

University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

Honors Theses

Student Research

1-16-1967

Alexander Spotswood's struggle with his council

Joan Schools

University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schools, Joan, "Alexander Spotswood's struggle with his council" (1967). *Honors Theses*. 746.
<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/746>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshipprepository@richmond.edu.

ALEXANDER SPOTSWOOD'S STRUGGLE WITH HIS COUNCIL

Joan Schools
Honors Paper
16 January 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Partial List of Abbreviations ii

Explanatory Note iii

Chapter

I. Introduction 1

II. Early Controversies with the Council, 1710-1715 4

III. Spotswood's Break with the Burgesses 11

IV. The Struggle with the Council, 1716-1720 17

V. Reconciliation 27

VI. Conclusion 30

Footnotes 32

Bibliography 39

PARTIAL LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

E.J.C.: Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia.

J.H.B.: Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia.

L.J.C.: Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia.

American Colonial Church: Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church, W. S. Perry, ed.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood, and Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church all contain unusual spellings, abbreviations, and capitalizations. In quoting from these sources I have reproduced the passages exactly as they appear in the works cited above.

I. INTRODUCTION

The condition of Virginia in 1710 was depressed, both politically and economically.¹ A royal colony, Virginia nevertheless had been establishing her own common laws and "ancient" practices, at the same time that English control was becoming increasingly inefficient.² The situation worsened during the administrations of Edmund Andros and Francis Nicholson and reached a minor climax during the four-year interregnum which began in 1706 and lasted until Spotswood assumed leadership of the government in 1710.³

During this period when lack of a royal governor placed colonial affairs in the hands of the Virginia Council and its president, the work of the government came almost to a halt. In the absence of the General Assembly governmental business accumulated in the form of public claims and an unfinished governor's mansion. Colonial defenses, moreover, went untended.⁴

Virginia's problems were not limited, however, to inefficient government. Excessive production of tobacco, due to increased Negro slavery, flooded the foreign market at a time when European wars and mounting tobacco production curtailed the demand for colonial tobacco. The resulting fall in prices seriously threatened Virginia's economy. Many planters, unable to make a living from tobacco sales, found themselves indebted to English merchants. The decline in prices also disturbed the currency of the colony, since tobacco notes served as the chief medium of exchange.⁵

Consequently Alexander Spotswood faced many problems when he arrived in Virginia in June 1710.⁶ The newly appointed lieutenant-governor had to

deal with these conditions as he tried to plan a viable government for the colony. His background and training had adequately prepared him for such a task. As a member of a prominent Scottish family Spotswood inherited royalist and Anglican loyalties. His great-grandfather, Archbishop of Saint Andrews and historian of Scotland, sided with James I in Scotland's religious conflicts and later tried to assist Laud in enforcing the Common Prayer Book there. His grandfather was equally loyal to the Anglican Church and the English monarchy, a loyalty which cost him his life at the hands of Parliament in 1646.⁷

Spotswood's parents, Dr. Robert and Catharine Elliott Spotswood, lived in Tangier at the time of his birth in 1676. Born at an English outpost like Tangier, Spotswood spent much of his early life in military surroundings. He remained there until his mother brought him to England in 1683. The next record of his activity was in 1693 when at the age of seventeen he served in Flanders as an ensign in the foot regiment of the Earl of Bath. The War of the Spanish Succession again found Spotswood in Flanders, first as a lieutenant quartermaster-general, then as a lieutenant-colonel.⁸

Soon after the conclusion of the war, Spotswood abandoned his strictly military career and turned to civil administration,⁹ retaining, however, his military attitudes. Combined with his royalist background, these attitudes were to reflect themselves in Spotswood's desire to defend the royal prerogative and his eagerness for governmental efficiency.¹⁰ In his position as lieutenant-governor of Virginia, he would find much to do.

As lieutenant-governor, Spotswood was the deputy of George Hamilton, Earl of Orkney, absentee governor of Virginia. Beginning with Orkney's appointment, the governorship of Virginia was always granted as a sinecure.¹¹

To Spotswood therefore went all the powers and duties of the governor of the royal colony,¹² powers and duties which were considerable. The lieutenant-governor was the representative of the English crown and defender of royal interests in the colony. As chief executive of Virginia he served as head of the government and commander-in-chief of the military forces and exercised authority over the colonial church. In addition, he possessed the privilege of nominating most colonial officials.¹³

Though his powers were broad, he shared the business of government with the House of Burgesses and the Council, which together with the lieutenant-governor made up the Virginia General Assembly.¹⁴ The lower house was popularly elected and often reflected the feelings of the people.¹⁵ When Spotswood's policies ran counter to popular attitudes, he frequently found himself at odds with the House of Burgesses.¹⁶

The Council, on the other hand, was selected by the crown, usually following the nomination of the lieutenant-governor. Advisers to the governor, members of the upper house of the assembly, and ipso facto judges of the General Court, the councilors represented the financial, intellectual, and social aristocracy of the colony.¹⁷ As members of this élite group, they had strong personal and colonial interests, which were further strengthened by the family ties that often united Council members. In Spotswood's case, the Burwell family dominated Council activities.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Spotswood looked for and often received aid from his Council in carrying out his policies and in securing the support of the Burgesses.¹⁹

II. EARLY CONTROVERSIES WITH THE COUNCIL, 1710-1715

During the first five years of his administration Spotswood enjoyed, for the most part, the support of the Council.¹ Though differences of opinion at times occurred,² the lieutenant-governor succeeded in securing counciliar consent for most of his significant measures. His tobacco bills,³ Indian policies,⁴ and land⁵ and quit-rent⁶ reforms all passed the Council eventually. In addition, that board stood solidly behind Spotswood in his attempts to deal with the crises in North and South Carolina, despite strong opposition from the Burgesses.⁷

Disagreements between Spotswood and certain individual councilors marred, however, the relative tranquility of these years. Chief among his early opponents were William Byrd and Philip Ludwell, two of the most powerful and influential men in the colony.

