his views of blacks and Indians. Using Jefferson's perspective of each group, the differences in his views about each group can be illustrated and the causes of these differences can be identified.

Any comparison between Jefferson's views of blacks and Indians is relevant only because he found in them one fundamental underlying equality. Jefferson's comparison of each group with whites did not commit him to a system of perfect and uniform equality. He believed that some men were physically superior or inferior. He believed some men were intellectually superior. Nevertheless, these differences in body and mind were incidental compared with their equality in the unique and governing faculty of man—the moral sense. Jefferson found this equality to be a scientifically observable phenomenon.¹³² It was seen in the examples of morality among the slaves, where the immorality of the institution made it virtually impossible to maintain one's morality. It could be understood as the defining characteristic of man, because it was that characteristic which set him apart from the beasts. And it was inherently equal in all men as descended from the single act of Creation from which all men have descended.

The Differences

Equality of the moral sense made blacks and Indians equal in their human dignity, but it did not make them perfectly equal. In fact, Jefferson saw blacks as distinctly unequal in all regards except the moral sense. In *Notes*, he explained that blacks were innately physically, emotionally, and intellectually inferior to whites. He avoided a comparison with blacks in Africa that might indicate these inferiorities could be explained by the environment in which blacks lived under slavery. Instead he suggested that these inferiorities excused keeping blacks under the benevolent protection of whites, until they could be emancipated and colonized. Jefferson claimed the fate of blacks in America would be

worse if they were emancipated but not removed from close proximity to whites by colonization, than if they remained enslaved. In contrast, Jefferson perceived the Indians to be part of the same race as whites, "created on the same module with *Homo sapiens Europaeus*."¹³³ He admitted that relative to whites, they did suffer some "deficiencies," but he circumvented this contradiction by appealing to environmental theory. To confirm the innate equality of Indians, he compared to whites at similarly undeveloped stages in their civilization and found that the Indian had the same potential for civilization as whites possessed.

The best way to understand the differences in Jefferson's views of the two groups is through a metaphor, which he uses specifically in reference to blacks. In their contemporary situations, Jefferson saw each race as resembling children, or more accurately, white children. Like children, each was clearly human. Jefferson had demonstrated this by their possession of the moral sense. But, again like children, they lacked the knowledge and skills of eighteenth century European civilization. They each required the protection and instruction that whites could provide for them. At this point, Jefferson's perception of them diverges. He perceived blacks as being in a permanent child-like state. The inherent weakness or untrainability of their faculties prevented them from ever acquiring the skills that would allow them to evolve. Indians, however, were created on the same "module" as the white man, and therefore possessed of the same innate potential as whites. They, like white children, simply required instruction in white civilization in order to learn and develop the skills that white adults possessed. Jefferson's theory of stages of civilization paralleled the stages of development in men. Indians were, like children, at an early stage in this process. They would, like children, grow and mature out of this stage with education, according to the inevitable course of nature.

The Causes

Jefferson once declared, "[t]he moment a person forms a theory, his imagination sees in every object, only the traits which favor that theory."¹³⁴ Jefferson proved his own theory in his views on race. The divergence in his views about Indians and blacks can be traced back to the experiences in the formative years of his youth.

His early experiences with and impressions of Indians were positive ones. Indians often visited his father at Shadwell, where Peter Jefferson treated them with friendliness and respect. As a student in Williamsburg, Jefferson observed many Indians visiting the Virginia government. He was impressed by the dignity of these visiting Indians, and by their skill at oratory, even though he could not understand them.

His early experiences with and impressions of blacks were formed by the institution of slavery. Living in the plantation society of eighteenth century Virginia, the values of the slaveholding gentry were impressed upon him. He was socialized in the benefits of slavery and the pseudo-moral justifications about black inferiority that slaveholders relied upon.

Jefferson's inquisitive mind would not let him end his investigation of either group with these initial childhood impressions. He was involved with the issue of slavery from the first day of his adulthood until the day he died. His fascination with Indians was also lifelong. Yet in all of his investigations and study of these two groups, he never discovered evidence that caused him to break from the predispositions formed in his youth. In part this was due to the inadequate knowledge and science of his day. However, in greater part, he fell into the trap of seeing only what he expected or wanted to see.

When Jefferson observed the Indians, he saw an admirable civilization. He examined them only within the context of their own society. The presence of clear political arrangements among the Indians confirmed to Jefferson that they had the potential and capacity to become civilized. In the Indian political arrangements Jefferson saw an understanding and application of natural rights and natural law. The federal system of small tribal government bound together by representative democracy was quite similar to Jefferson's plan for a system of ward republics. Indian political arrangements either motivated or confirmed many of the elements of Jefferson's own political philosophy.