William Byrd was born into a wealthy and politically prominent Virginia family. Educated in England, Byrd spent most of his early life there. After his father's death in 1704, however, Byrd quickly assumed the former's position of prominence in Virginia, taking the elder Byrd's place as Council member and as auditor and receiver-general of the revenues. When these financial offices were separated soon after his appointment, Byrd retained the post of receiver-general.⁸ Though he had also sought the position which Spotswood received,⁹ he cooperated with the lieutenant-governor for the first three years of the administration. Minor differences between the two at times arose,¹⁰ but no serious disagreements developed until 1713 when Spotswood attempted major reforms in collecting the quit-rents.¹¹

Quit-rents were a land tax of two shillings per hundred acres, and were usually paid in tobacco.¹² These were collected in a very haphazard and inefficient manner. The deputy sheriffs bore the major burden of collection, because few duties were placed on the deputy-auditor and receiver-general. The sub-sheriffs of the counties collected the tax and made an account to the sheriffs, who in turn reported to the deputy-auditor. After receiving these accounts, the latter issued a certificate to the sheriff, who paid to the receiver-general the amount indicated. On the basis of nothing more than the sheriff's certificate, the receiver-general drew up the General Account, swearing it was a correct report. This system provided no way for the auditor and receiver-general to check on the accounts of the sheriffs or for the sheriffs to check on their deputies. In addition, no one compiled a complete account of the quit-rents in one book. The irregular and unsystemized papers of the sheriffs served, therefore, as the only Rent Rolls.¹³

In 1713, Spotswood, always interested in governmental efficiency, set about to correct the situation. At this time, Byrd, probably at the instigation of the executive, submitted some proposals to improve the methods. Byrd's scheme would have transferred collection from sheriffs and their deputies to four newly created deputy-receivers, who were to take their accounts to the receiver-general and give sworn returns to the deputy-auditor (Philip Ludwell). These suggestions failed, however, to meet with Spotswood's approval and the issue became a public one. In July 1714, Spotswood requested that Byrd and Ludwell submit new proposals for collection of the quit-rents. Byrd's reply was a second offer of his old scheme, which provoked the lieutenant-governor to take the matter into his own hands.¹⁴

On November 4, 1714, therefore, he presented his plan to the Council. This passed,¹⁵ but Spotswood, not yet satisfied, proposed more extensive reforms in December of the same year. The Council again agreed and following the lieutenant-governor's suggestions, issued the "Orders of Government for the better collecting the Quitrents." These orders embodied several major changes. The high sheriffs only, and not their substitutes, were to receive the quit-rent money from the people holding land in their respective counties. The sheriffs must allow a five per cent discount to those bringing their quit-rent payments to them before March 1. For those paying the receiver-general before the same deadline, an eight per cent discount was allowed. The orders then set forth instructions for keeping accounts of the quit-rents and established methods for the sale of the tobacco usually given in payment.¹⁶

Byrd voted against all the major proposals of the scheme.¹⁷ Two considerations, however, prompted his opposition. In the first place, Spotswood, by reforming the quit-rent collection, implied that the old methods used by both Byrd and his father were extremely inadequate and, as a result, wounded Byrd's pride.¹⁸ The second and more important reason for Byrd's opposition was the sixth article of the orders, which allowed an eight per cent discount if quit-rents were paid directly to the receiver-general and thus greatly increased the duties of that post. Byrd demonstrated that this was the real issue by attacking only the sixth provision in his statement against the reforms. Spotswood invited all those who opposed his quit-rent scheme to present their criticisms in writing. Only Byrd responded and Spotswood enclosed his objections in a letter to the Lords of the Treasury.¹⁹

Though dealing with only one of the articles, Byrd composed a lengthy statement in which he attacked the proposed change on seven counts. The small amount of money saved by the new method would not be worth the extra burden placed on the receiver-general. The sheriffs would lose a great deal of business and thus become less diligent in carrying out their duties. No increase in salary would compensate the receiver-general for his new duties. If only a few people paid the receiver-general directly, the benefit to the crown would be inconsequential. On the other hand, a large number, even the entire colony, might take advantage of the opportunity, making him the constant collector of quit-rents. Such a duty, he said, was not included in his commission. For all the above reasons, Byrd believed the receiver-general should receive the quit-rents from the sheriffs, as had always been done.²⁰

On January 27, 1715, Spotswood answered these objections in an equally lengthy letter. He contended that decreasing the number of hands through which the money passed would bring a decrease in fraud. The duties imposed on the receiver-general were not new at all, but according to royal instructions had always been expected. Besides, it was the receiver-general's job to improve the royal revenues in any way possible. If the Lords of the Treasury supported the old method, then they didn't realize that its operation really fell on the sub-sheriffs, who were, in Spotswood's opinion, a "baser sort of men."²¹

Shortly after his exchange with Spotswood, Byrd departed from the colony and went to London, leaving Nathaniel Harrison as his deputy. The conflict, however, continued, for Byrd, very resentful of the lieutenant-governor, lost no time in renewing the struggle in England.²²

With the receiver-general gone, leadership of the colonial opposition to Spotswood's proposals fell on a new antagonist. Philip Ludwell, Council member and deputy-auditor, was Spotswood's second major opponent during the period. Like Byrd, he got on well with the lieutenant-governor for the first three years of the administration. When Spotswood began his revenue reforms, however, the deputy-auditor was as adversely affected as the receiver-general. The bookkeeping requirements outlined in Spotswood's scheme would have changed Ludwell's position (as well as Byrd's) from a sinecure to a post filled with time-consuming duties.²³ Although Ludwell too opposed these reforms from the first,²⁴ his active resistance came after Byrd had left for London, in the difficult years from 1716 to 1720.

Whereas Spotswood's early controversies with his Council were largely differences between the lieutenant-governor and individual members of that board, a dispute over another issue, the courts of oyer and terminer, was an important exception. Designed to provide speedier trials for persons accused of criminal offenses, these courts were established by royal instructions which Spotswood brought to Virginia and read in a Council meeting on July 5, 1710.²⁵

Previously only the Virginia General Court, which met in April and October of each year, had authority to deal with capital offenses. It was therefore possible for an accused criminal to spend six months in jail before being tried.²⁶ The oyer and terminer courts, which would also have jurisdiction in capital cases, were to meet once each summer and winter, thus reducing the longest possible stay in jail to three months.²⁷

The oyer-terminer controversy involved two areas of conflict. The first was unimportant and concerned the question of whether a commission

of oyer and terminer should always meet on the appointed day or if it should meet only if there were criminals awaiting trial. The Council held the former opinion, the lieutenant-governor, the latter.²⁸

This matter was first discussed in Council on June 10, 1712, when the Council unanimously agreed that the court should always convene for the convenience of accused criminals.²⁹ "...it may frequently happen," they said, "that persons may be committed for Crimes cognizable in the said Court some short time before the days appointed for holding the same, And ...it will be a great prejudice to them to be continued in prison till another Court...."³⁰

On May 2, 1713, however, because no one had appeared for trial at the the last court, and because the Council was anxious to spend no money unnecessarily, the board reversed its opinion, thereby solving a minor conflict.³¹

The second area of dispute concerned the personnel of the courts and was a much more important matter than the first. According to charter and custom, the councilors served as the judges of the General Court, the only court with jurisdiction in capital cases. They, therefore, felt that since criminal jurisdiction had been extended to the new courts, only councilors should be judges.³²