In his experience with blacks, Jefferson encountered very little evidence of a society or a social bond between them. Jefferson believed this bond was the foundation upon which civilization was built. Despite his abhorrence of slavery as a "cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty,"¹³⁵ he would not acknowledge that blacks had been taken from their respective civilizations and brought to America by force. He would not consider that blacks had created great societies in Africa. He limited his scope to the lack of a society, "on the same stage [of America] as whites,"¹³⁶ among a people whose identity was not defined by culture or interest, but only by an institution that degraded them. Without evidence found in America of potential for civilization, Jefferson found it difficult to believe that blacks possessed the potential in their faculties ever to equal whites.

Since Jefferson saw so much to admire and so much that he agreed with in the civilizations of Indians, his predisposition in favor of them made it easy to find environmental explanations for the deficiencies they did suffer. They were simply at an earlier stage of the evolution of civilization, and their deficiencies would disappear as their level of civilization advanced to the level of whites. Despite his abhorrence of

the institution of slavery as a moral evil for whites and blacks, without evidence of the potential for civilization Jefferson found it impossible to accept environmental explanations of their deficiencies. He saw little prospect of their evolution into civilized and capable men, their inferiority as innate and insurmountable.

The predispositions which Jefferson formed in his youth guided his thinking about race throughout his life. Because they shaped his observations of each group, these predispositions became self-fulfilling prophecies. The difference between them was the root of the paradox in his views about race. For Jefferson, blacks and Indians represented two distinct models of non-white man.¹³⁷

Blacks were primitive and inferior. Their defects demanded the benevolent protection and guidance of whites. In return for protection and guidance, this type of man provided the unsophisticated manual labor that whites, with their cultivated civilizations and intellects, were above. This view of blacks met Jefferson's need to vindicate continued slaveholding, without violating the tenets of equality in his natural rights philosophy, in which he included blacks.

Indians were also primitive in their contemporary circumstances, but there was nobility in their savageness. These noble savages possessed faculties equal to those of whites, but the potential of these faculties was uncultivated. Whites had an obligation not only to protect and guide these noble savages, but also to educate and cultivate the raw potential found in them. Jefferson believed, on moral and practical grounds, that once cultivated to the level of whites, Indians could and should be integrated into white society.

Conclusion

Jefferson believed it when he wrote, "all men are created equal." He believed that all men, whether they were white, red or black, were created equal in their moral sense and their endowment of natural rights. With this meaning, the paradox between this phrase and his divergent views on blacks and Indians did not exist in his mind. It exists only from the modern understanding that "all men *are* equal." His understanding of the equality of men was limited to those faculties which derived from the shared, single act of Creation by God. These were the faculties that defined them as men as distinguished from the beasts.

The paradox between Jefferson's views on blacks and Indians is unresolved and unresolvable. In his youth he learned to look at these groups very differently. As his views developed, they grew increasingly divergent. In retrospect as we examine him, his views seem to us to be contradictory. The difficulty for the modern scholar lies in understanding

how he can be so progressive in his views on one minority group (the Indians), and so racist towards the another (the blacks). The modern scholar sees an inherent connection between the two groups by virtue of being non-white and, therefore, minorities. Jefferson saw no such connection, instead seeing each group as a distinct and very different model of man.

I have tried to explain his views so that their causes and development are comprehensible. Nevertheless, doing so resolves the apparent paradox only by demonstrating that there is, in fact, a clear contradiction in his views about these two non-white groups. The roots of the contradiction can be identified, and they are somewhat understandable given the time period in which he lived. Unfortunately, this is a contradiction with which we must learn to live. Jefferson's life and intellect were far too complex and wide-ranging to be neatly labeled and tucked away in history.

Notes

1. Declaration of Independence. I would like to thank Lorn Foster, John Seery, Charles Kesler, Ralph Lerner, Brett Johnson, and Doug Walker for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.
2. These groups currently prefer the terms African-American and Native American respectively. However since black and Indian were the terms Jefferson used, I follow his convention for the sake of clarity as I shift between Jefferson's words and my own writing.
3. Jefferson, *Notes*, 143.
4. Boorstin, 59.
5. Jefferson, *Notes*, 63. Note that Jefferson's use of "race" here is not our contemporary usage referring to skin color, but closer to what we would mean by the zoological term "genus."
6. Boorstin, 69-60.
7. See Benson, 225 and Brodie, 41-44.
8. Boyd, Julian Parks, *The Declaration of Independence*.
9. Boorstin, 73.
10. Boorstin, 61.
11. Garry Wills, 225, explains how Jefferson drew these beliefs from the Scottish moral-sense philosophers (Hume, Hutcheson, Adam Smith, etc.). Other scholars have traced this idea back to Aristotle. Jefferson was exposed to the idea in both sources.
12. Jefferson to Francis Gilmer, June 7, 1816.