Spotswood, on the other hand, held the opinion that he, as crown representative, could appoint whomever he pleased to the oyer and terminer courts. The crisis came in December 1712, when Spotswood appointed three members of the House of Burgesses to an oyer and terminer court. Immediately the Council sent a representation to the lieutenant-governor expressing its sentiments on the matter. The statement gave four reasons for

confining membership to councilors. Criminal jurisdiction had traditionally belonged only to Council members. Unscrupulous governors having sole power of appointments to the oyer and terminer courts might misuse their authority and undermine colonial justice. In England, other gentlemen served as judges only when the commissions went on circuit. Finally, colonial methods should continue unless unusual circumstances necessitated a departure from customary practice.³³ Spotswood summed up the Council's position in a letter to the Commissioners of Trade, stating they felt

that since the Gen'l Court has hitherto been the only stated Court of Judicature in this Colony, which hath had Cognizance of life and Member, the Council, who are Constituted the Judges thereof, look upon that same Jurisdiction to be confined to them, and cannot submit to share it with other Persons; that some Govern'rs might make a very dangerous use of this precedent and bring thereby men's Lives and Libertys under less security than their Estates; That the Gentlemen of England are never added to the Judges in Commissions of Oyer and Terminer, but in their Circuits; and that it is done, because in those progresses there is but one Judge to sit on the Pleas of the Crown; and lastly, that such affairs should proceed in the usual method, except where unusual Accidents shall require an extraordinary exertion of the royal Power.³⁴

In the same letter to the board, Spotswood stated that he would give way on the matter of court appointments, if the Commissioners agreed. Until he received instructions, he promised to appoint none but councilors. The matter, thus placed in the hands of the Board of Trade, was settled-- for a time.³⁵

III. SPOTSWOOD'S BREAK WITH THE BURGESSES

Spotswood's troubles with the lower house of the General Assembly stemmed partly from his attitude toward the Burgesses and the people of Virginia. In various letters to his British superiors, he expressed the opinion that the House members were difficult to work with. Desire for personal gain and re-election, he said, not any wish to serve the colony or the crown, prompted them to bow to the will of the Virginia electorate, which the lieutenant-governor likewise regarded with great disdain. In June 1715, Spotswood eloquently expressed his feelings in a letter to the Board of Trade:

... I cannot forbear regretting y't I must always have to do w'th ye Representatives of ye Vulgar People, and mostly with such members as are of their Stamp and Understanding, so long as half an Acre of Land, (which is of small value in this Country,) qualifies a man to be an Elector, the meaner sort of People will ever carry ye Elections, and the humour generally runs to choose such men as are their most familiar Companions, who very eagerly seek to be Burgesses merely for the lucre of the Salary, and who, for fear of not being chosen again, dare in assembly do nothing that may be disrelished out of the House by ye Common people.¹

Though Spotswood held this opinion as early as October 1710,² disagreement and dissension did not in the beginning characterize his relations with the House of Burgesses. On the contrary, Spotswood, for the most part, got along very well with the Burgesses during the early years of his administration and many times succeeded in imposing his will on them.

Between June 1710 and August 1715, two General Assemblies met in five different sessions.³ In the first session of his administration the

lieutenant-governor and House of Burgesses, despite a disagreement over county boundaries, cooperated in passing seventeen new laws.⁴ The second session, meeting from November 7, 1711 to January 31, 1712, proved more difficult to handle. Failure to reach agreement over an Indian treaty and the payment of public debts caused a governmental deadlock, with lieutenant-governor and Council on one side and the House of Burgesses on the other.⁵ This deadlock resulted in dissolution of the assembly with only four bills passed, all of minor importance.⁶

With the election of Spotswood's second General Assembly, good relations between the lieutenant-governor and Burgesses were restored. The first session, called to discharge the public debt, was successful, despite the failure of the lieutenant-governor and Burgesses to agree concerning the payment of debts and claims. Spotswood, backing down from the position he took in the previous assembly, asked the advice of the Burgesses in dealing with the Indians, and the session resulted in the passage of seven acts.⁷

In the second session Spotswood appeared in complete control. The twelve laws enacted during the session covered most of the programs outlined in his several addresses to the assembly.⁸ Of extreme importance was "An Act for preventing frauds in Tobacco payments and for the better improving the Staple of Tobacco." The bill aimed primarily at stopping abuses in trade and payments. Since weight alone had previously determined the value, the colonists had raised much worthless or "trash" tobacco, for purposes of trading and exchange as currency. To correct this situation the new bill created agents to examine and certify all produce intended for export or use as legal tender. It further provided for the building of warehouses where the inspection would take

place, and required the destruction of all tobacco not meeting the necessary standards of quality. Spotswood, who was particularly fond of this measure, noted, however, that it passed the House of Burgesses only after much struggle.⁹

The third session of the assembly seemed a repetition of the second. Following once more the desires of Spotswood, the assembly passed seventeen laws, including "An Act for the better Regulation of the Indian Trade," another of his favorite programs. The tobacco policies of the lieutenant-governor, confirmed by the House of Burgesses, however, were evidently meeting opposition in the colony. This session, as a result, found it necessary to curb the destruction of public warehouses by passing a "An Act to prevent malicious burning or Destroying of Publick Store houses of Tobacco Agents."¹⁰

The Tobacco Bill, in fact, became the issue that split the two legislative bodies in 1715 and caused the break between Burgesses and governor. The General Assembly which met that year was a new one, and it no longer fell under the domination of Spotswood. Public opinion reflected in the numerous grievances against the 1713 tobacco act had no doubt expressed itself in the earlier elections. The new House of Burgesses, ignoring the lieutenant-governor's plea for money to aid South Carolina, turned its attention toward revocation of the tobacco act. To accomplish this the House tacked a repealing measure to a bill providing aid for South Carolina. The Council, still supporting Spotswood, rejected it, and the House in turn voted down a Council bill designed to modify "inconveniencys" found in the act.¹¹

Incensed, the councilors actively entered the conflict on the

governor's side and the dispute widened into questions of privilege, of the proper methods of dealing with grievances, and of regulation of attorneys. In the emotional atmosphere thus existing, any hope of positive legislation faded, and the session ended with the passage of three bills only.¹²

The importance of Spotswood's break with the Burgesses lies not, however, in the lack of legislation or in the issues involved, but rather in his reaction to the situation. On August 27, 1715, he delivered a message to the Burgesses in which he reprimanded the lower house.¹³ On September 2, the Burgesses passed a number of resolutions vindicating themselves and denying Spotswood's charges. Their final resolution stated:

...That the Message from the Lt. Governor on the 27th: August last contains in it undeserved and Scandalous Reflections upon the Persons and Proceedings of this House of Burgesses.¹⁴

The Council immediately responded by passing unanimously in executive session a resolution against their attack. Describing the behavior of several Burgesses as "disrespectfull," the councilors stated that the Burgesses' resolve was a "high Indignity to his Majesty... & unbecoming the Respect due to his Majesties Representative...."¹⁵

In legislative session the Council framed a message to the lower house. Each resolve of the Burgesses against Spotswood's message was answered in the lieutenant-governor's favor. Once more the councilors denounced the Burgesses' statement against Spotswood, this time adding that they felt it savored

... more of passion than Deliberation; And We doubt, will reflect more on the breeding and good manners of the Country than Convince any indifferent person, who compares the Message

and the Resolve together, that it deserved any Such harsh or disrespectful Censure. We are willing to believe most of your House were Surprized into it, and upon Second thoughts, will be for Razing it out of your Journals that it may not Expose our undutifulness to his Majesty or ingratitude to So good a Governor to the View of Posterity.¹⁶

With substantial support and vindication from the Council, Spotswood should have let the matter end here. With more "passion than Deliberation" also, however, he summoned the lower house to the Council chamber and delivered a lengthy diatribe against the Burgesses and the people of Virginia. Demonstrating his ability for sarcasm, Spotswood opened by stating that he would summarize the proceedings of the Assembly, since the Burgesses were obviously incapable of such action. He began:

It has been Practized by former Assemblys, at the Close of a Session, to give a Summary of their Proceedings; but as I question whether you have truly Considered what you have been doing, I judge the Task would be too difficult for you to undertake, or too ungrateful for your Speaker to Deliver; I shall therefore Spare you the Confusion of telling your own Actions, and Shall Sum them up for you....¹⁷

Spotswood went on to denounce the Burgesses for placing less value on the lieutenant-governor's message than on the petitions of the people, which he described as "the Giddy Resolves of the illiterate Vulgar in their Drunken Conventions...."¹⁸ Becoming even more bitter, he charged that the Burgesses had no interest in the welfare of the colony but cared only for the support of the voters:

...the true Interest of your Country, is not what you have troubled your heads about; all your proceedings have been calculated to Answer the Notions of the Ignorant Populace; And if you can Excuse your Selves to them, you matter not how you stand before God, your Prince, and all Judicious men, or before any others to whom, you think, you owe not your Elections.¹⁹

Spotswood then stated that to keep such an assembly in session would

discredit the entire country. He concluded his address by dissolving the General Assembly,²⁰ perhaps pleased with his performance. In the long run, however, it would cost him more than one supporter.

IV. THE STRUGGLE WITH THE COUNCIL, 1716-1720

Two characteristics distinguished Spotswood's struggle with the Council in the period from 1716 to 1720. The first concerned an intensification of old conflicts and the emergence of new ones with individuals on the Council; The second was the disaffection of the majority of the Council with the lieutenant-governor.

The first category involved three men: William Byrd, Philip Ludwell, and a new opponent, James Blair. Byrd was in London in 1716, where in October of that year he sold his position as receiver-general of Virginia, ostensibly because the duties of the office had become too heavy since the recent reforms.¹ If he hoped to diminish the hard feelings between himself and Spotswood by this action, his further activities increased animosities. Byrd, in fact, continued the struggle with the lieutenant-governor by serving as unauthorized agent for the colony.

By 1716 he was working actively for the repeal of two of Spotswood's most cherished plans: the 1713 tobacco act and the 1714 Indian bill.² In his endeavor he was successful, for in 1717 the Board of Trade repealed both measures.³ This, however, was due not so much to Byrd's activity as to the influence of the London merchants and the failure of the tobacco act to stop shipment of trash tobacco to England.⁴

In his other efforts to sway the Board of Trade, Byrd was not as fortunate. Repeated attempts to persuade the Board to take the Council's side in oyer-terminer controversy ended in failure.⁵ When the new

General Assembly chose Byrd to present the Burgesses' grievances to the Board of Trade in 1718, that body refused to accept any longer the complaints of an unofficial agent like Byrd.⁶

In Virginia, however, Spotswood was not faring so well. The controversy over collection of quit-rents raged between Spotswood and Ludwell, as the former continued to push his reforms and the latter refused to comply. The lieutenant-governor finally sent to the deputy-auditor the article of the royal instructions which directed the governor to see that accounts of the revenue were kept in proper books. When asked if he would submit to these instructions, Ludwell stated that he had no power to make these changes without the permission of his superior, the Auditor-General of Plantations. Spotswood therefore proceeded to suspend Ludwell.⁷

On May 23, 1716, he informed the Board of Trade of the action he was taking. The following day Spotswood presented the charge to Ludwell, who, regarding him as an unequal adversary, refused to let the lieutenant-governor see his reply and sent it directly to the Board of Trade. This action, which Spotswood felt unfair, caused him to write several more letters to the Board of Trade and to Auditor-General Blathwayt.⁸

In suspending Ludwell, Spotswood accused him of mismanagement of royal revenues, the most important instances being his failure to collect all the quit-rents and his refusal to keep proper accounts. Spotswood further charged that Ludwell had stated in the presence of many bystanders that compliance with the orders of governor and Council was unnecessary since "there was no law to oblige him to do so"⁹

A more personal issue than the collection of royal revenues influenced the animosity between Ludwell and Spotswood. The second dispute involved a piece of land. Virginia, while under the direction of the London Company, had set aside 3000 acres for the governor's use. When William Berkeley was governor, he acquired a large tract of land adjoining the governor's estate. While occupying both, he had encroached on some of the governor's land, claiming it as his own. Soon after Spotswood became lieutenant-governor he surveyed the governor's domain, and finding that it amounted to only 2000 acres, assumed that it had been taken into Berkeley's land, which Philip Ludwell by this time owned. Spotswood tried to settle the matter by having Ludwell give up some territory nearer the seat of government, in exchange for the governor's land which he held. No further action was taken until the winter of 1715-1716, when Ludwell attempted to secure his title to all the land in the Berkeley estate. Spotswood opposed the move, thus involving himself in a law suit. On May 23, 1716, when informing the Board of Trade that he had suspended Ludwell, Spotswood also sent a copy of the law suit, asking the king's council to settle the matter.¹⁰

Spotswood's sweeping indictment of Ludwell and the latter's secret defense had little influence on the outcome of the case. Blathwayt, desiring to end a quarrel which he considered primarily personal, removed Ludwell from his office before either message arrived. With Ludwell's dismissal from the auditor's post, the land dispute also apparently ended, indicating that the revenue reforms were the major reason for conflict.¹¹

One more councilor, Commissary James Blair, became embroiled in a struggle with Spotswood over an issue concerning the church. As