13. Jefferson to George Washington, April 16, 1784.
14. Jefferson to George Hay, 1807.
15. Malone, *Jefferson the Virginian*, 121.
16. Jefferson's draft of the *Declaration of Independence*, in Kurland & Lerner, Vol. 1, 523.
17. Kurland & Lerner, Vol. 1, 499.
18. Kurland & Lerner, 499.
19. Brodie, 632-633; Malone, *The Sage of Monticello*, 343.
20. Kurland & Lerner, Vol. 3, 278-279.
21. Chinard, 142. His proposal was never taken up by the Virginia legislature.
22. Sheldon, 135.
23. Chinard, 152.
24. Thomas Jefferson to Mr. Warville, Feb. 12, 1788.
25. Jordan, 435.
26. Peden, p. xvii, citing Jefferson to General Chastellux, 1785.
27. Jefferson to John Holmes, April 22, 1820.
28. Jefferson to Edwards Coles, August 25, 1814.
29. Lipscomb, Vol. 15, p. vi. Also in the case of the Parisian trained cook, Jefferson provided passage back to Europe upon his manumission.
30. Matthews, 67.
31. Jordan, 433.
32. Jefferson, *Notes*, 162.
33. Jefferson, *Notes*, 162.
34. Jefferson, *Notes*, 162.
35. Jefferson to General Chastellux, May 11, 1785.
36. Jefferson, *Notes*, 163.
37. Jefferson to Monsieur de Meusier, 1786.
38. Jefferson, *Notes*, 143.
39. Jefferson, *Notes*, 138-39.
40. Jefferson, *Notes*, 139.
41. Jefferson, *Notes*, 139.
42. Oakes, 8.

43. Jefferson to Edward Bancroft, January 26, 1788.
44. Jefferson to Benjamin Banneker, August 30, 1791.
45. Jefferson to the Marquis de Condorcet, 1791.
46. Jefferson to the Marquis de Condorcet, 1791.
47. Oakes, 20.
48. Jefferson, *Notes*, 142.
49. Jefferson, *Notes*, 140.
50. Jefferson, *Notes*, 140.
51. Jefferson, *Notes*, 140.
52. Jefferson, *Notes*, 139.
53. Jefferson in his final Draft of the *Declaration of Independence*.
54. Jefferson, *Notes*, 141.
55. Jefferson, *Notes*, 71.
56. Jefferson, *Notes*, 142.
57. Jefferson, *Notes*, 142.
58. Jefferson to Edward Bancroft, Jan. 26, 1788.
59. Jefferson, 1786, in Washington, Vol. ix, 279.
60. Jefferson to St. George Tucker, August 28, 1797.
61. Jefferson to Edward Coles, August 25, 1814.
62. Cited in Malone, Sage, 341-342.
63. Jefferson, *Notes*, 138.
64. Jefferson to Jared Sparks, February 4, 1824.
65. Jefferson to Jared Sparks, February 4, 1824.
66. Jefferson, *Notes*, 142 and Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Humphreys on Feb. 8, 1817.
67. See also Wills, 304.
68. Fawn Brodie, *Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate Biography*, 1974.
69. See Stanton, 147-171. The refutation of the DNA evidence includes the possibility that it was Jefferson's nephew, and not he, who had the affair with Sally Hemings. Depending on the nature of this relationship, his first-hand observation of it may also be expected to have significantly shaped his thoughts about Blacks.
70. Jefferson to Henri Gregoire, February 25, 1809.