Commissary for the colonies, Blair represented the Bishop of London and held the highest ecclesiastical office in Virginia. His position as President of William and Mary College further increased his influence.¹² He had previously in the 1790's demonstrated his power over colonial affairs by the instrumental role he played in the removal of Governors Andros and Nicholson.¹³

The issue over which Spotswood and Blair came to differ was the induction of parish ministers. Spotswood's commission gave him the right to induct ministers in the colony. Induction by the lieutenant-governor, however, gave permanent tenure and as a result removed control of the ministers from the hands of the parish.¹⁴

The parishes, backed by Virginia law, maintained that the governor's powers of induction did not give him the right to appoint ministers against the will of the parish involved. Instead, he could fill vacancies only after presentation of the minister by the local church. However, if a parish remained vacant for six months without presenting a minister for induction, the governor might then step in and use his authority.¹⁵

In the early years of his administration, Spotswood, exercising a wise caution, hesitated to use his powers of induction.¹⁶ In 1718, however, in the heat of his controversy with the Council, he decided to push his authority to the limit and claimed the right to fill immediately any vacancy that occurred. When both governor and vestry proposed different candidates, as soon happened in Saint Anne's parish, conflict was inevitable.¹⁷ In July 1718, Spotswood presented the case to his Council, which upheld the lieutenant-governor's right, though without enthusiasm.¹⁸

Not content with this victory, Spotswood soon aimed his attack at Blair, who maintained that the lieutenant-governor should induct ministers only on presentation, unless a six month vacancy occurred. To the convention of clergymen meeting in April 1719, Spotswood sent a letter accusing Blair of misconduct. He claimed that Blair did not want ministers inducted, that he allowed laymen to conduct church services, and that he had deserted the cause of the church. Though the convention took Spotswood's side, Blair easily demonstrated the ridiculous nature of the charges made against him and presented ably his side of the induction controversy.¹⁹

Blair used his position as minister of Williamsburg's Bruton Parish to further challenge the position of the lieutenant-governor. The Commissary had never been officially inducted. In 1720, therefore, perhaps desiring to bring the matter before the courts for a test case, or perhaps just fearing his removal, Blair persuaded the parish to present him to the lieutenant-governor for induction. Spotswood immediately refused. No settlement was reached until the reconciliation agreement of 1720, which provided that the general court should try the case. Even this failed to resolve the conflict that continued until 1722 and was largely responsible for Spotswood's removal at that time.²⁰

Whether Blair's opposition to Spotswood's position on induction caused him to turn against Spotswood on other matters, or whether in these stormy years of controversy, Blair's general opposition to the lieutenant-governor caused him to attack him on the induction issue, cannot be determined. The latter was probably true.²¹ Whatever the case, however, one thing was apparent: During the years of conflict between

Spotswood and the Council, Blair became one of the major opponents of the lieutenant-governor and joined with Ludwell in leading the counciliar resistance.²²

The most serious aspect of the struggle lasting from 1716 to 1720 was Spotswood's loss of the support of the majority of his Council. The situation can be attributed to two things. First of all, Spotswood's quarrel with Byrd and Ludwell had reached a high level of intensity by 1716. Indeed, before the year was over, the controversy had resulted in the resignation of the former and the suspension of the latter. Secondly, Spotswood's speech, castigating as it did both the Burgesses and the people of Virginia, also affected the Council adversely.²³

In the emotionally charged atmosphere that followed, governor and Council became mutually estranged. Thus in October 1716, when a letter from the Board of Trade arrived, upholding the lieutenant-governor's right to appoint whomever he pleased to a commission of oyer and terminer, Spotswood determined to use the power given him and the Council prepared to defend its position to the utmost. Upon discovering that Spotswood had not sent the councilors' 1713 representation to the board, but had merely explained their position in his own letter, the Council asked that the actual representation be sent to the Board of Trade in order that the ²⁴ commissioners could have the whole case before them.

In 1717, the matter came to a head after the lieutenant-governor appointed a court of oyer and terminer consisting of five Council members and four non-members. Of the councilors, however, all but one refused to serve.²⁵ In further attempts to advance their case, the councilors secured the very willing services of William Byrd.²⁶ Despite his repeated

efforts before the Board of Trade, he failed to sway the commissioners from their position.²⁷

On May 14, 1718, Spotswood presented to his Council letters from the Board of Trade and from Attorney-General Northey, both of which upheld the governor's power in appointing commissions of oyer and terminer, but urged him to be discreet in the use of it. Spotswood then asked the councilors if they agreed that he had the right to appoint commissions of oyer and terminer with or without Council members. To this the councilors replied that they acquiesced in the decision of the Commissioners.²⁸

The matter, however, did not end here. In December 1718, a criminal was in jail waiting to be tried. This situation necessitated the appointment of a commission of oyer and terminer, whereupon Spotswood announced that he would appoint none but councilors. They, in return, must admit that they had no right to be sole judges of the oyer and terminer courts and must agree with Attorney-General Northey's opinion that the nomination of commissioners for the courts belonged to the crown, as represented by the lieutenant-governor.²⁹

The declaration was necessary, he said, because he had heard it reported that the councilors' earlier acquiescence in the decision of the Board of Trade did not mean that they no longer claimed the exclusive right to be appointed to commissions of oyer and terminer. Spotswood was requiring this further statement lest his appointment of councilors only be construed as giving up a power vested in him by the crown.³⁰

In reply, Mann page and Edmund Jenings immediately acquiesced, while the remainder of the Council said that their earlier agreement to the decision of the Board of Trade automatically implied acceptance of Northey's

opinion.³¹ Though admittedly their statement was weak and unenthusiastic, the Council thus complied with Spotswood's conditions. Except for one misunderstanding a year later,³² the courts of oyer and terminer ceased to be a source of friction.

The councilors's disaffection with the governor involved more than one controversy however. In further attempts to thwart the lieutenant-governor, the councilors redefined their role as members of that board. Drawing a distinction between their capacities as councilors and their capacities as members of the upper house of the assembly, they declared it perfectly reasonable to support a law in the former position and reject it, when asked their advice, in the latter. Spotswood stated that this device was used as an excuse for opposing the interests of the crown in the General Assembly.³³

An even "more dangerous distinction," in Spotswood's opinion, was made when the councilors adopted the principle that judges should give no prior judgement on matters of law. They therefore refused to discuss the legality of governmental acts as councilors, because a case involving the same question might come before them as members of the General Court.³⁴

Of greater significance, however, was the representation which eight councilors sent to the Board of Trade in the spring of 1717. Admitting their action was unusual, they stated that they were at Spotswood's mercy, for he could blame the Council for everything that went wrong and take upon himself the credit for all beneficial actions. He had misrepresented their opinion on the oyer and terminer courts, for they did not deny the royal prerogative in the matter, but only said that the lieutenant-

governor should act in accordance with the laws and customs of the colony, unless expressly directed by his instructions to do otherwise.³⁵

They next took issue with Spotswood's accusation against Ludwell, in which he charged Ludwell with instigating the Burgesses' request to keep all the quit-rents in the colony. The councilors had approved this measure and therefore, if Ludwell deserved suspension for originating it, they merited the same for their approval. Also, they considered Spotswood's representation of the old methods of revenue collection as a reflection on the entire Council.³⁶

In addition, Spotswood had overemphasized his role in bringing about the recent reforms. The lieutenant-governor had attributed his trouble with the 1715 assembly to the actions of certain members of the Council. On the contrary, the Council had done all it could to ease the differences caused by Spotswood's vindictive and inflammatory messages. They had given their assent to as many of his programs as possible, but to have supported all that he pressed upon them would have been to the detriment of the colony. They asked that no councilors be suspended without an opportunity to answer the charges made against them. Their purposes in writing, they concluded, were to give a true account of the situation in Virginia and to end the current misunderstandings. To this representation were attached eight signatures: Robert Carter, James Blair, Philip Ludwell, John Smith, John Lewis, William Bassett, Nathaniel Harrison, Edmund Berkeley.³⁷

Spotswood may have known of this document by August of 1717.³⁸ By March 1718, at any rate, he had a copy in his hands and embarrassed his councilors by reading a paragraph and asking for an explanation. Regarding

the proposals he had made, Spotswood wanted "to know what was the New measures that had been thus prest upon them."³⁹ The signers answered that since the question was unexpected they desired some time to prepare an answer.⁴⁰

On May 31, 1718, Spotswood asked again for an explanation. When he received no answer the lieutenant-governor delivered a statement concerning the councilors' charge and had it entered in their journal. Setting forth the proceedings in the matter up to that point, Spotswood concluded that the Councilors had no basis for their accusations. The Council Journal recorded

. . .that he took their Evasive Answers, to be a Plain Confession that they knew their Accusation is Groundless, And that therefore he will not think of offering anything further relating to ye said Charge.⁴¹

On June 27, 1718, Spotswood read his statement to the Council.⁴² With this, the matter ended. The Council's inability to defend its charges against the lieutenant-governor indicated that personal antagonisms, not political principles, prompted the action.

V. RECONCILIATION

By May 1718, attempts at reconciliation were being made, apparently at the initiation of the Council. Spotswood, as anxious as the councilors to end the conflict, soon proposed some very general terms for agreement. The Council drew up articles of a more specific nature and suggested they be put in writing. At this, Spotswood took offense and declared that the councilors had taken his conciliatory attitude as a sign of weakness. Several other efforts toward reaching an understanding in 1718, also came to nought.¹

Despite these failures, Spotswood was apparently confident of his eventual success. On December 1, 1718, in his final address to the assembly, Spotswood offered to wager a thousand pounds that the crown would support him against his accusers.² He perhaps had reason for his confidence for, like a soldier engaged in battle, he had begun to secure his position in England. In a letter to Orkney, Spotswood blamed the Council for the difficulties in the colony and suggested the removal of certain councilors, such as Blair, Ludwell, Smith, and Byrd.³ Particularly he aimed at Byrd, recommending his removal from the Council because he had not been in Virginia for three and a half years.⁴

The Commissioners of Trade were solidly behind Spotswood in 1718, as demonstrated by their reactions to Byrd's numerous petitions. The councilors, soon aware that their dismissal was under consideration, took the defensive. Realizing their precarious position, his own case in particular, Byrd promised to use his influence to bring about a

reconciliation on the basis proposed by the lieutenant-governor. In addition, he set forth certain conditions with which Spotswood should comply. These so offended the Board of Trade that it at once sent a memorial to the king, suggesting Byrd's removal from the Council and proposing Peter Beverley as his replacement.⁵

By April 1719, at the urging of Orkney, the Board determined to settle once and for all the dispute between lieutenant-governor and Council. Though firmly supporting Spotswood, the Commissioners pursued a more moderate course than he had outlined. Suggesting Byrd only for dismissal, they nonetheless aided the lieutenant-governor by nominating his supporters for vacancies on the Council.⁶

On December 9, 1719, Spotswood presented to the Council indisputable proof of his British support. At this point some of his opponents, faced with the expectation of defeat, began to give in. On April 29, 1720, the reconciliation finally occurred. Blair, Ludwell, Byrd (having recently arrived in Virginia and been allowed his place on the Council) and six other councilors attended the meeting.⁷

Both lieutenant-governor and Council expressed a desire to end past controversies and prevent future ones. They therefore agreed that if any important differences again occurred, both sides would draw up objective statements of their position and present them to the Board of Trade for settlement.⁸ Based largely on the suggestions that Spotswood had made in 1718, the formal agreement stated that:

Whereas divers Disputes and Controversys have heretofore arisen between his Majtys Lt Governor, and some of the Council, occasioned by a difference in opinion in matters relating to the Administration of the Government. Both Parties heartily inclining to put a period as well to all past Contentions as

to prevent any future discords w^{ch} may happen of the like nature, have this day mutually agreed that all past Controversys of what kind soever between the Governor and any of the Council be forever buried in Oblivion, and that there may be hereafter no other contention than who shall most promote the Kings Service and the publick benefit of the Colony. It is Mutually agreed that where any difference of opinion shall happen between the Governor and the Major part of the Council, a fair and impartial State of the Case shall be prepared by both sides, and transmitted to the Rt Hon^{ble} the Lords Com^{rs} for Trade for their determination....⁹

With this -- at least on the surface -- Spotswood's struggle with his Council came to an end.

VI. CONCLUSION

Alexander Spotswood, armed with the banner of royal prerogative and eager for governmental efficiency, had arrived in Virginia in 1710. Before him lay a royal colony supposedly steeped in custom and generally averse to increased governmental functions,¹ whose independent and self-sufficient spirit had been fostered by ineffective royal governors and a four-year interregnum.² That such a governor administering such a colony would experience difficulty with his Council seems a logical assumption. Following this line of thought, one historian has characterized Spotswood's relationship with his Council as a long, bitter struggle,³ and another has seen in their conflicts the disruption of an empire and the beginnings of the American Revolution.⁴

To see such things in the events of these years is to see too much. Certainly Spotswood had a struggle with his Council, a struggle which at times and with certain individuals was bitter. To say that he had a long, bitter conflict, however, is to overstate the case and ignore the years of comparative tranquility. Spotswood's dispute with the Council as a whole lasted no longer than the four-year period from 1716 to 1720. And though formal reconciliation came only in 1720, beginnings were made as early as 1718.