71. Jefferson to General Chastellux, June 7, 1785.
72. Grinde, 6.
73. Grinde, 13.
74. Benson, 216-217.
75. Brodie, 557.
76. Benson, 216-217.
77. Jefferson to John Adams, June 11, 1812.
78. Grinde, 11 & 37-38.
79. Jefferson, *Notes*, 151.
80. Grinde, 13.
81. Jefferson, *Notes*, 143.
82. Lehman, 58-59. Unfortunately, this project was never completed because a thief broke into the trunk containing his materials as it was shipped from Washington to Monticello and dumped them into the river.
83. Jefferson, *Notes*, 102.
84. Jefferson to Ezra Stiles, September 1, 1786.
85. Jefferson, *Notes*, 100.
86. Jefferson, *Notes*, 101.
87. Jefferson, *Notes*, 101. "So that from this side [Asia] also [as opposed to from Europe, discussed just prior], inhabitants may have passed into America. . ."
88. Jefferson, *Notes*, 101.
89. Jefferson, *Notes*, 101. Note that despite the geographic misinformation, this is a rudimentary form of a current theory of how Indians came to North America across the Bering Strait between Russia and Alaska.
90. Boorstin, 85 & Jordan, 479.
91. Jefferson, *Notes*, 62.
92. Jefferson, *Notes*, 138.
93. Jefferson, *Notes*, 60.
94. C.A. Miller, 64.
95. Jefferson to General Chastellux, June 7, 1785.
96. Jefferson to William Ludlow, September 24, 1824.
97. J.C. Miller, 70.

98. Jefferson, *Notes*, 63.
99. The Abbe Raynal had further charged that America, "has not yet produced...one man of genius in a single art of a single science." Jefferson refuted this charge with passion. He began by pointing out that America was too young a nation to be fairly expected to have produced intellectual giants, when the nations of Europe had taken hundreds of years to do so. Turning his sights to genius in the contemporary age, Jefferson cited Washington's skill in warfare and the achievements of Rittenhouse and Franklin in science (modestly excluding his own stature as an Enlightenment thinker). Citing these examples of contemporary American genius and comparing their relative populations, Jefferson asserted that the nations of Europe were doing a far poorer job of producing geniuses than America. "We therefore suppose this reproach to be as unjust as it is unkind; and that, of the genius which adorns this age, America contributes its full share." (Jefferson, *Notes*, 66).
100. Jefferson to Francis Gilmer, June 7, 1816.
101. Jefferson to Governor James Jay, April 7, 1809.
102. Jefferson to James Pemberton, November 16, 1807.
103. Matthews, 71 & Grinde, 3.
104. Jefferson, *Notes*, 59.
105. Jefferson, *Notes*, 59.
106. Jefferson, *Notes*, 59.
107. Jefferson, *Notes*, 59.
108. Jefferson, *Notes*, 62. The fourth Appendix to *Notes* is a discussion by Jefferson of whether the events motivating Logan's speech actually speech. Jefferson came to no firm conclusion, being content to simply present the testimony of those involved. He did not rescind Logan's speech as an example of master oratory by Indians because he was able to confirm that regardless of whether the events were true, Logan did write and make the speech.
109. Boorstin, 98.
110. Jefferson to John Adams, October 28, 1813. In this letter Jefferson proposes and explains his theory of "ward republics."
111. Thompson, Appendix to Jefferson, *Notes*, 202.
112. Jefferson to James Madison, January 1, 1787.
113. Jefferson, *Notes*, 93.
114. Jefferson, *Notes*, 93.
115. Jefferson to John Adams, January 1, 1812.

116. Jefferson to Francis Gilmer, June 7, 1816.
117. Donald Grinde advances the thesis that the influence of Indians has been ignored by historical study generally, and that the scholarship of Jefferson is no exception, 35.
118. Thompson, Appendix to Jefferson, *Notes*, 202-203.
119. Thompson, Appendix to Jefferson, *Notes*, 203.
120. See the discussion of political arrangements in the "Stages of Civilization," and "Natural Society" sections.
121. Thompson, Appendix to Jefferson, *Notes*, 202-203.
122. Jefferson to Edward Carrington, January 16, 1787.
123. See "Stages of Civilization" section, 28-33.
124. Jefferson alternately used the term "brothers" and the more patronizing term "children" to describe the familial relationship to Indians to whites. The latter term he used in the context of the Presidency, as it derives from a loose translation of the term Indians used to describe the relationship between a chief and his people.
125. Jefferson, Address to Indians in Washington, DC, 1802.
126. Jefferson, Address to Indians in Washington, DC, 1809.
127. Jefferson, Response to an Address to the President, November 13, 1807.
128. Jefferson to Colonel Benjamin Hawkins, February 18, 1803.
129. Jefferson to Colonel Benjamin Hawkins, February 18, 1803.
130. Jefferson, Address to Cherokee Chiefs in Washington, DC, 1808.
131. C.A. Miller, 76.
132. Wills, 227.
133. Jefferson, *Notes*, 62.
134. Jefferson to Charles Thomson, September 20, 1787.
135. Jefferson, Draft of the Declaration of Independence.
136. Jefferson, *Notes*, 138.
137. Matthews, 71.