For a struggle foreshadowing the American Revolution, this conflict between governor and Council was singularly lacking in issues. The one issue involved, that of selecting personnel for the oyer and terminer courts, could certainly have been described as a matter of royal prerogative

versus colonial independence. When they resolved the dispute, however, by the lieutenant-governor's agreeing to appoint none but councilors if they upheld the royal prerogative to do otherwise, and the councilors' admitting the royal prerogative if they were chosen exclusively, it suggested more a conflict brought on by personal differences than a struggle over principle.

Aside from the oyer-terminer controversy, the struggle between governor and Council was scarcely a struggle between governor and Council at all. It can best be described as a conflict between the lieutenant-governor and certain public officials who happened also to be councilors. Spotswood's controversies with Byrd, Ludwell, and Blair were controversies with the receiver-general, the deputy-auditor, and the Commissary, respectively. That these three men were councilors is incidental to the dispute and significant only because they served as the leaders of the opposition during the short period of general disaffection.

Spotswood's relationship with his Council demonstrates not the independence and self-sufficiency of the Virginia Council, but its high level of conformity with the lieutenant-governor's will. His successes show the degree to which a colonial council would cooperate with the constructive policies of an enlightened governor. His failures depict the disruptive power of personal animosities and personality conflicts.

FOOTNOTES

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Leonidas Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia, 1710-1722 (Philadelphia, 1932), 14-15, 68; Richard L. Morton, Colonial Virginia (Chapel Hill, 1960), II, 417, 423.
2. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 10-11; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 410.
3. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 13.
4. Ibid., 13-14; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 417; Alexander Spotswood, The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood, Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of Virginia, 1710-1722, R. A. Brock, ed. (Richmond, 1882-1885), II, 7.
5. Spotswood, Official Letters, I, 12-13, 72-74; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 40-41; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 423.
6. William Byrd, The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712, Louis B. Wright, and Marion Tingling, eds. (Richmond, 1941), 194.
7. Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 409; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 4; Spotswood, Official Letters, vii.
8. Spotswood, Official Letters, viii; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 409-410; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 3-5.
9. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 5-7.
10. Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 410, 416.
11. Spotswood, Official Letters, vii; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 304.
12. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 6.
13. Ibid., 7; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 411.
14. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 8.
15. Ibid., 8-9; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 124.
16. Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 416.
17. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 8.

18. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 60, 65; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 414.
19. Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 411.

II. EARLY CONTROVERSIES WITH THE COUNCIL, 1710-1715

1. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 132.
2. Spotswood, Official Letters, I, 110; II, 80, 101-102; Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1619-1776, J. P. Kennedy and H. R. McIlwaine, eds. (Richmond, 1905-1915), V, 109-110.
3. J.H.B., V, 47; Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, H. R. McIlwaine, ed. (Richmond, 1918-1919), I, 563, 564, 566, 570.
4. J.H.B., V, 47, 63, 69, 80, 114-116.
5. Ibid., 28, 73; Spotswood, Official Letters, I, 110.
6. Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, H. R. McIlwaine, ed. (Richmond, 1925-1945), III, 385, 389, 396.
7. J.H.B., IV, 332-340; V, 122, 164-166.
8. William Byrd, The Writings of "Col. William Byrd of Westover in Virginia Esqr." J. S. Bassett, ed. (New York, 1901), xviii-xx, xxiii, xxviii, xlvi, xlix; Byrd, Secret Diary, ix.
9. Byrd, Secret Diary, 159.
10. Ibid., 264, 467, 470, 472-475.
11. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 84.
12. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 133.
13. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 177-178.
14. Byrd, Writings, lvi.
15. E.J.C., III, 385.
16. Ibid., 389-390.
17. Byrd, Writings, lvii; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 82.

18. Byrd, Writings, lv-lvi.
19. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 83-84.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid., 85-87.
22. Byrd, Writings, lx, lxi.
23. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 163-165.
24. Byrd, Writings, lvii; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 81.
25. E.J.C., III, 248-250.
26. Robert Beverley, The History and Present State of Virginia, Louis B. Wright, ed. (Chapel Hill, 1947), 257; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 26.
27. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 26; Hugh Jones, The Present State of Virginia, Richard L. Morton, ed. (Chapel Hill, 1956), 69.
28. E.J.C., III, 314; Byrd, Secret Diary, 542; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 25.
29. E.J.C., III, 313-314.
30. Ibid., 314.
31. Ibid., 341-342.
32. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 25.
33. Ibid., 25-26.
34. Ibid., 26.
35. Ibid., 25-26.

III. SPOTSWOOD'S BREAK WITH THE BURGESSES

1. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 124.
2. Ibid., I, 19.
3. J.H.B., IV, 237, 299; V, 1, 43, 75.
4. Ibid., IV, 281, 298.
5. Ibid., 299, 351-356.

6. Ibid., 356.
7. Ibid., V, 4, 15, 33, 41, 42.
8. Ibid., 73, 47-48, 63-64.
9. Ibid., 73; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 49, 50; Morton, Colonial Virginia, II, 423-424.
10. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 88-89, 94-95, 138, 144-150; J.H.B., V, 79-80, 116-117.
11. J.H.B., V, vii, viii, 121-122, 132-133, 147-148; L.J.C., II, 599-600.
12. L.J.C., II, 599-600; E.J.C., III, 411; J.H.B., V, 148-150, 166.
13. J.H.B., V, 152-153.
14. Ibid., 159-160.
15. E.J.C., III, 411.
16. J.H.B., V, 165-166.
17. Ibid., 166.
18. Ibid., 167.
19. Ibid., 170.
20. Ibid.

IV. THE STRUGGLE WITH THE COUNCIL, 1716-1720

1. Byrd, Writings, lxiii.
2. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 169.
3. Byrd, Writings, lxi, lxii.
4. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 57.

5. "Address of Wm. Byrd II to Lords of Trade Concerning the Court of Oyer and Terminer," 1718, Lee-Ludwell Papers, Blue Box; Sir "Edward Northey's opinion concerning the power of the Gov'r of Virginia to appoint Courts of Oyer and Terminer" to Lord Comrs of T. & P., Dec. 24, 1717, Lee-Ludwell Papers, Folder, Virginia, Court of Oyer and Terminer, #71; E.J.C., III, 470; William Byrd, The London Diary, 1717-1721, and Other Writings, Louis B. Wright and Marion Tingling, eds. (New York, 1958), 58, 75.
6. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 187.
7. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 181-182.
8. Ibid., 152, 160, 169-176.
9. Ibid., 182-186.
10. Ibid., 151-158.
11. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 165, 167.
12. T. J. Wertebaker, "The Attempt to Reform the Church of Colonial Virginia," Sewanee Review (1917), XXV, 267.
13. Ibid., 273; D. E. Motley, "Life of Commissary James Blair, Founder of William and Mary College," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, H. B. Adams, ed. (1901), XIX, 491, 495-497.
14. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 192-193.
15. Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church, W. S. Perry, ed. (Hartford, 1870-1878), I, 197, 198.
16. Spotswood, Official Letters, I, 4-5, 26-27, 66-67.
17. Ibid., II, 253-255; American Colonial Church, I, 197, 203-208, 313-314.
18. E.J.C., III, 482-483.
19. American Colonial Church, I, 201-203, 213-214, 226-227; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 199.
20. American Colonial Church, I, 202; E.J.C., III, 524-525; Motley, "Life of Commissary Blair," 500.
21. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 196.
22. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 284; Byrd, Writings, lxxiii; Motley, "Life of Commissary Blair," 499.
23. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 228-229.