Works Cited

- Bear, James Adam, editor. *Jefferson at Monticello*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, 1967.
- Becker, Carl Lotus. *The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas*. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, New York, 1922.
- Benson, C. Randolph. *Thomas Jefferson as Social Scientist*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Rutherford, 1971.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1948.
- Boyd, Julian Parks. *The Declaration of Independence: The Evolution of the Text as Shown in Facsimilies of Various Drafts by its Author*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1945.
- Boyd, Julian Parks, editor. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Volumes 1-25.
- Brodie, Fawn. *Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History*. Bantam Books, New York, 1974.
- Chinard, Gilbert. *Thomas Jefferson: The Apostle of Americanism*. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1939.
- Cunningham, Noble E. *The Image of Thomas Jefferson in the Public Eye: Portraits For the People, 1800-1809*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, 1981.
- Cunningham, Noble E. *In Pursuit of Reason: The Life of Thomas Jefferson*. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1987.
- Dabney, Virginius. *The Jefferson Scandals: A Rebuttal*. Madison Books, Lanham, Maryland, 1981.
- Foley, John P. *The Jefferson Cyclopedia: A Comprehensive Collection of the Views of Thomas Jefferson*, with an introduction by Julian P. Boyd, Volumes 1 & 2. Russell & Russell, New York, 1967.
- Ford, Paul Leicester, editor. *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, Volumes 1-14. G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1905.
- Grinde, Donald A, Jr. "Thomas Jefferson as A Scholar of the American Indian", Paper presented May 13, 1993 at the conference on "Thomas Jefferson and the Education of A Citizen" at the Library of Congress.
- Jackson, Donald Dean. *Thomas Jefferson and the Stony Mountains: Exploring the West from Monticello*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1981.
- Jordan, Winthrop. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. University of North Carolina Press, 1968.
- Koch, Adrienne. *The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson*. 1943.
- Lehmann, Karl. *Thomas Jefferson: American Humanist*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965.

- Levy, Leonard Williams. *Jefferson and Civil Liberties: The Darker Side*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Lewis, Jan. *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1983.
- Lipscomb, Andrew A., editor. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, Washington, DC, 1903.
- Malone, Dumas. *Jefferson and His Time*, Volumes 1-6. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1947-1987.
- Malone, Dumas, editor. *Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours, 1798-1817*. Da Capo Press, New York, 1970.
- Mapp, Alfred A. *Thomas Jefferson: A Strange Case of Mistaken Identity*. Madison Books, Lanham, Maryland, 1987.
- Matthews, Richard K. *The Radical Politics of Thomas Jefferson*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 1984.
- Miller, Charles A. *Jefferson and Nature: An Interpretation*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1988.
- Miller, John Chester. *The Wolf By the Ears: Thomas Jefferson and Slavery*. Free Press, New York, 1977.
- Oakes, James. "Why Slaves Can't Read: The political Significance of Jefferson's Racism", Paper presented May 13, 1993 at the conference on "Thomas Jefferson and the Education of A Citizen" at the Library of Congress.
- Peden, William, editor. *Notes on the State of Virginia, by Thomas Jefferson*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 1954.
- Peterson, Merrill D. *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1960.
- Peterson, Merrill D. *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation: A Biography*. Oxford university Press, New York, 1970.
- Peterson, Merrill D., editor. *The Portable Thomas Jefferson*. Penguin Books, New York, 1975.
- Pole, Jack Richon. *The Pursuit of Equality in American History*. The University of California Press, Berkeley, 1978.
- Sheehan, Bernard W. *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 1973.
- Sheldon, Garrett Ward. *The Political Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1991.
- Shipler, David K. "Jefferson Is America and America Is Jefferson," *New York Times*, April 12, 1993.

- Stanton, Lucia C. "'Those Who Labor For My Happiness': Thomas Jefferson and His Slaves," in Onuf, Peter S., editor: *Jeffersonian Legacies*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, 1993.
- Randolph, Sarah. *The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson*. University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1871.
- Washington, H.A., editor. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Volumes 1-9. Taylor & Maury, 1854.
- Wills, Garry. *Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence*. Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, NY, 1978.
- Wilson, Douglas L. "Thomas Jefferson and the Character Issue." *Atlantic Monthly*, November 1992. pp. 57-74.
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. Vintage Books, New York, 1991.