24. E.J.C., III, 431.
25. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 259-260; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 172.
26. Byrd to Ludwell, Sept. 24, 1717, Folder, Byrd to Ludwell, Lee-Ludwell Papers, #55.
27. "Address of Wm. Byrd," Lee-Ludwell Papers; "Northey's Opinion," Lee-Ludwell Papers, #71; E.J.C., III, 470; Byrd, London Diary, 58, 75.
28. E.J.C., III, 470.
29. Ibid., 493-494.
30. Ibid., 494.
31. Ibid., 494-495.
32. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 178.
33. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 225-226.
34. Ibid., 226.
35. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 171.
36. Ibid., 171-172.
37. Ibid., 172.
38. Ibid.; Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 260.
39. E.J.C., III, 464.
40. Ibid., 464-465.
41. Ibid., 479-480.
42. Ibid., 480.

V. RECONCILIATION

1. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 251-254; E.J.C., III, 479-480.
2. J.H.B., V, 240.

3. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 275-286; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 255.
4. Spotswood, Official Letters, II, 304.
5. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 256, 258.
6. Ibid., 259.
7. E.J.C., III, 517-518, 524; Byrd, Writings, lxxv; Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 259-260.
8. E.J.C., III, 524.
9. Ibid.,

VI. CONCLUSION

1. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 11, 14.
2. Ibid., 18.
3. Louis B. Wright, The First Gentlemen of Virginia: Intellectual Qualities of the Early Colonial Ruling Class (San Marino, 1940), 328.
4. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 276.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

1. Byrd, William, The London Diary of William Byrd, 1717-1721, and Other Writings. Louis B. Wright, ed. New York, 1958.

This secret diary of William Byrd's includes brief but valuable information on his London activities during the struggle with Spotswood.

2. Byrd, William, The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712. Louis B. Wright and Marion Tingling, eds. Richmond, 1941.

This diary provides interesting information on the life of a wealthy Virginian and at times sheds light on Byrd's relationship with Spotswood.

3. Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts, 1652-1869. W. P. Palmer, ed. 11v. Richmond, 1875.

Most pertinent passages in this collection can now be found in the Journals of the House of Burgesses.

4. Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia. H. R. McIlwaine, ed. 5v. Richmond, 1925-1945.

This extremely valuable source of early Virginia history was one of my major sources of information concerning Spotswood's struggle with his Council.

5. Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church. W. S. Perry, ed. 5v. Hartford, 1870-1878.

As my only primary source on the colonial church in Virginia, this provided valuable information concerning the Blair-Spotswood controversy.

6. Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1619-1776. J. P. Kennedy and H. R. McIlwaine, eds. 13v. Richmond, 1905-1915.

This invaluable source contains the proceedings of the House of Burgesses and the messages exchanged between the Burgesses, lieutenant-governor, and Council. It was therefore one of the indicators of whether Burgesses and Council were cooperating with the governor.

7. The Lee-Ludwell Papers. Virginia Historical Society.

This manuscript source, though interesting to look at, was not too helpful, due to the dilapidated condition of many of the articles and to incomplete cataloging of the contents.

8. Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia. H. R. McIlwaine, ed. 3v. Richmond, 1918-1919.

This source was not very helpful because it included none of the messages exchanged between governor, Burgesses, and Council. However, it occasionally contained some pertinent information not found in the J.H.B.

9. Spotswood, Alexander, The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood, Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of Virginia, 1710-1722. R. A. Brock, ed. 2v. Richmond, 1882-1885.

This was the single most important source for my topic, because it provided the best indication of disagreements between Spotswood and the councilors.

10. The Statutes at Large: being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia. W. W. Hening, ed. 13v. Richmond, 1819-1823.

Though interesting, this collection of Virginia laws was not very helpful, as the J.H.B. and L.J.C. provided sufficient information on colonial laws.

Secondary Sources:

1. Beverley, Robert, The History and Present State of Virginia. Louis B. Wright, ed. Chapel Hill, 1947.

This account by a contemporary of Spotswood provides interesting background material on Virginia, but the information was not relevant to the major portion of my paper.

2. Brown, Robert E. and B. Katherine, Virginia, 1705-1786: Democracy or Aristocracy?. East Lansing, Michigan, 1964.

The major emphasis of this book is on the relationship of the House of Burgesses to the Virginia populace. It dealt primarily with the period after Spotswood's governorship, and therefore was not useful in writing my paper.

3. Byrd, William, The Writings of "Col. William Byrd of Westover in Virginia Esqr." J. S. Bassett, ed. New York, 1901.

Bassett's introduction provided an excellent account of the difficulties between Spotswood and Byrd and was very helpful in writing that portion of my paper.

4. Dodson, Leonidas, Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia, 1710-1722. Philadelphia, 1932.

As the only secondary work dealing specifically with Spotswood, this book was valuable in providing background information and in suggesting other sources. The information it contained from the Colonial Office Papers in England was especially useful.

5. Morton, Richard L., Colonial Virginia. 2v. Chapel Hill, 1960.

This provided excellent background material and suggested other sources of information.

6. Motley, Daniel Esten, "The Life of Commissary James Blair, Founder of William and Mary College," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. H. B. Adams, ed. XIX (1901), 447-503.

Though the emphasis of this article was on Blair's connection with the College of William and Mary, it provided some useful information on the Blair-Spotswood controversy.

7. Jones, Hugh, The Present State of Virginia. Richard L. Morton, ed. Chapel Hill, 1956.

Another contemporary account of Virginia, this provided little useful information.

8. Wertenbaker, T. J., "The Attempt to Reform the Church of Colonial Virginia," Sewanee Review, XXV (1917), 257-282.

This account provides a good deal on the activities of Blair under Nicholson and Andros, but deals only briefly with Spotswood and Blair.

9. Wright, Louis B., The First Gentlemen of Virginia: Intellectual Qualities of the Early Colonial Ruling Class. San Marino, California, 1940.

This valuable source of Virginia intellectual history deals with the entire colonial period and thus touches only briefly on Spotswood's administration.